Claudio Abbado

IT WAS very telling that Abbado’s conducting life should have come to a close at the Lucerne Festival last summer at which he directed the Unfinished of Schubert and, finally, Bruckner’s unfinished Ninth Symphony. His Bruckner performances over the past decade with the Lucerne Festival Orchestra, notably of the Fourth, Fifth and Ninth Symphonies, are now fit to become the stuff of legend, but many obituary notices failed to record his late visionary involvement with Bruckner. TBJ reader, David Woodhead, wrote to The Times: “One composer is a notable omission from your obituary of Claudio Abbado (Jan. 21) and Richard Morrison’s tribute (Culture notes, Times 2), namely Anton Bruckner. It is in the symphonies of Bruckner as well as those of Mahler that Abbado has made such a marvellous impact during an Indian summer of great performances with his hand-picked Lucerne Festival Orchestra in recent years. I first saw him conduct at the Salzburg Festival (with the Vienna Philharmonic) in 1967, then in London and Berlin and, for the last time, at the Royal Festival Hall in 2011 when my wife and I heard a transcendent performance of Bruckner’s 5th symphony with the Lucerne orchestra: that those glorious sounds were produced under the direction of a figure by then so frail made the occasion even more moving.”

His passing is a great loss to Brucknerians. The performance of the Ninth at his last concert, re-broadcast by the BBC, was one of great refinement and nobility, with the dying fall of cadential phrases particularly rapt, the beautiful string tone of the orchestra especially evocative in the contrapuntal interweavings of climbing chromatic phrases in the Adagio, the great dissonant climaxes powerful but never brutal or ugly. It was a ‘farewell to life’ from both composer and the musician on the podium: a deeply-moving moment of extraordinary synchronicity and complete harmony. 
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Bruckner and Wagner – the relationship between two contrary personalities

Dr. Andrea Harrandt

AS THIS YEAR 2013 is also a year to celebrate the 200th birthday of Richard Wagner I thought this Conference should also be a place to speak about Bruckner and Wagner. These two composers are also of my special interest. The reception of Wagner’s works in Vienna was my doctoral thesis¹, and Bruckner is one of the central themes in my musicological life. In this paper I trace the connections and differences between these two composers.

Richard Wagner was born in 1813 in Leipzig, a city full of musical traditions. His family was attached to the theatre and so he started as an opera composer at the beginning of the 1840’s. Anton Bruckner was born in 1824 in Ansfelden, a little village south of Linz and near the monastery of St. Florian. His father was a teacher, and Bruckner himself grew up in the clerical atmosphere of St. Florian.

The first reports about Wagner arrived in Vienna at the beginning of the 1840s. The Viennese papers reported the first performances of Rienzi, The Flying Dutchman and Tannhäuser in Dresden. From the beginning the reports were critical and diffident, but the Viennese public was enthusiastic about Wagner’s music which reached Vienna in the 1850s. It was Johann and Joseph Strauss who were the first musicians in Vienna to play music by Wagner. In spring 1853 they performed pieces from Tannhäuser and Lohengrin. In August 1857 the first opera by Wagner was performed in Vienna, Tannhäuser, not in the Hofoper [Royal Opera House], but in the Thaliatheater, a wooden summer stage in the Viennese suburbs.

This was the time when Bruckner lived in Linz as an organist and church musician.

1. Bruckner’s first experience with Wagner’s music

Bruckner studied with Otto Kitzler who lived as conductor of the theatre in Linz and who reported, many years later²: “At that time there were no teaching manuals which included details of Wagnerian and Lisztian instrumentation techniques. Wagner’s operas had not yet been performed in Linz. To my knowledge, Bruckner had not yet heard any of Wagner’s operas, because, during the time that he was having lessons from Sechter in his short breaks in Vienna, he was so preoccupied with his studies that he would have had hardly any time to visit the Hofoper to see a work by a composer whose style would then have been quite foreign to him.”

Bruckner studied with Otto Kitzler “new” music by Berlioz and Wagner, and especially in December 1862 the score of Tannhäuser. Kitzler was allowed by Wagner to give two performances of Tannhäuser in Linz. The performance on 13 February 1863 was a great success, and Bruckner heard music by Wagner for the first time.

Kitzler left Linz, and Ignaz Dorn came to Linz as a violin player in the theatre. Dorn also extended Bruckner’s musical horizons and studied with him The Flying Dutchman and Lohengrin, both works were also performed in Linz in 1865 and 1866. We can suppose that Bruckner heard also these operas.

In June 1865 Tristan and Isolde was performed for the first time in Munich. Bruckner went there to hear the music. And he got to know Wagner who dedicated him a photograph on 18 May 1865.

At the beginning of the year 1868 Bruckner’s Mass in D minor was performed in Linz and the report in the Linzer Tagespost (Linz Daily Post) commented:³ “We came to know Bruckner in this...”

significant work as an adherent of the so-called Wagnerian movement, approaching his task with great seriousness of purpose." But the report also questions whether this musical style can be accommodated with church music. Bruckner knew Tannhäuser, probably The Flying Dutchman and Lohengrin, and he heard Tristan. It is astonishing that he caught the Wagnerian style in such a short time.

In January 1868 Wagner was elected an honorary member of the Liedertafel Frohsinn. Bruckner wrote to him asking for a choral piece which he wanted to perform at the choir’s anniversary concert in April. Wagner offered the closing scene of the yet not performed Meistersinger von Nürnberg, the chorus “Wacht auf!” and Sachs’ “Verachtet mir die Meister nicht”. The performance was a great success for the Liedertafel as well for Bruckner as conductor.

In June 1868 followed the first performance of the Meistersinger von Nürnberg in Munich. It is not known if Bruckner actually attended one of the performances. This was a time of change in Bruckner’s life. He was appointed as a professor at the conservatory in Vienna, but he was not really secure about this.

On 20 June 1868 he wrote to Hans von Bülow in Munich to ask for the recommendation of Wagner²: “I am confident that Mr. Wagner, who wrote affectionately to me a short time ago, would gladly do all he could for me if there was any possibility at the present time. Please be good enough to ask Mr. Wagner. And then, I beseech you, send me your own response and that of Mr. Wagner as soon as possible. If this is a possibility how much could I expect as an annual income? I await your reply most eagerly.” But no reply is known.

Ignaz Dorn who obviously was in Munich wrote to Bruckner³: “Have you heard Wagner’s Die Meistersinger? I consider it to be his greatest work! His other operas are so marvellously beautiful, of course – fine polyphonic works – but counterpoint is particularly prominent in Die Meistersinger. Be sure to have a good look at the score. You will find that it confirms what I said.”

The next time Bruckner met Wagner was in Vienna in May 1872. Wagner was there to raise funds for his Bayreuth project. Bruckner was a member of the deputation to welcome Wagner at the Westbahnhof.

On 8th May Wagner attended a performance of his Rienzi in the Hofoper and we can suppose that Bruckner did the same. We know that Bruckner attended the concert on 12th May conducted by Wagner with excerpts from Die Walküre, Tannhäuser and Tristan.

In June Bruckner’s Mass in F minor was performed in Vienna, and once again he was connected with the Wagnerian style. Eduard Hanslick wrote in his review⁶: “In style and conception – not only because of its great dimensions and performance difficulties – it points to the Missa solemnis as its model but also displays strong Wagnerian influences. It would be interesting if the Mass were granted a good concert performance and thereby brought to the notice of a larger public.”

2. Bruckner in Bayreuth

As mentioned above, Bruckner’s admiration for Wagner found its expression in his music very early. In October 1872 he began work on his Third Symphony which was also inspired by themes of Tannhäuser, Walküre, Meistersinger and Tristan. With the scores of the Second and Third Symphony Bruckner went to take the waters of Marienbad in August 1873. He wrote to Wagner and though he got no answer he went to Bayreuth at the beginning of September.

There he met Wagner who was occupied with the building of the Festspielhaus and also his house was not yet finished. He welcomed Bruckner in a room in what was to become his house, Wahnfried, where the sculptor Gustav Adolph Kietz had his workshop to make a bust of Cosima Wagner.

There are many stories and reports about this meeting in Bayreuth, anecdotes of similar content and perhaps they may be true. Bruckner himself liked to speak and to write about this meeting. But there is only one witness, Kietz, who also published his version.⁷

Wagner welcomed Bruckner who showed him the two symphonies and Wagner promised to have a look at them. Bruckner later came again, was served plenty of beer and Wagner made his decision for the Third Symphony. Many years later Bruckner reported to Hans von Wolzogen Wagner’s words⁸: “Dear friend, I accept the dedication, you give me enormous pleasure with the work” or in 1884 to Hermann Levi⁹: “Dear friend, it’s right that you should dedicate this work to me. It has given me immense pleasure.”

² Ignaz Dorn to Bruckner 6. 8. 1868, Briefe I 680806, quoted from Howie vol 1, p. 141.
³ Neue Freie Presse 29. 6. 1872, quoted from Howie vol. 1, p. 179.
⁶ Briefe I, 841208/2, quoted from Howie vol. 2, p. 419

The next day Bruckner was not sure which symphony Wagner had chosen. He asked Kietz who stayed in the same hotel as Bruckner, and he told him that he heard Wagner speak about the trumpet. The result of this little correspondence is a so-called double autograph: Bruckner wrote “Symphony in D minor, where the trumpet begins the theme ...” and Wagner answered “Yes! Yes! Best wishes!”

Bruckner went back to Vienna, became a member of the Wiener akademische Wagner-Verein, finished the Third Symphony on the last day of the year of 1873 and commissioned a dedication page. In April 1874 he sent the score with the dedication page to Wagner which is housed nowadays in the Nationalarchiv in Bayreuth. But it was not Wagner who replied. He was too busy with the Festspielhaus and the preparations for his festival. Cosima answered and sent Wagner’s “warmest thanks”.

One promise of Wagner came true: Bruckner was invited to attend the first Bayreuth festival. In 1876 he saw the third Ring cycle. From 1876 to 1892 he went to Bayreuth when there were performances. There are no comments by Bruckner about his Bayreuth experiences. He was also invited to Wahnfried where he got to know many people. It is reported that “The time Bruckner spent in Bayreuth near his adored ‘Master’ was perhaps the happiest in his whole life.”

4. Wagner about Bruckner – Bruckner about Wagner

What did Wagner think of Bruckner? We know that Bruckner adored Wagner. Did Wagner acknowledge Buckner as a composer, as a musician?

“We are both the first, I in the dramatic music, you in the symphony” said Wagner to Bruckner. That means Bruckner was no serious rival to Wagner. Wagner was a dramatic composer, and Bruckner symphonic composer. And again Wagner: “I know only one who can reach Beethoven, and this is Bruckner” – that means also that Wagner saw Bruckner as a symphonic composer. And we know that Wagner adored Beethoven who was his musical idol. Though Wagner did not write anything in his letters about Bruckner, it was Bruckner himself who wrote about the applause and recognition of Wagner, about Wagner’s words etc.

On 12 January 1875 Bruckner wrote to Moritz von Mayfeld: “... I have also made significant improvements in the Wagner Symphony (D minor). Hans Richter the Wagner conductor was in Vienna and let it be known in several circles how glowingly Wagner speaks about it ... Even Herbeck suggested that I should see whether I could get any help from Wagner.” But there was no prospect of a performance of the symphony in Vienna. And only a month later also to Mayfeld: “I cannot ask Wagner for anything as I do not want to lose his goodwill.”

On 24 of January 1875 Bruckner was the organist in a concert of the Wagner-Verein. He played Liszt, and not Wagner.

Wagner came again to Vienna in March 1875 and Bruckner was invited to a soirée. “Wagner is said to have given Bruckner a particularly warm welcome, referring to him as Beethoven’s true successor as a symphonist.” Bruckner himself reported about this meeting to Otto Kitzler: “Wagner has declared that my D minor Symphony is a very important work. He invited me and Countess Dönhoff to supper and gave me a remarkable welcome. Liszt likewise.” Wagner spoke about “the trumpet” as he called the Third symphony,
and once again he promised to perform the works of Bruckner — but only when he himself had finished his Bayreuth project.\(^\text{17}\)

On 12th October 1877 Bruckner wrote to Wilhelm Tappert\(^\text{18}\): “Much of what Wagner said to me is beginning to make sense.” What did Bruckner mean? On 16 December 1877 the first performance of the Third Symphony under the direction of the composer took place - Johann Herbeck had died in October. Eduard Hanslick wrote about the symphony\(^\text{19}\): “We are not able to make sense of its poetic intentions — perhaps a vision in which Beethoven’s Ninth is joined in friendship with Wagner’s Walküre only to come to grief under its horses' hooves at the end . . . .”

One true testimonial of Bruckner’s admiration for Wagner is his letter to Wagner’s birthday in 1878, again a praise of Wagner’s “immortal masterworks.”\(^\text{20}\)

In 1882 the two composers met for the last time. The story is well known as Bruckner reported it many years later to Hans von Wolzogen\(^\text{21}\): ‘In 1882 the Master, who was already ill, took me by the hand and said, ‘You can be sure that I myself will perform the symphony and all your works’. ‘O Master!’ I replied. The Master then responded, ‘Have you been to Parsifal? How do you like it?’ While he held me by the hand, I got down on one knee, pressed his hand to my mouth, kissed it and said: ‘O Master, I worship you!’ The Master replied, ‘Calm yourself, Bruckner — good night!’ These were his last words to me . . .”

There are in this all the stereotypes we know about Bruckner and his view of Wagner: Wagner once again assured to perform Bruckner’s symphonies which he never did and really never wanted to do. And there is also no answer to Wagner’s question about his Parsifal, no opinion by Bruckner about Parsifal. He only adored Wagner.

Wagner’s death was a shock for Bruckner. He had lost his adored master, the one who always promised to perform his symphonies. In September 1883 he wrote: “Last year Richard Wagner promised to perform all of my symphonies!!!”\(^\text{22}\) — adding three exclamations marks, and in 1884\(^\text{23}\): “Richard Wagner wanted to perform all seven of my symphonies. Unfortunately he is dead!!!” also three exclamation marks!

Wagner’s grave was now the first place of Bruckner’s pilgrimage to Bayreuth. In 1884 he picked up some ivy leaves from this grave as a souvenir. But he picked up also other things as a souvenir like a match-box with Wagner’s photograph.

5. Bruckner in Vienna as a Wagnerian

Wagner’s favour also had its negative sides for Bruckner in Vienna. He was situated between the Wagnerians and Brahmsians – between the progressive and the established art. Bruckner was a symbol for the modern art, and it was the Wiener akademische Wagnerverein who promoted him. Bruckner was the standard-bearer of the pro-Wagner faction. In 1873 August Wilhelm Ambros criticised Bruckner’s obvious devotion to Wagner, that he “prefers to jump on to the mounting-board of the Wagnerian chariot of triumph.”\(^\text{24}\)

Eduard Kremser wrote in his review about the performance of the Fourth Symphony in 1881\(^\text{25}\): “This is why many treat him as a mere imitator of Wagner. There is little truth in this, and it is perhaps even less true of him than it is of the composer who believes that he is completely free and independent of Richard Wagner’s direction. What is important when it is a question of the independence of the artist? Bruckner is a Wagnerian but just in the same way as Wagner a Beethovenian or Beethoven a Mozartian, and certainly not in any other sense.”

\(^{18}\) Briefe I, 771012, quoted from Howie, vol. 1, p. 318.
\(^{19}\) Neue Freie Presse 18. 12. 1877, quoted from Howie vol. 1, p. 319.
\(^{20}\) Briefe I, 780520.
\(^{21}\) Briefe II, 910211/2, quoted from Howie vol. 2, p. 374.
\(^{22}\) To an unknown, in: Briefe I, 830819.
\(^{23}\) Briefe I, 841208/1, quoted from Howie, vol. 2, p. 418.
\(^{24}\) Wiener Abendpost 28. 10. 1873, quoted from Howie vol. 1, p. 269.
\(^{25}\) Das Vaterland 3. 3. 1881, quoted from Howie vol. 2, p. 353.
the other side Max Kalbeck called Bruckner “A Richard Wagner in reverse who does not know the limit of his capabilities and searches for them most eagerly in those places where they are at least likely to be found!”

The first performance of Bruckner’s Sixth Symphony in February 1883 was overshadowed by Wagner’s death. The Adagio of the Sixth Symphony was called by Theodor Helm an “Adagio of Wagnerian inspiration... But the following Scherzo, which contained some typical Brucknerian drolleries and incomprehensible passages as well as conjuring up the Nibelung smiths from ‘Rheingold’ and the galloping Valkyries in the concert hall, seemed to us to be far too strident and bizarre, not to say eccentric.”

Also Ludwig Hahn stated that Bruckner “should make it his first priority to break free from the tyrannical influence of Wagnerian inspirations and ideas and purge his musical language of its polyphonic excesses.”

After the performance of the Quintet Gustav Dömpke wrote about the “bad influence of Wagner, namely his harmony and so-called dramatic polyphony” and also Theodor Helm stated that Bruckner “creates Wagnerian storm and stress both in his symphonies and in his Quintet.”

One year later when the Te Deum was performed Max Kalbeck regarded Bruckner “as no more than an imitator of Wagner” and Hanslick wrote: “Bruckner is the newest idol of the Wagnerians.” And he followed with a later famous quote: “In a letter to me, one of Germany’s most respected musicians describes Bruckner’s symphony as the chaotic dream of an orchestral musician overtaxed by twenty Tristan rehearsals.”

But not only in Vienna, also in Germany Bruckner was connected with Wagner. In 1886 Joseph Sittard wrote after a performance in Hamburg that Bruckner “is accused of the deadly sin of Wagnerianism” and about a performance in Berlin 1887: “He stands before us, half-Beethoven, half-Wagner, and yet more Wagnerian than Beethoven.”

In London also in 1887 the Third Symphony was called a “little more than a sonorous medley of Wagnerian reminiscences.”

6. Bruckner and Wagner – an endless discussion?

Much literature exists about Bruckner and Wagner, about their personal relationship, about their music. At the moment I am working on one more book on this theme, about “Anton Bruckner in Bayreuth”. I try to document Bruckner’s stays in Bayreuth during the festivals as well as his experiences with Wagner’s music in Linz, Munich, and Vienna.

But: “All’s well that ends well” – also for Bruckner. Let’s finish with this nice picture, Bruckner’s arrival in musical heaven. And we can see that he is warmly welcomed by Franz Liszt and Richard Wagner.

27 Wiener Signale 17. 2. 1883, quoted from Howie vol. 2, p. 385.
29 Wiener allgemeine Zeitung 17. 1. 1885, quoted from Howie vol. 2, p. 437.
33 After the performance of the Seventh Symphony in Hamburg 1886, quoted from Howie vol. 2, p. 500.
34 After the performance of the Seventh Symphony in Berlin 1887, quoted from Howie vol. 2, p. 538.
Dr. Andrea Harrandt works for the Music Collection of the Austrian National Library and is Secretary of The Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft (International Bruckner Society), and General Secretary of the Mozartgemeinde, Wien. (Mozart Community of Vienna). Previously, since the 1980s, she has worked with the Commission of Music Research at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, and with the Anton Bruckner Institute, Linz. Publications include Kirchenmusik im Biedermeier. Institutionen, Formen, Komponisten (Hans Schneider, 2010) and Wien – Budapest – Pressburg. Facetten biedermeierlicher Musikkultur (Hans Scheider, 2012), both with Erich Wolfgang Partsch, and as editor, with Otto Schneider, of the collected letters of Anton Bruckner in two volumes, (MWV 2004, 2009).

Illustrations:
2. Wagner, signed photograph 1865. Wien, ÖNB Musiksammlung Misc.68/11b
3. Ivy leaves from Wagner's grave. Wien, ÖNB Musiksammlung Mus.Hs.37156

Levi’s rejection of the Eighth and its impact on Bruckner the man and his attitude to his work and life

Malcolm Hatfield

This paper was presented to The Bruckner Journal Readers' Conference at Hertford College Oxford in April 2013

INSPIRATION for this paper came from correspondence with Professor Hawkshaw about the impact upon Bruckner of the rejection by Herman Levi of his Eighth Symphony in 1887. This developed into the idea of using this specific example in order to continue some of the suggestions about Bruckner's personality which were presented at the last BJ conference and in the recent BJ Vol. 17/1. It must be stressed in introduction that this represents a speculative suggestion for discussion, and is not written on the basis of systematic analytic review of sources.

Some introduction is in order. Firstly, the basic facts of Levi’s rejection of the Eighth are well known, but in summary, the shock is supposed to have sent Bruckner into another phase of panic and depressive self-doubt for months if not years; Robert Simpson\(^1\) regrets this in that it prevented him working on the Ninth, and made him undertake unnecessary revisions to the First and other works; Mahler was supposed to have begged him not to revise the Third; Derek Watson refers to contemplation of suicide,\(^2\) which has been repeated in the BBC Radio three programmes broadcast in 2013; other quotations concern his ‘revision mania’ and the suggestion that his troubled mental state allowed him to defer too easily to the Schalk brothers and others in both revision and also even to the possibility of allowing them to insert some of their own composition into the revisions.

Whatever the real situation it is clear that this was a pivotal time, paralleling Bruckner's collapse and the time spent in the water cure in Bad Kreuzen in 1867 and the reception of the Third Symphony in 1877. Clearly in these crisis periods, the apparently negative aspects of Bruckner’s personality are more evident, so these crisis events are important in helping us to become better informed about him.

So the intention in this paper is to unpick the crisis of 1887 by looking in some detail at Bruckner's life from the perspective of his basic personality structure and consideration of his interaction with his friends/supporters. In so doing some of the basics of the model of personality described in the previous paper will be amplified, together with its underlying proposition; that it is more acceptable from a position of psychological scholarship to start from the minimalist assumption, i.e. that Bruckner's personality was basically within the normal range, than to endeavour to explain away his behaviour by some form of quasi-clinical pathological attribution.

In particular, the way in which he sought to assert himself will be examined, together with Kirton’s ‘adaptation/innovation’ theory of creativity. This may then help us understand Bruckner’s reactions to this final major crisis in his life and then to suggest explanations of some of the apparent contradictions in his behaviour and to comment on the manner in which he dealt with the differing interventions of his friends and supporters. It may be helpful to indicate what is not discussed here. I am not talking about the underlying drivers of his motivation to write music in the way he did, nor to speculate about how his personality might have affected

---

the structure and emotional content of the music itself - interesting though that would be. The focus here is aligned around Bruckner’s personality, how he made decisions about what to do, how life events drove aspects of his behaviour and the manner in which he dealt with associates and friends. An attempt is made to map this onto where he was in his life and career in 1877, before looking at this in relation to the specifics of Herman Levi’s rejection of the Eighth.

In trying to use a more current analytical psychological process, what is known as the ‘big five’ model will be used, as articulated by many academic psychologists over the past 20 years, but perhaps most clearly for this purpose by Costa and McRae.\(^3\)\(^4\) The Costa and McRae big five model does in a sense parallel the MBTI which was used in my previous paper, and which is well suited to an introductory paper, but for further development of the ideas it is better to use a more modern theoretical base.

The big five model comprises five dimensions/broad domains - 1: Extraversion, 2: Anxiety, 3: Open-mindedness, 4: Agreeableness and 5: Conscientiousness. The academic research behind this indicates that most of the variability of human personality can be mapped onto these five domains, with particular emphasis on the combinations, a crucial point which I will return to. In this paper we will be concerned only with the first two, although a full analysis and description of Bruckner’s personality would require examination of all five.

In any modern theory of individual differences in personality, three main criteria should be satisfied: firstly psychological research evidence and coherence; secondly, some evidence of neurological correlates; and thirdly, some level of evolutionary or developmental explanation - this latter is particularly needed because there is increasing evidence that basic personality characteristics do have a significant inherited element to them. For discussion of this and as another introduction to the big five model in general, see Nettle.\(^5\)

I will focus in this paper primarily on the second of the big five scales, that labelled ‘neuroticism’. At this point it must be said that the label is unfortunate because it implies some kind of maladaptation, whereas the theory suggests that this is a dimension on which normal people or indeed all of us are distributed with varying levels. The issue of labels is difficult for psychology, the problem being that it is desirable for labels to be precisely defined, but in general lay usage the meanings of labels vary, leading to confusion. Attempts to invent new, precise terms often seem to be pretentious, or to add difficulty, and even these are often distorted if they become in everyday use, e.g. ‘inferiority complex’. So I need to use neuroticism for precision, but offer a definition without pejorative meaning: ‘Temperamental sensitivity to external events and internal thoughts leading to a range of disturbing emotions and behaviours’.

Each of the five big domains is comprised of six underlying ‘facets’. The ‘big five’ model may seem too simple to represent the huge range of different human personalities, but when the six elements of each of the five domains are understood then the level of subtlety increases dramatically. Any individual may be at the same relative level across all the six facets of any one dimension; however there are often significant differences in the level on each facet and this is always of particular importance in understanding the specific personality in detail.

The facets for ‘neuroticism’ are as follows, again taken from Costa and McCrae:

- Anxiety; a tendency to worry that things will go wrong, prone to fears
- Angry hostility; a tendency to experience anger and frustration and bitterness
- Depression; prone to have feelings of guilt, sadness, loneliness and hopelessness
- Self-consciousness; sensitive to ridicule, prone to feelings of inferiority
- Impulsiveness; inability to control cravings and urges
- Vulnerability; low capacity to deal with stress, becoming dependent or panicked when facing emergency

It is worth emphasising that these descriptions do not in themselves imply some clinical problem. They are present at different levels in all of us; they are also not a dichotomous description of something you have or don’t have. Pathology only becomes apparent if they overwhelm the individual concerned. Indeed, Nettle and others show how these feelings, which might seem to be altogether undesirable, do have real advantages to the species as a whole, so the evolutionary process ensures that they remain in us in varying levels.

As one can see, from all or any of the commentaries that have been made, Bruckner shows virtually all, if not all of these facets at different stages in his life. We have to assume also that he was born like this and, crucially for the discussion here, that the potential for these behaviours does not go away. What does happen

\(^3\) McCrae, R.R.; Costa, P.T. Jr., Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 52 (1), 1987, pp 81–90


is that every individual comes to terms with how they are on these characteristics in their own unique way and the way they do this depends hugely on life experiences. So the task remains in further research to look carefully at Bruckner’s early life to see how his experiences will have moulded the way in which these aspects of his personality developed.

However these facets of ‘neuroticism’ are not to be seen as something necessarily standing alone in themselves. Indeed they can be better seen as moderating contributors in interaction with other personality characteristics. Interaction between basic aspects of personality is where the potential subtlety of this kind of analysis starts to arise.

We now need to build our picture and incorporate Bruckner as an introvert on the introvert/extrovert dimension. The behaviour of extrovert and high neurotic people is very different from the behaviour of introverted neurotics. The six facets for Extraversion/introversion are as follows:

- Warmth; affectionate and friendly
- Gregariousness; the more people associated with the better
- Assertiveness; forceful, socially ascendant
- Activity; lives at a fast pace, sense of energy
- Excitement seeking; likes stimulation, noisy, fast-paced environments
- Positive emotions; tendency to experience joy, excitement, optimism

This is a technical definition of extrovert; it is not the everyday view of talkative bouncy sociability. I would take the view that Bruckner was low on a number of these facets and essentially introvert, despite the fact that number of contemporaries suggest that he was a friendly and relatively sociable person. However all that practice on his own in the organ loft, all that focused academic work with Simon Sechter, this would all point to basic introversion. Indeed his tendency to become more sociable in prescribed social situations, such as after several glasses of pilsner or in which there are rules of engagement, such as in dancing, or indeed restaurants and hostfries, would point to the same conclusion.

A further pointer lies in his tendency to give nicknames to everything, this includes his friends, his symphonies, the keys in which they are written, the clothes that he wears, even the themes within the symphonies. This propensity for nicknames is an interesting topic in itself. I would explain nicknames as the anxious introvert’s way of expressing a gentle sense of humour and of maintaining an internal sense of identity. Introverts typically have problems with self-disclosure. The nicknames are very personal, how he comes to see things and people so they have a personal meaning to him and so become a way of coding his thinking to others. Bruckner’s use of nicknames would make an interesting study.

It’s a characteristic of anxious introverts that as personalities they are always acutely aware of the big cloud that threatens to overcome the silver lining of the moment. However good the circumstances at any one time seem to be, they are always extremely sensitive to any sign that things are going to change for the worse.

It is likely that Bruckner was not as extreme on the introvert dimension as he was on neuroticism, and could well have had different levels on different facets, but I would suggest that he was however very low on the facet of assertiveness. As an anxious introvert you really don’t like conflict, so how does someone like Bruckner influence others? Robert Simpson asserts that “Bruckner’s extreme humility and bully-ability are well-known.” However, as might be expected, my view is that it is not quite as simple as this. Assertiveness can be looked at as a behavioural strategy.

There are a number of ways in which one can achieve a measure of influence over other people, for example. Firstly and most obviously, by force of natural personality, the extravert facet of dominance – which evidence indicates is not the case for Bruckner. Secondly, by argument and by persuasive skills, again probably not the case with him. Thirdly, by formalised authority: others have to accept what you say because you are in formal control over them. Fourthly by expertise: other people know that you know more about something relevant than they do, so that when a question about this kind of thing arises, your views will have ‘expert power’ and can be accepted. Fifthly, by getting people to like you; so that although you have often given in to what they want to do, because you don't like conflict, you hope that you've achieved a level of positive warmth and affection, so that when you ask for something important to you in a non-assertive way, they will accept it because they like you. Sixthly by a secretive independent stubbornness; that is by appearing to agree but actually doing your own thing when other people are not around. Seventhly, you reach the end of your tether in terms of being patient and accepting and then you explode in anger, stubbornness and rigidity; you don’t do

---

this well, because you are in a highly emotional state and as you don’t do it often you aren’t skilled; afterwards the general worry/anxiety state kicks in, so you profoundly regret it.

Looking at it this way, one can develop a set of different hypotheses about the choices Bruckner made in his life. Take the introvert anxious and non-dominant personality, and add in his conservative upbringing and the way this will have reinforced respect for authority - not to mention the influence of the Catholic Church. So his life experience and education and religion will be reinforcing him to do as he’s told or face the [dreadful] consequences. So if he can’t assert himself via the first two options above, then he learns and works hard at developing the others. Indeed Bruckner’s intense Catholic faith is clearly a mixed blessing in this situation. Authoritarian religions can offer release and support for the pain of unhappiness, but in return they tend to demand obedience and so can raise the level of anxiety, starting a circle of guilt and repetitive or ritualised behaviour.

So, given his undoubted high level of drive and motivation, he clearly wanted make an impact in the world, how does Bruckner get to assert himself? Well, he can become the teacher, the expert. Convention means that those in authority have expertise to tell and to instruct from their position of authority or indeed from their position of expertise. Maybe Bruckner didn’t quite see it in these terms, but one can take a more positive view of his behaviour by looking at it in this way and we do know that he grew up in an extremely conventional social situation.

And even in his social life, it’s easier to be social on the dance floor in the traditional format of dancing, your role is prescribed. Interaction in so-called polite and sophisticated Viennese society is a persuasive influential political game involving social skills and demands much more of a capacity to influence which Bruckner never learned and which he was temperamentally unsuited to develop. And this is one area where his prolonged apprenticeship would not have helped, as by the time he needed this in Vienna, he was too old and set in his ways.

So as a subordinate he acquiesces and then feels resentful if he’s been put upon and excluded. And when in control as a teacher, he expects to be listened to. And so in everyday life he puts up with other more naturally forceful people, possibly seeming to be weak and acquiescent, until he explodes, as he did in a number of the quoted stories of his behaviour, such as the incident with Josef Schalk and the Fifth Symphony in the restaurant.

This model of his behaviour also applies to social life. As Andrea Harrandt states in Cambridge Companion To Bruckner, 7 he preferred to “surround himself with his pupils in simple inns and taverns”, and so achieved no social prominence. Well, how you behave in a simple inn is less constrained, more easily relaxed, less demanding on social skills, and also his ongoing troubles and anxiety will recede somewhat after a few Pilsners…. What is relevant here is that he did enjoy the company of young people and importantly in this respect he is not reactionary and quite open minded. On their part they may have commented on his old fashioned dress and eccentricity - but what new generation 30 years younger does not in some ways see their beloved elders as curious relics?

One important point to note is that those close to him are likely to be surprised at his outbursts. They only see an easy-going nature and acquiescence until he explodes in anger, or they assume that he will do as they say until he simply doesn’t accept it and says no or goes away and ignores them when he is on his own. This is quite consistent for this personality type but can appear to others as unpredictable and contradictory. However when he does explode, because of his personality style, he does anger very badly - as he is not practised in it and only reacts in this way when he’s almost out of control. And after this what happens? A great deal of guilt, and often an apologetic letter, or reconciliation, as appears to have happened, especially with Josef Schalk.

So in this view a rather simple interpretation of his basic personality can illuminate various aspects of behaviour, even the “obsessional collection of certificates”, referred to by Donald Macleod in the recent, January 2013 BBC Radio Three Composer of the Week programme. This reading would say that he would see acquisition of certificates as proof of his expertise to allow him to assert himself and, given what he actually achieved, no one else had the right to challenge him. He was told by Herbeck after his examination at the Vienna Konservatorium, “he should have examined us”. 8

If we look at Bruckner in this way, we can also see why he was so subservient to Wagner. He regards Wagner as a pre-eminent musical talent and none of the learned approaches to assert himself described above could possibly work with Wagner, who was also a dominant, persuasive personality and far better read than Bruckner. And then his hero gives him a few glasses of beer and he becomes quite overwhelmed! The same thing could be said about Levi, the celebrated conductor, who premiered Parsifal, possibly only second to Wagner in Bruckner’s eyes.

---

8 Simpson, R op cit. p 17, from Gollerich-Auer, III / 1, page 117
At this point, we have a model of an anxious introvert whose repertoire of behaviour to succeed is by becoming hugely expert, located in a formal authority structure and, socially, restricted to a small group of close friends, with whom he does not feel the need to behave with special social niceties or strange etiquette. So in this interpretation some behaviours which seem excessive in a number of respects, are seen not as symptom of ‘pathetic dependence’ but an adaptation of his basic underlying personality to what he wants to achieve. This is not to say that he found life easy, as he clearly did not, but it is a more positive approach which accepts the reality of his personality.

I would like now to introduce a further psychological model, relating to creativity, which is Michael Kirton’s theory of ‘Adaptation and Innovation’. In the psychological jargon this is a measure of cognitive style or preferred approach to thinking and problem solving. Kirton sees two types of creativity; essentially described as people who ‘do things differently’, or people who seek to ‘do the same thing better’. In his view people can be equally creative in both modes and such people will differ from those people who are not very creative.

However, whether you typically and comfortably act in one or other of these styles is significantly driven by your personality structure. Kirton suggests that while adaptors prefer to do well within a given paradigm, innovators would rather do differently, thereby striving to transcend existing paradigms. My own research shows that most well-known personality theories and measures, such as the ‘big five’ can easily be mapped onto Kirton’s model. To summarise:

**Adaptors are:**
- Precise, disciplined
- Able to sustain accuracy
- Tend to be ‘authorities’ about their chosen subject
- Challenge rules only when assured of support

**Innovators are:**
- Undisciplined, think tangentially
- Capable of routine only in short bursts
- Challenge the rules and past custom
- Appear on the surface to have little self-doubt when generating ideas

Without going any further into this, the writer’s view is that Bruckner is an adaptor. This may be hard for some to accept, given that the music is clearly in many respects forward-looking and appears to be enormously innovative. However the crucial thing is the way in which it is created. Bruckner’s approach is to create symphonies by an extension of what has gone before, not by radical changes or “doing the whole thing differently”. His attention is focused, he doesn’t seek to overturn the basic model of a symphony, and by nature he is not a natural radical. A good example from this is from Frederick Eckstein, where he describes Bruckner’s model of teaching, which is only to allow yourself to compose after you have a total understanding of the underlying theory. Also see Julian Horton, “In effect Bruckner anchors an essentially modernistic technique in a strict compositional principle... the music embodies a dialectic of innovation and tradition that Bruckner has sought to synthesize into a coherent symphonic style.”

This is crucial to what follows. Bruckner is at heart a craftsman, a builder, and not a conceptual or intellectual architect. He is not a man who draws a grand concept but rather, he sees how his craftsmanship can build a bigger and grander symphony, but he has to work at it very carefully and systematically. Furthermore, like the mediaeval stonemasons, who I think have something in common with him, his efforts do not always succeed. The analogy of Bruckner’s music to cathedrals is well known, but I prefer to use it in the manner of how they were built. Many mediaeval cathedrals fell down partway through their construction as the will to build bigger was strong but the theory and knowledge of structure had to be learned as they went along. What they did have were peerless craftsmen and if it fell, the cathedral had to be steadily built again. Bruckner's construction, as described by scholars, is always careful, based on detailed knowledge and craftsmanship and never as it were dashed off in moment of inspiration. And one of the reasons that he does this is that he feels that he should never be criticised for what he composes, because of its impeccable grounding.

---

11 Johnson, S., *Bruckner Remembered*, Faber and Faber, 1998, pp. 91-95
However, his drive, his motivation to compose and to be a significant composer, sets his basically anxious personality against the musical orthodoxy of the time. His motivation and his drive to compose and be remembered as a composer of symphonies in the mould of Beethoven, but going beyond him, under the inspiration of Wagner, is at odds with his level of general anxiety. His ambition puts him into situations of real stress to his personality.

And this seems to me to be the source of the one of his core dilemmas. The problem of structure and form of larger and larger symphonies is very difficult to solve and indeed is the source of many of the issues that commentators subsequently see in his revisions. But the form was crucial to him and this is why simplistic criticism hurt so much when nobody else seemed to see the trouble that he took over it. We will return to this point when we come to Levi’s rejection of the Eighth, but to summarise at this stage: we have an anxious introvert, who influences by his expertise and the formal positions to which he can rise, who is driven to create, but the process of creation is built upon a total base of skill and expertise.

But crucially what the writer has learned from all the scholarship from many of those present at the Bruckner Journal Conference, and the contributions to the Bruckner Journal, is that the music is subtle and complex and sophisticated. The symphonies are enormous affairs and from the perspective of psychological task-analysis, they can be seen as huge problem-solving tasks to balance the structure with their level of aspiration and innovation, requiring a mix of inspired craftsmanship and focused effort to resolve the formal problems that they present. All this allows for many possible solutions, with by no means one best option.

But let us now turn to 1887. Bruckner is 62/63. What is his life situation? He has been successful, really for the first time in his career. However his health is declining as possibly is his energy. He has spent the past two to three years writing his Eighth Symphony, which is of a larger scale both in terms of size and emotional expressiveness than his earlier works. It is possibly the most complex and demanding thing that he’s yet done; his success may have allowed him to let his emotional guard slip somewhat given that nothing too bad has happened to him for some while; his own view is that the Eighth Symphony is the best thing that he’s done. His reputation in the community, as described in by Andrea Harrandt,13 is actually quite good, even though being the anxious person that he is, he is likely still to be concerned about Hanslick and money.

But it must be remembered that the underling anxieties and fears are still there; they don’t go away with a greater level of apparent security. It’s poor psychology to assume that his underlying personality will change as a result of success, the inbuilt sensitive warning systems are still in place. Last week’s show of recognition might have been good, but it may well not reassure this week. It is an imbalance between the capacity for positive and negative emotion - but remember, there a good many of us like that.

And then, in all hope and expectation, he receives this:

For eight days now my mind has been occupied writing you a long letter. Never has it been so difficult for me to find the right words for what I wish to say. But I cannot postpone any longer.

So: it is impossible for me to perform the eighth in its present form. I cannot grasp it. However masterful and grandiose the themes may be, their working out seems questionable to me, and I find the orchestration quite impossible. Far be it from me to wish to render judgment. I can only give you my impression and postulate about the potential impact upon a public such as mine. And so I cannot deceive you: the performance of the eighth on one of my subscription concerts is a risk that, in your interests, I must not take. When, at the first rehearsal of the seventh, the orchestra became impatient and protested that the piece should be removed from the repertoire, I was able to step in on behalf of the work and say to the musicians: “In the fifth rehearsal you will like it!” I cannot do this for the eighth. I have sat over the score for hours, in fact for days, and have not come closer to the work. How I wish I could say that the fault was entirely mine. What do your Viennese friends say? I cannot imagine that I have suddenly lost all understanding of you; I am much more inclined to believe that in recent years the isolation and the constant struggle with the world have somehow blurred your sense of beauty, symmetry and sound. How else can one explain your handling of the trumpets (and of the brass in general)? Don’t ask me to delve further into the details; believe me when I say how distressed I am to have to send you such disappointing news. Please release me from my promise to perform the work; I would certainly conduct it badly. Let me do the Romantic [fourth symphony] in November! -- Send me your response soon, whatever it may be. But let me know how you have received these lines that have been so difficult for me. Don’t lose your
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courage; look at your work again; consult with your friends, with Schalk. Perhaps a great
deal can be accomplished with a revision.

Don’t be angry with me! Take me for an ass; that doesn’t matter to me. But don’t think my
feelings for you have changed or that they ever could.\textsuperscript{14}

The letter may have been written in good faith, but in practice, and admittedly with hindsight, seems rather
inert. Essentially Levi won’t perform the symphony as he has spent a number of days reviewing it [but not
long compared to the three years spent in its composition]. From a letter sent to Josef Schalk, in advance of
his letter to Bruckner, reported in Gault,\textsuperscript{15} he thinks it’s too much like the Seventh Symphony, “almost
mechanical copying” [!] which seems even from an amateur musical perspective, quite a remarkable thing to
say; he does not address the detail of quite why he doesn’t like it or what it is about it that he doesn’t understand,
which is an important point I will return to later; and to add insult to injury, he suggests that maybe Bruckner
is getting rather old and tired and that his creativity is declining. Furthermore he knows that all of this will
upset him, and yet he sends a letter in these terms.

One might imagine that anybody might be upset by this. For Bruckner it seems rather like at the very time
that he’s beginning to relax at his Bösendorfer and compose, his best supporter pulls the rug from underneath
him. However, we can look at the Levi letter in detail to see why the criticism really hurts. Nobody seems to
ever have discussed with Bruckner the detail of his thinking about form and why the symphonies have the
structure they do. Levi does not say anything like, “I’ve studied [whichever movement it is] and at this point
don’t see why you have done this, or why is this key change here, or why is this theme returning at this point?”
In his comments he is just not at the same level of detail as Bruckner who has spent months and months
thinking of trying things out, altering and gradually building up the structure. As Donald Macleod said in the
BBC Radio 3 Composer of the Week programmes recently, “his friends may have understood him [a rather
generous comment] but they didn’t understand his music.” The writer has yet to see any literature which
suggests any significant in-depth discussion with Bruckner about the detail of the structure in the form of the
symphonies by anybody.

On this reading my conclusion is that Bruckner is, in his creative process, a lonely figure. No one seems to
appreciate the sheer effort he has put into trying to get the structure right. Levi says, “don’t ask me to go into
detail.” Why not, one is tempted to ask, if he sees so much wrong and he has spent so much time over it? Even
Bruckner’s hero Wagner does not seem to have talked through his work in detail with him. And when Bruckner
does tend to give examples about why he has done things, he uses non-musical, down to earth analogies, such
as the comment about the polka and the chorale in the Third Symphony finale, likened to dance music heard
from one side of the street, the master architect Schmidt on his deathbed on the other. So he isn’t assertive, he
just isn’t influential in explaining what he does, and he so has to sort out within himself all the massive criticism
that he receives of the form of his work.

What does an anxious introvert do under such pressure? He deals with it in his own ways, one of which is
to retreat to his strength and to ways in which he has dealt with problems before. Firstly, he works - hard. The
fact that he does this leads me to the view that he was not near collapse at this point. He did not descend into
helplessness or depressive inactivity. But in these situations, judgement can be poor. Typically under stress
people of this type sometimes fail to see the ‘obvious’ whilst pursuing some detail which has become crucially
important to them, for example the emphasis on removing consecutive octaves, referred to by Gault\textsuperscript{16}.

And the suggestion has already been made that age and deteriorating health are likely to have had the effect of slowing
down the amount of work he could do, as well as affecting his memory.

We must also remember that he is still concerned about his legacy. In spite of all that has happened, he has
set his sights high. He has no difficulty in generating music, as he has a reputation as an inspired improviser,
as indeed was Beethoven. But composition is different, a much more serious matter. It needs care and time to
get it right, as he taught his pupils. So, under threat, he will be concerned as never before to ensure that his
existing works are as good as he can make them. Perhaps only after this is done, re-working the First
Symphony, can he address the hurtful question of reworking the initially ill-fated Eighth. This is because
typically creativity is stimulated by pressure and stress but in a U shaped curve, too little and there is no real
commitment, and too much is stultifying. So it may have been to the Eighth Symphony’s advantage that he
did not rush to totally revise it when he was in the initial stages of upset.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14} Harrandt A., & Schneider O., eds. Briefe 1887 - 1896, Vienna, MWV 2003, p. 23, trans. Hawkshaw P., in his critical report for the
scores of the 8th symphony, to be published MWV 2014.


\textsuperscript{16} Ibid. p. 137.
\end{flushright}
He reworks everything from the position of the craftsman that he is. He looks at the whole complexity of the composition again and at times comes to a different solution to the problems that he is facing. Dermot Gault’s suggestion that he tends to apply what he has learned as he has progressed through his compositional career to what he has composed in the past is totally consistent with this view.\(^\text{17}\) This is not to say that his later efforts are always ‘better’; in solving one problem with a newer approach he may let other problems arise. But it does not seem to suggest that he became unable to work or unable to focus his attention, it’s simply the choice and direction of his attention that changed as a result of Levi’s rejection.

There remains the question of cuts. If the foregoing analysis is at least partly correct, the issue of cuts is profoundly difficult. Bruckner is caught in between two unpleasant options: on the one hand he wants the music performed and is worried that orchestras and audiences will not understand and react against the length, but on the other had he seeks to have the scores exactly as he wants them. And this dilemma is only cranked up by his high level of drive and motivation; he must decide and not let others do so for him. So he might agree in desperation to cuts, albeit only for one performance, which are likely to be less than well-judged because he only knows one way to compose; as I said in the earlier paper, when forced out of a preferred way of working, decisions made by anyone can be immature or imbalanced.

So what about the influence of other people? Well, as has been suggested here, Bruckner can see different solutions to all of the problems faced with the structure and form of his works. This doesn't stop him listening to suggestions. He’s not rigid, although he can often be stubborn. If he likes an idea, he may choose to graft it into his own working; after all an idea from somebody else might solve some of the problems that he is seeking to resolve. An example of this might be the inclusion of harps in the Eighth Symphony, a reminiscence of Friedrich Eckstein.\(^\text{18}\) He was of the conviction that harps do not belong in symphonies. Liszt might use them, but Liszt was writing symphonic poems. So he refuses to contemplate harps, whatever anyone else might do or suggest, until within his own thinking process he creates a moment in a symphony where they must appear. And at this point he is then really pleased and happy and seeks to tell people about it. In short, he is both amenable and stubborn at the same time and, in terms of this analysis, for quite understandable reasons.

So it is clear that the issue about the detail and control that he has over his scores is crucial. This is indeed why at times he can be stubborn, although most of the time he is acquiescent, and sometimes he can get angry and other times he can seem contrite. One notes that although Levi, as he wrote to Josef Schalk, couldn’t even begin to understand the finale of the Eighth,\(^\text{19}\) Bruckner in his revision following Levi’s rejection chose to change the finale least of all. This hardly seems the response of someone who simplistically wished to acquiesce to his ‘Artistic Father’. And so I think it is extremely unlikely that Bruckner would allow someone else to compose and insert something that he not would agree with, to be printed. In my view, this is not consistent with his personality, despite what others may have thought.

To summarise from this continued speculative analysis of Bruckner’s personality: Levi’s letter of rejection is quite an insensitive and hurtful document, despite his stated concern; the rejection hit Bruckner very hard, but in a very specific way, reinforcing his loneliness and feeling that even his friends did not understand what he was attempting to realise; most of his behaviours and his reactions are quite understandable from his basic personality structure, that of an anxious introvert with a limited repertoire of assertive behaviours, such as, for example:

- intrinsic friendliness yet at times anger and rejections
- acquiescence and occasionally stubborn resistance
- open-mindedness to ideas and suggestions yet insistence on doing things his way, in his own time, without consulting others
- insistence on not ‘patching up’ with revisions but wholesale rewriting almost from scratch
- a cognitive style of seeking to innovate on the background of huge appreciation of traditional perspective
- concern to ensure that all of the works he considered part of his legacy should be worked through in detail, without possibility of criticism from a traditional musical perspective

As happened before, the criticism did slow his creative process, so that he abandoned any new work for several years, and this again is understandable. The rejection must have been particularly hard as he probably was beginning to see his health and strength fade at this point in his life. It is possible that cuts may have been accepted by him under pressure to have his works performed, but his judgement in making cuts likely to be

---

\(^{17}\) *Ibid* e.g. Introduction, pp. 7-11.

\(^{18}\) Johnson S., *op. cit.* p. 105

impulsive, very different form his normal, detailed, focussed approach to composition. Signs of mental stress are seen in his occasional arrogant outbursts. Under stress his judgement is likely to be compromised, for instance in deciding which of his works to revise and in what manner. Whether the efforts on revisions to other symphonies and other works were worth it in the years following 1887 is open to debate, but from this perspective they are all very likely to be by Bruckner.

And then what of the delayed work on the Ninth Symphony? I suggest that the idea that he may have been able to finish the Ninth Symphony if not distracted by Levi’s rejection is rather naïve. Any artist must be seen to create from his or her personal inspiration on the basis of experience. The Eighth Symphony represents a significant change, including of emotional content, and the Ninth even more. What we have of the Ninth will have been produced by someone working with the particular inner fears and distressing feelings that he was having at the time. So a Ninth, completed in the absence of the Levi rejection of the Eighth would not be the same Ninth as we have today. That’s the creative process and that’s life. And it also seems that many take the view that the Eighth was improved as a result of the revisions brought on by Levi’s rejection of the first version.

So a final word about Levi? It has taken many inspired conductors a good deal of time to fully realise the potential in Bruckner’s symphonies, so perhaps we should not blame Levi too much for his misunderstanding. But when everyone knew rejection would be devastating to the man it does seem a shame that no one managed a better job of breaking the news to him. But the Schalk brothers were young, only in their 20’s and maestro conductors as a breed are not known for their interpersonal skills…It is pointless to speculate what would have happened if things had been different, but this will have made his last years much less contented than they might otherwise have been.

Commentary: November 2013

This paper was the first to be presented at the 2013 Bruckner Journal conference. Many of the papers which followed caused the writer to reconsider what he had presented and some of the conclusions reached. Hence some additional notes in a commentary seem appropriate.

Firstly, the writer was pleased to note Abram Chipman’s statement that Bruckner, “vulnerable, anxious, perhaps suggestible and plagued by a lack of confident assertiveness, did not make him mentally ill in a major sense so much as burdened by neurotic level inhibitions and compromised his struggle for acceptance,” which in so far as two psychologists from very different theoretical backgrounds ever agree on anything, must represent agreement! This paper also nicely likened psychological profiling to an archaeological dig looking for clues to personality from period anecdotal data.

What the current musicological scholarship is doing is to generate greater levels of detail and accuracy in this very form of data – actual behavioural evidence which will help build a more coherent picture of the psychology of the man. So the detailed effort of unravelling musicological complexity can also yield important behavioural data. As an example, take Paul Hawkshaw’s reference to thousands of disordered folios for the Eighth Symphony. If Bruckner really had OCD to the extent of illness, then it would be unlikely that he could have lived without having these folios either obsessively neatly catalogued or, alternatively, destroyed. But from Paul Hawkshaw’s report he was sufficiently disorganised to mistake one folio belonging to the finale as part of the Adagio. 20

Benjamin Korstvedt in his paper at the conference outlined Bruckner’s continuing work on the Fourth Symphony, showing that contrary to what was suggested in the writer’s paper, Bruckner did “tinker” with details, sometimes over many years, as well as engaging in large-scale structural revisions. If he was convinced something wasn’t right, he continued to work on it. However, from a psychological perspective, it is interesting that this revising was not scattered equally across all the works; some he was clearly more content with than others, which does suggest that he discriminated, he could make choices, that this obsession was contained.

William Carragan’s paper showed in detail how Bruckner worked meticulously, trying out ideas, keeping some and rejecting others. These documentations of his detailed working differ in their psychological implications from the ‘old Bruckner’ orthodoxy, because they show his capacity to focus attention and illustrate his working style, of needing to make changes to written scores before being able to review what he had done. I would suggest that this does reflect the view expressed in the paper that his approach is basically that of an adaptor/craftsman – he needs to “make” something and then look at it to review it, as opposed to thinking through any ideas in his mind’s eye before accepting or rejecting them. This accords with the view expressed in the paper that he is open to ideas but will not accept them until he has worked them through in the score and made it all his own.

20 Hawkshaw P., “Consult with your friends, with Schalk.” More Questions and Answers from Sources for the Eighth Symphony. The Bruckner Journal 17 (iii) November 2013
Paul Hawkshaw’s work provides clear new evidence about Bruckner’s complex relationship with the Schalk brothers and indeed with Levi. Hawkshaw’s view is that Bruckner is ultimately responsible for the second version of the Eighth Symphony, and this is consistent with the view of my paper and this commentary. However, my comments on Bruckner’s loneliness and lack of opportunity to discuss with anyone have to be amended following Paul Hawkshaw’s delving into the relationship between the Schalk brothers and Bruckner. Further reading of Dermot Gault’s book, *The New Bruckner*, also supports this. Clearly Bruckner had an involved and complex relationship with the Schalks. Indeed, consistent with the paper, it seems highly likely that the presence of enthusiastic, younger people around him, prepared to engage in great detail about his scores, must have been a really positive experience for him, quite unlike anything that he had experienced before. So he is in another potential conflict situation, between this new pleasure, feeling less isolated, and his anxieties, his concern for perfection, his need for control, so it is not surprising that the relationship was turbulent.

Just consider that in 1887, Bruckner was 63, Levi was 43, Joseph was 30 and Franz was 23. We have to imagine the relationship between Paul Hawkshaw’s “often obstreperous” composer in his 60s and the drive and enthusiasm of the young guns, sharing the work on the symphony, discussing the way things should go, drinking together in the evening and developing this mutually supportive but complex relationship. We must also keep in mind that Bruckner must have been slowing down, his judgment was likely unpredictable and, as postulated by Paul Hawkshaw, if not alcoholic, he could well have been regularly drinking, all of which is likely to have reduced his capabilities at the very time he set about trying to do so much, trying to keep up with the impatience of his young supporters.

But we can at this point abandon the concept of a weak or mentally ill composer struggling to deal with manipulative opportunists and give up attempts to apportion blame in a simplistic manner. We have a much more real sounding, complex, meaningful psychological scenario of great interest.

Malcolm Hatfield is a Chartered Occupational Psychologist and one of the founders of the Association of Business Psychologists. He graduated from University College London with postgraduate studies at Birkbeck College London. He worked for P&O, Chloride, Saville & Holdsworth Ltd, before setting up his own company, Hatfield Jefferies in 1986, where he developed a successful range of psychometric tests. More recently he has worked as an independent, specialising in senior management assessment and the analysis of jobs and careers to identify the psychological demands made on individuals.
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**Friday 22 August, 8pm, St Florian Abbey**  
Orchestral Concert  
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8  
Upper Austrian Youth Symphony Orchestra / Rémy Ballot

**Saturday 23 August, 8pm, Sala terrena**  
Bruckner Cabaret - with Joschi Auer

---

**“In August 2014 the BrucknerTage will focus on the mighty Eighth Symphony. I think it might be worth making a special effort to be there!” ken ward on bachtrack.com**

---

21 *Ibid.* p. 11
Book Review

The Power of Robert Simpson – A Biography
Donald Macauley

Also available as hardback or e-book.

‘A mass of platitudes and clichés’ was the reaction of A. H. Fox Strangways, music critic of The Observer, when Klemperer conducted Bruckner’s Seventh Symphony in London in February 1932. William McNaught in The Musical Times was no kinder, suggesting that the symphony was ‘not merely naïve, it is uneducated, badly conceived, badly worked out, badly orchestrated. In fact, it is not worth discussing.’

If attitudes have changed since then, it is to a large extent because, after the Second World War, a small band of musicians, who included Robert Simpson, Deryck Cooke and Hans Redlich, insisted against all the odds on the artistic worth of Bruckner’s music. They faced an uphill struggle, and being a Brucknerian in those days must have been like belonging to the Wagner-Verein in 1880s Vienna – a few enthusiasts holding out against a mixture of derision and indifference. No account of Bruckner reception in the UK can ignore Simpson’s contribution. The 1967 publication of The Essence of Bruckner followed 20 years of articles, broadcasts and lectures (and goodness knows how much private lobbying).

The child of serious-minded Salvation Army parents, Robert Simpson might have been cut out from birth for the role of man of opposition. Childhood religion did not survive his experiences in an ARP Mobile Surgical Unit in wartime London, when his duties included pulling dead bodies out of bombed buildings, but he remained a dedicated socialist and pacifist, a man of principle who resigned his post at the BBC when he could have retired on a full pension a year later – in protest against what he felt was a lapse in standards. Although a significant figure in British musical life as writer and broadcaster, he saw himself first and foremost as a composer, and the primary focus of this book is on Simpson’s composing career.

A biography of this fascinating figure is naturally welcome. It is self-produced by enthusiasts, and slick presentation is not to be expected; still, more trouble could have been taken over spelling. Foreign names fare especially badly, but English ones do not escape: Wilfrid Mellers becomes ‘Wilfred Mellors’ on page 72 and 76 (and again in the Index), Harrison Birtwistle is ‘Birtwhistle’ on pages 248 and 404, while the Australian conductor Bryan Fairfax is ‘Brian’ throughout. They are however more fortunate than Constant Lambert, who undergoes a sex change, becoming ‘Constance Lambert’, on pages 75 and 408. After this it seems quibbling to point out that the composer Halvor Haug is Norwegian, not Danish.

The Index could also have been more accurate; looking up Simpson’s Third Symphony, the one recorded by Horenstein, we find that one of the references is actually to Nielsen’s Third Symphony and another is to Bruckner’s Third, but page 85, where the author begins his informative account of Simpson’s Third, is not listed, and neither is the mention on page 183.

More seriously, the author falls into the trap of trying to answer back Simpson’s critics. Noel Goodwin’s complaint that the Second Symphony suffered from ‘insufficiently memorable thematic material’ and ‘an oratorical over-insistence of repeated fragments and emphasised rhythms, tiresomely hammered home’ is followed by ‘I hope the poor man took a powder’. Reviewing the First Symphony, Neville Cardus felt that ‘an acute brain is obviously in action but nothing strikingly memorable remains, except the technical know-how’. It may be, as Macauley suggests, that Cardus was ‘still smarting’ over an altercation with Simpson; but these critics are articulating widespread listener responses which cannot simply be put down to prejudice or intellectual laziness. It is surprising then to find no comment when a new note appears in a review of Simpson’s Violin Concerto:

1 Quoted by Peter Heyworth in Otto Klemperer, His Life and Times (Vol. 1), Cambridge 1983, page 388.
2 He is however ‘Constant’ Lambert on page 79.
3 From a review (published in The Guardian, 11 March 1970), of a Royal Festival Hall performance conducted by the composer (page 61).
I know of nothing lovelier in contemporary music than the sustained meditation of the slow movement, growing organically out of the wonderful slow canon for muted strings.\(^4\)

Likewise Bayan Northcott in *The Independent*:

There is nothing quite like the Simpsonian meditation, or the sound of Simpson in full cry, to be found anywhere else in music.\(^5\)

In other words, these listeners have *enjoyed* Simpson’s music, and this is crucial, for there is no point in a work being ‘music of the high intellectual imagination’, \(^6\) or ‘the composition of a strenuous thinker with abundant contrapuntal resource’ \(^7\), if it doesn’t live in the hearts and minds of its listeners.

This is an accessible biography which makes no claim to be a mature academic consideration of Simpson’s output. But what Simpson needs most is enthusiasm, and Donald Macauley has that in abundance. He has also carefully researched Simpson’s unusual family background, and there is a good selection of letters, especially welcome as Simpson’s letters show a sense of humour not always apparent in his media appearances.

Macauley deals tactfully with Simpson’s first marriage, to Bessie Fraser (alias ‘Squibs’), a fellow ARP veteran considerably older than himself. She cooked him enormous meals – transforming the slim youth of early photographs into the familiar tubby figure – but also suffered from mental illness, at one point threatening the composer with a carving knife. She then spent two years in an institution before Simpson eventually agreed, on what he called ‘the worst day of my life’, to a lobotomy. Amazingly, it seems to have worked. We are also told that Simpson was (at the same time?) ‘very good friends’ with the violist Dorothy Hemmings, who as a member of the Element String Quartet was involved in the first recordings of Simpson’s music; at which point English reticence descends.

Thereafter the book is mainly a discussion of pieces and performances – nice to know the sometimes incongruous accompanying items. There are also useful lists of works, articles, and recordings, filled out with sketches of friends, including Havergal Brian. He said of Brian the man that ‘you couldn’t tell what he was thinking or feeling’, \(^8\) and was far from being an uncritical admirer of Brian’s music:

I still think he’s an incredibly uneven composer. Some of his music I think is really bad, terrible. But at his best he’s got tremendous originality…\(^9\)

He must also have had some fellow-feeling for a composer even more bloody-minded and determinedly unfashionable than himself.

There is a list of works and a list of recordings (neither of them very numerous), and profiles of friends such as Deryck Cooke, Robert Stevenson and Hans Keller. Also reproduced are several essays, including Simpson’s notorious Preface for *The Symphony*, a popular history published in the 1960s – notorious because, as editor, he had excluded Schoenberg, Hindemith and Stravinsky for what seemed to many to be unconvincing reasons. At least one review devoted more space to Simpson’s Preface than to the articles – which, as Simpson pointed out, was hardly fair to the contributors.

Simpson does come over as a man of limited sympathies. He had little time for Berg’s Violin Concerto (‘a slimy work’) or the music of Harrison Birtwistle (‘plain nasty’) or the quartets of Bartók (‘overrated’) or Shostakovich (‘unidiomatic and not really quartets’ – the Eighth Quartet was ‘a dreadful piece’). He didn’t ‘like Elgar’s music very much’ but preferred him to Strauss, who was ‘completely hollow’. And so on. But there are also appreciative insights, and above all he valued Bruckner when few others did (in England, at any rate). Simpson’s music never sounds superficially like Bruckner’s, but he resembled him in other ways: like Bruckner, he faced public indifference, but also never lacked advocates. Most unusually, and somewhat to his embarrassment, a society was founded for the promotion of his music in his lifetime. Meetings seem to have been refreshingly convivial!

---

\(^4\) J.F. Waterhouse in *the Birmingham Post* in 1960. The work was later withdrawn, Simpson suggesting that it had been ‘composed by an orang-utan when I wasn’t looking’ (page 85). After listening to a recording, Macauley can ‘understand why [Simpson] withdrew it’, but finds the slow movement ‘very fine’. A projected revision was never realised.

\(^5\) Bayan Northcott, *The Independent*, 2 March 1991, quoted on page 303. It is not clear if any specific work is being referred to.

\(^6\) J.F. Waterhouse, reviewing the Third Quartet in the *Birmingham Post* in 1955 (page 72).

\(^7\) RC [Richard Capell?] reviewing Simpson’s First Quartet in the *Daily Telegraph* (page 71).

\(^8\) From a 1976 broadcast talk, quoted on page 261.

The account of Simpson’s last years makes sad reading. Having found peace and a measure of contentment in Ireland, he succumbed in September 1991 to a stroke which damaged his thalamus, an organ which normally acts to reduce the sensation of pain. The malfunctioning thalamus sent out signals that the body was in pain, even when there was no reason for it. As there was no organic cause, the usual palliatives did not work, and alternative remedies were tried in vain. No-one could be expected to do any constructive work under such circumstances. From then until his death in November 1997 Simpson completed only one work, his second String Quintet, whose bleak ending is one of his most powerful passages. Other requests and commissions had to be turned down.

One is left with the feeling that life is very unjust sometimes – something I suspect Simpson would not have disagreed with.

Dermot Gault

The author of this biography, Donald Macauley, notes on his website that he was born in 1949 and grew up in the East Anglian countryside. He was educated at Grammar Schools in Newmarket and Cambridge and (incidentally) at Reading University Art Department. He worked for the Civil Service for 26 years, maintaining his sanity by writing a polemical trade union branch magazine. Since taking early retirement in 2005 he has occupied himself by painting pictures, writing and researching family history. He is single and lives in NW London. This is his first book. His paintings may be viewed on website www.donaldmacauley.com

The ‘1992’ version of The Essence of Bruckner had been completed in 1984, but publication was held up until Simpson’s American publisher had sold off the existing stock.

Simpson’s passing was marked in the fourth issue of The Bruckner Journal (2/1, March 1998; an obituary by Brian Duke is on page 15).
NEW AND REISSUED RECORDINGS  November 2013 to March 2014

Compiled by Howard Jones

While dominated by reissues, first releases include the completion (with Sym. No. 4) of Janowski's cycle for Pentatone Classics, an interesting compilation of sketches and early versions arranged for chamber ensemble led by Ricardo Luna from Preiser Records and a third instalment (Sym. No. 6) of Barenboim's partial set of symphonies 4-9 with his Berlin Staatskapelle from Berlin, June 2010, on Accentus DVD and Blu-ray.

CDs and Downloads

SYMPHONIES

*first issue

Nos. 00 & 0  Bosch/Aachen SO (Aachen, 26 & 28/05/2012) COVIELLO SACD COV 31315 (36:29 & 41:23).
Nos. 0 & 8  Mehta/Israel PO (Tel Aviv, 2 & 8/89) NEWTON CLASSICS 2CD set 8802143 (41:43 & 80:52).
Nos. 1 (Linz v.)  Abbado/Vienna PO (Vienna, 11 & 12/69) DECCA 7 CD set 4785365DX7 ’Abbadio the Decca Years’ (46:16). With music by 7 other composers.
Nos. 3, 7  *Pinnock/Royal Academy of Music Soloists Ensemble (London 3/13) LINN Hybrid SACD CKD 442.
Nos. 3 & 7  Hindemith/Mannheim Nat. Theatre Orch. & New York PO (Mannheim, 5/63 & New York 2/60) MEMORIES REVERENCE 2CD set MR 2267/68 (54:00 & 63:30).
Nos. 4,5,7,8,9  Hindemith/Mannheim Nat. Theatre Orch. & New York PO (Mannheim, 5/63 & New York 2/60) MEMORIES REVERENCE 2CD set MR 2267/68 (54:00 & 63:30).
Nos. 4 & 9  Masur/New York PO (New York, 10/93) & Inbal/Frankfurt RSO (Frankfurt, 1986/87) WARNER CLASSICS 50 CD set 2564 64385-1 ’Teldec Legacy’ (TT 60h). Includes Samale & Mazzuca completion of #9 Finale.

No. 4 (1878, with Volksfest finale, ed. Carragan)

Symphonies

*Schiller/Philharmonie Festiva (Bad Kissingen 1/13) Profil PH13049 (60:11).
Nos.4,5,7,8,9  Schuricht/OSR (12/6/61); Stuttgart RSO (18/10/62); Danish RSO (30/9/54); Stuttgart RSO (10/3/54); Frankfurt RSO (11/49, 5/49, 2/56, 9/49 & 10/51) MEMORIES REVERENCE 5CD set MR 2251/55 (63:40, 76:05, 62:30, 78:11 & 54:00).
No. 6  Herreweghe/Orch. des Champs-Elysees(Dijon, 10/85) HARMONIA MUNDI CD HMC 901921 (64:42).
No. 7  Horenstein/Berlin PO (1928) DEUTSCHE GRAMMOPHON 50CD set 479 1049 GB 50 ‘BPO Centenary Edn.’ (58:35). 38 other composers.
No. 8  *Inoue/Kyoto SO (23 & 24/5/2013) EXTON 2CD set OVCL-00521 (81:30).
No. 9  *Haitink/ London SO (London, 17 & 21/02/2013) LSO LIVE SACD LSO 0746 ( ).
No. 9  *Luna/Ensemble ViennAyres/Pno Duo Groeber-Trisko (Vienna, 14-17/09/2012) PREISER RECORDS CD PR 91250 (64:32). Sym. in B flat (1869) 1st mvmt. sketches; Sym. #1 Adagio & Scherzo (1865/66); Sym.#9 (Scherzo, Trios 1-3, 1889, 1893 & 1894, and Finale fragments). Christus factus est, first version, WAB10 (1873), Hard-Chor Linz, Ensemble Wien-Linz (Linz, 19/01/2013).
INSTRUMENTAL & VOCAL WORKS


15 Secular Choruses, and Kantate WAB 60


Sym.3 (v2) Solti/ Bavarian RSO (10/06/93) ARTHAUS MUSIK DVD 100321 (57:31). With Stravinsky Symphony in 3 Movements.

Sym.3 ed. Rättig Szell/Vienna PO (Vienna, 05/06/66) VIDEO ARTISTS INTERNAT. ‘Mono’ DVD 4566 (54:46).

Sym.6 *Barenboim/Berlin SK (Berlin, 22/06/2010) ACCENTUS DVD & BLURAY ACC 202176 & 102176 (52:50).

CORRECTION: In TBJ Vol. 17/iii, Nov 2013 p. 27, the entry SYMPHONIES nos. 4 & 8 Karajan/Berlin PO (Berlin, 1975) 82CD set DG 4791577 should have included SYMPHONIES #5,6,7 & 9 (Berlin, 12/76, 9/79, 4/75 & 9/75) and also the Te Deum (9/75). TT 73h 11 min.

CD, DVD and Blu-ray reviews

Bruckner: Male Voice Choruses

Anton Bruckner Männerchöre Vol.2
Männerchor Bruckner 12, Ensemble Linz / Thomas Kerbl and Christian Schmidbauer.
Gramola 98997 www.gramola.at  www.sonare.at  www.brucknerhaus.at

THIS, THE FOURTH of Thomas Kerbl’s excellent recorded survey of Bruckner’s lesser-known choral and instrumental music, comprises those male voice choruses that were not performed in the earlier Anton Bruckner Männerchöre disc (Brucknerhaus Liva 027, 2008, now also on Gramola). The printed music can be found in Vol.23/2 of the Bruckner complete edition (Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, Vienna, 2001), with the exception of the cantata Auf, Brüder! Auf, und die Saiten zur Hand! (no. 4 in Vol.22, Vienna, 1987) and the piano and voice version of Volkslied (no.6 in Vol.23/1, Vienna, 1997).

In his extremely informative liner notes, Cornelis van Zwol reminds us of Bruckner’s close association with male voice singing throughout his musical career – from his time as an assistant schoolmaster at Kronstorf (1843-45), when he sang in a men’s quartet, during his 13-14 years in Linz through his involvement as singer, conductor and accompanist with the ‘Frohsinn’ and ‘Sängerbund’ choirs, and again in Vienna until only a few years before his death when the composition of the Ninth Symphony was the main focus of his musical energy. While Bruckner’s development as a symphonist can be charted over a period of 33 years, his development as composer of secular choral music can be traced over a much longer period of 50 years (1843-92), from the derivative Kronstorf and St. Florian and much more adventurous Linz male voice works to the impressive Vienna works which, admittedly on a smaller scale, rival the symphonies in their harmonic complexity.

The earliest work featured on the CD is An dem Feste WAB 59, an a cappella chorus written in Kronstorf in 1843. Bruckner slightly revised it in 1893, exchanging the original text by Alois Knauer for a new text by Karl Ptk. Four of the six St. Florian works are also a cappella - Das Lied vom deutschen Vaterland WAB 78 (c.1845), a patriotic chorus written for Hans Schläger, the founder of the St Florian male voice choir, Ständchen WAB 87 (c.1846) for male choir with humming voices and tenor soloist, Der Lehrerstand WAB 77 (c.1847), a longer composition for male voices with quartet and dedicated to Michael Bogner, director of the village school, and Des Dankes Wort sei mir vergönnt WAB 62 (c.1849 or possibly later) for five-part male choir (including humming voices) with the addition of tenor and bass soloists. The other two - Laßt Jubeltöne laut erklangen WAB 76 (1854?), an occasional piece written for the reception of the Bavarian Princess Elisabeth in Linz, and Auf, Brüder! Auf, und
**die Saiten zur Hand** WAB 60 (1855), a cantata dedicated to the St Florian prelate Friedrich Mayr on the occasion of his name-day, require substantially larger forces, the former for male voices, two horns, two trumpets and four trombones, the latter for male voices, male solo quartet, four-part mixed choir, two oboes, two bassoons, three horns, two trumpets and three trombones. Although 27 bars are omitted from the final section in this performance of the cantata, we hear enough to recognise something of the mature Bruckner in the bold harmonic excursion of the closing bars.

The two Linz choruses - *Vaterländisches Wehndl* WAB 91 (1866), a short patriotic drinking song to words by August Silberstein, a poet whose texts were also used by Bruckner for his equally patriotic *Germanenzug* (1863) and *Helgoland* (1893), and *Des Höchsten Preis* WAB 95/2 (c. 1868 but possibly much earlier), a motto (a kind of ‘signature’ chorus) that Bruckner composed for the Sierning Choral Society – are *a cappella* and not entirely representative of the more substantial and well-crafted choruses of the 1855-68 period (covered more generously in the first volume of male voice choruses). But some of the chromatic part-writing, not to mention the top c” required of the first tenors at the end of the drinking song, would require a certain amount of sobriety!

The first two of the Vienna choruses, *Wir alle, jung und alt* WAB 148/2 (1869) and *Freier Sinn und froher Mut* WAB 147 (1874) - are also short ‘mottos’. *Wir alle* was written for the saint’s day of Simon Sechter, his erstwhile teacher who had died two years earlier, and is a companion piece to another motto, *Im Wort und Liede wahr und frei* WAB 148/1 composed on the same day. *Freier Sinn*, only four bars in length, was one of several short ‘signature’ pieces written for choral societies in Upper Austria, in this case Grein near Bad Kreuzen.

Of the five remaining choruses, *Volkslied* WAB 94, which was composed in 1882 for a musical competition to find a suitable ‘anthem for the German nation in Austria’ and exists in two versions - for voice and piano in D major and for male voice choir *a cappella* - is homophonic throughout and uncomplicated harmonically. In contrast, the other four all display Bruckner at the height of his powers. The choral writing in *Zur Vermählungsfeier* WAB 54 (1878), written for the wedding of his young benefactor Anton Ölzelt Ritter von Newin, is much more complex harmonically and texturally. *Um Mitternacht* WAB 90 (1886) is the second setting of Robert Prutz’s poem, composed 22 years after the first one. In the middle section, Bruckner again makes use of humming voices to accompany the tenor soloist. He also creates a richer texture in the opening section by occasionally subdividing the first and second basses and, in the final section which is a modified repeat of the opening section, he goes even further by expanding the sonority to seven-part choir in the hushed closing bars. *Träumen und Wachen* WAB 87, composed at the end of 1890 for the bicentenary celebrations of Franz Grillparzer’s birth in 1891, is also *a cappella* and has a similar ABA structure, the middle section also being set for tenor soloist and accompanying humming voices. Finally, *Der deutsche Gesang* WAB 63 (1892), akin stylistically in many ways to the contemporary Psalm 150 and also written during his ongoing work on the Ninth Symphony, is another rousing patriotic chorus, scored for male voices and brass ensemble (four horns, three trumpets, three trombones and bass tuba).

Thomas Kerbl, with the help of his associate conductor Christian Schmidbauer and combined vocal and instrumental forces, is once again to be thanked for bringing so much of Bruckner’s rarely heard choral music to our attention and for reminding us how important it is to listen to and come to terms with these works in order to get a more rounded picture of the composer and his output as a whole. The performances are first-rate and the recorded sound exemplary.

**Bruckner - Symphony No. 4** (1878, with Volksfest finale, ed. Carragan)

Philharmonie Festiva / Gerd Schaller

Live recording, total time 60.11, in Regentenbau, Bad Kissingen, 01/2013

Profil CD PH13049

This splendiferous recording seems to me to be an important release that may significantly change our view of the Fourth Symphony.

At the last Bruckner Journal Readers Conference Dr. Benjamin Korstvedt delivered a very informative paper entitled *A Long View of the Fourth Symphony, 1874-90*. The accompanying hand-out listed the major events and documents associated with the composition, revisions and performances of the Fourth until 1896 - a mere fifty entries! But from all the welter of modification and re-composition, there are three complete versions that stand out as having been the result of a discrete compositional process: 1874, 1878 and 1888. The finale we usually hear, that composed in 1880 and associated in the first two performances with the 1878 version of the first three movements, stands out as a separate, late and radical re-composition of that movement alone, contemporaneous with the Sixth Symphony, that drastically altered the weight, proportions, indeed the whole character of the work.
The finale which was originally written for the 1878 version is the one that Bruckner called (he wrote the movement’s title on the manuscript) the Volksfest - meaning a public festival, a fair, even a funfair. Most of us will know it only, if we know it at all, from Georg Tintner’s ground-breaking recording (coupled with the Study Symphony in F minor) on Naxos, or possibly from Rozhdestvensky’s all-encompassing cycle. Both these recordings are on the slow, monumental side, lasting the best part of 20 minutes, and present a style of performance that is hard to reconcile with Bruckner’s title of Volksfest. And both the recordings and the publication of the score in the complete edition present the work as something separate, as a stand-alone movement, the implication being that we might wish to sample it out of interest but it’s not really to be considered as part of a complete symphony.

This new recording demonstrates powerfully how inappropriate that somewhat dismissive approach to the Volksfest finale is. Here we have a Fourth Symphony that is pastoral, joyful, not without gravity but avoiding the grander pretensions that the 1880 and 1888 finales add to the work, and this takes pressure off the early movements to make grand statements to justify the mighty aspirations of the finale. Gerd Schaller and the Philharmonie Festiva have already recorded an impressive performance of the 1878/80 version (in a four CD box together with the Seventh and Ninth with Carragan finale, Profil PH11028), but this performance sounds quite different. Partly it’s a matter of acoustics: the earlier performance was in the vast echoing space of Ebrach Abbey, very effectively controlled by the sound engineers; this new performance is in the excellently warm but somewhat drier acoustic of the Regentenbau, Bad Kissingen. It is wonderful to hear the brass and woodwind sound so clearly, though never overbearing, and the sound of the timpani and basses well-defined.

But beyond the considerations of the acoustic of the recording venue, this is an interpretation of the Fourth that is bright and purposeful, but wonderfully humane and joyful. The playing of the orchestra is exemplary, and Schaller shapes the paragraphs with great skill. Details of the performance are very appealing - the opening horn call has great presence, but with it a hint of distance, just enough to evoke the Romantic world of the symphony’s title; the triplets in Bruckner’s signature duplet-triplet rhythm are consistently nicely accented, and give a real feel of their special triplet nature in the duple time context; the demi-semi quavers of the pervasive opening horn call theme are kept crisp and short; the transitional moments between thematic sections are always nicely handled so that the new theme falls into place with a tempo that sounds just right. At the close of each movement I had the feeling that it had been well accomplished, nicely shaped and satisfyingly complete.

The Volksfest finale itself - the shortest finale Bruckner ever provided for this symphony - lasts just under 16 minutes in this performance, and is full of incongruous variety - just like a fairground. From the opening droplets of Regenwetter (rainy weather - Bruckner’s own description), through rather clipped and restrained versions of gestures that become wrt-large in the later finales, and extraordinary weird and atmospheric moments, to a very effective double-wave coda (including an unexpected modulation that suddenly seems to veer off-course), this is revealed as a delightful and original movement, that holds together and performs its function well, (now unencumbered by the somewhat clunky quintuplets that pervade the much longer 1874 finale with which it shares much thematic material). Suddenly the Fourth Symphony is a different work altogether, a lighter, more joyful affair - and if any movement should best be heard as something separate that might stand alone, maybe the 1880 Finale would be a better candidate.

Ken Ward

Bruckner - Symphony 6 (ed Nowak)
Netherlands Radio Philharmonic Orchestra / Jaap van Zweden
Challenge Classics CC72552 (Hybrid CD/SACD)
57 mins - Recorded at Studio MCO 5, Hilversum, Netherlands, 6/2012

Bruckner - Symphony 6 (ed Haas)
Orchestre Métropolitain / Yannick Nézet-Séguin
ATMA Classique ACD2 2639
54 mins - Recorded in the Maison symphonique de Montréal, Canada, 12/2012

THIS IS NOT the first time that two releases in the ongoing cycles by Jaap van Zweden and Yannick Nézet-Séguin have come up against each other in the The Bruckner Journal. Both conductors’ recordings of the Seventh Symphony were assessed by Colin Anderson in July 2007 (Vol 11, No 2) and those of the Ninth Symphony by The Pink Cat in November 2008 (Vol 12, No 3). Colin Anderson found much to admire in both accounts of the Seventh Symphony, whereas The Pink Cat Ninth greatly preferred Nézet-Séguin over van Zweden in the Ninth. Of the two new versions of the Sixth
Symphony, however, it’s the van Zweden’s version that I find the more impressive. Indeed, as both a performance and a recording, it outshines almost every other version I’ve ever heard.

Among the many strengths of van Zweden’s performance is the richness and accuracy of the Netherlands Radio Philharmonic Orchestra. The strings in particular have a compelling warmth and expressiveness, but all departments of the orchestra are on top form. Bruckner’s dynamic markings are scrupulously observed and balances are exemplary throughout. Combined with the propulsive energy that van Zweden brings to the outer movements and the intensity of feeling he finds in the Adagio, the result is an exceptionally involving account of the symphony. Van Zweden maintains a steady pulse for the most part, but his approach to tempo is sufficiently flexible to avoid any feeling of rigidity and transitions in particularly are handled with considerable subtlety. An example of this is the way he leads up to the lovely woodwind melody towards the end of the exposition in the first movement. So engrossing is the performance, I found it difficult to tear myself away when comparing versions for the purposes of this review.

By comparison, the rival recording from ATMA Classique sounds rather ordinary. Nézet-Séguin gets the symphony off to a swift start, the urgency of the rhythmic figure for violins slightly at odds with the Bruckner’s marking of Majestoso, but otherwise his tempi for the rest of the movement are fairly mainstream. However, the start of the symphony doesn’t generate a great deal of excitement and the E minor second subject sounds relatively matter of fact. The opening of the Scherzo provides a useful point of comparison, Nézet-Séguin’s interpretation unable to match the fire and urgency of van Zweden’s, despite the similarity of their tempi. Here, as elsewhere, the playing of the Orchestre Métropolitain lacks the clarity of balance and sharpness of attack of their Dutch counterparts, the result sounding thinner and less involving. Nézet-Séguin’s interpretation of the finale offers a step up in terms of focus and emotional engagement, but not enough to give this disc a claim on the collector.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.

In terms of sound quality, the balance is also in van Zweden’s favour, Challenge Classics providing a hybrid SACD recording of impressive range and transparency despite the reverberant acoustic of the Hilversum studio. The result sounds particularly good on headphones. As so often, the multichannel layer adds a degree of clarity over that available through stereo. The ATMA Classique CD recording is slightly closer focused but the brass occasionally sounds harsh in climaxes. Curiously, both recordings are afflicted by watch chimes, a faint one occurring at 3:03 in the first movement of the Challenge Classics disc and a somewhat more prominent one at 5:07 in the third movement of the ATMA Classique disc.
The recorded sound (heard through headphones from the Blu-ray disc on PCM Stereo) is splendid, with much detail shining through the overall sound picture, and Bruckner’s noble tones in the first movement climax and coda are done full justice. The timing for the symphony suggests, correctly, that there was no languishing, even the heartfelt Adagio kept to a flowing pace, and its climax, with the horns wailing the plaintive oboe melody from the opening of the movement, is especially impressive. Although Barenboim indulges in some interesting tempi in parts of the finale, it doesn’t disrupt the formal cogency of the movement which, like the whole performance, is imbued with vitality, blessed with solo and ensemble playing of consummate beauty, and makes for a rewarding and thoroughly enjoyable audio/visual experience. As I watched and listened to this repeatedly, sitting in front of the fire over the Christmas and New Year holiday, I felt my expenditure on the disc had been well repaid. The discs are embellished with attractive, if enigmatic, cover art - a work by Nadja Bournonville - showing a model galleon perched on a pile of rocks. The only ‘extra’ is a trailer for the Staatskapelle Berlin’s performance of the 4th symphony, which also sounds magnificent.

BRUCKNER unknown. Works completed and arranged for chamber orchestra by Ricardo Luna

- Symphony in B major (sketch for the 1st movement)*
- Symphony No. 1 - Adagio & Scherzo, 1865-66 early versions*
- Symphony No. 9 - Scherzo, with Trios 1*, 2 & 3; Finale fragment (based on ‘Documentation of the Fragment’ by Dr. John A Phillips)
- Motet “Christus factus est”, second composition 1873*

Ensemble ViennAyres; Ensemble Wien-Linz; Hard-Chor Linz; Klavierduo Gröbner-Trisko / Ricardo Luna, conductor

*world premiere recording

Preiser Records CD. PR 91250, 2013

RICARDO LUNA’S “BRUCKNER unknown” is a remarkable release.

We are accustomed to envision Bruckner’s output - consisting almost exclusively of the symphonies and better-known choral works - as a closed universe, impervious to anything new, at most perhaps the occasional release of a lesser known version of one of the symphonies, but otherwise the same undeviating musical verities, the only permitted variables being version, Haas/Nowak, interpretation, orchestra and conductor. Many of the secular choral works are also significant, but little known, especially outside “German realms”. Then we have a mere handful of songs, and piano and organ music, craftsman-like but rarely ascending into the demesne of the inspired, nor do we encounter the usual body of chamber music (pace the exceptional string quintet) characteristic of the nineteenth-century composer.

This unique situation is very largely the outcome of Bruckner’s single-minded obsession with the symphony, an idée fixe that dominated the output of this erstwhile provincial church organist from his late 30s onwards. There is a further salient factor. In mid-1895, on moving, by imperial privilege, into what was to be his final dwelling, the Lodge of the Belvedere Palace, Bruckner ensured he had in hand the scores of his principal works, and oversaw the destruction of a large number of MSS, drafts, sketches, and correspondence, official and personal, that had accumulated in his fourth-floor Hessgasse apartment. What lesser, unfinished or discarded works may have been sacrificed in the flames of this hecatomb we do not, in many cases, know. Suffice it to say that few minor works and fewer drafts survived. A large body of sketches for the Eighth (both versions) and the preliminary materials for the first three movements of the Ninth were spared. And despite its composition ‘post-holocaust’, the score of the unfinished but largely complete Finale of the Ninth suffered the further indignity of becoming (in the words of Bruckner’s doctor Richard Heller) the ‘prey of vultures’ – who swooped down on his unsecured property after his death in October 1896, eager for souvenirs...

So – as this recording reminds us – we should be grateful for what little we have left. Argentinian-Austrian conductor, choral director and editor Ricardo Luna has here brought together some of the more significant of these
fragments, arranged for an ensemble chosen far from at random but which is itself remarkable for the historical perspective it lends.

For the chamber ensemble chosen by Luna – single flute, oboe, clarinet, horn, piano, harmonium and string quintet - is the same as that used for performances of orchestral works by the Society for Private Musical Performances, the legendary Viennese concert society founded in 1918 by Arnold Schoenberg for the airing of “difficult contemporary works” (and to whose concerts, be it noted, admittance by critics was expressly forbidden!). In the three years and 117 concerts of its existence, the Society performed no fewer than 154 works by leading progressive composers of the day such as Stravinsky, Bartók, Debussy, Ravel, Webern and Berg, among many others, including – be it noted – Bruckner – apparently, an arrangement of the Seventh was prepared in 1921 by Schoenberg pupils Hans Eisler, Karl Rankl and Erwin Stein. This is significant – the Seventh was by then far from a contemporary work any more, its premiere had taken place in 1884, yet it must still have been regarded as sufficiently ‘modern’ to have merited inclusion. In practical terms the instrumentation of this ensemble makes perfect musical sense, maintaining as it does the parts of the strings and the principal voices of the winds (flute, oboe, clarinet and horn), while allotting the harmonic ‘filling’ provided orchestrally by the horn section to the harmonium (in the early 1900s by no means such a bizarre choice as it seems today) and assigning the heavy brass and timpani to the incisive timbre of the piano.

Inevitably, much of the sheer physicality of Bruckner’s music, its inherent mass (and perhaps much of its bombast) must be surrendered under these conditions. What soon become strikingly apparent, however, in listening to this recording, is the net gain in immediacy, textural transparency and clarity, and in the effortless continuity of what Wagner so usefully spoke of as the melos – the essential continuity of the music regardless of external events. It is worthwhile noting that exceptional preparedness, clarity and comprehensibility were the stated aims of Schoenberg’s ensemble, and it may well be that these same values, not merely the superficial choice of instrumentation, were adopted by Ricardo Luna, who for this recording forged into seamless unanimity the combined forces of the Ensemble ViennAyres, Klavierduo Gröbner-Trisko and in the concluding choral work, Hard-Chor Linz and Ensemble Wien-Linz. This is a high-quality recording, recorded in beautifully suitable Baroque acoustic spaces. Released by Austrian label Preiser, it is complemented by Luna’s detailed account of the works chosen and his editorial mediations.

Bruckner and ‘arrangement’ – aye, there’s the rub. Despite, or perhaps even because of the ubiquity of the practice of arranging/transcribing in nineteenth-century music-making, twentieth-century musicology, especially the germanophone variety, and allied performance-practice, with its idolization of “Werktreue”, adopted a dismissive, holier-than-thou attitude to anything other than the “Fassung letzter Hand” – the final, finished score left by the composer. Fragments, unfinished works, earlier versions, as well as ‘canonically peripheral’ works regarded as infra dignitatum by the Kunstreligion ethos of this rampant musical purism – whoever claimed Beethoven’s Wellington’s Victory a consummate masterwork? – were summarily disregarded. Only the highest manifestation of divine (and especially, German) musical art was actually worthy of performance. Bruckner’s legacy had a further problem – that of the first editions edited by Bruckner’s pupils and conductors, versions which in the 1930s, with the gradual adoption of Bruckner’s autograph scores, were relegated to the status of illegitimate falsifications and corruptions of his true intentions – despite, in many cases, Bruckner’s demonstrable endorsement of them, an issue still unresolved to this day. The notion of arranging a Bruckner score for another ensemble, completing an unfinished movement or making a performable score of an earlier version of one, however nugatory the editorial intervention required, became anathema maranatha. “One should not try to perform these things”, claimed Leopold Nowak in a private interview he kindly gave me a few days before his death in May 1991 (at which he agreed to my and MWV’s new publications on the Finale of the Ninth, a work that had held a lifetime fascination of him), “one must educate the people to read music” – an absurd arrogation of the composer’s intentions and demotion of an intended performing score to the status of Augenmusik.

In the case of the Ninth, the results of this pointless discrimination have been frankly catastrophic for our understanding and appreciation of that work. It has meant that the score of the ‘canonical’ first three movements has been endlessly extolled as consummate masterwork, perfect and complete in itself, the largely completely composed (though subsequently dismembered, if very largely construable) score of its Finale dismissed as irrelevant, invalid, a preliminary sketch of no greater interest than mere musical curiosity. Funnily enough, its composer didn’t see things that way. Nor, arguably, do modern audiences, given the choice, yet the practice established in 1903 of performing the work in three movements continues widely unchallenged, despite the existence and remarkable effectiveness of the “SPCM” Performing Version of the Finale, most recently manifested in the extraordinary success of Simon Rattle’s 2012 performance of the four-movement Ninth with the BPO on EMI.

The bizarre case of the Ninth shows up the cognitive dissonance required by this canon hypocrisy for what it is. In more recent times (forgive me here for sounding like a tactless colonial – we Australians tend to be that way), such sanctimonious, pseudo-religious attitudes to what are simply musical texts (for whence originates the notion of a ‘canon’ but in religion?) have broken down along with an increasing, identifiably postmodern awareness of the broad possibilities afforded by recursion to older historical practices. These practices regarded a ‘work’, once left by the composer, as existing potentially quite independent of its original scoring or even purpose, and acknowledged the
process of arrangement for what it was and is: a useful, vital, fruitful and insightful tool by which fresh aspects of well-known, or in this case, lesser-known music may be brought to light.

The works (or are they texts?) included here in what are in part premiere recordings, are ushered in by an intriguing early sketch, WAB 142, for the first theme group of the first movement of an envisaged Symphony in B flat. Dated October 1869, and hence composed following the conclusion of the latterly ‘annulled’ Symphony in D minor (the alleged “Nullte”), its jaunty rhythm distantly prefigures the much later, albeit more stately first movement of the Fifth (1875), perhaps significantly in the same key. Luna has done little here than make the most essential realization of Bruckner’s short score, its 68 measures can only leave us speculating as to what the rest of the work’s thematic material may have sounded like.

More substantive, and significant contributions to our understanding of the emergence of the First Symphony are the recordings of the original Adagio and Scherzo of that work, dating from 1865, only recently brought to light in scholarly editions by Wolfgang Grandjean (MWV, 1995), and here arranged by Luna with completions of instrumentation and continuity based on comparison with the later, completed versions of the same movements. In particular, the continuity of the later part of the Adagio was extensively altered by Bruckner in the later version, while the brief but delightful original Scherzo was replaced entirely; Bruckner retained only the original Trio.

The remainder of the instrumental tracks of the CD relate to the extensive drafts for the Scherzo and Finale of the Ninth, principal scholarly research into these two movements having been undertaken by my colleague Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs and myself respectively. Ben Cohrs’ text volume on the Scherzo movement was published by MWV in 1998; he also prepared performing editions of both rejected Trios, published by Doblinger the same year.

The wealth of materials available here reminds one of the not unimportant fact that Bruckner planned his Ninth Symphony as his opus summum musicae, taking a leisurely nine years (September 1887 to October 1896, minus the major revisions of earlier works such as the Third Symphony, composition of Helgoland and 150. Psalm, etc.) and amassing well in excess of a thousand pages of MSS in the process. Alas, all too leisurely, since the work remained incomplete at his death. And not by much. Extensive drafts for all four movements, and in particular no less than four hundred pages for the Finale alone survive, enabling us in the case of this work, a unique and unparalleled insight into his compositional practice. A number of passages went through very protracted processes of evolution, among them the second subject (Gesangsperiode) of the first movement and the opening of the Adagio, two passages among many others which altered radically through iteration after iteration, from first draft to final score. In striking comparison to the continuity of the Scherzo proper, which was established to Bruckner’s satisfaction virtually in a single draft, Bruckner conceived the Trio of the Scherzo no less than three times over. The first two versions feature the remarkable, indeed unique inclusion of a viola solo (for Bruckner an unprecedented act of creative licence). The first of these Trios, in F major, has more in common with the bucolic world of the Trio of the Eighth; the second, in F sharp major, is strikingly chromatic, while the third, also in F sharp major, which Bruckner adopted, unites elements of both, but within a new and almost alien landscape. Luna has here undertaken to arrange not only the three versions of the Trio, but also the Scherzo proper, enabling the listener via CD programming to compare the three separate versions of the entire Scherzo movement thereby created.

Luna concludes the excerpts of the Ninth with his arrangement of what I perhaps clumsily termed the “Documentation of the Fragment” of the Finale (MWV 1999), a performing score for the Finale based on my earlier reconstruction of the autograph score of the movement (MWV 1994), which first established, unequivocally (for those not irremediably deafened by decades of misinformation), that the Finale existed for Bruckner as an emergent realization of Bruckner’s short score, its 68 measures can only leave us speculating as to what the rest of the work’s thematic material may have sounded like.

The “Documentation”, as compared to my and my colleagues’ completed Performing Version (generally referred to now as the “SPCM” Finale, after its authors’ initials), eschews compositional interventions of any significance; it was in this form that the Finale received its first-ever Viennese performance in December 1999, 103 years after its composition within walking distance of Vienna’s hallowed Musikverein. (Nikolaus Harnoncourt, who conducted the premiere, aptly compared the experience of confronting this lost music to encountering “a stone from the moon”.) Some details of the reconstruction of the Finale have since been revised (notably, the later versions of the “SPCM” Finale feature a shorter reconstruction of the second subject, and my colleagues Nicola Samale and Ben Cohrs, I less so, contend that they have reconstructed the missing bifolio of the fugue from the short-score sketches), however, the thoughtful yet flowing account given of the movement by Luna, especially in the Schoenberg scoring, gives a poignant impression of the lost grandeur of this intended ‘Finale of all Finales’. In the later course of the movement, the lengthy silences marking the sites of the missing bifolios allows their tragic loss – symbolic of the susceptibility of all human achievement to the ravages of time – to strike home. Luna also includes two of the sketches for the coda omitted by Harnoncourt in his Vienna performance and later WPO recording. As Umberto Eco concluded his bestseller, “Stat rosa pristina nomine, nonina nuda tenemus” – “The rose of yore is but a name; mere names are left to us.”
The CD concludes with a world premiere recording Bruckner’s second composition of Christus Factus Est, dating from December 1873, a work of unquestionable power and calm sublimity. Luna’s gesture in having this work follow the unfinished Finale recalls for me the poignant inclusion by Carl Philip Emmanuel Bach in the first publication of “Die Kunst der Fuge” of his father’s “death bed chorale”, “Vor Deinen Thron tret’ ich hiermit” by way of an apology for the unfinished torso of the quadruple fugue with which the work breaks off. The spacious, radiant reading of this work owes much to Luna’s extensive experience as choral conductor. Treasures indeed.

Dr John A. Phillips, Adelaide.

The current season is an important one for the maestro. In addition to celebrating his sixtieth year of conducting activity, he will have his eighty-fifth birthday in March. As a result, a series of concerts and events will take place to commemorate this significant stage of Haitink’s life. I do not know if he (or the orchestra personnel) purposefully chose the Romantic Symphony in this concert with the Chicago Symphony as part of the celebration, but the piece must have meant something to him, since it is “a work to which he felt increasingly close” early on in his career, when he presented it for the first time with the NRPO in 1958.

Bernard Haitink is a giant in the world of classical music. Not only that, he is an advocate for Bruckner, as witnessed by the complete set of symphonies he produced with the Concertgebouw Orchestra in the 1960s and early 1970s, as well as his ongoing performance of Bruckner’s music. Haitink’s acquaintance with the composer, however, dates back to the beginning of his career when, in 1957, three years after his conducting début with the Netherlands Radio Philharmonic Orchestra, he gave his first Bruckner performance - the Second Symphony - with the Concertgebouw Orchestra. Apart from his love of Bruckner’s music, the Haitink-Bruckner connection probably owes some to the influence of Eduard van Beinum, who established an “Amsterdam Bruckner tradition” during his time as chief conductor of the Concertgebouw Orchestra (1945-59), as well as Eugen Jochum, who co-directed the same orchestra with Haitink throughout the intervening years of 1959-61 before the latter assumed sole leadership of the orchestra. Haitink’s devotion to the cause of Bruckner’s music was recognized in April 1970 at a concert in the Carnegie Hall as part of an overseas tour with the London Philharmonic, when the Bruckner Society of America presented him with the Kilenyi Medal.

In a review of this concert, which also featured the Second Symphony, Haitink’s “superiority as a Bruckner interpreter” was lauded, for he “made the music eloquent at every point by giving the themes breadth and an affecting sense of importance, yet this was encompassed within firmly controlled rhythms...”

The current season is an important one for the maestro. In addition to celebrating his sixtieth year of conducting activity, he will have his eighty-fifth birthday in March. As a result, a series of concerts and events will take place to commemorate this significant stage of Haitink’s life. I do not know if he (or the orchestra personnel) purposefully chose the Romantic Symphony in this concert with the Chicago Symphony as part of the celebration, but the piece must have meant something to him, since it is “a work to which he felt increasingly close” early on in his career, when he presented it for the first time with the NRPO in 1958.

13 Mundy, 44. As early as the 1980s, Mundy concedes that “Amsterdam is perhaps the only city other than Vienna where Bruckner’s music is at the core of the repertoire” and “the Concertgebouw Orchestra has taken the style required by Bruckner’s music as part of its traditional sound” (114-15). In a review of a 1962 concert of Bruckner’s Third Symphony by the London Philharmonic, Peter Stadlen praises “Haitink’s understanding of the Amsterdam Bruckner tradition in his ‘deeply considered performance’” (44).
14 Haitink probably learned from Jochum during this period, in particular through their joint participation in the American tour of the Concertgebouw Orchestra in 1961, for he says, “I well remember my first tour - a very extended one across the United States. Eugen Jochum conducted most of the concerts and so, wherever we were, I was very often sitting in the hall listening. The sound...opened my eyes to the importance of balance, and that awareness has made an imprint on my musical taste” (Mundy, 36, 115; see also p. 39 and picture opposite p. 49). Another mentor Haitink benefited from during his initial years of conducting was Ferdinand Leitner (Mundy 21-22, 33-34).
15 Mundy, 69. Information about the Kilenyi medal, including a list of recipients, is available from John Berky’s website at http://www.abruckner.com/thembrucknersociety/kilenyimedal/.
17 See http://www.askonas Holt.co.uk/artists/conductors/bernard-haitink.
18 Mundy, 29. According to information in abruckner.com, there are no less than eight commercial recordings of the Fourth Symphony under Haitink (http://www.abruckner.com/recordings/Haitink/Bernard). The earliest was made with the Concertgebouw Orchestra in 1965, and the most recent with the Bavarian Radio Symphony in 2012. He also has two Bruckner recordings with the CSO: no. 7 (CSO Resound) and no. 9 (Antec Music).
Moreover, in the “Meet the Musicians” section of the concert program, two of the players express their excitement for the Bruckner fourth with Haitink when asked: “What work are you most looking forward to performing this season?”

It was therefore with great anticipation that I attended this concert and, not surprisingly, the qualities that mark Haitink’s interpretive style four decades ago in New York continued to resonate in this performance.

Sitting at the Terrace Level for the first time had opened my eyes, for it afforded me a full view of both Haitink’s facial expression and stick technique, making the concert experience more enjoyable as well as educational. To my surprise, he directed the piece not from memory, but with a score in front of him. Rather than a sign of old age, I believe this initiative has more to do with his seriousness toward an authentic interpretation of the music. The tremolos at the start of the symphony were extremely soft, almost inaudible, giving the effect of a *creatio ex nihilo*. However, these tremolos were fuelled with energy, which gradually accumulated, gathering momentum, until its release at the first outburst at letter A. Though marked and played *ff*, this fanfare sounded rather fluid and non-aggressive. On the contrary, the passage based on the same material at letter I of the Development was put forth in a *marcato* manner. At *fff*, it therefore sounded like a continued development of the former “lyrical” counterpart in the Exposition. But that is not the end of it, for Haitink reserved the full power of the orchestra for the peroration at the conclusion of the movement. Even within this Coda (mm. 557-73), one could sense a dynamic upsurge that rose from the statement of the opening horn call (m. 3ff) to peak at m. 565, where the four horns re-entered in unison in the most forceful manner with a final affirmation of the theme punctuated by E-flat major chords in the rest of the orchestra. Through this meticulous pacing of terraced dynamics at various climactic signposts, Haitink had constructed an expanding structure from the beginning to the end of the movement, reminding me of the teleological design that some scholars have identified in Bruckner’s symphonies. Even at a local level, we can experience this kind of dynamic growth. Toward the end of the Development (mm. 305-20), a brass chorale that William Carragan calls “Stars Place” dominates the scene. Although the two phrases are marked with a single *ff*, the first was subdued, whereas the second was focused and energetic. This approach to Bruckner’s music is just one of many “tricks” that Haitink uses in creating structural coherence in extended symphonic movements, as Simon Mundy has remarked: “Haitink…was able to mould the overall shape of a piece of music so that its directions were clear to the listener even while the detail was being explored.”

The slow movement featured some of the most expressive playing from the CSO. A glance of the score reveals how meticulous the composer was in matters of expression, dynamics and manner of playing. One can imagine the challenge a conductor faces when dealing with such passages - a mere following of these markings could result in something mechanical and lifeless. With Haitink, however, the story is different. Not only was he faithful to Bruckner’s indications, but he managed to link individual parts in a seamless manner and combine them into organic entities through his unique handling of phrasing and pacing. In addition, he was careful to highlight the contrapuntal fabric, such as the canon between the low strings and the horns at letter F. In some performances I heard, although the first entry comes out clearly, the answer is drowned underneath the *spiccato* strings. The importance of this canon cannot be undermined, for it paves the way for the ensuing contrapuntal expansion, and serves as a reference point for a later canon at letter H (which is itself anticipated by the oboe at the beginning of this section at letter G). To highlight the final climax of the movement at letter F, Haitink held back just a bit at the measure before. This magical touch works well with the marked *Langsamer*, which sustains the musical drama. The excitement in C-major notwithstanding, the

---

19 Chicago Symphony Orchestra, October/November 2013, 20, 24.
20 This attitude toward interpretation has been observed by other commentators. For example, Gillian Widdicombe, in his review of a 1970 performance of Mahler’s Third Symphony, states that “the exceptional thing about Haitink as a Mahler conductor is his brilliant fidelity to the score; tempo, dynamics, phrasing and all: and only by this can the symphony be made to hold together, to generate taut, emotional excitement all the way through” (Mundy, 71). For the same program I am reviewing, Lawrence A. Johnson speaks of Haitink’s “textual integrity” in the October 31 performance (“Haitink, CSO Deliver Majestic and Eloquent Bruckner,” http://chicagoclassicalreview.com/2013/11/haitink-cso-deliver-majestic-and-eloquent-bruckner/, accessed November 1, 2013).
21 See Warren Darcy, “Bruckner’s Sonata Deformations,” in Timothy Jackson and Paul Hawskshaw, ed., *Bruckner Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 256-77; and Julian Horton, *Bruckner’s Symphonies: Analysis, Reception, and Cultural Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 152-57. Although the effect of teleology can be created by various musical means including tonality, harmony, proportion, etc. and their combinations, my example here is based solely on dynamics.
23 Mundy, 49.
24 This treatment is also observed in John von Rhein’s review of the October 31 concert: “in the Andante…Haitink's subtle tempo adjustments kept the music from dragging or rushing. So skillfully handled was his preparation for the mighty peroration that when it arrived, its impact was spot-on” (“Haitink’s Quiet Authority Carries Austrian Masters with CSO,” http://www.chicagotribune.com/entertainment/columnists/rhein/chi-cso-haitink-review-20131102,0,7942507.column, accessed November 4, 2013).
ending to me sounded more like a half cadence in the key of F, in anticipation of the tonality of the ensuing Scherzo.

As the only Scherzo in duple meter among Bruckner’s symphonies, the third movement was swift and rhythmically precise. In the introductory section, the Bruckner duplet-triplet motive was executed perfectly first by the horns, then the trumpets and finally the whole orchestra, culminating in the brass fanfare at m. 27. Throughout the Scherzo, Haitink maintained a transparent texture that uncovered the interplay of thematic material. This is especially clear right before the recapitulation, where over a dominant pedal the Bruckner rhythm is heard in imitation (mm. 151-62). The tranquil atmosphere and relaxed tempo of the Trio that contrast sharply with the rhythmic and agitated style of the Scherzo provided temporary relief for the listener. Unlike its first appearance, the da capo repeat of the Scherzo was more goal-directed due to the extra effort the orchestra put into the final two pages of the score. Never have I heard such a strong and conclusive Bb major chord in my life.

In the Finale, we once more encountered Haitink’s skillful handling of tension and release within extended dynamic curves. These moments are particularly felt at the opening passage (m. 1 till letter A) and the Coda. In the second group, the dirge-like passage played by strings (letter B) is followed by a spirited and folk-like melody in the woodwinds (letter C). Although the two themes have different character, Haitink was able to make audible the unifying elements between them, namely, the turn figure (D-C-B-C in m. 93 and A flat-G-F-G in m.106) and the pizzicato bass. In the Recapitulation (letter Q), Bruckner further develops the two themes by placing the characteristic octave skips and dotted rhythm of the woodwind idea above the string melody (instead of juxtaposing them as in the Exposition). To me, this superimposition of materials of contrasting character creates a humorous effect. In this movement and throughout the performance, I was impressed by not only the orchestra’s expressive finesse, but also the power that Haitink could draw from them. For example, in the middle of the Development, the brass introduces the first two phrases of a chorale with material from the second group (letter H). Played ff, they were answered by an additional phrase on the strings (mm. 245-48). In some recordings I am familiar with, this last phrase (also marked ff) sounds more like an echo to the brass phrases than their continuation. Quite the contrary, under Haitink’s direction, I was completely blown off by the sheer volume and energy of that first G-sharp minor chord of the last phrase. The strings were so powerful that all three phrases were on the same par and heard as a complete unit. In the Coda, which features one of the most unique endings in Bruckner’s symphonies through its chromatic bass descent instead of the typical V-I cadence (mm. 529-41), Haitink took his time in letting the harmonic drama unfold within the Steigerung that culminated in that victorious moment, when the opening motive of the symphony appeared one last time in the full brass section within the harmonic expanse of E-flat major.

Joining the rest of the audience in the thunderous applause, it suddenly dawned on me that it was only two years ago when the same work was played by the CSO in the same hall under Kurt Masur. Although one can never seem to satisfy enough the Chicago fans’ appetite for Bruckner, tonight’s performance certainly marks another historical moment in not only the CSO-Bruckner tradition but also the CSO-Haitink collaboration. It was fascinating to watch this octogenarian, who stood the entire concert only to sit for a brief fifteen seconds between movements, conduct with such intensity and versatility. I will sure look forward to other opportunities to hear him again, Bruckner or other.

Eric Lai

From BBC Music Magazine, January 2014

“If I could only live with one piece for the rest of my life, I think it would probably be Bruckner’s Eighth Symphony. The recording by the BBC Symphony Orchestra conducted by Jascha Horenstein is absolutely mind-blowing. It’s a live recording from 1970 and the sheer passion and emotion is just sublime; Horenstein manages to squeeze out every last drop of emotion. It’s not without its flaws, of course, but it’s so convincing and there’s a big cheer after those epic final bars.”

The words are those of Jennifer Pike, violinist.

25 Although the Scherzo of 1874 is in ¾, the fast tempo and the duplets cause one to hear each measure functioning as a simple beat, giving the impression of a simple duple hypermeter. This duple conception perhaps provides a subtle link to the 1880 version of the Scherzo, although the two movements sound so different from each other.

26 Benjamin Korstvedt has drawn attention to the similarity between the opening gesture of the Sixth Symphony and the woodwind idea in mm. 105-106 (“Harmonic Dating” and Symphonic Design in the Sixth Symphony: An Essay in Historical Musical Analysis,” in Crawford Howie et al., ed., Perspectives on Anton Bruckner [Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001], 205).

27 See Horton, 127, 130.

THE BEAUTIFUL setting of the nave of Bath Abbey was the venue for this concert by the City of Bath Choir. The concert opened with Bach’s motet and immediately we knew we were in for a splendid evening. The bloom of Bach’s counterpoint floated into the large space in the motet of Jesu meine Freude, but one wondered whether the complexity was a little lost in the open and resonant acoustic. But reassurance came with the performance of Britten’s Missa Brevis of 1959, composed to mark the retirement of George Malcolm, the celebrated organist of Westminster Cathedral.

Not known to this reviewer, this piece was sung beautifully, in what the program described as “exquisite use of tonal dissonance” – but the notes should have added that this would so often be resolved into beautiful, clear and bright harmony. An original piece, inventive, fresh sounding, a real delight and with its intense feeling, clear sonorities and the important, often idiosyncratic, but not continuous organ part, quite an interesting comparison to the Bruckner to come later – you could even believe that Benjamin Britten knew the Bruckner Mass.

The next item was organ pieces, intended as a relief for the choir, scheduled to be from the Swiss composer Guy Bovet. It had been intention to perform three pieces but at the last minute, computing control of the complex combinations of organ stops needed for the work broke down; so we were played two other pieces; firstly a quite unremarkable and thankfully short sugary piece which did not fit the rest of the programme. We were then treated to Bach’s Prelude and Fugue in G, ringing out through the Abbey. One could imagine Bruckner himself playing as an introduction to his Mass to come after the interval.

We then heard the core of the concert. The writer had notepaper and pen to hand, with the Bruckner Journal in mind, but frankly forgot to write anything. From the first bars of the Kyrie, floating out into the open spaces of the Abbey, the experience held a large audience spellbound. The wind band was arranged in front of the choir, the balance was good, and the contrast from the quite ecstatic passages to the climaxes was quite thrilling. The difference between the sections exploring the simple texts such as the Kyrie and the Sanctus, and the dramatic texts of the Gloria and the Credo, were completely telling in terms of the concept of the piece as a whole. Not a normal fan of the view that Bruckner’s music is always best heard in cathedrals, on this occasion and with this piece, the effect was stunning.

The couple next to us were in a choir and had performed Bruckner’s motets, but didn't know the Mass and were quite overwhelmed by the music - but also recognised its level of difficulty for the choir and the beautiful way it was sung.

There is little to comment really about Nigel Perrin’s conducting. The performance was well played, straightforward, with no particular surprises alongside what was obviously a genuine love and understanding of the music. He had a highly capable and clearly enthusiastic and committed choir; he just simply seemed to let Bruckner's music speak for itself. If one searches for any criticism it could be that the choir was so overwhelmed by the loud climaxes that sometimes it took a few seconds to settle into any quiet passage that followed - and maybe they had ever so slightly flattened before the brass enters in the otherwise hair standing up upon the neck rendering of the Sanctus. But no substantive matter. Hearing this work in a beautiful setting and with a lovely acoustic… every time the music came to a climax, cut off as often with Bruckner, then to hear it clearly ringing and settling quietly in the resonance of the building…. quite wonderful.

Readers will perhaps realise that this is one of the writer's favourite Bruckner pieces, which surely must have made numerous converts to those in the audience who had not heard it before. And I would not have known about this performance without the listing in the Bruckner Journal!!

Malcolm Hatfield

Forthcoming Bruckner performances in Austrian churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windhaeger Messe</td>
<td>10:15 16 March 2014</td>
<td>St Stephan - Baden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass No. 2 in E minor</td>
<td>10:15 25 May 2014</td>
<td>St Stephan, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass No. 1 in D minor</td>
<td>09:15 8 June 2014</td>
<td>Hofmusikkapelle, Schweizerhof, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass for Maundy Thursday</td>
<td>18:30 17 April 2014</td>
<td>Stiftskirche St Peter - Salzburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass No. 2 in E minor</td>
<td>10:30 8 June 2014</td>
<td>Stiftskirche Wilten, Innsbruck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was a splendid performance of the Prokofiev concerto, but I found the Bruckner far less successful. Russell Keable chose to conduct the 1873 version of this symphony. It’s still quite rare to hear this first version, the version that Bruckner actually showed to Wagner who then accepted its dedication, and usually it makes a good case for Bruckner’s first thoughts being his most convincing. But tonight the conductor seems to have decided to treat it like an ordinary classical symphony and kick off with a good old symphonic allegro. Bruckner’s marking ‘measured and mysterious’ seemed to be ignored and the misty atmospheric opening through which the trumpet sounds the opening theme sounded more like an urgent Prokofiev ostinato. It’s not that the symphony cannot work taken at this speed but it means that one dimension of the Brucknerian experience, its measured spaciousness, is squeezed out and must needs be replaced by something equally interesting. When the Heidelberg Philharmonic performed this version, even quicker than the Kensington Symphony Orchestra tonight, it was the sheer energy and ferocity of the playing, and the virtuosity of the orchestra in keeping up with it, that made the performance an exhilarating experience; but there was no such interest to compensate for the lack of mystery in Keable’s view of the work.

Even so, the first two movements worked quite well, and the consistent tempo relationships between the themes gave the movements an effective formal cogency. The tutti climaxes were always impressive, though the acoustic or the orchestral balance was such that the inner voices were often lost. The moment of calm at the opening of the development, when the solo horn plays pianissimo octave drops above pianissimo strings, was nicely done but was over all too soon. The movement’s closing pages were very effective. The slow movement, marked to be a solemn adagio, strained at the limits of that description, but the tender second theme was very affectingly played by the violas and then cellos. But the second theme of that group, a halting theme marked misterioso and triple piano, was neither of those things. Indeed, the quieter end of the dynamic range was rarely effectively observed throughout this performance. The Wagnerian climax, with trombones in fine form, sounded tremendous.

The man beside me, unsolicited, remarked there had been no tunes so far, which didn’t bode well for this performance’s effectiveness in winning new friends for Bruckner’s symphony. But in the Scherzo and Finale I fear things deteriorated. There needed to be more precision and togetherness in the strings, a more determined attack, in the stamping rhythms of the Scherzo - though the accents of the Trio’s dance were attractively weighted. And come the Finale, once again very fast, though at least here Bruckner’s marking is allegro, the whole thing just became unutterably noisy. The polka of the second subject on violins was undermined by both its speed and the orchestral balance so that the full contour of the theme was rarely to be heard, even by those of us who know it well. There was one really special moment, when the four horns play a chorale, otherwise unaccompanied, towards the end of the development, to be taken up by woodwind. This was very beautifully done, as was the coda - a moment where Russell Keable seemed to allow space for a little grandiloquence and this close, which sometimes lacks the requisite finality in this version of the symphony, at last gave us a glimpse of the visionary inspiration that lies behind this symphony.

Ken Ward
ON THE evidence of this fine performance, it is hard to understand why Bruckner ever doubted the validity of this symphony. Ian Lowes, the conductor, has played in performances of all the Bruckner symphonies in his role as professional horn player with various orchestras, including the Brno, Royal Liverpool and Bournemouth Symphony Orchestras, and he has conducted several. For this performance he went through the arduous task of making all the orchestral parts himself, so in effect what was played was the Lowes’ edition of the symphony. This gave him a knowledge of the work so thorough and so intimate that he was able to conduct the performance without a score - no mean achievement for such a rarely played work performed by a non-professional orchestra.

This allowed that there could be considerable attention to detail in the performance, dynamics were especially well controlled. It’s rare to hear any orchestra in Bruckner grade the dynamic level with any subtlety throughout the range from pianissimo to treble forte, but the St Aldhelm’s Orchestra had obviously been very effectively rehearsed: they achieved this and enhanced the work’s appeal immensely. This was at times quite a challenge for the strings, keeping the intonation secure in quieter passages stretched their capabilities, but often, especially in the lyrical second subjects, or the Trio of the Scherzo, they surprised with a beauty of tone that was a sudden joy to hear. The lower strings were very secure and right from the start provided the firm ground upon which their colleagues were able to construct the thematic burden of the work. ‘Where’s the main theme?’ the conductor Dessoff had asked Bruckner when they played the symphony through on the piano. There was no doubt where it was this evening, the violins presenting the slightly hypnotic repeated figure with an infectious vitality that drew you immediately into the narrative of the work.

The brass throughout showed themselves equal to the big brazen main themes of the outer movements, but also handled their chorale-like meditations with an apposite inwardness. Every now and then in the work a horn solo rises above the bustling strings, and these were accomplished with aplomb. There were woodwind interventions, quasi-ornamental, in the quiet central development of the first movement, and also in the finale, that were beautifully played by flute and clarinet, a delight to hear.

There were many such enchanting details in this performance, but a word needs to be said about the overall proportions of the work. The codas, to each movement, were especially effective, but this was due not merely to the exemplary handling of the tempo and dynamic. Certainly the expressive playing of clarinets, oboes and bassoon in their quiet interruption of the race to the first movement close was spellbinding, and the final phrase of the slow movement was uttered by the strings as though it were a prayer, and the wonderfully forthright timpani playing made sure the Scherzo and Finale ended with bang - but above and beyond all this was the great formal arch that Lowes managed to construct, so that each movement and the symphony had a natural proportion, and this mere ‘attempt’, as Bruckner called it, came over as a masterpiece worthy of the composer of symphonies, as the programme note has it, “now considered to be some of the finest ever written.”

In the first half Sam Hanson, organist, rock musician, composer, improviser - oh, and pianist - was an effective soloist in Mozart’s Piano Concerto No. 21. The church of St. Aldhelm’s was filled with almost as many glittering Christmas trees as there were orchestral musicians, to which festive decoration a warm-hearted performance Humperdinck’s Hansel and Gretel overture added a suitably seasonal soundtrack. And the place was packed with people, like me, who’d never heard Bruckner’s Symphony No. 0 in live performance before!

Ken Ward

Donations to The Bruckner Journal have been gratefully received from George Banks of Bromley, David Billinge of Waterlooville, Paul Coones of Oxford, Geoffrey Gill of Worcester Park, Colin Hammond of Radstock, Eric Lai of Waco, Texas, James Larcombe of York, Chris Mansell of Solihull, Gerard Robello of Wilmislow, James Savage of Twickenham and Lawrence Tomlinson of Penrith. Many thanks indeed to all of them, and to the many subscribers who gave an additional contribution when subscribing via PayPal to cover the commission charge. Thanks also to the many readers who wrote to express their appreciation and gratitude for the quality and the work that goes into the production of The Bruckner Journal. Such feedback is very encouraging!
A Conference of the Anton Bruckner Institute Linz working together with the Upper Austrian State Music Collection took place in Linz, 17/18 October, 2013 under the title:

**Upper Austria: Brucknerland?**

- **Anton Bruckner's Contemporary Significance**

Without doubt Bruckner is the composer of Upper Austria. He towers above all others, around and after him. Academic institutions occupy themselves with him, Universities, Schools, Orchestras, Concert Halls, Societies, Streets and Squares are named after him. Bruckner is present throughout the whole region. But really, how do Upper Austrians relate to him? How well known is he actually? How much significance has Bruckner today in pedagogy, musical education, artistic discussion and cultural memory? Has he really been appropriated, or is his personality totally unsuitable? To all these questions this academic conference sought to find answers. The range of the discussion can be gauged from this list of titles of papers that were scheduled to be presented.

Who needs Bruckner? - The reflections of a cultural journalist and historian - Dr Johannes Leopold Mayer, Baden
The Upper Austrians and Bruckner - Dr Andreas Lindner, Linz/Vienna and Dr Klaus Petermayr, Linz
Memorial sites - Bruckner in the topography. - Univ. Doz. Dr. Regina Thumser, Linz
Bruckner in school teaching - Dr Constanze Wimmer, Linz
Bruckner in contemporary sacred music education. - Dr Wolfgang Kreuzhuber, Linz
The significance of Bruckner’s orchestral music in Upper Austria in the present day. - MMag. Isabel Biederleitner, Linz
Bruckner in the choirs of the time. - Mag. Sandra Föger, Linz
Bruckner’s works in the oeuvre of contemporary Upper Austrian composers - Mag. Helmut Schmidinger, Wels
Bruckner in contemporary visual arts. - Dr Lothar Schultes, Linz
Bruckner Tourism - Dr Klaus Landa, Linz

**Unusual Offerings at two Bruckner Marathons!**

I again enjoyed two USA Bruckner marathons in September: the 15th annual “Brucknerathon” organized by Dave Griegel and Ramon Khalona and hosted at Dave and Seiran’s home in San Diego, California on Saturday, August 31st, and the 5th annual “Brucknerathon” put on by John Berky at the Simsbury, Connecticut home of Ken and Ruth Jacobsen the following weekend. Unlike the previous two pairs of marathons I attended, we were treated to a number of performances recorded live, several being in the “air check” or private recording category. In addition the East Coast event chose a novel theme, performances by American orchestras. For the East Coast event we were again privileged to have William Carragan in attendance. He provided very enlightening timed analyses of several of the symphonies in the versions we heard. At both events about 15-20 folks were in attendance, and good food, good drink (much beer), and stimulating conversations were the order of the day. This year the F minor was not on either playlist. As in previous years I’ll present brief (personal) reviews, and where possible, references to sources for the commercially-available recordings, for which more detailed information may of course be obtained from John Berky’s website, www.abruckner.com:

West: **Symphony No. 1 in C minor (1891 “Vienna” ed Brosche), Abbado, Lucerne Fest O, 8/12**
East: **Symphony No. 1 in C minor (1891 “Vienna” ed Brosche), Botstein, American SO, 1/03**

How unusual it was to hear the “Vienna” 1st at both events! The performances were very different in character. Abbado’s was invested with considerable personality and made a very strong impression, even among those of us who wished that Bruckner had spent his time otherwise (as in, completing the 9th). Abbado invests this symphony with a gravitas that befits its late date of composition. In contrast, Botstein’s approach is very light and transparent, even spare in character. In a way his performance emphasized the weirdness of the piece. It was quick and dramatic. My preference was for the Abbado, which for me was the first performance of this version I’ve heard that really “clicked,” but I could see others feeling differently. Both are commercially available, Abbado on Accentus and Botstein on an ASO download.

West: **Symphony in D minor (“Die Nullte”), Bosch, Aachen SO, 5/12**
East: **Symphony in D minor (“Die Nullte”), Venzago, Indianapolis SO, 9/04**

Bosch’s “Nullte” on Coviello Classics sounds oddly anonymous. Everything is there, it’s pleasant and lively but rather tame. But it’s well played and recorded, and the finale is impressive. Mario Venzago’s live aircheck from Indianapolis has many of the quirks of his commercial recording with the Tapiola Sinfonietta on CPO: extreme fluctuations in tempo, big variations in dynamics and texture. For example, as in the commercial release he drops the tempo from the scherzo to lead into a very slow trio. Like Bosch, he generates a rousing finale. Unlike the Tapiola recording, this performance is big orchestra all the way, and they play very well. On balance, neither of these hit the level of consistent excellence that we’ve heard from, say, Chailly (Decca/London).
West: Symphony No. 2 in C minor (1877 ed Carragan), Gilbert, New York PO, 6/11
East: Symphony No. 2 in C minor (1877 ed Haas; scherzo Haas/Nowak mix), Skowraczewski, Minnesota O, 2003

Alan Gilbert’s 2nd, available on iTunes, is a good, mainstream concert performance, but underinflected - too many potentially big moments simply glide by. One could characterize it as being too polite. He does use Carragan’s new edition of the 1877 version, from which a variety of errors that appeared in the Hass and/or Nowak editions have been corrected, and a nice trombone lick in the final coda restored. Live in Minnesota, Stanislas Skowraczewski turned in an energetic performance that improved as it progressed. Rhythmically a bit square at first, things began to unfold in a lovely manner by the second movement, with all the patterns clarified. A hot scherzo led to an outstandingly effective, hugely powerful finale, one of the finest presentations of the last movement of this symphony any of us have heard. This performance was one of the highlights on the East Coast.

West: Symphony No. 3 in D minor (1889 ed Nowak), Tennstedt, Bavarian RSO, 11/76
East: Symphony No. 3 in D minor (1873 ed Nowak), Blomstedt, San Francisco SO, 1998

Two fantastic performances made the 3rd a special treat on both coasts. Tennstedt’s was extroverted, impetuous, bold, and brassy, with a fiery scherzo and a hell-for-leather finale. I suppose the closest comparison might be any of Jochum’s 3rds, but this one sounded much deeper and richer in the low voices. On the Profil label, it was a great choice out West and one to grab. We heard Blomstedt’s marvelous new Leipzig 1873 3rd on the Querstand label last year in California. In Connecticut this year we heard an aircheck of his first performance in San Francisco - a concert I attended with my family. As I remembered, it was tremendously exciting, spectacularly well played and beautifully recorded for broadcast. There are wickedly difficult passages in this version, and this orchestra plays with edge-of-the-seat virtuosity. As mediocre as San Francisco’s Davies Hall is as a concert venue, it is astonishing how well the recordings made in that space sound.

West: Symphony No. 4 in E-flat major (1878/80/86 ed Nowak), Cambreling, SWR Sym O, 9/03
East: Symphony No. 4 in E-flat major (1880 ed Korstvedt), Welser-Möst, Cleveland O, 9/12

Sylvain Cambreling’s 4th displays a nice lilt to the opening movement, leading up to an energetic, strong coda. Good, deep bass characterizes the sound, but there is some sonic congestion when the brass let loose. The finale seemed rushed at times, especially at the end. Franz Welser-Möst took the Cleveland Orchestra to St. Florian a year ago and the Arthaus Musik Blu-Ray results are very impressive. His opening movement is warm and lyrical, with tempos understandably on the slow side to maintain clarity in the resonant environment. The second movement is perhaps a bit too slow, but very beautiful. The last two movements display great energy, and the first great climax in the finale (with the cymbal!) gave me chills. Overall the performance is very effective - with superb video, both in clarity and direction, showing fascinating details of the cathedral - and a favorite of those assembled. His use of Ben Korstvedt’s recent edition of the 1880 version made a good case for this score, perhaps the best to date. Yes, Bruckner made some weird decisions in preparing this version, with the big cut in the scherzo probably being the most peculiar, but like it or not, that’s what he chose to leave us.

West: Symphony No. 5 in B-flat major (1878 ed Nowak), Konwitschny, Leipzig Gew O, 6/61
East: Symphony No. 5 in B-flat major (1878 ed Nowak), Asahina, Chicago SO, 5/96

Franz Konwitschny brings us a powerful, personal, no holds barred 5th with very effective use of tempo variation to make points along the way. For example, he pulls back mid-way through the development of the 3rd movement, but manages to hold the tension brilliantly. A moderately-paced second movement has great flow and true nobility amidst many tempo changes. The scherzo is also moderately paced, but everything is so well gauged that the power comes through. Finally, the last movement displays finely managed dynamics and a marvelous build up to a real capper of a coda. Just a great performance. Originally on Berlin Classics (the version we heard), it is now available in a Classics Haus restoration. In contrast, the Asahina video of his first concert in Chicago was, sadly, a real let-down. It was the slowest 5th he ever recorded, unremittingly loud and episodic; he and the orchestra really didn’t mesh at all, and the recording (by NHK for TV broadcast) had a flat, harsh sound. Made me tired. Pass that one up.

West: Symphony No. 6 in A major (1881 ed Nowak), Albrecht, Czech Phil Orch, 2/04
East: Symphony No. 6 in A major (1881 ed Nowak), Bernstein, New York Phil Orch, 3/76

Albrecht’s 6th in Prague has a lot going for it. He opens swiftly, and his well-judged dynamics lead to a potent first movement. The adagio is warm and heartfelt, and the scherzo is initially spritely, then quick and powerful. The finale practically tumbles all over itself in high spirits as it drives into a solid coda. Good deep bass sound in the Exton recording from the Rudolfinum. It’s a very viable choice for this symphony. Lenny’s 6th, available as part of a New York Philharmonic special boxed set, is noteworthy but for many of the wrong reasons. After a fairly normal beginning, things spiral seriously out of control, with the brass and tympani overwhelming everything else. A nicely lyrical adagio (divided strings—who would have guessed?) is the best part. As many know, Bernstein did little Bruckner over the course of his career. I’d hazard the guess that his choices of 6 and 9 may have been motivated to some extent by the intense emotional content of their slow movements, giving him the opportunity to tap into his empathy with the music of Mahler, which he certainly does here. Afterwards, however, we come to a scherzo that is fast and brutal with a slow and aimless trio, and a finale that is no better, with willful tempo fluctuations serving no purpose. Amusing stomping from the podium. Unfortunately, as interesting a document as it is of one of the giants of the last century addressing Bruckner’s music, for me this performance ultimately falls into the party record category.
West: Symphony No. 7 in E major (1885 ed Nowak), Welser-Möst, Gustav Mahler Youth O, 8/89
East: Symphony No. 7 in E major (1885 ed Nowak), Tennstedt, Boston Sym Orch, 5/77

Wolfgang Sawallisch, who passed away in early 2013, we heard a marvelous 9th from much earlier in his career and with this outstanding youth orchestra, is fast and lacking in repose. The scherzo is good, but the rest shows a lack of patience. In dramatic contrast was the stunning video showing Tennstedt live in Boston. The opening is measured and warm, with a nice flow and lift to the quicker passages and great drama and tension leading to a superb coda. The adagio is deeply moving; Tennstedt adds an anticipatory tympani roll leading up to a thrilling Nowak climax. The scherzo and finale again show a lovely lift to the forward motion, with powerful brass and tympani when called for. The BSO plays as if possessed: They clearly loved making music with this man, and this glorious performance had to be one of the highlights of their association. ICA Classics’s 35-year old video is better than we had any right to expect, making this another high point of the day in Connecticut.

West: Symphony No. 8 in C minor (1887/90 Haas), Kubelik, Chicago Sym Orch, 12/66
East: Symphony No. 8 in C minor (1890 ed Nowak), Mehta, Los Angeles Sym Orch, 4/74

An aircheck of a Kubelik 8th from Chicago shows the best of this conductor. A vivid, potent opening movement is accented with a natural elasticity of tempo. A solid scherzo gives way to a surging, passionate, and very powerful adagio. Kubelik then unleashes the orchestra for an urgent, kinetic finale, but not without felicitous moments of relaxation. The only minor let down was a rather wimpy end to an otherwise powerful coda. Overall, a wonderful document of an often underrated conductor, and a wonderful penultimate offering for the day in California. Mehta has made rather a speciality of the 8th over his long career, and this was his first recording of the work. The sound is much better now than on the original Decca/London LPs, and his opening movement goes better than the performances I attended then, with better flow and less awkwardness in the tempo changes. But the rest leaves much to be desired. Basically, Mehta is on autopilot outside of the Big Moments. The scherzo moves well, but louder parts are rushed. His last two movements are largely soporific, with tension repeatedly deflating as Mehta calms down from the exciting moments. Oh, yes, he “borrows” two Furtwänglerian ritards for the opening fanfares in the finale. I didn’t much like this recording then, and I still don’t now, but some others in the room thought better of it.

West: Symphony No. 9 in D minor (1894 ed Nowak), Graf, Houston Sym Orch, 2012

Bruckner 9ths have almost always been high points of the marathons, and this year was no exception. In remembrance of Wolfgang Sawallisch, who passed away in early 2013, we heard a marvelous 9th in San Diego. Though a live performance, the sound on this Altus import is rich, deep and clear, enhancing the power of the ominous opening with its imposing brass. Compared with his studio 9ths Sawallisch shows greater intensity but still knows when and how to relax without losing tension—nothing is rushed. Orchestral balances are managed with great care. The entire performance is absolutely gripping—a very special event. This year in the East John Proffitt again treated us to a live performance conducted by Hans Graf, this one taking place in the warm acoustic of Houston’s Co-Cathedral of the Sacred Heart. As always, Graf conducts with a very natural flow, lovely transitions, and well-managed dynamics. In the vast cathedral space, he makes a point of emphasizing articulation; with the violins divided the music comes across with impressive clarity. Tempos are subtly manipulated to allow power to build effectively. In particular, the noble adagio closes with a special degree of urgency.

The East Coast event also included a number of bonuses: performances of the Four Orchestra Pieces by the M.I.T. Orchestra, a Steinberg/Pittsburgh Overture in G minor, and Graf in Houston playing material from the finale of the 9th (sketches with some emendations by the SMPC “committee”). Of special note was a rousing performance of the early March in E-flat, performed and recorded by the crack musicians of the United States Coast Guard Band especially for John Berky. The East coast event was the first public playing of this recording.

So there you have it: again two very enjoyable weekends, with 20 Bruckner symphony recordings. My favorites included Abbado’s Vienna 1st, Skrow’s 2nd, both 3rds, Konwitschny’s 5th, Kubelik’s 8th, and Sawallisch’s 9th. Special mention should be made of both the W-M 4th and the Tennstedt 7th, on which the Board of the Bruckner Society of America bestowed its Best Video Recording and Best Historical Recording awards for 2013, respectively. (The Best Audio Recording award went to the new Blomstedt set on Querstand.) Once again, thanks to Ramon, Dave, and Seiran in California, and John, Ken, and Ruth in Connecticut, for making these experiences possible.

Neil Schore Davis, California, USA

www.abruckner.com
Vast on-line Discography of Bruckner Symphonies and Orchestral works
Home of the Bruckner Society of America
Repository of The Bruckner Journal archive, March 1997 - November 2010
Web-store for Bruckner CDs, downloads and collectables
A wealth of Bruckner articles in English (and other languages)
Information on the autumn Bruckner Tour of Austria 2014
- altogether an essential web-site for Bruckner enthusiasts!
Timed Structure Tables for Bruckner Symphonies
Professor William Carragan

With these tables for the Symphony in D minor (1869) and Study Symphony in F minor (1863) Prof. Carragan’s series of analytic charts of the symphonies is complete. 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 in D minor (1869)
Hortense von Gelmini, Nürnberger Symphoniker (1975)
Mario Venzago, Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I (Kopfsatz)</th>
<th>Gelmini</th>
<th>Venzago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (D minor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (D minor) 2nd violins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (D minor)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (D minor) 2nd violins</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ax (loud)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (A major)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (F major) (horn)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bx</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (F major) (A)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (F major)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence (F major)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction (K) (F major)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (B)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[G] (bass)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th notes</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>5:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chorale (horns)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chorale (strings)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>6:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fifth</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>6:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trumpets</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E fifth</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>6:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trumpets</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>6:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scale in bass</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retransition, winds</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (D minor)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>7:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (D minor) 2nd violins</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>8:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (D major)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>8:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (F major) (horn)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>8:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bx</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>9:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (D major)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>9:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (brass)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>9:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transition to coda</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>10:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) (D minor) 1st wave</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) (D minor) 2nd wave</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>11:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tristan?) (Mass 3?)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>12:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) (D minor)</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>13:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (D)</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>13:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bruckner: Study Symphony in F minor (1863)
Hortense von Gelmini, Nürnberger Symphoniker (1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II (Kopfsatz)</th>
<th>Gelmini</th>
<th>Venzago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (F minor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (F minor) 2nd violins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (F minor)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (F minor) 2nd violins</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ax (loud)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (G major)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (C major) (horn)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bx</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (C major) (A)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (C major)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transition to coda</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (F minor)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>7:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (F minor) 2nd violins</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>8:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (G major)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>8:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (C major) (horn)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>8:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bx</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>9:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (C major)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>9:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (brass)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>9:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transition to coda</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>10:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) (F minor) 1st wave</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) (F minor) 2nd wave</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>11:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tristan?) (Mass 3?)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>12:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) (F minor)</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>13:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (F)</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>13:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: Andante</td>
<td>Gelmini</td>
<td>Venzago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (B flat major)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (B flat major)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (F major)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk (to F major)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (F major) winds</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bk)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk/A (bass) (D flat)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk/A (bass) (A flat)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) (C minor, 6-4)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (B flat major)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (B flat major)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk (to B flat major)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strings</td>
<td>135½</td>
<td>8:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violins</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) (B flat major)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>9:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (B flat major)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9:59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III: Scherzo</th>
<th>Venzago</th>
<th>da capo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scherzo, part 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 (D minor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 (D minor)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 (D minor)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (to A minor)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence (A minor)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scherzo, part 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 (B flat major)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A2) (D major)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retransition</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 (D minor)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 (D minor)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 (D minor)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (to D minor)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence (D minor)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trio, part 1</strong></td>
<td>repeat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (G major)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (D major, 6-4)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence (D major)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trio, part 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (G major)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (to G major)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence (G major)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>168A</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E flat major (6-3)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D major</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (D major)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV: Finale

**Introduction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gelmini</th>
<th>Venzago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m (D minor) Moderato (12/8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:01</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m (D minor)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0:49</td>
<td>0:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trumpets... accelerando</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1:26</td>
<td>0:57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gelmini</th>
<th>Venzago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (D minor) Allegro vivace (4/4)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1:42</td>
<td>1:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (D minor)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2:07</td>
<td>1:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fugato</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2:24</td>
<td>1:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (m) (C major)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2:51</td>
<td>2:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3:08</td>
<td>2:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (A) (F major)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3:31</td>
<td>2:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (to F major)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>3:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadence (to A major)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4:34</td>
<td>4:11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gelmini</th>
<th>Venzago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m inverted (A major) Andante (12/8)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4:37</td>
<td>4:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stretto (C minor) Allegro vivace (4/4)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5:38</td>
<td>5:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A inverted</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5:58</td>
<td>5:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A inverted/A (B flat)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>6:11</td>
<td>5:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/unison (D minor)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>6:27</td>
<td>6:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retransition</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>6:50</td>
<td>6:33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recapitulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gelmini</th>
<th>Venzago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B (D major)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7:07</td>
<td>6:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>7:21</td>
<td>7:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bn/(A) (D minor)</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>7:41</td>
<td>7:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B inverted</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>8:09</td>
<td>7:43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gelmini</th>
<th>Venzago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (D minor)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>8:56</td>
<td>8:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (full orchestra) (B)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>8:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (E flat)</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>9:21</td>
<td>8:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (solo flute)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>9:37</td>
<td>8:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peroration (A) Schnell (D major)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>7:21</td>
<td>9:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (D major)</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>9:40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FIRST PERFORMANCE FROM THE NEW ANTON BRUCKNER COMPLETE EDITION**

In the context of the Bruckner Symphony Cycle at the 2014 Salzburg Festival, from 23 July to 29 August, the first publication of the New Anton Bruckner Complete Edition, (see back cover, p. 48)

Symphony No. 1 (Linz version, ed. Prof. Dr. Thomas Röder)

will be performed on 9 August by ORF Radio-Symphonieorchester Wien, conducted by Cornelius Meister at 7.30pm in the Felsenreitschule.

[www.salzburgerfestspiele.at](http://www.salzburgerfestspiele.at)
Bruckner: Study Symphony in F minor (1863)
Stanisław Skrowaczewski, Saarland Radio Symphony Orchestra (2001)

I (Kopfsatz)  
Exposition
A (F minor)  1 0:00
B (A flat major)  85 1:25
Marienkadenz  112 2:02
B winds  116 2:07
C (A flat major)  146 2:41
K (to A flat major)  180 3:14
end  208 3:44
Exposition repeat
A (F minor)  1 —
B (A flat major) strings  85 —
Marienkadenz  112 —
B winds  116 —
C (A flat major)  146 —
K (A) (to A flat major)  180 —
end  208 —
Development
(K)  209 3:45
(A) C minor  221 3:57
4 chords (Sym. 2)  284 4:56
retransition (F major)  325 5:34
Recapitulation
A (F minor)  364 6:14
B (F major) strings  432 7:18
Marienkadenz  459 7:54
B winds  463 7:59
C (F major)  493 8:31
K (to F minor)  561 9:33
Coda
(K)  607 10:15
end  625 10:31

II: Andante  
Part 1
A1 (E flat major!)  1 0:00
A2 (B flat major) oboe  23 2:06
Part 2
B (G minor)  50 4:36
Repeat mm. 50-57  50 —
B continues  58 5:17
Part 3
A1 (E flat major)  69 6:32
A2' (E flat major) bassoon  93 8:53
Coda
(A)  118 11:17
end (E flat major)  128 12:19
### III: Scherzo

Skrowaczewski

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scherzo, part 1</th>
<th>1st time</th>
<th>repeat</th>
<th>da capo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (C minor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (C minor)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0:10</td>
<td>0:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (C minor)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0:20</td>
<td>0:41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scherzo, part 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) (A flat major)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0:42</td>
<td>1:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (C minor)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>2:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (C minor)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (C minor)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1:31</td>
<td>2:24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trio, part 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (A flat major)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (to E flat)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A' (A flat major)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2:41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K' (to E flat)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trio, part 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2:59</td>
<td>3:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A flat major)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>3:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (A flat major)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>3:44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV: Finale

Skrow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (F minor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (A flat major)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (A flat major)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2:08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (A flat major)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2:38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (A flat major)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition repeat</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (F minor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (A flat major)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (A flat major)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (A flat major)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (A flat major)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>induction (A major etc.)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) C minor etc.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3:29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retransition</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4:52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (F minor)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>5:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (F major)</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>5:42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coda</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N (F major)</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>6:47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) continuation</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>7:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) winds</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>7:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) horns</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>7:44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end (F major)</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>7:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19th Century Multimedia

*Line in a programme note:* Anton Bruckner’s powerful Fourth Symphony opens with one of the finest credenzas in classical music.

Sadly, a little-known fact is Bruckner’s test of multimedia. Once upon a time, he turned his latent carpentry talents to good artistic use, daringly creating a sideboard of colossal proportions,

burnished wood, quadrant glass, marquetry of eye-popping detail, central cupboard of glazed cherry,

and he placed it upstage opening night of his mighty Symphony Number Four, the staring audience amazed, aroused, the first movement’s swelling cadenza matching perfectly the great, gleaming furniture before them, and astonished they stood and cheered, thunderous in thrilled appreciation of a visual art well-blended with an awesome audial.

Today, Bruckner’s credenza stands next to his tomb inside St. Florian, testament to his multi-skilled hands.

*Rob Jacques*  
*WA, USA*

---

**Stanisław SKROWACZEWSKI 90TH Birthday Collection**  
The complete OehmsClassics recordings  
28-CD set in a deluxe box  
OC 090

Detailed booklet with accompanying text by Fred Harris, Jr. (author of the biography *Seeking the Infinite: The Musical Life of Stanisław Skrowaczewski* (Create Space 2011) 634pp  
ISBN 1439257744)

- **BRUCKNER** Symphonies Nos. 1–9; Symphony F minor; Symphony D minor  
- **BEETHOVEN** Symphonies Nos. 1–9  
- **SCHUMANN** Symphonies Nos. 1–4  
- **BRAHMS** Symphonies Nos. 1–4  
- **BARTOK** Concerto for Orchestra, Divertimento for String Orchestra  
- **BERLIOZ** Symphonie fantastique Op. 14; Scène d’amour Love Scene from “Roméo et Juliette”  
- **CHOPIN** Piano Concerto 1 & 2 (Ewa Kupiec, piano)  
- **SKROWACZEWSKI** Music at Night | Fantasie for Flute and Orchestra “Il Piffero della Notte” (Roswitha Staeger, flute); Symphony [2003] in Memory of Ken Dayton  
  *Deutsche Radio Philharmonie, Saarbrücken Kaiserslautern*
World-wide Concert Selection
March - June 2014

Considerable 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**

9 March 7.30pm, Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Staatskapelle Dresden / Christian Thielemann

15 March 7.30pm, Bruggen Freistele +43 5574 407 6
Gruber - Rough Music
Abé - Prisn Rhapsody

17 March 7.30pm, Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Brahms - Violin Concerto (Hilary Hahn)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Radio SO Frankfurt / Paavo Järvi

20 March 7.30pm, Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 0/732 775230
Mozart - Symphony No. 28
Royal Philharmonic / Jannik Nézet-Séguin

28 March 5pm, Innsbruck, Congress +43 512 59360
29 March 7.30pm, Linz, Brucknerhaus +43 (0)732 775230
30 March 7.30pm, Vienna: Musikverein +43 1505 8190
Brahms - Violin Concerto (Sakari Oramo)

20 April 7.30pm, Graz, Konzerthaus +43 1814 7500
Wagner - Parsifal: Prelude Act 3 & Good Friday music

24 April 7.30pm, Graz, Konzerthaus +43 1814 7500
Wagner - Lohengrin: Evening of Music

27 April 9pm, Graz, Konzerthaus +43 1814 7500
Wagner - The Ring Cycle cycle: Siegfried: Page 3 & 4

2 May 7.30pm, Graz, Konzerthaus +43 1814 7500
Wagner - Rienzi: Act 2 & 3

Canada

28 May 8pm, Quebec Grand Théâtre +1 418 643 8131
Bach - Magnificat
Verdi - Stabat Mater
Bruckner - Te Deum
Quebec Symphony Orchestra & Choir / Fabien Gabel

12, 13 June 7.30, Montréal, Maison symphonique +1 514 842 2112
Brahms - Piano Concerto No. 1 (Hélène Grimaud)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Orchestre Métropolitain du Grand Montréal / Yannick Nézet-Séguin

**China**

6 March 8pm, Hong Kong, HK Cultural Centre + 852 2734 9009
Mozart - Symphony No. 40
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Bangladesh Festival Orchestra / Ivan Fischer

28 March 8pm, Macau, Dom Pedro V Teatro, 853 2855 5555
Bruckner - String Quartet

**Croatia**

23 May, 7.30pm, Zagreb, Koncertna dvorana Lisinski, +385 1 6121 167
Schubert - Symphony No. 8
Zagreb Philharmonic / Dennis Russell Davies

**Czech Republic**

3, 4 April 7.30pm, Brno, National Theatre, +420 539 092 811
Schubert - Symphony No. 8
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Brno Philharmonic / Alexandr Markovici

**Denmark**

27 March 7.30pm, Aarhus, Musikhuset +45 8940 4040
Segerstam - Symphony No. 262
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 (three movements)
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra / Leif Segerstam

28 March 7.30pm, Aarhus, Musikhuset +45 8940 4040
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 with Nors S Josephson finale
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra / Leif Segerstam

25 April 7.30pm, Odense Concert Hall +45 63121314
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Odense Symphony Orchestra / Alexander Verdernikov

8 May 7.30pm, Copenhagen, Koncerthuset, +45 3520 6262
Bruch - Scottish Fantasy (Stefan Jackiw) / Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
DR Symphony Orchestra / Mario Winzago

**Finland**

20 March 7pm, Lahti, Sibelius Hall +358 (0)3 814 2801
Sallinen - At the Palace Gate
Rautavaara - Flute Concerto (Sharon Bezaly)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Lahti Symphony Orchestra / Okko Kamu

8 May 7pm, Kuopio Concert Hall
Jänäcke - Adagio / Segerstam - Symphony No. 259, "A Loving, Serving and Remembering Symfoniine Sinfonia"

**France**

13, 14 March 8pm, Strasbourg Palais de la Musique +33 (0)36906 3706
Straus - Oboe Concerto (Sébastien Giot)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Strasbourg Philharmonic Orchestra / Theodor Guschlbauer

28 March 8pm Metz, Arsenal +33 (0)3 8774 1616
Mozart - Don Giovanni, Overture

**Belgium**

22 March, 8pm, Brugge, Concertgebouw +32 7022 3302
Strauss - Metamorphosen
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Bamberger Symphoniker / Jonathan Nott

28 May 8pm, Quebec Grand Théâtre +1 418 643 8131
Bach - Magnificat
Verdi - Stabat Mater
Bruckner - Te Deum
Quebec Symphony Orchestra & Choir / Fabien Gabel

12, 13 June 7.30, Montréal, Maison symphonique +1 514 842 2112
Brahms - Piano Concerto No. 1 (Hélène Grimaud)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Orchestre Métropolitain du Grand Montréal / Yannick Nézet-Séguin

6 July 7.30, Beijing, Forbidden City Concert Hall +86 10 6559 8285
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
China Philharmonic / Semyon Bychkov

23 May, 7.30pm, Zagreb, Koncertna dvorana Lisinski, +385 1 6121 167
Schubert - Symphony No. 8
Zagreb Philharmonic / Dennis Russell Davies

**Czech Republic**

3, 4 April 7.30pm, Brno, National Theatre, +420 539 092 811
Schubert - Symphony No. 8
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Brno Philharmonic / Alexandar Marković

27 March 7.30pm, Aarhus, Musikhuset +45 8940 4040
Segerstam - Symphony No. 262
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 (three movements)
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra / Leif Segerstam

28 March 7.30pm, Aarhus, Musikhuset +45 8940 4040
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 with Nors S Josephson finale
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra / Leif Segerstam

25 April 7.30pm, Odense Concert Hall +45 63121314
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Odense Symphony Orchestra / Alexander Verdernikov

8 May 7.30pm, Copenhagen, Koncerthuset, +45 3520 6262
Bruch - Scottish Fantasy (Stefan Jackiw) / Bruckner - Symphony No. 4

**Croatia**

23 May, 7.30pm, Zagreb, Koncertna dvorana Lisinski, +385 1 6121 167
Schubert - Symphony No. 8
Zagreb Philharmonic / Dennis Russell Davies

**Czech Republic**

3, 4 April 7.30pm, Brno, National Theatre, +420 539 092 811
Schubert - Symphony No. 8
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Brno Philharmonic / Alexandar Marković

27 March 7.30pm, Aarhus, Musikhuset +45 8940 4040
Segerstam - Symphony No. 262
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 (three movements)
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra / Leif Segerstam

28 March 7.30pm, Aarhus, Musikhuset +45 8940 4040
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 with Nors S Josephson finale
Aarhus Symphony Orchestra / Leif Segerstam

25 April 7.30pm, Odense Concert Hall +45 63121314
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Odense Symphony Orchestra / Alexander Verdernikov

8 May 7.30pm, Copenhagen, Koncerthuset, +45 3520 6262
Bruch - Scottish Fantasy (Stefan Jackiw) / Bruckner - Symphony No. 4

**Finland**

20 March 7pm, Lahti, Sibelius Hall +358 (0)3 814 2801
Sallinen - At the Palace Gate
Rautavaara - Flute Concerto (Sharon Bezaly)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Lahti Symphony Orchestra / Okko Kamu

8 May 7pm, Kuopio Concert Hall
Jänäcke - Adagio / Segerstam - Symphony No. 259, "A Loving, Serving and Remembering Symfoniine Sinfonia"

**France**

13, 14 March 8pm, Strasbourg Palais de la Musique +33 (0)36906 3706
Straus - Oboe Concerto (Sébastien Giot)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Strasbourg Philharmonic Orchestra / Theodor Guschlbauer

28 March 8pm Metz, Arsenal +33 (0)3 8774 1616
Mozart - Don Giovanni, Overture

**Belgium**

22 March, 8pm, Brugge, Concertgebouw +32 7022 3302
Strauss - Metamorphosen
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Bamberger Symphoniker / Jonathan Nott
30 March, 5pm Paris: Salle Pleyel +33 (0)14256 1313
Haydn - Cello Concerto No. 1 (Truls Mørk)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Royal Concertgebouw Orchestra / Mariss Jansons

31 March 8pm, Paris, Salle Pleyel +33 (0)14256 1313
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 5 (Kristjan Zimerman)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Royal Concertgebouw Orchestra / Mariss Jansons

1 April 8pm, Paris, Salle Pleyel +33 (0)14256 1313
Mozart - Violin Concerto No. 3 (F. P. Zimmermann)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Royal Concertgebouw Orchestra / Mariss Jansons

3 May 8pm, Hombourg-Haut, Église St. Étienne +33 (0) 38781 4869
Gouvy - Symphony No. 6 6p. 58
Mozart - Flute Concerto No. 1 (Britta Kaliunas-Jacobs)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Deutsche Radio Philharmonie / Markus Huber

16 May 8pm, Paris, Salle Pleyel +33 (0)14256 1313
Schönberg - Begleitmusik zu einer Lichtspielszene
Mozart - Concert Arias (Christine Schäfer)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3
Orchestre Philharmonique de Radio France / Kent Nagano

23 May 8pm, 24 May 4pm Nice, Opéra de Nice +33 (0)49217 4079
Dvořák - Violin Concerto (F. P. Zimmermann)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Orchestre philharmonique de Nice / Philippe Auguin

5 June 8pm, Lille, Auditorium du Nouvel Siècle +33 (0)3201 28240
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Orchestre National de Lille / Theodor Guschlbauer

6 June 8.30pm, Grenoble, MC2 +33 (0)47600 7900
7 June 6pm, Lyon, Auditorium de +33 (0)478 959595
Strauss - Horn Concerto No. 2 (Guillaume Tétu)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Orchestre National de Lyon / Emmanuel Krivine

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

9 March 6pm, 10 March 8pm, Aachen, Eurogress +49 (0)241913100
Bruckner - Overture in G
Berio - Rendering
Schubert - Symphony No. 8
Bruckner - Psalm 150
Aachen Symphony Orchestra / Erik Nielsen

9 March 11am, 10 March 8pm,
Wuppertal, Historische Stadthalle +49 (0)20 02569 4444
16 March 7.30pm,
Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Kongresshaus +49 (0) 88 219100
Mendelssohn - Violin Concerto No.2 (Tobias Feldmann)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Wuppertal Symphony Orchestra / Toshiyuki Kamioka

11, 12 March 7.30pm Dortmund, Konzerthaus +49 231 22696 200
Rachmaninov - Piano Concerto No. 1 (Joseph Moog)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Dortmunder Philharmoniker / Gabriel Feltz

11, 12 March 7.30pm, 16 March 6pm,
Münster, Theater +49 (0)25159 09100
Tchaikovsky - Piano Concerto No. 1 (Lukáš Vondráček)
Ullmann - Die Weise der Liebe und des Todes
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6 (movements 2 + 4)
Münster Symphony Orchestra / Daniel Klajner

13, 14, 15 March 8pm, Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 88999
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 9 (Emmanuel Ax)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4 (1878/80)
Berlin Philharmonic / Bernard Haitink

15 March 7pm, Baden Baden, Festspielhaus +49 (0)7221 30 13101
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Staatskapelle Dresden / Christian Thielemann

17 March 8pm, Kölner Philharmonie +49 (0)221 280 280
Tchaikovsky - Piano Concerto No. 1 (Ivo Pogorelich)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
BBC Philharmonic / Juanjo Mena

19 March 8pm, Bamberg, Joseph-Keilberth-Saal +49 95196 47145
Strauss - Metamorphosen
Liszt - Totentanz, pno & orch (Alexander Kreichel)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Bamberger Symphoniker / Jonathan Nott

19 March 7pm; 20, 21 March 8pm, Frankfurt am Main,
Alter Oper +49 (0) 6913 40400
23 March 8pm Düsseldorf Tonhalle, +49 (0)211 8996123
24 March 8pm München Philharmonie, +49 (0)8954 818181
Brahms - Violin Concerto (Hilary Hahn)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Frankfurt Radio Symphony Orchestra / Paavo Järvi

23 March 8pm Leverkusen, Forum +49 (0)214406 4113
Ligeti - Melodien
Liszt - Totentanz, pno & orch (Alexander Kreichel)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Bamberger Symphoniker / Jonathan Nott

26 March 8pm, Bamberg, Joseph-Keilberth-Saal +49 95196 47145
Korngold - violin concerto (Hart Vandenbogaerde)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Bamberger Symphoniker / Jonathan Nott

27 March 8pm Leverkusen, Forum +49 (0)214406 4113
Strauss - Metamorphosen
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Bamberger Symphoniker / Jonathan Nott

4 April 8pm, Bielefeld, Rudolf-Oetker-Halle +49 (0)5232 8389
Mozart - Horn Concertos Nos 1 + 4 (Radovan Vlatković)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Bielefelder Philharmoniker / Alexander Kalajdjić

10, 11 April 8pm, Stuttgart Liederhalle +49 (0)711 2027710
Sibelius - Lemminkäinen’s Return, Violin Concerto (Nikolaj Znaider)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Radio-Sinfonieorchester Stuttgart des SWR / Stéphane Denève

11, 14 April 8pm, 13 April 11am,
Düsseldorf Tonhalle, +49 (0)211 8996123
Gräner - Feierliche Stunde
Hartmann - Symphony No. 2 (Adagio)
Bruckner - Mass No. 3
Chor der Städtischen Musikverein Düsseldorf
Düsseldorfer Symphoniker / Constantin Trinks

18, 19 April 8pm, Mannz, Hoher Dom, +49 (0)6131 2851 222
Britten - Violin Concerto (Hyeyoon Park)
Bruckner - Symphony in D minor “Die Nullte”
Philharmonisches Staatsorchester Mainz / Hermann Baumer

“20 years LJOA”
18 April, 5pm, Weiden, Max Regier Halle (open rehearsal)
20 April 8pm Bayreuth, Ordenskirche St Georgen
21 April 5pm, Weiden, Max Regier Halle
22 April 8pm, Selb, Rosenthaltheater
23 April 8pm, Jena, Philharmonie
24 April 8pm, Leipzig, Thomaskirche
Schubert - Symphony No. 8
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Internationale Junge Orchesterakademie / Simon Gaudenz

26 April 8pm, Frankfurt am Main, Alter Oper +49 (0) 6913 40400
Mozart - Violin Concerto No. 3 (F. P. Zimmermann)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Royal Concertgebouw Orchestra / Mariss Jansons

29 April 8pm, München Philharmonie im Gasteig, +49 (0)8954 818181
Wagner - Parsifal Prelude Act 3, Good Friday music
Strauss - Four Last Songs
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Gustav Mahler Jugendorchester / David Alkham
1, 2 May, Leipzig Gewandhaus +49(0)341 1270 280
Schumann - Violin Concerto (Julia Fischer)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra / Christoph Eschenbach

2, 3 May 8pm, 4 May 4pm Berlin, Konzerthaus +49 (0)30 203092101
Lutoslawski - Symphony No. 3  Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1877)
Konzerthausorchester Berlin / Jukka-Pekka Saraste

3 May 7pm, Pforzheim, Theater +49 (0)7231 392440
Mozart - Flute Concerto No. 1 (Britta Kalius-Jacobs)
Gouvy - Symphony No. 6  Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Deutsche Radio Philharmonie / Markus Huber

9, 12 May 8pm, 11 May 11am, Düsseldorf Tonhalle, +49 (0)211 8996123
Schreker - Nachstück, from Der ferne Klang
Strauss - Horn Concerto No.1 (Radovan Vlatkovic)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Düsseldorfer Symphoniker / Andrey Boreyko

9 May 8pm, Koblenz, Rhein-Mosel-Halle +49 (0)261 1000466
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 5 (Herbert Schuch)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7  Staatsorchester Rheinische Philharmonie / Daniel Raiskin

21, 22 May, 8pm, Heidelberg, Stadthalle +49 (0)6221 5820000
Vasks - Tala Gaisma (Alina Pogostkina)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 with SPCM finale
Philharmonisches Orchester Heidelberg / Yordan Karamazhalov

23 May 8pm, 25 May 7pm, Cottbus, Staatstheater +49 (0)355 7824 2424
Mozart - Symphony No. 33  Pena - New work.
Philharmonisches Orchester der Staatstheaters Cottbus / Evan Christ

23 May 8pm, Stuttgart Liederhalle +49 (0)711 2027710
24 May 7.30pm, Mannheim, Rosengarten +49 (0)621 26044
Shostakovich - Violin Concerto No. 1 (Gidon Kremer)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
Radio-Sinfonieorchester Stuttgart des SWR / Cornelius Meister

25 May 11am, 26 May 8pm, Frankfurt am Main, Alter Oper
Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 3 (Radu Lupu) +49 (0) 6913 40400
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Frankfurter Opern- und Museumsorchester / Sebastian Weigle

28 May 8pm Würzburg, Kiliandsdm, www.mozartfest.de
Mozart - Clarinet Concerto (Martin Fröst)  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Bamberger Symphoniker / Jonathan Nott

29, 30 May 8pm München Philharmonie, Gasteig, +49 (0)89954 818181
31 May 8pm Dresden, Frauenkirche +49 (0)351 65606701
Haydn - Motet: In sasane et vanae curae
Mendelssohn - Symphony No. 5 "Reformation"
Bruckner - Mass No. 1
Symphonieorchester des Bayerischen Rundfunks / John Eliot Gardiner

1 June 7.30pm, Dresden, Frauenkirche +49 (0)351 65606701
Lutoslawski - Cello Concerto (Jan Vogler)  Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Bruckner Orchester Linz / Heinrich Schiff

1 June 7pm, Nürnberg, St Lorenz Church +49 911 2313808
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Nürnberger Philharmoniker / Marcus Bosch

4 June 8pm, Dresden, Semperoper +49 (0)351 4911705
5 June 8pm, Freiburg im Breisgau, Konzerthaus +49 (0)761 38 18552
6 June 8pm, Mannheim, Rosengarten +49 (0)621 26044
Bráhms - Violin Concerto (Hilary Hahn)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)
hr-Sinfonieorchester / Paavo Järvi

5, 6 June 7.30pm, Magdeburg, Opernhaus Bühne +49 (0)391 540 6555
Schubert (arr. Webern) - German Dances
Berg - Violin Concerto (Yoichi Yasumashita)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Magdeburgische Philharmonie / Christian Ehwald

7 June 4pm, 8 June 8pm, Berlin, Philharmonie +49 (0)30254 88999
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 25 (Richard Goode)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 6
Deutsches Symphonie-Orchester Berlin / Heribert Blomstedt

17 June 8pm, Solingen Theater und Konzerthaus +49 (0)212 204820
18 June 8pm, Remscheid, Teo Otto Theater +49 (0)2191 162650
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Bergische Symphoniker / Peter Kuhn

18, 19 June 8pm, Chemnitz, Stadthalle +49 (0)371 4000 430
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 with SPCM finale
Robert-Schumann-Philharmonie / Frank Beermann

22 June 11am, 23 June 8pm, Braunschweig, Staatstheater +49 (0)53122 2345
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9 - Te Deum
Staatstheater Choir & Extra-Choir, Concert Choir, Braunschweig Staatssolisten / Alexander Joel

22 June 11am, 23 June 7.30pm, Stuttgart Liederhalle +49 (0)711 2027710

Scelsi - Hymnos (Johannes Knecht, org.)
Tallis - Spem in Alium  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Staatstheater Stuttgart / Sylvain Cambreling

29 June 3pm, Ottoheuern, Basiliika +49 (0)8332 921950
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Radio Orchester Berlin / Marek Janowski

1, 2 July 7.30pm, 6 July 6pm, Münster, Theater +49 (0)25159 09100
Schumann - Herman and Dorothea, Overture
Mozart - Clarinet Concerto (Sabine Meyer)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Münster Symphonie Orchester / Fabrizio Ventura

4, 5 July 8pm, Cologne Philharmonie +49 (0)221 280 280
7 July 8pm, Wiesbaden, Kurhaus +49 (0)61 1729290
Dvořák - Violin Concerto (F. P. Zimmermann)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
WDR Sinfonieorchester Köln / Kent Nagano

Hungary
28 Feb, 2 March 7.45pm; 1 March 3.30pm, Budapest, Bela Bartók National Concert Hall +36 1555 3300
Schubert - Symphony No. 8  Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Budapest Festival Orchestra / Iván Fischer

28 April 7.30pm, Budapest, Operaház +36 555 353 0170
Dudaróy - Cello Concerto (István Várdai)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Budapest Philharmonic Opera Orchestra / György Györrívány-Ráth

Italy
5 April 8.30pm, Florence, Teatro Comunale +39 055 2779 350
Liszt - Piano Concerto No. 2  Bruckner - Symphony No. 8
Orchestra del Maggio Musicale Fiorentino / Zubin Mehta

Japan
13 March 7pm, Tokyo Sunntory Hall +81 3 3584 9999
Strauss - Don Juan; Salome: Dance of the 7 Veils  Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Waseda Symphony Orchestra / Kazuomi Yamashita

24 March 7pm, Tokyo Bunka Kaikan +81 3 382207
Beethoven - Symphony No. 1  Bruckner - Symphony No. 1 (Linz)
Tokyo Metropolitan Symphony Orchestra / Kazuhito Koizumi

30 March 2pm Osaka, Symphony Hall +81 (0)6 64536000
Schumann - Piano Concerto (Miki Yumihari)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Kansai Philharmonic / Tajiro Imori

12 April 6pm, 13 April 3pm Tokyo, NHK Hall, +81 (0)3 3456 1780
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
NHK Symphony Orchestra / Marek Janowski
Orquesta Filarmonica de Gran Canaria
Bruckner
4 April 8.30pm, Oviedo, Palacio de Congresos Príncipe Felipe +34 985246217
Sibelius - Lemminkäinen’s Return; Violin Concerto (Nikolaj Znaider)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Radio Sinfonieorchester Stuttgart des SWR / Stéphane Denève

7 April 7.30pm, Madrid, Auditorio Nacional +34 (0)9133 703072
Glanert - New Work
Mendelssohn - Violin Concerto No. 2 (Nikolai Znaider)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4
Radio Sinfonieorchester Stuttgart des SWR / Stéphane Denève

10, 11 April 8pm, Madrid, Teatro Monumental +34 (0)91429 1281
Szymanowsky - Stabat Mater
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
RTVE Orchestra & Choir / Thomas Dausgaard

23 April 7.30pm Madrid, Auditorio Nacional, +34 (0)9133 703072
Berg - Three Orchestral Pieces Op. 6
Strauss - Four Last Songs (Emily Magee)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Gustav Mahler Jugendorchester / David Afkham

23 May 8.30pm, Tenerife, Auditorio de Tenerife +34 96 3375020
Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 18 (Elisabeth Leonskaja)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Orquesta de Valencia / Thomas Dausgaard

17 June 7.30pm, Auditorio Nacional de Musica, +34 (0)9133 703072
Cruz de Castro - El Halcón
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Orchestra, Choir & Youth Orchestra of the Community of Madrid / Víctor Pablo Pérez

Sweden
1 March 4pm, Orebro Konserthus +46 (0)1921 2121
Bruckner - Symphony No. 2
Swedish Chamber Orchestra / Thomas Dausgaard

2 March 3pm, Stockholm, Berwaldhallen +46 (0)8784 1800
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9
Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra / Valery Gergiev

7 March 6pm, 8 March 3pm, Göteborgs Konserthus +46 (0)31726 5310
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Göteborgs Symfoniker / Skrowaczewski

3 April 7pm, 5 April 3pm, Stockholm, Konserthuset +46 (0)850 667788
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (1st version, 1887)
Royal Stockholm Philharmonic / Alan Gilbert

10 April 7pm, Malmö, Konserthus +46 (0)40  343500
Lalo - Le Roi d’Ys, overture
Saint-Saëns - Cello Concerto No. 1 (Jakob Koranyi)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 1
Malmö Symfoniorkester / Marc Soustrut

Switzerland
9 March 5pm, Zürich Tonhalle +41 44206 3434
Weber - Overture to Peter Schollm
Brahms - Double Concerto (Bartek Niziol, Claudius Hermann)
Bruckner - Symphony in D minor “Die Nullte”
Orchestergesellschaft Zürich / Jonathan Brett Harrison

19 April 7.30pm, Interlaken, Casino Kursaal +41 (0)33 827 6100
Strauss - Four Last Songs (Emily Magee)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 7
Gustav Mahler Jugendorchester / David Afkham

1 June 11.15am, 9 March 5pm, Zürich Tonhalle +41 44206 3434
Mozart - Clarinet Concerto (Sabine Meyer)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 5
Philharmonia Zürich / Karl-Heinz Steffens
Taiwan
15 March 7.30pm Taipei National Concert Hall 8862 3393 9882
Schubert - Symphony No. 8  
Bruckner - Symphony No. 9  
London Philharmonic Orchestra / Iván Fischer

6 June 7.30 Hsinchu, Performing Arts Center
8 June 7.30 Taichung Chiang Hsing Hall

Mosart - Die Entführung aus dem Serail, Overture  

Liszت - Piano Concerto No. 1 (Boris Berezovsky)  
Bruckner - Symphony No. 4  
National Taiwan Orchestra / Okko Kamu

Turkey
13 March 8pm, Istanbul ICEC. www.biletix.com
Brahms - Double Concerto (Nicola Benedetti, Leonard Elsschenbroich)
Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (1890)  
Borusan Istanbul Philharmonic Orchestra / Sascha Goetzelt

26 March 9pm Istanbul, İş Sanat Hall, +90 212 316 1083
Brahms - Violin Concerto (Hilary Hahn)

Bruckner - Symphony No.3 (1889)  
hr-Sinfonieorchester / Paavo Järvi

29 March 9pm, Ankara, Bilkent Concert Hall

Bruckner - Symphony No. 8  
Bilkent Symphony Orchestra, Ankara Youth SO / Fazli Orhun Orhon

UK
14 March 7.30pm, London Royal Festival Hall 0844 875 0073
Mendelssohn - Violin Concerto No.2 (Benjamin Beilman)

Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1889)  
London Philharmonic Orchestra / Stanislaw Skrowaczewski

16 March 7.30pm, Ilkley, King’s Hall 01943 602319

Wagner - Siegfried Idyll  
Zipoli - Elevazione

Mozart - Violin Concerto No.3 (Jacqueline Cima)

Bruckner - Symphony No. 1  
Airedale Symphony Orchestra / John Anderson

20 March 6pm, London, RAM Dukes Hall
Beethoven (arr. Liebeck) - Coriolan Overture (arr. organ)

Mahler (arr. Binns) - Symphony No. 4 (1st movement, arr. organ)

Bruckner (arr. Vaduva) - Symphony No. 9 (1st mvnt, arr. keyboard)

Sibelius (arr. Holder) - Intermezzo from Karelia Suite (arr. organ)

Mozart - Violin Concerto No. 9 (Alexandra Binns, Peter Holder, Jonathan Liebeck (organists))

Airedale Symphony Orchestra / John Anderson

USA
6 March 7.30pm, 8 March 8pm, Rochester NY, Eastman Theatre

Berlioz - Carnaval Romain Overture  
+1 585 454 2100

Beethoven - Piano Concerto No. 2 (Jon Kimura Parker)

Bruckner - Symphony No. 6

Vienna Philharmonic / Franz Welser-Most

14 March 11am, 15 March 8pm, Cincinnati, Music Hall

Mozart - Flute Concerto No. 2 (Sir James Galway)  
+1 513 381 3300

Bruckner - Symphony No. 7

Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra / Louis Langrée

15 March 8.45pm, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan

Bruckner - Symphony No. 8 (1890 Nowak)

Israel Philharmonic / Zubin Mehta

27 March 7.30pm, 28, 29 March 8pm, New York, Avery Fisher Hall, Lincoln Center  
+1 212 875 5656

Vivier - Orion  

Bruckner - Symphony No. 9

New York Philharmonic / Gustavo Dudamel

30 March 4pm, Phoenix, Central United Methodist Church

Bruckner - Symphony No. 3 (1874 variant)

Musica Nova Orchestra / Warren Cohen

9, 11 April 8pm, San Francisco, Davies Symphony Hall

Mozart - Piano Concerto No. 21 (Garrick Ohlsson)  
+1 415 864 6000

Bruckner - Symphony No. 4

San Francisco Symphony Orchestra / Herbert Blomstedt

1, 2, 3 May 8pm, Philadelphia, Kimmel Center  
+1 215893 1999

Barber - Adagio for strings

Bartók - Violin Concerto No. 1 (Lisa Batiashvili)

Bruckner - Symphony No. 9

Philadelphia Orchestra / Yannick Nézet-Séguin

12 June 7pm, 13, 14 June 8pm, Washington, Kennedy Center

Bruckner - Symphony No. 8

National Symphony Orchestra / Christoph Eschenbach

With gratitude to Mr. Tatsuro Ouchi whose website www.beikkoarne.no/~hippo/musik-konzertvorschau/bruckner.html is the source for much of the concert listing information
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A recommended web-site for worldwide concert listings and reviews
The tradition of the Anton Bruckner Collected Works Edition dates back to the 1930s. A pioneering publication at the outset, it has been revised and expanded piecemeal through the years as practices have changed, sources have been reexamined, and new materials have surfaced.

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

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

Overview:

- Each volume will be printed in both full-sized conductor’s score and study score
- Each volume will contain a detailed Foreword in German and English
- The notation will reflect the most modern standards
- Each volume will contain an Editorial Commentary with essential philological information
- The latest research and editorial standards will be brought to bear on all volumes
- The new edition will have a website with updates and new information