



Bruckner The Journal

<http://www.zyworld.com/BrucknerJournal>

Issued three times a year and sold by subscription

Editorial and advertising: telephone 0115 928 8300
2 Rivergreen Close, Beeston, GB-Nottingham NG9 3ES

Subscriptions and mailing: telephone 01384 566 383
4 Lulworth Close, Halesowen, West Midlands B63 2UJ

VOLUME SIX, NUMBER ONE, MARCH 2002

Managing Editor: Raymond Cox

Editor: Peter Palmer

Associate Editor: Crawford Howie

In This Issue

	page
Concerts	2
Takashi Asahina	8
Compact Discs	9
'Celi' on Video by Colin Anderson	13
Publications	15
Exton Weekend	18
2001 Marathon by David Griegel and Ramon Khalona	19
The Third Version of Bruckner's 3rd by Dermot Gault	23
Letters	34
Calendar	36

Copyright in all material is retained by the authors.

Translations of pages 2, 3, 5 (Cohrs) & 15 by Peter Palmer.

Silhouettes by Otto Böhlér.

Cover drawing: William Flowers.

Next copy deadline for reviews
- 15 May 2002.



Takashi Asahina

BRUCKNER CONCERT SERIES IN TOKYO, 26-30 September 2001

On a Japanese tour last autumn, the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra of Flanders (Antwerp) under its music director Philippe Herreweghe visited Aichi, Tokyo, Shizuoka, Tottori, Fukuoka and Osaka. The programmes included Brahms' First Symphony, Bruckner's Symphonies Nos 7 and 9 (the latter in its four-movement form) and Mahler songs from Des Knaben Wunderhorn, sung by Britta Schwarz and Jochen Kupfer. At the centre of the tour were the three concerts the Belgian orchestra gave as part of a Bruckner series in Tokyo. The New Japan Philharmonic, the resident orchestra of Sumida Triphony Hall, played the opening concert on 26 September. They performed Bruckner's Overture in G minor, the early F minor Symphony and Symphony No "0" in D minor. Ken Takaseki conducted performances whose interpretative features were seemingly derived from the perspective of Bruckner's late works. His very slow readings did not always do justice to the music's storm-and-stress character, especially in the allegro sections. The orchestra displayed high-level technical skills and a warm and rounded overall sound. The performance of the Overture in G minor was a welcome chance to hear the original coda, which Bruckner later abridged and reworked. Exceptional power and dramatic grandeur were achieved in the finale of the Symphony in D minor.

On 27 September the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra of Flanders gave the first of its Tokyo concerts in the excellent acoustics of Suntory Hall. Given in the Nowak edition, the Seventh Symphony showed Herreweghe to be a meticulous and highly competent Bruckner interpreter. He is one of the few conductors with the courage to take the opening movement as a true allegro moderato and not as an andante; over its 17-minute duration the movement had vitality and was richly faceted. There was also a pleasant flow to the Adagio, and the melody was shaped with care. In the finale Herreweghe successfully resisted any temptation to speed up: the movement retained its massive, static character to the end.

I myself had the honour and the pleasure of conducting the Belgian orchestra's next concert on 28 September in Sumida Triphony Hall. A review by Rob van der Hilst is appended below. The third concert took place in the same hall on 30 September, when Herreweghe conducted the first complete performance in Japan of the Bruckner Ninth with the reconstructed finale by Samale et al. Here again, the conductor favoured brisk tempi enabling the public to assimilate what was now an 80-minute symphony without an interval and the architecture to achieve balance and symmetry.

The orchestra played all its concerts with a modified layout resembling the disposition in the Vienna Musikvereinsaal--traditionally with the violins to the left and right, and double basses in a line across the back. Violas and horns were seated on the left, and the cellos, trombones, tuba and trumpet on the right to the rear of the violins. This turned out to be a very effective arrangement producing a transparent and well balanced sound. There was also finely nuanced playing among the different instrumental groups. The carefully judged dynamics included a pianissimo which was extremely soft and yet carried. The audiences listened with a stillness and concentration almost unthinkable in the West--but the shouting and clapping afterwards was all the louder.

BENJAMIN GUNNAR COHRS

"DOCUMENTATION FOR A FRAGMENT"

Young German musicologist Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs made his Japanese conducting debut with the Royal Philharmonic of Flanders on 28 September 2001. In the first half of the concert, he presented the "Documentation for the Fragment" of the unfinished finale to Bruckner's Ninth, edited by John Phillips.

Bruckner did not leave a jumble of sketches for the finale but an ongoing autograph score which originally consisted of about 700 bars. Of the partly orchestrated score, some 562 bars (up to the recapitulation of the third theme) are currently available, together with 56 bars of sketches for the coda as far as the final D major. There are only some interruptions to the movement as we have it because souvenir hunters stole a number of pages after Bruckner's death. These gaps were the subject of explanatory comments in English (Cohrs) and Japanese (Prof. Yoko Yokosawa). After the interval the orchestra played the performing version of the finale by Samale/Phillips/Cohrs/Mazzuca, using a new text made by Cohrs for his own concert performances. This, however, he sees simply as his personal interpretation of the "official" team edition; it does not substantially exceed a conductor's retouchings. Cohrs has rescored some passages, re-ordered and extended a number of bar-periods (especially at the beginning of the movement, in the exposition of the second theme and before the coda), and modified the string accompaniment in the coda. There are also numerous adjustments to details of phrasing, articulation and dynamics. The aim, according to a programme note, was "to fit Bruckner's musical material even more tightly together if possible", and the impressive results did indeed constitute a persuasive organic whole.

To hear first the fragments and then the completion was a unique experience. Cohrs conducted the finale not only by heart but in a whole-hearted and completely convincing way. He allowed himself enough time in the second theme's slower paragraphs and took a broad, expansive view of the great climaxes, particularly the spaciouly unfolding coda. The use--envisaged by Bruckner himself--of motifs from the Te Deum and "non confundar", heard in augmentation, produced the effect of an overwhelming and unceasing peal of bells. Equally memorable were the profound desolation of the second theme (sensitively and tellingly played by the strings without vibrato), the splendour of the chorale theme, and the very eloquent phrasing and articulation of the fugue. Here Cohrs achieved a positively epic grandeur. The recourse to a historical seating plan based on the Vienna Philharmonic's [see the preceding report] helped to secure a near-perfect balance.

I venture to suggest that this concert was not only a triumph for the orchestra and its guest conductor but also a "second birth" of the final movement. Many details of this score's rich inner life, so to speak, could be heard for possibly the very first time. A commercial recording by Cohrs of both the fragment and the completion--preferably observing period performing practices--would therefore be extremely welcome. Meanwhile a revised version of the "team edition" of the finale has been announced for 2002.

ROB VAN DER HILST

LONDON CONCERTS

ROBERT BACHMANN is a devoted Bruckner conductor. His recent visits to the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra have always included a Bruckner symphony, conducted from memory. On 1 November the location was not the Barbican as usual, but the Royal Festival Hall. I have reported on most of Bachmann's London Bruckner performances and have been consistently critical of over-loud brass. In this, Bachmann's third traversal of the Fifth Symphony, I can only state again that brass decibels were excessive and render pointless a discussion of the performance.

Things were scarcely better a few nights later (Barbican Hall, 4 November) when Mariss Jansons conducted the London Symphony Orchestra in Bruckner's Fourth Symphony. Using the "New York" version as edited by Nowak--Bruckner made some modifications for a New York performance under Anton Seidl in 1886--Jansons had quadruple woodwind and four each of trumpets and trombones. Surely it should be trumpets and trombones in triplicate? In each case the fourth only supplemented the tuttis, which were made thick and over-loud, a textural labyrinth.

The performance, while thoroughly rehearsed and superbly played, lacked distinction. Jansons was an objective guide, so that one could admire the architecture but not the "Romantic" features. The Andante became a well moulded 18-minute adagio glorying in radiant, gorgeous-sounding strings, not least the violas, but the beauty was applied rather than inherent. The finale developed a more involving character, but in the coda the horns' intoning of the opening theme was lost in textural confusion.

On 16 December the Barbican welcomed Walter Weller as the short-notice replacement for Donald Runnicles in Bruckner's Ninth. (Weller also conducted Berg's Seven Early Songs with Susan Chilcott, as advertised.) Although the BBC Symphony Orchestra has not played Bruckner regularly, except during Günter Wand's period as principal guest conductor, it responded instinctively to Weller with integrated, polished and palpably emotional playing. Weller first heard the Ninth as a youngster with the Vienna Philharmonic under Furtwängler and then Schuricht; as a VPO violinist he took part in it many times. His reading reminded me of Schuricht's VPO recording (EMI): spacious and breathing, involved and fiery.

The culmination was a forward-moving Adagio that was both resigned and terrifying, the music advancing to its dissonant dénouement inexorably. Weller's Ninth, full of insight and very "human", proved memorable indeed.

COLIN ANDERSON

Second (and Third) Opinion

Robert Bachmann's concert with the RPO at London's Royal Festival Hall on 1 November 2001 featured a kind of Bruckner premiere. The Swiss conductor performed the Fifth Symphony in a cleaned-up score which took account of all the existing misprints listed by the Viennese publishers (MWV) and also of Bruckner's late revision of the last bars of the Adagio, as described in Nowak's Critical Report. This is a convincing variant which must rank as Bruckner's last word on the passage, but which virtually no conductor has heeded, not even Günter Wand. In addition Bachmann drew on 19th-century models for the orchestral seating arrangement. This resulted in an admirably transparent sound which was clearly to the benefit of Bruch's First Violin Concerto (soloist, Priya Mitchell) as well. The intensity of the playing revealed the high quality of a concerto that is often dismissed as a mere salon piece.

The interpretation of the Bruckner symphony was conceived on a broad scale. Bachmann showed his willingness to take risks, for instance in the very fast tempo adopted for the scherzo. Moreover he is one of the few conductors to observe that Bruckner does not prescribe a slower tempo in the first movement's Gesangsperiode (second thematic group). He also judged to perfection the ratio between the introductory adagio and main allegro.

Serious questions, however, must be asked of the Royal Philharmonic. Why did the ensemble immediately fall apart when the conductor was beating time in musically meaningful larger units, instead of chopping up phrases into sub-divisions (e.g. from bar 163 in the Adagio)? Why was it that the clarinets could phrase their music in an eloquent and obviously well rehearsed manner at the start of the finale, whereas in the first of the subsequent fugatos, the basses were unable or unwilling to adopt this beautiful phrasing? Given that this orchestra routinely doubles the first horn and has the alto trombone part played on a heavier tenor trombone, why did the brass consistently ignore all the conductor's clearly visible gestures to lower the volume? In these ways the RPO torpedoed its own concert.

B.G. COHRS

The performance of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony given by the RPO under Robert Bachmann on 1 November was very impressive. He understood the music completely, conveying the content in a satisfying overall picture. In spite of the Festival Hall acoustics, the performance was well balanced across every section of the orchestra, showing clarity of detail and due consideration for musical expression. The Finale, after references to material in previous movements, starts the listener off on a false fugal trail with a jagged theme, followed later by a chorale motif. The magnificent double fugue based on these two ideas climaxes in the chorale motif, which brings the symphony to its end in a paean of praise to J.S. Bach and his Renaissance predecessors. Bruckner's genius was well served by this performance.

A.M. CUTBUSH

Bruckner: Symphony No. 7 - arranged for chamber ensemble by Erwin Stein,
Hanns Eisler and Karl Rankl
Sirius Ensemble/Daniel Capps

The Sirius Ensemble was formed in 2000 by senior players from the Royal Academy of Music in London. Ten instrumentalists are involved in the arrangement of Bruckner's Seventh--a string quartet, double bass, harmonium, horn, clarinet and piano duet--which was intended for a concert at the Society for Private Musical Performances (Verein für musikalische Privataufführungen) under the presidency of Schoenberg. The society was active from December 1918 until December 1921, but the Bruckner arrangement does not appear in the record of works performed there.

About a hundred people were in the audience in the Duke's Hall of the RAM on 21 September. The symphony was the only work on the programme, and entrance was free. I was hoping the small forces would encourage the conductor to take the first movement faster than usual so that we could hear a real Allegro moderato, but the opening theme was introduced at the customary slowish tempo. Even so, it was a glorious opening, with the cello playing most expressively; but the sound of the piano at the enhanced repetition of the theme came as a shock. Such surprises continued, some of them beguiling and revealing, some unnerving and not entirely successful. A wonderful duet was heard between clarinet and piano at the beginning of the development (bar 165), where the piano took the flute part. There was much molto espressivo playing, especially from the first violinist. Although very powerful when first heard, this began to verge on the sentimental and to undermine the structure.

For the Adagio the horn player had a Wagner tuba for the opening phrase of the theme, and the string quartet gave their all for the theme's continuation. The ingenious arrangement enabled the two climaxes to reflect Bruckner's orchestral palette quite effectively, although the main climax did not register as strongly as the music demands. This seemed to be partly a matter of balance--the harmonium subtle to the point of inaudibility, the horn sounding out over everything. The elegy for Wagner tubas was taken by the horn with the piano playing sepulchral chords beneath: a moving effect. The Scherzo was done well, the piano introducing the trumpet theme, and the violins going at their rhythmic accompaniments with verve. The Finale had to open with piano tremolo so that the violins could state the theme, which was again a shock. But the movement then took flight with some very robust playing which brought a fine performance to a rousing end.

It's hard to tell how the arrangement would sound to someone who didn't know the work in its usual guise, but the impression was of a most Schubertian chamber work. Bruckner's melodies came over beautifully as instrumental solos allowing a quality of individual expression that a full orchestra cannot provide.

KEN WARD

Last year's performance of Bruckner's Eighth Symphony in the De Montfort Hall, Leicester, by the Philharmonia Orchestra under Lorin Maazel was given on 2 June and not 1 June as indicated in our last issue.

TWICE NO. 3 AT SYMPHONY HALL

SAKARI ORAMO and the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra began their concert on 27 September with Wagner's Tannhäuser overture played, to my ears, in the style of Bruckner. There was brass aplenty and it was at times fit to blast your ears off, leaving the strings struggling to be heard. That said, I found the performance exciting and at the same time lyrical. A change of mood came with Christian Tetzlaff as the soloist in Mozart's Fifth Violin Concerto. His delivery was competent, but humour was missing; the whole piece suffered from a drawing-room sedateness.

For Bruckner's Symphony No. 3 Oramo chose the final version of 1889. He began the first movement at a slower pace than the orchestra seemed comfortable with. More than once I felt that the music would fall apart. But we were soon on our way and the orchestra were obviously playing their hearts out. The sustained slow speed made it difficult for solo players, particularly the trumpet, and there were moments when the strings tended to "chug". The second movement featured some beautiful and eloquent phrasing, while the country-dance section of the third movement became a less predictable waltz. Freedom for the players came in the finale, where the strict disciplinarian finally gave the orchestra its head. The result was glorious--a coming together of all parties to the common purpose, with the chorale-like music soaring to an ecstatic and radiant conclusion.

MICHAEL PIPER

It is unusual to open a concert season with Bruckner, as Oramo and the CBSO did for 2001/2002--and with two performances (27 & 29 September)! Conductor and orchestra have built a strong and creative partnership with wide-ranging programmes. This was Oramo's first venture into Bruckner with the CBSO, and one relishes the thought of more (he has announced his intention of performing Bruckner's Fifth).

The first movement of the Third was--perhaps surprisingly--slow, broad and stately. It was beautifully played, inner parts being clearly revealed, and with a structural insight which allowed some exquisite phrasing, particularly in the woodwind section. The pulse was never varied for effect, not even at climactic moments. The Adagio had a flow that seemed just right. The Scherzo was suitably bouncy in fine Austrian fashion, especially in the Trio. The Finale was taken at a slightly brisker pace than is often the case, thereby transforming one's view of the work as a whole. The culmination with the trumpet theme brought no holding back. Altogether this was a satisfying and very engaging performance.

RAYMOND COX

Bruckner: Symphony No. 7

Sheffield Symphony Orchestra/John Longstaff

When applying an amateur orchestra to a Bruckner symphony a conductor is taking on quite a task. There is the sheer scale of the work to consider, and the need to hold it together particularly in the transitional sections. A pace must be set which is within the players' capabilities, and a sense of flow must be maintained while at the same time injecting some interpretative excitement. Longstaff produced fine playing all round at St Mark's Church, Broomhill on 10 November. The Nowak cymbal came in on cue in the Adagio; the slowest Scherzo I have heard created unexpected drama (and prompted applause); and the symphony was steered to a glorious and fulfilling culmination.

MICHAEL PIPER

TAKASHI ASAHINA (1908-2001)

TAKASHI ASAHINA enjoyed unparalleled prestige in his native Japan, where he regularly conducted all the leading orchestras until shortly before his death on 29 December 2001 at the age of 93. He also enjoyed a prolific recording career. His numerous accounts of Schubert, Schumann, Brahms, Richard Strauss and Tchaikovsky are supplemented by five complete Beethoven cycles and the entire *Ring* with an all-Japanese cast. He is particularly associated with Bruckner, and as well as his three cycles of the nine numbered symphonies, recorded in the 1970s, 80s and 90s, there are many single recordings of individual works. Asahina's recordings were invariably issued in de luxe editions, making the few imports to reach these shores highly expensive and less likely to attract collectors. Nor were there any live appearances in the UK to enable us to form first-hand impressions of his conducting.

Asahina was born in 1908 in Tokyo and studied Law and Philosophy at Kyoto Imperial University before deciding on a musical career. He then studied under the Russian conductor Emmanuel Metter before making his debut in 1940 with the Shin Symphony Orchestra, now the NHK Symphony. During the war he worked in Japanese-occupied China, where he conducted ensembles largely made up of Jewish refugees from Germany and Eastern Europe. It was in those unusual circumstances that Asahina conducted his first performances of Bruckner, whose works he had got to know as a student. After the Second World War he spent some time in Germany and discussed Bruckner with Furtwängler.

In 1947 Asahina returned to Japan and founded the Kansai Symphony Orchestra, reorganized as the Osaka Philharmonic in 1960, remaining its General Music Director for the rest of his life. He began conducting abroad again in 1953 and established good relations with the Berlin Staatskapelle and the North German Radio Orchestra, but his undoubted successes were never followed by invitations to conduct the leading European orchestras. Residual anti-Japanese feeling after the war was certainly a factor in this. There may however have been another, more insidious prejudice, an ill-informed notion that Asian conductors would not bring the requisite *Innigkeit* to the Austro-German classics. On his European visits Asahina was usually asked to conduct Tchaikovsky, Mussorgsky, Respighi, and so on, but when he offered to conduct Bruckner he was advised that German orchestras had plenty of Bruckner conductors at their disposal.

Asahina was virtually unknown in the English-speaking world until Henry Fogel, Executive Director of the Chicago Symphony, heard him conduct Strauss' *Alpine Symphony* in Tokyo in 1991. Although recovering from illness, he was very much in control. A few years later Fogel saw him conduct Bruckner's Eighth and was surprised by 'one of the most noble and warm-hearted Bruckner performances I have ever heard'. He got to know Asahina, whom he describes as 'a truly sweet, warm human being', and collected as many of his recordings as he could. Daniel Barenboim was equally enthusiastic when he heard them and invited Asahina to conduct the Chicago Symphony Orchestra in Bruckner's Fifth. The resulting performance was not perfect, but detail in the finale was illuminated as seldom before, and Asahina built the work to an overwhelming conclusion which brought a cheering audience to its feet. A legend was born at last.

DERMOT GAULT

Bruckner: Symphony No 7, ed. Haas

Tokyo Metropolitan Symphony Orchestra/Takashi Asahina
Fontec FOCD9132 [rec. Suntory Hall, Tokyo, 24.10.97]

Bruckner: Symphony No 8, ed. Haas

Tokyo Metropolitan Symphony Orchestra/Takashi Asahina
Fontec FOCD9124/9125 [rec. Suntory Hall, Tokyo, 28.9.98/1.10.98]

These two recordings show Asahina to be a natural Bruckner conductor. He uses the Haas edition of both works, and there is no percussion in the slow movement of the Seventh. Asahina draws expressive and carefully balanced playing from the excellent Tokyo Metropolitan Orchestra and excels in subtle nuances, especially at moments of transition.

His gentleness of spirit suits the Seventh Symphony. Tempi are broad but for the most part not unduly slow, the long drawn-out coda being largely responsible for the first-movement timing of 23 minutes. The third theme of the finale has a craggy, monumental grandeur. Here again, however, a slow tempo which is impressive at first comes to seem laboured. The scherzo, on the other hand, is precise, rugged and lively, and the trio is persuasively phrased at a flowing tempo. The real problem is Asahina's reluctance to allow the music its full dramatic range. He irons out contrasts. The third theme in the opening movement is performed heavily, with the violins playing on the string instead of the bouncing, off-the-string effect suggested by Bruckner's staccato marks. As a result the movement loses its one moment of animation. The great C minor outburst at letter M is toned down; marcato accents in the brass are refined away. The performance is wise and appealing, but I feel that something is missing.

Bruckner's Eighth is given a sympathetic reading with memorable moments--the slow middle section of the first movement, for example. Tempi are flowing here and even slightly impatient in places. Asahina draws silkily eloquent playing from the orchestral strings. The absence of ego from the conducting is welcome, but once again I felt that it never quite got to the heart of the music. The Fontec recordings have the same character as the performances; they are warm and natural but somewhat lacking in impact. The symphonies were recorded live, but there is no sign of an audience apart from the applause at the end.

I couldn't help wondering whether recordings Asahina made more than twenty years ago, when he was a mere seventy-year-old, showed greater intensity. Japanese Victor [VDC-1214] has issued a performance of Bruckner's Seventh recorded in October 1975 in the Marble Hall at St Florian: a good venue as the sound is ample without being cavernous. After this performance Leopold Nowak is reported to have said: 'I have never heard it quite like that before'--a rather ambiguous compliment! To my ears Asahina's interpretation doesn't radically differ from the 1997 performance reviewed above, but the scherzo lacks rhythmic control and the brass playing becomes increasingly uncertain. Above all (and to a greater extent than in the Suntory Hall performance) the tempi don't hang together convincingly. There is, however, a magical moment in the pause between the second and third movements when a church bell chimes distantly. I'm glad the engineers left this in.

The St Florian concert was given with the Osaka Philharmonic Orchestra, as was a 1977 cycle of live Bruckner performances released on LP by Kobe and on CD by JeanJean Disques. Of these, I have heard the Fourth [JeanJean JJGD-2004] and the Eighth [JJGD-2009/2010]. Unfortunately these performances suffer from a closely balanced recording which robs the music of natural warmth and compresses its dynamic range. The brisk account of the Fourth resembles the Klemperer EMI recording, down to the exchanging of the oboe and flute parts in the Trio. While the orchestral playing sounds disciplined, the lack of poetry is a drawback. The horn solo at the start is pinched, and the player seems unwilling to play the phrase legato. In the great solo writing of the second movement the violas are matter-of-fact.

The Eighth Symphony is at once broader and more rugged than in the 1998 Tokyo performance. The Trio is slow but vibrant with meaning. This performance has a spontaneity missing from the later, smoother Fontec recording, although it is not as well played, the heavy brass being particularly fallible.

These few recordings give only a sampling of Asahina's prowess as a Brucknerian. Who is to say that they represent him at his best? Japanese collectors who want to explore his legacy on disc are certainly spoiled for choice. **What we need now is a judicious, reasonably priced and widely distributed selection of recordings which will enable Western listeners to decide Asahina's stature for themselves.**

.....

My thanks to William Flowers, John Berky, Henry Fogel, and Takanobu Kawasaki for their help and information.

DERMOT GAULT

ブルックナー：交響曲 第七番 木長調 (ハース版)
ANTON BRUCKNER: SYMPHONY NO.7 IN E MAJOR (HAAS EDITION)



BRUCKNER: SYMPHONY NO. 7
TAKASHI ASAHINA

朝比奈 隆 指揮 / 大阪フィルハーモニー交響楽団
TAKASHI ASAHINA, conductor / OSAKA PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA

COLIN ANDERSON writes:

I was sorry indeed to hear that Takashi Asahina had died. His reputation in Japan seems to have been god-like. If, in recent years, he gave a concert, it would be recorded; and if he conducted the same concert the following night, that too would be recorded and issued on CD!

My first encounter with Asahina was via a JVC recording of Furtwängler's Second Symphony. Then came Bruckner's First with the Osaka Philharmonic for Canyon Classics: a powerful, structure-conscious reading sufficient for me to invest in Asahina's Osaka cycle of Symphonies Nos 1-9. More Bruckner followed, such as Symphonies Nos 5 and 7-9 with the Tokyo Symphony (also for Canyon) and earlier Bruckner for Fontec.

In the last few years a steady stream of CDs has been released. Just recently Bruckner's Fourth and Seventh Symphonies (both edited by Haas) have appeared on Fontec. Whatever the influence of Furtwängler, Asahina's conducting rarely contains what might be termed Furtwänglerisms; in fact it is closer to that of Böhm and Klemperer. In general, from the Asahina recordings that I have (they include Beethoven, Brahms, Mahler, Tchaikovsky and Verdi's Requiem), I would describe him as a "central" interpreter, more fluent than heroic, a musician who valued articulacy and the long view, and who trusted the composer. Like Klemperer, Asahina could be slow for the sake of textural clarity and delineation of structure. A Karl Böhm-like buoyancy and Viennese sense of comfort are apparent in the warm orchestral sound he produces, and in the yielding but not mawkish phrasing that Asahina successfully incorporates within the whole.

The "Romantic" Symphony recorded in November 2000 (Fontec FOCD9150) is as fine as anything I've heard him do. Asahina here conducts the NHK Symphony Orchestra in NHK Hall. At 68 minutes, this is a spacious reading, lyrically fiery without exaggerated dynamics and always in patient search of the musical summit. Asahina was a meticulous rehearser, and there have been times when his performances have struck me as worthy but uninspired. Not, however, this perfectly paced Fourth, which is magnificent, not least in the Andante quasi Allegretto. Omnipresent are light and shade in the phrasing and dynamics, beauty of sound, a careful blend of timbres. The NHK orchestra plays superbly, its strings outstanding. The audience sounds commendably quiet and attentive, while the immediacy of the recording doesn't compromise Asahina's realization of Bruckner's inner world.

Asahina is a somewhat enigmatic figure in the West. I have no idea how many recordings of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony he left (although I have got others!). But if you don't know Asahina's Bruckner interpretations, the above "Romantic" would be a good place to start. In London, Tower Records (Kensington) should be able to help--expect to pay £20 or so.

MEHTA, MATAČIĆ, MACAL ON CD

ZUBIN MEHTA's 1965 recording of Bruckner's Ninth with the Vienna Philharmonic was previously available on a Belart CD. Only now, however, has it been issued by the parent company of Decca--in a "96kHz 24-bit SuperDIGITAL Transfer" for its "Legends" label. So there! And it does sound wonderful: a precise reproduction of orchestral instruments in the admirable acoustics of the Sofiensaal, with a musical blend and balance, and little or no artifice from the control-room. I also respond to Mehta's direction. This was "his first recording of any significance", and the choice of work was audacious for the time. The VPO could not have played it more beautifully. The aching lyricism is enthralling, the ardour of the orchestra everything that the 29-year-old conductor could have dreamt of. Clearly he loves the music, but such devotion retards progress through the first movement's exposition when he inserts tempo changes almost ad libitum. The scherzo is controlled and menacing, the trio a tad subdued, while the Adagio is an intense, dramatic threnody. A flawed but compelling interpretation by a conductor and orchestra who remain "an item" to this day. The booklet reprints the original LP sleeve--although to portray Mehta as a *matinée* idol rather belies his assiduous response to a visionary symphony [DECCA 468 494-2].

On 23 July 1983 Lovro von Matačić, then aged 84, made his only appearance at the Henry Wood Proms in London.* He conducted Bruckner's Symphony No. 3 with the Philharmonia, with whom he had recorded the "Romantic" Symphony in 1954 using the Loewe/Schalk edition. For No. 3 Matačić chooses the 1877 version edited by Oeser (with a bit of tweaking). The performance is old-fashioned in its "stop-go" approach and tempi that are not always related to each other. The recording is digital: an early BBC example of this technology. The Royal Albert Hall's space becomes all too apparent, which means that the Philharmonia sounds distant; upper strings are a shade thin while basses can seem rather thick. Nonetheless, this fiery and lyrical rendition has personality and individual touches, like a lightly turned *ländler* and polka. Refreshing [BBC LEGENDS BBCL 4079-2].

The 1984 recording of Bruckner's Fourth by the Hallé Orchestra under Zdeněk Macal was an early digital entry to Classics for Pleasure's LP catalogue. Only now have I heard it. Macal's reading is curious in being among the more spacious, at 68 minutes, yet appearing small-scale. Quieter moments are given breadth and an attractive intimacy. The Andante quasi allegretto movement is hushed and reverential. But in fortissimos or climaxes there is an emotional and dynamic restriction which suggests playing for microphones; there are also a few noticeable edits [EMI 574 9422].

COLIN ANDERSON

* See Nigel Simeone, TBJ November 1998

D V D V I D E O

Now out on DVD [ARTHAUS MUSIK 100 250, distributed by Select] is a 60-minute film of Sergiu Celibidache rehearsing Bruckner's **Mass in F minor**--a fascinating glimpse of Celi at work. The stated year of 1993 is questionable.* The soloists, Margaret Price, Doris Soffel, Peter Straka and Matthias Holle, are those on the EMI 1990 recording of the Mass with the Munich Philharmonic Orchestra and Choir. Using extracts from a St Florian rendition (in which Hans Sotin replaces Holle), the film intercuts rehearsal there with Munich preparations featuring the choir with piano and with soloists and orchestra; also the orchestra alone. The booklet suggests an interview with Celibidache, but this is neither in the film nor tracked separately.

Whatever Celi's dislike of the recording studio, he allowed his concerts to be broadcast and archived, and he generally had no problem with cameras or an audience at rehearsals. He was infamous for wanting something like ten rehearsals for each concert. When, after a long absence, he returned to London in the late 'seventies to work with the LSO, his week of preparations for a programme of Stravinsky, Debussy and Brahms (Fourth Symphony) was not spent working solely on the music. According to two current members of the LSO, he spent the first session tuning the orchestra, a 50-minute process followed by an early release for the players. He also gave a non-compulsory talk on his musical philosophy. Otherwise rehearsals were a psychological preparation for the concert. Celi spent time challenging the players to listen to each other and to adapt accordingly with regard to balance and the acoustics. No doubt work in Stuttgart and Munich was similarly Zen-like.

The results, live and on CD, could be astonishing. Criticism of slow tempi fails to appreciate Celi's finite colours, blends and balances or his sense of harmonic and directional structure. Charges that he was a crank, a charlatan or just plain boring are easily refuted by anyone with perceptions that go beyond the obvious.

This film comes with English subtitles and includes Celi's observations on the music and Bruckner's harmonic and motivic construction. After the move to St Florian, the meticulous rehearsal in Munich and "home" performance are adjusted to the different acoustic. "There is no discussion!" barks Celi when he wants the choir to move forward. There are repeated asides to his players to mind St Florian's echo and to fashion the required legato accordingly. On first-name terms with the orchestra, Celi can be questioning, witty, intimate and berating. "Can't you hear he's coming down, it's marked pianissimo anyway," he demands of the strings when the flute decrescendos in the Benedictus and they do not react. With the choir he is friendly, smiling and patient; with the soloists he is courteous and conversational. He rehearses from memory and does not "interpret" (a word he hated). Rather he raises the performers' perceptions so that they understand their part in the whole. That Celi could be difficult does not alter the fact that he was a remarkable musician. The DVD video goes some way towards explaining why and how, and I recommend it to friend and foe of Celi alike.

* See remarks on next page

Anyone new to Bruckner and keen to build a collection has arrived at a time when there are several bargain sets to be found. Among these are the Tintner, Skrowaczewski and Jochum/Dresden recordings mentioned in the November 2001 review section. In addition, all the Inbal/Frankfurt RSO recordings have been re-issued in recent months at bargain price. - To celebrate Günter Wand's 90th birthday, BMG have issued a 10-CD set at mid price that includes three Bruckner performances (see below). - We have listed our first DVD video. Some readers will have seen this on cable/satellite TV. It shows Celibidache preparing the Munich PO and Choir, plus soloists, for a performance of the Mass in F minor at St Florian. German sources confirm that this took place in 1990; the 1993 date on the video relates solely to the final editing.

SYMPHONIES

* = new issue

- Nos 2 & 4 Jochum/Dresden Staatskapelle (Dresden 7-80, 12-75)
EMI CZS5 574837-2 [52:41, 65:07]
- No. 3 *Gielen/SWR SO (Baden-Baden 5-99) HÄNSSLER 93.031 [55:45]
*Matacic/Philharmonia (London 7-83) BBC LEGENDS BBCL4079-2 [59:26]
- No. 4 Knappertsbusch/VPO (Vienna 4-64) LIVING STAGE 347.18 [69:59]
+ Wagner *Die Walküre*, Act I
- Nos 4 & 5 Kempe/Munich PO (Munich 12-75/1-76, 5-75) SCRIBENDUM [65:13, 75:12]
- Nos 4,5,9 Wand/BPO, Cologne RSO (Berlin 1/2-98, Cologne 7-74, Berlin 9-98)
RCA RED SEAL 74321 90114--ten CD set [68:40, 74:38, 61:59]
- No. 5 Furtwängler/BPO (Berlin 10-42) DG 471 294-2GB4--four CD set
with other composers [68:36]
- No. 7 *Vonk/St Louis SO (St Louis 4-97) ARCH MEDIA AM1005 [64:28]
available direct from the orchestra
- No. 8 Knappertsbusch/BPO (Berlin 1-51) ARCHIPEL ARPCD0036 [78:30]
*Karajan/VPO (Vienna 4-57) ANDANTE 4997/5000--four CD set
with Mahler and Strauss
*Rosbaud/SWR SO (Baden-Baden 1951) URANIA 22 188 [64:33]
8 minutes missing from Adagio!
- No. 9 *Wand/BPO (Berlin 1-01) RCA 74321 82866 [87:07]
Knappertsbusch/BPO (Berlin 29/30-1-50) TAHRA TAH417/8 [59:00]
+ Schubert Symphony No. 8 and overtures by Beethoven, Wagner
Knappertsbusch/BPO (Berlin 28-1-50) ARCHIPEL ARPCD0034 [55:04]
Mehta/VPO (Vienna 5-65) DECCA 468 494-2 [63:40]

PIANO WORKS

- *Fumiko Shiraga (Hamburg 7-01) BIS CD1297 [64:50]
includes Adagio of Symphony No. 7, transcr. C. Hynais

CHORAL

- E min Mass, Herreweghe/Chapelle Royale, Collegium Vocale/Ensemble
Motets Musique Oblique (11-89) HARMONIA MUNDI HMX2981322 [62:19]
F min Mass Celibidache/Munich PO, Choir & Soloists (rehearsals in Munich,
St Florian 1990) **DVD VIDEO** ARTHAUS MUSIK 100 250 [60:00]

Ten pages are allotted to Bruckner in a new, 1566-page edition of the Penguin Guide to Compact Discs (paperback, £20). The late Giuseppe Sinopoli is awarded a rosette for his Bruckner Fifth.

Elisabeth Maier, Verborgene Persönlichkeit - Anton Bruckner in seinen privaten Aufzeichnungen (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 11). 710pp & 426 pp.
Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna, 2001

ELISABETH MAIER's book is one of the recent publications which, a hundred years after Bruckner's death, are finally supplying us with facts that should have been the basis for Bruckner research and reception a long time ago. The work contains all 23 of Bruckner's surviving calendars and commonplace-books (at least three calendars, and possibly more, are missing at present). It is to the publishers' credit that in recognition of its special importance, they have financed the printing themselves.

The result is a handsomely finished double volume in a slip-case, the second volume containing facsimiles of all the jottings which Dr Maier has meticulously transcribed and above all annotated in the first volume. Compare the two volumes, and it will become apparent how much industry she brought to her task of deciphering, page after page, Bruckner's sometimes barely legible writing, identifying the authors of entries in other hands, adding explanatory remarks and plausible interpretations where possible, as well as going into the biographical background of the countless persons mentioned. All this must have been a labour of sisyphian proportions. The production of these volumes, with their illustrations, various useful indices and notes on special features of the handwriting, is also a model in every respect.

Indispensable though this compendium will be for investigating the details of Bruckner's life, a cautionary note must be sounded. Firstly, the publication is not a "reader", and secondly, as Dr Maier points out, anyone looking at Bruckner's sparse jottings for the first time will have an initial sense of disappointment. "What is striking about Bruckner's private jottings is the total lack of reflections on his work as a creative artist. There is no artistic theorizing in these modest records, no composer's maxims, no 'musical orders of the day'. We have only the plain and simple duties, the banalities of household and economic management, the desire for a little shelter and relaxation among friends, naive or scurrilous musings on nature, and an increasingly unrealistic casting around for a feminine ideal which grew younger and younger. And finally, surpassing all that the reader expects or might expect in their range and their dominance, the equally plain and sparse jottings concerning an intense and steadfast spiritual life."

Elisabeth Maier wisely avoids a more extensive assessment of her findings. Providing just a few pointers in her preface, she leaves it to the reader to piece together a kind of Bruckner kaleidoscope from the numerous slivers. And yet these jottings offer an enormous profusion of details and facets that constantly inspire fresh thinking about Bruckner as man and artist--that complex, shy, vulnerable, unguardedly self-revealing, yet "hidden" personality. Naturally the wealth of material raises questions that will occupy Bruckner scholars for a long time to come. The exceptional merit of this publication is to have provided clear-cut foundations far removed from the fanciful scribbles of whole generations of Bruckner apologists.

BENJAMIN GUNNAR COHRS

Weltliche Chorwerke 1843-1893, edited by Angela Pachovsky and Anton Reinhaller. **Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, XXIII/2**. 186pp. ISMN M-50025-226-9. Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna, 2001

It is good to have, at long last, a volume of Bruckner's small-scale secular choral music in the Critical Edition. It supplements the earlier volumes of secular vocal works--Name-Day Cantatas, Festival Cantata, Germanenzug and Helgoland (XXII/1-8, Vienna 1987)--edited by Burkhardt, Führer and Nowak. The volume contains 36 pieces of different type and character. Compositions for male voice choir are in the majority, but there are also works for male voice quartet, mixed vocal quartet, and the "mottos" or short signature tunes Bruckner wrote for several choral societies. These works cover more or less his entire compositional career--from 1843, when he was a school assistant in Kronstorf, to 1892. The volume includes a revision of his first chorus An dem Feste which Bruckner provided for the Akademischer Gesangverein in 1893, the year of Helgoland.

Most of the choruses were written for specific occasions, but some of the earlier works cannot be dated precisely. During the St Florian period, for instance, Bruckner composed Wie des Bächleins Silberquelle for the male voice quartet he had formed. Des Dankes Wort sei mir vergönnt is dedicated to Count O'Hegerty, whose children he taught at their home in Tillysburg Castle near St Florian. Der Lehrerstand was written for Michael Bogner, the school headmaster, and Die Geburt for a friend's name-day. During his years in Linz Bruckner was inspired to write several works as a member and eventually principal conductor of the Frohsinn choral society, and through his association with another two societies. Finally, during his years in Vienna he wrote pieces for a number of choral associations.

The conventional categories of the 19th-century secular repertoire--patriotic and nature choruses, love songs and drinking songs--are substantially represented. At the same time the volume includes pieces of a more religious character such as Vor Arnehts Grab and Am Grabe, both written for funerals, Nachruf in memory of Bruckner's friend Josef Seiberl, and two choruses for weddings. Most of the choruses are for male voices a cappella, sometimes with solo voices. In the 1860s, however, Bruckner wrote three choruses with piano accompaniment. With two exceptions, only choruses written during the Vienna period have wind (or string) accompaniment. In Abendzauber (1878) a horn quartet joins a solo tenor/baritone, male voice choir and three distant female yodellers. In the second (1879) version of Das hohe Lied a mixed accompaniment of strings and optional brass supports the voices. A brass ensemble accompanies the male voices in the nationalistic Das deutsche Lied of 1890.

Das hohe Lied in its original version of 1876 is one of several choruses to include parts for "humming voices" [Brummstimmen] which, although atmospheric, are difficult to perform. This, plus the fact that the choruses are very much of their time, explains their lack of popularity today. But there is much fine music in this volume, and I hope that some enterprising choral societies will explore its treasures. A critical report will appear in due course. In the meantime, Angela Pachovsky has provided an excellent introduction in the foreword to her edition.

CRAWFORD HOWIE

Amanda Glauert: Hugo Wolf and the Wagnerian Inheritance.

Cambridge University Press, 1999. ISBN 0 521 49637 3 (hardback).
£40/\$54.95



POETRY played no part in Bruckner's composing after his early-to-middle years,* while the nearest that Hugo Wolf came to writing a symphony was his orchestral tone-poem, Penthesilea. But these two very different personalities, born 36 years apart, were united by more than the choral works which, on one memorable occasion, caused them to travel by the same train to a concert in Berlin.

Both composers found themselves at the centre of what Ernst Kurth called the crisis in Romantic harmony--a crisis sparked off by the opening of Wagner's Tristan. For a variety of reasons, Bruckner was actively promoted by some of his Viennese supporters as "the Wagner of the Symphony" and Hugo Wolf by much the same faction as the "Wagner of the Lied". In their day, observes Amanda Glauert, both were

seen as courting unpopularity, "pushing the Lied and symphony in new directions that sometimes seemed to make little sense to the uninitiated". To explain their independent approach to matters of style, the myth of the simplicity (or naivety) of genius was conceived. In Bruckner's case, this idea was still being perpetuated by such English critics as Ernest Newman several decades after his death. In Hugo Wolf's case, on the other hand, Ernest Newman rejected the myth with great eloquence in a pioneering monograph published in 1907, four years after Wolf's untimely death.

Newman's book did not spawn any immediate successors; it is only relatively recently that a body of scholarly writing on Hugo Wolf has begun to emerge. This book by a lecturer at the Royal Academy of Music in London is a solid example. After considering the general nature of the Wagnerian musical inheritance, Glauert turns to Hugo Wolf as a critic of Wagner in her second chapter and his challenge to 19th-century aesthetics in Chapter Three. It is revealing that the work of Hans Sommer, a song composer truly indebted to Wagner in style, has now disappeared without trace. In her next chapter Glauert deals with Wolf's "reworking" of Wagner's aesthetics of words and music in his Mörrike Lieder. There is in-depth technical analysis here and in the following chapter on Wolf's Goethe Lieder (where the composer perhaps displays the greatest formal mastery, without necessarily surpassing Schubert when setting the same poem).

For some commentators, the Romantic Lied virtually ended with Hugo Wolf, and with the dawn of a new century German song reinvented itself. Glauert provides her own tentative take on this subject in her closing discussion of "The Wolfian perspective--comparisons with the songs of Strauss and Mahler".

For a multi-faceted view of the field, nothing can beat Edward F. Kravitt's The Lied: Mirror of Late Romanticism (New Haven/London, 1996). But on the Wagnerian connection, Glauert will be required reading.

PETER PALMER

* except in the texts for secular choruses, where Franz Grillparzer (Träumen und Wachen) is the one writer of distinction

BRUCKNER IN SOMERSET

The guests are met, the feast is set:
May'st hear the merry din.

COLERIDGE: THE RIME OF THE ANCIENT MARINER

Exton Hall Hotel on the edge of Exmoor was the delightful setting for an Arts in Residence weekend at the end of September 2001, devoted in equal measure to excellent food and wine and the music of Anton Bruckner. Those attending included some Bruckner "addicts" but also others who, while appreciating serious music in general, had no special love of Bruckner; indeed in some cases they had needed gentle persuasion from their spouses to attend at all.

The group of some fifteen people presented Terry Barfoot, the leader, with the difficulty inherent in addressing a mixed ability class. At the top end of the scale were those who were comfortable in following a score, while at the lower end were those (like the present writer) who are still a bit shaky in distinguishing a quaver from a crotchet. Terry Barfoot's engaging manner, fluent presentation and knowledge of his subject were more than equal to the challenge.

Each day was structured so that the periods between meals were occupied by talks, illustrated by CD excerpts: two in the mornings, followed by a free afternoon and then a further talk. After dinner, light-hearted (not to say light-headed) musical quizzes took place, causing some of us to reflect that our knowledge of classical music was not quite as extensive as we had imagined.

To carry off solo--as the presenter did--such a schedule of talks is no mean feat. The selected works were the E minor Mass and Symphonies Nos 0, 3, 7 and 9. These were taken in chronological order to enable us to appreciate the composer's development and increasing levels of accomplishment. Terry Barfoot revealed his personal admiration for the first movement of the Ninth as one of Bruckner's highest achievements. By way of an encore, the motet Locus iste was also illustrated. No less than the Ancient Mariner's glittering eye, this gem held the audience spellbound, even those who had hinted at reservations about Bruckner. It showed that he could be marvellous in miniature, as well as magnificent when he was being monumental.

At the end of the event, soundings were taken as to whether there would be interest in holding another Bruckner weekend. The suggestion was well received, and I for one would like to repeat this thoroughly agreeable experience.

JEROME CURRAN

NO CONTEST. No entries were received for the competition in our last issue. In view of this reticence, the setter and the editor will not let out their own suggested nicknames!

THE 2001 BRUCKNER MARATHON
SEPTEMBER 1, 2001
CARLSBAD, CALIFORNIA

Hosted by
 RAMON KHALONA and DAVE GRIEGEL

.....

Symphony in F minor
 Elyakum Shapirra/London Symphony Orchestra
 Recorded 1972
 EMI LP C-063-02-300019



Although Elyakum Shapirra, an Israeli conductor who has enjoyed a career in Europe, is not a household name, to him falls the honor of having made the first commercial recording of Bruckner's early F-minor symphony. Shapirra's reading falls somewhere between Tintner's vigorous recording for Naxos and Ashkenazy's more romantic interpretation for Ondine. He was known at the beginning of his career for his choice of interesting, seldom-heard repertoire. We are fortunate that he chose to make this recording.

.....

Symphony No. 1 in C minor (1877 version)
 Jascha Horenstein/BBC Northern Symphony Orchestra
 Recorded 16 October 1971
 aircheck

Jascha Horenstein's name comes up very quickly when discussing historical recordings of Bruckner, as he conducted the Berlin Philharmonic in the first electrical recording of a Bruckner symphony (the Seventh in 1928). Just two more commercial recordings, of the Eighth and Ninth with the Vienna Symphony, followed in the 1950s. Fortunately the BBC recorded--with the exception of the Seventh--a complete cycle of the numbered symphonies with Horenstein, some of which have come out on the BBC Legends label. The present recording of the First is not yet available on BBC Legends, but copies of an aircheck exist in reasonable sound.

.....

Symphony No. 0 in D minor
 Ferdinand Leitner/Bavarian Radio Symphony Orchestra
 Recorded 11 June 1970?
 Orfeo 269921



One of the finest recordings of "Die Nullte" is a broadcast recording by Ferdinand Leitner with the Bavarian Radio Symphony Orchestra. We are guessing at the date. Orfeo claims a date of 11 June 1960, but this is a stereo recording, and Bavarian Radio recordings prior to 1964 were mono,

according to the discographer Mark Kluge. Orfeo's coupling is a recording of Helmut Eder's Organ Concerto from 16 April 1970, so we might guess the Bruckner is of the same vintage.

Despite the fairly recent date, Leitner's reading is definitely of the old school, especially in the Finale, which is phrased in a manner reminiscent of such distinguished old-timers as Schuricht and Furtwängler.

.....

Symphony No. 2 in C minor (1873 version)
Kurt Eichhorn/Bruckner-Orchester Linz
Recorded 25-28 March 1991
Camerata 195/196



Kurt Eichhorn made TWO recordings of Bruckner's Second during 25-28 March 1991, presenting for the first time the first two versions of the symphony, edited by William Carragan. The version of 1872 was subsequently recorded by Georg Tintner, so we have decided to play the less familiar second version of 1873. Since the details will be buried in Carragan's Revisionsbericht for the Complete Edition, Eichhorn's recording is likely to remain the only example of this version for years to come. Fortunately the conductor and orchestra, working closely with the editor, turned in a performance that will stand the test of time.

It is interesting to listen to some of the changes from the 1872 version: a violin solo in the Adagio, with a clarinet solo at the end; no Scherzo repeats; some completely different music in the Finale, along with the cancellation of not the second but the first crescendo at the end.

.....

Symphony No. 3 in D minor (1873 version)
Georg Tintner/Royal Scottish National Orchestra
Recorded 27/28 August 1998
Naxos 8.553454

Recordings of the first version of Bruckner's Third Symphony are rare, and none of those from the past approaches the level of commitment that Tintner and the RSNO give us. While Tintner's tempi are expansive indeed (far more so than Inbal's, Norrington's, and Rozhdestvensky's), there is a sense of inevitability and of passion in this performance. The recording is arguably the crown jewel in Tintner's Bruckner cycle.

.....

Symphony No. 4 in E flat major (1874 version)
Kurt Wöss/Munich Philharmonic
Recorded 20 September 1975
Bruckner-Haus Linz LP 2/12430-315



The first version of Bruckner's Fourth was published by Nowak in 1975, over a hundred years after Bruckner completed it, and Wöss' performance was the world premiere. We can be thankful that the ÖRF (Austrian Radio) was there to capture it, as this is one of the finest recordings available. The performance, though on the slow and deliberate side, displays an excitement only heard on special occasions. The brass are particularly brilliant, and the symphony is followed by several minutes of applause from a very enthusiastic audience.

.....

Symphony No. 5 in B-flat major
Giuseppe Sinopoli/Staatskapelle Dresden
Recorded March 1999
Deutsche Grammophon 469527



This is Sinopoli's last commercial Bruckner recording (edited from a series of live performances at the Semper Oper in Dresden) before his untimely death in April 2001. Sinopoli was a controversial but highly gifted musical personality, full of ideas and always ready to convey the passion he felt for his favorite composers. This Fifth unfolds at a steady pace in a somewhat reserved manner, but seldom have the intricacies of its Finale been resolved with such force and conviction, and as well supported by such a magnificent orchestra. It is as though everything was saved for that culminating moment in the coda, where this performance shows its glory. The recording is a fine memorial to a conductor who will be missed.

.....

Symphony No. 6 in A major
Rafael Kubelik/Chicago Symphony Orchestra
Recorded 9 & 11 December 1982
CSO CD 92



This live performance (edited from two performances at Orchestra Hall) comes from Kubelik's late period. He had a special affinity with Bruckner's Sixth, which he championed in Chicago during his tenure as music director in the early 1950s and continued to perform with various orchestras throughout his career. One of us (RK) witnessed one of those Chicago performances and still remembers the powerful impression made by Kubelik's persuasive reading. Most of all, it is his masterful treatment of tempo relationships, especially in the first movement, that shows how effectively he solved the problems posed. The Chicago orchestra plays with the power that they are known for, but also with the affection that they always had for their old music director. Incidentally, he chose to repeat with them in these later years some of the repertoire he conducted during the 1950s when he first became acquainted with them.

Symphony No. 7 in E major
 Eugen Jochum/Vienna Philharmonic
 Recorded 9 June 1974
 Bells of St Florian CD AB-2

This is one of the few recorded occurrences of the Jochum-VPO partnership (he recorded the Seventh with the orchestra for Telefunken as early as 1939!). It is taken from a concert given in Vienna as part of the Wiener Festwochen's special Bruckner tribute on the 150th anniversary of his birth. It is a performance of great passion, slightly more expansive than Jochum's commercial recordings with Berlin (twice) and Dresden, and with a sense of occasion which the studio recordings can't match.



.....
 Symphony No. 8 in C minor (1890 version, revised by Haas)
 Hans Rosbaud/SWF Symphony Orchestra, Baden-Baden
 Recorded 17 November 1955
 aircheck

Hans Rosbaud's performances with the Munich Philharmonic during the post-World War II period served to mark him as a distinguished Brucknerian. Later, as music director in Baden-Baden, he made a highly regarded studio recording of the Seventh Symphony (issued on Vox) as well as live recordings of the Second through Ninth Symphonies, excepting the Seventh; some have appeared on CD. The present performance, taped off-the-air from German Radio, shows Rosbaud's propulsive handling of this great symphony. One hopes that the remaining Bruckner recordings in SWF archives will soon be released.



.....
 Symphony No. 9 in D minor
 Carl Schuricht/Vienna Philharmonic
 Recorded 20-22 June 1961
 EMI 67279

Like Horenstein and Jochum, Schuricht's name goes back to the early days of Bruckner recordings. Schuricht made studio recordings of the Seventh and Ninth in 1938 and 1943 respectively. Fortunately, he was also able to make stereo recordings of the Third, Eighth and Ninth with the Vienna Philharmonic in the 1960s. His view of the Ninth, presented in its unfinished form, is unique but absolutely "right" in all ways. Although movement timings are relatively short, Schuricht shapes the work so that tempos never seem brisk. One can enjoy some fascinating changes in the orchestration of the Adagio. Once you hear Schuricht's dissonant horns, you'll miss them in all other recordings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: We would like to thank Richard Williams for kindly providing sources for recordings of the Symphony in F minor and the Fourth.

Who Wrote the Third Version of Bruckner's Third Symphony?

by DERMOT GAULT

FEW WORKS in the concert repertoire have had such a tortuous history as Bruckner's Third Symphony. The Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft has issued three distinct versions, dating from 1873, 1877 and 1889, together with a separate Adagio from 1876. Of the three full versions, the 1889 one has been the most frequently played--and the most controversial. Doubt has been cast on its authenticity and musical value; and Deryck Cooke, in the now superseded 1980 New Grove, dubbed it the "Bruckner-Schalk revision".¹ The terminology introduced by Cooke never passed into general use, but in this case it does raise the valid question as to what extent the 1889 score is Bruckner's original work.

It is a question which raises itself particularly with respect to the finale. As Leopold Nowak explains in his preface to the IBG's critical edition of the 1889 version, the manuscript for this movement is mostly in the handwriting of Bruckner's former pupil, Franz Schalk.² As a result the blame, or at least the responsibility, for the changes in this movement--especially those which have not met with the approval of the commentators--has traditionally been laid at his door. However, a study of the autograph MS. (S.m. 6081 in the Music Collection of the Austrian National Library) leads one to very different conclusions. It is clear that the 1889 version indeed incorporates the creative input of Franz Schalk; but it is equally clear that the great majority of Schalk's changes were accepted by Bruckner, while the few which he rejected formed no part of the completed version and have never found their way into any printed edition. It is also clear that most of the changes in detail evident to anyone who compares the printed scores of the 1877 and 1889 versions were made by Bruckner himself. Above all, there can be no doubt that Bruckner approved of the final product.

It also becomes apparent that, far from being a panic-stricken compromise which was somehow forced on Bruckner as a concession to the taste of audiences and critics, the 1889 version sits squarely in the tradition of Bruckner's other revisions. It shows a consistent determination to evolve structures which are less schematic and more organic--an aim that may be perceived by comparing the 1873 and 1877 versions of the work.

The 1889 version cannot be divorced from its historical context. The assumption that the third version was motivated by the failure of the 1877 version, which implies a reaction to external circumstances rather than the promptings of an inner need, is consistent with the established negative view of this version, but it is not entirely consistent with the facts of the matter. In actual fact the fortunes of the Third had started to revive after Bruckner's successes with his Fourth and Seventh Symphonies. The mid-1880s saw it performed in Dresden, Frankfurt, Utrecht, The Hague and New York. According to Otto Kitzler, Schuch's performance in Dresden was a success,³ and the same applies to the performances in Holland.⁴ Admittedly there were no performances in

Vienna, where it would have mattered most to Bruckner, but he must have chosen to revise the symphony again just as it seemed to be gaining acceptance out of dissatisfaction with it as it stood. There are precedents for this. Bruckner withdrew the original 1874 version of No. 4 after Benjamin Bilse had accepted it for performance in Berlin,⁵ and it seems that he also replaced the 1878 finale of that symphony entirely on his own initiative. As will be shown, the 1889 finale of the Third Symphony embodies the more fluid and empirical formal concepts he had evolved in the mid-1880s, concepts which are also evinced by the finales of Symphonies Nos 6 and 7.

This is not to say that one can exclude the influence of the brothers Franz and Josef Schalk. Josef (1857-1900) had been one of the small band of faithful students who cheered Bruckner after the first performance of the Third Symphony in 1877. He had become a pupil of Bruckner's at the Vienna Conservatory earlier that year, and he was joined there a year later by his precocious younger brother, Franz (1863-1931). Bruckner was at that time still very much an outsider where music in Vienna was concerned, and the support of such bright and progressive young musicians must have been a tremendous stimulus. This goes a long way towards explaining the influence his pupils and ex-pupils had on Bruckner, even if it does not fully explain the extraordinary influence enjoyed by Franz Schalk--an influence which his brother never shared. A letter Josef wrote to Franz on 26 November 1888 shows just how great the latter's influence was:

I was recently quite alone with him [Bruckner] in the "Kugel"* and he was never weary of telling me his heartfelt affection for you, so that I was quite moved. All of the many changes which he is now, with quite extraordinary industry, making to the Eighth and the Third he would like to submit to your judgement [Urtheil].⁶

It would seem, therefore, that there was an unusually close relationship between Bruckner and the younger Schalk. But in assessing the extent of Franz's involvement with Bruckner revisions, it should be remembered that his successful conducting career took him all over the German-speaking world and that he was only intermittently in personal contact with Bruckner after his graduation in 1881. However much Bruckner may have wanted to submit his scores to Franz for approval, he was working on his own for the most of the time. We must also remember that Bruckner's decisions were his alone, no matter what Franz's "judgement" might have been.

We have Franz's prolonged absences from Vienna and the ill-health which confined Josef to the city to thank for their large and revealing correspondence, now preserved in the Austrian National Library. Unfortunately this correspondence fails to shed light on the origin of the third version of the Third Symphony. I believe it is very likely that Franz's work on this version followed discussions with Bruckner. For want of any written evidence of this, however, the earliest documentation for the third version of the Third Symphony remains the MS. score of the finale which Franz made in the first half of 1888.

Franz's Manuscript

The MS. as it exists today includes Franz's complete draft, with some pages which Bruckner eventually rejected. One can see from this how

* The café "Zur goldenen Kugel" (The Golden Globe), Am Hof, was a favourite meeting-place.

Franz's draft initially looked, except for some details where Bruckner has overwritten Franz's original to the extent of rendering it illegible.

The facsimiles reproduced by Thomas Röder⁷ demonstrate the obvious difference in character between Franz Schalk's handwriting and Bruckner's. It is much smaller, and he tends to draw stems and joining bars carefully rather than with quick strokes like Bruckner's. Although neither of them is especially consistent, Franz is the more likely to join downward-pointing stems to the right-hand side of a note-head. Unfortunately Franz used a poor-quality manuscript paper with very small staves, and his cramped handwriting leaves no room for emendation--something the more experienced Bruckner is always careful to do. As a result Bruckner had to write his alterations in the space available. This means that there are places where it is not as easy to distinguish between the two authors as it should be.

Form

Franz Schalk's score of the finale differs from the 1877 version of it primarily in terms of length and form. Whereas the 1877 score is 638 bars long (including a final silent measure), Franz's seems to have been originally only 473 bars long. It omits the following material:

Bar 58. Since bar 58 is a virtual repetition of bar 57, and since bar 57 comes at the end of a system, it is possible that the omission was inadvertent.

1877 bars 283-297 (between 1889 bars 278 and 279, before letter P). This cut joins the two main blocks of the development section.

1889 bars 358-360, which seem originally to have been just one bar in Franz's Ms.

1877 bars 379-432: the first-group recapitulation.

1877 bars 465-586.

Franz's score has been criticized for violating the formal symmetry of the 1877 version, but in fact two of the most substantial cuts were already present (as optional cuts indicated by "vi-de") in Rättig's 1879 edition of the 1877 version. The first of these cuts omits 1877 bars 379-432 (the entire recapitulation of the first group). The second cut begins at bar 465 in the third group. Although there is no "-de" to indicate its termination, the printer's copy for the Rättig edition (S.m. 34.611 in the Austrian National Library) and the Mahler-Krzyzanowski piano reduction both show that it ends at bar 514 (just before letter Bb, the final section of the third-group recapitulation, where first-group and third-group material join).⁸ Franz, however, greatly extends this cut, and in his original draft he replaced the subsequent passage with 26 bars of his own.⁹ The first eighteen bars of this passage were derived from the material of 1877 letter Bb, while the final eight bars were more or less identical with the eventual 1889 bars 433-440.

The cut of bars 283-297 is certainly substantial, and it does seem to have originated with Franz. But Bruckner broadly accepted Franz's score, cuts included: this is the only conclusion to be drawn from the fact that he used it as the basis of a revision of his own.

There are just two minor exceptions. The first is the omission of bar 58, which Bruckner restored by extending the printed stave manually. It is interesting that Bruckner only restored this bar after his added metrical numbers failed to reach an even total. The MS. shows that bar 64 originally bore the number 7: a clear violation of Bruckner's metrical precepts as bar 64 is the final bar of a period. Bruckner perceived the discrepancy, restored bar 58 and re-numbered bars 57-64 as 9-16, continuing the previous metrical series. His second intervention was to restore bars 358-360, which he did by subdividing one of Schalk's bars.

Bruckner then went on to make further formal changes of his own. He cut four bars from Schalk's draft before the present 1889 bar 193, and he changed the melodic line of the previous passage from the second half of bar 188, presumably to give a greater sense of climax. (Schalk's deleted bars were closer to the equivalent passage in the 1873 score than to 1877 bars 193-196.)¹⁰ The cut in the middle of the development section--at 1877 bars 283-297--is therefore the first significant change to have originated with Schalk. As the cut appears in the middle of a page, there can be no doubt that it was part of the MS. as Franz Schalk originally wrote it. Far from being arbitrary, this cut continues the tendency to eliminate crescendo passages based on the opening quaver figure already evident in the 1877 version. An obvious example is the start of the recapitulation. In the 1877 score the preliminary crescendo based on the quaver figure [cf. 1873 bars 469-482] is removed, so that the recapitulation begins abruptly with the *ff* tutti at letter U (1877 bar 379).

This accentuates the disjointed effect which has often been a target for criticism of the Third, and it may explain why the 1889 version goes a stage further by cutting the entire first-group recapitulation. The cut has been seen as a deviation from Bruckner's established formal procedures, which in the early versions of the early symphonies always entailed a full recapitulation. But the Bruckner who began work on the third version of Symphony No. 3 in 1888 had completed the finales of Nos 6 and 7--and, for that matter, the 1880 finale of the Fourth, which all take a far more empirical approach to form than earlier scores such as the 1877 version of the Third. He had also endorsed and indeed participated in the 1887 version of the Fourth by Franz Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe, where an analogous process can be seen.¹¹ The 1880 finale of the Fourth cuts the quiet opening of the recapitulation to be found in both the 1874 and the 1878 version, and it begins with the tutti statement of the principal theme. As in the 1877 version of the Third, the principal theme arrives abruptly as a result, which is doubtless why Bruckner assented to the removal of the entire first-group recapitulation in the 1887 version.

The new version of the latter half of the movement has a cogency of its own. The development section is now a single span which reaches a climax in G major, crowned by the first-movement motto theme. Bruckner may have thought a full recapitulation would be unnecessary with the end thus in sight. Accordingly he lets the reminiscence of the second-group "chorale", which begins in C minor (bar 333) and ends on the dominant of F, flow smoothly if rather weakly into the second group itself, which begins in A flat. Later, instead of letting the second group meander round to the conventional key of A major, Bruckner (with Franz Schalk's

assistance--see below) accelerates into the new passage beginning at bar 393. This cut connects the middle of the second-group recapitulation to the middle of the third group. The removal of the reminiscence of the first movement (1877 bars 555-558) which this entails merely goes a stage further than the 1877 version, which had cut the previous references to the second and third movements, leaving the first-movement reference sounding rather forlorn.

Bruckner's replacement passage in the third group, beginning at 1889 bar 393, is longer and more sophisticated than Schalk's, but it is based again on the material which originally appeared at 1877 letter Bb. Since it was not possible to emend Schalk's score, the new passage was written out afresh on a quite different type of manuscript paper. (The instrument indications at the side show that these pages were originally intended for the Eighth Symphony.) Bruckner did, however, retain Schalk's two transitional bars 391-392, although with changes.

The following tabulation of all three versions shows their relationship:

FORMAL COMPARISON OF THE 1873, 1877 & 1889 VERSIONS OF THE FINALE

1873	1877	1889
<u>First Group</u>	<u>First Group</u>	<u>First Group</u>
1-64 (64)	1-64 (64)	1-64 (64)
<u>Second Group</u>	<u>Second Group</u>	<u>Second Group</u>
(a) in F sharp 65-146 (81) transition 147-160 (13)	(a) in F sharp 65-124 (59)	(a) in F sharp 65-124 (59)
(b) in F 161-208 (47)	(b) in F 125-154 (29)	(b) in F 125-154 (29)
<u>Third Group</u>	<u>Third Group</u>	<u>Third Group</u>
(a) tutti 209-220 (11)	(a) tutti 155-166 (11)	(a) tutti 155-166 (11)
(b) episode 221-244 (23)	(b) episode 167-184 (17)	(b) episode 167-184 (17)
(c) tutti 245-256 (11)	(c) tutti 185-196 (11)	(c) tutti 185-192 (7)
(d) second part 257-278 (21)	(d) second part 197-218 (21)	(d) second part 193-214 (21)
(e) codetta 279-298 (19)	(e) codetta 219-232 (13)	(e) codetta 215-228 (13)
<u>Development Section</u>	<u>Development Section</u>	<u>Development Section</u>
(a) quiet prelude 299-314 (15)	(a) quiet prelude 233-250 (17)	(a) quiet prelude 229-246 (17)
(b) first wave 315-358 (43)	(b) first wave 251-292 (41)	(b) first wave 247-278 (31)
(c) second wave 359-422 (63)	(c) second wave 293-350 (57)	(c) second wave 279-332 (53)
(d) "alternating" passage 423-432 (9)		

(e) second theme in c 433-468 (35)	second theme in c 351-378 (27)	second theme in c minor 333-360 (27)
<u>Recapitulation</u>	<u>Recapitulation</u>	<u>Recapitulation</u>
first-group recap 469-537 (68)	first-group recap 379-432 (53)	
second group in A flat 537-580 (43)	second group in A flat 433-466 (33)	second group in A flat 361-392 (31)
second group in A 581-600 (19)	second group in A 467-478 (11)	
third-group recap 601-618 (17)	third-group recap 479-498 (19)	
episode 619-636 (17)	episode 499-514 (15)	
tutti 637-674 (37)	tutti 515-554 (39)	tutti 393-412 (19)
ref. to other movts. 675-688 (13)	ref. to first movt. 555-560 (5)	
second part of third group 689-724 (35)	second part of third group 561-596 (35)	second part of third group 413-450 (37)
<u>Coda</u>	<u>Coda</u>	<u>Coda</u>
725-764 (39)	597-638 (41)	451-495 (44)

Changes in Detail

Franz Schalk also had an input in matters of notation, nuance, dynamics, and scoring. Robert Simpson once stated that the changes made in the 1889 edition would fill a book.¹² It is not the intention here to write that book but only to isolate the main stylistic features of the 1889 revision which originate in Schalk's handwriting.

All the changes of key signature which appear in the printed score, apart from the final change to the major, are Schalk's; so are virtually all the horn and trumpet transpositions. (The 1877 version uses trumpets in D and horns in F and B flat throughout, although it was Bruckner who changed the pitch of the 3rd and 4th horns from low B flat to F at the start of the movement.) Schalk also modernizes the brass notation, replacing Bruckner's key signatures with accidentals. The various expressive directions like zart ("tender", bar 63), breit ("broad", bar 87), ausdrucksvoll ("with expression") and sehr weich ("very gentle", bar 65) are Schalk's, as are all uses of the term subito. Schalk is more generous with slurs than Bruckner, and more sparing with accents, even in the main theme, but he makes more extensive use of the direction marc. and

the chevron accent. He is also responsible for the added pauses and changes in tempo indications--although when he altered the indication at the start to Sehr bewegt ("Very animated"), Bruckner changed it back to Allegro. The numerous modifications of dynamics, mostly concerning the "chorale" in the second group, are all Schalk's. He also makes far more use of differentiated dynamics, which Bruckner occasionally employs when he wants to distinguish between particular instrumental groups, e.g. the winds and strings between letters C and F. Bruckner seldom uses these to distinguish between different instruments within a group, as Schalk does at the start of the second subject-group, where the horns are marked louder than the trombones.

Schalk was also responsible for a large number of changes of orchestration. The most obvious is a new wind passage connecting the first and second groups. This particular alteration involves actual composition but is in accordance with Bruckner's later practice of joining thematic groups, instead of separating them by silence. (A pivotal instance is his addition of sustained horn notes to link the first and second groups in the first movement of the Fourth Symphony--a change made after the 1881 première.)¹³ Elsewhere, Schalk aims at a subtler and more refined orchestration consistent with his preference for milder dynamics. At bar 91, for example, he contents himself with one oboe where the 1877 score has both flutes and both oboes in unison. Likewise, at letter D shortly afterwards, Schalk makes do with one flute and gives the second oboe a different part. The wind parts between letters U and V are all his, although Bruckner later modified them to match alterations he had made in the strings. The partial doubling of wind and strings here is quite unlike Bruckner's usual practice.¹⁴

Schalk's nuanced dynamics aim for smooth blends rather than clear contrasts. The brass dynamics in the second group are the most obvious example (mf replaces ff in the passages beginning at bars 105 and 372). Admittedly, the dynamics in the 1877 version are rather extreme, and Schalk may simply be making explicit the kind of adjustments conductors would have been expected to make in performance. There are, however, cases--for instance, in the second group--where the changes in articulation show how Schalk was aiming at a different effect. The various modifications of overall dynamic in the tuttis, such as the meno f at bars 42 and 44, are also Schalk's.

Finally, Schalk increases the role of the timpani, who have a greater array of pitches than in any Bruckner symphony apart from Nos 8 and 9. Whereas in the 1877 score they are confined to D and A, in Schalk's score they are also given G, B flat, F, C, and D flat. Bruckner made no attempt to increase the use or expand the pitch range of the timpani when he revised the other movements. Since the other changes in Schalk's MS. are not consistent with Bruckner's usual practice, they can only be ascribed to Schalk himself.

But once again it is also clear that Bruckner accepted Franz's suggestions. This is a remarkable fact no matter how one views it, and it is made even more remarkable when one considers those characteristic features of Bruckner's revisions which emerge from a comparison of (for instance) the 1873 and 1877 versions of the Third. Dynamics become starker, with blunt contrasts replacing gradations--see, for example, the

"chorale" in the first movement of the Fourth. Detached articulation replaces slurred (the 1877 version of the second group in the finale of the Third is the best example), and where methods of string playing change, pizzicato replaces arco (the start of the 1880 finale of the Fourth is a very rare exception). Instrumentation is strengthened, with increased doubling, and textures are simplified. The condensations of form evident in the 1889 score are therefore consistent with the general trend of Bruckner's revisions, but Schalk's alterations to dynamics, articulation and scoring are not; if anything they are in direct opposition to Bruckner's practice in the 1877 revision.

At this point one has to emphasize that Bruckner's MSS are a testimony to the extreme care he took over every aspect of the revision, no matter how small. They are the work of a composer who overlooked no detail and left nothing to chance. Since he could not possibly have overlooked any of the changes Schalk made, he must have accepted those changes which he allowed to stand. A study of this manuscript therefore leads one to conclude that the changes in detail evident in the original state of the MS. are indeed Franz Schalk's work, but that Bruckner approved of them and endorsed them.

Bruckner's Changes

One must be careful not to exaggerate the extent of Franz Schalk's contribution to the Third. His alterations form only a part of the great number of differences evident to anyone who compares the printed scores of the 1877 and 1889 versions. The great majority of these changes are in Bruckner's hand and were effected by Bruckner's usual means: adding and deleting stems, adding and scratching out note heads, entering new parts in previously vacant bars, and gluing MS. patches on to the original.

Among these alterations is the important added figure--related to the motto theme of the first movement--in the winds and trumpets at bars 13-14 (echoed by the horns at bars 15-24), and in the repetition of this passage at bars 36-48. The changes in the wind parts in the first group, which include a more sparing use of winds in general, are also Bruckner's. So too are the great number of reshapings of the string parts which occur throughout the first group (viola parts from bar 37 onwards, upper strings from bar 41) and in the second group (virtually throughout, but especially at bars 105-108 and bars 133-138), and of the new brass parts at bars 97-100. The new brass and bassoon parts in the third group (letter K) also appear to be Bruckner's and were certainly emended by him. It was he who made bar 182 an echo of the previous bar, in accordance with the tendency of his revisions to regularize phrasing. The new wind and brass parts at the climax of the third group (bars 193-212) are certainly his, although the little timpani solo which follows is Schalk's. Here once again, it seems, we have an example of Schalk's composing, and once again it seems that Bruckner accepted it.

Similar changes are found in the development section and the recapitulation, and the changes of harmony at bars 265 and 267 are Bruckner's. Occasionally a passage which appears to be changed is identical with the 1877 score (e.g. the violas in bar 35), but Bruckner's reworkings are so prolix that one cannot necessarily assume he was

reversing a change made by Schalk. Bruckner also extensively reworked the coda, where the moving inner parts for the trombones are a striking if minor detail. Some of these changes seem to have been made in the interests of dramatic effectiveness: the added wind figure in the first group, for instance, greatly enlivens the texture. The point of others, however, is not immediately obvious. Here Bruckner's obsession with consecutives becomes relevant.

Bruckner's "Octave Hunt"

When Amalie Klose, sister of Bruckner's pupil Friedrich Klose, asked after the composer at this time, the reply was: "The Herr Professor is constantly hunting for octaves."¹⁵ Bruckner's pupils were recruited to search in his scores for any forbidden parallels. When they pointed out octaves between the flute and the tuba in Lohengrin, Bruckner replied: "That's all right in Wagner--he's a master, I'm just a schoolmaster!"¹⁶ The Schalks seem to have viewed the process as a waste of time, as is shown by a letter from Josef to Franz dated 10 June 1888:

[Bruckner] is, unfortunately, still working on the Finale of the Third. He has recomposed some things. Your cuts and transitions, by the way, were kept.

Now he is plagued, with the force of an obsession, by the desire to rid his score of consecutive octaves.* In this way he is wasting a lot of time, and taking tremendous trouble, but he is immovable in the face of any objection from Löwe or me. It is really sad to see natural voice-leading sacrificed and everything chopped and changed just because of this fixed idea. He has not yet turned to the other movements.

I should also tell you that in the Finale, a great many sheets between the G major and your favourite passage have been removed completely. I doubt if this will help. But one must let him have his way.¹⁷

This letter is puzzling in several respects. "The G major" may refer to the climax of the development section (1889 bar 323ff.), but one can only guess as to what Franz's "favourite passage" was. Josef refers to the removal of "a great many sheets", but it is clear that the extant MS. includes Franz's complete draft and that none of his sheets was removed. Josef must have meant that a great many sheets of the 1877 version had been removed. This shows that he had not been following the work by Bruckner and Franz on the initial stages of the revision. It also explains the throwaway reference to "your cuts and transitions", which suggested to some earlier commentators that all the cuts made in 1889 were Franz Schalk's work. As we have seen, this was not the case.

Bruckner's Second Thoughts

The influence the Schalk brothers had over Bruckner, and the limitations of that influence, are attested to by a crisis which arose a month later. This was to become the most notorious episode in the whole history of Bruckner's relations with the Schalks. Rättig, who had undertaken to publish the new version, later recalled: "G. Mahler then chanced to visit Vienna and explained to Bruckner that he considered the revision entirely unnecessary. The latter immediately changed his mind and rejected the

* On this preoccupation, see Timothy Jackson, "Bruckner's Oktaven: the problem of consecutives, doubling, and orchestral voice-leading" in Perspectives on Anton Bruckner, ed. C. Howie et al., Aldershot 2001.

already half-finished work."¹⁸ Josef then went on the counter-offensive and wrote to his brother on 13 July 1888:

Write to me when your present engagement ends so that before the one in Pest begins, I hope you can stay with us for a week or two and gather strength for the new campaign. I would also like this to happen for the sake of Bruckner, who can't come to terms with your proposals for the Third Symphony and now, having been made timid [kopfscheu] by Herr Mahler, who chanced to be in Vienna, wants the old score printed again, which I have personally vetoed with Rättig. There is nothing for it but to go ahead with the printing without Bruckner's knowledge and hope that your presence will restore his equanimity. No news otherwise!¹⁹

The upshot was that, in Rättig's words, "the above friends managed to achieve a partial revision"²⁰ after all. The letter paints the rather grim picture of Josef imposing a "personal veto" and organizing a printing "without Bruckner's knowledge". It also shows that Bruckner sometimes changed his mind about the need for revision and that his ex-pupils were capable of acting without his consent. But despite Josef's pretensions as a musical power-broker, a subsequent letter dated 5 October 1888 shows the limitations of his influence:

Bruckner is well and still sweating over the first movement of the Third and playing terrible havoc all around him [wüstet erschrecklich herum]. One can't do anything about it.²¹

This indicates that the revision of the earlier movements did not involve the Schalks and was, if anything, resisted by them. Certainly there is no evidence of anyone else's handwriting in the autograph score.

The eventual autograph of the 1889 version (S.m. 6081 in the Austrian National Library) is unusual even for Bruckner. In the first three movements he again emended an existing score, in this case the Rättig printing of the 1877 version--an ingenious piece of labour-saving. Note heads, stems, dynamics, phrasing and articulation marks are all scratched out and inked in at need. Whole bars are crossed out, others added by hand, and individual lines are pasted over. Where necessary, whole pages have been cancelled and new manuscript leaves added. Although it is hardly fair to speak of Bruckner's "playing terrible havoc", there are many changes of detail, and the margins of both the old and the new pages are filled with copious voice-leading annotations.

With regard to the finale, it is certain that most of the individual changes are by Bruckner, and that most of the cuts can be shown to have originated with him. Above all, whether the alterations were his or not, those of Schalk's which he allowed to stand--the majority--were approved by him. The MS. of the 1889 version bears Bruckner's distinctive dates, metrical numbers, comments, and voice-leading annotations throughout, and there is no indication that anyone worked on the manuscript after him. Bruckner oversaw the first performance and probably attended others. A letter to Hans von Wolzogen is proof that the end-product had not only his approval but also his enthusiastic endorsement:

If only that great genius [Wagner] could see it now!²²

The First Printed Edition of the 1889 Version

There can be no doubt concerning the authenticity of the 1889 version. Such doubts as do arise concern the first published version, where there are many deviations from the autograph, which also served as the printer's copy: dynamics are altered and attenuated, tempo indications and metronome markings are added. The whole score is smothered in slurs, notably in the first section of the slow movement, reversing the trend of Bruckner's own revisions to replace slurred with separate bowing. Some of the changes in dynamic merely make conductor's nuances explicit (for instance, the brass decrescendos at bars 33 and 41 in the first-movement main theme are essential to the clarity of the string and wind parts), but others alter the effect.²³

The first published edition of the 1889 version was apparently supervised by Josef Schalk, who was also responsible for the first published editions of the Eighth Symphony and the Mass in F minor. Nowak regarded his changes as inauthentic, inasmuch as there is no evidence that Bruckner approved them. Indeed, Bruckner deeply disapproved of the changes to the F minor Mass made by Josef Schalk and Max von Oberleithner.²⁴ Nowak therefore removed these alterations from his critical edition of 1959.

It is surely time to reassess the 1889 version. Critics have not been slow to castigate certain aspects of it, such as the broadening of the climax of the second group in the first movement--an effect which is not repeated in the equivalent passage in the recapitulation. There are, however, telling details. The new passage in the first-movement development section (1889 bars 373-404) replaces disjunct alternations of piano and forte with a forward-moving single paragraph. This is cogent and effective, if more in keeping with the style of the later Bruckner.

Listeners will continue to respond in their own ways to the various versions of Bruckner's Third and continue to make their own judgements. But at least these can now be based on an awareness of how and why the 1889 version was made--and of who made it.

1. The latest Grove features a new article by Timothy Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw.
2. Leopold Nowak, Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke Band 3, III/3, Preface. The translation has been amended; Kürzungen (cuts) was originally mistranslated.
3. According to a letter to Bruckner from Otto Kitzler, Briefe [Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke Band 24/1], ed. A. Harrandt & O. Schneider], p. 282.
4. See letter to R. Prohaska, Briefe, p. 240. 5. Letter to W. Tappert, Briefe, p. 175.
6. Quoted in Thomas Leibnitz, Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner, Tutzing 1988, p. 137.
7. Thomas Röder, ABSW Band 3, Revisionsbericht, pp 269 (first page of finale), 275, 296.
8. On this piano reduction, see Crawford Howie, TBJ V/2, pp 19-23, & TBJ V/3, pp 22-25.
9. Published in Röder, Revisionsbericht, pp 289-93. 10. See Revisionsbericht, pp 316-19.
11. B.M. Korstvedt, "The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity", in Nineteenth Century Music XX/1, pp 3-26.
12. Simpson, however, began to champion the first version of the Third after 1977. [Ed.]
13. See Haas's editorial report, and Nowak's preface to ABSW Band 4, IV/2.
14. An instance occurs in the scherzo of "No. 0", but the effect and context are different.
15. A. Klose, "Meine Begegnungen mit Anton Bruckner", in Neue Zeitschrift für Musik 99 (1932) p. 1201. 16. Ibidem. 17. T. Leibnitz, Die Brüder Schalk und AB, p. 134.
18. Max Auer et al., Anton Bruckner. Wissenschaftliche und künstlerische Betrachtungen zu den Original-Fassungen, Vienna 1937, p. 9. 19. Leibnitz, Die Brüder Schalk und AB, pp 135-7.
20. See Nowak, Preface to ABSW, III/3. 21. Ibid. p. 136. 22. Ibid. p. 144. 23. Röder's Revisionsbericht lists the deviations, pp 333-42. 24. See P. Hawkshaw, "The Bruckner Problem Revisited", in Nineteenth Century Music XXI/1, pp 96-107.

L E T T E R S

C.A. LINNEY-DROUET (Cliffe, Kent):

I enclose two copies of Bruckner's Symphony No. 4 performed by the Leondinger S.O. under Uwe Christian Harrer. Herr Harrer kindly sent me three copies. I wrote to him after seeing the CD written about in the Journal. As there was a considerable delay before he replied, he sent them as a gift. Obviously I have kept one, and I thought that I would offer the other two to fellow subscribers.

I would also like to congratulate you on a fine publication.

[This is a "live" recording of the 1877-78 version of the Fourth with the Volksfest finale. The CD cover shows the inn at Leonding where Bruckner celebrated the completion of his studies with Otto Kitzler in 1863. To enter a draw for the two CDs, send your name and address to: TBJ(4), 2 Rivergreen Close, Beeston, Nottingham NG9 3ES by 16 March.]

JOE LOBELLO (New Jersey, USA):

There has been quite a bit of attention in the New York Times recently relative to the new conductors of the Munich Orchestras since the passing of Celibidache (James Levine at the Philharmonic and Lorin Maazel at the Bavarian Radio). The interpretation is that Celibidache's following amounted to "a Cult ready to excuse the deity's foibles, including monumentally slow performances and blatant sexuality against women". The Times accused the conductor of too many rehearsals and unwavering demands "leaving virtually no freedom for the talented performers". It now sees the Philharmonic released from bondage, and the players "have become like teenagers with crushes".

As for Celibidache, the newspaper's criticisms are precisely what I cherish in Celi's performances, i.e. an individualistic vision of the score and its meaning, and an unrelenting passion and love for the Master's work.

[In the Nov/Dec 2001 American Record Guide, a Bruckner reviewer remarks that the New York Times's attack was evidently designed to paint Levine "as the savior of a lost ensemble."]

HOWARD JONES (Dronfield, South Yorks):

I have enjoyed the November 01 issue of TBJ. Page 10 mentions an NDR S0-Knappertsbusch No. 8 of Oct 61. I suspect this is the VPO recording listed just below it ("19 Oct 61"--should this be 28/29 Oct 61?). Its first issue in 1979 was on a 2LP Discocorp mono set with Beethoven's No. 8 on side 4 with the NDR S0--a possible source of the confusion.

[DERMOT GAULT writes: My information came from an on-line Knappertsbusch discography. An LP Discocorp set is the only source given for both the "NDR performance" and the VPO, so it seems that Howard Jones is right. I should have checked with Lani Spahr's on-line Bruckner discography. My thanks to Howard!]

GERRY ROBELLO (Wilmslow, Cheshire):

I wonder if other Brucknerians have noticed that our favourite composer has made it on to TV advertising? If you tune into Sky Sports 1 or ITV I'm sure you'll recognise the "jingle" used by Nikon Digital....

FIVE YEARS OF "THE BRUCKNER JOURNAL"

VOL. 1 NO. 1, MARCH 1997 (12pp)	£2
C. Floros: Bruckner Propositions; E. Thompson at St Florian	
VOL. 1 NO. 2, JULY 1997 (16pp)	£2
Bruckner Propositions II; Centenary Events; Student Symphony	
VOL. 1 NO. 3, NOVEMBER 1997 [out of print - <u>photocopy only</u>] (16pp)	£2
Propositions III; A. George on Bruckner's String Quintet	
VOL. 2 NO. 1, MARCH 1998 (16pp)	£2
D. Scott: Lux in Tenebris; E. Neville: A Cellist Writes	
VOL. 2 NO. 2, JULY 1998 (16pp)	£2
Lux in Tenebris II; B.G. Cohrs: Bruckner and Schubert	
VOL. 2 NO. 3, NOVEMBER 1998 (16pp)	£2
Lux in Tenebris III; N. Simeone: Lovro von Matacic	
VOL. 3 NO. 1, MARCH 1999 (28pp)	£2.50
O. Biba on Bruckner's Dedications; Joseph Braunstein interview	
VOL. 3 NO. 2, JULY 1999 (36pp)	£2.50
A.C. Howie: Bruckner Letters; M. Audus: Jascha Horenstein	
VOL. 3 NO. 3, NOVEMBER 1999 (36pp)	£2.50
Bruckner Letters II; A. Pachovsky on Bruckner's Songs	
VOL. 4 NO. 1, MARCH 2000 (36pp)	£2.50
Franz Schalk and Bruckner's Fifth; E. Maier: Ignaz Dorn	
VOL. 4 NO. 2, JULY 2000 (36pp)	£2.50
A. Harrandt: The Late Letters; R. Cox on "Die Nullte"	
VOL. 4 NO. 3, NOVEMBER 2000 (36pp)	£2.50
B.G. Cohrs on Bruckner's Ninth; New Books; Paul Hindemith	
VOL. 5 NO. 1, MARCH 2001 (32pp)	£2.50
F. Zamazal: Linz Festival; K. Warsop on Spohr and Bruckner	
VOL. 5 NO. 2, JULY 2001 (32pp)	£2.50
T. Barfoot: Tintner's Recordings; L. Botstein: Music & Ideology	
VOL. 5 NO. 3, NOVEMBER 2001 (36pp)	£2.50
D. Aldeborgh: Austerity or Charm; Skrowaczewski Speaks	

VOLUMES 1 - 4 INCLUSIVE £25

VOLUMES 1 - 5 INCLUSIVE £30

All prices include postage. Please make cheque payable to "Bruckner Journal" and send to TBJ, 4 Lulworth Close, Halesowen, West Midlands B63 2UJ

MEETING OF TBJ READERS. Subscribers are cordially invited to meet in Room 21, Birmingham & Midland Institute, Margaret Street, BIRMINGHAM on Saturday 13 April 2002 from 2.15pm (doors open 1.45pm). Mark Audus will give an illustrated talk on Eugen Jochum as a Bruckner conductor. Refreshments available, but please make your own lunch arrangements. If you have not already told Raymond Cox you are coming, please write to the Halesowen address above, or ring 01384 566 383. Map supplied on request.

A DATE FOR YOUR 2003 DIARY. Our Third Conference will be held at the University of Nottingham Arts Centre on Saturday 26 April 2003, with professional concerts in the evening and on the following afternoon.

The e-mail address given for the Editor last year is no longer in use. Messages can be sent via the internet to: acrhowie@dialstart.net

C A L E N D A R

OLAV GUTTORM MYKLEBUST, theologian and Bruckner champion, died in Oslo in 2001, aged 97. His nephew Bernt Heid reports that he read our Journal avidly. His book Anton Bruckner was published in Norwegian by the Solum Forlag, Oslo (see TBJ, March 1999).

WÜRZBURG is to stage its fourth Bruckner festival between 11-20 October 2002. Visiting orchestras include the Linz Bruckner Orchestra, Munich Radio Orchestra and Stuttgart Philharmonic. Along with orchestral and choral music by Bruckner, there will be songs, piano and orchestral works by his organ pupil, Hans Rott. For details contact Erwin Horn, tel. +49 931 32187 245 or +49 172 6600367, fax +49 931 464304.

FRANZ WELSER-MÖST will conduct the Gustav Mahler Youth Orchestra in Bruckner's Eighth (1890, Nowak) at the Lucerne Easter Festival on 22 March. Tel. +41 41 226 4480, fax +41 41 226 4485. Booking opens on 25 March for the Lucerne Summer Festival 2002. Daniel Barenboim conducts the Chicago Symphony in the Fourth, Seventh and Ninth Symphonies of Bruckner between 13-15 September.

RENE VEEN directed what may be the first performance since 1855 of Bruckner's St Jodok Cantata (WAB 15) in Utrecht on 9 September 2001. The piece was written for the name-day of Jodok Stülz, a priest at St Florian. Rob van der Hilst, who initiated this performance by the Utrecht Vocal Ensemble, gave a lecture on Bruckner.

Philip Weller will direct Nottingham University Choir and Wind Orchestra in Bruckner's Mass in E minor at St Mary's Church, High Pavement, Nottingham, on 2 March. Admission is £7 (conc. £5).

The Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra under Yakov Kreizberg plays Bruckner's Fourth in Poole (tel. 01202 685222), Basingstoke (tel. 01256 844244) and Cambridge (tel. 01223 357851) on 6, 7 and 8 March.

At London's Barbican Hall on 9 April, Kent Nagano conducts the Deutsche Symphonie Berlin in Bruckner's Third Symphony. Tel. 020 7638 8891.

Bruckner's Seventh will be given by Vassily Sinaisky and the BBC Philharmonic in The Bridgewater Hall, Manchester (tel. 0161 907 9000) on 13 April.

Daniele Gatti is to conduct the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra in Bruckner's Ninth at the Royal Festival Hall, London, on 25 April. Tel. 020 7960 4242.

Edward Warren and Stockport Symphony Orchestra give Bruckner's Third at Stockport Town Hall on 28 April. Tickets are £8 (conc. £6). Cheque/SAE to Stockport Symphony Orchestra, PO Box 102, Alderley Edge SK9 7GH, or tel. 07947 474 574.

Bruckner motets will be sung by Ramsey Choral Society at a concert in Ramsey Parish Church, near Peterborough, on 18 May.

Christoph von Dohnányi will conduct a Cleveland Symphony performance of Bruckner's Eighth in the Barbican Hall, London on 13 June. Tel. 020 7638 8891.

Bruckner's Sixth will be played by the Nottingham Philharmonic under Jacques Cohen at Southwell Minster on 22 June. Tickets are £7.50 & £10 (conc. £1 off). For info ring 0115 981 2212 evenings.

DONATIONS to TBJ are gratefully acknowledged from George Banks, Malcolm Bennison, Albert Bolliger, Paul Coones, Kenneth Cooper, Richard Crowder, Jerome Curran, G.W. Gill, Colin Hammond, Ian Hibbert, Roger Humphries, Tony Newbould, Bryn Parkhouse, Michael Piper, Gerard Robello, James Savage, Ken Ward, David Wilson, and David Woodhead.