



The Bruckner Journal

ISSUED THREE TIMES A YEAR AND SOLD BY SUBSCRIPTION

Editorial and Advertising: tbj@dsl.pipex.com
23 Mornington Grove, Bow, London, E3 4NS

Subscriptions and Mailing: ☎ 01384 566 383
4 Lulworth Close, Halesowen, B63 2UJ

VOLUME EIGHT, NUMBER THREE, NOVEMBER 2004

Managing Editor: Raymond Cox
raymond@cox269.freemove.co.uk

Editor: Peter Palmer
Editor-Designate: Ken Ward
Associate Editors: Crawford Howie
Nicholas Atfield

In This Issue

	page
Concerts in Vienna and London	2
Compact Discs by Colin Anderson	5
Publications	8
Interview with Arthur Walker	14
Bruckner's Eighth: The 1890 Version by Dermot Gault	17
1 9 0 4	28
Letters	30
Editorial	31
Calendar	32



Bruckner and the Critics:
contemporary drawing by Theodor Zasche
(1862-1922)

Copyright in all pieces remains
with the author

Silhouette by Otto Böhler

Hamburg concertgoers nickname Bruckner's
Ninth Symphony *die Verworrene* [the muddle-headed]
---see 1 9 0 4 on page 28

Concerts

VIENNA

THREE BRUCKNER CONCERTS within three weeks in Vienna's Musikverein: a far cry from my first experience of a Bruckner symphony (No. 4) in Manchester's Albert Hall, with Josef Krips conducting the Hallé Orchestra. I was fifteen, it was one of the first orchestral concerts I had been to, and I had never heard of Anton Bruckner. Except for Brahms' Fourth, my symphonic knowledge stopped at Beethoven, Schubert and Mendelssohn. I remember how I thrilled at the glorious, rich sounds, and up to a point that concert has influenced the way in which I listen to Bruckner's music. As a student of piano and organ, I studied harmony and counterpoint, and I love the way he utilizes both to create wonderful sound. Although I am always aware of the underlying mechanics in composition - canon, fugue, inversion, etc. -, for me the Bruckner sound is paramount. And so to the Grosser Saal and to Symphonies Nos 1, 5 and 9 and the Te Deum.

The "Linz" version of the First Symphony was given an unusual airing by the relatively small forces of the Wiener Akademie conducted by Martin Haselböck [17 May 2004]. In the wake of a sparkling performance of Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto, with Daniel Hope as the soloist, it came across as coldly clinical and two-dimensional. There was no faulting the playing which, as always from this orchestra, was technically excellent, with every note in place, phrasing clean and precise, and perfect orchestral balance. It showed us an academic Bruckner. Only in the third movement, for example, were we allowed a glimpse of the teasing rustic humour which first appears in the opening bars of the work and is found throughout. An interesting treatment, deserving of praise for being different. In an odd kind of way I enjoyed it.

Georges Prêtre conducted the Vienna Symphony Orchestra in Bruckner's Ninth Symphony [15 and 16 May]. The opening bars encapsulate all the emotions the composer had experienced during his life, from the anguish portrayed in the bare octaves, hollow fifths and minor third to the soaring rich harmonies and dramatic key-modulation at the vision of the Divine Majesty to whom the work is dedicated. I feel that few conductors have ever achieved the deep despair in those octaves and fifths that van Beinum did with the Concertgebouw Orchestra of Amsterdam. This time the opening phrase was thick and heavy, so that it became difficult to progress with any sense of direction; the movement just seemed to lumber from *ff* to *ff*. By the end of it, the forces were spent, and

possibly the orchestra too, for the second movement lacked aggression and, in lighter moments, grace. In the third movement the playing often lacked atmosphere - in particular, the strings seemed unable to create a transparent luminescence where the music transcends the soul's torment. Throughout the symphony the trumpets were strident and horn sound was "fat", the brass often smothering the strings and woodwind, and there were just too many untidy entries.

In the Te Deum, soloists, choir (the Wiener Singverein) and orchestra were welded together in a reverent performance. Even here, however, the three trumpets managed to drown the whole assembly a number of times, and two of the soloists were possibly more suited to opera. Overall, I have to admit to being sadly disappointed.

The name of Claus Peter Flor was known to me, but I had not thought of him as a Bruckner champion. Indeed, I wondered how the Fifth Symphony would fare [28/29/30 April] under the direction of this slightly built man with the economical conducting style. From the opening *pp* ostinato it was clear that here was someone to be reckoned with. He allowed the music to unfold with just the right amount of guidance. I never felt that he was imposing himself on it; there were no histrionics. Rather, he persuaded the Vienna Symphony Orchestra to create music - Bruckner's music - and they complied spontaneously. Strings and woodwind were never blown away by the brass, yet the climaxes were huge. The allegro entry in the first movement was jauntily cheeky. Falling octave leaps positively snarled. The second movement was serene, the juxtaposition of six crotchets against four flowing easily, and the various sections of the scherzo were beautifully contrasted. The Finale was simply glorious in every respect. Everything happened effortlessly, and Flor extracted from the strings the most extreme *ppps* I have ever heard. Each movement was perceived in its own right within a wider perception of the whole symphony. Flor kept back that little extra for the end of the Finale, when the players gave their all...and more.

I found this performance well paced, well thought-out, well controlled and well played, with tremendous musicianship. It would have been perfection in a vast cathedral, for the Musikverein did not have the acoustics to allow the music to resonate. I look forward to hearing more Bruckner under Flor's baton.

FLORENCE BISHOP

ConcertLONDON

Bruckner's Seventh Symphony in the Royal Albert Hall, Friday 3 September 2004. Staatskapelle Dresden / Bernard Haitink

THE SOLE appearance of Bruckner's music at this year's BBC Henry Wood Proms came on 3 September, when Bernard Haitink conducted the Staatskapelle Dresden in Symphony No. 7. It's been some time since Haitink recorded this work, and while he has made three recordings of it (one is in a Q-Disc set of live Concertgebouw performances under Haitink), his more recent conducting of the Seventh has only been heard in concerts or broadcasts. Haitink made his London Proms debut in 1966 conducting Bruckner's Seventh with the BBC Symphony Orchestra and had conducted it at the Proms three more times prior to this 2004 rendition. Those previous performances were with the BBC SO once again and then with the European Union Youth Orchestra [reviewed by Peter Palmer in *TBJ*, March 1998] and with the Berlin Philharmonic (August 2000), when Haitink stood in for Claudio Abbado.

For Haitink's fifth Proms reading of the Seventh, the Dresden orchestra was in good form, and rather more secure and engaged than with Mozart's "Jupiter" Symphony in the first half. Tonally, however, it sounded less distinctive than in past years, although its appreciation of Bruckner's idiom and its ability to sustain long musical paragraphs was not in doubt. Haitink conducted a performance that seemed longer than the 66 minutes it actually took. Beautifully played, certainly, and lucidly balanced for the most part, the first movement had a measured gait that allowed the slower, reflective music to be an integral part of the design. The slow movement, affectingly chaste, kept grief private. Although Haitink moved towards the climax with sureness, the cymbal clash seemed superfluous. The scherzo was lumpy, yet the trio section offered perhaps the most naturally heartfelt playing in the symphony. The finale, lightly sounded, bore its classical features with distinction.

The capacity audience listened intently. Anyone unfamiliar with the music, or Haitink's way with it, would probably have found it an enthralling beatific experience. This was certainly a fine example of a dedicated Brucknerian at work with one of the world's most cultured orchestras.

Haitink himself seems not to tire of conducting Bruckner's Seventh and will do so again in London on 15 December, this time at the Barbican with the LSO - one of the projected Schubert-Bruckner concerts that Lorin Maazel was to have conducted.

Colin Anderson

R E C O R D I N G S
N E W
& O L D



PHILIPPE HERREWEGHE'S period-instrument recording (from April 2004) of Bruckner's Symphony No. 7 is impressively prepared and convinces through its lack of exaggeration. There's some excellent playing by the Orchestre des Champs-Élysées. As might be expected, Herreweghe's tempos are flowing and forward-moving, but the 'point' of this issue is how naturally Bruckner's scoring falls into place. The unforced brass never dominates, while the string sound is warm and attractively soft. Much detail beguiles the ear; and the Scherzo has propulsion. There are, however, moments in the first movement where the swift pace makes the music fall all too easily into a groove. The slow movement is often moving (the climax is without a cymbal clash but with timpani). The finale, tellingly paced, is satisfyingly integrated into the whole: a real through-line. It's an interesting release, and also an important one because it affords an opportunity to gauge how Bruckner's music might have sounded in his day [HARMONIA MUNDI HMC 901857].

A decided contrast in Brucknerian style comes with Evgeny Svetlanov's account of Symphony No. 8, "recorded 1981 in Moscow" according to the booklet. The booklet also states that Svetlanov is conducting the "1890 version ... prepared by Bruckner and Schalk". Nowak's edition is used. This is an imposing, imperious reading, one with a particularly full sound that is further swelled by the generous acoustic; the reverberation period is four seconds. The interpretation is sometimes perplexing, with Svetlanov at his most deliberate in the first movement – here 18 minutes. The Adagio is relatively flowing, living and breathing, the heartbeats in the lower strings aiding momentum. The Scherzo is fiery and the finale exultant. While not always idiomatic or through-structured, the performance is worth hearing, even if the Russian brass sound will not be to all tastes. The finale's stated timing of 21'28" is actually one minute longer; it's a 79-minute performance [SCRIBENDUM SC 020].

An even longer account of Bruckner's Eighth at 85 minutes, again using Nowak, comes

from Carlo Maria Giulini and the Philharmonia Orchestra, recorded in the Royal Festival Hall, London on 18 September 1983. But timings are no indication of the qualities of a performance. Svetlanov appears to meander, whereas Giulini's engrossing account seems wholly organic. In the closing bars of the first movement, the ticking clock really does stop when, like Giulini, the conductor resists even the merest suggestion of a ritardando. BBC Legends has previously released a radiant performance under Giulini of Bruckner's Seventh. This eloquent, deeply felt and spiritually transporting performance of the Eighth Symphony is, I suggest, another mandatory purchase. The second CD includes 'live' 1963 accounts of Dvořák's Symphony No. 8 and Rossini's *Semiramide* Overture [BBC LEGENDS BBCL 4159-2, two CDs].

In April 2002 I was very impressed by Kent Nagano's London concert performance of the first version of Bruckner's Symphony No. 3 with the Deutsches Symphonie-Orchester Berlin. Although the recording this team made, in March 2003, doesn't have quite the impact of that live occasion, it is still an impressive achievement. Nagano seems wholly convinced by Bruckner's initial conception of the symphony. His pacing is broad, if not as epic as Georg Tintner's on Naxos. There is fastidious detailing and a welcome avoidance of hardness or harshness, something which is helped by a warm acoustic. This is a fine performance with which to fathom Bruckner's original thinking, and it repays attention [HARMONIA MUNDI HMC 901817].

A mention now of Otto Klemperer's Philharmonia recordings of Bruckner's Fourth and Sixth Symphonies. The former has long seemed to me to be one of the very greatest accounts of the "Romantic", and it's good that it remains in the catalogue [EMI 5628152]. Klemperer's rugged account of the Sixth continues to grow on me. Its latest appearance has been the most positive encountered so far [EMI 5626212].

Finally, Reginald Goodall conducted Symphony No. 7 with the BBC Symphony Orchestra in the Royal Festival Hall on 3 November 1971. This is a fascinating performance, individual yet absolutely dedicated, which will raise eyebrows but will also be found revelatory. I had both reactions! Goodall includes the cymbal clash in the Adagio and balances it with enough finesse to make it persuasive [BBC LEGENDS 4147-2].

Colin Anderson

CD ISSUES JULY-OCT 2004 Compiled by Howard Jones and John Wright

The record companies have continued to keep us reasonably well supplied. However we noted a marked reduction in releases for August and September. There is no item that stands out from this listing, although some readers may welcome the Herreweghe #7 on period instruments. It is difficult at this time to see where the next great Bruckner conductor is coming from.

SYMPHONIES

* = new issue

No. 3 *Nagano/Deutsches SO Berlin (Berlin 3-03) HARMONIA MUNDI HMC901817 (68:42)

No. 4 Karajan/BPO (Berlin 9/10-70) EMI ENCORE 7243 585801 (70:14)
 *Asahina/New Japan PO (Tokyo 3-79) TOKYO FM TFMC-0007 (67:35)
 Furtwängler/VPO (Stuttgart 10-51) ARCHIPEL ARPCD0263 (66:11)

Nos 4,7,8,9 *Frantz/Philharmonie der Nationen/Rosbaud/SWRSO/Furtwängler/BPO (#4 & 8 unknown, #7 Baden-Baden 12-57, #9 Berlin 10-44) QUADROMANIA 222116-444 (65:59, 63:09, 78:02, 58:40)

No. 5 Solti/Chicago SO (Chicago 1-80) DECCA ELOQUENCE 476 223-8 (79:01)

No. 7 *Herreweghe/Orchestre des Champs-Élysées (Utrecht 4-04)
 HARMONIA MUNDI HMC901857 (59:54)
 *Goodall/BBCSO (London 11-71) BBC LEGENDS BBCL4147-2 (67:44)
 Furtwängler/BPO (Rome 5-51) CENTURION CLASSICS 2106 (63:04)
 *Böhm/VPO (Vienna 3-53) ALTUS ALT075 (61:00)
 Maticic/Czech PO (Prague 3-67) SUPRAPHON ARCHIV SU3781-2 (69:06)

No. 8 *Asahina/New Japan PO (Tokyo 4-77) TOKYO FM TFMC-0008/9 (86:36)
 plus Haydn.
 *Schuricht/VPO (Vienna 12-63) ALTUS ALT085 (70:09)

No. 9 Furtwängler/BPO (Berlin 10-44) DGG477 006-2 (58:54) 6 CD set
 plus other composers - disc 6 contains interviews with Furtwängler
 Jochum/Bavarian RSO (Berlin 12-64) DG 474 990-2 (60:49)
 *Schuricht/VPO (Vienna 3-55) ALTUS ALT080 (60:05)

CHORAL

Te Deum Karajan/VSO & Singverein (Perugia 9-52) ARCHIPEL ARPCD0259 (25:09)
 plus Beethoven #3

Mass #3 Jochum/Bavarian RSO & Choir (Munich 7-62) DG 477 503-2 (57:51)
 plus 3 motets (12:17)

DVD VIDEO

Mass #2 *Schreizer/Stuttgart Windensemble MEDUSA 8547 (55:47)
 subtitled "Anton Bruckner: The Magic of Light" this is essentially a nature film with the music as soundtrack.

BMG UK has brought out as a 9-CD collection Bruckner's Symphonies Nos 1-9, performed by the Gewandhausorchester Leipzig under Kurt Masur on RCA Red Seal 82876603952 (8)

ANTON BRUCKNER

8

**IX. SYMPHONY IN D, WAB 109:
FINALE (UNFINISHED)**

COMPLETED PERFORMING VERSION
SAMALE-PHILLIPS-COHRNS-MAZZUCA:

**NEW EDITION BY NICOLA SAMALE &
BENJAMIN-GUNNAR COHRNS 2004**

represented by

**benjamin-gunnar cohns
conductor**

artium bremen

research and publication on music

letters

postfach 10 75 07

d – 28 075 **bremen**

fon 0 [049] 421 • 794 00 23

mail bruckner9finale@web.de

Bank Account: Cohrs, Sparkasse Bremen

BLZ 29050101; Konto-Nr. 12365268

IBAN DE83 2905 0101 0012 3652 68

BIC SBREDE22

PRESS RELEASE

September 2004

The Completed Performing Version of the unfinished Finale from Bruckner's Ninth Symphony, gradually developed by Conductor and Composer Nicola Samale (Rome) and his Editorial Team since 1983, was remarkably successful – in particular the score by Samale-Phillips-Cohrs-Mazzuca 1992, edited by John Phillips, which received its First Performance by the Bruckner Orchestra Linz. However, this project was from its very beginning a 'work in progress' – and if only because Original Sources hitherto lost might once come back to light. Due to various new findings, Samale and his colleague, conductor Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs (Bremen), now indeed present a New Critical Edition of this version, in which Dr. Phillips did not wish to participate, since in central questions regarding the musical text he and the present editors came to no agreement. Samale and Cohrs wish to express their gratitude for his valuable collaboration of many years and his philological studies on the original manuscripts, published within the Bruckner Complete Edition.

Above all, two hitherto major gaps (in the Second Theme and the Fugue) could now be replenished completely with material from Bruckner's original sketches. The reconstruction of lost score bifolios, the overall instrumentation, the elaboration of the Coda (largely recovered from Bruckner's sketches and own material), Tempi, Dynamics and Articulation were likewise thoroughly revised. 554 from the 665 bars of this New Edition are original (208 b. finished, 224 b. incomplete Score; 122 b. Continuity Drafts and Sketches). From 111 b. of replenishment (ca. 17% of the Finale, 5,4 % of the Symphony, or approx. 4 minutes of music), 68 were to be regained from repetition, sequencing, or transposition of original material. 43 b. only have been synthesized without concrete proof, less than two third of the instrumentation required completion by the editors. – For comparison, Mozart left from his Requiem only 81 finished bars, and 596 b. of Vocal Score and Basso Continuo, with only marginal indication of instrumentation. 187 from 864 b. of the completed score (= ca. 22% or 11 min. of music) have been composed by Süssmayr, 783 b. (= ca 90 %) of instrumentation finished by him.

Information and Orchestral Parts (on hire) will be available from Cohrs, whom Samale entrusted with the Representation of the New Edition in July 2004 (Postfach 107507, D-28075 Bremen; bruckner9finale@web.de). The score will be available on sale in 2005 from Musikproduktion Höflich [http://www.musikmph.de/musical_scores/information/information.htm], Enhuberstr. 6–8, 80333 München, Germany.

A. Bruckner, Symphony No. IX in d minor, WAB 109, Finale (unfinished), Completed Performing Version by Samale-Phillips-Cohrs-Mazzuca (1983–91): New Critical Edition (2004) by Nicola Samale & Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, including Commentary, Tables and Music Examples (210 p.)

Publication

Theophil Antonicek, Andrea Harrantdt and Erich Wolfgang Partsch, eds., *Bruckner Symposion 2000 Bericht: Kreativität und Gesellschaft. Die materielle und soziale Situation des Künstlers*. Anton Bruckner Institute Linz, 2004. ISBN 3-900270-66-X. 22.50 Euros

THERE HAS BEEN a significant sea-change in the position of the artist vis-à-vis society during the last 200–250 years. The papers presented in this symposium cover topics as diverse as the social position of the writer in the 19th century, the social position of the orchestral musician in the 20th century, the social situation of the jazz musician, and the woman composer in the 21st century. Of the papers devoted to 19th-century composers, three are concerned with different aspects of Bruckner's creativity; two discuss specific social issues central to a proper appreciation of the musical output of two of his contemporaries. Uwe Harten looks afresh at the tragically short life of the brilliant Hans Rott (1858–1884), while Gerhard Winkler stresses the importance of Franz Liszt's Weimar period in his personal and artistic development.

Peter Stachel argues that Bruckner was typical of the 19th-century composer in experiencing a tension between his dual roles of teacher and creative composer. Taking the definition of creativity in the twentieth edition of the Brockhaus encyclopaedia (Leipzig–Mannheim, 2001) as his starting-point, especially the sentence 'creative training can be regarded as the basic premiss of education and is possible from earliest childhood in many learning situations inside and outside school', Stachel examines the Austrian educational system in the 19th century and, with particular reference to Bruckner, seeks to answer two questions: (1) How was 'knowledge' imparted during that period and what importance was attached to the promotion of independent thinking?; and (2) What role was music intended to play within the educational system?

Stachel begins by tracing Bruckner's development as a teacher. The nine-month course at the Linz Teacher Training Institute which Bruckner successfully completed in 1841 consisted primarily of religious and elementary musical studies but also included reading, writing, elementary mathematics and regional (but not international) geography. Subjects such as literature, history and the natural sciences were not taught. Bruckner's subsequent harsh experiences as a school assistant in Windhaag and Kronstorf were typical. His social position was that of an apprentice learning his trade. During his spell as assistant teacher at St Florian (1845–55), he passed examinations qualifying him to teach in secondary schools, but his career as a schoolteacher effectively came to an end when he was appointed cathedral organist in Linz. As a teacher his duties would have been no different from that of his predecessors and of his successors well into the 20th century, namely to give religious instruction and to impart the basics of reading, writing and arithmetic by way of a system in which learning by rote was the norm. School reforms requiring regular school attendance that had been initiated in the late-18th century were not fully observed in rural areas, as many of the children were expected to work on the land. Musical instruction was also fairly basic (rudimentary harmony and counterpoint) and was essentially determined by the requirements of the local church for singers in the church choir.

It was not until the middle of the 19th century that a real attempt was made to modernise secondary and tertiary education in Austria. This was largely the result of reforms introduced by Count Leo Thun–Hohenstein, Minister of Education, in the years 1847–53. The main thrust of earlier reforms introduced during the reigns of Maria Theresia and Joseph II was to increase the power of the state at the expense of the nobility, who had exercised almost feudal control at a regional level hitherto, and had

been primarily concerned with looking after their own interests. Although the Catholic church was given the task of implementing these reforms, the objectives were determined in detail by the state. There was rigid state control over what was taught in secondary schools. Independent thinking was not encouraged and students were not expected to explore beyond the text books supplied. The fine arts had no place in the educational system; they were considered not only unnecessary but even disruptive. Thanks to Thun's reforms, however, the fine arts were eventually regarded as 'teachable' subjects in higher education. Bruckner's eventual success in obtaining a position as Lecturer in Music Theory at Vienna University in 1875 would not have been countenanced twenty years earlier. Even Eduard Hanslick, appointed Lecturer in Music Appreciation at the University in 1861 and promoted to a Professorship in 1870, was initially opposed to Bruckner's application, declaring that the proper place for composition teaching was a special school or conservatoire, not a university.

Theophil Antonicek argues that, even with the significant change in the social position of the musician in Austria from 1750 onwards and the greater variety of employment opportunities available, one of Bruckner's main ambitions was to become court music director – a conservative albeit high-reaching aspiration. Although he became at first unpaid provisional and eventually paid assistant organist, he was unable to move beyond this comparatively minor position and achieve even the status of assistant music director. Antonicek points out that, in the social pecking order, the court musician occupied a position midway between the court official and the liveried servant and was not eligible for a pension. He was in the tenth of the eleven classes and 'occupied the same rank as the imperial confectioner'.

Although Bruckner, thanks to the efforts of Hermann Levi, Princess Amalie of Bavaria and Archduchess Marie Valerie, was granted the Knight Cross of the Franz Joseph order, this should be seen in the context of, for instance, the more prestigious Commander Cross of the same order awarded to Liszt. Bruckner could not rely on his position as assistant court organist to provide him with much more than the minimum of social prestige and financial remuneration. He relied almost entirely on the income from his teaching post at the Vienna Conservatoire and private teaching and, to a far lesser extent, his lectureship at the University. As far as an improvement in his social position was concerned, the award of an honorary doctorate in 1891 was of far greater consequence. He was particularly proud of this achievement.

Nevertheless, Antonicek makes the important point that other leading composers like Liszt, Brahms and Johann Strauss junior, and less prominent composers like Carl Goldmark and Ignaz Brüll, either did not have comparable qualifications or did not attach so much importance to them – and their social standing was much higher than Bruckner's. And, in assessing his social position, we should not forget that while many of his contemporaries turned a blind eye to his eccentricities, several treated him with contempt and condescension. Bruckner was both unable and unwilling to change his personality. With more cultivated social graces he may very well have attained the position of court music director – but at what cost to his originality as a symphonist?

Antonicek also touches on Bruckner's great faith; and it is the religious dimension – Bruckner's relationship with the church, particularly in the years up to 1868 – that Elisabeth Maier discusses in her article. She concentrates on two aspects: first, Bruckner's own perception (in a letter to Ignaz Assmayr in 1852) that music and musicians were 'treated indifferently' at St Florian Abbey, and his later recollection, as recorded by Göllerich/Auer, that he was treated as a mere servant in the abbey; second, Bruckner's social position as cathedral and parish church organist in Linz. Hansjürgen Schaefer [see *TBJ*, July 1998, p. 7] is taken to task for not questioning assumptions

made by early biographers like Göllerich and Auer, for over-dramatising the gloomy atmosphere at the abbey and for suggesting that Mayer, the provost, abused his position of authority to intimidate young Bruckner on several occasions. Elisabeth Maier argues that Bruckner's social position during the years 1845–55 should be examined more carefully before arriving at extreme conclusions. It is certainly true that there was a tightly-knit religious community at St. Florian, and Bruckner was an outsider in the sense that he made a deliberate decision in 1840 not to become a priest but to train as a teacher. He was employed in the St Florian village school as assistant schoolmaster and lived in the village in the house of Michael Bogner, the schoolmaster. Although he was given every opportunity to make use of the musical resources at St. Florian Abbey, was asked to write both sacred and secular choral music for performance there, and was encouraged by Mayer to consider pursuing his musical studies with Sechter in Vienna, his paid appointment as provisional organist was never up-graded. This was undoubtedly frustrating and perhaps contributed to his feelings of dissatisfaction. But when he was successful in applying for the vacant post of organist in Linz, he specifically mentioned the privilege of being trained in such a fine monastery as St Florian and secured Mayer's assurance that his organist post would be kept free for two years in case the Linz appointment did not work out.

Having made the break with St Florian, Bruckner now embarked on a career as a professional musician. It would appear that he had no difficulty in quickly becoming involved in Linz's social life and, certainly in the 1860s when his first important large-scale compositions were written, becoming a highly-regarded member of the community. Elisabeth Maier gives credence to the possibility of a musical post for Bruckner in the court of Emperor Maximilian (Emperor Franz Josef I's younger brother) in Mexico in the 1860s, inasmuch as Maximilian had a strong connection with Linz. He was a close friend of Emilie von Binzer, who had a salon in Linz which Bruckner occasionally frequented. This certainly explains Bruckner's interest in Maximilian's ultimately tragic 'Mexican adventure'.

It is Bruckner's relationship with Bishop Franz Joseph Rudigier that most clearly illustrates the nature of his social standing in Linz. Rudigier valued Bruckner's gifts as a musician highly, not only encouraging him (like Mayer earlier) to have lessons from Sechter in Vienna but giving him the free time to do so. His concern for Bruckner's well-being in 1867 when the composer had to receive treatment for a nervous breakdown at Bad Kreuzen has been well documented. But his generosity in granting Bruckner a sum of between 50 and 60 florins to pay for medical treatment in October 1856, only a few months after he had taken up his appointment in Linz, is not so well known. Elisabeth Maier perceptively remarks that, in spite of their moving on different social levels, there was a strong friendship between the two men that was expressed in a very subtle way, not only while Bruckner was in Linz but later, when the composer was forging a career in Vienna. Bishop Rudigier's pastoral care for Bruckner and his far-sightedness in giving him every opportunity to develop his talents in Linz cannot be disputed.

Provost Mayer and Bishop Rudigier, as representatives of the church in St Florian and Linz, cannot be held entirely (or even partly) responsible for those tensions or feelings of unhappiness or inadequacy that Bruckner experienced between 1845 and 1868. More credible is the view that they are attributable primarily to Bruckner's 'growing pains' as a practical musician and composer.

Julian Horton on "Perspectives" and "A Documentary Biography"

JULIAN HORTON is a lecturer in music at University College, Dublin. He has contributed to the Cambridge Companion to Bruckner and has completed a book entitled Bruckner's Symphonies: Analysis, Reception and Cultural Politics for Cambridge University Press, due out this autumn. He reviewed the CUP Bruckner Studies in "Music Analysis" in March 1999 and Benjamin Korstvedt's monograph on Bruckner's Symphony No. 8 in "The Bruckner Journal" in November 2000. In a review-article published in the February 2004 "Music & Letters", Horton discusses Crawford Howie's documentary biography of Bruckner and Perspectives on Anton Bruckner, edited by Howie et al.*

Scholarly perceptions of Bruckner in the English-speaking world, Horton writes, have shifted 'radically' during the last twenty years. Leopold Nowak's death resulted in wider access to the surviving source materials, generating a new internationalism in the continuing production of the second Complete Bruckner Edition. William Carragan's seminal work on the 1872 version of the Second Symphony is just one example. A concern to unmask political affiliations has guided recent work on reception history, while analytical studies have burgeoned and diversified. The publication of Crawford Howie's biography and of Perspectives sustains this scholarly impetus. The latter book engages with a particularly broad cross-section of issues. The essays on textual matters break new ground or supply fresh approaches to old problems; they also uncover analytical problems. Like the overtly analytical essays, those on biography and reception history show a productive diversity. Constantin Floros's readings of the symphonies confront the convergence of biography and analysis directly, and with 'difficult consequences': events such as Bruckner's nervous breakdown in 1867 still demand explanation.

Crawford Howie's biography, comments Horton, is the first work of such scope in English. Containing an impressive arsenal of primary and secondary sources, it assists our understanding of the early reception of the symphonies and the mature sacred works. The picture of Bruckner himself is refreshingly distant from the dated stereotype of the hapless yokel. However, the 'neutrality' of Howie's method often precludes consideration of important psychological or cultural issues. Many features of Bruckner's character, Horton argues, fall within the behavioural categories through which Graham Reed has defined the 'compulsive personality'. With regard to cultural politics, the space given to antagonisms between the Brahmsian and the Wagnerian faction urges an enquiry that is not pursued. What remains to be written is an extended study of Bruckner's complex psychological profile, the cultural politics that surrounded his career, and the question of how these factors affected the compositional process.

[PP]

* ISBN 0 521 82354 4
282pp £45

Julian Horton on his "Bruckner Symphonies: Analysis, Reception and Cultural Politics"

This book arose from two primary, and complementary, motivations. On the one hand, my aim was to bring a novel approach to some of the more problematic issues surrounding Bruckner's symphonies and their reception, by scrutinising them from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. On the other hand, Bruckner's music offers a challenge to many of the methodologies commonly applied to 19th-century music and sheds a provocative light on important recent debates. I wanted to use Bruckner as a vehicle for exploring these matters, with the aim of accelerating his admission to the canon of Anglo-American musicology. The book starts by identifying 'the critical problem'. From the Wagnerian polemics of Bruckner's early supporters to recent reappraisals of the first published editions, the guiding impulse has been the belief that each stage of commentary has somehow possessed an objectivity that previous stages lacked. This tendency will persist so long as we maintain that solutions to Brucknerian dilemmas are to be found in an increasing scholarly specificity. As an alternative, I propose a broadly comparative approach which attempts to trace problems to common cultural foundations.

I then offer six case studies. Chapters 2 and 3 broach issues of cultural politics. The former deals with the political circumstances of late 19th-century Vienna, the latter with the Nazi appropriation of the symphonies. In each case, I have sought to identify the implication of these contexts for an analytical understanding of the music, and thus to link analysis, cultural politics and reception history. In Chapter 2, sacred and secular associations of the material in the Finale of the 1873 version of the Third Symphony are related to the conditions of Church and State in late 19th-century Vienna. In Chapter 3 I scrutinize two commentators whose relationship with the cultural politics of National Socialism has been clearly established: Hans Alfred Grunsky and Robert Haas. Although its overall focus is quite different, Chapter 7 likewise explores three topics: psycho-analytical theories of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder; biographical evidence of Bruckner's compulsive behaviour; the relevance of all this to analysis of the music, with particular reference to the 1891 revision of the First Symphony.

Chapters 5 and 6 relate analysis to more narrowly defined issues. The former investigates the concept of musical influence, comparing the 1873 first movement of the Third Symphony with two prominent models: Beethoven's Ninth and Schubert's 'Unfinished'. The latter tackles the vexed question of the editions with the aim of assessing the impact of editorial policy on analysis. The Finale of the Second Symphony is taken as a case study, and the differences between the Haas and Nowak editions receive close attention. Ultimately, I argue for a pluralist stance towards the versions.

In many respects, Chapter 4 departs from the other case studies, being an investigation of prevalent analytical approaches to the symphonies. My concern was to evaluate the difficulties Bruckner's music causes, as evidence not of the peculiarity of Bruckner's style but of the shortcomings of theory. The chapter elaborates analytical models of Bruckner's harmonic, thematic, tonal and formal practices. The works considered here include the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Symphonies.

Ultimately, I hope to have made a case in this book for a type of critical Bruckner scholarship that comes to the music without the ubiquitous anxiety of revisionism.

[With thanks to Paolo G. Cordone for communicating the above explanatory remarks, which have been abridged for publication]

Interview with Arthur Dennis Walker

Arthur Dennis Walker is well known as one of the pioneers of interest in and research into Bruckner and his music in the English-speaking world from the late 1950s onwards. I got to know Arthur for the first time when I was appointed Assistant Lecturer in Music at Manchester University in 1966. On his retirement Arthur moved to Haworth in Yorkshire. It was a great joy and privilege to visit Arthur in July, to view his outstanding collection of music and books, to reminisce on old times, and to conduct the following interview.

CRAWFORD HOWIE

CH First, a few details about your life and your work as a music librarian.

ADW I was born in Bradford in September 1932. My work as a librarian began as an Assistant at Bradford Public Libraries (1951-57). I then moved to London to become Senior Assistant Librarian at Battersea Public Library (1958-64). Finally, I spent thirty years as Music Librarian at the University of Manchester (1964-94).

CH When did you first become interested in Bruckner and his music?

ADW My interest in both Bruckner and Mahler began during the war years when the two composers were virtually unknown in this country. I attended Hallé performances of Bruckner's Third and Seventh Symphonies and Mahler's *Das Lied von der Erde* in Bradford and recall listening to relays of two performances of Mahler's Third (from Holland, with Erich Kleiber conducting the Concertgebouw; and from London, with Sir Adrian Boult conducting the BBC Symphony Orchestra). My particular interest in the different versions of Bruckner's symphonies began towards the end of 1958 when I purchased a copy of the Third Symphony in the Philharmonia edition. Inserted in this copy was a letter which drew attention to the fact that there was more than one version of the symphony. This started me on the search for miniature scores of Bruckner's works.

CH When did you meet Hans Ferdinand Redlich for the first time? Tell me something of your friendship and collaboration, including work on Bruckner.

ADW Whilst working at Battersea Public Library, a copy of Redlich's *Bruckner and Mahler* book ['Master Musicians', London 1955] came to my notice. I pursued my increasing interest in Bruckner on the basis of this book. Kurt Eulenburg, for whom I was doing some editorial work at the time, wanted me to meet Redlich as we both had the same interests. We met for the first time in Kurt Eulenburg's office at 22 Darblay Street, and this resulted in Redlich sending me a proof copy of Mahler's First Symphony to check through and then return by post to him.

As Redlich in 1963 was in need of a music librarian in the Music Department at Manchester University, he invited me to Manchester to see the library. We discussed the matter further as well as my work on the different versions of Bruckner's works. When the second edition of Redlich's *Bruckner and Mahler* appeared

in 1963, he gave me a copy. I was then able to further my interest in the versions which resulted in the publication of an article in *Brio* in 1966. In a subsequent article, 'Bruckner Scores', in *Audio Record Review* (November 1967), I provided information about the editions used in recordings of Bruckner's works, a practice which has been continued to a greater or lesser extent since then.

My appointment as librarian in the Music Department in 1964 meant that Redlich and I were in almost daily contact during the next four years, and we collaborated on Bruckner and Mahler regularly until Redlich's death in November 1968. When Redlich was preparing the Eulenburg score [no. 961; E.E. 6527, 1968] of the 1881 version of the F minor Mass, for example, I transcribed a section of the autograph and this was printed in the Foreword and Commentary to the edition [see pages v-ix]. My own copy of this edition has an inscription from Redlich, dated May 1968: 'For Arthur Dennis Walker, my comrade-in-arms--in the hope that he will carry on the good fight'.

CH And how did you carry on the good fight in your own work on Bruckner?

ADW After 1968 I was asked by Eulenburg to edit the Overture in G minor and to include the earlier version of the coda in an Appendix. Difficulties with Leopold Nowak and the Austrian National Library meant that I was unable to get copies of Bruckner autographs to work on. In a letter from Nowak, he said that I could have copies of anything else in the Library, but 'Bruckner nicht'! I raised this matter of access to Bruckner autographs in a letter to the *Musical Times*, and both Deryck Cooke and Robert Simpson, with whom I had already discussed Bruckner versions during my time in London, got in touch with me.

My interest in the incomplete Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony had already been stimulated by Redlich who lent me a copy of the Orel transcription of the sketches so that I could make a working copy for my own use. In my programme note for a performance of the Ninth by the Hallé Orchestra in Manchester in 1966 [the London performance, 29 July 1966, is on BBC Legends, BBCL 4034-2], I explained that, contrary to the view then prevalent, the sketches were substantial. After the 1966 performances, I told Sir John Barbirolli that I was attempting to complete the movement and showed him my work in progress. He expressed great interest in my work. It was really after Redlich's death at the end of 1968 that I began to examine the Finale sketches in more detail. I was convinced that the bar numbers used by Bruckner must have been there for a purpose. After transcribing a section of the opening I found that there was a gap which would not join up. Was a leaf missing? I then began to check the bar numbers to determine their purpose and tried to ascertain if I could find what I was looking for by counting these numbers and thinking in terms of transposing the previous numbered section. But, as I couldn't find a suitable passage to fit in Orel's transcription, I left this passage blank, knowing that at some later stage I could come back to it, do the transposition and complete the join. After Barbirolli's

death in July 1970, however, I abandoned work on the Finale and have not returned to it since.

CH Could you mention some of the details revealed in your study of the printed versions of Bruckner's works?

ADW Perhaps I could pinpoint two features. First, there has been no bibliographical study of the texts printed by Ernst Eulenburg of Leipzig and the subsequent transfer of this material to London. Second, the Steinitzer edition of 1912 has Universal Edition plate numbers for some of the symphonies and Eulenburg numbers for the others. The early printings in the 'Eulenburgs kleine Partitur Ausgabe' of 1912 have the Universal Edition as a text source. Instruments are given, after the first page of each movement, in line with the clef and key signature. In the 1930s, the placing of instrument names was transferred to the left, outside the area of the musical text, in an attempt to tidy up the page. The edition numbers were changed by adding an extra 'prefix' number, so that the Third Symphony, for example, whose number had been 61 in 1912 was now 461. The general principle was that the 400 series represented Symphonies, the 600 series represented Overtures and the 900 series was divided between Operas and Choral Works. Forewords were added or renewed. But a close inspection of these 1930 scores reveals many anomalies and inconsistencies. Bar numbers are not above the first bar of each system but are in tens. Rests are often missing. To take Bruckner's Third Symphony as an example--on page 175, the keys for transposing instruments can be found both in the accolade and above the first note; earlier, on page 102, there is a superfluous *mf* in the flute part at the beginning of the third bar. And I could go on!

CH You have done some work on other composers, principally Handel.

ADW Yes, I have been responsible for Eulenburg editions of Handel's *Dettingen Te Deum* and *Judas Maccabeus*, and re-edited Redlich's edition of Mozart's Symphony no. 34 in C, K.338. I also compiled a catalogue of the Newman Flower Handel Collection in the Manchester Central Library.

CH And you have many other interests outside music, ranging from church law to the Brontë family. In retiring to Haworth in the mid-1990s, you returned to your roots, as it were.

ADW As I grew up in Cullingworth, the next village to Haworth, I have had a great interest in the Brontës from early childhood. My guide to the Correspondence of the Brontë family was published in 1982 and I remain a very active member of the Brontë Society.

CH Arthur, it's been a great pleasure to speak to you and renew our acquaintance. I look forward to visiting you again!

Arthur Walker's revised study of the versions of the Bruckner symphonies will be published in TBJ next year

The 1890 version of Bruckner's Eighth – Haas contra Nowak

*Änderungen mache mir ich persönlich.*¹

In the March 2003 issue of *The Bruckner Journal* Ramón Khalona referred to the still-prevalent misconceptions surrounding Bruckner's Eighth Symphony, pointing out that the Nowak edition does not make 'cuts' in the Adagio and Finale; rather, the Haas version inserts a passage from the 1887 version into the 1890 Adagio, and 'adds four passages that originated in the first version – and another by Haas himself – to the finale.' Khalona concludes that 'it is time to put this misconception to rest.'²

Responding in the July 2003 issue, Colin Anderson acknowledges that 'Nowak honoured Bruckner's intentions in his revision', but suggests that 'what is uncertain is whether Bruckner was coerced, and whether he really believed he was doing the right thing.'³ This is, broadly speaking, the line taken by Deryck Cooke, who contributed the entry on Bruckner in the 1980 *New Grove*. Cooke in turn derived his arguments from Robert Haas, editor of the *Gesamtausgabe* edition which appeared in 1939. But in recent years scholarly opinion has become increasingly critical of the Haas editions, which once enjoyed such great prestige.

This change is largely due to two factors: the publication of the revealing correspondence between the brothers Franz and Josef Schalk, which has led to a re-evaluation of their relationship with Bruckner, which in turn has led to a re-evaluation of the brothers' input into Bruckner's revisions and into the first published editions of his scores; and the increased accessibility of Bruckner's manuscripts. The aim of the present article is not so much to compare Haas with Nowak as to compare Haas with the manuscript sources.

The sources in question are held in the Music Collection of the Austrian National Library in Vienna, where the manuscript of the revised version of the Eighth has the call number Mus. Hs. 19.480. This manuscript takes the form of four volumes, each consisting of a folder containing a stack of unbound bifolios. Each volume has a quite distinct history.

In the case of the first movement, Bruckner emended a copy of the 1887 version made by Leopold Hofmeyr. The resulting manuscript is a composite of original Hofmeyr bifolios, emended as necessary by Bruckner, and new bifolios entirely in Bruckner's hand. Naturally, it is the Hofmeyr bifolios which are the most revealing in terms of showing exactly how the revision was carried out. Bruckner scratches out or writes over the existing text as necessary, pastes over other passages with little patches of fresh manuscript paper, and supplements the score with the periodic numbers and voice-leading annotations which reflect his theoretical concerns; he was for instance very concerned at that time that consecutives should not arise between different parts, especially at page turnings.⁵

The first significant passage for our purposes comes in the first page of bifolio 6, one of Hofmeyr's original bifolios, where it can be seen that Bruckner has altered the horn parts in bar 101. Haas reverts at this point to the 1887 score. One has to ask why an editor should reject changes made by a composer in his own handwriting. In this case one suspects that Haas simply preferred the greater rhythmic definition of the earlier version. In any case it is an unusual way for an editor to proceed.

The scherzo differs from the other movements in that in this case Bruckner wrote out an entirely fresh score. Both Haas and Nowak follow the manuscript here, although Nowak is more scrupulous when it comes to distinguishing editorial emendations. The situation is different in the Adagio, where close comparison

between the Haas edition and the source reveals a large number of differences, many of them significant.

Confusingly, the third volume of Mus. Hs. 19.480 consists of the manuscript of the original 1887 version of the Adagio, possibly because the manuscript of the revised version remained for many years in the possession of the Schalk family. It was not until quite recently that the manuscript of the later version was acquired by the Austrian National Library, where it now has the number Mus. Hs. 40.999. For whatever reason, this manuscript is particularly fragile (fortunately, all the Bruckner material in the Austrian National Library has been transferred to microfilm).

Mus. Hs. 40.999 is another copy score, in the hand of a different, unidentified copyist, in which once again some bifolios have been replaced by new ones entirely in Bruckner's handwriting. There is no room here to list all the differences between the Haas score and the manuscript. Some of them are listed below, but in the meantime a comparison between page 103 of the Haas score with its equivalent (page 101) in the Nowak edition will serve to illustrate the selective and arbitrary nature of Haas's changes. Inexplicably, Haas cuts the violins short at the big chord in bar 239 (bar 249 in the Haas score), the main climax of the movement, leaving the harps to finish on their own, even though in all of Bruckner's manuscripts the violins sustain their high note.⁶ Haas has *ppp* at letter W, where the manuscripts have a simple *p*, and he substitutes the 1887 version of the horn and trombone parts in bars 249-250 (Haas bars 259-260) for what Bruckner wrote.

Nowak's score is faithful to the source, although in this passage both he and Haas have to address an anomaly in the manuscript itself, as the essential third of the chord is missing at two bars before letter W. Haas follows the 1887 score in giving the missing *a* to the second violins. Nowak gives it to the firsts, but unlike Haas, he shows that his emendation is editorial.

The most important difference between the editions of Nowak and Haas is found in the final section of the movement. In the 1890 score the quiet passage between 1887 bars 225-234 is omitted, so that the two tuttis at letters P and Q follow each other without a break. Haas however inserts the ten bars Bruckner had written in the 1887 version. Reference to the manuscript of this passage, which is to be found on the last two pages of bifolio 14 and the first two pages of bifolio 15, shows that these bars have been crossed out by Bruckner, twice, once in pencil, once in ink. But a closer look at the crossed-out text brings a major surprise: because the text which Bruckner crossed out is not the text of the 1887 version at all. Although the text that originally stood there was indeed that of 1887, it was subsequently altered by Bruckner himself. The flute part has been removed, new horn parts have been added, and the passage has been shortened from ten to six bars. What we have here is the text of the so-called 'Intermediate' Adagio, composed possibly in the course of Bruckner's revision of this movement from March to May 1889, but probably earlier, in 1888. This is a quite distinct version of the Adagio which otherwise survives only in a single manuscript score (Mus. Hs. 34.614), written by another anonymous copyist with some corrections by Bruckner. The reduction to six bars is confirmed by the voice-leading annotations at the right-hand side of the staff of this page, which prove that the sixth bar of the passage was to be followed by the tutti at letter Q:

Oboe: as [ab] – es [eb]

Clarinet: fes [fb] – es [eb]

Horns 1: b [bb] – c

Horns 2: b [bb] – as [ab]

Violin 1: fes [fb] – es [eb]
 Violin 2: des [db] – es [eb]
 Viola: des [db] – es [eb]
 Cello: b [bb] – es [eb]
 Double Bass: b [bb] – es [eb]

[Note that in German notation F flat becomes 'fes' and B flat becomes 'B']

I suspect that Bruckner attempted to change the function and effect of this passage. In the 1887 original, the 10-bar episode functions as a musical island separating the two big tuttis. In the Intermediate version it seeks to join them by means of a crescendo in the final bars, a procedure which is in line with the consistent trend of Bruckner's revisions to establish greater continuity and cohesiveness between sections. Eventually, Bruckner decided that these aims would be best served by removing the passage altogether. In inserting the 1887 version of this passage, therefore, Haas was undoing not one but two revisions made by Bruckner himself. In the light of this, I feel that it is not credible to suggest that Bruckner might have been 'coerced' into making either of these changes, let alone both.⁷

And so we come to the most disputed movement of all, the finale. The score of this movement is yet another composite, but in this case Bruckner emended his own original manuscript. Once again, some of the bifolios are original and others are new. Haas's version of the movement is 38 bars longer than Nowak's. He cuts a total of 10 bars of the 1890 text, and inserts 48 bars, most – though by no means all – of which come from the 1887 version. The exception is (Haas) bars 609-614.

The textual situation here is rather complicated. The original form of this passage, corresponding to 1887 bars 625-630, is found on page 3 of bifolio 26, and was crossed out by Bruckner, who added **vi-de** for good measure. The new version (1890 bars 577-580) is found on a single leaf inserted into bifolio 26, and this is what Nowak gives us. The question arises as to where Haas's passage comes from. Reference to the cancelled page 3 of bifolio 26 shows that the flute part *only* of Haas's version has been pencilled into the flute line – which suggests that Bruckner considered emending the score along these lines, before deciding not to. The question of the origin of Haas's other wind and string parts naturally remains.

As it happens, the revised version on the interpolated page shows another anomaly, as the brass chord which began in the previous bar (1890 bar 576) has not been continued on the new page. The first published edition of 1892 follows the manuscript exactly here, with the result that the chord sounds unnaturally truncated. Both Haas and Nowak believe that this omission was merely an oversight, and restore the brass parts as they stood in the first bar of the original bifolio 26. In this case the musical sense is, surely, self-evident.

There is no reason to doubt Bruckner's authorship of the many changes in this manuscript. There is no evidence that anyone other than Bruckner has written in the score.⁸ The use of simple diagonal lines, covering the entire staff, for crossing-out is consistent with Bruckner's practice elsewhere, and some of the excisions are confirmed by characteristic comments in Bruckner's distinctive handwriting, such as the 'weg' [literally, 'away'] written over the 12-bar passage deleted before letter Oo or the 'vi – de' written around 1887 bars 305-312. The removal of 1887 bars 687-690 is explicitly confirmed by adjustments to the metrical numbers placed underneath the staff. 1890 bars 635-636 were originally numbered '1' and '2', as they began the 6-bar phrase which included 1887 bars 687-690. In the manuscript these bars have been

re-numbered '9' and '10', confirming that they continue the metrical period begun at 1890 bar 627.

It has been suggested that Haas's edition respects Bruckner's changes when he alters the manuscript, but restores passages which have been crossed out. But a change is a change, no matter how it is effected. In some cases it was more convenient for Bruckner to cross out a passage (especially when it was split between two bifolios), in others it was simpler to write a new one. As it happens, we finally, at the end of the finale, come across a brief passage which was crossed out on the manuscript and not reinstated by Haas (1887 bars 701-702).

At this point one must refer to a letter which Bruckner wrote to the conductor Felix Weingartner on 27 January 1891, with reference to a planned performance of the Eighth which never took place, which contains the following sentence:

Please cut the finale severely, as indicated; it would be much too long and is valid only for later times and for a small circle of friends and connoisseurs.⁹

This is of course one of Bruckner's most famous quotes, but it is not clear which cut or cuts he was referring to.¹⁰ However, the fourth volume of Mus. Hs. 19.480 contains an extra page inserted into bifolio 16, with a proposal for an optional cut from bar 344 to bar 387, from letter Z to letter Aa. This would remove 43 bars and replace them with the following rather makeshift patch:

[example 1] ----->

This is an example of the 'expedient' cuts which Bruckner authorised from time to time simply to make his symphonies more digestible for the general public, and which must be distinguished from the integral, organic deletions made elsewhere in the 1890 version of the Eighth. Other examples of expedient cuts include the cut (later rescinded) from letter H to letter M in the second movement of the Fourth Symphony, and the cut from letter L to letter Q in the Finale of the Fifth. The conclusion is inescapable: Nowak gives not only what Bruckner wrote but also what he meant, while Haas gives us a 'pick & mix' version, based on the 1890 score but including elements of the 1887 version, selected on the basis of personal preference.

In the absence of a Critical Report, the grounds for Haas's editorial choices remain a matter for conjecture. All we have to go on is his brief, one-page Preface, given here in the revised version which accompanied the 1949 reprinting by the Brucknerverlag in Wiesbaden:

In preparing this edition of the Eighth Symphony special considerations have had to be taken into account. This work has to be seen in terms of its inner meaning, as well through the history of its creation. Its essence can best be understood through a creative source-critical investigation.

Bruckner created the Eighth in a period of great spiritual enthusiasm, in the years 1884 to 1887, when he was sustained by his recent hard-won success [with the Seventh Symphony]. The finale, which he called his most significant movement, was completed on August 10, 1887, and immediately afterwards, on August 12, began the first work on the Ninth. This burst of creative energy suffered a sudden interruption when the just-completed symphony was abruptly rejected by the master's inner artistic circle. Hermann Levi in Munich, and Josef Schalk who seconded him in Vienna, were at a loss [*ratlos*] concerning the score and pushed with great energy for

This page of a musical score, numbered 21, contains the following parts and markings:

- Flutes 1, 2, 3:** Part 1.2.3. Includes a circled 'Z' and a boxed 'AA'.
- Oboes 1, 2, 3:** Part 1.2.3.
- Clarinet 1, in Eb**
- Clarinet 2, 3, in Eb**
- Bassoons 1, 2, 3:** Part 1.2.3.
- Horn 1, 2, in F**
- Horn 3, 4, in B flat**
- Horn 5, 6, in F**
- Horn 7, 8, in B flat**
- Contrabass Tube**
- Trumpet 1, in F**
- Trombone 2, 3, in F**
- All. Ten. Trombones**
- Bass Trombone**
- Timpani:** Includes a 'trum.' marking and a 'pp' dynamic.
- Violin I:** Includes a circled 'Z' and a boxed 'AA'.
- Violin II**
- Viola**
- Violoncello**
- Contrabass**

wide-reaching alterations. The result of this reworking, or second version, after further retouchings, was brought before the world in 1891 in the first printed edition.

Bruckner was deeply affected and cast down by the depressing experience of October 1887. We hear of his "suicidal thoughts". The promise forced [*abgetrotzte*] from him, to do everything possible "according to his best knowledge and belief", led to a spiritual struggle which resulted in the most precious flowering of his Muse.¹²

An examination of the sources, especially in the first movement, testifies that it was only through a positively titanic struggle with his own creation and the stress of much toil that the familiar continuity appeared.

The second version [of the first movement] took shape between the end of 1889 and the start of 1890 through an inexorably hard effort of will, attested to, as if by sighs, by a series of precise date annotations [in the manuscript]. The other movements had been taken care of earlier without such expenditure of energy. The finale especially betrays in its externals a more superficial [*flüchtigere*] and more casual [*lässigere*] type of organisation, and even a lack of inner involvement [*Teilnahme*], for the forced cuts cannot be explained in any other way.

My textual presentation has had to restore those elements which are organically essential. An extraordinarily rich supply of sources for the Eighth has been preserved, which however in the meantime have through carelessness become confused. Only through many pains and with a lot of luck have I succeeded in bringing them together, and only recently has this precious treasure taken shape.

Through painstaking inspection and review a clear separation and removal of alien influence was possible. The cuts, which affect 10 bars in the Adagio and 50 in the finale, can and must be opened, and also various misunderstandings, indeed senselessnesses [*Sinnlosigkeiten*], can and must be removed. [The original 1938 Preface adds that "in certain passages, reference to the first version was necessary in order to restore an authentic sense and sound."]]

The main source is Bruckner's autograph manuscript, Hs. 19480 in the Austrian National Library. Accompanying that is the printer's score for the first publication, consisting of copy scores prepared by Viktor Christ and Leopold Hofmeyr; in it, the additions in red ink by Max von Oberleithner are easily identified. Finally, various accompanying parts of the large supply of sources were chosen and made use of. The details of the sources and source criticism are available in the critical report in the Collected Edition. [The original version adds here: "The text of the first version will be found in the Collected Edition in score."]]

Vienna, December 1948¹³

Haas's rhetoric of compulsion and coercion shaped the perception of a whole generation of listeners and performers, and his assertions concerning 'forced cuts' were for many years accepted without question. But if 'cuts' had indeed been forced on Bruckner, who had done the enforcing?

Traditionally, Josef Schalk has been cast as the villain of the piece. It was Josef, after all, to whom Levi had written his now-notorious letter in October 1887, and who had, presumably, failed to stand up for Bruckner. Deryck Cooke's worklist in the 1980 *New Grove* announced, as established fact, that the 1890 version had been 're-composed with Josef Schalk', a claim never made by Haas. Hans Redlich's *Bruckner and Mahler* suggests that Josef's influence was 'greater still' than his brother's,¹⁵ but the fact is that the relationship was often stormy, as Bruckner's barbed nickname for Josef, 'the Generalissimo', indicates. Although Josef's devotion to Bruckner's cause was never in doubt, it seems that his manner of advancing it often caused resentment. Josef was the target for an outburst of rage on Bruckner's part at rehearsals for a two-piano arrangement of the Fifth Symphony in 1885, and the

flowery language of the programme he wrote for the first performance of the Eighth Symphony brought forth rather earthier language from Bruckner.¹⁶ Bruckner's anger at Josef's meddling in the score of the F minor Mass led to another scene at a rehearsal for the F Minor Mass in 1894.¹⁷

The relationship is discussed in detail in Thomas Leibnitz's indispensable study *The Brothers Schalk and Anton Bruckner*,¹⁸ which draws on the 473 letters between the two brothers now preserved in the Austrian National Library. Although the present author has already cited these letters with reference to the 1889 version of the Third Symphony, it is worth quoting them again, as Josef continually pays tribute to his younger brother's capacity to influence Bruckner and laments his own inability to do so. A letter of 26 November 1888 shows how great Franz'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 industriousness making to the Eighth and the Third, he would like to submit to your judgement.¹⁹

This letter shows that while Bruckner was prepared to submit his revisions to Franz Schalk's judgement – a remarkable enough circumstance – there is no indication that Josef was trying to participate in or otherwise influence the revision process. He specifically states that *Bruckner* was making changes to the Third and Eighth Symphonies. Nor does the correspondence suggest that Josef's opinion carried much weight with Bruckner. On the contrary. On 10 June 1888, Josef writes, concerning Bruckner's obsession with ridding his scores of consecutive octaves, that Bruckner 'is immovable in the face of any objection from Löwe or myself',²⁰ and in subsequent letters of 13 and 20 July 1888 he begs Franz to use his influence with Bruckner. Finally in a letter from 5 October in the same year he deplores the changes which Bruckner was making to the Third, but admits that he couldn't 'do anything about it'.²¹

The picture that emerges is therefore the reverse of what was traditionally assumed: Josef has been credited with having an enormous influence on Bruckner, but in his letters he continually laments his lack of influence; Bruckner has been cast as pliable and too easily swayed, but time and again Josef complains about his obstinacy.

There is admittedly one instance, referring to the new quiet ending for the first movement, which could be interpreted as showing input by either or both of the Schalks into the revision:

The day before yesterday Bruckner finished the revision of the Eighth. The first movement now finishes pianissimo according to our wish.²²

But it is not actually stated that the brothers suggested this change to Bruckner, let alone 'coerced' him into making it. It may be that of two options then being considered by Bruckner, this was the one they favoured.

The conclusion is therefore that the 1890 version of Bruckner's Eighth is the composer's unaided work, uninfluenced by Josef Schalk. From this it follows that the Haas edition is a personal amalgam of two distinct versions, together with inventions of his own. The onus therefore rests on defenders of the Haas version to account for its anomalies. Why, for instance, did Haas alter orchestral details in the first movement? Is it suggested that Bruckner was 'coerced' into changing the horn parts in bars 101 and 345? Why, in the later movements, did Haas accept some changes and

not others? Why should some details of the 1890 revision be considered suspect, and not others? It is not enough to 'prefer' one version or another; it is for supporters of Haas to show why they cannot accept alterations made in the composer's own handwriting.

Deryck Cooke himself acknowledged that there has never been any doubt that Nowak gives us the score as Bruckner wrote it in 1890, but he then attempted to make a distinction between Bruckner's actions, as enshrined in his manuscript, and his true wishes. But if we accept the 1890 version as it stands, the malign Josef disappears along with the spineless Bruckner.

For many Brucknerians all this will of course be old news. For some scholars the name of Haas has become demonised because of his political involvements in the Nazi era, and the entire basis of the 1930s *Gesamtausgabe* has been seen as ideologically suspect (as indeed it was for Egon Wellesz in the 1930s). For this, the blame must fall on Haas. Readers familiar with the post-war Preface of 1948 translated above will be brought up short by the final paragraph of the original Preface:

As for the significance of the content of the Eighth, let the 'German Michael' mythos be briefly thought of here, in which Bruckner became wondrously absorbed after 1885. Its transfiguration is the finale with the mystico-technical contrapuntal device of combining the four themes of the symphony at the end. The meaning of this mythos seems to me to be given in the concept of the greater Germany as an attitude of mind. It is a sign from Providence that the restored score could ring out precisely in this year as a greeting from the *Ostmark* [literally, 'eastern marches' – i.e., Austria].²³

My concern here however is not so much with the motivation for Haas's 'return to the pure sources' as with the fact that he was not faithful to the sources in question.

Hitherto, criticism of Haas's editorial practices has been confined to scholarly circles. A gulf has opened up between scholars on the one hand and performers and the wider musical public on the other, and the Haas scores continue to enjoy particular prestige among conductors, critics and the musical public generally. The name of Haas rapidly acquired the status of a seal of approval (one has for example seen a recording of the Ninth Symphony with the words 'Haas edition' in large letters on both the cover and the disc itself, even though the first critical edition was edited by Alfred Orel). In Britain, Deryck Cooke and Robert Simpson used their position at the BBC not only to promote Bruckner's music – and its current standing among audiences, critics and scholars in the UK is to some extent due to their efforts – but also to promote Haas's editions, specifically of the Eighth. Cooke's influential article *The Bruckner Problem Simplified*²⁴ reads for much of its length as a pro-Haas, anti-Nowak polemic, and Erwin Doernberg's *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*²⁵ is if anything more partisan.

This is not to say that the prestige enjoyed by the Haas editions generally is unjustified. Haas's editions of Symphonies 5 and 6 are faithful to the manuscript sources he worked from, as is his edition of Symphony No 4, which skilfully disentangles various layers of reworkings in the manuscript Mus. Hs. 19.476. By his own account Haas also did a lot of the necessary spade work, assembling and sorting out manuscripts which had 'become jumbled up' as he puts it, and arranging the bifolios in order. It may well be that the research students who appear to be the only persons, apart from Haas and Nowak themselves, to have accessed these manuscripts have Haas to thank for finding such clearly presented material. Haas's editor's reports

too are, for the most part, models of thoroughness and accuracy. To that extent later scholars are building on Haas's work. In fact the first *Gesamtausgabe* was admirable so long as it conformed to the musicological principles both Haas and Nowak learnt from Guido Adler. But we have to accept that in his composite versions of Symphonies 2 and 8 Haas fell short of the critical standards he demonstrated elsewhere.²⁶

It could be argued that the Preface to the Nowak edition of the Eighth, which appeared in 1955, could have explained more clearly why his score differed from Haas's. Nowak did state that the publication of the first version of 1887 would make the relationship between the versions clear, as indeed it does, and it is unfortunate that it took nearly twenty years for it to appear.

In the meantime the Haas edition became the version of choice for many leading interpreters. But with all due respect, it is hard to see why the preferences of conductors should outweigh the findings of scholars. Nikolaus Harnoncourt – who has incidentally opted to record the Nowak edition – has reportedly spoken of a conflict between heart and head in editions of the Eighth. But is the Haas version musically preferable to Bruckner's own? When Bruckner revised his works there were often losses as well as gains, but each version has its own stylistic as well as its own textual integrity. The longer passages that Haas inserted from the 1887 score belong stylistically to that version, to its gentler and more overtly expressive idiom. The excision in the Finale of 1887 bars 265-268, and the replacement of 1887 bars 601-614 with 1890 bars 565-566, demonstrates a disciplined elimination of inessentials, together with a finer control of symphonic architecture and long-term harmonic rhythm. Listeners accustomed to the Haas edition find the 1890 score truncated, but those accustomed to the 1890 score find the passages Haas inserted intrusive.

It must sometimes seem that we live in an era of debunking, of cutting down to size. It is not my intention to demonise Haas or to spoil listeners' enjoyment of Haas-edition recordings. But it is important to redress the persistent misrepresentation of Leopold Nowak and his work, which has if anything become more unpleasant over the years.

Dermot Gault

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due first of all to the organisers of the 2003 Bruckner Conference in Nottingham for inviting me to give the paper on which this article is based, and to Dr Günther Brosche and Dr Inge Birkin-Feichtinger of the Musiksammlung of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek for granting access to Bruckner's original manuscripts and for permitting facsimiles to be shown in the course of my talk. Thanks are due too to William Carragan for giving permission to quote from his translation of the original version of Haas's Preface, and to Peter Palmer for his help and advice.



Caricature of Bruckner as the "Deutsche Michel" (2nd movement theme, 8th Symphony) by Ferry Béron, 1892

Summary of main differences between Haas and the manuscript sources (omitting minor differences concerning accents, tenuto lines, etc)

First movement

101 – Horn parts as per 1887

103 – Haas has the 2nd and 3rd oboes in octaves, doubling the violins and violas in these bars; in Mus. Hs. 19.480 the 2nd oboe and 2nd clarinet double the violins, while the 3rd trumpet doubles the violas

164-172 – Here Haas reverts to the 1887 score. In 19.480 the violins drop an octave at bar 164, the seconds take both parts at bar 167 while the firsts double the oboe and clarinet, and the bassoon part at bar 169 is given to the 3rd horn

345 – Horn parts as per 1887 in Haas (see bar 101)

Third movement

Haas inserts 1887 bars 225-234 between 1890 bars 208-209, slightly altering the horn parts in bar 209 in the process. In addition to the other changes mentioned above, he omits the horns and trombones in bars 14 and 32, the clarinets in bar 60 and in bars 169-176, and substitutes Wagner tubas for the horns in bars 129-132, besides altering the string articulation in the same passage. He also adds a second trumpet in bars 197-200 and 203-204, and adds second violins and violas in bars 279-282. Minor changes – and the following list is by no means exhaustive – are found in the brass and bassoon parts in bars 24-25 and 42-43, the flutes in bar 60, the first clarinet in bars 66-67, the second violins in bars 67 and 70, the first horn in bars 99-100, the horns and violas in bar 122, the 3rd clarinet in bar 124, the first flute in bar 150, the bassoons, the solo violin and the first violins in bar 160, the violas in bar 186, the cellos in bar 188, the Wagner tubas in bar 199-200, the bassoon, horn, Wagner tuba and trombone parts in 209-210, the oboe parts in bars 224-226, the trombones in bar 236, the bassoons in bar 241, the first violins in bars 272 and 274, and the horns in bars 280-281. In addition, the string sextuplets are phrased differently throughout the final section.

Fourth movement

Haas omits 1890 bars 211-214 and inserts 1887 bars 223-242 (Haas bars 211-230.

Haas's bar 210 also reverts to 1887)

Haas cuts 1887 bars 265-268 after 1890 bar 236 (Haas bars 253-256)

Haas cuts 1890 bars 565-566 and inserts 1887 600-614 (Haas bars 585-598)

Haas cuts 1890 bars 577-580 and inserts Haas bars 609-614 (not in the 1887 or 1890 versions)

Haas inserts 1887 bars 687-690 (Haas bars 671-674) after 1890 bar 636

In all, Haas adds 48 bars and cuts 10 bars, so that his version is a total of 38 bars longer. The orchestral writing also contains reversions to the 1887 text, for example the wind between bars 379-384 (Haas bars 399-404).

- ¹ 'Changes are made only by me personally'. Bruckner, letter to Albert J. Gutmann, 12 June 1886 (with reference to the Fourth Symphony). See Anton Bruckner, ed. Andrea Harrandt and Otto Schneider, *Briefe 1887-1896*, (hereafter 'Briefe'), page 38.
- ² Ramón Khalona, TBJ Volume 7 No 1, page 31.
- ³ Colin Anderson, TBJ Volume 7 No 2, page 6.
- ⁵ He was not always successful, and the re-ordering of the string parts in bars 251-252 creates two sets of parallel fifths, which Haas 'corrects'. Nowak gives us what Bruckner wrote, as does the first published edition. My thanks to Takano Kawasaki for bringing this detail to my attention.
- ⁶ There is a precedent of sorts in the first published edition of 1892, in which the high E flat is sustained by the wind, rather than the violins. However, the entire thrust of Haas's conception was opposed to this edition.
- ⁷ It is interesting that in incorporating this passage from the 1887 version Haas took over two minor details of phrasing in the oboe part in (Haas) bars 212-213 from the Intermediate version!
- ⁸ Apart possibly from some bifolio numberings which may have been added later.
- ⁹ *Briefe* page 114.
- ¹⁰ In another letter to Weingartner dated 2 October 1890 Bruckner states that 'there are big cuts in the Finale'. *Briefe* page 87.
- ¹² In a letter to Levi dated 20 October 1887, Bruckner wrote: 'I will do what is possible – to the best of my knowledge and belief [*Wissen und Gewissen*].' *Briefe* page 26.
- ¹³ Robert Haas, *Einführung* to Brucknerverlag edition of Symphony No 8, Wiesbaden 1949.
- ¹⁵ Redlich, *Bruckner and Mahler*, London 1955, page 283.
- ¹⁶ The exact expression is 'Locherl'. Carl Hruby, *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*, Vienna 1901.
- ¹⁷ *Briefe* page 258.
- ¹⁸ Thomas Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*, Tutzing 1988.
- ¹⁹ Leibnitz, page 137. See also *Briefe* page 45. The 'Kugel' is the inn 'Zum goldenen Kugel' (the Golden Globe).
- ²⁰ *Ibid*, page 134, and *Briefe* page 38. This letter refers specifically to the Third Symphony.
- ²¹ *Ibid*, page 136.
- ²² *Ibid*, page 129.
- ²³ Haas, Robert, *Sinfonie Nr 8 in c-Moll, Einführung*, Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna 1939. I am indebted to William Carragan for this translation. See also Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt, *Anton Bruckner: Symphony No. 8* (Cambridge Music Handbooks), Cambridge 2000, pp 104-106, and Korstvedt, 'Return to the Pure Sources': *The Ideology and Text-Critical Legacy of the First Bruckner Gesamtausgabe*, in *Bruckner Studies*, ed. Timothy Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw (Cambridge 1997), pp 91-109. Also Morten Solvik, *The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P.: A Case Study of Robert Haas and the Critical Edition*, *Musical Quarterly* 83 (1998). The term 'Ostmark' for Austria was however current before the 1930s, and even appears in the text of the militant *Folkslied* to words by Winter which Bruckner set in 1891.
- ²⁴ Cooke, *The Bruckner Problem Simplified*, revised and reprinted in *Vindications*, London 1982.
- ²⁵ Doernberg, Erwin, *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, London 1960.
- ²⁶ Likewise, comparison between the Haas and Nowak scores of the Linz version of No 1 will show hundreds of minor differences, and although few of these are audible in performance, some of them do raise substantive editorial concerns (an issue fudged in Cooke's article). More recently, Rüdiger Bornhöft's *Revisionsbericht* for the Seventh Symphony, while remaining aloof from controversy, effectively vindicates Nowak's edition, while exposing anomalies in Haas's, for instance his selective adoption of details suggested by Bruckner to the conductor Karl Muck. See Rüdiger Bornhöft, *VII. Symphonie E-Dur Revisionsbericht*, Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna 2003.

Rudolph Sabor's new translation of Wagner's Mastersingers can be ordered from: Dr Rudolph Sabor Book Sales, 6 Kedleston Drive, Petts Wood, BR5 2DR. £5.95 + p&p £2.50, payment by cheque.

1 9 0 4

Bruckner events in 1904 were dominated by concerts which featured the Ninth Symphony--first performed the previous year--in conjunction with Bruckner's Te Deum. Writing in a spring edition of *Die Musik*, Anton Klima reported a performance in Teplitz-Schönau (Teplice). On May 6 the Ninth Symphony and Te Deum were given in Königsberg under the baton of Ernst Wendel; 105 orchestral players and some 250 singers took part. But these forces were modest, compared to the 120 American players and 800-strong chorus who premiered the Te Deum in Cincinnati during Bruckner's lifetime. Richard Strauss conducted the Ninth and the Te Deum in a Whit Sunday concert at the Bavarian Music Festival in Regensburg. A correspondent to *Die Musik* expressed regret that in Mannheim, the orchestra of the Court Theatre had given Bruckner's Ninth without the Te Deum. In the autumn of 1904 the two works were coupled once more at a Karlsruhe concert which opened with Brahms' *Song of Destiny*. They were also scheduled for a Concert populaire in Brussels. On November 24, Karl (Wilhelm) Pohlig conducted both compositions in Stuttgart.

In addition, the Ninth Symphony and Te Deum were often performed separately in 1904. Oskar Wermann directed Bruckner's Te Deum in the Dresden Kreuzkirche in January. That month saw the Leipzig première of the Ninth, given by the city orchestra of Chemnitz. On February 5, Wagner's former associate Franz Fischer conducted the Ninth Symphony in the Munich Odeon. An article on Bruckner by Alexander Reichel, with an analysis of the Te Deum, appeared in the *Schweizerische Musikzeitung*. This followed a Berne performance in the winter. On February 19 and 20 Theodore Thomas conducted the North American première of Bruckner's Ninth in Chicago. On May 14 the work was played under his baton in Cincinnati. The Te Deum was given in Melbourne under the direction of George H. Clutsam (later to collaborate with Berté on the musical, *Lilac Time*).

Ferdinand Löwe, whose version of the Ninth remained unchallenged for nearly thirty years, conducted performances of it with the Vienna Konzertverein Orchestra in Prague, Graz, Laibach/Ljubljana and Trieste. The critic Richard Batka wrote that, despite an "excellent" performance, the work met with little understanding in Prague. Nor was it greeted with universal delight in the Brahmsian stronghold of Hamburg, where Arthur Nikisch was reported as annoying concert patrons with a second performance in November. Some of the more obtuse subscribers, according to Heinrich Chevalley, nicknamed the work "die Verworrene" [the muddle-headed]. Hans Dorner directed Bruckner's Te Deum in Nuremberg, along with Liszt's "Gran" Mass and Wolf's *Christnacht*.

Finally, *Die Musik* reported that in 1905, the Te Deum would be heard at the Lithuanian Music Festival in Memel.

There were several English Bruckner events in 1904. Hans Richter conducted the London Symphony Orchestra in Bruckner's Eighth. In Manchester he gave the Seventh Symphony with the Hallé Orchestra (February 11). On June 26, a choir of railway officials from Vienna sang *Germanenzug* in St James' Hall, London.

OTHER MUSICAL EVENTS

Death of Dvořák (May 1)...Debussy begins work on *La Mer*, Richard Strauss on *Salome*, Charles Ives on his Symphony No. 3...Webern completes his orchestral idyll, *Im Sommerwind*.

Première of Janáček's *Jenůfa* (Brno, January 21), Puccini's *Madama Butterfly* (Milan, February 17), Mahler's Fifth Symphony (Cologne, 18 October) and Reger's Variations on a Theme of J.S. Bach for piano solo (Munich, December 14).

A congress of the International Musical Society (1899-1914) is held in Leipzig. Publication commences of Hugo Riemann's *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*.

SOME OTHER EVENTS IN 1904

Politics: The year sees the establishment of the Entente Cordiale between Britain and France. War breaks out between Russia and Japan over Manchuria.

Inventions: The Thermos flask is marketed in Germany. French jeweller Louis Cartier devises the first wristwatch. Teabags are introduced in the USA.

Art: The painter and sculptor George Frederic Watts, renowned for his allegory of *Hope* (Tate Britain Gallery), dies in the summer. Paul Cézanne completes the version of *Mont Sainte-Victoire* now in the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

Dance: The American dancer Isadora Duncan opens a school in Berlin.

Literature: Henry James writes *The Golden Bowl*. J.M. Barrie's play *Peter Pan* receives its première in December. Anton Chekhov dies of tuberculosis; *The Cherry Garden* has its first production.

Transport: The first section of the New York subway is opened. 150,000 people use it on the first day.

Information on Bruckner performances is taken from Franz SCHEDER's "Anton Bruckner Chronologie: Die Jahre 1897 bis 1999", Nuremberg (loose-leaf)

L E T T E R S

From Michael G Piper (Leamington Spa):

Thank you for the latest BJ and for two items of particular interest to me. The first was a recording of the Symphony in E by Hans Rott. Lovers of Bruckner should hear this symphony. Sometimes described as the missing link between Bruckner and Mahler, it is much more than that. The first movement contains echoes of both the young and the mature Bruckner. You will hear Wagner in the second movement, pure Mahler in the third, and unmistakable Brahms in the finale. Mahler called Rott "the founder of the new symphony". Most of all, it is a homage to all the great musical influences in his short life.

TBJ also drew attention to a new recording by the Saratoga Symphony Orchestra of Bruckner's Ninth with William Carragan's latest working of the finale (2002/2003). I have obtained a copy and will be happy to make it available to readers who would like to phone me (01926 421221) and listen to my wife's answerphone message (Teds). Alternatively, my e-mail address is: two.teds@virgin.net

A review-article by Dermot Gault on Hans Rott's Symphony in E major appeared in the November 2003 issue of *The Bruckner Journal*.

From Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs (Bremen):

Re: "Cui Bono? Thoughts on the New Edition of Bruckner's Ninth" [TBJ, July 2004]. Mr Hiltl suggested that the New Edition proves to be unpracticable, due to the higher degree of supplemented information in brackets or small type. He even mocked that the performance material was brought into line with the new score. But his demand for an "unequivocal text" is simply wishful thinking, as everybody who deals daily with editorial practice knows. On the contrary, we did our utmost to make the new material a real improvement. Cellos and basses, for instance, now use the Tenor clef where Bruckner gave the lower-octave G-clef, which often confused today's players. Much care was taken in regard of bar numbers, rehearsal letters and general layout, and we even prepared some parts with transposing alternatives - for instance the clarinet parts in the Adagio, written by Bruckner for alternating instruments in A and B, which now also include a version continuously written in B if no A-clarinets are available. Additional horn and Wagner tuba parts entirely in F are likewise given. Every single part includes an explanatory note about editorial practice and how to deal with it; the musicians are asked simply to play all the indications.

"Individual cases not required by the conductor may be crossed out lightly in pencil." For the conductor, all this is explained in detail in the preface. So Mr Hiltl's statement that "the Haas [correctly: Orel] and Nowak editions were more practical" cannot be upheld. One has only to compare some of the old Orel orchestral parts with the newest ones, and Mr Hiltl did not.

EDITORIAL

I am delighted to welcome Ken Ward as the next Editor of *The Bruckner Journal*. We first met outside the Royal Albert Hall, in the early days of the Journal. I was proffering subscription leaflets to a deeply suspicious queue of Prommers, while Ken was bearing some postcards of his friend David Cheepen's portrait of Bruckner. Ken has since played an active part as a contributor, and I know he will do an excellent job as Editor.

We also welcome Nicholas Attfield as junior Associate Editor. Nick is a D.Phil. student at St Catherine's College, Oxford, and is currently furthering his research at Princeton University. He is particularly interested in the 20th-century reception of Bruckner, as well as cultural life in Bruckner's Vienna.

I have occasionally wondered whether the *BJ* should switch over to the more common format of Newsletters plus Yearbook. However, both Ken and Nick are strongly in favour of the status quo, as promoting the exchange of views between scholars and "laity". Better to fall between two stools than to position them acres apart!

Raymond Cox and Crawford Howie have agreed to continue in their present roles. I would like to thank them here for their unfailing support since 1996–1997. Thanks, also, to those other readers who have offered to help in various ways. Please back the new team by renewing your subscription.

Ken Ward would be glad to hear from you on any topic. In the present issue, Florence Bishop briefly recalls her early introduction to Bruckner. It would be interesting to know just how other devotees first discovered his music. Are there some who, like Bruno Walter, became "converts" to a composer they previously avoided? Write to Ken at *TBJ*, 23 Mornington Grove, Bow, London, E3 4NS, or send an e-mail to tbj@dsl.pipex.com

Let me sign off by mentioning a recent book which is not primarily about Bruckner. Among countless stimulating remarks in his *Franz Schubert: Music and Belief* (Boydell Press, Woodbridge 2003), Leo Black recalls Franz Schmidt's description of the first movement of Schubert's G major String Quartet, D.887, as "the seed-corn from which Bruckner's entire life's work arose". There is nothing like sticking one's neck out.

Peter Palmer

TBJ Conference 2005. On the enclosed subscription renewal form, readers are invited to book for our fourth biennial conference on Saturday, 25 June 2005. Note that we have switched from spring to summer. The event is again in the University of Nottingham Music Department and Lakeside Arts Centre, starting at 10am and ending with a short but varied choral concert (3.15pm–4pm).

We plan to open with conductor Jacques Cohen's account of his preparation for the performance of Bruckner's Ninth to be given in Southwell Minster that evening. Stephen Johnson will chair a discussion of unfinished works from Mozart's *Requiem* to Elgar's Third, and possibly beyond. Ideas for talks and other enquiries to: acrhowie@blueyonder.co.uk, or contact Raymond Cox. Full details in our next issue.

Useful addresses: Innkeeper's Lodge at Wollaton Park, Wollaton Vale, Nottingham, NG8 2NR, ☎ 0870 243 0500, www.innkeeperslodge.com, Saracen's Head Hotel, Market Place, Southwell, Notts, NG25 0HE, ☎ 01636 812 701, www.saracenshead-hotel.co.uk

C A L E N D A R

NOVEMBER 28

Symphony No. 8 (with Schubert's "Unfinished" Symphony). London Symphony Orchestra: Lorin Maazel. Barbican Hall, London, 7.30pm

DECEMBER 12

Symphony No. 7 (with Mozart's Symphony No. 35). London Symphony Orchestra: Bernard Haitink. Barbican Hall, London, 7.30pm.

JANUARY 12, 2005

Symphony No. 6 (with Carl Nielsen *Maskarade Overture*, Sibelius *Scènes Historiques Suite No. 2*). BBC Nat Orch of Wales: Petri Sakari. St David's Hall, Cardiff, 2pm. £6. ☎ 029 2087 8444

FEBRUARY 12

Symphony No. 9 (with Brahms Violin Concerto: Christian Tetzlaff). BBC Scottish Orchestra: Ilan Volkov. Leeds Town Hall. Talk by Julian Rushton, 6.45pm. ☎ 0113 224 3801/2

FEBRUARY 24/25

Symphony No. 7 (with Salonen *Insomnia*). Los Angeles Philharmonic: Esa-Pekka Salonen. Walt Disney Concert Hall, Los Angeles

MARCH 1

Symphony No. 8. CBSO: Manfred Honeck. Symphony Hall, Birmingham, 7.30pm (talk by Stephen Johnson, 6.15pm). £7-£36. ☎ 0121 780 3333

MARCH 4/5

Symphony No. 2 (with Dvořák Cello Concerto). Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra: Stanislaw Skrowaczewski. Marcus Center, Milwaukee

MARCH 5/6/7

Symphony No. 3, 1st version (with Mozart Violin Concerto No. 5). Houston Symphony Orchestra: Hans Graf. Jones Hall, Houston [USA listings by Gregory T Werge and John M Proffitt]

MARCH 17

Symphony No. 6 (with Mozart Piano Concerto No. 20, KV 466: Freddy Kempf). Royal Liverpool PO: Gerard Schwarz. Philharmonic Hall, Liverpool, 7.30pm. £8.50-£28.50. ☎ 0151 709 3789

MISSENDEN ABBEY WEEKENDS. Ian Beresford Gleaves launched a three-part course on Bruckner Symphonies with illustrated lectures on Nos 1-3 between 29-31 October. Nos 4-6 will be discussed during the weekend of 18-20 February 2005 and Nos 7-9 between 22-24 April. For fees and information, call Buckinghamshire Adult Learning on 0845 045 4040.

Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs and Nicola Samale have parted company with John Phillips and Giuseppe Mazzuca over a new "Critical Edition" of their completed performing version of the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth (see page 8 of this issue). Cohrs' Report on the new edition can be found at John Berky's website (<http://home.comcast.net/~jberky/BSVD.htm>). An exchange on this subject between Cohrs and Jacques Roelands has been posted by the Yahoo Anton Bruckner Club at <http://launch.groups.yahoo.com/group/antonbrucknerclub> Message numbers are 2552, 2564 (correction of 2552), 2655 (Roelands), 2660.

PRIVATE PASSIONS. Two recent guests on the BBC Radio 3 "Private Passions" series hosted by Michael Berkeley named Bruckner among their musical passions. Ceramics expert Hugo Morley-Fletcher favoured an extract from the Seventh Symphony, while religious journalist Mark Tully chose Bruckner's *Te Deum*.

Another "Bruckner Marathon" with a recording of each Bruckner symphony was staged on the composer's birthday, 4 September 2004, in Carlsbad, California. The hosts were again Ramon Khalona and Dave Griegel. TBJ hopes to publish the playlist and notes next year.

Memo to new Editor. Press releases should be treated with caution. In our last issue it was stated that the refit of the pipe organ at London's Royal Albert Hall cost £7½ million. This was the cost of the original organ; the recent restoration cost £1.7 million.

The figure of 9,999 pipes refers to the present total. Father Willis' 1871 organ was enlarged to 9,779 pipes between the World Wars, and a further 220 were added during the refit.