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With an introductory Commentary by Dermot Gault
Bruckner Symphony No 8 – ‘Intermediate’ Adagio

The following score is a transcription of a hitherto unpublished and little-known version of the Adagio of Bruckner’s Eighth Symphony, intermediate between the two published versions of 1887 and 1890, and referred to here as the Intermediate Adagio.

Sources

This transcription is based on the following two sources:

(1) Mus. Hs. 34.614 (formerly S.m. 34614) in the Austrian National Library. This number has been assigned to two copy scores of the Adagio of the Eighth Symphony. The wrapper of the first of these (Mus. Hs. 34.614/1) reads:

Adagio zur 8. Sinf. v. Anton Bruckner
Abschrift vor aus dem Besitz Franz Schalk
Frau Lili Schalk gehörend
oder ihren Rechtsnachfolgern

Below which is written:

Spätere Fassung?

The question mark indicates uncertainty as to the identity of the score, which is in fact the Intermediate Adagio. The wrapper for the second score (Mus. Hs. 34.614/2) bears the following:

In Abschrift aus dem Besitz Franz Schalk
Lili Schalk gehörend oder
ihren Rechtsnachfolgern

Below this is written (in pencil or crayon):

frühere Fassung

This score is a copy of the original 1887 Adagio.

(2) Mus. Hs. 40.999. The autograph manuscript of the revised 1890 version of the Adagio. This consists of a copy of the 1887 version (made by a different, unidentified copyist) which Bruckner reworked into the 1890 version, replacing some bifolios in the process. Its importance as a source for the Intermediate Adagio lies primarily in pages 3 and 4 of bifolio 14, which contain 1887 bars 225-230. These bars have been reworked by Bruckner to bring them into (near) accordance with the MS of the Intermediate Adagio.
Although Mus. Hs. 40.999 is therefore a primary source for only one short passage of the movement, it is an important one, as Bruckner himself has converted the 1887 text into that of the Intermediate Adagio. It therefore provides further authentication for this version, besides introducing some textual variants. Nevertheless Mus. Hs. 34.614/1 (hereafter MS) remains the main source for this transcription, and unless stated otherwise it is the source to which the Commentary below refers.

History

We know from the dates in the manuscript that the original version of the Adagio was completed on 4 September 1886, Bruckner’s 62nd birthday, while the symphony as a whole was finished on 10 August 1887. In October 1887 Hermann Levi wrote to Bruckner, urging him to revise the work, and in a letter to Levi dated 18 October 1887 Josef Schalk wrote that Bruckner had already begun to revise the first movement. But according to Leopold Nowak, it was not until March 1889 that Bruckner settled to this task in earnest. The Adagio belonging to 1890 version was made between 4 March and 8 May 1889, but the likelihood is that the Intermediate Adagio dates from the otherwise not especially productive year of 1888.

The question naturally arises as to how this score came into being. The most likely scenario is that, at some stage following Levi’s rejection of the original version, Bruckner decided to revise this movement, and had a copy made from the original manuscript. This copy (here designated Copy 1) was then transformed into the Intermediate Adagio. The resulting score (Copy 1A) would have been a composite, consisting of original bifolios in the hand of a copyist, emended as necessary, and replacement bifolios in Bruckner’s own hand – which is what we find in other Bruckner scores of this period such as Mus. Hs. 19.480/1 and Mus. Hs. 40.999.

Bruckner then had a copy made of this score (the MS) – the only complete surviving score of the Intermediate Adagio. Bruckner began looking through this score, correcting some errors, but then ceased work, presumably deciding at this juncture that a further revision would be necessary.

He then had a further copy of the Adagio made, by a different copyist, which was reworked into the eventual 1890 version, again replacing some of the original bifolios in the process. The 1890 version includes some material which had already appeared in the 1887 Adagio, some material which is entirely new, and some which had first appeared in the Intermediate Adagio. In the Intermediate version, for example, the climax at letter M is in C major, while the main climax of the movement is in E flat. The crucial re-ordering of the tonal trajectory of the movement, with its implications for the tonal ordering of the entire work, was therefore present already in the Intermediate version.

It is particularly interesting to look at Bruckner’s treatment of the quiet passage between letters P and Q in Mus. Hs. 40.999 (1887 bars 225-234). He began by transforming this passage into the Intermediate version, and even started making further changes. But he then decided abruptly to delete this passage entirely. By inserting these 1887 bars into his edition of the 1890 version, Robert Haas was therefore undoing not one, but two waves of revision by Bruckner.

The origin of the MS and the related copy scores can be traced as follows:
It is the time necessary for the copyist(s) to make Copy 1 and the MS, rather than the time Bruckner would have needed to make two thorough revisions of this movement, that makes a date of 1888 more likely than March-May 1889. At present, the crucial intervening manuscript, Copy 1A, has not been located.

The Manuscript

The MS consists (apart from the wrapper) of 22 bifolios of 24-stave manuscript paper, with ‘J.E. No. 8’ printed in the bottom left-hand corner of each right-hand page. Each bifolio has subsequently been numbered in the top right-hand corner of the first page, and each right-hand page has also been numbered in the top right-hand corner. The last two pages of the MS, pages 3 and 4 of bifolio 22, have been left blank.

The manuscript is in the hand of an unidentified copyist, with handwritten corrections by the copyist himself and by Bruckner, whose contributions are written in darker ink and with a broader trace, and whose style can be identified from other Bruckner autographs from this period such as Mus. Hs. 19.480. This copyist’s handwriting, which is quite different from Bruckner’s own, is not found in other manuscripts of the Eighth Symphony.

As explained above, the manuscript is probably based on a copy of the 1887 version emended by Bruckner. This may explain why certain minor errors and omissions in the MS are also to be found in other copy scores; they have been conscientiously copied from the copyist’s source.
In some cases (the trombone 1 e# in bar 17, for instance), mistakes can be traced back to Bruckner’s original manuscript of the 1887 Adagio (Mus. Hs. 19.480/3). This may also explain why the list of instruments on the first page of the score includes a piccolo, although the text does not.

This instrument is used in the 1887 version at the main climax of the movement (letter U). In the Intermediate version the climax is in another key, and so one can suppose that Bruckner replaced the original bifolio with an entirely new one containing the revised climax, in which the piccolo is not used.

The MS is not signed, and there are no visible dates, or any of the other comments that can be found in Bruckner’s original autographs (such as voice-leading annotations and metrical numbers). The first of Bruckner’s corrections is in bar 26 and the last is in bar 215, except perhaps for some dynamic indications in bar 235 (see below).

Otherwise, Bruckner does not seem to have looked over the last eight bifolios of the MS, which may be why he did not notice that the pages of bifolio 17 had been copied in the wrong order. It could be that he had already decided to revise the movement again.

There are no rehearsal letters before J (bar 139), and rehearsal marks A – H have been supplied, parenthetically, from the corresponding passages in the 1887 version. Note that there is no letter ‘I’ in the 1887 score of the Adagio, following the German practice of regarding I and J as equivalent (there is likewise no ‘I’ in the first and second movements, while in the Trio and Finale there is an ‘I’ but no ‘J’. The latter movement does however have a ‘Jj’, but no ‘Ii’).

Key signatures are seldom used after the first page, one reason for the many redundant, as opposed to precautionary, accidentals. Exceptions are found at the a tempo at bar 95 and the similar a tempo at bar 191, the start of the final section, where both clefs and key signatures re-appear. Key signatures also appear in the harp parts at bars 25, 43, 143 and 145.

Clefs are not used after the first page, except at bar 191 and sometimes in the trombone, Wagner tuba and cello parts. However, changes of clef in these instruments are not always indicated where necessary (e.g., cellos at bars 91; bass tubas at bars 255 and 297).

Time signatures appear at the start, at the change to triple time at bar 81 and the reversion to common time at bar 95, and at the a tempo at bar 191. Dual time signatures are required in the final section (from letter N onwards), but changes of time signature from common time to 12/8 and vice-versa are not always given where the music requires them.

**Instrumentation**

On the first page of the score the instruments are listed at the side of the stave as follows:

- Piccolo / Flauti I II III
- Oboi I II III
- Clarinetti I II III
- Fagotti I II III
- Corni in F / 1. 2.
- Corni in B / basso [3. 4.]
- Tuben / Tenor in B / 1. 2.
- Tuben / Bassi in F / 1. 2.
C. B. T. [Contrabass tuba]
Tromba I in F
[Trombe] II III in C
Timpani / tief F [?]
Tromboni / Alt. Tenor
[Trombone] basso
Drei / Harfen / womöglicher
Triangel
& Becken
Violino I
Violino II
Viola
Cello
Basso

Note:
Contrabass tuba – a treble clef is written at the side of the stave (a bass clef appears at bar 191) and there is no key signature, contrary to Bruckner’s practice elsewhere.
Timpani – in fact, the timpani play F, B♭ and C♭

The Transcription

This transcription aims to give a faithful picture of the original, with some provisos:

1. Modern up-bow signs have replaced the old-fashioned inverted ‘heel’ sign used by Bruckner.
2. A large number of redundant accidentals, most of them necessitated only by the practice of omitting clefs and key signatures at the side of the stave, have been omitted. A number of precautionary accidentals have been retained in the interests of clarity, especially in the brass parts. Precautionary double accidentals have not been included.
3. Editorial dynamics and articulation marks have been put in brackets. Editorial note changes are however referred to in the commentary.
4. Editorial slurs are written with a broken line.
5. Editorial ties are written with a dotted line.
6. However, where slurs or ties begin on one page but are not continued on the next (or vice-versa), an unbroken line has been used, and the matter noted in the commentary.
8. Bruckner’s (and the copyist’s) notation of the percussion instruments has been respected. Bruckner assigns pitches to the percussion, both here and in the Seventh Symphony (as can be seen from Mus. Hs. 40.999 and Mus. Hs. 19.479, the autograph score of the Seventh – Nowak’s edition of the Seventh does not reflect the composer’s practice). Thanks to Takanobu Kawasaki for bringing this matter to my attention.

9. Tremolando. Bruckner indicates tremolando by three strokes through the stems of crotchets / quarter notes and minims / half notes, and by three strokes under semibreves / whole notes. Tremolando quavers / 32nd notes are indicated by two strokes through the stem, tremolando semiquavers / 16th notes by a single stroke through the stem. Bruckner adheres to this system even when – as in this movement – the notation, literally speaking, indicates 32nd notes which can be heard separately. In a few places (violin 1 at bar 125, timpani at bars 129, 211 and 257) he adds ‘trem.’ as well, sometimes with an extending line. In this MS these lines are not extended for very long. Nevertheless, it is clear that, in this movement at least, all notes with strokes through the stems are to be played as unmeasured tremolando. This is made clear in Mus. Hs. 40.999, where the tremolando continuing line is extended to cover the violin 1 part throughout bars 125-128. (Nowak’s edition of the 1890 score is slightly misleading as he ends the extending line at the end of page 81, a bar early. His edition of the 1887 version is however true to 19.480/3). I suggest that Bruckner added a precautionary ‘trem’ here and at bar 171 as the violin part in these places is melodic. Thanks once again to Takanobu Kawasaki for raising this issue.

10. String divisari are not indicated consistently in the MS. Editorial divisari have been added for the sake of completeness, although there are no passages in this movement which seem to call for non divisari (Bruckner’s ungrammatical use of divisari for the viola part has been retained).

Commentary

It is not proposed here to undertake a detailed comparison between the three versions of the Adagio. The following Commentary lists erasures and corrections in the manuscript, and explains where the transcription departs from the MS due to wrong notes, missing clefs or accidentals, missing or inconsistent slurs and ties, etc.

It has been found useful to refer to the following sources for the 1887 and 1890 versions:

- **19.480/3** The autograph of the original 1887 version of the Adagio, which now makes up the third volume of Mus. Hs. 19.480, the remaining volumes of which consist of the autograph scores of movements 1, 2 and 4 of the 1890 version.
- **40.999** The autograph manuscript of the 1890 version, as described above
- **34.614/2** The copy score of the 1887 Adagio acquired at the same time as the MS
- **6001** A bound copy score of the complete 1887 version, of which the first three movements are in the hand of Karl Aigner
Reference to these manuscripts can help to resolve internal inconsistencies – always bearing in mind that each version has its own individual variants. It has also been useful to refer to the following printed editions:

1887 The published edition of the 1887 version, edited by Leopold Nowak
1890 Nowak’s edition of the 1890 version
1892 The first published edition, edited by Joseph Schalk and Max von Oberleithner
Haas Haas’s version of the score
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Commentary

**Bifolio 1 – bars 1-4 / 5-8 / 9-12 / 13-16**

*Adagio 3. Satz VIII Symphonie* is written at the head of the first page.

**Bar**

1 violas – *divisi* in 19.480/3 and 6001, no indication in MS, 34.614/2 and 40.999
2 double bass – *ohne Anschwellung* in 19.480/3 and 6001, no indication in MS and 40.999
3 violin 1 – the 4th note has a tenuto line in 1890, 1892 and Haas, but not in MS, 19.480/3, 6001, 1887 or 40.999
4 tenor tuba 2 – a sharp sign has apparently been erased before the single note, which should be g natural (sounding f natural), as per 1887, 40.999, 1890 and 1892. 19.480/3 is unclear; a natural sign has been placed before the note, but it seems that a sharp sign at the start of the bar has been allowed to stand. In 6001 a natural sign appears to have been written over a sharp sign
cello – *cresc.* in 19.480/3, missing in MS, 6001 and 40.999
double bass - no *cresc.* in MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001 and 40.999. Editorial (*cresc.*) in 1890 and Haas
5 cello – *dim.* missing from MS, 34.614/2, and 6001. Cello has *dim.* in 19.480/3, 1887 and 40.999
6 violin 2, viola, cello, double bass – no *cresc.* in MS or 6001. All string parts have a *cresc.* in 1887 and 1890, but only violin 1 and 2 have a *cresc.* in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 40.999 and 1892
7 violin 2 – slur, tie and tenuto lines omitted in second half of bar
tubas – this chord is tied across the bar line to bar 12 in MS, 40.999, and 1892, but not in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 1887 or 1890
violin 2 – hairpin mark (as per violin 1) omitted in MS, present in 19.480/3 and 34.614/2
viola – copyist’s erasure before second note (wrong accidental?)
viola, cello – no dynamic marking (*pp* in 19.480/3 and 1887, *p* in 40.999 and 1890)
8 double bass – no *cresc.* in MS and 40.999. Present in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887 and 1890
9 viola, cello – no *cresc. sempre* in MS, present in 19.480/3 and 34.614/2; 6001 has *cresc. sempre* in the cello part only
double bass – MS has *cresc.* (only) in double bass; 19.480/3 and 34.614/2 also have *semp* 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 1887 and 1890 have a [subito] *p* and *cresc.* in all string and tuba parts in this bar. 40.999 and 1892 have a simple *cresc.* in all parts
tenor and bass tubas – no tie in MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 or 1890. The editorial tie has been inserted by analogy with bars 11-12 and 199-202 (compare the latter with 1887 bars 209-212

ix
no rehearsal mark in MS, \textit{A} in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

contrabass tuba – \textit{marc. semp.} omitted in MS, present in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

**Bifolio 2** – bars 17-24 / 25-26 / 27-28 / 29-32

17 horns 1 & 2 – tie sign carried from previous page in MS (these notes are not tied, as the horns are not playing sustained notes, unlike the other brass)

bass tubas – ties from previous page (bifolio 1 page 4) missing in MS, present in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

trombone 1 – erroneous sharp sign before the e in MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001: removed in 1887, 1890 and 40.999 (the natural sign in 40.999 appears to be an emendation)

cello & double bass – written c (natural), should be c\# (as in 19.480/3, 6001 and 40.999, and as per double basses, bassoons, bass trombone and contrabass tuba)

cello – no slur in MS, 34.614/2 and 40.999. Slurred in 19.480/3, 6001, 1887 and 1890 (see bar 36).

double bass – no dynamic marking (p in all other string parts, and in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)

clarinet 2 – second note emended by copyist (from crotchet / quarter note?)

trombone 1 – the precautionary natural before the final note seems to be an insertion, possibly by Bruckner (natural sign also in 40.999)

harp – dynamics missing (ff in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890, and also in the equivalent passage in MS, bar 43)

violin 2 – middle note of second chord has been changed (by Bruckner?) from g to f, turning it into a simple b flat minor chord (as per 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001 and 1887, although differently spaced)

viola – the original top note (g natural) of second chord deleted (by Bruckner?)

The deleted g natural is restored in 40.999 and in 1890

harp – no dynamic mark in MS (p in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887 and 40.999 – see also bar 45)

viola – erasure before second note (accidental removed)

no rehearsal mark in MS, \textit{B} in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

violin 1 – no dynamic marking in MS, \textit{pp} in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890

viola – divisi in 19.480/3 and 6001, missing in MS

cello – divisi in 19.480/3 and 34.614/2, not in MS (in 6001 the direction may apply to both violas and cellos)

violin 1 – the extent of the slur is not entirely clear in MS; elsewhere, and in all sources, only the first two notes are slurred

**Bifolio 3** – bars 33-36 / 37-42 / 43-44 / 45-46

contrabass tuba – chevron accent in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890 (as per other brass parts), missing from MS
36 violin 1 & 2 – *dim.* missing from MS (*dim.* in all parts in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)
double basses – first note corrected to **E♭** (by Bruckner - larger print and heavier ink)
39 violin 1 – slur in second half of bar missing in MS and 6001, slurred in 19.480/3, 1887, 40.999, and 1890, and in MS bar 21
40 viola – *divisi* missing from MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001 and 40.999
42 contrabass tuba – dynamics missing in MS (**f** in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999, and 1890)
43 horns 1 & 2 / 3 & 4 - slurs not carried over from bifolio 3 page 2
violin 2, viola – *divisi* missing from MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

**Bifolio 4** – bars 47-50 / 51-54 / 55-58 / 59-62

47 no rehearsal mark in MS, **C** in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001
violin 1 – accidental changed (by Bruckner) to a natural sign
51 viola – last two notes should be semiquavers, each with a single stroke through the stem, as per 6001, 40.999, 1887, 1890 and MS bar 61
55 cello – tenuto line missing from all manuscript sources. Editorial tenuto line in 1887, 1890 and Haas, as per bar 65
57 no rehearsal mark in MS, **D** in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001
horn 2 – part wrongly written in the horn 3 & 4 line. On page 4 of bifolio 4 the part continues with horns 1 & 2. A tie to the previous note is shown in bar 59 of the MS. It is clear by analogy with bars 47-50 and 147-150 that horns 1 and 2 play the whole passage.
The same error occurs in 40.999, where once again the horn parts jump from horns 3 & 4 to horns 1 & 2 between pages 3 and 4 of bifolio 4, but is corrected in 1890 and Haas.
58 oboe 1 – slur missing, although its ending is found in bar 59 on the next page (page 4 of bifolio 4)
59 clarinets – slur not carried over from previous pag.
60 flutes – second note unclear; could be **g**#. 34/614.2 and 6001 have **f**# (TK suggests a#)
horn 2 – no slur in sources, slurred in Haas, editorial slur in 1890 (see also bar 150)
61 viola – MS has **mf** – should be **f** as per cellos (TK), as per 19.480/3 and 6001 (no dynamic marking in 34.614/2 or 40.999)

**Bifolio 5** – bars 63-66 / 67-70 / 71-74 / 75-78

64 clarinet 1 – first two notes (written b natural – A natural, concert A natural – g natural) should be A natural – **g**# (concert g natural – **f**#, as per flute 1, 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001 and 1887)
65 violin 2 – no dynamic marking (**p** in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 40.999, 1887 and 1890)
clarinet 1 – sixth note is written d# (concert c#), but should probably be d natural (concert c natural), as per 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 40.999, 1887 and 1890 (where this bar is deliberately different from the bar preceding)

violin 2 – repeat sign in heavy ink (a correction?)

clarinet 1 – slur does not continue over the page to last note in MS or in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001, but does continue in 19.480/3 and 1887 (it is clear from 19.480/3 bar 66 that the slur is intended to continue over the page, but it is missing from bar 67)

bass tubas – no dynamic marking (something has been written but erased) – p in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

violin 2 – divisi missing in MS and 40.999 (divisi in 19.480/3, 6001, 1887 and 1890)

violin 1 – lower part – the A natural should be a semibreve (as per 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 40.999, 1887 and 1890)

clarinets – presumably only clarinet 1 (as per oboe part, and 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)

cello – bass clef added by Bruckner (the cellos last played in treble clef, bar 65)

obo and clarinet – slurs missing (slurred in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 1887, 40.999, 1890 and in MS bar 76)

violin 1 – divisi should be half a bar earlier (i.e., in the second half of bar 74 – editorial divisi in 1890)

oboes, clarinet 2 – no slurs in MS, slurred in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 1887

cello – f in MS (TK), ff in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

double bass – no dynamic marking (TK), f in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

**Bifolio 6** – bars 79-84 / 85-90 / 91-96 / 97-100

no rehearsal mark in MS, E in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

double bar line only in MS and 1890 – 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887 and 40.999 have an ordinary bar line

horn 3 – the quavers in bars 81-82 are barred differently (two groups of two) in the other sources (possibly indicating accentuation)

flute – minor erasure by copyist (near note-head)

oboe 2 – not clear where the slur starts in MS - 2nd or 3rd note? 1887 takes the slur from the 4th (written) note, 40.999 takes the slur from the 2nd note (the second d>c), while 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001 and 1890 have no slurs in the oboe 2 part.

oboe 1 – in the sources the first notes of bars 84 and 86 are written as dotted crotchets with a triplet sign

oboe 2 – tie missing between first note and second note; slur taken from the start of the bar in MS, 40.999 and 1890 and from the 4th note in 1887; 19.480/3 and 34.614/2 have no oboe 2 slur in these bars; in 6001 the last two notes only are slurred

clarinets 1 & 2 – slurs missing in MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887 and 40.999; bracketed slurs in 1890
87 oboes, clarinets – no dynamic marking (*mf* in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)
clarinet 2 – 4th note written b natural in MS and all the manuscript sources, corrected to b♭ in all the published versions (1892, Haas, 1887 and 1890)
clarinets – last dyad is written f / A natural (concert e♭ / g natural) – should be g natural / b natural (concert f / A natural), as per 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890
88-9 oboe 2 – no slur in MS or 34.614/2, slurred in 19.480/3, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890
89 flutes 1 & 2 – first note written double-dotted minim in MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887 and 40.999, but should be minim tied to quaver (as in 1890)
oboe 2 – first note is a crotchet b natural in MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 40.999, which clashes with the clarinets. 6001 and 1887 have an ordinary quaver. The triplet quaver in 1890, 1892 and Haas is editorial, but necessary for correct performance
clarinets 1 & 2 – triplet number missing
91 violin 2, viola, cello – first note has a tenuto line in MS, violin 1 has an accent. As the indications in the MS are inconsistent, markings have been made uniform in bars 91-94 as per 19.480/3, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890, in which the first note of each bar has a down-bow and an accent in all parts.
cello – bass clef change missing from MS (appears to be an emendation in 6001).
94 strings – violin 1, viola and cello have a tenuto line in the MS, while violin 2 has an accent. The transcription has been regularised in accordance with 19.480/3, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890, where all parts have a tenuto line as well as a down-bow and an accent on the first beat. (In 34.614/2, violin 1 and 2 and viola have a tenuto line, an accent and a down-bow on the first note; the cellos only have a tenuto line)
viola, cello – no down-bow marking
95 no rehearsal mark in MS, *F* in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001
violin 1 – *G Saite* extending line editorial
viola – *divisi* missing from MS and 6001
97 violin 2 – tenuto lines and slurs missing from second half of bar
99 violin solo – ‘solo’ is used in this transcription, following Bruckner’s practice, although the part is to be played ‘a 3’
vioin 1 – 1887, 6001 and 1890 have an accent on the first note, MS and 40.999 have a decrescendo. Reference to 19.480/3 shows that an accent is correct, although the accent sign is perhaps larger than usual. 34.614/2 has an ambiguous marking midway between an accent and a hairpin; later copyists probably misread the mark as a decrescendo.
vioin 2 – triplet marks missing
Bifolio 7 – bars 101-104 / 105-108 / 109-112 / 112-116

103 violins – there are three sets of hairpins in two lines, and it is not clear which parts they refer to (violas and cellos do not have any dynamic change in 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)

105 violas – no cresc. semp. (as per other parts) in MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001 (in the last of these there is no room) or 40.999. Editorial cresc. sempre in 1887 and 1890

106 violin 2 – slur missing (as per violin 1) in MS and 19.480/3

109 no rehearsal mark in MS, G in 19.480/3 and 34.614/2

126 violin 1, viola, cello (upper), double bass – no dynamic markings (p in 19.480/3, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)

105 violin 2 – tenuto lines missing on the first note, throughout bar 110, and on the first note of bar 111 in MS and 40.999. The first notes of bars 113 & 115 do however have tenuto lines, although bar 114 does not. In the equivalent passage in the exposition (bars 8 and 10), the two final notes of this phrase have tenuto lines. There are no tenuto lines in 19.480/3, 6001 or 1887, but all the detached notes have lines in 1890

109 cello (lower part) – missing opening hairpin (as per double bass) in MS, present in 19.480/3, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890

110 bassoon 2, contrabass tuba, cello (lower), double bass – slurring of the main theme is not consistent in bars 109-116 in the MS, where in any case slurs are sometimes omitted or not always indicated clearly.

19.480/3 – cellos and basses slur notes 1 & 2 throughout, bassoon and contrabass tuba slur notes 1 – 3, apart from bar 116, where the contrabass tuba has no slur

1887 – cellos and basses slur notes 1 & 2 throughout, bassoon and contrabass tuba slur notes 1 – 3 throughout. This is also the phrasing given in 6001, apart from bar 116, where there are no slurs in the bassoon and contrabass tuba parts.

34.614/2 – cellos and basses slur the first two notes only in bars 110, 112, and 114, while in bar 116 the slur is ambiguous. Bassoon 3 slurs notes 1-3 in bars 110, 112 and 116, while the slur in bar 114 is ambiguous. The contrabass tuba slurs notes 1-3 in bars 110, 112, and 114, but has no slur in bar 116.

MS – cellos slur notes 1 & 2 in bars 110 and 116, and notes 1-3 in bars 112 and 114; double basses slur notes 1-3 in bars 110, 112, and 114, and slur notes 1 & 2 in bar 116; bassoon slurs notes 1-3 throughout; contrabass tuba slurs notes 1-3 in bars 110 and 112, and has no slurs in 114 and 116.

1892 – notes 1 & 2 only are slurred in all parts.

1890 and Haas - All three notes are slurred in both strings and wind.

The question arises therefore as to how the text in 40.999 reads, and so far as can be seen, slurring in 40.999 is consistent with 1887. Pasting over in the horn parts in pages 3 and 4 of bifolio 7 of 40.999, and in the trumpet parts in page 4, have however covered over slurs in the bassoon and contrabass tuba parts (respectively), but it is still clear that notes 1-3 are slurred in the contrabass tuba parts in bars 110 and 112, while notes 1 & 2 only are slurred in the strings throughout this passage (1890 bars 109-116).
Although the MS is the most inconsistent of all the sources, it is clear from the sources, taken globally, that Bruckner intends that the bassoon and contrabass tuba should slur notes 1-3 throughout this passage, and that the cellos and double basses should only slur notes 1 & 2. It appears that Bruckner sought, by adopting different phrasing for strings and wind, to combine fullness of sound with clear articulation (see also bars 6-8 in all versions). This system is consistent with the slurring of the theme elsewhere (see for instance 1890 bars 186, 188, 194 and 196 in Nowak’s edition), and is the system adopted here. The conclusion therefore is that the same slurring holds good for the 1887 and 1890 versions, and that of the published scores only Nowak’s edition of the 1887 score represents Bruckner’s intentions correctly.

**horn 3** - no dynamic marking in MS, 34.614/2 or 40.999 (p in 19.480/3 and 1887)

**horns 1 & 2** - the last note should be f#. Horn 1 should be tied, and horn 2 should be slurred to the first note of bar 112 (see bars 113-114)

**violin 2** – missing tenuto line (see note to bar 109)

**cello (lower part)** – no opening hairpin (closing hairpin found in bar 112)

**flutes, oboes** – no dynamic marking (p in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999, and 1890)

**horn 3** – slur not carried over from previous page in MS or 34.614/2

**viola** – no divisi indication in sources


**117** no rehearsal mark in MS, H in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001

**horn 2** – first note unclear (should be written e natural, sounding A natural)

**strings** – no dynamic markings (mf in other parts, and in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)

**119** bassoon 3 – first note should be c# (as per bassoons 1 & 2, cellos, basses, bass trombone and contrabass tuba)

**122** bassoon 3 – first note should be d# (as per other instruments as above).

**125** tenor tubas – editorial (loco) added as per 1887

**cellos, double basses** – no ties between second and third notes (throughout next four bars) in MS, 40.999 or 1890. The direction gestrichen confirms that this is intentional

**126** horns 1 & 2 – second note corrected from f# to f natural (concert bb, as per horns 3 & 4), probably by Bruckner (much darker ink)

**127** bass tuba 1 – written f♭, but should be f natural (concert bb) (an emendation?)

The bass tubas have db / bb in 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890

**violin 1** - the ‘trem’ should be extended to the end of bar 128, as per 40.999 and 1887 (see above). 34.614/2 has ‘trem’ with a short extending line

**Violin 2** – ‘trem’ missing from MS; present, and extended for all four bars in 6001; added in pencil to 19.480/3; 34.614/2 has ‘trem’ with a short extending line.

**129** all parts – poco a poco accel. in all parts in MS and other sources – transferred to system text (as per 6001, 1887 and 1890)

**129** tenor tubas – editorial (loco) added as per 1887
violin 1 – no tenuto line on first note of this phrase in bars 129-132 (or 40.999 or 1890). Violin 2 does have a tenuto line on the first note of the phrase in MS, but not in 40.999 or 1890 (apart from bar 129)

violin 1 – accidental before the second note corrected to ebb (by Bruckner? darker ink and slightly broader trace) – erasure before final note

ritard. in all parts – transferred to system text

violin 1 – second note corrected to ebb (by copyist? The handwriting is different from the emendation in bar 133)

viola – unclear, but should be ab / gb / ebb / cb

oboes, clarinets – should be tied to the following notes. The continuation is found on the next page (the sources are inconsistent. 19.480/3 ties the wind in bars 135-136, but the tie is not carried over the page; its continuation is found on the next page, but while the clarinets are tied, there are no slurs or ties in the oboe parts. There is no tie in oboe 2 in bars 136-7 in 6001)

violin 1 – last note corrected to ebb (by copyist. Extra flat inserted)

violin 2 – slur not carried over the page to first note of bar 137. The continuation is found on the first page of bifolio 9 (in 19.480/3, 6001 and 1887 the slur is extended to the second note)

Bifolio 9 – bars 137-142 / 143-144 / 145-146 / 147-150

viola – unclear – should be ab / gb / db / cb – changing to ab / ab / db / cb (remaining in four parts)

viola – should read ab / f natural / db / cb

rehearsal mark J original, as are all following rehearsal marks

bass tuba 2 – first note unclear (should be db, sounding gb) - second note erased and c (concert f) substituted

all parts – a tempo transferred to system text

flutes, oboes – cresc. semp. (as per clarinets and harp) in 19.480/3, but missing from MS and 34.614/2 (TK). 6001 has cresc. semp. in the oboes and clarinets only

violin solo – slur not carried over to the next bar in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 1887, 40.999 and 1890

cello – slur missing from second half of bar (as per viola part)

horn 1 has a tie, but no note to tie to

horn 2 – no slur in MS or 40.999, slurred in Haas and 1890

Bifolio 10 – bars 151-154 / 155-159 / 160-164 / 165-170

violin solo – down-bow in second part of bar in MS, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887 and 40.999. Should possibly be an up-bow. 1890 and Haas retain the down-bow but remove the slur

violin 2 – copyist’s ? in second half of the bar (possibly querying if the second violins should have the same rhythm as the violas and cellos)

cello – no dynamic marking (pp in viola and in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 1887 and 40.999)
cello - slur missing from second half of bar (see viola part), present in 34.614/2
viola, cello – second note should have a down-bow, as per all other occurrences of
this theme (bars 53, 63, and 163)
cello – first note tenuto line missing from MS, present in 34.614/2 and 6001
cello - accidental in front of the third note has been corrected to f#

154 violin 2 – first note, upper part, should be a dotted minim

155 flutes 1 & 2 – no dynamic marking in MS, (p in clarinets, and in the flute parts in
34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)
viola, cello – tenuto line missing in MS and 19.480/3, present in 34.614/2

157 horns 3 & 4 – first note amended (from g? - unclear) to bb (concert eb)

158 trumpet 1 – accent missing (as per trumpet 3, 40.999 and 1890)

159 cello – slur missing from first two notes

159 violin solo – first note up-bow in MS, 19.480/3, 6001 and 40.999, down-bow in
1890

161 violin 2 – copyist ? over the last two notes – again, querying whether these notes
should not be semiquavers (quavers are correct)

162 violin 1 – cresc. missing from MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001
viola – cresc. missing from MS, 34.614/2 and 6001 (no room under the line)

163 viola – tenuto line on first note in 19.480/3 and 6001, missing from MS and
34.614/2

164 violin 2 – last note in upper part is ab in MS, A natural in 19.480/3, 6001, 1887
and 40.999

165 clarinets 1 & 2 – no dynamic marking (mf in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001, as also
in the oboe parts)
horns 1 & 2 – MS does not specify how many horns play (1. in 19.480/3, 6001,
1887, 40.999 and 1890)
NB - violin solo – the first three notes in MS are quaver – semiquaver –
semiquaver. In 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890 the first note is a dotted
quaver and the two following notes demisemiquavers, which is surely what is
intended here.

167 contrabass tuba – no dynamic marking in MS, 34.614/2 or 40.999 (p in 6001,
1887 and 1890 and in other brass parts, apart from tenor tuba 1)
violins – it is unclear which part the divisi applies to, but it should apply to both
(in 6001 divisi is written under the violin 2 line)

168 horns 1 & 2 – erasure in first (silent) part of bar (a 2 corrected to 1) (all other
sources have a 2)

**Bifolio 11** – bars 171-176 / 177-182 / 183-190 / 191-192

171 clarinets – the layout at the side of the stave (cl. 1 – 2 / = 3) does not correspond
to the music, where clarinet 1 is on the upper stave, clarinets 2 and 3 on the lower
bassoons – no dynamic marking - should be ff (as per other wind, 40.999 and
1890)
violins – ‘trem’ should logically apply to both parts (TK)
trumpet 1 – last note corrected by Bruckner from b natural to bb (concert eb) –
natural erased and flat sign written underneath the stave
viola – 1st note – double dot missing
cello – slur seems to carry over to the next bar (probably wrong) (In 40.999 the
cello does not carry over, but the part has been emended)
timpani – treble clef at the side of stave
violin solo - part is indicated at the side of the stave, but is not required for the
remainder of the movement
viola – dynamic mark missing in MS and 40.999 (other parts have p, as does
34.614/2, 6001, 1887 and 1890)
- in MS, the direction zart hervortretend seems to be written above the viola part
instead of the violin 2 part (as in 34.614/2, 6001, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)
- 12/8 time signature in 19.480/3, but not in MS (it doesn’t appear until bar 203,
when the other upper strings share the sextuplet figuration) or 34.614/2, which
indeed adds a C. In 6001, 12/8 seems to be written over C (unclear). In 40.999
Bruckner inserts Alto 12/8
- 12th note should be eb (as per 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 1887, 40.999 and 1890), not
db
second violins, violas, and double basses – no arco after the previous pizz. in MS,
19.480/3 34.614/2 or 40.999 (editorial arco in 1890 and Haas)
cello – no divisi in MS, 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001 or 40.999
viola – 3rd group of sextuplets amended (possibly by Bruckner?) so that the
second and third notes read f natural
viola – flat sign inserted before last note of 4th group of sextuplets (by copyist?)

Bifolio 12 – bars 193-194 / 195-196 / 197-198 / 199-200

horns 3 & 4 – instrument name at the side of the stave corrected by Bruckner from
F to B [bb]. Repeated throughout bifolio 12 (bars 195, 197 and 199)
violas – the bb before the 6th note looks like a correction by the copyist from bb
oboes – tic / slur not carried over from previous page
tenor tuba 2 – dotted minim in MS and 40.999 – should be minim tied to a quaver,
as per other parts and 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 1887 and 1890)
viola – 6th note unclear, should be b natural (as per 34.614/2, 6001, 40.999, 1887
and 1890)
horns 3 & 4 – slurs missing (as per horns 1 & 2)
violet 1 – 5th note (a#) – accidental seems to have been emended by the copyist
(sharp inserted between natural sign and notehead)
viola – 6th note unclear, should be d natural (as per 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001,
40.999, 1887 and 1890)
viola – overall slurs missing from the first two sextuplet groups
horns 3 & 4 – should be tied to next note, as per bars 201-202 (TK) (and as per
19.480/3, 6001, 40.999, 1887 and 1890)
violet 1 – last note f in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001 and 1887, no dynamic marking
in MS
violin 2 – no dynamic marking in MS or 34.614/2, but 19.480/3, 6001, 40.999, 1887 and 1890 have $f$, as do oboes, clarinets, horns in MS
viola – 12th note unclear, should be d natural, as per 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001, 40.999, 1887 and 1890
cellos – slurs and bowing marks missing (TK)

200 viola – overall slur missing from 3rd sextuplet group

Bifolio 13 – bars 201-202 / 203-204 / 205-206 / 207-208

201 horn 4 – first note corrected by Bruckner to $b\flat$ (concert $a\flat$)
contrabass tuba – slur missing (not carried over from previous page) (TK)
202 clarinet 2, horns 1 & 2 – slur missing (as per clarinet 1 and bar 200)
violin 1 – second note is $b\flat$ in MS. 19.480/3, 6001 and 1887 have $b\flat\flat$, while 34.614/2, 40.999 and 1890 have $b\flat$. The melodic profile resembles the 1887 rather than the 1890 version, but the MS reading could be a variant.
viola – 4th and 5th notes written $d\flat\flat$, which could be an error for d natural (as per 19.480/3, 1887, 40.999 and 1890)
strings – should all have a $pp$ on the fourth group of sextuplets, as per brass parts, 19.480/3, 6001 and 1887 (see the equivalent passage in bar 207)
203 violin 2 – divisi in 19.480/3, missing in MS
viola – notes 16 and 17 should be $f\#$ (as per upper parts), not f natural
viola – note 19 should be A natural (as per upper parts), not $a\flat$
cello, double bass – missing divisi in MS and manuscript sources; 1890 has editorial (div.)
204 violin 1 – 10th note corrected by Bruckner to d natural (as per violin 2 and viola)
205 horns 1 & 2 – accents missing (as per horns 3 & 4) (TK)
horns 1-4 – NB: double dotted in all other sources (a variant of this version?)
trumpets, trombones and contrabass tuba – the slur is not carried over from the previous page in MS or 34.614/2, but is carried over in 19.480/3, 6001 and 1887 and in the MS at the equivalent passage at bars 208-9
206 trumpet 1, contrabass tuba – no cresc. (as per 1887, 40.999 and other brass)
horns – last note corrected (by copyist?) to b natural
207 cello, double bass – divisi missing
208 trombone 1 – second note changed from f natural to $f\#$ (by copyist?)


209 trumpet 1 – slur not carried over from previous page in MS, unlike trombones and contrabass tuba (and as per 19.480/3, 1887 and 40.999)
210 horns 1 & 2 – third note – accent corrected from ordinary accent to chevron accent (by copyist?) – as per 19.480/3 and 6001
timpani – no dynamic marking (should be $ff$, as per 19.480/3, 6001 and 40.999) (TK)
214 trumpet 2 – first note corrected to $c\flat$ (possibly by Bruckner. bigger handwriting – N.B. the $c\flat$ in 19.480/3 also seems to be a correction)
As stated above, reference to 40.999 shows that Bruckner initially revised the first six bars of this passage (pages 3 and 4 of bifolio 14), to make it consistent with the MS.

It seems that he originally intended to reduce this passage (1887 bars 225-234) to six bars in length (as in the Intermediate version), corresponding to 1887 bars 225-230, omitting the four bars on pages 1 and 2 of bifolio 15 (1887 bars 231-234). The alterations change the effect of the passage, so that instead of separating the two massive tutti at letters P and Q, it instead links them through the crescendo in (Intermediate) bar 220. Bruckner’s voice-leading annotations at the right-hand side of the stave of page 4 of bifolio 14 confirm that the final bar of the passage was intended to lead directly into the tutti at letter Q:

Oboe: as [ab] – es [eb]
Horns 1: b [bb] – c
Horns 2: b [bb] – as [ab]
Violin 2: des [db] – es [eb]
Viola: des [db] – es [eb]
Cello: b [bb] – es [eb]
Double Bass: b [bb] – es [eb]

40.999 also shows substantial erasures in the flute, horn 1 & 2, and violin 1 lines. Eventually Bruckner decided to omit the passage entirely, crossing out both pages and the four following bars (three of which are on page 1 of bifolio 15, while the fourth is on page 2). The result is that in the 1890 version the tuttis at letters P and Q follow each other without a break.

It should be noted that while bars 209-218 of the Haas score are for the most part consistent with 1887 bars 223-234, two small variations between Haas’s score and Nowak’s edition of the 1887 version can be traced to 40.999: the slurring of the oboe 1 part in bar 218, and the grouping of the first four oboe notes in bar 219.

215 violin 1 – In the MS, Bruckner has inserted accidentals before the first two notes (in a much larger hand and in darker ink), making it hard to see how the MS originally read. The second note may have been written as g natural. The amended text agrees with the 1887 original.

Bruckner altered the text in 40.999 to give a different version of the first group of sextuplets: bb′ – cb″ – cb″ – bb′ – bb′ – a natural. The revised version is in keeping with the more even, less melodically distinct style of the sextuplet figuration adopted in the 1890 score, but is not consistent with the pattern of the figuration in the rest of the passage – for instance, in the second half of the same bar. The earlier version has been retained in the transcription. It may be that Bruckner would have gone on to revise the remainder of the violin 1 part had he decided to retain this passage, but as it stands the text in 40.999 is not musically
logical. It could be that Bruckner had no sooner begun to revise the violin 1 figuration than he thought better of it, and decided to remove the passage entirely.

216 violin 2, viola – tenuto lines missing, present in 40.999
217 tenor tubas – written $eb$ / $cb$, should be $f$ / $db$ (concert $eb$ / $cb$) as per 40.999. Ties to following bar missing in 40.999.
218 violin 2, viola – $p$ in MS, $mf$ in 40.999
218 clarinet 2 – illegible mark before end of bar (erasure?)
219 tenor and bass tubas – ties from previous bar missing in MS (in 40.999, the ties from the previous bar are present)
219 tenor tubas – are loco from this point to the end of the movement.
220 violin 1 – last note of second group of sextuplets changed in MS – should be $ab$ (as per bar 220 and 40.999)
220 violin 1 - fourth note from the end unclear in MS – should be $bb$ (as per bar 220 and 40.999)
220 violin 2, viola – $mf$ in MS, $f$ in 40.999
220 oboe 1 – final note ($ab$) in 40.999, not in MS (see note above on voice-leading annotations)
220 tenor & bass tubas – cresc. missing in both MS and 40.999 (TK), but added (in parentheses) in Haas
220 clarinet 2 – third note (g) has no accidental in MS, $gb$ (concert $fb$) in 40.999
220 violin 2 – first note is a dotted crotchet in MS, a crotchet following a quaver rest in 40.999 (as per violas). The dynamics and articulation in 40.999 give a stronger crescendo and therefore a more convincing link to the tutti at letter Q

**Bifolio 15** – bars 221-222 / 223-224 / 225-226 / 227-228

221 wind – dynamic markings missing in all wind parts in MS (should be $ff$, as per 34.614/2 and 6001. The $ff$ in 40.999 has been added by Bruckner)
221 viola, cello, double bass – dynamic marks missing ($ff$ in 40.999 – copyist’s original dynamics – and in 34.614/2 and 6001)
222 clarinet 2 – slur missing from quintuplet, as per 40.999 and all other wind parts
223 horns 3 & 4 – [in] F written at the side of the stave (on the next page the transposition is correctly given as B [B♭])
223 viola – no dynamic marking ($p$)
224 violin 1 – slurs inaccurately placed (the first slur should cover the first five notes, the second slur should start with the quintuplets, as per 1887)
226 violin 1 – erroneous extra slur on the last two notes
228 horn 4 – no dynamic marking (should be $pp$) (TK)
228 viola – overall slurs missing from 3rd and 4th sextuplet groups

**Bifolio 16** – bars 229-231 / 232-234 / 235-236 / 237-238

229 horn 4 – second note written c natural – should be $eb$ (concert a natural, as per violin 2). 34.614/2 has a $b$ with an erasure in front
230 horn 3 – written $f$ should be $f#$ (concert e natural) as per 34.614/2 and 1887
230 violin 2 – sextuplets have no overall slurs (they resume in bar 232)
violin 2 – 10th note should be c# (not c natural), as per violin 1
violin 1 – last note unclear (altered) – should be d#
flutes 1 & 2 – slur missing (as per flute 3 and other wind)
flutes – the initial f [forte] seems to be in a different hand from the fortés in the other parts and elsewhere – possibly by Bruckner? It is typical of his way of writing f.
oboe 3 – 7th note and last note unclear – should be e♭ (as per violas)
oboe 3 – rests and note values not clear – seventh note should be a demisemiquaver, following a dotted semiquaver rest
viola – the slurring in this passage is inconsistent and unclear. In bar 235 the four demisemiquavers are slurred, but an extra line seems to extend the slur to the following quaver g natural. The remaining slurs are ambiguous. In bars 237-238 however it is clear that the viola slurs only the four demisemiquavers. The wind (oboe 3 and clarinet 3) slur all five notes throughout, another example of differential articulation
Bifolio 17 – bars 239-240 / 245-246 / 241-242 / 243-244 [sic]
horn 3 – last note written b natural, should be a# (concert g#)
this bar and the next are in the wrong place in the MS (on the second page of bifolio 17 – as it stands, they appear to come between bars 240 and 241)
vio 2 – second sextuplet group seems to be written over an erasure
Bifolio 18 – bars 247-248 / 249-250 / 251-253 / 254-255
strings – precautionary time signatures entered in all parts
horn 3 – first note written as a semibreve – should be a minim
bassoon 2 & 3 – the first note should be double dotted
bassoon 3 – written c natural should be c#
cello – the third note from the end is missing a natural sign (to apply also to the final note)
violin 1 – first group of sextuplets (only) has an overall slur in MS
viola, cello, double bass – redundant common time signature indication
flute 1 – semp. (after cresc.) should logically be extended to the other wind and brass
bass tubas – the part should have a treble clef for the next seven bars (bass tuba 1 has written e natural, sounding A natural, as per horn 2 and violas, bass tuba 2 has written c natural - c#, sounding f natural – f#, as per cellos)
Bifolio 19 – bars 256-257 / 258-259 / 260-261 / 262-268
horns 3 & 4 – first note written g natural, should be g# (concert f#)
viola – top note written b# – should be b natural, as per horn 1

bassoons – tie omitted and no accent (the end of the tie is visible on the next page)
trumpet 2 – accidental has been emended
bassoons – no accent (as per other wind parts)
timpani – roll notated in minims throughout this passage. ‘Trem’ and extending line added for bar 257 only (intended to apply to whole passage)
cymbals and triangle – no dynamic marking (fff in 1887)
NB – these instruments notated in the treble clef – triangle plays a ‘g natural’ and the cymbals a ‘b#’ – see note above (TK)
Triangle – tremolo lines editorial (MS unclear)
harp – last three notes should have an 8va (TK)
cello, double bass – missing divisi (TK)

trumpet 1 – accent missing on first note (all the other wind and brass instruments have the chevron accent, as does 40.999)
timpani – MS has a tie to the second written note, which is not in accordance with 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 19.480 or 40.999, or with Bruckner’s usual practice. The note cb is itself unusual – 40.999 has eb (TK) – but not necessarily wrong

cymbals and triangle once again assigned pitches in the MS (both on eb)
triangle tremolando mark editorial

viola – missing divisi

violin 1 – slur missing from second half of bar
viola – missing divisi
trombone 1 – second note written ab, should be A natural (as per violas and 19.480/3)
trombone 2 – second note written c natural, should be c# (as per violas – 19.480/3 seems to have been emended to cb)

Bifolio 20 – bars 269-270 / 271-274 / 275-278 / 279-282

harp – no dynamic marking (mf in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 1887) (TK)
violin 2, viola – divisi missing in MS, given in 19.480/3, 34.614/2 and 6001
viola – bottom note of chord should be e natural throughout (as per violin 1 & 2)
cello – missing divisi in latter part of bar
harp – no dynamic marking (f’ in 19.480/3, 6001 and 1887) (TK)
horn 1 – no dynamic marking (p in 19.480/3, 6001 and 1887)
violin 1 – slur missing from second half of bar (as per 1887)
horn 4 – second note should be f# (concert e natural) as per violin 2, cellos and basses
violin 1 – slur on second half of bar missing in MS, 19.480/3 and 6001
violin 2, viola – divisi in 19.480/3, missing in MS and 6001
cello – missing divisi in MS, 19.480/3 and 6001

xxiii
clarinet 1 – no dynamic marking in MS – 19.480/3, 6001 and flute part have *mf*

**Bifolio 21** – bars 283-287 / 288-292 / 293-298 / 299-304

284  cello – notation indicates *divisi* in latter part of bar (two stems)
285  horns 3 & 4 – MS does not make clear how many horns play - only horn 3 plays in 19.480/3, 34.614/2, 6001 and 40.999
cello - *divisi* missing in MS, 19.480/3 and 6001, present in 40.999
290  horn 1 – slurred in 19.480/3 and 6001, slurs missing in both MS and 40.999
(which may however be a pasted-on passage) (see also bars 292, 294 and 296)
[NB – 34.614/2 has no slurs between bars 293-296]
297  tenor tubas – tie missing in MS, 19.480/3 and 34.614/2, present in 6001
bass tubas - bass clef missing in MS and 6001, present in 19.480/3 and 34.614/2
violin 1, violin 2, viola, cello – *p* missing (as per double bass part, 19.480/2, 34.614/2 and 6001) (TK)
300  horn 1 – last note should be b♭ (concert e♭)

**Bifolio 22** – bars 305-312 / 313-317 (last two sides blank)

309  violin 2, viola, cello – no dynamic marking (double basses have *pp*; violin 2, viola
and cello have *pp* in 34.614/2, 6001 and 40.999; all parts have *pp* in 19.480/3).
317  tubas have a pause on the final note in MS, tubas and violin 1 have a pause on
final note in 34.614/2. No pause for either violin 1 or tubas in 19.480/3, 6001,
40.999, 1887 or 1890.