

FRANZ SCHALK
AND BRUCKNER'S FIFTH SYMPHONY

by David H. Aldeborgh

My subject today is Franz Schalk, of whose work I am a shameless admirer -- an admiration which extends in particular to his revision of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony, which is also the subject of this paper. A bit further on I will explain my reasons for saying this -- reasons which are more aesthetically than philologically predicated.

At the time of his death in 1931, at the age of 68, Franz Schalk was one of the most respected conductors in Europe. During the course of his career he was Kapellmeister -- that is to say conductor or music director -- of more than a dozen different orchestras, the first of these being in the Moravian city of Olmütz, an appointment he received in 1884 at the age of 21. This was followed by a series of similar appointments over the next five years to posts in Dresden, Czernowitz (in the Ukraine), Karlsbad, Breslau (a German-speaking city in what is now Poland) and then in Graz -- the city where he would later premiere Bruckner's Fifth Symphony. In 1885 he became Kapellmeister in the Deutschen-Landestheater in Prague, and in 1898 Kapellmeister at the Königlichen Oper -- that is to say the Royal Opera -- in Berlin. Although he was only 35 at this time, his reputation had already reached the shores of America, resulting in his serving as conductor for a large portion of the 1898-1899 season at the Metropolitan Opera in New York. He also conducted in Chicago. The year 1898 also saw him in London, where he conducted the Wagner Ring cycle at Covent Garden, which cycle he repeated there in 1907 and 1911 -- performances that greatly impressed both audiences and critics.

In 1900, at the age of 37, he was appointed Erster Kapellmeister an der Wiener-Hofoper -- meaning First Conductor at the Vienna Court Opera -- in reality first assistant conductor when Gustav Mahler was its Director.

In 1904, in addition to his duties at the Opera, he succeeded Ferd-

inand Löwe as conductor of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde -- a very prestigious post that he held for the next 17 years and which provided him important opportunities for the performance of Bruckner's music. Also, in 1909, he assumed the directorship of the Conductor School of the Vienna Music Academy -- Die Kapellmeisterschule der Wiener Musikademie.

When Mahler's term as Director of the Court Opera ended in 1908, he was succeeded by Felix Weingartner who, in turn, was succeeded by Hans Gregor -- a non-musician but an able manager and producer. Then in 1919 Franz Schalk and Richard Strauss became Co-Directors of the Opera, succeeding Gregor. It was no longer called the Court Opera because the Monarchy had been abolished as a consequence of Austria's defeat in the First World War. It was now known as the Wiener Staatsoper -- or Vienna State Opera -- as it is today. The co-directorship worked well at first and included in its highlights the premiere of Strauss' "Die Frau ohne Schatten", which Schalk conducted. However, because of increasing differences between the two, of an artistic as well as personal nature, Strauss took his wrathful leave (to use Bruno Walter's words) in 1924, leaving Schalk in sole charge of the Opera until 1929. During the closing years of Schalk's tenure, the Opera flourished, its productions including even modern operas by composers such as Hindemith, Krenek, Korngold and Stravinsky. Although the music of these composers did not appeal to Schalk's more traditionalist views, he felt it his responsibility, as Director of the Vienna State Opera, to maintain ties with contemporary composers, for which purpose he engaged an assistant conductor, Robert Heger, who was put in charge of these more modern productions. The year 1927, the centenary of Beethoven's death, saw splendid productions of "Fidelio" and "Der Rosenkavalier" -- productions which Schalk also brought to Paris, along with the entire opera troupe, to the enthusiastic acclaim of both audiences and critics.

The crown of Schalk's career came in 1930, when the Austrian

government elevated him to the unprecedented position of General Music Director, meaning for all Austria -- a title created especially for him. He died a year later, in the summer of 1931, as the result of an influenza-related lung infection.

Four years ago, in April of 1995, the musicologist Dr. Benjamin Korstvedt and I had the pleasure, indeed the privilege, of interviewing Dr. Joseph Braunstein, a musician, musicologist, author and teacher, who, at that time, was 103 years old and who had many times played as a violinist in orchestras under Franz Schalk's direction, and who remembered him clearly. When asked what he thought of Schalk as a conductor and as a person, he said, and with great earnestness "[quote] I had the highest regard for him; I had the highest regard for Schalk [end of quote]:" Then, after a pause, he said "[quote] I still remember with greatest pleasure when there was a memorial concert for Schalk and when a critic -- Robert Konta was his name -- said that Schalk was not a musician, was not a conductor, but was an Austrian institution! And it was true! [end of quote]"

Incidentally, this interview with Joseph Braunstein is currently being published by The Bruckner Journal in two parts, the first of which is in the March issue. Dr. Braunstein passed away at the age of 104, eleven months after our interview with him.

Before discussing Franz Schalk's involvement with the Fifth Symphony, I should touch on a few aspects of his background and education.

He was born in May of 1863, the second son of Ignaz and Anna Schalk. Six years prior to this, in the early part of 1857, the couple moved from Linz to Vienna, presumably for business reasons. In March of that year their eldest son Josef was born. The couple also had two daughters, Anna and Maria, this last going by the nick-name "Mizi." Of the two, Anna was

the older, and in terms of age, I believe that both of them fell between Josef and Franz.

In 1863, the year that Franz was born, Bruckner was 39 and studying form and orchestration under Kitzler in Linz. That same year saw the revision of his Overture in G minor and the completion of his "Study" Symphony in F minor. It was also the year that he first heard "Tannhäuser" in a performance under Kitzler's direction at the Landesstadttheater in Linz.

Two years later, in 1865, Ferdinand Löwe was born -- the year that Bruckner turned 41. I set these dates before you in order to stress the relative youth of the persons who later comprised Bruckner's inner circle.

It was sometime subsequent to this, probably around 1870, that the father, Ignaz Schalk, died at the young age of 35, passing on to his widow Anna Schalk the responsibility for the care and upbringing of the children. Josef, now in his teens, was very helpful to his mother in this regard, which meant a delay in his own education.

In 1877, Josef, at the age of 20, began his studies at the conservatory, taking piano under Julius Epstein and music theory under Bruckner.

The following year, 1878, Franz, now only 15, entered the conservatory, taking violin under Joseph Hellmesberger, piano under Julius Epstein and music theory under Bruckner. It was during this year that Bruckner completed his work on the Fifth Symphony.

In 1881, while still 17, Franz Schalk made his debut as a violinist in a recital in the Bösendorfersaal, performing Bach's Chaconne for solo violin before a large and enthusiastic audience, according to the memoirs of Friedrich Eckstein -- another of Bruckner's pupils and friends. This year also saw the premiere performance of the first three movements of

Bruckner's String Quintet, which performance took place at an internal concert of the Wiener akademische Wagnerverein at the initiative of Josef Schalk. Franz played second viola. During this same year, Franz also completed his studies at the conservatory and received an appointment as an orchestral violinist under Felix Mottl in Karlsruhe. He immediately persuaded Mottl to undertake a performance of the unpublished Fourth Symphony, which actually took place in December of that year. Franz must have been an extremely persuasive 18-year-old!

1883, the year of Wagner's death, saw the second performance of the String Quintet, this time in the Bösendorfersaal, with Franz playing the first viola part.

In 1884, Franz received his first appointment as Kapellmeister in Olmütz in Moravia -- the beginning of his career as a conductor.

* * * * *

What sort of conductor was Franz Schalk? The most valuable information we have in this regard, aside from his very impressive list of achievements, is contained in the recordings he made in 1927, 1928 and 1929. These include Beethoven's Fifth, Sixth and Eighth symphonies, the Leonore Overture No. 3 and the "Unfinished" Symphony of Schubert. They are all available in a CD set put out by Dante Productions on the LYS label. A French scholar by the name of Jean-Charles Hoffelé wrote very interesting notes for the CD booklet, from which I have excerpted the following: "[quote] Franz Schalk was one of Mahler's pet hates. He made some very harsh, uncalled for judgments on this conductor who came from a different era, accusing him of incompetence, pedantry and outrageous conservatism [end of quote]." This leads one to wonder why Mahler kept him on as assistant conductor for the remaining eight years of his own tenure as Director of the Court Opera. Hoffelé then goes on to say "[quote] These accusations are certainly exaggerated by biographers. Franz Schalk was

no more conservative than the average conductor of his generation [end of quote]." With respect to the recordings Hoffel  says the following: "[quote] The repertoire he recorded is limited to Beethoven and Schubert. ...His death at the age of 68 meant that he was not able to benefit from the electric era of recording. Interestingly enough, the sessions planned by HMV for 1932 included two Bruckner symphonies: the Third and the Fourth. The recordings that Schalk made are surprisingly natural. The simplicity of the gestures, particularly obvious in the Pastorale, is complemented by a somewhat limited, yet skilfully mastered dynamic range, with a rare sense of tonal color and the ability to achieve stunning decrescendos that are rarely heard on 78s. Schalk was apparently not particularly careful about picking up on mistakes... But he did manage to set very intelligently chosen tempi and tended to apply them to whole movements, or even more globally, which was a new concept in Vienna, and in fact quite anti-Mahler. He also refrained from using portamentos and forbade vibrato in the strings, reducing to a strict minimum the expressive and ornamental glissandos, much to the despair of his Konzertmeister. The simplicity of this approach enabled all the qualities of the Vienna Philharmonic to shine, and the main value of these sessions comes from the orchestra itself, recorded when it was still playing old instruments [end of quote]."

M. Hoffel  is to be complemented for giving us a concise and vivid idea of Schalk the conductor, in terms of his values, methods and style -- certainly the extreme opposite of Mahler's subjectivism. M. Hoffel  refers to Schalk's "rare sense of tonal color", to which I would add Schalk's extraordinary sense of orchestral texture, which comes through in the andante movement of the Pastorale. Despite the age and fidelity limitations of this accoustical recording, made in 1928, what we hear in

the latter part of the second movement can only be described as exquisite. This remarkable sensitivity to orchestral texture also characterizes Franz Schalk's reorchestration of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony, as I shall later show.

* * * [Here play sample from Pastorale] * * *

Part II

Franz Schalk began his revision of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony sometime during the first half of the year 1892. The first evidence we have of this is a letter from Franz to his brother Josef, dated 14 July 1892. In it he says "[quote] My work on the Fifth proceeds very slowly, but nonetheless ever forward. Just now I am at the concluding measures of the first movement. -- The accomplishment of this was of enormous difficulty [end of quote]." This revealing letter makes clear the thoroughness of his review of Bruckner's orchestration and the fact that it was undergoing substantial revision. Why Franz undertook the revision, which was a project of "enormous difficulty", as he indicated in his letter to Josef, must be left to conjecture. A possible answer to this question is submitted toward the end of this paper. It is certain that Bruckner had authorized him to mount the premiere, undoubtedly with a certain amount of freedom with respect to detail. Clearly he wanted the premiere to succeed and he naturally felt responsible for its success. To understand what took place, one must realize that there was a virtual father-son relationship between Bruckner and his pupils, particularly Franz. He loved them and they loved him. This undoubtedly led Franz and Josef to extreme presumptions as to what they were justified in doing. As Erwin Doernberg writes in his biography of the composer, "[quote] Although it is inadmissible that Bruckner should have given his consent to versions not only differing from his own compositions in countless details, but which al-

tered his style fundamentally, the fact remains that Schalk and Löwe were intimate and devoted friends of the composer, and active apostles. What can have led them to believe that his works needed their revision? ...No doubt such an idea may have sprung in the first place from the fact that the composer discussed his works with them, despite their youth. By listening to their criticism he gave them a false idea of its value; sometimes he even acted on their advice [end of quote]." In point of fact, he acted on their advice a great deal, as is evidenced by the 1889 edition of the Fourth Symphony and the 1890 edition of the Third.

Robert Simpson, in his book The Essence of Bruckner, advances a similar view: "[quote] There can be no doubt that the Schalk brothers, Ferdinand Löwe, and others genuinely believed that they were of real assistance to Bruckner. His simplicity led them to think they were helping him discover his own dimly perceived intentions. The trouble is that they were wrong. Although the composer himself did in fact have no more than the dimmest explainable idea of his own goal, their conception of it, though lucid to themselves, was a complete misunderstanding based on what they found in Wagner [end of quote]."

I think that both of these analyses are very perceptive, but taken at face value, are over-simplifications and therefore somewhat misleading. I am inclined to give these disciples a greater benefit of the doubt. They were extremely talented and capable young men. Bruckner himself referred to Löwe as "my Berlioz." They were among the first really to recognize Bruckner's genius, and the fact that Bruckner admitted them into his inner circle is evidence of his evaluation of them. They interacted with him, often on a daily basis, and to suggest that they completely misunderstood him is nonsense. More than anyone else, they did understand him. What can fairly be said, however, is that their understanding of

him was imperfect, especially as regards his inmost goals -- but as Robert Simpson points out, and I think correctly, "...the composer himself did in fact have no more than the dimmest explainable idea of his own goal." His constant revisions, his problems with form in some of his finales, and his malleableness with respect to the suggestions of his disciples and friends, all point to a lack of certainty with regard to detail, as well as to a lack of clarity with regard to his objectives. This does not mean that he did not have objectives -- on the contrary, his objectives were constantly pressing on his consciousness, but were of such scope and monumentality as never to be within easy reach. Without doubt he was, from time to time and for various reasons, distracted from his vision -- an incredibly far-reaching vision that extended beyond his own horizon and certainly beyond that of his contemporaries. The value of Bruckner's disciples, on the other hand, lay in their ability, as performing musicians, to see Bruckner's vision (insofar as they were able) in terms of his potential audience. With respect to this, their understanding of his vision was, at times, better than his own.

The most disturbing thing about Schalk's emendations is not the final result, which I think is quite good, but in the fact that they were done behind the composer's back and without his permission. In this respect it was clearly an abuse of trust, whatever the motive. Franz was, after all, making alterations to that which was most precious and most important to the composer -- namely his music, his fruit, his legacy; and we know that Bruckner was jealous of every detail, as is evidenced by his letter of 1891 to Felix Weingartner regarding a planned performance of the Eighth Symphony, in which he wrote "[quote] Please arrange everything to the liking of your orchestra; however I beg you not to alter the score; also, in case of publication, to leave the orchestral parts unaltered [end of quote]." Bruckner did indeed know what he wanted and labored very hard to achieve

it. This does not mean that he could not be persuaded to make significant alterations, the most dramatic example of this being the already cited 1889 version of the Fourth Symphony, which was mostly the work of Ferdinand Löwe, done with the composer's permission and personal involvement. With respect to the premiere of that version, which was every bit as "Wagnerized" a score as Schalk's version of the Fifth, Bruckner wrote to the conductor Hermann Levi, "[quote] The success in Vienna is unforgettable to me [end of quote]." Indeed, this version, deemed corrupt by today's musicological establishment, was performed 17 times in Bruckner's lifetime, several performances of which he attended. It obviously delighted audiences, Bruckner himself often having to mount the stage to accept their enthusiastic acclaim, and represented a great triumph for the composer. He never disowned it. Clearly, the brothers Schalk hoped to create a similar triumph for their master with the Fifth Symphony.

With respect to the conspiracy in which the brothers were clearly involved, I like to stress the "family" aspects of the affair -- Bruckner being the father figure. The boys knew that if Father knew what they were up to, there would be "hell" to pay, as is evidenced by their secrecy, but they also must have been convinced that they were doing the right thing and that "Papa" would be pleased if he heard the revision under the right circumstances. Interestingly, while Franz was in the throes of revising the Fifth Symphony, Josef himself was engaged in an unauthorized reorchestration of the Mass No. 3 -- the most notable feature of which was the addition of two horns -- and expressed his uneasy conscience in a letter to Franz -- but his unease was focused more on doubts regarding his ability to do the revision well than on his lack of authorization to do it at all. Thomas Leibnitz, in his very fine book Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner, comments on this letter as follows: "[quote] Josef saw, as did

Franz, his revision activity in the same light, as a part of his practical championship for Bruckner: as idealistic service of friendship; far removed from the trace of uneasy conscience here developing, he regarded himself, as ever, as one of the very true, integrity-possessing friends of Bruckner (at times perhaps the only) [end of quote]."

By the following spring Bruckner was growing impatient and Josef conveyed this fact in a letter to Franz dated 17 May, 1893:"[quote] Bruckner speaks about the partitur of the Fifth. He has naturally become mistrustful, since you have not yet brought about a performance [end of quote]."

According to Thomas Leibnitz, a reconstruction of the exchange of letters between Josef and Franz, reveals the following: "[quote] In close coordination, Josef and Franz Schalk deceived Bruckner deliberately, but apparently with the best subjective intention and good conscience: They led him in the belief that his own version would be performed in Graz and told him nothing about the revision. On the other hand they did truly want his presence at the performance. The underlying intention had already become discernible at Josef's performance of the F minor Mass, namely that Bruckner should be set before the completed work and, through the actual hearing of it and the witnessing of its success with the audience, convince himself of the sensibility of the improvements resulting from the interventions [end of quote]." This is indeed astounding!

The notion that someone, however close, could take another's work of art into which countless hours of effort and devotion had been poured, completely re-work it without the artist's knowledge or permission, present it back to him as a fait accompli, and expect him to be pleased with the result, boggles the mind. From where could they have possibly gotten such an idea? The curious thing is that they seemed to think it would work. Either they were crazy or they really understood their man!

I am of the opinion that three factors came into play, which provided

the motivation for this seemingly bizarre undertaking:

First of all, they felt that the composer's orchestration did not serve the music as well as it should. They knew the music well from having played it on the piano. Where the brothers, Franz in particular, had learned the art of orchestration is not clear from biographical material that I am acquainted with, but it is my guess that it came from their association with the Wiener akademische Wagnerverein; in any case Wagner's principles of orchestration were becoming widely accepted as the latest thing, and any composer who did not utilize them was certainly failing to realize the potential of his music and just wasn't "with it."

Secondly, correspondence shows that the brothers were well-acquainted with Löwe's work with Bruckner on the Fourth Symphony -- in fact Franz himself had become involved in the project. Furthermore the premiere of this version under Hans Richter in 1888 had been a huge success, as were the subsequent performances under other conductors. As to the composer's potential resistance to a revision, the triumph of the Fourth was the ice-breaking precedent through which Bruckner might become persuaded to revise the Fifth, utilizing Wagnerian principles of orchestration, of course.

Thirdly, Bruckner's advancing age and increasing health problems, to say nothing of his other commitments, must have made the possibility of his active cooperation in another revision project seem unlikely in the extreme, leaving Franz's authorization to mount the premiere of the Fifth as the only clear opportunity for making and presenting a revision -- if one was to be made at all.

I believe that the foregoing considerations are what motivated Franz to undertake the revision. As to the first of these, namely that the brothers felt that Bruckner's orchestration did not serve the music as

well as it should, I would like to provide a defense based on my own experience as a listener. On one occasion in the mid-1980s I attended a performance of the Fifth in Carnegie Hall in New York with a friend and musicologist who is a well-known Bruckner expert -- and who happens to be in this room. It was the first time he had heard the Fifth in live performance, and after the concert, with tears in his eyes, he remarked "it's so cold, it's so cold." He knew the symphony well from scores and recordings, but couldn't get over the lack of warmth that the orchestra had projected and was blaming the conductor. I had thought the performance to be quite good, but it was the sixth time I had heard the piece live, and with respect to warmth, it had been no worse than other performances I had heard. Some years earlier I had been present at two performances of the work by the New York Philharmonic under William Steinberg in Lincoln Center. During the Finale, eleven brass players filed out onto the stage behind the orchestra, in keeping with the practice of some conductors (the use of extra brass having been specifically authorized by the composer). This was handsomely done and generated excitement in the audience, but when the brass players finally intoned the chorale, the effect, rather than the crowning glory we had been led to anticipate, was simply a louder dose of what we had already heard.

I takes a long time for a Bruckner-lover to admit, let alone come to terms with, the existence of an aesthetic flaw in one of the master's universally acknowledged masterpieces, yet my experience with six live performances and three rehearsals points to some kind of problem. The fact of the matter is that the music itself is not cold. Nonetheless, it has an objective quality which tends toward the impersonal, and for this reason, the orchestration should be such as to minimize this quality -- if the piece is to sound friendly, that is. Bruckner's penchant for heavy brass

writing does just the opposite, and this must be one of the things that Franz Schalk saw in the score when he made the decision to mount the premiere performance, a performance that took place on 8 April, 1894.

I cannot help but note that in the current issue of The Bruckner Journal there is a thumbnail review, by Colin Anderson, of Robert Bachmann's performance of the Seventh Symphony by the Royal Philharmonic at the Barbican this past November. He writes "[quote] The major problem I had with his conducting is a penchant for blatant brass. Loudness is one thing, but encouraging the brass to lacerate our ears is absurd, and ruinous to the long spans of a Bruckner symphony where a terracing of dynamics is paramount [end of quote]." I couldn't agree more, but such loudness is almost inherent in the Fourth and Fifth Symphonies. Indeed, in these symphonies, the orchestra too often seems to be playing at the audience rather than to it, this being primarily because of the brass-writing.

In his preface to the critical edition of the Fifth Symphony, Leopold Nowak notes that, in the Schalk edition, "[quote] the work in many places sounded softer than Bruckner had intended [end of quote]", to which I must add my quiet "hurrah."

Schalk's emendations are indeed very far-reaching, leaving scarcely a bar untouched; yet despite the revision's extensiveness, it is unlikely that the average concert-goer would notice much difference, except in the Finale. The net effect of the changes is one of a subtle enrichment and softening of tone, resulting from a blending of instruments and a reduction in the use of brasses, particularly the trumpets -- sometimes to the disadvantage of the music if a point-by-point comparison is made. There is, however, an aesthetic logic to Schalk's over-all plan, which is to ingratiate the listener with warmer tones and to be more sparing with the full power of the orchestra, saving this for the closing pages of the Fin-

ale. Prior to the Finale's coda, the music has been pressing the listener toward a new tonal dimension that the original version utterly fails to deliver (the brasses having already been over-used), whereas Schalk's emendations provide that promised dimension of sound that is so liberating as well as overwhelming.

On 13 January, 1995, the American Symphony Orchestra, under Leon Botstein, gave an all-Bruckner concert in Avery Fisher Hall at Lincoln Center in New York City. The final work on the program was the Schalk version of the Fifth Symphony, and the event attracted musicologists from as far away as Berlin. Needless to say, I was there. Knowing the the version from the old Hans Knappertsbusch recording on London Records, and feeling the sound on the LP to be a bit opaque, I anticipated experiencing some of this opacity in live performance because of Schalk's blending of instruments. However, while attending the rehearsals, I was struck by the radiance and gentle warmth of the sound -- very much the impression I remembered from a performance by the New York Philharmonic of the Löwe version of the Fourth Symphony under Josef Krips. There was something about the sound that was richer and more detailed, yet not in such a manner as to distract the listener's attention -- quite the opposite. The effect was to involve the listener more intimately with the music, so that it was being played to him rather than at him -- a distinction I made earlier. One has to hear the piece live to experience the incredible atmosphere that fills the concert hall. There is no way that the original version can deliver the benevolent sense of enveloping sound that this version yields, and its instant success at the 1894 premiere is no wonder to me at all. Theodor Helm, a critic and contemporary of Bruckner, attended the premiere and reported that "[quote] the enthusiasm of the audience grew with each successive movement; again and again the orchestral players had to rise

from their seats to acknowledge the tumultuous applause [end of quote]." Four years later, on 1 March, 1898, the symphony made its debut in Vienna with the Vienna Philharmonic under Ferdinand Löwe, and the response was even more spectacular. Max Auer, in his biography of Bruckner, says the following: "[quote] Not since the concerts personally conducted by Richard Wagner could the critic Theodor Helm remember any enthusiasm as great as with this performance. On the stair cases and in the cloak rooms one saw elderly people overflowing with tears, falling in each other's arms from joy at having had such an experience. The most extreme opponents must acknowledge the greatness of this work of art. Even Max Kalbeck praised the richness of musical ideas and spoke of the high enjoyment the work had caused in him. In Hanslick's paper R.Heuberger opined '[subquote]As to invention, the symphony belongs to the most radiant that Bruckner has written; as to beautiful sound, to the most outstanding works of the modern age [end of subquote].'[end of quote]." Please note Herr Heuberger's mention of beautiful sound as being one of the work's outstanding features. Leibnitz then quotes August Göllerich as follows: "[quote] The contrapuntal art herewith unfolded is unprecedented, the construction of the climaxes fabulous, and when the brass band proclaims an enlargement of the chorale theme like a halo arching over the entire surge of sound, the impression is overpowering [end of quote]." Leibnitz then continues "[quote] After the successful beginning, the Fifth Symphony in the Schalk revision continued on its victory march through the concert halls and became a firmly established part of the repertory [end of quote]."

This leaves me to wonder whatever happened to that "victory march" through the concert halls? While the symphony in its original version is greatly admired by convinced Brucknerites and musicologists, it does not seem to be a favorite with audiences -- at least not in the U.S.A.-- whereas in Europe the Schalk version certainly was. The reasons for

this are partly addressed in this paper, and I think that the length of the original version is another factor.

What, then, should be the future of the Schalk version? Regardless of the conspiratorial aspects of its beginnings, it cannot be dismissed as being totally inauthentic. It is definitely a product of Bruckner's workshop, albeit an illegitimate one. The music is entirely Bruckner's, an offspring, so to speak, which, through stolen DNA, gestated in the mental womb of Franz Schalk. Though illegitimate, the combination of genes was very favorable, and the result was an exceedingly comely youth. While this youth cannot claim to be the legitimate heir -- only the original version can claim that title (despite its relative clumsiness) -- it should, by its intrinsic virtues, claim our respect and be allowed its place in the concert hall. Then let the public decide. In any case, the whole matter is, as I have indicated, a family affair.

* * * [If time permits, play examples from both versions] * * *

© David H. Aldeborgh
April 3, 1999

