

**ANTON BRUCKNER:  
NINTH SYMPHONY, FINALE (UNFINISHED)**  
COMPLETED PERFORMANCE VERSION BY  
SAMALE–PHILLIPS–COHRS–MAZZUCA (1983–2012)  
**THE CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION 2012:  
AN INTRODUCTION**  
BY **BENJAMIN–GUNNAR COHRS**

**CONTENT**

THE CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION: AN INTRODUCTION .....	2
BRUCKNER'S NINTH IN THE PURGATORY OF ITS RECEPTION HISTORY .....	2
BRUCKNERS WORK ON THE FINALE .....	4
WHY ATTEMPT TO RECONSTRUCT THE FINALE? .....	7
A WORK IN PROGRESS: THE COMPLETED PERFORMANCE VERSION.....	10
REQUISITE RECONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION WORK .....	14
TABLE I: THE SOURCES FOR THE FINALE AS USED IN THE CPV .....	16
TABLE II: RECONSTRUCTION WORK ON THE FINALE, COMPARED WITH THE MOZART/SUESSMAYR REQUIEM ....	18
TABLE III: FORMAL ANALYSIS OF THE COMPLETED FINALE (CRE 2011) .....	20
REPORT ON THE CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION .....	22
I. RECONSTRUCTION OF BIFOLIO [»1«E] .....	22
II. RECONSTRUCTION OF BIFOLIO [»4«] .....	24
III. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE GESANGSPERIODE (4C/»5«; [5/»6«]; [6/»7«]) .....	25
IV. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE BEGINNING OF THE DEVELOPMENT (»13a«E; =>13b«E; [14/»15«]) .....	29
V. RECONSTRUCTION OF BIFOLIO [19D/»20«] .....	30
VI. TRANSITION AFTER THE GESANGSPERIODE IN THE RECAPITULATION ([27/»28«]) .....	34
VII. DESIGN OF THE CHORALE RECAPITULATION ([30/»31«]; 31E/»32«; [32/»33«]) .....	35
VIII. PARTIAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CODA FROM THE SKETCHES .....	39
IX. ELABORATION OF THE FINAL HALLELUJA PLENO .....	41
X. REVISED INSTRUMENTATION .....	43
XI. REVISED DYNAMICS, PHRASING, AND ARTICULATION .....	44
XII. REVISED TEMPI .....	45
TABLE IV: CONCORDANCE OF TEMPO INDICATIONS.....	47
ABOUT THE CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION (2012) .....	48
CORRIGENDA 2012 .....	52
APPENDIX: EXTRACTS FROM THE CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION 2012 .....	52

**ANTON BRUCKNER, NINTH SYMPHONY, FINALE**  
 COMPLETED PERFORMANCE VERSION BY  
 SAMALE–PHILLIPS–COHRS–MAZZUCA (1983–2012)  
**THE CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION 2012:**  
**AN INTRODUCTION**  
 BY BENJAMIN–GUNNAR COHRS <sup>1</sup>

*»Just a simple remark – if you don't approve of performing versions of composer's unfinished sketches, no one is holding your hand to the fire forcing you to listen. In the meantime, those of us with intellectual curiosity, although we know such things as this and other performing versions can never really exist as the composer would have completed them, would still rather hear the sketches in some way rather than having them remain mute in archive drawers. Again: no one is forcing you to listen ...«*

[Bruckner-Fan Dace Gisclard, Houston/USA, 26. 8. 2003, www.amazon.com]

**BRUCKNER'S NINTH IN THE PURGATORY OF ITS RECEPTION HISTORY**

To this day, Bruckner's Ninth languishes in a purgatory of misunderstanding, erroneous interpretation, appropriation, even barbaric abuse, having long fallen »prey to taste« (Adorno). Bruckner had scarcely taken his last breath when souvenir hunters swooped down on the manuscripts lying around the room where he died, which was only secured some time later. The executors of his estate entrusted Bruckner's pupil Joseph Schalk to inquire into the correlation of the remaining 75 score bifolios for the Finale of the Ninth, but he died on 7 November 1900 without having undertaken the task. His brother Franz quietly took the manuscripts into his possession when, according to Bruckner's testament, they should have belonged to the Hofbibliothek (Court Library), today the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Wien (=ÖNB, Austrian National Library, Vienna).

When the conductor Ferdinand Löwe prepared his rehearsals for the first performance on 11 February 1903 in Vienna, he was daunted by the Ninth's radical nature, and completely re-orchestrated its first three movements; the material for the Finale, still unexamined, was dismissed. Löwe, »out of piety for the master's wishes«, as he wrote, indeed included the Te Deum, but had not considered the stylistic discrepancy between his altered arrangement and the Te Deum, left in its original form. Löwe's conviction, as cited in his foreword, that the three completed movements constituted in themselves a performable, closed unit, ultimately became dogma, for the distorted first editions maintained their validity on the concert podium for decades; in the meantime such opinions hardened into concrete. Löwe even published his own arrangement without comment as the authentic score. The Te Deum was excluded from his edition, although Bruckner repeatedly stated that he wished it to be performed with the symphony.

Only slowly did it become common knowledge among Bruckner scholars that »there was something wrong« with the first editions. In 1929 the Critical Bruckner Complete Edition was begun, which in 1934 published the original score of the Ninth, edited by Alfred Orel, together with a study volume which contained transcriptions of many of the Finale manuscripts for the first time. But Orel omitted several sources, scattered to the four winds as they were; his presentation was not especially clear and contained many errors of transcription. Apart from that, his edition, like Nowak's 1951 reprint, contained only the first three movements, although at least Universal Edition had published a study score of the Ninth together with the Te Deum before 1920, and thus to some extent realised Bruckner's intentions. The Te Deum was first published separately in the Complete Edition in 1961 without any reference to Bruckner's wishes regarding the Ninth.

---

<sup>1</sup> This essay (2012) replaces older versions. The text is a large extract from the English notes to Repertoire Explorer Study Score No. 444 (Revision 2008), available on sale from [www.musikmph.de](http://www.musikmph.de). Some material was taken from earlier publications, such as booklet and programme notes, including texts which were originally conceived in collaboration between B.-G. Cohrs and John Phillips, in particular from the Musik-Konzepte Vol. 120–22. Some material was also written anew. It was prepared for [abruckner.com](http://abruckner.com), to provide all important information on the philological insights which led to the Conclusive Revised Edition, in order to better understand the nature of the reconstruction work being undertaken, as well as to inform about the differences between this and the older editions of the SPCM-score. The conclusive impression of score and commentary shall be released in 2012. However, an appendix to this essay offers extracts with the revised sections (and in particular the new coda) in advance.

A proper critical discussion of Orel's ›*Entwürfe und Skizzen*‹ never took place. Nonetheless, attempts to complete the Finale were repeatedly based on this misleading source. Some were never published or later withdrawn; other scores were occasionally performed or even published, but have not established themselves, and justifiably so: none of their authors ever published a detailed Commentary on their activities, an absolute necessity in a case such as this. Apart from that, all these scores reveal errors in their methodologies and remarkable carelessness in their handling of Bruckner's manuscript texts. On the one hand, the arrangers dispensed with significant original passages; on the other, a high proportion of free composing can always be found. One arranger, for example, filled a demonstrably 16-bar-long gap in the score with no less than 100 bars of his own composition; others seem to prefer their ›own visions of Bruckner's work‹ even when there was sufficient original material, overlooked by them.

New steps in the resolution of this problem were only undertaken in 1983, as Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca began their *Ricostruzione*, the first soundly based and properly documented performance version of the Finale. This was followed by a new edition incorporating the philological research of Australian musicologist and composer John A. Phillips, substantially revised and recomposed by Samale and Phillips and published in 1992 under the names of its four contributing authors Samale, Phillips, Cohrs and Mazzuca. This research also stimulated renewed interest within the Bruckner Complete Edition in publishing the surviving manuscripts, a task that Leopold Nowak, its former director, had intended to undertake, but was no longer able to. Shortly before his death he entrusted it to Phillips. By 2008, this extensive project had grown to comprise six volumes: Phillips edited a Facsimile Edition (FE) of all surviving manuscripts of the Finale, a Reconstruction of the Autograph Score (RAS) and a Documentation of the Fragments (DF), an arrangement of the incomplete score for workshop concert performance. The present writer edited a new Critical Edition of the first three movements of the Ninth, wrote an extensive Critical Report and published a study volume containing the manuscripts for the second movement, including the autograph score of a discarded Trio with Viola solo. Thus, one hundred years after the composer's death, the sources for two movements of his Ninth Symphony had been published in full.

To mark the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its first performance (2003), the editors of the series *Musik-Konzepte*, Heinz-Klaus Metzger and Rainer Riehn, decided to publish a triple issue under the title *Bruckners Neunte im Fegefeuer der Rezeption* (Bruckner's Ninth in the Purgatory of Reception). The title was chosen to highlight the fact that misprision concerning the Ninth Symphony is due very largely to the aesthetic imperatives of the Romantic era, as Phillips had demonstrated in his doctoral thesis (2002). Scholars such as Willem Erauw and Peter Schleuning had already shown that the way music was experienced in Central Europe gradually took on features of a kind of ›Ersatz-Religion‹ in the course of the 19<sup>th</sup> century: As the influence of the Church declined, cultural activities adopted its transcendental functions into bourgeois life. Since then, the German/Austrian tradition of musical aesthetics has worshipped a limited canon of selected musical ›monuments‹, as Erauw described cynically, yet accurately: ›With Beethoven's symphonies as the new Holy Scripture, the audience would never become bored of listening to the same music, in the same way people in a Church would never tire of listening to the same words at Holy Mass every Sunday.‹ (*Acta Musicologica* 70, No. 2, 1998, p. 109–15) His assertion is confirmed by the dominant position of such ›Holy Scriptures‹ in the world of classical music on the one hand, and the neglect to which major composers of other countries tend to be subjected to on the other.

Erauw also observed that ›in classical music, almost all music making has to do with texts. The belief that the real truth is only to be found in the score, this obsession with the musical text, means that during a classical concert, musicians are interpreting musical texts instead of playing music.‹ This may be put a little drastically, but many musicians and musicologists who rely entirely on the score still frown at the idea of trying to understand a work from the context of its origin. Scholars outside Central Europe have long since begun to focus on the complex relationships between the listeners and the music they hear, whereas many German and Austrian music researchers continue to see themselves as ›closet music critics‹, the aesthetic underpinnings of late-romantic musical experience never being called into question. This already started with a particular spelling. Romantic aesthetics changed Beethoven's ›Sinfonia‹ into ›Symphonie‹ to give the form more weight – an ideologically burdened spelling avoided in the German version of the present text, since this language still allows ›Sinfonie‹. Unfortunately, there is no English equivalent, so we will continue here with ›symphony‹, but this should at least borne in mind.

Among many such music researchers, the term ›historically informed performance practice‹ is frequently used in a derogatory fashion. And no wonder: anyone who finds the positive example of a revived practice revealing his own shortcomings cannot help but respond by rejecting it. Indolence and ignorance find a perfect excuse – music-historical knowledge and skill is claimed to be ›academic‹ in nature, and thus of no relevance to actual ›musical performance‹. This ideology is still propagated in musical education, sometimes with consequences nothing short of grotesque, as indignantly criticised by Peter Lamprecht: »When a successful conductor admits in a rehearsal, without blushing, that he has never heard of 18<sup>th</sup> or early 19<sup>th</sup> century rules and practice on bowing; when another fails to understand the wavy lines stipulating a ›Bogenvibrato‹ [i. e. vibrato with the bow] in Gluck's opera *Orphée* and asks the orchestra to play a trill on every single semiquaver, the tolerance threshold has clearly been crossed – all the more so when such gentlemen concerned hold university positions, giving them the chance to multiply the gaps in their own education with impunity.« (*Das Orchester*, No. 11/2002, p. 19–26)

In light of this it is not hard to comprehend how those critics who have fallen prey to a misunderstood ›Werktreue‹ (i. e., fidelity to the original), have taken hold of Bruckner's Ninth in a way that is diametrically opposed to its composer's intentions. Giving the lie to the widespread cliché of ›Preußische Gründlichkeit‹ (Prussian thoroughness), it took an entire century for the sources of the Ninth to be re-evaluated. It appears that hitherto no-one wanted to know exactly what new findings had come to light so as not to damage a much-loved Romantic legend. According to this, Bruckner was allegedly suffering from »too severe a mental decline« in the last months of his life to be able to jot down more than a »pile of disjointed sketches« for the Finale; moreover – thus the general opinion – the first three movements were seen as »unfinished, but not requiring completion«. Only Phillips, in his *Musik-Konzepte* essay ›Erst fakteln, dann deuteln‹ (›First the facts, then the interpretation‹), got to the bottom of this legend: he was able to show without any shadow of a doubt that the scholarly opinion that has prevailed up to now is chiefly the result of a campaign cleverly staged by Ferdinand Löwe and a couple of music critics whom he had accordingly briefed. If, on the other hand, we summarise the more recent research findings on the Ninth, a completely different picture emerges.

## BRUCKNER'S WORK ON THE FINALE

It goes without saying that Bruckner designed the Ninth Symphony, on which he started work on 12<sup>th</sup> August 1887, in four movements. He spent at least a year working on the Finale while still in fairly good health, and probably actual composition was largely finished by June 1896, with just the instrumentation of woodwinds and brass awaiting completion. Its gestation was not significantly different from that of Bruckner's earlier works.

Bruckner treated his forms mostly as broadly conceived schemes, quite independent from the required musical material itself. From the very beginnings he sketched their elements with a fundamental conception of their position within the score and relation to earlier or subsequent sections. This position was mostly so clear that for later revisions a personal shorthand writing, consisting of symbols, pointers, figured bass numbers, cuts, repetitions and other special signs was sufficient. Due to this factor alone it seems highly unlikely that Bruckner could not have had a clear idea of the entire structure of the Finale during the many phases of elaborating the score. Usually Bruckner's composition procedure followed four phases:

- An initial notation of the basic continuity of the music, sketched in three- or four-staved *particella*, at least up to the end of the exposition.
- The gradual preparation of the score and its main elements – the metrical numbers, the elaboration of the string parts intended as the basis of the instrumentation, as well as the beginnings or endings of important wind or brass entries, often first in pencil, later erased and overwritten with ink.
- The systematic elaboration of the score, usually first the woodwinds, then brass parts, first the leading voices, later the additional or supporting parts.
- A last correction phase, that Bruckner himself called »Nuancier« – the addition of nuances in playing, ties, slurs, dynamics, accents as well as final corrections, refinements and retouches.

Apart from the last, these phases were not always clearly separated from each other. Obviously Bruckner proceeded from section to section (exposition, development *cum* recapitulation, coda). But if required he made further

sketches from time to time. The score bifolios were assembled one after the other and numbered in the top right-hand corner of their first pages. If larger revisions were required, he often discarded earlier bifolios, replacing them with new ones. If he intended such replacements, he often used score bifolios already prepared for use in order to draft the altered continuity, often in only one leading voice. Phillips called such bifolios »Satzverlaufs-Entwürfe« (= SVE, i. e., continuity drafts). Sometimes the magnitude of the corrections, cancellations and pasted-over passages made it necessary to write out a clean copy of a bifolio without significantly changing its content. Hence, one cannot speak of separate »sketch« and »score« phases. Even simpler forms like the tripartite A-B-A- Scherzo or Trio movements were usually sketched only up to the repeat of their first sections. Therefore it is wrong to think about a »draft score« in the case of the Finale: the sequence of valid, numbered bifolios was itself an »emergent autograph score«, as Phillips first described it.

This score, therefore, was intended as a »public document«, and is mostly clearly legible; finished bifolios were in some cases even noted as »fertig« (finished). Bruckner's early sketches, on the other hand, being intended as strictly private jottings and somewhat hastily notated in pencil, are far from easy to decipher. The paper, glue and ink used by Bruckner have also proven extremely fragile over time. In the case of the Ninth, Bruckner's handwriting also mirrored his state of health, as one may also trace from his last pocket calendar (1894/95), published by Elisabeth Maier in 2001 (»*Verborgene Persönlichkeit*«, Vol. II, p. 397–415). Given these circumstances, it is astonishing how clearly most of the score has been notated, despite better or worse days, or the weaknesses of old age. An analysis of all surviving primary and secondary sources (including thorough paper and script research) could be regarded as an almost »forensic« undertaking if we consider the loss of so much important material, since as we have pointed out, significant portions of the Finale were stolen from Bruckner's apartment shortly after his death. The results of this analysis, presented *en detail* in the various publications of the Complete Edition, seems to be sometimes more, sometimes less speculative, as indeed it is in every forensic examination, dependent upon where more or less material was lost. The results of many years of debate and research, as presented in what follows, can be considered as adequately substantiated.

For the score of the Finale, Bruckner used six different identifiable rulings and paper types. His last assistant and secretary, Anton Meissner, assisted with the preparation of most of them. He listed the names of the instruments, their clefs and key signatures, and ruled the barlines, usually dividing a single page into four bars. Hence, most of the surviving score bifolios and SVE consist of a total of 16 bars. As they came to be used, Bruckner appears to have taken them from a pile that was replenished from time to time by the acquisition of new paper. Thus, paper that had been prepared earlier remained underneath new paper placed on top. However, neither Bruckner and Meissner prepared the bifolios consistently, so that each ruling reveals small differences, for instance, in the instrumental abbreviations or, significantly, the use of the lower horns alternating with Wagner tubas. Alfred Orel interpreted such differences as marking variant, independent »versions«, misleading, since all they do denote are compositional stages. Bruckner's own work processes proves this to have been the case. The six main paper rulings merely aid in the identification of what could more readily be seen as five work phases. John Phillips accordingly revised Orel's nomenclatura in his own publications for the Complete Edition. The results of his examinations have made it possible to describe the chronology and genesis of the Finale quite accurately.

The composition of the last movement was not much different from that of the first three movements of the Ninth. Following Bruckner's severe illness in winter 1895, his calendar entry »24. Mai 895. 1.<sup>mal</sup>, Finale neue Scitze« would appear to represent the beginnings of work on it. The words »neue Scitze« (new sketch) may be interpreted that he already sketched some ideas when still working on the foregoing movements. (The surviving bifol. 1A could indeed have been already written early in 1895, because it survived in the estate of Richard Strauss, who is said to have received it from Bruckner when he visited him in Vienna. Strauss' only known sojourn in Vienna during this period of time was from 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> of April 1895.) Secondary literature also revealed many clues that Bruckner had played music from all four movements to visitors at the piano, and that he also may have used in his late organ improvisations material intended for the Finale.

#### *Work Phase 1 (until c. August 1895)*

Early drafts for the exposition up to the chorale theme date back from a time before Bruckner moved into the *Kustodenstöckl* of the Belvedere on 4<sup>th</sup> July 1895 (see the date »8. Juni«, FE, p. 9). According to the report of his

physician, Dr. Richard Heller, Bruckner started to compose the full score immediately after moving in, hence the exposition must have been laid out in those six to eight weeks following 24<sup>th</sup> May. This is comparable to the first movement – the manuscripts preserved in Cracow show Bruckner's intense work on the exposition from the first surviving sketch (dated »12. August«) and the first score bifolio (»1«, later discarded) dating from 21<sup>st</sup> September 1889. Since Bruckner progressed gradually with the score, the exposition of the Finale must have been more or less finished in a relatively short time (c. July and August 1895).

*Work Phase 2 (until c. December 1895)*

This included the continuation of the score with the development up to the beginning of the fugue. Using paper from the C pile he obviously completed an initial version of the entire exposition, possibly including some clean copies of earlier bifolios. It is most likely that only at about this time (autumn 1895) did Bruckner decide to introduce a fugue on the principal theme. The initial sketches show that his initial idea was to introduce a regular recapitulation via a series of variants of the theme in inversion. Thereafter Bruckner undertook a re-conception of the development. The score thus developed as far as bifol. 17, the beginning of the fugue.

*Work Phase 3 (c. January to May 1896)*

Bruckner made many sketches for the fugal exposition; several discarded score bifolios with different conceptions of its initial bars are extant. The beginning of this phase is represented by bifol. 17<sup>a</sup>D, dated by Bruckner on December 16<sup>th</sup>, 1895 (FE, p. 169). By May 1896 Bruckner may well have finished the score in its primary stages, including the entire second half with the strings fully elaborated in ink and numerous indications of essential woodwind and brass lines. Sketches for the coda date from the days prior to Whitsunday (18<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> May 1896), including a reference to a bifol. »36«, suggesting that the score had advanced up to, or nearly up to, that point. In apparent confirmation of this, Bruckner's friend Franz Bayer reported on May 10<sup>th</sup> 1896 in the *Steyrer Zeitung* that the composer had »probably entirely sketched out the final movement of his Ninth Symphony« (*»den Schlußsatz seiner 9. Symphonie wohl vollständig skizziert«*).

*Work Phase 4 (c. May/June 1896)*

At this stage Bruckner obviously began completing the instrumentation and also reshaping parts of the Exposition. In doing so, he split up bifol. 2F, which had in the course of repeated revisions grown to a crowded 36 bars long, into two separate bifolios. This made it necessary to renumber all subsequent bifolios. Something similar had happened earlier during the last work phase on the first movement (see the Critical Report on the first three movements, p. 48) – by erasing and overwriting all the following numbers. This phase ended suddenly with a severe pneumonia which Bruckner contracted at the beginning of July.

*Work Phase 5 (Summer 1896)*

Although Bruckner had physically recovered quickly by July 19<sup>th</sup>, the Finale did not significantly progress any further, due to his failing mental constitution, which oscillated drastically between better and worse days. However, he still continued to work on details whenever possible. The last surviving date in the manuscripts is August 11<sup>th</sup>, when Bruckner sketched an important extension of the beginning of the development on two surviving SVE, one »13a« and one unnumbered, but obviously »13b«. He had undertaken a similar last-minute expansion earlier in the first movement (see Critical Report, p. 31ff, and its Preface, p. XIV).

By the time of Bruckner's death on 11<sup>th</sup> October 1896, the score must have comprised about 40 valid bifolios containing perhaps more than 600 bars of music. The exposition and further sections in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half were obviously finished in full score. From this last stage, five bifolios are missing today out of the 13 that comprised the exposition and five from the rest of the movement up to the last surviving bifol. 31/»32« – in all, 10 bifolios, including final versions of [»1«, [»4«, [5/»6«, [6/»7«] and [»13«] (later obviously intended to be replaced with »13a«E and »13b«E), as well as [14/»15«, [19/»20«, [24/»25«, [27/»28«] and [30/»31«. From the ensuing bifolios, at least a bifol. [32/»33«] is missing and perhaps some further bifolios from the coda extending as far as the end of the movement, all probably containing the completed strings and significant woodwind and brass entries. Hence, from the final version of the score as many as 17 bifolios – almost half – may be lost today.

## WHY ATTEMPT TO RECONSTRUCT THE FINALE?

Audience's tastes vary as far as performance versions of unfinished works by another hand are concerned. Despite their quality, some of them have been accepted over time (the Mozart/Süssmayr Requiem; Mahler/Cooke Tenth Symphony; Bartok/Serly Viola Concerto; Elgar/Payne Third Symphony), other performance versions are mostly rejected or consigned to a minor role in the world of classical music today (the Schubert/Newbould unfinished symphonies in B minor, E and D Major; Bach/Schulenberg *Contrapunctus XIV*, Liszt/Maxwell *De profundis*; Borodin/Glazunov Third; Tchaikowsky/Bogatryryev's Seventh Symphony). Arguments for or against such efforts are discussed rather irrationally under the aegis of musical critique and aesthetics. In such debates, philological research is of little concern. This is all the more remarkable when one considers the usual obsession of critics with the musical text and the concept of ›Werktreue‹ referred to above.

Music history has handed down to us fragments of all kinds. Some are purely notated ideas, that from the outset were not intended to be fully elaborated; many are simply studies; others could not be finished for biographical reasons – perhaps because their creator turned his attentions elsewhere or died during their conception. Still others are the remains of works which were once complete, but have only come down to us in fragmentary form. Is it permissible for these to be completed by others? If one attempts to answer this question one should be clear from the outset about a basic, underlying issue. »In order that music can actually sound, can really exist, it has to be placed in score; the compositional process has to be complete. This necessity leads to the fact that musical fragments play a far lesser role in the aesthetics of art than do torsos in all the other arts. On the other hand, this imperative that music must be finished – experienced at times by great musicians as a real burden – leads in many cases to the fact that works that have been ›completed‹ are nonetheless not ›perfected‹ – a most unpretentious concept. The Germans speak of Schubert's ›Unvollendete‹ (imperfected, literally), the English are more pragmatic and call it merely the ›Unfinished‹. The German concept of ›Vollendung‹ not only implies that something has been brought to an end, but that it has been brought to a conclusion in a ›perfected‹ manner. The result is almost hyperbole, which in language and in our conceptual thinking appears greater and more radical than it really is.« This is how conductor and musicologist Peter Gülke, himself a prominent editor of Schubert's fragments, has formulated the problem.

This problem was discussed even more comprehensively by conductor and composer Robert Bachmann, who directed the first performances of the Ninth in its New Critical Edition as well as the British and Russian premiere of the completed Finale: »It is merely a Utopia of a ›work idea‹ that a work should be ›perfect‹ in shape, form and content. This seems to be most likely a perverted misinterpretation by aesthetics, from which we rather suffer. The movements of the Ninth are not ›vollendet‹ (perfected). By the way, even the ›most perfect‹ work as we know it is *per definitionem* not yet ›perfected‹; it would merely be perfected in the infinite diversity of possible realisations in concert. Every performance would then become additionally a part of this realisation of a Utopia of perfection. It is simply wrong to think or speak here in terms of perfection. One has merely finished something only in order to begin its realisation. Here we simply deal with notation, with something being fixed in written form, and only thereby it became for us an inspiration to make it sounding, based on particular ideas. The word ›Vollendung‹ should not be addressed even; it is not worth it, an absurd option to think about it this way. Whoever tries to understand himself as an ›entirety‹, his being in the world not as something separated from the world around us – the latter became in the last years even an intrinsic part of our language –, whoever looks at himself as being part of the real world, won't be able to follow such an idea of ›perfection‹, since everything is in a permanent flow. Such it is with musical works being finished with a double barline.«

Bachmann asked a provocative question: »What then is perfected in Bruckner's Ninth? We have the task every time anew at least to make this work sound, and to master it on the ground of performing practice, not even to mention the spiritual ability to let Bruckner's music appear as a emanation of the divine presence. This does not matter yet when we start to rehearse it. Then consider the imponderables of a concert, and then you carry this later to the recording studio in order to realize the in itself impossible idea of the ›perfect, ultimate‹ recording of the work: that is presumption, totally beyond every reality. Even the finished work *per se*, where the composer says with a double barline ›This is the work as I have considered it to be‹, is only the beginning. There starts the search within the work. What shall constitute it, and where is its deeper truth? And so there is no ›Vollendung‹. It would

be impossible to achieve. In the best case, we are always close to achieving it, but next time failure may be even closer again. If there is any myth at all, it would be the ›Myth of the Perfected‹ and not that of the ›Unperfected‹. The world is permanently in a state of gestation, and we don't know where it comes from and where it goes to. We are ›in a flow‹ ourselves all the time; our life, the whole world is part of an incredible energetic dynamic. The music reminds us constantly that this inextinguishable force is there. It is the miracle of music-making that we can evoke this experience again and again. The concept of ›Vollendung‹ has no room here. Related to Bruckner's work we should perhaps ask: wherein lies the ›perfected‹? Perfection is in death. Only then you can discuss the man. But still it reaches out beyond this, since this work develops autonomy. Also there is no ›perfection‹, merely a physical one of the person's presence. But the work itself dissolved, and Bruckner's work is, as a whole, a ›work in progress‹ as it could not be any more modern at all. Perhaps there is one problem of the reception, that one would like to fix him to ONE work, to THE ONE symphony and not three or four, revised, edited or perhaps withdrawn versions, which, on the other hand, Bruckner did NOT destroy. He left them as they were, not because he could not get away from that, but because he let them stand there as independent works, and in his efforts to find different solutions he thus found another shape for the selfsame work. This is a very up-to-date principle of composing, that somebody out of his own material creates something new again and again.«

Whether it is really appropriate to produce a performance version of a fragment has to be determined on the individual merits of each case. How can one evaluate the surviving original material, and is it sufficient enough for a performance version? Was the material further fragmented by events in history, or did the fragmentation occur by biographical circumstances (illness, death of the composer)? And, above all: did the composer explicitly wish to complete his work or not? Mozart's Requiem, for instance, was a commissioned work. He had already got a payment of half the sum in advance, which could not have been easily returned by his widow, and the commissioner, Count Walsegg, had the right to expect a completed work. It would be a different question, however, if Mozart had agreed to our custom to perform the Requiem completed by another hand under his own name, since he had already agreed to write it anonymously and to give it out of his hands.

The pros and cons of reconstructions or performance versions of other unfinished compositions may likewise be discussed, of which perhaps two are especially problematic – Cerha's performance version of Berg's opera *Lulu* and the recent performance version of Puccini's *Turandot* by Luciano Berio. In the case of Berg, Cerha used the material as he had found it, but we now know from Berg's own surviving letters that he intended to massively re-assemble the opera's formal structure. And Puccini was simply never able to agree with his librettists on a dramaturgically satisfying end for *Turandot*. (By the way – Alfano's ending works astonishingly well here; one should only perhaps revise the instrumentation of his performance version thoroughly, which would have to be better adapted to Puccini's own instrumentation.) Certainly composers of later times may actively discuss Schubert's sketches for his last Symphony D 936a (Luciano Berio: *Rendering*), or even material from the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth (Gottfried von Einem: *Bruckner-Dialog*, which includes its Chorale Theme) in works of their own. Also, the posthumous, creative elaboration of Elgar's sketches for a Third Symphony by Anthony Payne brought such a convincing and moving result that this enrichment of the repertory was not even criticized by ingrained purists. But who would now benefit from six further elaborations of these sketches? In my opinion it exceeds the limit of good taste if only for a media sensation a composer's original concept is intentionally distorted – for instance by the commissioned work *Pluto*, which Colin Matthews incorporated into the orchestral suite *The Planets* by Gustav Holst without any good reason. And if now a composer of our time would dare to supplement the three surviving movements of Bruckner's Ninth with a brand new Finale of his own hand, neglecting the original material, would then the posthumous incapacitation of Bruckner not be perfect?

However, the attempt to reconstruct and complete the Finale seems to be admissible for various reasons. Robert Bachmann suggested that this would mean ›reconstructing a work which had already been handed down to us in large portions. In such a case I always expressed my opinion that posterity is required to preserve such a cultural heritage, quite as much as it is demanded on the premises of a well-based performing practice. From all we know about the history of this movement, it was absolutely necessary to make it somehow performable. It is almost an act of barbarity to uphold the fatal situation of presuming the symphony might already be ›perfected‹ as a three-movement-torso. (...) This is arrogance built on ignorance and not on passion in philosophical terms, nor on love

for the music or the work, not to mention respect for the composer himself. Let us imagine this in the fine arts – somebody goes straight into a national gallery and attacks a painting with acid. Without any delay all necessary efforts would be undertaken to rescue that painting, and if possible reconstruct it based on the knowledge what it looked like. Now let us assume that during this rescue one were also to find some earlier layers of the painting, hitherto unknown – hence one would perhaps start to reconstruct something which has not yet been seen, but which is possible to reconstruct based on sufficient scientific criteria. I would like to explain this further: let us assume it is a picture of a man. He has his limbs, he has his head. Even if the forearm were missing one would still know there has to be a hand with five fingers (unless the artist wanted to show a cripple or monster). Transfer this back to the issue of what survives from Bruckner's Finale, the solution should be the same – meticulous reconstruction, based on established scientific research. Not only is this legitimate; one has an obligation to do so, in particular in music, since this is a linear medium, manifesting itself in the dimension of time. Hence, one should not let a work break off which exists almost finished, especially if one knows from established information what was intended for the missing conclusion. Certainly some speculation remains. But such speculation is also to be found in what precedes. There is no such thing as a final version of the first three movements of Bruckner's Ninth, as if what he left was already his ›last word‹. We know from the practice of performing this work that many questions remain unsolved – regarding tempi, refinements in dynamics *etc.* Bruckner had the habit of ›finalising‹ a composition once more at the end, and this is missing here as well.«

Even if a final double barline is nowhere to be found in the extant material today, one can scan the entire movement surprisingly well, due to Bruckner's systematic approach to composing and the surviving earlier stages. For this purpose, techniques of reconstruction are required that are not only legitimate in the natural sciences, but vital if one wishes to demonstrate certain processes. Unfortunately, in other fields such reconstruction techniques are accepted far more than in music: In medicine, victims of accidents are more than grateful for the possibility of replacing lost parts of their body by plastic surgery. In forensic pathology such reconstructions are of great value. This was demonstrated very effectively in 1977, when in the eponymous TV series Dr. Quincy reconstructed from a single femur not only the general appearance of the deceased but also that of his murderer (*The Thigh Bone's Connected to the Knee Bone* by Lou Shaw, also available as a novel by Thom Racina).

Reconstructions are also well known in the fine arts and archaeology. Paintings, torsos of sculptures, mosaics and fresco, shipwrecks, castles, theatres (Venice), Churches (Dresden), and even entire ancient villages have been successfully reconstructed. The resistance in musicology to the use of such techniques for musical scores may come from the fact that in the 20<sup>th</sup> century the dogma of ›the one and only‹, untouchable text of a ›final version‹ became established. Hence in musicology to this day the search for the presumably ›authentic‹ dominates over the ›trivial‹, and grants canonical status to the ›original artwork‹ only. But what do we have to lose if, in full awareness of editorial responsibility and knowledge of the philological foundations, we try to reconstruct a movement on which the composer himself had worked hard and for a long period of time, but which then was in part lost due to the senseless attitudes of posterity? [disrespectful action was far too weak

Moreover, in this case speculation can be much reduced, since Bruckner himself already made analytical and music-theoretical adjustments and examinations again and again, which are understandable from the standpoint of a thorough knowledge of his ›scientific‹ approach to composing. Among his rules regarding composition, harmony and counterpoint is his systematic control of arsis and thesis in metrical periods, regulated by his metrical numbers, his use of ›Kustoden‹ (i. e. voice-leading shorthand), his tendency to compose in block-like structures and sequences of regular eight-bar periods, as well as the systematic notational layout of the composition itself. The assertion that Bruckner did not write anything worthwhile for the fourth movement is thus already untenable from a philological point of view. Some scholars realised this early on. Already in 1949, Hans Ferdinand Redlich wrote that »every single bar is carried forward by the overwhelming momentum of an imagination nothing short than Michelangesque. The astonishing originality of the architectural plan deserves special praise in its own right.« That it remains customary to perform just the first three movements represents a gross injustice to the composer. Bruckner even expressly ordered – what other composer was so far-sighted? – that in the event of his death, his *Te Deum* should be performed as the best possible substitute for the missing Finale.

We owe it to the conductor of the first performance, Ferdinand Löwe, that the composer's injunction is so rarely followed. Löwe's conviction that the Ninth made sense in its truncated, three-movement form rapidly became the accepted doctrine. On the other hand, the Te Deum does actually constitute a worthy ›substitute Finale‹ for many reasons. The tonal tendencies within the symphony would allow an interpretation of the first three movements making a kind of cadence into the C major of the Te Deum, especially since Gustav Mahler had already experimented with progressive keys. Even the harsh Bruckner critic Max Kalbeck referred to a »pedantic and outmoded ban« after Löwe's performance: »After the E major of the Adagio, C major sounds neither better nor worse than D minor would have.« And it is true that, even today, many critics still regard such a C major ending to the Ninth to be out of question, although the E major close of the Adagio doesn't seem to bother them particularly. Further prejudices against the Te Deum as a Finale result from Löwe's own performing practice, which juxtaposed the original orchestration of the Te Deum of the first edition with his own, ›Berliozesque‹ arrangement. Nowadays, a choir, four soloists and an organ mean additional costs for any concert promoter, and – to be honest: most concert-goers are already perfectly satisfied with 60 minutes of Bruckner.

### **A ›WORK IN PROGRESS‹: THE COMPLETED PERFORMANCE VERSION**

In 1983, Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca initiated the arduous task of completing the final movement of Anton Bruckner's Ninth Symphony in D minor, a movement originally almost complete in its conception, but today only partially extant. The first phase, finished in 1985, was published by Ricordi and subsequently recorded for CD with Eliahu Inbal (Teldec) and Gennadij Roshdestvenskij (Melodiya) conducting. Giuseppe Mazzuca, after the 1985 Ricordi publication, showed no further interest in the Finale. At about the same time, Nicola Samale started a collaboration with the present writer and developed with him further phases of the score, recorded, for instance, by Hubert Soudant for the Netherlands Broadcasting Company NCRV (Producer: Cornelis van Zwol) as well as live by Samale himself and released on CD by Melodram Italia. The latter already included important new features – apart from massive changes in instrumentation, also for the first time the realization of a final *Halleluja* in D major, based upon the *non confundar* motif, further elaborated by me in 1989. In 1990, Samale also began collaborating with Australian scholar John A. Phillips, who re-evaluated earlier philological findings and correlated them with his own research on the manuscripts. They substantially revised the reconstruction of bifolio 1, the Gesangsperiode, the chorale reprise, the entire instrumentation and placed the SPMC realisation of the coda, using what Phillips first identified as Bruckner's late sketches of May 1896, into what very largely remains its definitive form. Phillips later published his findings in his Thesis (University of Adelaide, 2002) as well as in his volumes within the Bruckner Complete Edition. At the proposal of Herbert Vogg, Phillips summarised his and Samale's current understanding of the philology of what Phillips first recognised as the ›emergent autograph score‹ of the Finale in his ›Reconstruction of the Autograph Score‹, published in 1994 by Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna. His ›Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten‹ for the Finale (›Facsimile Edition of all Surviving Musical Autographs‹; =FE), which followed in 1996, made available to a wider public, for the first time, all that survived for this movement from Bruckner's own hand. It serves as an indispensable reference source for the Conclusive Revised Edition (=CRE). Phillips also edited the next phase of the score, which appeared in self-publication in 1992 in Adelaide and Bremen, later becoming known as the Samale-Phillips-Cohrs-Mazzuca, or SPCM version (=PV 1992).

This version, premiered 1991 by the Bruckner-Orchester Linz under Manfred Mayrhofer, was rather successful – almost 40 performances in nine countries, by 17 orchestras under 14 conductors, including a Studio-CD-Production (Bruckner Orchester Linz, Kurt Eichhorn/Camerata Tokyo), a Live-CD-Recording (Neue Philharmonie Westfalen, Johannes Wildner/SonArte), a Studio-Radio-Production (BBC) and three Live-Radio-Recordings (Netherlands Broadcasting Company, Hilversum; *DeutschlandRadio*, Cologne; *Bayrischer Rundfunk*, Munich) between 1991 and 2003. The Completed Performance Version (=CPV) gained additional support from the ›Documentation of the Finale Fragment‹ (=DFF), edited by Phillips, first performed by the Wiener Symphoniker under Nikolaus Harnoncourt (Vienna, 1999), and repeated by the same conductor with the Wiener Philharmoniker, performed in Salzburg in 2002 and later issued on CD by RCA/BMG Classics; this production also used for the first time the present writer's Critical New Edition of the first three movements.

Why then publish a newly revised score? Above all, the authors maintain that two equally important approaches are both valid in making this music performable – a) the sonic realisation of the surviving manuscripts themselves, as in the DFF, suitable for workshop concerts, concert introductions or media presentation; as well as b) a completed performance version which would allow at least an approximate impression of the Ninth Symphony as a four movement unity. While the DFF allows one to compare the surviving material with its completions in aural experience, listeners want to hear MUSIC in a concert, not philology. For this reason we do not understand the motivation behind conflating these two approaches, as was attempted in the *Ricostruzione* by Neill/Gastaldi (1962). Philological questions should certainly be addressed in scholarly debate, but what is the point of producing a score which would necessarily still include speculative reconstructions of lost portions, while not making any use of the substantial sketch material that survives for the coda? Apart from ignoring the audience, which, after all, does not consist mainly of scholars, this approach could only replace the old legend of a three movement Ninth as being sufficiently ›vollendet‹ by a new myth of an ›Unfinished‹ – this time with an even more clearly audible break.

Other fragments should teach us that reality may be totally different from legend in any case: Bach's *Kunst der Fuge*, for instance, did not only survive in a complete, initial version (Christoph Wolff, Ed.; Peters 1986) much too rarely considered by performers – but according to modern research, the famous, incomplete quadruple fugue was finished long before the composer's death, its conclusion lost on its way to the engraver, who finally decided himself to fill up the space reserved for the missing final section with other, fitting music of Bach. (In 2007, Ton Koopman even assumed that C. P. E. Bach did not include the ending of this fugue in order to maintain the fragmentary character of the work). The performance version of *Contrapunctus XIV* by David Schulenberg (1992, the only one based on philological research so far) has even been included in the Bärenreiter Urtext Edition (Klaus Hofmann, Ed., Kassel 1998), but performers almost never dare to play this brave and convincing attempt at a completion, and people still prefer the abrupt stop – not to mention the fact that, as Butler pointed out, the quadruple fugue was perhaps not even the final piece of the cycle; more likely, Bach intended to conclude with the four canons.

The present writer and Nicola Samale have had the opportunity to conduct the Ninth and the Finale on various occasions since 1985; each performance brought new insights. Finally, in 2003 we became convinced that a revision of the entire score should be the next step, and Samale, as the initiator of this project, decided to prepare a new edition together. This was published 2005 as Study Score 444 of the Repertoire Explorer series at Musikproduktion Höflich, Munich. Subsequent performances as well as new manuscript research undertaken by me in preparation of my dissertation (University of Hamburg, 2008) brought further new insights, requiring various corrections and revisions, to be included in a revised reprint. This version of the Finale received its première in Stockholm (8 & 9 November 2007; Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra, Daniel Harding) and was later recorded by the Mannheim Academy Orchestra under Friedemann Layer (2008). Nevertheless, further insights led to a new discussion and to the revision being presented here.

Such a protracted process in the development and publication of a score may appear as being confusing to outsiders, however, it is not without precedent in History of Editions. An example taken from literature may serve as an illustration. The scholar Stefan Schenk-Haupt demonstrated in his comprehensive study on A. Pope and T. S. Eliot (*Dulness Never Dies*, Europäische Hochschulschriften 399, Peter Lang, Frankfurt 2003) that *The Dunciad* by Alexander Pope – a book holding a key position in the 18<sup>th</sup> century – should not only be understood as ›work in progress‹, being developed between 1728 and 1743 (i.e. c. 15 years), and in at least four work phases, but also has been published during this time in 15 editions corrected or authorised by Pope himself, as well as in three further ›pirate editions‹, in all, 18 editions and 59 further reprints, many of them available simultaneously on the market. Similarly, the CRE of the Finale only represents a further stage of a ›work in progress‹, which could be considered finished only under the condition that all lost score bifolios had come back to light – apart from the fact that a ›final‹ evaluation of details was rendered impossible by Bruckner's death in any case.

Some of the changes presented in this score are the result of new philological research and insight. Others merely represent variants and not necessarily ›improvements‹, but based on now almost 20 years of experience in examining, discussing, editing and performing this music. This also comprises the new elaboration of what were

hitherto believed to be gaps within the exposition Gesangsperiode and the fugue (now fully established from the original sketches) as well as many refinements of instrumentation, phrasing, articulation, dynamics and tempi. Particularly in the coda many changes have been undertaken in order to give a more coherent impression of these important final bars. From a fresh re-examination of the manuscripts it was possible to find some convincing new solutions, binding the music even better together. This impression was confirmed by some notable Brucknerians, for instance, well-known author Prof. Harry Halbreich, who, after listening to my own complete performance of the Ninth (Gmunden 2002), enthusiastically wrote to the present writer in May 2003: »This is to express my admiration for this last version of the Finale for Bruckner's Ninth. For years I remained sceptical about this undertaking and also the highly problematical movement in general. But now the coherence and integrity awaited for a long time seems to be achieved. The piece now sounds totally organic and unified, the few transitions in question successfully abridged, and above all, the coda now grows as a matter of course out of all the movements preceding, not only the Finale. As in every great work of Bruckner, the ›bridge-maker‹ (he so well deserves his last name!) successfully closed the giant arc between the opening and final bars – musically and spiritually now finally a sufficient whole. In short, I don't think one could come much further with the surviving manuscripts, unless unknown, new material would come to light – not very likely, but not absolutely impossible. This last version needs to be urgently printed now, and made available for musical performance. Good luck! In admiration, Harry Halbreich«

The authors decided to follow such wishes, and to ignore the possibility that a certain confusion could arise from the existence of newly revised › Fassungen ‹, since they are convinced that the CRE of the CPV will decisively contribute to the comprehensive impression of the Finale on its own as well as of the symphony as a whole. Philological research undertaken during the last decades had already revealed beyond doubt that Bruckner did not leave a pile of disconnected sketches for the Finale, but actually an emergent autograph score, most likely complete in at least its primary work phase almost half a year prior to Bruckner's death. The surviving manuscripts constitute material from various work phases, which could be combined to a surprisingly complete extent; for only very few bars did no material survive at all. It was possible to cover such gaps not so much by using › free composition ‹, but merely a technique of › synthesis ‹ (similar to reconstruction techniques in forensic medicine and plastic surgery), in which the musical fabric of lost bars has been restored to a certain extent from deductive analysis, observing the material before and after the gap as well as an awareness of Bruckner's own, remarkably › scientific ‹ approach to composing, hence to dispense with free composition in any sense.

The PV 1992 had a hard time to this day: despite its almost 40 performances and productions even in important cities such as Berlin, Brussels, Frankfurt, London, Munich, Moscow and Tokyo, the classical music establishment showed little interest, and star-conductors avoid the completed Finale. The reasons for this may be left undecided here, though, the most well known conductors of the Finale – Peter Gülke, Philippe Herreweghe, Elisha Inbal and Gennadij Roshdestvenskij – deserve mention. A similarly small number of critics warmly welcomed the performance version. Hence, it is still very controversial for the › musical public ‹, despite the fact that the basic information provided by published texts and printed music, CD productions and performances has been around since the mid-eighties. The debate was taken up again only following autumn 2003, when two important CD productions were internationally released – the first release of the Critical New Edition of movements 1–3 plus the › Documentation of the Finale Fragment ‹, played by the *Wiener Philharmoniker* conducted by Nikolaus Harnoncourt (RCA/BMG), as well as the entire Ninth including the CPV 1992 (rev. 1996), recorded live with the New Philharmonia Orchestra of Westphalia under Johannes Wildner, re-released on Naxos and thus available worldwide. At about the same time, the above-mentioned *Musik-Konzepte* Vols. 120/121/122 appeared, which presented some key results of the philological research on the sources of the Finale.

The present writer collected more than 100 reports and reviews on these three publications (in both English and German) between summer 2003 and 2004. However, music criticism once again gave a poor account of itself. Critics found at least some well-worded compliments for the recording of the Finale fragment under Harnoncourt, but also often enough hymns of praise not underlined by facts. On the other hand, the reviews on the Naxos recording once more displayed only the well-known prejudices, sometimes using critical remarks on the artistic quality of the production against the performance version itself, quite often in a rude manner, or even defaming its

authors. Vienna critic Walter Dobner naively upheld the clichéd objection to Bruckner's own intentions in the *Mitteilungsblätter der Bruckner-Gesellschaft* in December 2003: »Nevertheless, Harnoncourt's manner of performing what remained from the Finale and in doing so to open up perspectives is by no means unproblematic, since he gives the impression that Bruckner's Ninth, despite being in three movements, is less than perfect, which it is not, not as much as other unfinished works ...«

Only exceptionally few critics accepted their responsibility to gain sufficient information on the topic. In general, debate over the facts themselves continued to be rejected. Instead, the tendency to switch into purely aesthetic argument is clearly apparent. Illuminatingly, the sole fact that the renowned Nikolaus Harnoncourt and *Wiener Philharmoniker* – virtually the »Keepers of the Holy Grail« in occidental orchestral tradition – performed and recorded the Finale fragment, seemed to make this movement fit for polite society. More than half of the collected reports appeared on this topic, and almost no critic dared any longer to question the quality of Bruckner's music itself, or the basic value of such a »Documentation of the Finale Fragment«. On the other hand, the published sources for the Ninth still remain to be reviewed or become the subject of scholarly debate. It may well take years before the information provided here may find any broader interest. Furthermore, musicians, as Nikolaus Harnoncourt pointed out, have almost no experience of playing this music yet, in effect making it for them »contemporary« to some degree, and hence it may well be simply too early to talk about the possible results of the publication of the Finale in regard to the reception of the Ninth. But it is clear that the new findings on the Finale still await vastly better recognition than it is the case today, if one wishes to comprehend Bruckner's own ideas about the Ninth – if the lack of interest shown in the Finale is not to be seen as a capitulation before the mass of new information and material on the subject. The eminent Bruckner scholar Elisabeth Maier even spoke out in a review in June 2004 that there may well be more than a handful of colleagues, »which are not capable of or unwilling to work through the ten volumes on the Ninth«.

Audience reaction, however, to the possibility of experiencing the believed-lost Finale in sound, as witnessed by many letters to the authors as well as statements in internet-newsgroups, was overwhelmingly positive. A letter from Gerd Fassbender (Mönchengladbach, Germany) may be quoted here as representative: »It is my concern to wholeheartedly thank you and your colleagues for the wonderful reconstruction of the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony. As with most music enthusiasts and admirers of Bruckner, I had also thought for ages that the Ninth would remain unfinished for eternity, which is certainly still true somehow. However, I can hardly express in words what I felt when listening to the completed version. I had already read much on Bruckner's original plans with this Finale. But what then came out in sound was just thrilling and great, in particular the very ending, which arises from an apparent breakdown into nothing up into a glory which must simply be moving for every listener to music. Does it really play a role then that this is not 100% by Bruckner himself? Without any prejudice: if one did not know that Bruckner was not able to complete the Finale, one would not notice that this music is indeed a reconstructed, not fully authentic version, so congenially have you and your colleagues [...] found the typical Brucknerian tone. I would like to wish your work now by all means many performances, since I cannot imagine that esteemed conductors could avoid this version of the Finale and continue to perform [...] three movements only without being accused of a know-it-all attitude. This opens up a chance to make the magnificence of the original Finale available to]a large audience.«

The interpreter therefore has a number of choices: He can combine performances with the DFF in order to give at least an idea of Bruckner's concept. He can also adhere to Bruckner's own wish and round off the three movements with the *Te Deum* (certainly nobody would have objections to performing it after an interval following the *Adagio*). And last but not least, the symphony can also be ended with the CPV – a score that was produced with next to no new composition, and used restoration techniques familiar from the fine arts or indeed, from plastic surgery. However, it should go without saying that »music-forensic« arrangements like the DFF or CPV can only have a provisional status: Such works aim to give the interested listener an idea of music that, strictly speaking, must be regarded as lost. And, at the same time, these projects also represent a »work in progress«, since we can by no means rule out the possibility of lost material coming to light again. Only in summer 2003 a previously unknown page of sketches (c. June 1895) came to light in a private collection – originally from the estate of a Munich critic. Also serious rumours about an Austrian autograph collector remain, who is said to own several of

the hitherto unknown score bifolios, but selfishly keeps them under lock and key. Be that as it may, the fact remains: if we want to do justice to Bruckner's own wishes, we need finally to bid farewell to the transfiguration of the Adagio as the ›true Finale‹ of the Ninth. The boldness of the composer's original concept of a fourth movement doesn't fit into the popular Bruckner cliché that so many people adhere to. If we were not looking at ›the Finale‹ here, but simply some ›Toccata infernale‹ found amongst the papers of a composer like Liszt, then the music itself would doubtless find easier acceptance. And one is more inclined to accept a compromise solution worked out with care and love – good examples are the Mahler/Cooke Tenth or Elgar/Payne Third – than to throw away this bold movement entirely, when so much has actually survived. Even in the fragmentary form that it has come down to us, this is still Bruckner's very own music and an indispensable part of a symphony that he designed in four movements. Anyone who pretends in retrospect that Bruckner needs to be ›protected from himself‹, as it were, can be accused of arrogance, and reveals the deepest lack of respect to the composer.

## REQUISITE RECONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION WORK

The authors have frequently been asked to what extent the movement was completed by Bruckner himself, how much original material survived, what kind of reconstruction or completion had to be undertaken, and above all, how much composition by foreign hand it contains. In advance of the detailed Introduction and Commentary to the printed score, the following section provides a comprehensive overview in answer to such questions.

As already explained above, *Work Phase 5* the emergent autograph score must have seen the composition of at least 36, perhaps up to 40 bifolios, well over 600 bars, by June 1896. We have good reason to assume that Bruckner completed the entire exposition in full score (12 bifolios with over 200 bars) and completed the remainder (at least 24, or perhaps as many as four bifolios more, comprising c. 400 to 450 bars) at least in the initial score stage (the strings fully elaborated, annotations of woodwind and brass entries, some pages already fully orchestrated). Today, out of this last phase, 10 bifolios are lost up to the abrupt break-off of the score, as well as at least four, perhaps up to eight bifolios from the coda, a total of 14 to 18 bifolios, hence almost the half of the bifolios from *Work Phase 5*. Apart from this, a large amount of material from earlier work phases survived – discarded score bifolios, SVE (explained above), sketches for continuity and details. In order to be able to reconstruct and complete the continuity of the movement, an intimate knowledge is required of the work processes which Bruckner followed systematically throughout years and years of compositional practice.

Already from the surviving previous material for the first three movements (in particular for the first movement) we can draw conclusions important for the work on the Finale. Furthermore, a thorough examination of the work phases and compositional changes during the genesis of the Finale is indispensable. Some of the last surviving bifolios show that Bruckner fixed certain passages very early and did not significantly alter them in later phases, for instance, the chorale theme, of which many bifolios from the early work phases remained unaltered to the very end. On the contrary, other sections were worked over and over again, particularly the beginning of the Finale up to the end of the principal theme with its various versions, before Bruckner found a final solution in a very late work phase. (A full record of the sources and their use in the present score is given on the following pages.)

Obviously the results of a reconstruction and completion cannot compensate for the loss of the original material, and even less that of a score finished by Bruckner himself. On the other hand, when Bruckner died, the Finale had not only been fixed in an almost definitive text, laid out in a musically and structurally matured primary stage – some of its sections already had been developed beyond this. Since it was now possible to fully bridge two of the earlier assumed gaps within the exposition and fugue with material from Bruckner's sketches, also reducing the total length of this version, the quantity of original material used being significantly increased.

From the 653 bars of the CRE, 557 bars are from Bruckner himself (440 bars from surviving score bifolios, 117 bars of continuity drafts). From the 96 bars supplemented, 83 were restored via repetition, sequence or transposition of original material; merely 13 bars have been synthesised by the authors without immediate precedent, and less than two thirds of the whole had to be subsequently orchestrated. This is, in all, less than 4 minutes of music and much less than Franz Xaver Süssmayr's input into Mozart's Requiem: Mozart himself left only 83 bars in full score and 594 bars of continuity in vocal parts and bass. 189 out of 866 bars (=c. 22%, or 11 min. of music) have been composed by Süssmayr, 783 bars instrumented by him – almost the entire work. Despite this, the Mo-

zart/Süssmayr Requiem remains extremely popular. Why apply two different standards here? To demonstrate this, a comparative overview of both performance versions follows on p. 18. The following passages had to be reconstructed or completed, in order to restore the movement as much as possible.

- 1.) The final phase from the beginning of the movement, most likely a bifolio [»1«E], of 16 bars length, as indicated in the manuscripts. For such a reconstruction sufficient material survived, giving credibility to the solution presented here.
- 2.) The climax of the principal theme and the transition to the Gesangsperiode (lit. Gesangsperiode, Bruckner's term for his second theme groups), notated on a missing bifolio [»4«], of 16 or perhaps 18 bars length. Its content is preserved in discarded bifolios and sketches.
- 3.) Bifolios [5/»6«] and [6/»7«] of the Gesangsperiode, their content being preserved largely in discarded bifolios and sketches.
- 4.) The beginning of the development, which presents two possibilities: a) the reconstruction of a last-valid, lost bifolio [12/»13«] of 16 bars length (as Phillips demonstrated; see *Musik-Konzepte* Vol. 120–22, p. 43), or b) respecting Bruckner's last expansion, as given in two surviving SVE, one »13a« (Bruckner) and one subsequently written, yet unnumbered SVE of both 16 bars length. Despite the fact that the last page of »13b« is empty, requiring a gap of four bars to be bridged, the authors already decided in 1985 to elaborate the latter possibility, as in the first movement, where Bruckner similarly decided upon a last-minute expansion in order to intensify the characteristic zone of stillness at the beginning of the development.
- 5.) The missing bifolio [14/»15«] from the development. For its 16 bars, eight were restored from the surrounding bars and from earlier drafts; for the remaining eight bars material was no longer extant.
- 6.) Bifolio [19/»20«D] including bars 33 to 48 of the fugue. Later philological research made it possible to fully recover these 16 bars from the surviving sketches.
- 7.) Bifolio [24/»25«] including sections of the Gesangsperiode recapitulation. The music was fully recoverable from the corresponding section of the exposition and the extant sketches.
- 8.) Bifolio [27/»28«] at the end of the Gesangsperiode recapitulation. Here the sketches end after 16 bars, however, the metrical numbers of the sketch compared with those on the surviving 28E/»29« suggest a gap of four or eight bars. Since the music is directed towards a »Schluß d-moll« (Bruckner), which was certainly the climax of a crescendo and had to have some weight, as well as for other reasons explained below, the authors decided for the longer option, restored here using the techniques of repetition and sequence.
- 9.) Bifolio [30/»31«] in the chorale recapitulation. These 16 bars could be restored as an inversion from the parallel passage of the exposition, a solution already proposed by Samale and Mazzuca in 1985 and which had found definitive form in the 1992 score.
- 10.) Bifolio [32/»33«] comprising the end of the chorale recapitulation. The exact length of the missing section between the end of bifolio 31E/»32« and this sketch is not known, but the metrical numbers as well as a comparison with the parallel passage at the end of the Development make clear that it could have been only very few bars. The CRE has found a rather short, yet convincing transition, ending the period begun on 31E/»32« with its two missing bars, adding one further eight bar period, taken from the first four bars of the previous period, augmented and transposed into G major, formed by sequence and repetition, and a truncated return of the principal theme of the first movement in the unison tonic, ending characteristically with the dominant key and a fermata before the beginning of the coda.
- 11.) For the coda itself, significant sketches survived for the important sections, namely, a) 28 bars of the initial crescendo, built on the motto from the beginning of the movement; b) sketches for a chorale-like ascent of which the first five bars can be most readily deciphered, and which prepared c) the final cadence of the movement, sketched in 16 bars, and d) eight bars of the certainly final pedalpoint on D. Additionally, several clues from witnesses and secondary literature were of significant value here.

**TABLE I: The Sources for the Finale as used in the CRE 2012  
(Concordance with FE and PV 1992)**

CRE (bars)	PV 1992	Bifol.	FE (page)	Length	Metrical Numbers	Condition / Structure
1–16	1–16	»1«E	--- 67–70 95–8	16	1–4; 1-[2–5]-6–8; 1–2; 1–2-	Reconstr. [»1«E] (16) from: 1 <sup>d</sup> C, t. 1–5, 8–9, 14–16, 21–24 SVE 1 <sup>e</sup> E; Sketch FE p. 3 & 12
17–34	17–34	»2«E	135–8	18	-3–4; 1–8; 1–4; 1–4-	Finished, valid bifol.
35–50	35–50	»3«E	139–42	16	-5–12; 1–8-	Finished, valid bifol.
51–68 [51–66?]	51–68	[»4«E]	--- 131 143–6	18? 16?	-9–10-[-11–12; 1–4;] 1–8; 1–2-? 9–10-[-11–12; 1–4;] 1–8;?	Reconstr.[»4«E] from: 2F, last 2 b. (finished instr.) and text from 3A
69–84	69–80; 83–86	4C/»5«	151–4	16	-3–8; 1–2- [-;1–8];	4C/»5« still »giltig« (= valid)?
67–82? 67–84? 67–86?		[»5«] ?		16? 18? 20?	1–8; 1–8? 1–2; 1–8; 1–8? 1–2; 1–8; 1–2; 1–8?	Or a re-copied [»5«] lost?
85–100	99–114	[5/»6«]	--- 33 164–6	16	[1–8]; 1–8; 1–4- -5–8; 1–8	Reconstr. [5/»6«] (4-4-4-4) from: Sk., 4.–6. syst., and 5B, last 12 b.
101–18	115–32	[6/»7«]	--- 173–6	18 18	1–6 (or 1–3; 1–3); 1–8; 1–4- 1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–4	Reconstr. [6/»7«] (18 b.) from: 6 <sup>c</sup> B, almost compl.
119–36	133–50	7C/»8«	181–4	18	-5–8; 1–6; 1–2; 1–6-	Finished, valid bifol.
137–52	151–66	8B/»9«	189–92	16	-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-	Finished, valid bifol.
153–68	167–82	9B/»10«	193–6	16	-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-	Finished, valid bifol.
169–84	183–98	10A/»11«	197–200	16	-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-	Finished, valid bifol.
185–200	199–214	11A/»12«	201–4	16	-7–12; 1–8; 1–2-	Finished, valid bifol.
201–16	215–30	»13a«E	217–20 205–7	16	-3–8; [1–8; 1–2-] -7–8; 1–8	SVE, instr. & supplemented from: 12C, first 10 b.
217–32	231–46	= »13b«E	221–4 213–6	16	[-3–12; 1–6-] -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-	Incompl. SVE, instr.; part. supplemented from: SVE »13« <sup>b</sup> E
233–48	247–62	13E/»14«	225–8	16	-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-	Bifol. almost complete
249–64	263–78	[14/»15«]	--- 207f	16	-7–8; 1–6-[-7–8; 1–6-]	Reconstr. [14/»15«] (16 b.) from: 12C, last 8 b.; Connection to 15D/»16« synthesized from the surviving (8 b.).
265–80	279–94	15D/»16«	253–6	16	-7–8; 1–6; 1–4; 1–4-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
281–96	295–310	16C/»17«	257–60	16	-5–8; 1–12;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
297–312	311–26	17 <sup>c</sup> D/»18«	277–80	16	1–8; 1–8;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
313–28	327–42	18D/»19«	281–4	16	1–4; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3-;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
329–44	343–58	[19/»20«]	--- 21 23	16	-4–8; 1–8; 1–3;	Reconstr. [19/»20«] (16 b.) from: Sketches on 18D/»19«; Sk., 3. & 4.syst., b. 33–41 and 1. syst., last b., 2., 3. & 5. syst.
345–60	359–74	20F/»21«	285–8	16	1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–2-	Bifol. almost complete

CRE (bars)	PV 1992	Bifol.	FE (page)	Length	Metrical Numbers	Condition / Structure
361–76	375–90	<b>21D/»22«</b>	289–92	16	-3–8; 1–8; 1–2-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
377–92	391–406	<b>22D/»23«</b>	293–6	16	-3–8; 1–8; 1–2-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
393–408	407–22	<b>23D/»24«</b>	297–300	16	-3–12; 1–6-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
409–24	423–38	<b>[24/»25«]</b>	--- 24 25 165–66	16	-7–8; 1–8; 1–6- -7–8; 1–[2]–3–[»4«]- -5–8; 1–6;	Reconstr. [24/»25«] (16 b.) from: Sk., 2. syst., 6 b.; 3. syst., 4 b. and 5B, 6 b., Str. almost complete
425–40	439–54	<b>25D/»26«</b>	301–4	16	-7–8; 1–6; 1–8;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
441–56	455–70	<b>26F/»27«</b>	305–8	16	1–4; 1–8; 1–4;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
457–80	471–94	<b>[27/»28«]</b>	--- 24 25	24	1–8; 1–8-[9–12; 1–4-] 1–8; 1–4- 5–8; »Schluß d-moll«	Reconstr. [27/»28«] (24 b.) from: Sk., 3. & 4. syst., 12 b. and 1. syst., 4 b.; 8 b. synth. from 26f/»27«, last 4 b. (transp.) and beginning of 28E/»29«
481–96	495–510	<b>28E/»29«</b>	309–12	16	5–6; 1–12; 1–2-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
497–512	511–26	<b>29E/»30«</b>	313–6	16	-3–8; 1–8; 1–2-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
513–28	527–42	<b>[30/»31«]</b>	---	16	[-3–12; 1–6-]	Reconstr. [30/»31«] (16 b.) from: Inversion of the Chorale, respecting last 2 b. from 29E/»30« and first 2 b. from 31E/»32«
529–44	543–62	<b>31E/»32«</b>	317–20	16	-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
FROM THIS POINT ONWARDS, THE REMAINING SCORE BIFOLIOS ARE NO LONGER EXTANT						
545–60	563–72; 573–78	<b>[32E/»33«]</b>	--- 319f	16?	[-7–8; 1–8;]1–8-	Reconstr. [32/»33«] from: 31E/»32«, 2 b. continued, b. 11–14 transp., and augmented to 8 b. truncated return of Principal Theme of 1 <sup>st</sup> mvmt.
561–84	579–602	<b>[33/»34«]</b>	--- 6	24?	1–8; 1–8; 1–8 1–8; 1–8; 1–8;	Hypothetical [33/»34«] (24 b.) from: Sk., 1.–3. syst., first 24 b. (transp.)
585–600	603–18	<b>[34/»35«]</b>	--- ---	16?	1–4; [1–8; 1–4] 1–4 [1–8; 1–4;]	Hypoth. [34/»35«] (16 b.) from: Sk., 4. syst., 4 b. synth. Coagmentation of Principal Themes
601–16	619–34	<b>[35/»36«]</b>	--- 305 45	16?	[1–8;] 1–4-[5–8] [1–8] 1–4-[5-]-6-[7–8;]	Reconstr. [35/»36«] (16 b.) from: Chorale: first 4 b. from 26F/»27« augm., Sk. 5 b.; 3 b. continuation synth.
617–32	635–50	<b>[36/»37«]</b>	--- 47	16?	1–8; 1–8; 1–8; 1–8;	Reconstr. [36/»37«] (16 b.) from: Sk., cadence, 16 b.
633–51	667–87	<b>[37/»38«]</b>	--- 47 ---	21?	1–8; [1–4;1–4;] [1–5]	Hypoth. [37/»38«] from: Sk., pedalpoint, last 8 b.; Final Pleno / <i>Halleluja</i>

## TABLE II: Reconstruction Work on the Finale, compared with Mozart's Requiem

Abbreviations of instruments as original in German, according to the score; annotations on supplemented scoring in italics; reconstructed bars additionally bold; length of sections in square brackets; formal sections from the Finale as in the tabular analysis; sections from Mozart's Requiem as given in Christoph Wolff, *Mozarts Requiem*, p. 74 (Kassel 1991).

### Wolfgang Amadé Mozart, Requiem KV 626 (unfinished) Completion by Franz Xaver Süssmayr, 1790/91

#### I. INTROITUS & KYRIE (100 bars)

*Requiem* (48): Vocal parts & Basso Continuo (V/B) by Mozart; Instrumentation begun by Mozart, possibly not entirely completed by him.

*Instrumentation finished by Süssmayr and Freystädler.*

*Kyrie* (52): V/B Mozart; *Instrumentation in two unknown hands; final version by Süssmayr.*

#### II. SEQUENTIA (332) [+22]

*Dies irae* (68): V/B, Str. 1–4, Viol. 1 5–9, 19–31, 40–57, 65–68 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süssmayr.*

*Tuba mirum* (62): V/B, Pos. 1–19, Viol. 44–62 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süssmayr.*

*Rex tremendae* (22): V/B, Viol. 1 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süssmayr.*

*Recordare* (130) V/B, 1–13, 126–30 compl., also Viol. 1 34–38, 52f, 68–79, 109f, Viol. 2 109f, Vla. 52f Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süssmayr.*

*Confutatis* (40): V/B, Viol. 1 7–12, 17–40, Viol. 2 38–40; B.-Hrn., Fag. 26–29 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süssmayr.*

*Lacrymosa* (8) [+22]: 1–2 vollst.; 3–8 V/B Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süssmayr. 9–30 [22] Composition by Süssmayr.* (c. 11–18 sketched by Mozart?)

[*Amen* (16): Vocal sketch for exposition by Mozart; *not elaborated by Süssmayr.*]

#### III. OFFERTORIUM (167)

*Domine Jesu* (43): V/B, Viol. 1–43 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süssmayr.*

*Quam olim* (35): V/B, Viol. 1 1–3, 24–35, Viol. 2 24–28 Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süssmayr.*

*Hostias* (54): V/B, 1–2 obviously compl., also Viol. 1 44–54, Viol. 2 44f Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süssmayr.*

*Quam olim da capo* (35): wie oben

#### IV. SANCTUS [114]

*Sanctus* [11]: *Composition by Süssmayr.* (c. 1–5 sketched by Mozart?)

*Osanna* [27]: *Composition by Süssmayr.* (c. 1–16 sketched by Mozart?)

*Benedictus* [53]: *Composition by Süssmayr.* (c. 1–22 sketched by Mozart?)

*Osanna da capo* [23]: *Composition Süssmayr, transposed from D major to B<sup>b</sup> major, shortened by 4 b.*

#### V. AGNUS DEI & COMMUNIO [53] (+80)

*Agnus Dei* [51]: *Composition by Süssmayr.* (c. 1–14 sketched by Mozart?)

*Lux aeterna* [2] (+28): **1–2 Composition by Süssmayr.** 3–30 (=28) Repeat of section from the INTROITUS.

*Cum sanctis tuis* (52): Repeat of Mozart's KYRIE. *Instrumentation as in the Kyrie, final version by Süssmayr.*

<b>Total length:</b>	<b>866 bars</b>
Instrumentation completed by Mozart (incl. 28 b. of repeated material)	83 bars
Instrumentation by Süssmayr	735 bars
Vocal parts & Basso and sketches for parts by Mozart (incl. repeats)	594 bars
Total length of all music composed by Mozart	677 bars
Composition by Süssmayr (possibly by making use of some sketches by Mozart)	[189 bars]

**Süssmayr's 189 b. comprise approximately one fourth (22%) of the total length, or c. 11 min. of music.**

## Anton Bruckner, Symphony No. IX with Finale (unfinished): Finale, CPV by Samale-Phillips-Cohrs-Mazzuca (CRE 2012)

Introit: 1–42 (=42) full instrumentation original; *b. 8/9 sequence altered by SC (=2)*

Principal Theme: 43–54 (=12), 67–74 (=8) full instr. orig.; 55–66 (=12) full Str.; Winds in shorthand notes. 55–8 (=4): *Woodwind & Brass replenished; 59–66 (8) shorthand notes written out in full (1. Klar., Fag., Pos., K.-Btb.)*

Song Period: 75–92 (=18) full instr. orig.; 93–106 (=14) Str., 101–5 Klar. orig.; 107–28 (=22) full instr. orig.; 85–88 (=4) *recovered from sketch and 23D/»24«; 1. Fl, 1. Klar. 97f, 1. Ob. 92f & 96–98, 1. Hrn. 93–98, 2. Hrn. 96–98, 3.4. Hrn. 93–96 supplemented.*

Transition: 129–54 (=26) full instr. orig.; *131–54 3.–6. Hrn. parts reversed to facilitate change from Tb. to Hrn.*

Chorale Theme: 155–206 (=52) full instr. orig.; *2.3. Klar., 1. Fag. 199–202 written out in full from »13a«E; 203–06 Vla. cancelled.*

Development: 207–28 (=22) leading parts sketched; 233–48 (=16) almost full instr. orig.; 265–84 (=20) Str. complete; Winds in shorthand notes; 285–88 (=4) full instr. orig.; 289–96 (=8) Str. complete; Winds in shorthand notes; 207–28 (=22) *instr. elaborated (Klar., Fag., Hrn., Vla., Vc., Kb.); 227–30 [=4] composition supplemented from sketches; 235–40 1. Ob. with 2.3. and Fag. continued with Vc. from 235f.; 246–49 1. Hrn. added; 249f [=2] reconstructed as sequence from 247f.; 251–56 [=6] transposed elaboration from 12C; 257–62 [=6] composition supplemented from the surrounding; 263f [=2] reconstructed from the following (265f); 265–76 shorthand notes written out in full (1. Fl., Ob., Klar., Fag., Hrn., 1. Trp., Pos.; 274–77 1. Viol.); 277–84 shorthand notes written out in full (2.3. Ob., 2.3. Klar., 7.8. Hrn., Trp.), 1.–6. Hrn. added; 281f 1. Ob., 1. Klar., Pos. added; 289f 1. Ob., 1. Klar., 1.3. Hrn., 1. Trp. added; 219–25 shorthand notes written out in full (Ob., Klar., Fag., Hrn., Pos., K.-Btb.).*

Fugue: 297–328 (= 32) Str. complete, Winds in shorthand notes; 329–44 (=16) sketched; 345–50 (= 6) full instr. orig.; 297–328 (=32) *shorthand notes written out in full; 329–41 (=13) instr. elaborated from sketches and 326–28; 342–44 (=3) full instr. adapted from 343–48.*

Epilogue: 352–82 (=32) Str. complete, Winds in shorthand notes; *351–62 (=12) shorthand notes written out in full (Klar., Fag., Hrn.); 363–82 (=20) some shorthand notes written out in full (Fl., Ob., Klar., Trp.) Woodwind and Brass supplemented.*

Horn Theme: 383–402 (=20) Str. complete, Winds in shorthand notes; *383–402 (=20) shorthand notes written out in full; 383–90 Woodwinds, Tb., Pos., K.-Btb.; 391–95 Fl., Ob., Klar., Hrn.; 395–402 Ob., Klar. supplemented.*

Song Period: 403–08 (=6) Str. complete; 409–18 (=10) sketched; 419–24 (=6) sketched as repeat from Exposition; 425–32 (=8) Str. complete; 433–56 (=24) Str. complete, 433–35 1. Fl.; *403–08 (=6) Hrns. supplemented (comp. 77–82); 409–18 Str. instr. elaborated from sketch and continued from 403–08; 1.2. Ob., 1.2. Klar., Fag., 1.-4. Hrn., Trp. added; 425–32 (=8) Woodwinds, Hrns., Tb. & Trp. supplemented; 433–56 (=24) all Winds supplemented.*

Transition: 457–72 (=16) sketched; 481–94 (=14) Str. complete, Winds in shorthand notes; *457–72 (=16) Str. elaborated from sketch; some Winds supplemented; 473–76 [=4] transp. repeat of 453–56 in Tutti instrumentation; 477–80 [=4] Str. reconstructed from 481ff backwards and Winds elaborated.*

Chorale Theme: 495–512 (=18) Str. compl., 495–510 1. Trp.; 511f 1. Ob.; 529–38 (=10) Str. compl., Winds in shorthand notes; *495–510 (=16) Brass replenished from 155–70; 512–528 [=16] reconstructed and elaborated as inversion of Chorale Theme; 529–38 (=10) shorthand notes written out in full, some Winds supplemented.*

Horn Theme: 539–44 (=6) Str. compl., 1.–4. Hrn.; *545f [=2]: reconstructed from 543f.; 547–54 [=8] composition supplemented as transposed and augmented repeat of 541–44. 555–60 [=6]: varied return of the Principal Theme of the 1<sup>st</sup> Mvmt.*

Coda Introit: 561–88 (=28) sketched; 555–82 (=28) *Str. elaborated from Sk., Winds supplemented.*

**Coagmentatio: 589–600 [=12] composition supplemented as overlay of Principal Themes; 601–608 [=8]; composition supplemented; elaborated as transposed and augmented repeat of 441–44, also consulting 531–38).**

Cadence: 609–12, 614 (=5) , 617–32 (=16) sketched; **613, 615f [=3] composition supplemented from 603–06; 603–26 (=24) sketch elaborated for Str., all Winds elaborated.**

**Halleluja: 633–40 (=8) pedalpoint sketched; 641–53 [=13] composition supplemented from Halleluja and Te Deum motif; 633–53 (=21) entire instrumentation elaborated.**

<b>Calculated total length of the Finale (CRE 2012)</b>	<b>653 bars</b>
Score bifolios: Instrumentation finished by Bruckner	208 bars
Score bifolios: Strings complete, shorthand notes for Woodwinds and Brass	232 bars
Sketches and continuity drafts by Bruckner	117 bars
Supplement provided by the authors, making use of music-forensical reconstruction methods	96 bars

**559 bars original; 96 bars had to be reconstructed and supplemented.**

**This corresponds to c. 14,7 % of the Finale, or c. 3 minutes of music.**

TABLE III: Formal Analysis of the Finale (CRE 2012)

<i>Bars</i>	<i>Section</i>	<i>Length</i>	<i>Periods</i>	<i>Annotations</i>
<b>1–42</b>	<b>EINGANG</b> [Introit]	<b>42</b>		
1–12	motto	12	4 / 8	from first movement, hrns., b. 19 / toccata rhythm
13–30	condensation; crescendo	18	2 / 4 / 8 / 4	cross motif in mutation (Adagio-coda)
31–42	theme antic. / pre climax; reduction	12	12	augmentation & diminution simult.
<b>43–74</b>	<b>THEMA</b> [Principal theme]	<b>32</b>		
43–58	principal theme (toccata rhythm)	16	12 / 4	cross motif; minim progression; Trp. fanfare
59–68	reduction ( <i>memento mori</i> )	8	8	<i>passus duriusculus</i> [=pd]; cross motif
69–74	chorale transition (Brass)	8	8	
<b>75–128</b>	<b>GESANGSPERIODE &amp; TRIO</b>	<b>54</b>		
<b>75–92</b>	»Gesangsperiode« [Song period]	<b>18</b>		
75–84	(toccata rhythm, deriv. fr. principal theme)	10	2 / 8	cross motif; minim progression; <i>pd</i>
85–92	repetition	8	8	lyrical counterpoint; woodwind bridge
<b>93–106</b>	»Trio Fis-Dur«	<b>14</b>		
93–100	Trio ... (toccata rhythm)	8	8	cross motif; lyrical counterpoint;
101–06	... to be continued	6	3 / 3 [= 6]	<i>pd</i> and <i>memento mori</i>
<b>107–28</b>	<b>Gesangsperiode da capo (var.)</b>	<b>22</b>		
107–14	»F-Ges« (Klar., Fag., Hrn., Tb.)	8	8	cross motif; minim progression
115–22	variant in g major / str.	8	8	cross motif; <i>pd</i> ; lyrical counterpoint (Vla.)
123–28	pendulum of low notes (>Ges-F<)	6	6	>Ges-F< (phrygian) as <i>memento mori</i>
<b>129–54</b>	<b>ÜBERGANG</b> [Transition]	<b>26</b>		
129–38	motto (inv.)	10	2 / 8	toccata rhythm
139–54	ascent; annunciation (Woodwinds)	16	8 / 8	quoted from Adagio (b. 151–4)
<b>155–206</b>	<b>CHORAL</b> [Chorale Theme]	<b>52</b>		
155–70	»Choral E-Dur«	16	8 / 8	Triplet figuration; chorale theme
171–78	interjection	8	8	
179–90	chorale repeated (var.)	12	12	
191–206	reduction; Te Deum	16	8 / 8	<i>pd</i> ; Te Deum motif as <i>memento mori</i>
<b>207–96</b>	<b>DURCHFÜHRUNG</b> [Development]	<b>90</b>		
207–42	passacaglia: <i>pd</i> + Te Deum (Ob.: gregorian motif in semibreve)	36	8 / 12 / 8 / 8	triplets; motto & toccata rhythm + dimin.; <i>pd</i> ; Te Deum motif rect. (augm., dimin.)
243–50	motto	8	8	(inv. only), imit., augm., dimin.
251–66	passacaglia repet.	16	8 / 8	triplets; Motto & toccata rhythm + dimin.; <i>pd</i> ; Te Deum motif rect., inv., imit., augm., dimin.
267–76	motto	10	6 / 2 / 2	inv., rect., augm., dimin.
277–96	Gesangsperiode & lyrical counterpoint	20	8 / 6 / 6	rect., inv.; Trp. fanfare; <i>memento mori</i>
<b>297–350</b>	<b>FUGE</b> [Fugue]	<b>54</b>		
297–316	fugue exposition	20	8 / 8 / 4	theme variant; motto & toccata rhythm, dimin.
317–41	fugue development	25	3x3 / 8 / 8	theme imit., rect., inv., augm., dimin. (quot.: Beethoven, Ninth Symphony, first movement, b. 427ff.)
342–50	pleno >cis / b / fis<	9	3 / 3 / 3	theme simult. rect., inv., dimin., imit.(!)
<b>351–82</b>	<b>FORTGANG</b> [= Continuation]	<b>32</b>		
351–66	fugue epilogue; pedalpoint	16	8 / 8	Halleluja (Vc.), theme inv., imit. (quot.: Toccata BWV 565)
367–72	»Unisono c-moll«	8	8	theme rect., imit.; dimin., imit.
373–82	pedal progression; pleno	8	8	theme rect., imit. (quot.: <i>Aeterna fac</i> / Te Deum and Symphony No. 6, Finale).

<i>Bars</i>	<i>Section</i>	<i>Length</i>	<i>Periods</i>	<i>Annotations</i>
<b>383–402</b>	<b>HORN-THEMA</b> [Horn theme]	<b>20</b>		
383–90	horn theme (imit.)	8	8	triplet; Halleluja; octave fall from principal theme first movement; toccata rhythm
391–402	continuation (Trp.; Woodw.)	12	12	<i>memento mori</i>
<b>403–60</b>	<b>GESANGSPERIODE &amp; TRIO</b>	<b>58</b>		
<b>403–18</b>	»Gesangsperiode«	<b>16</b>	8 / 8	cross motif; minim progression; lyrical counterpoint; <i>pd</i>
<b>419–32</b>	»Trio Fis-Dur«	<b>14</b>		
419–26	Trio ...	8	8	cross motif; lyrical counterpoint;
427–32	... to be continued	6	6 [= 3 / 3]	<i>pd</i> ; <i>memento mori</i>
<b>433–60</b>	<b>Trio, Chorale, Gregorian motif</b>	<b>28</b>		
433–40	Trio developed (4 b. Viol., 4 b. Vc.)	8	8	cross motif imit.
441–44	chorale antic. in minims (Str.)	4	4	chorale; minim progression
445–52	Gesangsperiode (inv.)	8	8	cross motif inv.; minim progression inv.; <i>pd</i>
453–56	gregorian motif	4	4	cross motif and minim progression; allusion to »Christ ist erstanden« ...
457–60	Trio repet., Vc.	4	4	... and <i>memento mori</i>
<b>461–76</b>	<b>UNISONO; PLENO; TRANSITION</b>	<b>16</b>		
467–72	double unison; stringendo	12	12	Chorale antic.; cross motif; minim progression
473–76	pleno: gregorian motif (rep.)	4	4	cross motif; minim progression
<b>477–94</b>	<b>TRANSITION</b>	<b>18</b>		
477–86	climax and reduction	10	10	octave fall; triplet motif
487–94	ascent; annunciation	8	8	triplet motif; Adagio reminiscence (b. 13–6)
<b>495–538</b>	<b>CHORALE + TE DEUM</b>	<b>44</b>		
495–510	»2. Abtheilung: Choral D-Dur«	16	8 / 8	chorale; Te Deum motif
511–22	repeat (inverted; sustained four b. omitted)	12	12	chorale inv.; Te Deum motif
523–30	interjection (inverted)	8	8	triplet motif rect., inv., imit.
531–38	chorale variant	8	8	chorale var.; triplet motif rect., inv., imit.
<b>539–600</b>	<b>HORN-THEMA</b>	<b>22</b>		
539–46	horn theme	8	8	triplet motif; Halleluja; octave fall
547–54	horn theme repeated	8	8	<i>memento mori</i>
555–60	climax	6	6	Principal theme of first movement
<b>561–88</b>	<b>CODA INTROIT</b>	<b>28</b>		
561–76	motto (stasis); <i>memento mori</i>	16	8 / 8	Motto inv., imit. (Ob.: <i>pd</i> )
577–88	condensation; crescendo	12	8 / 4	elements from transition into chorale (Part I)
<b>589–600</b>	<b>PLENO (Coagmentatio)</b>	<b>12</b>		
589–600	overlay of four principal themes in pleno	12	8 / 4	Finale fugue + Adagio + Scherzo + first movement
<b>601–16</b>	<b>CHORALE &amp; CRESCENDO</b>	<b>16</b>		
601–608	chorale (variant from b. 457ff.) + Te Deum	8	8	(Viol.: cross motif; cf. Adagio, b. 235)
609–16	chorale ascent	8	8	cross motif; Te Deum
<b>617–53</b>	<b>KADENZ [= Cadence] &amp; HALLELUJA</b>	<b>37</b>		
617–24	»Ces / F«: Fugue Theme inv.	8	8	+ triplets (Woodwinds); motto
625–32	pleno (Dominant Eleventh)	8	8	motto; Trp. fanfare and <i>memento mori</i>
633–53	pleno, pedalpoint, Te Deum, <i>Halleluja</i>	21	8 / 4 / 4 / 5	triplet motif; Te Deum; Adagio closing theme; Adagio Trp. motif, principal theme of first movement

## REPORT ON THE CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION 2012

This report shall serve as a summary of new philological research, insights and revisions, leading step by step through the most important new features of the finally revised Conclusive Revised Edition (CRE) in comparison with the old performance version from 1992 (=PV 1992) and the following intermediate phases (2005, 2008). It refers to Bruckner's own nomenclature, such as »Gesangsperiode«, »Eingang«, or »Pleno« (if necessary, equivalents in English will be given). Terms and abbreviations are basically congruent with the principles of the Bruckner Complete Edition. Instruments have been abbreviated as in the score and the present writer's Critical Report on the Ninth (German terms, such as »Kb.« for »Kontrabaß« – Double Bass –, or »1.2. Fl.« for »First and Second Flute«). Reference to the FE is indispensable in order to fully understand the reconstruction procedures.

### I. Reconstruction of Bifolio [»1«E]

Bruckner's final version of the very beginning, a bifolio [1], is lost, but we have evidence that it must have belonged to a sequence of E-paper bifolios that continued with »2«E and »3«E, all of which were prepared by Meissner with four bars to each page. This makes it likely that Bruckner intended to have a [»1«E] of only 16 bars, instead of 24 as given on the discarded 1<sup>d</sup>C (Facsimile Edition, p. 67–70). Further evidence can be found in the manuscripts: Bruckner obviously estimated the different length of the beginning (as he also often did by counting sections with bars continuously numbered, for instance, the fugue, or the chorale recapitulation). 1<sup>d</sup>C has on its last page (FE, p. 70) several times the figure »60«, which is the precise length of the then valid bifolios 1<sup>d</sup>C plus 2<sup>c</sup>C (FE, p. 117: »50«; p. 118: »60«). When, in the last revision, Bruckner decided to split up 2F (FE, p. 131ff) into two bifolios, he wrote on the last page of »2«E (FE, p. 138) »50«, and below this »18«. This is best explained as an estimate of the length of the first three new E-bifolios, of which »2E« has 18, »3«E 16 bars, thus leaving 16 for [»1«E]. Remarkably, *all* surviving SVE for bifolio 1 on E paper (FE, p. 83f, 85ff, 89ff, 93f, 95ff, 99f, 101f, 103f, 105f) contain only 16 bars (and not 24), even when their content is not absolutely clear.

One could opt here for using the longer version from 1<sup>d</sup>C, but this is not justified, and it is also not satisfying for musical reasons. If we compare the various stages of the beginning as it survives in full score with the initial sketches (see FE, p. 3–6, 12, 31f and 37), we find that Bruckner originally intended to start the Finale with four sequential steps of tritone progressions, given on 1A as D<sup>b</sup>/G–C/F#–A/E<sup>b</sup>–F<sup>b</sup> (E)/B. About the final two steps, however, he was in doubt: on 1<sup>b</sup>C (FE, p. 60) he replaced the third step with C<sup>b</sup>/F and cancelled the fourth in order to replace it with a chorale-like interjection of 1.–4. Hrn. and 1. Fl. Bruckner obviously could not find a harmonic progression convincing enough for him, joining the initial stasis with the ensuing crescendo, starting with the first-inversion B<sup>b</sup> major chord. His decision to change the initial pedalpoint from A to G (SVE 1<sup>b,c,d</sup>C) – underlining the Dorian aspect of his use of D minor, perhaps also as a kind of perfect cadence to the »emergency exit«, the Te Deum in C – is principally an effort to achieve a better link. But the various SVE on E-paper as well as the heavy pencil annotations on 1<sup>d</sup>C show that Bruckner worked towards another solution. On 1<sup>d</sup>C he again changed the third step, now from C<sup>b</sup>/F to A<sup>b</sup>/D, and, remaining still uncertain about the pedalpoint, corrected it once from G to F, but later cancelled this out again, to re-instate the G.

On the other hand, Bruckner must have finally achieved a solution. From the surviving »2«E as well as from the preceding discarded versions of bifolio 1 we already have some information about the content of [»1«E]. Its last four bars obviously were structurally and musically identical with those of 1<sup>d</sup>C (beginning of the crescendo; metrical numbers 1–2; 1–2–), but with its scoring reduced to Str. and 1. Ob. only, as proven by the beginning of »2«E. The first 12 bars then needed to be reconstructed from earlier versions. It is very likely that the basic features, which Bruckner never changed, would have been maintained – the static pedalpoint, tritone sequence and overall scoring (1. Klar., 1.2. Hrn., Pk., Viol., Vla.). To convincingly reconstruct the music itself requires analysis and further review of the sketches. First of all, the metrical structure of 12 initial bars preclude retaining the Hrn./Fl. interjection; hence the beginning of b. 13 needs an appropriate harmonic connection. Considering the material from 1<sup>d</sup>C, the most convincing way would be to use Bruckner's final sequence A<sup>b</sup>/D, but not above a bass with G as its root. This would imply an incomplete G<sup>9</sup>, not optimal for preparing the following B<sup>b</sup> major chord – perhaps the reason Bruckner inserted the Hrn./Fl. interjection in the first place. Most interestingly, the second page of 1<sup>d</sup>C (FE, p. 68) already seems to include sketches for revisions, shortening the bifolio down to 20 bars, and proving

that Bruckner indeed planned to finally exclude this interjection, as follows: On top of the Fl. stave, Bruckner sketched the metrical numbers 1–4 –, obviously indicating that the entire first page of the bifolio should be omitted (6 bars) – and then sketched the new continuity in ›Tonbuchstaben‹ (musical letter notation) on top of the B.-Pos stave. On each of these first four bars of the second page (FE, p. 68) we find repeatedly »a« there, suggesting that Bruckner indeed wished to return to the A pedalpoint. To re-establish this from the very first sketch seemed to be a good device indeed, connecting much better with the preceding Adagio as well as initiating a long-term preparation for Bruckner's sketched final cadence for the Coda. Then he continued the sketch with (each twice) »f ces es d«, »e b d #« and »c ges b a«, up to the end of the third page (FE, p. 69), where we find the last »c ges b a«, now at the right margin, to the left of the B.-Pos. stave, because for those two bars there was no longer any space. Apparently for this reason, Bruckner wrote »NB 2 Tacte« on top of the second page where the sketch began, establishing 16 bars, plus the four that must have been maintained on the last page, in all suggesting a bifolio of 20 bars length.

However, later in the Finale – in particular, twice in the development (FE, p. 227f and 253–5; see also the transition to the chorale theme, p. 184 and 189) – Bruckner significantly used four sequential steps, and not three. Even in the very first sketches he strove determinedly towards finding a convincing four-step progression, decisively given on FE, p. 12. Since the very beginning of the Finale should serve as a motivic core, initiating later processes of development, and convincingly link it together with the Adagio, Bruckner already prepared the tritone progression in the coda of the Adagio (see b. 225/6). Ten.- and B.-Tb. there unmistakably announcing it with four sequential steps as well. Despite this, the second period of PV 1992 retained a sequence of three tritone progressions, the last one repeated, creating a period of 2+2+(2x2). This created an unlikely break in the harmonic tension that is already building; the energy should carry on here.

The most straightforward way to reconstruct a new four-step progression from what we find on 1<sup>d</sup>C is to simply insert one further stage: D<sup>b</sup>/G – C/F# – B<sup>b</sup>/E – A<sup>b</sup>/D. (**Illustration I**) This progression returns finally to Bruckner's very first sketch for the beginning of the Finale (FE, p. 3), where we find indeed, even if crossed out later, the progression B<sup>b</sup>/E (2<sup>nd</sup> syst., b. 4–7, and 3<sup>rd</sup> syst., first b.). It also allows for strong connections with later events in the Finale: strangely, all parts of the harmony would include the first tetrachord of the chorale theme (G – F# – E – D), likewise the four notes from the [initial?] motto itself.

The image displays a musical score for Illustration I, which is a reconstruction of a four-step progression. The score is written in 4/4 time and consists of two systems of staves. The first system includes staves for 1. Klar., Viol. I, Pk., and Viol. 2; Vln. (Hrn. hier ausgelassen). The second system includes staves for Viol. I, Viol. 2; Vln., and Pk. The progression is marked with 'r' and 'v' above the staves. The first system shows measures 1-3, and the second system shows measures 4-8. The progression is marked with [4], [5], [6], [7], and [8] below the staves.

**Illustration I:** Reconstruction of [›1«E] (b. 1–12)

It is also interesting to note that shortening this sequence as given here – from the initially sketched 16 bar structure with repeated stages down to an eight bar structure with single stages – may well coincide with the surviving sketch for the beginning of the coda (FE, p. 6), where the inversion of the tritone progression is given four times in two-bar augmentation, expanding its corresponding stasis by effectively doubling the length of the original eight-bar period. This new reconstruction of [»1«E] may also serve to illustrate the general aim of the CRE – to make the CPV a musically even more comprehensive whole, often by minimal intervention, but with much positive effect on the entire musical organisation. This was precisely the compositional stage of the Finale achieved by Bruckner himself, as we can deduce from comparing sketches, SVE and discarded with surviving final bifolios.

## II. Reconstruction of Bifolio [»4«E]

After Bruckner decided to split up the 36 bars of 2F (FE, p. 131–4) into »2«E (18 bars) and »3«E (16 bars), the last two bars of 2F were allotted to the beginning of a bifolio [»4«], now lost. This raises some questions. Why did Bruckner renumber the old bifolio 2 into »2.« and »3.«, with the consequence that he had to renumber all subsequent bifolios hitherto written as well? Why did he not simply make a »2a« and »2b« of it, as appears to have been in the case of the expanded bifolio 13, marked by himself as »13a« (FE, p. 217; discussed in Section IV of this report), thus avoiding the labour of scratching out the old numbers and overwriting them? We will never know unless this bifolio someday comes to light.

However, we have to take what was left for a reconstruction, in this case, the only surviving, early 3A (FE, p. 143–6) and the sketches (FE, p. 31–4; some earlier sketches partially lost). The musical content of »3«E, pre-sketched on 2F, demonstrates that the lost bifolio again most likely used E-paper and continued the new musical design of the principal theme. In this stage, Bruckner supported what may be described as the ›toccata rhythm‹ (str., woodw.) with resonant minims, for good reason, namely, to strengthen the relationship of the principal theme with the Gesangsperiode, which contains the same minim progression. However, given that the ensuing 4C/»5« (FE, p. 151–4) was indeed valid, as Bruckner's annotation ›giltig‹ implies, [»4«E] would have contained 18 bars, somehow including the two final bars from 2F not taken over into the new »2« and »3«. (For further possible explanations see the following section.)

This hypothesis is supported by the extant sketch, if we bear in mind the particular importance of this insight into Bruckner's practice: this and other extended sketches were not a pre-draft, but merely a ›working paper‹ that Bruckner continued to use during his elaboration of score bifolios and their revisions. ÖNB 6086/1&2 is in fact such a sketch (FE, p. 31–4); another important one is ÖNB 3194/13&14 (FE, p. 21–4), which includes the fugue and the recapitulation of the Gesangsperiode (discussed in Section VI). The principal theme was obviously worked out first on a lost [2A], preceding 3A. In later stages, Bruckner decided to change its first two entries, originally starting from C and B<sup>b</sup>, later re-designed to commence on D and F. But the general structure of the climax of the theme and the two subsequent eight bar periods (the descending *passus duriusculus* and the brass chorale transition obviously remained musically unchanged, since even the sketch does not contain any changes or bars subsequently crossed out or replaced. If we simply stick to this music as outlined on 3A, the content of the lost bifolio seems clear. The most elegant way to explain how a [»4«E] of 18 bars would have looked is to assume that Bruckner inserted an extra bar line in the very first and last bar. Bar 51 has only a semibreve in all instruments; the two initial bars of the chorale transition likewise consist of semibreve and minims only; this would opt for a page disposition of 5–4–4–5 bars – especially if we consider that all other bars contain the toccata rhythm, demanding an identical amount of space on the page. Bruckner indeed quite often inserted extra barlines (for instance on »2«E with 6–4–4–4 bars, fol. 1<sup>f</sup>, b. 2 and 3 subdivided, see FE, p. 135). However, if [»4«E] maintained the 16 b. standard length he would have had to write an entirely new [»5«], as discussed in Section III.

The scoring of the third entry and climax of the principal theme was easily adapted from 2F, 3A, and »3«E, but the following two bars differ from PV 1992 in the CRE: 3A contains Bruckner's advice ›8<sup>va</sup>‹ above the high C<sup>b</sup> (b. 55 / FE, p. 143, third bar). This ›8<sup>va</sup>‹ can only be justified if this four bar period was intended to be the Tutti climax of this sequence D-F-A<sup>b</sup>-C<sup>b</sup>, followed by an eight-bar descent in the remaining period before the chorale transition. A much-reduced scoring of those four bars can hardly be justified (see, for instance, Te Deum, b. 249f,

or Seventh Symphony, first movement, b. 245–8); however, all performance versions of the Finale (with the exception of SM 1985 and PV 1992), make this sudden reduction (but note Bruckner's own changes, strengthening the basic tritone progressions in the Finale, D/A<sup>b</sup> and F/C<sup>b</sup>). Bruckner's »loco« (FE, p. 148, 152) is related to the »8<sup>va</sup>«, which only makes sense if the violins rest throughout the entire 16 bars between climax (b. 55–8) and Gesangsperiode (b. 75ff). In fact, on 3A the ink notation of the violins ends at b. 59 (FE, p. 11). The re-scoring of this passage supports the most important harmonic line with tremolo by Vla., in order to foreshadow the design of this motif as it reappears likewise at the end of the chorale theme (Vc./Kb., b. 193ff, Vla., 201ff, see also 209). The solution of PV 1992 (sustained semibreve and minims in Viol. and Vla.) seemed to be atypical for passages where Bruckner decreases energy from preceding climaxes (see, for instance, in the first movement, b. 77ff, which served as a model here).

### III. Reconstruction of the Gesangsperiode (4C/»5«; [5/»6«]; [6/»7«])

One of the crucial issues in the Finale is the reconstruction of the Gesangsperiode, of which at least two bifolios of the final stage, [5C/»6«] and [6C/»7«], are lost. SM 1985 and PV 1992 incorporated Alfred Orel's old theory that a surviving SVE »#«D (FE, p. 155–8) was intended as a substantial extension. (Orel, p. 103, No. 28: »Außerdem ist ein Partiturentwurfbogen vorhanden, der auf eine geplante Erweiterung des Bogens 5 hindeutet.«) The musical result was the PV 1992 reconstruction of two assumed bifolios [»5a«] and [=»5b«] (**Illustration II**). Yet this solution remained unconvincing.

A re-assessment of Bruckner's tripartite Gesangsperioden in his late-period sonata structures (exposition and recapitulation) revealed that the structure of the initial section (A) and most of the Trio section (B) remained essentially untouched in the recapitulation. Massive changes appear only in the repeat of the beginning after the Trio (A'):

Sixth Symphony, Finale	Exposition	A = 16; B = 16; A' = 16+12
	Recapitulation	A = 16; B = 16+2; A' replaced with transition
Seventh Symphony, Finale	Exposition	A = 16; B = 14; A' = 20+8
	Recapitulation	A = 16; B = 18; A' replaced with transition
Eighth Symphony, Finale (Initial Version)	Exposition	A = 30; B = 12; A' = 20+16
	Recapitulation	A = 32; B = 14+4; A' replaced with transition

Only in the revised Finale of the Eighth Symphony (1890), the beginning of the Gesangsperiode is substantially shorter in the recapitulation (to the regret of Robert Haas and many later conductors, who re-established the full-length repeat of this section for good reason from the initial version). In the finales of the Sixth and Seventh Symphony, for instance, the A section is 16 bars long in both exposition and recapitulation. In the first movement of the Ninth, the A section preceding the Trio is 26 bars in both exposition and recapitulation (compare b. 97–122 and 421–46).

In the Finale of the Ninth, the initial section of the Gesangsperiode in the recapitulation is only 16 bars long, as shown by a comparison of the surviving 23D/»24« with the sketch (FE, p. 24f). In the exposition, this section could not have been much longer, but the reconstruction given in PV 1992 (developed from SM, which had already included »#«D as an extension), brought it to 32 bars – twice as long as in the recapitulation. Even worse, this interpretation of »#«D as SVE for an intended »5b« also meant dispensing with 4C/»5«, despite the fact that Bruckner explicitly wrote »giltig« (valid) on its first page. In 2002 the present writer re-examined the original manuscripts in Vienna, with the surprising result that all the music believed lost may in fact be there, if we understand the sketch as a »working paper« used by Bruckner during the various stages of elaborating the score, and if we follow his particular annotations and pointers correctly.

The sketch for the Gesangsperiode (FE, p. 33) shows the entire course of the A section and Trio. The surviving bifolios 4A, 5A and 6A show that Bruckner initially transferred this sketch directly into score. Only one section was changed – the second half of the eight bar period before the Trio, crossed out in the sketch (5<sup>th</sup> syst.). Hence Bruckner discarded 5A (see FE, p. 160) and replaced it with 5B, composing these four bars anew (FE, p. 164), re-designing the beginning of this second period over a pedalpoint on G (5B, FE, P. 163) that was not to be found in the sketch at all (4<sup>th</sup> syst.). This first draft of the Gesangsperiode was rather empty, much like the initial stages (1887) of the exposition for the first movement. Obviously, in a revision phase following work on the later part of the Finale, Bruckner intended to fill in some well-balanced counterpoints to bind exposition and recapitulation motivically better together. The changes contained in 6cB and 7B (FE, p. 173–7) show that Bruckner already was working towards a continuous accompaniment in quavers (see Klar., p. 173, and the »Variande« sketches, p. 176f), much like the fabric of the Gesangsperiode in the first movement. Another important clue is the lyrical counterpoint to be found before the fugue on 16C/»17« (FE, p. 258), obviously deriving from the Gesangsperiode.

This makes the older theory concerning »#«D unlikely: all evidence points to the counterpoint additions being part of Work Phase 2 (c. autumn 1895), written mostly on C-paper. A supporting argument for this is the valid 7C/»8« (FE, p. 181), continuing the quavers sketched on 6cB and 7B. Also, the lyrical counterpoint must have been inserted somewhat earlier in the lost 5C and 6C, because the Vla. part on 7C/»8« (FE, p. 181) is already a clear variant deriving from it (b. 121f). Why should Bruckner have written a draft for an extension on D-paper, to include a »new« counterpoint – as assumed by Samale and Phillips – which most probably had been included already, on earlier C-paper? On the other hand, »#«D can easily be explained as a discarded »4D« (see also Orel, p. 103, No. 28: »5. Bogen D«), written perhaps before Bruckner re-validated 4C/»5« as »giltig«, if we imagine how one fills such a bifolio – in fact: a »double-folio« – with written music.

The bifolios were already prepared with clefs, key signature and barlines, four on each page. Since they are rather large, one would prefer to put them on the table, as often as possible displaying only one page on top, because if two pages are exposed, one can easily smear one page with the resting arm while writing on the other. Certainly Bruckner would have preferred to write on a single exposed page, dry the written lines with blotting-paper, then re-fold the bifolio to display the ensuing page. If we look at »#«D as an intended newly-written 4C/»5« on D-paper, the first six bars of this bifolio would have to contain the end of the chorale transition, already written out several times. Presumably Bruckner simply left these bars empty for convenience, and then eventually made a mistake: he may have folded the bifolio so that the entire first folio, recto and verso, was skipped, instead of only one page (perhaps due to an interruption), and then erroneously begun work on the page facing him, without realising it was already the second fol. recto, indicated the number »4« on top of the same (wrong) page, and continued the Viol. line to the end of the bifolio, 10 bars later, automatically re-folding and writing page by page.

This would perfectly explain the strange design of the bifolio The »#« given next to the almost fully scratched-out, original »4« (note the shape of the razor-scar) would then most probably be intended to indicate that this bifolio was not valid, or perhaps that the cancelled number »4« should not be overwritten later with a renumbering. The changes in the metrical numbers could likewise be easily explained, if Bruckner were to have used the now invalid bifolio as a metrical sketch later. An unfortunate twist of fate allowed this misleading »#«D survive and the important [»4«] disappear!

For these reasons, the CRE decided not to accept at all the theory of an expansion sketched on »#«D, but stick to surviving bifolios and the sketch, which nowhere indicates such a massive expansion. Bruckner inserted the lyrical counterpoint at the beginning of the second period, however, it would not be possible to paste it into the first page of 5B, because the clashing voice-leading would create an odd simultaneity of suspension (g-f#, Viol. 2) and resolution (f#, Vla./Vc.) as well as a parallel octave (e-f#) in the last bar. (**Illustration III**)

The musical score for Illustration II is divided into four systems. The first system (measures 1-8) features Blech in both staves. The second system (measures 1-6) features Viol. 1 in the upper staff and Viol. 2, Vla., and Hrn. in the lower staff. The third system (measures 8-12) features Viol. 2 in the upper staff and Viol. 1, Vla., Hrn., Vc., and Kb. 8va b. in the lower staff. The fourth system (measures 3-8) features Viol. 1&2 in the upper staff and Kb. 8va b. in the lower staff. Measure numbers are indicated below the staves.

**Illustration II:** Hypothetical [»5a«] and [=»5b«] as given in PV 1992 and RAS

The musical score for Illustration III shows Viol. 1 in the upper staff and Kb. 8va b. in the lower staff across measures 1-4. The score illustrates a counterpoint introduction in the beginning of measure 5B.

**Illustration III:** Impossible introduction of the counterpoint into the beginning of 5B

If we also consider that this rash pedalpoint idea anticipates the beginning of the Trio a semitone higher, and perhaps prematurely, it seems possible that Bruckner, on the lost 5C, intended to return to the old idea as sketched – a simple repeat of the first period, now supplemented with the timid counterpoint, without the basses, to be followed by the seraphic woodwind passage. But another hint in the manuscripts needs to be observed as well. 4C/»5« bears an important pencil annotation at the beginning of the Gesangsperiode (FE, p. 152) – »R.n. G. D. G.«, under a slanting line. According to Bruckner's usual abbreviation practice, this reads as »Repetition G-Dur Gesang« (i. e., repeat of the Gesangsperiode in G). Furthermore, we find a pointer ( X ) on top of Viol. 1. This pointer has its equivalent in the sketch, most significantly, directly before the repeat of the first period, now including the

sketched counterpoint. The most likely interpretation of this is that Bruckner indicated here an inclusion of the two opening bars as well, hence underlining his early idea of judging these two bars not as a separation, but as being part of a ten-bar period, which was to be fully repeated as  $(3 \times 2) + 4$  (see FE, p. 33, 2<sup>nd</sup> syst., third b., »3« overwritten with »1«; see also »#«D, end of the last period, altered into »7–8–9–10«). On the other hand, the elaboration of the recapitulation makes a structure of two simple eight bar periods most likely. If we summarise all this, we can deduce four hypothetical layouts for the Gesangsperiode (**Illustration IV**):

- 1.) [»4«] of 18 bars plus 4C/»5« still valid, however, if Bruckner maintained the content of 5B, we would come to 2+8 and 8 bars, without the two initial bars being repeated.
- 2.) [»4«] of 16 bars plus a newly re-written, lost [»5«] in 16 bars. This would suggest – against all evidence from the surviving sketch – that Bruckner finally deleted the two initial bars as well, simply bringing the Gesangsperiode to 8 + 8 bars, as in the recapitulation. Musically this seems to be a rather convincing solution.
- 3.) [»4«] of 18 bars length plus 4C/»5« still valid. If we then want to accept a symmetrical structure of the Gesangsperiode beginning as 2+8, 2+8 we must also assume that the lost [5C/»6«] would have contained 18 instead of 16 bars so as to include the repeat of the opening two bars as well (perhaps with a page disposition of 4-6-4-4).
- 4.) [»4«] of 16 bars length plus a newly re-written, lost [»5«] in 20 bars. In this case we could assume Bruckner may have subdivided all bars on the first p. of [»5«], bringing it to 8-4-4-4 bars, with the first p. with 1–8, containing the eight-bar brass chorale with its long notes, then the beginning of the Gesangsperiode, as 1–2; 1–2- / -3–4–5–6- / -7–8; 1–2, hence allowing for the 2+8; 2+8 structure as well.

The illustration shows four systems of musical notation, each representing a different hypothetical reconstruction of the Gesangsperiode. The first system, labeled 'Blech', shows measures 1 through 8. The second system, labeled 'Viol. 1' and 'Viol. 2', shows measures 1 through 4, with an annotation 'Diese 2 Takte später getilgt? (Hypothese 2)'. The third system, labeled 'Viol. 1' and 'Viol. 2', shows measures 5 through 8, with an annotation 'Diese 2 Takte nachkomponiert? (Hypothese 3 & 4)'. The fourth system, labeled 'Viol. 1' and 'Viol. 2', shows measures 2 through 8, with an annotation 'Diese 2 Takte nachkomponiert? (Hypothese 3 & 4)'. The instruments listed for each system are: Blech (1-8), Viol. 1, Viol. 2, 1.2. Hrn., Viol. 2, Vla. (1-4), Viol. 1, Viol. 2, 1.2. Hrn., Vla., Vc., Kb. (5-8), Viol. 1, Viol. 2, 1. Fl., Klar., 1. Ob., + 2.3. Ob. (2-8).

**Illustration IV:** Possible further reconstructions of the Gesangsperiode

#### IV. Reconstruction of the Beginning of the Development (»13a«E; =»13b«E; [14/»15«])

From fresh examination of the manuscripts, the CRE was able to establish the entire exposition with almost unbroken continuity, even if with the exception of four optional bars and some minor ambiguities. The first serious gap only occurs at the beginning of the »2. Theil« (second section), as Bruckner referred to the development + recapitulation + coda of his sonata forms. From the sequence of final valid bifolios, [12/»13«] and [14/»15«] are lost. However, some of their musical content seems to be preserved already in the extant, earlier 12C and some SVE. [12/»13«] could easily be reconstructed from them, as suggested by Phillips, and this does not entail much speculation. However, at a very late date Bruckner tried a credible expansion of this section, sketched in two SVE from August 1896, according to the annotation »11. August neu« on »13a«E (FE, p. 217). If Bruckner wanted to avoid a further, time-demanding renumbering, he would have been perfectly justified in assigning »13a« here, making a subsequent »13b« plausible, even if it remained unnumbered (FE, p. 221–4). Already SM 1985 and later PV 1992 decided to elaborate these two SVE for strong musical reasons, even if this required some speculation to fill a gap of four bars for which Bruckner left no sketch at all in situ (FE, p. 224), presumably because the music for those bars was to be re-copied from the last p. of the lost [»13«], which could then have been discarded.

But note the sketched motto, FE, p. 223, and the letters on p. 204, right margin, suggesting twice a chromatic descent, in ink »d-cis-c-h-b-a-gis-g-fis-e-d-cis«, repeated in pencil as »d-cis-c-h-b-a-gis-g-fis-f-e«; compare this with FE, p. 225, last four bass notes f $\sharp$ -f-e-d $\sharp$ , continued in Vc. a $\flat$ -e $\flat$ -d-d $\flat$ . These displaced sketches were obviously not intended for a re-conception of the preceding bass line (FE, p. 202: »c-h-b-a-g-fis-f-e« etc.), but contain a sketch for a correction of the earlier idea, originally moving downwards from C (see also the sketch, FE, p. 11).

First of all, Bruckner must obviously have found it necessary to extend the typical stasis following the final climax of the exposition here. Likewise, the enormous length of the Finale chorale – almost 48 bars of *fortissimo* full brass – seems to require an ensuing quiet zone of some length. More important, however, is Bruckner's typical late-period device of intensifying connections between themes and motives and strengthen parallels between formal sections: the *passus duriusculus* or chromatic descent (here: d-c $\sharp$ -c-b, b. 207ff) is of crucial importance, since it is the core of the principal theme of the first movement, now with the same rhythm as in the principal theme of the Eighth Symphony. In the Finale, Bruckner re-introduced it in the transition before the Gesangsperiode (b. 63–6) and also used it to finish the chorale theme (b. 191ff). One reason for expanding this motif at the beginning of the second section may well be Bruckner's intention to bring back the principal theme of the first movement later in the Finale: already the sketch of the beginning of the coda prominently introduces this motif (a-g $\sharp$ -g-f $\sharp$ , see Ob., b. 556ff). In order to make sure the listener hears the connection, the beginning of this line cannot be located too far from the end of the chorale. This is why the authors introduced it immediately after the Te Deum motif (1. Fl.), at the beginning of the second section. This is another parallel to the first movement, where Bruckner cites the selfsame motif (see there, b. 235ff: e $\flat$ -d-d $\flat$ -c).

A further reason to adhere to the unnumbered, subsequent SVE can again be found in its content: the leading voice (Ob.) consists of e''-e''-b'-b'-a'-a', which can be seen as a double augmentation of the later Gregorian motif (FE, p. 308, as discussed in Section VI), hence it was complemented here with -b'-b'-e'. In all, the CRE had reason enough to maintain the reconstruction as given in PV 1992. However, the overly thick scoring and dynamics at the beginning of the Te Deum motif (PV 1992, b. 217–20; CRE: 203–06) created an ugly sonority (a resonant upper Fifth as b', audible on both the Eichhorn and Wildner recordings). For a similar reason Bruckner himself reduced dynamics and scoring at the end of the exposition of the first movement (see there, b. 225–7), used as a model here (CRE, b. 205ff).

The reconstruction of [14/»15«] given earlier in PV 1992, basically already part of SM, showed that the last period from 13E/»14« (1–2–3–4–5–6–) needed to be continued as –7–8. Likewise, the ending of [14/»15«] had to contain the first six bars of a period (1–6–) to connect with the following –7–8 at the beginning of 15D/»16«, leaving room only for a further eight bar period between them. There is only one important difference in CRE: the decision to change the first two bars in order to finish this period with the sequential steps naturally following one another, instead of suddenly switching to the triplet figuration in the seventh bar of a period. Such a kind of joint-overlap as given in PV 1992 (there: b. 263f) seemed atypical for Bruckner, particularly if we consider that in the

model used here – the last 8 bars of 12C – these two bars were intended to continue the figuration established from the beginning of the chorale.

This device brings more coherence into the structure, because now the reconstructed opening bars of the Finale are clearly ›developed‹ here in eight bars, as later repeated by Bruckner (FE, p. 253f). It is much more typical for him to separate such blocks with short rests to take a breath – note the similarity with the development of the first movement: a stasis, built upon the Introit, leading into a crescendo (first movement, b. 226–44), finishing with a first quotation of the horn call in eight bars (cf. b.19–26 with 245–52), a short pause, then a second crescendo on the Introit (b. 253–68), again leading into an eight bar repeat of the horn call (b. 269–76). (Illustration V)

Illustration V: Partially new reconstruction of [14/»15«] by Samale and Cohrs

## V. Reconstruction of Bifolio [19D/»20«]

Orel believed that some bars of the lost [19D/»20«] were not contained in the sketches. Phillips similarly assumed in his thesis (p. 494f): »An unbroken musical continuity for the development of the fugue was not achieved in the earlier pc. sks. (...), but there is every indication that [19D/»20«] would have consisted of a clear and to some extent probably reconstruable structure.« Therefore, also SM 1985 and PV 1992 provided at least nine bars of additional composition, even if based on a sequential technique using Bruckner's own material, and confirmed by Phillips on the basis of Sechterian theory (*Musik-Konzepte*, Vol. 120–22, p. 44f).

But to the surprise of the present writer, a re-evaluation of the original sketch, undertaken by him in 2002, proved this assumption to be false. If we carefully follow these sketches (ÖNB 3194/13 & 14, FE, p. 21–4) and order them periodically in their most likely chronological order of gestation, we find that the composition of the fugue falls into roughly four phases – two of them incomplete, but two indeed complete. (Illustration VIa–c)

Interestingly, this sketch shows that Bruckner originally intended to continue the fugue directly by the recapitulation of the Gesangsperiode, as indicated on 14<sup>v</sup> (see voice-leading sketch at the end of 1<sup>st</sup> syst.). The entire fugal epilogue with the introduction of the horn theme was an afterthought. This wholly new conception was completed before the renumbering phase. Obviously Bruckner also used this sketch as a ›working paper‹ while laying out the score, as many annotations reveal. Bruckner did not depart very far from it in the bars surrounding the gap. He only sharpened the harmony from b. 21 onwards and replaced the third sequence step of the climax with a new one a semitone higher, in order to achieve a more convincing transition to the newly composed epilogue. Hence it was possible to reconstruct the entire fabric of the lost [19D/»20«] with a high degree of certainty using Bruckner's own, clearly established metrical numbers (-4-8; 1-8; 1-3). The instrumental layout was based on the surviving bars before and after the gap.

[Skizze, Phase I - IV]

[Partitur]

**Illustration VIa:** Fugue, bars 30–37: Periodically ordered transcription of the sketches by Cohrs

[Phase I - IV] [Phase I] a moll

♩ E moll

Alto

h e l

2do

8ba g a

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45

[Phase II] As D Ten

6 4

6 b7

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

[Phase III]

6 4

1 45

[Phase IV] H D Ten

e g h e

fis cis

5 6 7 8

Cis m. B.

[19]»20«

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45

Illustration VIIb: Fugue, bars 38–45: Periodically ordered transcription of the sketches by Cohrs



We can summarize these four phases as follows:

*Phase I (1–48; incomplete)*

Initially, Bruckner sketched the entire fugal exposition, including its beginning, which many commentators indicated to be missing (note Bruckner's shortcut •/• before the very first bar of 13<sup>r</sup>, and his annotations on the entries of instruments above it). He continued the fugue well into its development, but finally deleted the last four bars (45–8, last three unnumbered).

*Phase II (1–49; incomplete)*

Bruckner decided to rewrite the continuation of the fugal development, inserted a pointer behind b. 37, started anew with b. 38 (unnumbered, see pointer on 13<sup>v</sup>, above b. 1), and continued until the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> syst. (not continuously numbered, metrical numbers 1–8, 1–4). Again, this was crossed out.

*Phase III (1–61; complete)*

Now Bruckner re-instated the original bars 38–44, but also wrote a new continuation, inserted a new pointer /// from b. 44 (13<sup>r</sup>, below last syst., b. 1) to the new b. 45 (13<sup>v</sup>, beginning of 3<sup>rd</sup> syst.), and then rewrote 45–61 (14<sup>r</sup>, 1<sup>st</sup> syst., b. 4), now again continuously numbered.

*Phase IV (1–62; complete)*

Finally Bruckner again returned to the first page, decided to sketch a new continuation, beginning with b. 41, and indicated this with a further pointer (//// below b. 41), directing to 14<sup>r</sup> (1<sup>st</sup> syst., b. 5). He started to re-sketch b. 42–62, unfortunately again without any continuous numbering, but clearly until the end of the Fugue (14<sup>v</sup>, 1<sup>st</sup> syst., four bars). As an afterthought, he decided to replace the single bar before the sketched climax (b. 45) with another solution, indicated by a final pointer (last syst. of 14<sup>r</sup>), followed by the annotation »Cis m. B.« (= »Cis-moll, B moll«, or perhaps »Cis moll Bass«), referring to that very progression at the climax.

## **VI. The Transition following the Gesangsperiode in the Recapitulation ([27/»28«])**

Philological research revealed that the Gregorian motif, alluding perhaps to the old hymn »Christ ist erstanden« (FE, p. 308), was a quite late device. The Ob. line sketched on the late »13a« indicates this as well. Originally Bruckner stated only the first two bars here (26F/»27«, last p.), which were then repeated once (a-e-d-e, a-e-d-e). Later, the two repeated bars were scratched out and replaced by the entire line, now four bars long, in order to avoid an implicit fifth parallel: the first version, ending with an e, would have moved a semitone upward together with the bass fundament (a) into the following a<sup>b</sup> / e<sup>b</sup>. The new line (a-e-d-e-a-g-c-d) leads into the ensuing Vc. much more beautiful.

Bruckner's indicated corrections of the metrical numbers (p. 308, lower line: 1–2–3–4) suggest an interpretation of this as an intentional four bar insertion into normally regular eight bar periods. This gives support to the suggested Tutti repeat of the Theme, which is further justified by the mutation processes. Bruckner must have noted earlier that this line derives from the beginning of the repeated Gesangsperiode (see ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> syst., -5–6–7–8 from the first period). Interestingly, it also includes the motif which we think Bruckner may have intended for the final Halleluja (discussed in Section IX): transposed as in PV 1992 (b. 487–91; CRE: 473–77), the line reads d-a-g-a-d-c-f-g-a, foreshadowing the final progression of the CPV (f#-a-d-e-f#; here a-c-f-g-a). The structure of this passage is certainly a crescendo, which must at least lead to some kind of a break-through by using important motivic material with the weight of a »Schluß d-moll« (Bruckner). However, originally it was most likely intended to lead directly into the chorale recapitulation; the words »Schluß d-moll« were added most likely only when he already had decided to transfer all sketched material into score bifolios, and possibly also the final two notes of the sketch, the double-dotted D octave fall, was only added then, which may best be understood as incipit of the repeat of the transposed gregorian motif.

At the beginning (bifolio 26D/»27«) Bruckner developed elements from the Trio and Gesangsperiode; then he introduced the string chorale in minims in order to prepare the double unison crescendo, both of which anticipate the Chorale Recapitulation (c<sup>b</sup>-b<sup>b</sup>-a<sup>b</sup>-g<sup>b</sup>). Those steps all contain the minim, which emerged from the accompaniment of the principal theme in the exposition, was continued in the Gesangsperiode, taken up again in the development of the Te Deum motif at the beginning of the second section (also in our elaboration of the d-c<sup>#</sup>-c-b Passacaglia), intensified within the recapitulation of the Gesangsperiode, and finally in the Gregorian motif. After this culmination, Bruckner brought back the triplet figuration of the chorale, including reminiscences of the end of the first movement (the open fifth D/A) and – as in the exposition (compare b. 139ff of the Finale with b. 151ff of the Adagio) – the Adagio (the ascending Vla. line preceding the chorale at b. 489, taken from the Adagio, b. 13–16). Indeed, across this entire zone Bruckner moulded together important motifs (minim progression, toccata rhythm, triplet figuration, chorale-like descent) from all the Finale themes (principal theme, Gesangsperiode, Trio, chorale) as well as reminiscences from earlier movements in a dense field of continuous development. Hence, a climactic repeat of the gregorian motif seems to be indispensable for musical reasons, as a preliminary staging post during the long-term development of the minim progression.

Even more important is the fact that the sketched crescendo by Bruckner ended in the root position of D minor, displacing the tonic note on top, but the surviving 28E/»29« continues with the fifth in the treble, and with the fifth bar of a period as well. The structure of this surviving continuation of a period strongly suggests that the string design (repeated bars of triplet figuration in Viol., Vla. melody and D/A pedalpoint in Vc. and Kb.) must already have been there in the missing first four bars of that period. Hence, the inclusion of a transposed repeat of the Gregorian motif as d-a/-g-a/-d-c/-f-g in four bars seemed to be inevitable in order to naturally reach the top note a of the missing beginning of the following period, continued on 28E/»29«. This convincing reconstruction of the lost [27/»28«], taken from the sketches and strictly limited to material by Bruckner himself, as given by PV 1992, was basically maintained in the CRE, although some changes have been undertaken. (See Commentary)

The exceptional length of this reconstructed bifolio finds supporting evidence from a hitherto overlooked hint in the manuscript: The last page of the previous 26F/»27« contains an optional cut, indicated by Bruckner with »2. Vi–« (FE, p. 308), and at the right top corner »(40)«, most likely the number of bars to be included in the cut. Following up this brings us almost exactly to the chorale recapitulation, however, in this reconstruction 42 bars later. If the missing [27/»28«] would have had 22 only, this would perfectly match. If we revisit the sketch, we find that the bar period preceding the »Schluß d-moll« had originally 6 bars only. It is quite possible that Bruckner first placed this in score, indicated the cut, and only then decided to expand this period to 8 bars, by repeating those two last bars, adding extra barlines and the additional metrical numbers 7 and 8, indicating an expansion of two further bars. We also find in many other scores by Bruckner that he indicated repetitions in this way.

## VII. The Design of the Chorale Recapitulation ([30/»31«]; 31E/»32«; [32/»33«])

The reconstruction of the missing [30/»31«] also retained here was essentially developed by Samale and Mazzuca, and later corrected by PV 1992 with an alteration of the final 6 bars so as to ascend via an inversion of the tritone progressions found in the corresponding exposition phrase. The first period had to continue from 1–2- with [-3–12], the second to start with [1–6-], as the surviving 31E/»32« suggests. Bruckner certainly would have begun its imitative counterpoint there. The reconstruction is based on a strict inversion of the chorale in the exposition (excluding the non-invertible sustained note in four bars, hence reducing the solution here from 16 to 12 bars), determined also by the first two bars of 31E/»32«, where Bruckner designed the first two notes as a fifth and a sixth in the harmony (Ob.: »5«, »6«). Phillips confirmed this reconstruction via a Sechterian analysis of the fundamental harmonies. (Illustration VII)

Herleitung als Umkehrung des Choralthemas der Exposition mit Analyse der Fundamente nach Sechter

Choral in der Exposition

Musical score for the Choral in the Exposition, measures 1-12. The score is written for two staves (treble and bass clef) in a key signature of one sharp (F#). The notes are organized into groups numbered 1 through 12, corresponding to the root analysis below.

Bg. 29E/»30« letzte 2 Takte      Bg. [30/»31«] 16 T., rekonstruiert als Umkehrung des Choralthemas

Musical score for the reconstructed Bg. [30/»31«], measures 1-16. The score is written for two staves. The notes are organized into groups numbered 1 through 16, corresponding to the root analysis below.

Musical score for the reconstructed Bg. [30/»31«], measures 13-24. The score is written for two staves. The notes are organized into groups numbered 13 through 24, corresponding to the root analysis below.

(Diese 4 Takte wohl nicht verwendbar, da durchgehaltene Note unumkehrbar)

(Tritonus - Fortschreitungen in der Umkehrung beibehalten)

Musical score for the reconstructed Bg. [30/»31«], measures 21-24. The score is written for two staves. The notes are organized into groups numbered 21 through 24, corresponding to the root analysis below.

Rekonstruierter Bogen [30E/»31«]

Viol. 1, Viol. 2 8va b.

Musical score for Violins 1 and 2, measures 111-114. The score is written for two staves. The notes are organized into groups numbered 111/131, 112/141, 113/151, and 114/161, corresponding to the root analysis below.

Ob.  
Vc., Vla. 8va

Musical score for Oboe, Viola, and Violoncello, measures 111-114. The score is written for two staves. The notes are organized into groups numbered 111/171, 112/181, 113/191, and 114/1101, corresponding to the root analysis below.

Fl., Ob.,  
Viol. 1

(Viol. 2, Vla. ausgelassen)

Musical score for Flute, Oboe, and Violin 1, measures 115-118. The score is written for two staves. The notes are organized into groups numbered 115/1111, 116/1121, 117/1111, and 118/1121, corresponding to the root analysis below.

Vc., Kb. 8va b.

Musical score for Viola and Violoncello, measures 115-118. The score is written for two staves. The notes are organized into groups numbered 115/131, 116/141, 117/151, and 118/161, corresponding to the root analysis below.

Illustration VII: Sechterian root analysis by Phillips; Reconstruction of [30/»31«] as already given in PV 1992

It is hard to understand why other performance versions insisted upon a soft layout for solo Trp. and Str. at this point. The indications in the manuscript are indisputable: Bruckner indicated two whole bar rests before the entry of the Chorale in both Trp. syst. (FE, p. 312); this clearly indicates that all Trp. should join in together with the 1. Trp., which was obviously written down by itself in order to save time and effort. Bruckner's own »dim.« in the eighth bar (FE, p. 314, b. 2) makes clear anyway that at its beginning the music must have been loud enough to justify a diminuendo. The entire setting for strings with tremolo Vla. providing supporting harmony, and with both Viol. and Vc./Kb. in unison, suggests a loud tutti, not a soft instrumentation. The last two bars from 29E/»30« (FE, p. 316) make it evident that the following line must bring about a still further reduction in dynamics (Kb. silent); the cessation of the Vla. tremolo and the register change (Ob.) imply that the harmonic support needs to be taken over by woodwinds (comp. with Te Deum, b. 15ff). The reconstruction by SM, confirmed in PV 1992 followed these indications precisely.

SM 1985 and PV 1992 both concluded that Bruckner might have intended to repeat four bars from 31E/»32«, because his continuous numbering was repeated on its last page (FE, p. 319, upper margin, »43–44–45–46«, faintly in pencil on p. 320 again). However, the recapitulation of the horn theme is different from its first appearance at the end of the fugal epilogue. There it was gradually decreasing; but here it is obviously used in order to increase energy, initiated by the triplet figuration in a variety of contrapuntal devices. Therefore the CRE follows the text precisely as Bruckner wrote it. This decision was followed by a reconsideration of how to reconstruct the lost [32/»33«].

To complete the period already given as 1–6- on 31E/»32« seemed to be quite natural, by repeating -5–6- as -7–8-, in symmetry with its first half (comp. 1–2- with -3–4-). The first appearance of the horn theme on 31E/»32« passed by in a mere four bars. On the other hand, considering its structural importance, it seemed clear that it had to be repeated somehow. Furthermore, it was obviously intended to finish an important section again, as it had done earlier, before the recapitulation of the Gesangsperiode, corresponding somehow with the abrupt end there (b. 399–402), which produced raised eyebrows within the Wiener Philharmoniker when Nikolaus Harnoncourt first rehearsed it. It should be noted that Harnoncourt very convincingly described this as a *memento mori*. In fact, this expression perfectly explains the character of the various endings of Finale sections as a musical reminder of mortality (as already in the first movement of the Eighth, where every theme group in the exposition ends with a reference to the famous ›Grail Bells‹ of Wagner's *Parsifal*). The older versions already included an extended repeat of the horn theme based on G, developed for eight bars (PV 1992, b. 565–72), convincing enough in itself, considering the Neapolitan progression (here: C#/G), and also the fact that the first movement contains similar harmonic fields (preceding its coda, b. 493–504, based on F; within the coda], significantly, on G, b. 541–48).

The old idea from SM 1985 and PV 1992 was to re-introduce the principal theme from the first movement before the coda, as a goal of the chorale epilogue. This solution lacked conviction and appears to produce a blockage, due to a wrong, too early entry of D major, a massive ritardando at the end, and sudden break-off of the line following the second octave fall (G-F-E). On the other hand, a six-bar truncation of the principal theme would complete the missing bifolio, so that the coda begins on a new, hypothetical [32/»33«]. The 1992 solution was so unconvincing that Samale and the present writer decided to simply delete these six bars, ending the chorale epilogue with an eight-bar period, designed as a pre-climax to the coda, built on a sustained G, with a typical general rest at the end. Interestingly, there is at least one parallel to be found. In the Third Symphony, first movement, following the recapitulation of the principal theme (see there, b. 393–404), Bruckner used almost the same triplet motif in a very similar manner. As has been observed by Harry Halbreich, this passage was the fruit of a very late revision (1888) undertaken at a time when Bruckner was also already working on the first movement of the Ninth. Halbreich even suggested that Bruckner could have worked from a sketch for this particular passage when he composed the parallel passage in the first movement of the Ninth (b. 366–76), which reveals the origin of the Horn theme in the Finale as well.

However, following the performances in October 2011, which made use of this solution, the authors finally agreed that this deletion would damage the formal integrity of the chorale recapitulation, which must have had such a conclusive climax. The re-introduction and mutation processes of the triplet motif from b. 523 onwards, with such an untypical change of the earlier Te Deum string figuration, could in fact only be justified if seen as a preparation

of the return of the principal theme of the first movement, and the introduction of the strong unison motif of the strings in the last two surviving bars of the bifolio would also only make sense if somehow being taken up later again. Hence, the return of the principal theme was re-instated, however, avoiding the major third at b. 555 (which would overshadow the final breakthrough of D major at letter Z), providing a cleaner instrumentation, and in particular avoiding the enormous halt of the earlier version, by deleting the 1992 ritardando as well as the notes G-F-E, ending now convincingly with the octave fall in the dominant key. This leads into the surviving sketch that begins the coda in a now harmonically very satisfying manner. **(Illustration VIII)**

In preparation of this all, the instrumentation of b. 539ff had also to be expanded, including now all woodwinds, supporting the octave fall and providing imitations which would be taken up at the beginning of the Coda.

The musical score for Illustration VIII is presented in four systems, each with a right-hand (r) and left-hand (v) part. The instrumentation includes Flute, Oboe, Clarinet, Horn, Trumpet, Trombone, String, and Woodwind. The score features complex rhythmic patterns, including triplets and sixteenth notes, and dynamic markings like 'f' and 'v'. The key signature is D major, and the time signature is 4/4. The score is divided into measures [7], [8], [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], and [6].

**Illustration VIII:** New reconstruction of [32E/»33<]

### VIII. The Partial Reconstruction of the Coda from the Sketches

To this day, critics remain sceptical of the attempt to elaborate the coda from the few surviving sketches; the result in PV 1992 aroused controversy. Music lovers were often grateful for the possibility to hear the Finale as a whole and also considered the closing section with the elaborated Halleluja satisfying or even moving. On the other hand, professional writers especially criticised the entire development from the chorale recapitulation onwards as being »incoherent« and »in blocks« – even if many of them showed only a limited knowledge of the philological problems of the Finale. Also, the importance of the coda sketches was widely ignored. Unfortunately, even Nikolaus Harnoncourt omitted them, arguing that they were not part of the score as it survived.

Hence the authors felt obliged to reconsider the coda yet again (as elaborated in the preliminary versions) for the CRE, in order to achieve an even greater coherence of this section which is so crucial for the entire symphony. The aim of such a (necessarily provisional) coda must be to bring thematic processes to a close – an aim that is comprehensive enough under the circumstances given. The examination of all extant sources revealed that, in a preliminary stage, the coda was apparently finished in summer 1896; hence it is still appropriate to speak of a »reconstruction« at this point, even if the result is speculative in places. Perhaps it would be best to call it an »elaboration«, based on all available information – which is by no means scant.

Phillips' philological studies revealed without doubt that Bruckner renumbered the bifolios of the score only in May/June 1896, after he had at least sketched the coda, and we have even a date for this as an evidence – »14.6.96«, given on 13E/»14« (FE, p. 225). This renumbering was undertaken because by this phase of composition he had decided to split up the very long bifolio 2F (which increased now to 36 bars) into a »2« and »3«, all written on the later-used paper type E; hence, all subsequent bifolios had to be renumbered. Most likely his secretary Meissner may have had the task of scratching out the old consecutive numbers with a razor blade, which would be overwritten then with one number higher. We had noted something similar in the first movement already: Only after initially finishing its score (which in autumn 1892 had 23 numbered bifolios), Bruckner decided during a revision in autumn 1893 to expand the transition to the recapitulation of the Gesangsperiode and to include a new bifolio »18« (see Critical Report on the first three movements, p. 50ff), which made it necessary to renumber all subsequent bifolios from »18« to »23« into »19« to »24«. Such a procedure would make sense only when the entire score already existed.

But if this renumbering in the Finale indeed occurred in May/June 1896, it also gives us a clue as to the entire length of the original score, even if now partially lost, with a high degree of certainty. In one of the sketches for the coda we find a remarkable annotation, by Bruckner, »Bogen 36. 19. Ces« (FE, p. 45). This would read: On May 19<sup>th</sup> Bruckner reached the  $C^b$ , the beginning of the »final cadence«, clearly re-sketched and further established two days later (FE, p. 47: »am 21. Donnerstag, 22. Freitag, 23. Samstag«). If we follow Bruckner's usual practice, he would write such a bifolio indication precisely at that point of the sketch where the new bifolio (here 36) would have to start. (We have several other instances in the manuscripts where he did the same, for instance, the *particello* sketch of the exposition, FE p. 33, where Bruckner wrote »neuer Bog.« precisely at the same spot where later 4C/»5« began.)

But this indication was written in May, obviously *prior to* the renumbering; Bruckner would have had written out the primary score bifolios for the coda perhaps immediately after sketching their content (again: this was part of his usual compositional practice; as soon as a music was clearly sketched, first lay it out in score, for strings; it could be revised later anyway) and only thereafter returned to the exposition and renumber the bifolios subsequently. Hence the bifolio on which the cadence began was later to be renumbered [36/»37«].

In any case, this indication by Bruckner in the sketch makes it possible now to at least roughly estimate the length of the gap between the final surviving score bifolio [31E/»32«] and the cadence beginning on the lost [36E/»37«]: Four bifolios must be missing here ([32E/»33«, [33E/»34«, [34E/»35«, [35E/»36«]). Furthermore, if our reconstruction of the coda is correct, then the chorale statement constituting the eight-bar period before the  $C^b$  cadence must have occupied the second half of the lost [35/»36«]. What we do not know is, where exactly the coda would have started, of which we have the sketched beginning (28 bars); hence we do not know exactly how much music existed between the last bar of 31E/»32« and the first bar of the sketch for the beginning of the coda, and how

much music there was between the last bar of that sketch and the first bar of this C major chorale fragment preparing the cadence. We also do NOT know whether Bruckner himself followed strictly the 16 bar structure of the E paper bifolios, or whether he might not have inserted further barlines, as, for instance, already on the first page of »2«E which contains 6 instead of 4 bars.

One of the earliest sketches appears to contain the beginning of the coda, including the motto, repeated relentlessly in tritone sequences at a solemn, slower speed (marked by Bruckner with »4/4«). Its design as a stasis, then proceeding by gradual compression of metrical structures in perfect symmetry into a crescendo, is very similar to the design of Bruckner's other Finale codas. Such a design must have led naturally into a big climax. We have sufficient evidence to believe this was an overlay of all themes.

The elements from the chorale recapitulation onwards can be interpreted as a gradual preparation for such a synthesis, mainly built on the triplet core (str. counterpoint; horn theme) and the octave fall (see Vc./Kb., FE, p. 319/20) of the principal theme of the first movement. This is continued in the first coda sketch, including the motto and *passus duriusculus* (Ob.) – an allusion to the principal theme from the first movement of the Eighth, but mainly recalling the *memento mori* before the fugue that culminates in the clash of the Trp. fanfare (FE, p. 260), which can also be seen as a preparation of the Scherzo rhythm. The realisation of such a climax as an overlay of the principal themes seems to be musically inevitable as the ultimate point of re-unification. If we analyse them, their ability to be combined with one another actually seems to be as predictable as Nottebohm's discovery that the themes in Contrapunctus XIV can be overlaid by the B-A-C-H motif. This technique was a characteristic part of the Baroque fugue, named *coagmentatio*, and it is prominent in Bruckner's own fugues as well.

SM and PV 1992 constructed the *coagmentatio* upon the Adagio theme in augmentation, but it would seem to be perhaps more typical of Bruckner to place the principal theme of the first movement in the bass (as in the codas of the Fifth and the Eighth), with the solemn Adagio theme in the tenor, the Finale Theme in the alto (in its form as the basis for the fugue, which Bruckner actually seems to have constructed in order to make it more suitable for such an overlay), the typical quaver figuration in the Soprano (as in all Finale Codas), and the Scherzo rhythm in the timpani (such a »tattoo« is by no means impossible for Bruckner, see for instance the principal theme of the Finale of the Eighth Symphony, the Scherzo of the Ninth, b. 97ff, 115ff, or its Trio, b. 77ff, 109ff, and 229ff). Furthermore, with the Adagio theme in the bass, the e<sup>b</sup> of the third bar would move above the D of the Timpani (Scherzo Theme), which looks rather clumsy.

The clash of the d/e<sup>b</sup> progression (from the end of the first movement) and the climactic nature of this Coagmentation could certainly have led into a broad zone of final glory – if we did not have further evidence for the continuation of the coda. The next surviving sketches clearly indicate that Bruckner intended to include four further elements – a chorale ascent starting on C in eight bars (of which the last four are not entirely clear), leading into eight bars that present the tritone progression (C<sup>b</sup>/F here; cf. the first movement climax at b. 381ff: B<sup>b</sup>/F minor) for a final time, followed by another eight cadential bars built on a dominant eleventh (perhaps evoking the climax of the Adagio), and a final peroration built on a tonic pedalpoint. We have every reason to accept these sketches, thanks to Bruckner's indication for their use in a lost bifol. [36] (FE, p. 45) and the surviving dates from May 1896. It seems to be likely that they indeed contained all that Bruckner needed for the elaboration of the coda.

Such an ascent as sketched (FE, p. 6, ÖNB 3194/3<sup>r</sup>) would certainly initiate a new crescendo, but it would not be appropriate to make a jump from the *coagmentatio* into it. Furthermore, the sketch for the coda beginning might well be a re-conception of a passage earlier intended as a transition to the chorale (see also the initial sketch of this passage, FE, p. 13, ÖNB 3194/7<sup>r</sup>), of which the recapitulation was basically destructive. For these reasons, as early as 1986, as one of the first fruits of their collaboration, the authors augmented the aspirational statement of the chorale in the strings that occurs midway through the Gesangsperiode recapitulation (CRE: b. 441–44), laid it out for full orchestra, and transposed it from C<sup>b</sup> into D, which here allowed a perfect transition into the initial C of the ascent, which also seems to be an inversion of the end of the principal theme of the Finale (see b. 63–66). At this point both SM and PV 1992 changed the string figuration into triplet quavers. Since Bruckner never changed figuration once it was established for the coda, the CRE decided to maintain the quavers of the *coagmentatio* instead, creating an allusion to Bruckner's very last surviving coda, that of *Helgoland*, and including the (surely

significant) ›Cross‹-shaped pattern of notes prefigured in the final bars of the Adagio and also found in the principal theme of the Finale.

The completion of the chorale ascent (-5–6 and 8 of the period not yet finished by Bruckner) had to connect with the C<sup>b</sup> of the following period (FE, p. 45). It was a straightforward task to continue harmony and melodic line. The Adagio of the Fifth (b. 169ff), and that of the Eighth Symphony (b. 23ff) served as a model here – in fact, a further use of what might be termed Bruckner's »Himmelsleiter« phrase (=Jacob's Ladder, most likely a quotation from Mozart's Requiem, Lacrymosa, b. 5–8). Largely established by PV 1992, the entire instrumentation of this progression and the following Neapolitan cadence was thoroughly reworked once again, continuing the quaver figuration and introducing a last appearance of the inverted fugue theme in the bass, and redistributing the disposition of the partwriting to achieve a better balance and a more audible connection with the climax of the Adagio evoked by the harmony sketched by Bruckner (triplets in the woodwinds, supporting harmony in Vla. and Wagner-Tb., falling ninths in low brass).

### IX. The Elaboration of the Final *Halleluja Pleno*

Critics insist that a completion of the final peroration is impossible, because nowhere does a final double bar exist in the surviving material. However, we can regain a surprising amount of it by simple deductive reasoning. The last eight bars of the cadence sketch indicate that the last Pleno was to be built on a tonic pedalpoint, as usual with Bruckner. Furthermore, it seems likely that somehow there had to be a ›final capstone‹ of the coda of 37 bars, as was likewise the case for all the foregoing movements (first movement: beginning of the cadence with the bass triplets, b. 531–67; Scherzo: beginning of the variations to the exposition, b. 210–47; Trio: 36 bars from 229–64, plus the extra rest added by Bruckner at the beginning of the Scherzo da capo = 37; Adagio: b. 207–43, entire Coda after the general rest). This tonic pedalpoint brings the symphony full circle, since the first movement began with the same kind of stasis. This can be impressively experienced by concluding the DFF with this very sketch, ending where the symphony began. It is also likely that the fabric of the final section would have constituted a glorious, culminative Pleno, ending with the typical extraordinary weight of an irregular period.

No musical material would be better suited for this than the Te Deum motif, with its majestic open fifth, fourth and octave, which was already evoked in the first movement (note also its final section with a ›vertical‹ reading of this motif as a *Klangfeld* of D/a/d), and then re-appeared prominently at the end of the first section of the Finale, its development, and chorale recapitulation. Consequently, the CRE uses this motif here as the main feature of the last bars, recalling the end of the Adagio, as well as that of the first movement (open fifth) and Scherzo (Trp.). Its use in the woodwinds was now limited to minims, as prefigured by Bruckner in the development, in order to complete the ›history‹ of the minim progression. This is all the more convincing if we consider that Bruckner himself wished the Te Deum to be used as the best substitute, should he not live long enough to complete the instrumental Finale – another strong indication that the Finale itself should end in similar manner.

Additionally, the authors made reference to the memoirs of Dr. Heller, who related Bruckner's playing of the conclusion of the Finale to him on the piano as a »Song of Praise to the Dear Lord«, according to the composer. There has been much speculation as to how this should be understood – particularly Heller's enigmatic reference to Bruckner's words that he wished to »again conclude the Finale with the Alleluiah of the second movement.«. (Heller's spelling of the word is different from Bruckner's; Bruckner explicitly wrote »Halleluja« in his personal annotations, calendars and letters. Hence, it has been maintained here.) The present writer had offered a new interpretation of this in the first print of this edition: before trying to locate such a »Halleluja of the second movement« within other late Bruckner works, can convincing evidence not be found from the Ninth itself? In fact, the Adagio contains a highly significant Halleluja-like phrase (Trp., b. 4–6), quoting the *non confundar* from the Te Deum as well as the Halleluja from Psalm 150. But this is the third movement. However, is it not possible that Heller, or Bruckner himself, was simply momentarily confused regarding its position in the symphony?

We know that Bruckner sometimes struggled with the inner balance of movements, especially in the Second, Seventh, and Eighth Symphony. Perhaps he was also not absolutely certain about the position of the Adagio in the Ninth for some time: as discussed in the Critical Report, the cover bifolios, designating the Scherzo as »2. Satz« and the Adagio as »3. Satz«, were written very late, possibly as late as the autumn of 1895, considering the simi-

larity of the cover of the original and copy of the first movement (Critical Report, Facsimiles, p. 206f). The first score page of the second movement contains merely the heading »Scherzo« (Critical Report, Facsimile, p. 81); that of the Adagio in fact reads »III. Satz. Adagio (E-Dur) 9. Sinf.« (Critical Report, Facsimile, p. 145), but it looks as if the third beam of the III was added later, hence it was only in 1895 that Bruckner decided upon the order of the movements. It could be likewise possible that Bruckner in fact said »Adagio«, but that Heller remembered it as »second movement«, simply assuming that the Adagio was in fact intended to be the second movement, »as usual«. Interestingly, even Joseph Schalk, in his piano reduction of the symphony (preserved in the ÖNB, re-examined by the present writer in 2002), arranged the Adagio second, explicitly marked by him as »II.«, only then followed by the Scherzo, which after his death in 1900 was completed by Löwe from bar 110 onwards. Hence one suspects that Schalk worked from a copy which is no longer extant (perhaps the *Stichvorlage* used by Löwe for his later arrangement of the instrumentation, now lost), consisting of three separate volumes in which Scherzo and Adagio were perhaps not expressly marked as second and third movement at all. A further possible support for the use of this material in the Finale coda is to be found in *Helgoland*: the prayer »Der du in den Wolken thronest« serves there as second subject, which one could well interpret as a »zweiter Satz« as well (>Satz< = subject).

This music contains the same melodic material as the Halleluja and is also repeated in the horns in augmentation at the very end of the coda. Elisabeth Maier's assumption that Bruckner would have used the second Halleluja from »Christ ist erstanden« in the version sung in Austria at the time seems to be less likely, since it contains musical material which cannot be readily related to the symphony. This would not be appropriate, considering the strong musical argument of the symphony as a »final exercise« for Bruckner, in which, as Heller quoted him, »the thematic idea should be elaborated once again in the greatest clarity«. It also contradicts Bruckner's own efforts to motivically prepare the Halleluja in the Finale.

Preparing his own thesis on Bruckner's Ninth and its Finale, the present writer reassessed this problem in autumn 2007. As Phillips pointed out, Heller's words are available in two different versions – one in the book *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner* (Ed. Karl Kobald, 1924, p. 21ff), and one in the Göllicher/Auer biography (1934, Vol. IV/3, p. 564 and 571). Both versions were edited by Max Auer, with whom Heller had a vivid correspondence. Unfortunately it was impossible to locate Heller's original account as published in 1924. However, in the correspondence of Heller with Göllicher, Auer and Schwanzara (today in the archive of the Institut für Geschichte der Medizin der Universität Wien), as early as 1902 Heller had sent his memories to Göllicher (explained in his letter to Auer, 15. 11. 1923, HS 3.667/1; see also letters from Göllicher to Heller, 7. 3. 1902 and 30. 5. 1906, HS 3.666/2 & 3). Heller also prepared an extensive correction list for Auer's biography, dated 1 August 1931 (HS 3.659). A part of it seems to be lost, and there must have been further correspondence with Auer, since the text as published in Göllicher/Auer IV/3. is quite different from the 1924 edition, as evident from HS 3.659.

Furthermore, Heller's letter gives some important entries from his private diary: »18/VIII 95 (...) Today we talked again about his last, Ninth Symphony which he dedicated to the »Dear Lord« in gratitude. The second section contains a marvellous Te Deum and he told me that, like Beethoven, who has in his Ninth the Song of Joy, he would have to elaborate the Te Deum as the ending. Three majesties he had already glorified, Ludwig of Bavaria, our Emperor and now he would come to the greatest duty of his entire life, »the glorification of the Dear Lord«. Only somewhat unwillingly I had to part from him. (...) 25/VIII 95 Today I had a rare pleasure as only a very few mortals could have it – Bruckner played to me the organ setting and the Te Deum itself and was touched too when he saw that I was touched.« These two passages, omitted by Auer, show that Bruckner obviously played to Heller from the second section of the Finale already on the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 1895. The word »organ setting« could refer to the chorale theme; the words »the second section contains a marvellous Te Deum« to the second section of the Finale with the chorale recapitulation, or perhaps the coda, confirming that Bruckner had a clear idea of the entire movement and in particular of its ending already in August 1895, and obviously in those days he spoke quite often about it with Heller.

However, the texts as published by Auer should be reviewed carefully, since Heller wrote to Auer: »You must excuse my corrections but on the one hand I wanted to put some things right according to my private diaries, on the other hand expand some of it.« (HS 3.659, last page. The diaries of Heller and the letters to his wife seem to be

lost.) Heller died in 1934, and it is by no means impossible that Auer made further changes of the text on his own. This may also explain Auer's irritating words »Alleluiah from the second movement«.

Musical evidence should test the case: Bruckner indeed finished the Adagio with this Halleluja phrase of the Trumpets, b. 5ff, transformed by the four horns shortly before the end (b. 237–39). Perhaps Romantic hermeneutics might interpret this as a »nostalgic reminiscence from the Seventh«, likewise considering the chorale (Wagner-Tb., b. 231–34) shortly before as a »last farewell to the Adagio theme from the Eighth«. In fact, this is a very early variant from 1893 sketches for the Ninth's Adagio theme itself. Such reception can only detract from considering the underlying motivic processes which support the coherence of the Ninth, as Phillips pointed out. In fact, this is a clear hint that the illustrious Halleluja must have been the Trumpet motif from b. 5, there breaking through designed as for a tutti (three Trumpets in unison, only in the last moment dividing up into three), and even in the final tonal destination, D major, a complete stranger in an Adagio in E major. It appears only once later in the recapitulation, but is nowhere developed or transformed, except for the horn phrase at the very end of the Adagio. All in all the treatment of this important motif looks very much as if Bruckner intended to preserve it for the ending of the Finale. (Note also that when Bruckner prepared the Second Symphony for its first print edition in 1893, he strengthened the same motif at the end of the Finale, supported by Trombones in the low octave, using the same kind of partwriting.)

Hence, the decision to use this Trumpet phrase for the conjectural end of the Finale makes perfect musical sense within the parameters of the symphony itself. The original ending of SM was an open fifth, similar to the end of the first movement. For the Halleluja conception, the present writer discovered the evidence of Heller's memoirs as early as 1985. In 1988, he and Samale developed an intermediate solution that included the Horn motif from the Adagio Coda in augmentation as well as the self-imitating Trumpet triplets, combining the Chorale figuration with the Halleluja and thus relating it to the end of the Scherzo and of Helgoland.

This use of the motif gains further credence from the opening Halleluja of *Psalm 150* (c-d-e-g-c). This sequence, as transformed into the trumpet motif in the Adagio, was maintained in the CRE (here: d-D-F#-A-d-e-f#) as a rising minim progression, in self-imitation; it thus contains the entire Halleluja with which Bruckner often concluded movements of his symphonies (see also *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1989/1990*, p. 202). The progression seems to be the ultimate destination of the very beginning of the Ninth (b. 1–18), containing those notes in minor (Hrns.) which when arranged in rising order, form d-e-f-a-d (note also its inversion in the third theme group, Fl., b. 167ff as a quotation of the Agnus Dei from the Mass in D minor). Their final return, transfigured into the major, brings the symphony full circle.

## X. Revised Instrumentation

Preparation of the CRE also required a re-examination of the instrumentation. Particularly the limitations of the instruments available in Vienna during the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century and Bruckner's particular practice of writing for them had to be observed. Indispensable here was Dieter-Michael Backes' dissertation *Die Instrumentierung und ihre Entwicklung in Anton Bruckners Symphonien* (Mainz 1993).

It was important to reconsider the ambit of the instruments as observed by Bruckner in his writing. For the flutes Bruckner avoided notes higher than b<sup>b</sup>''' by choosing lower alternatives or octaves (but note, for instance, PV 1992, Fl., b. 55, c<sup>b</sup>''', now corrected to the lower octave). The alto trombone should not climb beyond b<sup>b</sup>' (Scherzo, Ten.-Pos., b. 223; but note, for instance, PV 1992, b. 55, now corrected). He also avoided higher notes than e'' for violoncello in the Ninth (Adagio, b. 182; but note that Bruckner himself transposed the passage in the Finale, bifol. 15D/»16«, b. 275, one octave lower later). This made the reconstruction of [19D/»20«] in PV 1992 rather unlikely (Vc. up to g''/PV 1992, b. 355). Likewise, Bruckner made no use of the five-stringed double-bass and preferred notes in higher octaves to notes lower than E. The one exception in the Finale (18D/»19«; FE, p. 281) may originate from the *col Basso* notation of the Vc., which certainly goes down to low C here; but a typical deviation into the upper octave was chosen for Kb., following b. 45 as a model (b. 3 of the principal theme). The extreme notes of Viol. 1 presented in this new elaboration of the coda, up to d''', may be surprising, given that in the other movements as well as in the final valid bifolios of the Finale Bruckner did not write for them higher than c<sup>b</sup>'''. However, considering the extremes of the *coagmentatio*, the authors felt justified in using this range once,

referring to Bruckner's own »8<sup>va</sup> sempre« above Viol. 1 on bifol. 2<sup>a</sup>C (FE, p. 109, see also 2<sup>b</sup>C / p. 113, 2<sup>c</sup>C / p. 118); likewise his own one use of the d" in the first horn pair at this point, which he usually avoided. Inevitably, Bruckner left much of the wind and brass scoring – particularly in the second section – to the imagination of posterity. The situation is now exacerbated by the loss of so many of the final bifolios. If one wishes to recapture something of the original sound conception, it is most important to develop an aural imagination of how the lost portions could have sounded for Bruckner himself. This can only be achieved from instruments of the period:

Bruckner was used to hearing gut strings, played with a light, natural and flexible vibrato, also some *portamento*, and in more distinct intonation. The Viennese flutes had a distinct, wooden, but thin sound. Quite new were the pungent Viennese oboes with their pear-like mouthpiece (from c. 1875, sounding quite similar to a Baroque oboe d'amore), and pungent Viennese clarinets and bassoons were common, in particular the sharp-sounding bassoon, which very often had a metallic soundcup. The famous Viennese horns were handmade, more narrow bored, like all other brass instruments about one third smaller, and produced much less volume than modern brass instruments. One should also note that the Vienna valve, due to its special construction, allowed for a real legato, because the air-stream was never interrupted. The Wagner tubas and Contrabass-Tuba (a Viennese tuba in F with a fourth valve) were of Viennese manufacture as well. The blazing, large F-trumpet and lighter, more narrow-bored trombones were also common. In 1883 the Vienna Philharmonic decided to replace the valve trombones, which were in common use since 1862, with slide trombones of German fabrication. The orchestra contracted players from Leipzig and bought instruments from Penzel, but still included an alto trombone in E<sup>b</sup> (together with a tenor trombone in B<sup>b</sup> and a tenor-bass trombone in B<sup>b</sup> with a fourth valve). Bruckner would assuredly have had in mind three trombones of different bore and sound character even when he wrote the Ninth.

All this must be taken into account when attempting to finish the instrumentation of the Finale. On the contrary, the PV 1992 was shaped very much from the experience of listening to modern instruments. In many instances, revisiting the manuscripts solved some further questions. Some of the major changes are already described above (end of the principal theme; beginning of the second section; the entire coda). Some further differences of instrumentation between PV 1992 and CRE are the result of a new examination of the first three movements and some other works (the famous ›Analogverfahren‹, as already referred to in 1985 by Samale and Mazzuca in their Commentary).

Another important decision was to substantially reduce the scoring of the Trio in the Gesangsperiode (PV 1992, b. 107–20; CRE: 95–108) to create a greater contrast to its enriched recapitulation (PV 1992, b. 433–46; CRE: 421–34). Such an approach was typical for Bruckner; see for instance the Finale of the Eighth. The Gesangsperiode from the Adagio of the Ninth (see b. 25ff thereof) with its enriched recapitulation (b. 113ff) presents another similar case. A particular problem for the lower horn players occurred at the beginning of the transition to the chorale (CRE, b. 129ff): the manuscript gives them only five bars to change from Ten.-Tb. back to Hrn. For this reason, Bruckner's partwriting was changed in order to give them substantially more time (CRE, b. 129–54). At the first appearance of the Gregorian motif (CRE, b. 453ff), the instrumentation of PV 1992 was so thick that the dotted rhythm of Viol. 1 was hardly audible. The new scoring supports them with 1. Ob. and Klar. (Viol. 2 and Vla. with 2.3. Ob. and Klar.). Likewise, the strange partwriting for Klar. and Fag. before the chorale recapitulation (PV 1992, b. 503–6; CRE: b. 489–92) was altered, following the model of a passage in the first movement of the Fourth (b. 305ff).

## XI. Revised Dynamics, Phrasing, and Articulation

Bruckner left only very rare indications of phrasing, articulation, dynamics, and tempi; hence a thorough understanding of his practice is indispensable. These features were thoroughly revised in the CRE, with particular reference to the comprehensive studies on Bruckner's technique undertaken by the present writer when preparing his Critical Report for the first three movements. Generally speaking, the PV 1992 preferred fluid dynamics which often contradicted Bruckner's block-like instrumentation. For instance, its organisation of the crescendo into the principal theme twice included a *cresc.* in long, repetitive sections (b. 19, Str.: *f cresc. poco a poco*; b. 31: *cresc. sempre*; b. 39: Bruckner's own *dim.*). The CRE follows the structure perhaps more consistently (b. 19: *f*, b. 27: *cresc.*; b. 31: *ff*; b. 39: *dim.*; b. 41: *p dim. sempre*). Here the authors would also like to underline the importance of Bruck-

ner's own »accel.« and »dim.« in the four bars before the principal theme (FE, p. 133), since most conductors maintain the crescendo and tempo at this point. But note the particular dramatic expression of this sudden fall – surely the genuflection of the sinner confronted with the appearance of the Eternal Judge. This too is not without a model in Bruckner's music – see the first movement of the Sixth Symphony, just prior to the recapitulation of the principal theme (there, b. 191–4, again often neglected by conductors). In the gradually increasing sequences of the motto in the development, PV 1992 gave a continuous crescendo (*p cresc. sempre*). The CRE (b. 244, 268) prefers terraced dynamics instead, designing these four sequences gradually (*pp. p. mf. f*). It was also very important to observe the development of the climaxes: Bruckner was always careful about his *fff*, reserving this only for the peaks, but marking »local highlights« no stronger than *ff*. Hence the two climaxes in the fugue (PV 1992, b. 327 and 356; CRE, 313 and 342) were reduced to *ff* only (see also first movement, b. 207).

Similarly, the entire phrasing and articulation were re-examined. For instance, the imitation of the motto first introduced by 1. Klar. (b. 5) was not consistently notated by Bruckner himself. His three different variants were harmonised here as »semiquaver; single-dotted-quaver; semiquaver; quaver«, in order to avoid discrepancies, particularly in the development and fugue. Since Bruckner developed the Gesangsperiode directly out of the relentless principal theme, it should contrast strongly with the lyrical character of its counterpoints. Consequently, all slurs from PV 1992 (b. 75ff) were removed from the insistent motif. It seemed to be appropriate to basically maintain the articulation of its lyrical variants in half-bar divisions (see, for instance, 1. Fl. before the Trio, PV 1992, b. 103–6, one four-bar slur; CRE, b.89ff, revised here to half-bar slurs). One notable exception was PV 1992, b. 121–9 (Klar.), where retaining long slurs seemed inevitable in order to maintain resonance (CRE, b. 107ff). Longer slurs were required only if the woodwinds were doubling string parts, in order to give them greater resonance, for instance, the Klar. doubling of Vla. at the beginning of the fugue epilogue (CRE, b. 351ff), here with a two-bar legato added (PV 1992, b. 365: no legato). Likewise, string counterpoints in continuous chains of quavers were given half bar slurs, following the model of the first movement (note, for instance, PV 1992, b. 129ff, »zart gestrichen«, now CRE, b. 115ff, half bar legato; also preceding the fugue, PV 1992, b. 301ff, »gezogen«, now CRE, b. 287ff, with lyrical legato added). Drawing on practical experience, the triplet figuration of the chorale theme was supplemented with a *tenuto* on every crotchet, in order to pre-empt stop-gap bowing before each triplet. In the chorale recapitulation, the slurs were re-adjusted following the model of the Te Deum (half-bar legato in *p*, whole-bar legato in *pp*).

The important book by Wolfgang Grandjean, *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner* (Tutzing 2001), provided invaluable new insights into Bruckner's formal structures, particularly regarding the metrical numbers, which refer to the systematic regulation of emphasis within periods. Research by the present writer revealed also that Bruckner's typical accents (»Druck«: >; »Keil«: ^) were mostly used to underline the rhetorical phrasing which seems to be essential for Bruckner interpretation – as performances under Sergiu Celibidache, Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Daniel Harding and Roger Norrington have revealed. This led to some crucial additions of accents in order to bring a certain Baroque eloquence to this toccata-like Finale: Bruckner himself already gave a clear idea of this in surviving, discarded bifolios (see 2<sup>a</sup>C, FE, p. 107, and 2<sup>b</sup>C, p. 111). Some further features were added: following the model of the first movement, the motto (b. 4 ff) was consistently marked with > on the second note; its companion (1.2. Hrn., Viol. 2, Vla., b. 4 etc.) received an additional > on the first note as well (see first movement, Woodwinds, b. 78ff; Scherzo, Pos., b. 202ff; 2<sup>b</sup>C, lower Str.). The principal theme originally bore only Bruckner's ^ on the very first semibreve to indicate the four bar phrase. However, the various two- and one-bar truncations of this seemed to require an additional > for the third bar as well. This device particularly helps the listener follow the contrapuntal writing in the fugue, where a much more refined phrasing was achieved in the CRE by additional articulation. In the tremolo of lower strings in the chorale, > have been added, according to the changes of harmony (note Bruckner's own writing on 2<sup>a</sup>C, lower strings, FE, p. 109). Likewise, in the chorale recapitulation, the > added follow the model of the beginning of the Te Deum.

## XII. Revised Tempi

The PV 1992 introduced no fewer than 36 tempo indications (see table on the following page); however, only seven of them derived from Bruckner's manuscripts, and most of them were on discarded bifolios. In the first movement – not significantly shorter than the Finale – Bruckner used only 25 such indications. The main reason

for this was the assumption that the movement required three tempi – the main one, a slower one for the Gesangsperiode, and an even slower one for the Trio, following the model of the Finale of the Eighth. However, the Gesangsperiode is derived directly from the principal theme, hence there is no reason why they should not share the same tempo, especially if we observe Bruckner's late introduction of the minim progression into the principal theme (»3«E), not extant in the earlier versions.

Considering the basic tempo, the relationship to the first movement established by the common dotted rhythm should be respected: the principal theme of the Finale was certainly not intended to be faster than the end of the first movement. Another important clue is Bruckner's device of re-introducing the string accompaniment of the Te Deum in the chorale recapitulation. The shared, principal tempo of Finale, first movement and Te Deum should hence be Bruckner's typical, moderate Allegro, as has been respected here (»Misterioso; nicht schnell«). Bruckner's own characterisation of the end of the first movement of the Eighth Symphony as a »Death Clock« suggest that this should be chosen perhaps with one beat per second, consistent also with his own metronome marking in the Finale of the Eighth Symphony ( $\downarrow = 60$ ), or, considering the slower »Moderato« in the first movement of the Ninth, perhaps slightly less than that (56–60).

Precisely this relationship with the first movement seemed to require another important addition. The CRE decided to add a 4/4 time signature for the Trio in both exposition and recapitulation, considering that its character and counterpoint bears many similarities to the Gesangsperiode of the first movement and that of the Adagio as well. Interestingly, also in the first and third movements Bruckner decided to use a slower tempo for the Gesangsperiode only in the very last stage of composition, as the present writer has shown in the Critical Report (p. 13, see also Critical New Edition of movements I–III, p. XIX). To acknowledge two basic tempi, and not three, is also in line with the Te Deum and its main »allegro moderato«, and the »moderato« of its second and fourth movements. Bruckner himself considered a change to 4/4 in the Finale at least twice – in a later discarded version of the fugue (marked as »bedeutend langsamer«, FE, pp. 261 and 265), and in the initial sketch for the coda. He obviously later decided to keep the fugue in the basic moderate allegro tempo after composing its epilogue, which includes quotations from the Te Deum and would hence require the same tempo. (The CRE suggests »Mäßig bewegt« here, replacing the »bedeutend langsamer« from the PV 1992.) However, a slower 4/4-speed had to be established somewhere, and Bruckner's design of the Trio, so similar to the Gesangsperiode of the first movement, seemed to be evidence enough to justify such a suggestion. Another hint for a considerably slower tempo can also be found in Bruckner's own indication »sehr langs.« before the fugue (FE, p. 259) – though, without any change of time signature, but it is quite typical for Bruckner to require such a momentary return to a slower tempo (first movement, b. 375f).

Interestingly, a re-examination of the manuscripts even revealed a further tempo device by Bruckner himself at this point, hitherto overlooked: in the second bar (FE, p. 259), above Viol. 1, one can find a letter, transcribed by Phillips in his RAS (p. 75) as »n [?]«, but which is certainly an »r«, a Brucknerian shortcut in *Kurrentschrift* (running hand), indicating a »rit.«, which indeed serves well here to prepare the slower tempo that follows. Of particular importance for the tempi of the CRE was another observation made by the present writer during his preparation of the Critical Report on the Ninth. In his late works, Bruckner almost invariably used »ritardando« before returning to the previous tempo, but »ritenuto« when followed by a new tempo. With great care, he frequently wrote only the initial »r« or »rit« without using a dot, thus leaving room for later amendments. In all, the revised tempi allowed us to reduce the 36 indications in the PF 1992 to 26 in the CRE.

**TABLE IV: Concordance of Tempo Indications**

<u>Indications by Bruckner</u>	<u>bar</u>	<u>PV 1992 (687 bars)</u>	<u>bar</u>	<u>CRE 2012 (653 bars)</u>	<u>metrum</u>
<i>Finale</i>		FINALE		FINALE	
<i>2/2</i>	1	2/2; Misterioso, nicht schnell	1	2/2; Misterioso. Nicht schnell	♩; Tempo I
<i>accel.</i> [2F/discarded]	39	accel.	39	accel. sempre	
<i>langs.</i> [2 <sup>a</sup> C/discarded]	41	---	41	---	
<i>a tempo</i> [2 <sup>a</sup> C/discarded]	43	a tempo	43	Tempo I	♩; Tempo I
	75	Langsamer	75	---	♩; Tempo I
	106	---	92	riten.	
	107	Noch langsamer	93	4/4; Langsamer	♩; Tempo II
<i>rit.</i>	118	rit.	104	---	
	121	a tempo	107	2/2; a tempo	♩; Tempo I
	141	accel. sempre	127	accel.	
	143	Erstes Zeitmaß	129	Erstes Zeitmaß	♩; Tempo I
<i>langs.</i> [erased]	289	Langsamer	275	ritard.	Tempo II (in 4)
	290	rit.	276	---	
	291	a tempo (langsamer)	277	a tempo	Tempo I (beat in 4)
<i>r.</i>	304	---	290	riten.	
<i>sehr langs.</i>	305	Sehr langsam	291	Sehr langsam	Tempo II (in 4)
	307	accel. sempre	293	accel. sempre	
<i>Bedeutend langsamer</i> [17C/discarded]	311	Fuge. Bedeutend langsamer	297	Fuge. Mäßig bewegt.	Tempo I (beat in 4) (beat in 2)
	413	riten.	399	---	
	417	Langsamer	403	---	♩; Tempo I
	431	---	417	riten.	
	433	Noch langsamer	419	4/4; Langsamer	♩; Tempo II
---	444	rit.	430	---	
	447	a tempo	433	---	
	455	Sehr langsam	441	---	
	457	---	443	riten.	
	459	a tempo	445	2/2; a tempo	♩; Tempo I
	463	accelerando	449	---	
	467	Erstes Zeitmaß	453	---	
	471	Langsamer	457	Langsam	Tempo II (but in 4) (in 2; ♩ = ♩)
	475	---	461	---	
	479	Stringendo poco a poco	465	Stringendo poco a poco	
	487	Erstes Zeitmaß	473	Erstes Zeitmaß	♩; Tempo I
	572	rit.	554	---	
	573	Sehr feierlich	---		
	578	riten.	---		
<i>4/4</i>	579	4/4; Ruhig	561	4/4; Langsamer	♩; Tempo II
	595	accel. poco a poco	577	accel. poco a poco	
	603	accel. sempre	585	accel. sempre	
	607	2/2; Sehr feierlich	589	2/2; Feierlich	♩; Tempo I
	649	riten.	631	---	
	651	a tempo	633	---	
			652	riten.	

Recommended Tempo I: ♩ = 56–60 (should be identical with principal tempo of first movement and Te Deum)

Recommended Tempo II: Crotchet = 84–92 (should be identical with tempo of Gesangsperiodes in both first movement and Te Deum)

## ABOUT THE CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION (2012)

The attempt to prepare a performance version of the Finale is in some ways similar to making a movie. Editorial decisions can be compared to the post-production decisions of the director. For the final cut, his earlier function is complete and instead he now has to put himself in the shoes of the audience. His selection and order of the footage determines the structure and also influences the effect of the movie on the audience. Sometimes it may happen that, years after the première, film directors decide to prepare a new »director's cut« of a movie, for reasons which are known to everyone who likes movies; sometimes, new technology makes improvements possible; sometimes a director restores scenes he had to take out earlier on the demand of the producers – but sometimes he may also simply have come to new insights which would help to make the movie more convincing. (For this, Francis Ford Coppola's *Apocalypse now: Redux* may be a good example.) Likewise in the case of this performance version.

Once more the authors revisited Bruckner's preceding finales and examined in particular two aspects – the structure and elements of the coda, and how he treated the return of material from the first movement. Bruckner has basically two models for a Finale coda: The first type has a simple, final plateau, sometimes prepared by a crescendo from the end of the recapitulation (symphonies II/2, IV/1880, VI and VII, sometimes even like an appendix (Third Symphony in D minor). The second type employs a complex structure, more or less in five sections: a) an initial crescendo, often based on the initial Finale motif; b) a dramatic first climax; c) a new crescendo, often with chorale elements; d) an area providing a final cadence, sometimes continuing the crescendo, sometimes arriving at a pre-climax; e) the final affirmation of the tonic (Symphony in F minor and nos. I, II/1, IV/1, V and VIII). It should be noted also that no symphony of Bruckner ends in the minor key. Considering the thematic material, we find that most of the Finale codas start with a motif from the beginning of the Finale (the principal theme itself, its incipit, or the initial motif of the introduction). The one, notable exception is the Third. Here the preceding crescendo continues with the syncopated motif from the closing period, and the coda itself comprises the unexpected re-appearance of the initial trumpet theme of the first movement, dispensing with any further important Finale materials. The figuration of the violins is indeed taken from the beginning of the Finale, but in the context (a dense overlay of various rhythmical features) this is almost inaudible and drowned out by the powerful trumpets.

The return of material from the first movement at the end of the Finale is treated rather differently in each symphony; it depends on how much the theme of the Finale is related to it, and also on how significant the first theme of the first movement actually is. In the final coda of the F minor symphony there is no material from the first movement at all, also nor is there in the »annulled« D minor symphony (»Die Nullte«). In the First all Bruckner took from the first movement was the element used for the violin figuration of the coda (first movement, b. 18ff). In the Second, the initial string figuration contains the chromatic idea from the beginning of the first movement, and the final plateau contains the significant trumpet rhythm from the first movement in the woodwind, together with the transformed principal theme of the Finale. In the Third we find the initial trumpet theme of the first movement dominating the coda. The coda of the Fourth (1<sup>st</sup> version) combines the horn call from the first movement with the principal theme of the Finale, but in the 1880 version provides only the rhythm of the horn call in the low brass is provided. In the Fifth we find complex contrapuntal overlays, including the principal theme from the first movement, its end providing the final clausula. In the Sixth, before the coda the rhythm from the beginning of the first movement (b. 349) returns preceding the coda, but more important is the oboe motif from the beginning of the Adagio, and in the coda itself we find dominated by the Finale theme; only at the very end does the theme of the first movement re-appear twice in the low brass (b. 407). In the Seventh the Finale theme appears to be a direct variant of the beginning of the first movement; as in the Sixth, this theme itself re-appears only shortly before the end, but the end itself is provided by the Finale theme. In the Eighth, the principal theme of the first movement appears theatrically at the climax of the recapitulation of the closing period, in the dominant, to prepare for the coda; the coda itself broadly unfolds largely the initial theme of the Finale, culminating in the famous superimposition of themes. In the first version of the Eighth there was an soft, earlier entry of the Adagio theme in *pianissimo* at b. 751, however, in the later version this was wholly deleted by Bruckner.

What we do find in all the codas is important motivic material of the symphony in the final plateau, stated in an affirmative way, sometimes with elements from the first movement. Also, in most of Bruckner's symphonies, this final affirmation contains elements which can be significantly linked to the famous »Jacob's ladder« idea which

later became the ›non confundar‹ of the Te Deum, as Oskar Lang observed already back in 1936 (except the symphonies in F minor and »Die Nullte«); this is particularly evident in the Second, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth. Moreover, each Finale coda provides a string figuration which is maintained throughout, only sometimes culminating in some final strokes (in harmony or unison, as in the F minor, » Nullte«, I, II and V), and only in both second and third versions of the Third does this end with the motto from the first movement in unison. Mostly this is a straight-forward quaver figuration. A rare exception is the 1880 version of the Fourth, with a calm string accompaniment in crotchet triplets, while in the final version of the Third, due to a change of meter, the earlier quavers become very fast crotchets. However, there is no single Finale coda ending in a triplet quaver string figuration, and in no single Finale coda does the string figuration, once established, change into something different.

Taking all this into account, the parameters for the coda of the Finale of the Ninth seem to be clear. The structure of the entire movement, the surviving sketches for the coda as well as secondary information suggest the predominant five-part structure, leading in one huge arc through higher and higher levels up to the final culmination. However, the earlier structure of the CPV (1992–2008) did not fit with this, because it actually combined both types of Finale coda, ending the gradual five-part ascent with a further codetta, an appendix to the coda. As we can see from Bruckner's own revisions to two other symphonies, he tried to avoid precisely this. In the Second he later changed the repetitive structure of the Finale coda, eliminating b. 695–760 of the 1872 version, and in the Eighth he deleted the sudden *pianissimo* recurrence of the Adagio theme (b. 751–58 of VIII/1) and revised the ending in a way that, as in most of his codas, at letter **Z** after the final cadence the last plateau appears after breaking through. Hence the authors resolved to delete the 16-bar crescendo of 16 bars at letter **Z**, now going directly into the final plateau.

This decision had numerous consequences for the entire coda, including the necessity to revisit the question of the final Halleluja and the motifs of the final plateau. If we think about material from the first movement that is to reappear in the coda, it seems to be clear that not much of it could be suited for a triumphant break-through in D-major. What could perhaps be used is a variant of the initial horn theme in the bass, transformed into D major, as recognised by William Carragan, but this would not match with the new solution presented here, and the music is clearly a beginning of something, and not an end. Another idea would be perhaps a major variant of the ending of the first movement, but the relentless dotted rhythm seemed inappropriate for a final song of praise. Hence, only the octave fall and triplet core from the principal theme remained. The unison principal theme of the Finale is certainly not material suited for a final apotheosis, in particularly in the light of what we know from Heller, that Bruckner wanted to create a Halleluja-like song of praise. To imagine how such a hymn might have sounded, the significance of Bruckner's preceding two compositions, Psalm 150 and *Helgoland* (which contains a literal song of praise in its coda: »Oh Herrgott, Dich preiset frei Helgoland!«) cannot be overlooked.

Even the chorale theme of the Finale is not suited to provide the final apotheosis, because its design and function of it is entirely different from the Fifth. In the Finale of the Fifth, the chorale appears as a new element at the end of the exposition, following the closing period, and providing the theme of the fugue. Its re-appearance in the coda seems inevitable, because that is the only place where the chorale could return. Also the structure of that chorale is destined for a final statement: its four stanzas end in a clearly conclusive formula (b. 193–96), later bringing the coda to an end in a similar way (b. 607–14). But the chorale in the Finale of the Ninth is the closing period, properly brought back in the recapitulation, and there presented in the only way which makes a musical sense: instead of a simple repeat, Bruckner created a series of inversions starting, from the first stanza, gradually leading over into the epilogue with the horn theme. And an even greater impediment: this chorale has no last stanza which could serve as a final clausula. In the exposition there is the first long stanza of 16 bars, the second a short interjection of eight bars, the third a repeat of the first, but after 12 bars it leads not into a final clausula, but into a brutal chromatic descent. In the recapitulation, the first stanza is presented with a diminuendo explicitly wished by Bruckner himself, followed by an intended inversion of it (as one can see from the last two bars of the extant 29E/»30«), and providing a certain feeling of finality in the reconstruction by the authors, then the inversion of the second stanza, another cadence-like eight-bar period in falling fifths, and all that leading into – the unexpected outburst of the horn theme, in F sharp/G flat, and again no ›finalising‹ stanza. So this chorale appears to be almost

designed to fail, and it would be difficult to imagine how it could return again, in a triumphant, concluding manner, and even more glorious than at its first appearance in the exposition.

So the only element from the Ninth itself which really seems to fit musically for such a last hymn of praise, remains the trumpet motif from b. 5 of the Adagio: It is closely integrated into the motivic processes of the whole symphony, deriving from the first movement (b. 1–18 and closing theme), further prepared in the Scherzo (b. 89ff) and Trio (theme), also gradually prepared in the Finale (celli b. 351ff; ›horn theme‹ b. 383ff and 539ff; also the minor variant at b. 407ff and 453ff), and is the only element of the Ninth which actually permits an allusion to the ›non confundar‹ to be found in most of Bruckner's Finale codas. John Phillips also observed the unique way Bruckner introduced this motif: the three trumpets in unison bring it out in D major, within a movement in E-major the ›wrong‹ key, and again so at b. 81, but nowhere further developed (except the echoing passage of the strings in the Adagio at b. 89), as if this motif was to be held back for a special moment. Further consideration was also given to the significance of the part-writing of this motif. All the trumpets appear in unison at b. 5, and only at the last possible moment do they split up into three parts, as it is typical within the context of an orchestral tutti. Precisely the same thing happened with precisely the same motif at the end of the Second, revised by Bruckner for the first print edition in 1892 (see new edition by W. Carragan, Vienna 2007, p. 173) in the way that trumpets were doubled with trombones in octaves to bring out the motif more clearly, and in the same way split up into three parts at the very end. Looking at this one cannot help to feel this somehow foreshadows the intended conclusion of the Finale of the Ninth. Accordingly, the trumpets were re-designed in a way that the origin of the motif is now clearly recognisable: All three trumpets in unison, supported by the horns, and naturally growing out of the fanfare established in the final cadence at b. 625ff, and even forming a rhythmic augmentation of that motif. The manifold ways of using the Te Deum ostinato motif are justified by the manner Bruckner himself introduced it as a fourth theme at the end of the exposition and later used it in the development section and chorale recapitulation, the new string figuration at b. 633 now naturally growing out of the preceding, conforming to the voice leading of the upper line. Likewise the string basses continue from the preceding, as well as the woodwinds, now enabling a reference to the horn motif from the end of the Adagio in the flutes. The beginning of the principal theme from the first movement appears in the trombones and basstuba, but only in a rhythmic reduction, as it is typical for Bruckner at this point. The rhythmic triplet core legitimates the trumpet fanfare at the end.

These decisions required further changes in the preceding passages, in order to make the crescendo more powerful, the orchestration more dense, and the voice-leading more clear. After b. 616, the trombones and Wagner tubas were reversed again, returning to the design of the old 1992 version of the Finale, because the support of harmony has more weight in trombones and tuba, and because the Wagner tubas should motivically connect with b. 633. In b. 617–24 trumpets, horns, Wagner tubas and bassoons were rewritten as well. Trumpets now mark the changes of harmony at 617 and 621 with a restatement of their motif from the principal theme at b. 43, providing a destination point for the preceding crescendo as well as a better preparation for the fanfare at b. 625. Horns, bassoons and Wagner tubas, instead of providing an almost Respighian entry of the inverted fugue theme, now continue the truncated, syncopated head of the Finale theme as already at b. 601ff, now with the bass tubas and bassoons imitating the horns in inversion; the horns also much better prepare for the diminished imitation in diminution at b. 625.

At b. 609, the preceding woodwind triplets were now continued to intensify the crescendo and rhythmic tension created by the combination with the violin figuration in quavers. In a way this reinstates an idea from PV 1992, but there we had clarinets only were used, in three-part-writing, which seemed to be rather uncharacteristic for Bruckner. Bar 187 of the Adagio provided the model for the new arrangement: all flutes, first oboe and clarinet start with the melody alone; the lower parts providing supporting harmony enter four bars later (a doubling at b. 609–16 would be too low for the oboes and uncharacteristic if provided by low clarinets alone), and connecting with the part-writing at b. 617. Also the bass line of the chorale was reinforced, giving it to the first bass tuba and contrabass tuba one octave lower in b. 609–12, taken over by two bassoons, two horns and second bass tuba at b. 613. A very important change occurs at b. 596–99: the older versions basically held fast to the tonic, somehow over-iterated, and in particular with a weak connection to the following chorale. The new solution provides a more seamless preparation, chromatically ascending to the chorale, taking up the model from b. 145ff of the Adagio

(and similar to b. 207ff of Psalm 150), with the woodwinds changing to triplets already at b. 597, taking over from timpani, and the violins providing a figuration better preparing for b. 601.

A final, significant change occurs before the coda, at the re-appearance of the horn theme, observing Bruckner's own writing for strings: the motif as presented here, in unison, and with the octave fall in the low basses, is a typical accompaniment for a more massive unison writing of woodwinds and brass. It seems to be designed to imitate a full statement of the head of the principal theme of the first movement, in a similar way as introduced by the authors already at b. 383. Also, at b. 543, the massive unison of horns, Wagner tubas and strings makes the octave fall in bass trombone and contrabass tuba almost inaudible. Finally, it would be odd to have such a long crescendo as has been built up, for it not to be continued: the instrumentation, as can be recognised from Bruckner's preparatory sketches for wind parts on 31E/»32«, clearly suggests high woodwinds at b. 523 and a register change at b. 531, creating a soft interjection, but then it would be better if all woodwinds continue at b. 539. Accordingly, the octave fall was now reinforced with woodwinds (similar to b. 367ff of the first movement), continuing the voice leading of b. 537f, with flutes re-entering at b. 539, first in the lower position, later (b. 547) going to the high g. After b. 543 the second and third oboes and clarinets now also introduce a series of imitations, already preparing for the beginning of the coda (and also with a reference to b. 269f of the first movement). The part-writing for woodwinds was designed in a way that the canons of the triplet motif are still clearly audible; on the other hand, the sound is now richer, the octave fall, being so important as a preparation for the coagmentatio, emerges much better, and the entire chorale recapitulation now arrives at a culmination point, creating more contrast and sense of expectation after b. 554 for the already explained re-instatement of the return of the principal theme of the first movement (p. 37).

The authors hope that these revisions make the coda even more coherent and stronger than before. Further revisions are to be found at b. 411–14, where some clarinet imitations have been added. For structural reasons, the earlier bars 85/86, already indicated ›ad lib.‹, have now been eliminated completely. As a result, the bar numbers from that point onwards differ from the earlier editions by two.

*Dr. Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, Bremen, 1 February 2012 (© 2012)*

I am indebted to my colleague Dr. John Alan Phillips who helped with the correction of this essay.

# CORRIGENDA 2012

## Referring to the revised impression 2008 (Repertoire Explorer Study Score 444, MPH)

<i>Bar (2008)</i>	<i>Bar (2012)</i>	<i>CRE 2012</i>
85/6		optional bars entirely deleted
228–35	226–33	<b>1. Ob.;</b> <b>5.6. Hrn.:</b> <i>hervortretend</i> added
274f	272f	<b>Vc.:</b> Tenor clef instead of Violin clef; one octave lower (the MS clearly indicates »8a«)
340	338	<b>2.3. Fag., Vc.:</b> last note <i>fis</i> instead of <i>gis</i>
341	339	<b>2.3. Fag., Vc.:</b> first note <i>dis</i> instead of <i>fis</i> ; <b>1.–4. Hrn.:</b> rhythmically corrected (as in b. 335)
342	340	<b>2.3. Hrn.:</b> first note <i>fis'</i> instead of <i>gis'</i>
413–17	411–15	<b>1. &amp; 3. Klar.:</b> imitations added
467–70	465–68	<b>A.-Pos.:</b> octave lower (with Ten.-Pos.)
471f	469f	<b>2.3. Fag.:</b> octave lower; <b>T.-Tb.:</b> octave higher
471–78	469–76	<b>2. B.-Tb.:</b> with 1.; 473–76 as in B.-Pos.
473f	471f	<b>2., 4. Hrn.:</b> with 1., 3. Hrn. (octave higher)
477f	475f	<b>K.-Btb.:</b> sustained note abbreviated, as in T.-Tb.
479–82	477–80	<b>1.2. Hrn.:</b> changed with 3.4.; <b>3.4. Hrn.:</b> <i>hervortretend</i> added
541–55	539–54	<b>Fl., Ob., Klar., Fag.:</b> all music added (octave fall and imitations)
548f	546f	<b>Hrn., Tb., Trp.:</b> <i>hervortretend</i> added
556	554	Revised to link with the following
---	555–60	Return of the Principal Theme of the 1 <sup>st</sup> Mvmt. reinstated from PV 1992, thoroughly revised.
585–96	589–600	<b>Vla.:</b> supporting tremolo instead of Finale Theme doubling
591f	595f	<b>Pk.:</b> added
593–96	597–600	entirely re-composed, except Trp.
600	604	<b>1.–4. Hrn.:</b> <i>d', fis, a, d</i> , imitating Wagner Tb. b. 602f
605–08	609–12	<b>2. B.-Tb.:</b> replaced with K.-Btb.
605–12	609–16	<b>Fl., Ob., Klar.:</b> added
613–16	617–20	<b>2.3. Fag., 2. B.-Tb.:</b> added
612–20	616–24	<b>Fag., Hrn., T.-Tb., B.-Tb., Trp., Pos., K.-Btb.:</b> entirely recomposed
616, 620	620, 624	<b>Vc., Kb.:</b> last crotchet deleted and replaced with rest
620–28	624–32	<b>1. Fag., T.-Tb., B.-Tb., Pos.:</b> recomposed
628	632	<b>riten.:</b> double bar line, fermata deleted
629	632	<b>Viol.:</b> recomposed
		earlier bars 629–644 entirely deleted
629–49	633–653	almost entirely recomposed

## ABOUT THIS SCORE

Total length: 653 bars

Taken from surviving score bifolios: 1–216 [= 216], 233–48 [= 16], 265–328 [= 64], 345–408 [= 64], 425–56 [= 32], 481–512 [= 32], 529–44 [= 16]: = 440 bars

Elaboration of original sketches or drafts (SVE) in their correct position: 217–28 [= 12], 329–44 [= 16], 409–24 [= 16], 457–72 [= 16], 561–88 [= 28], 609–12, 614 [= 5], 617–40 [= 24]: = 117 bars

Gaps supplemented by the authors: 229–32 [= 4], 249/50 [=2], 251–56 [= 6], 257–64 [= 8], 473–80 [= 8], 513–28 [= 16], 545–60 [= 16], 590–608 [= 20], 613, 615/16 [=3], 641–53 [= 13]: = 96 bars

*Dr. Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, Bremen, 1<sup>st</sup> February 2012 (© 2012)*

## APPENDIX: EXTRACTS FROM THE CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION 2012

The following musical examples present those sections from the revised score 2011 which are significantly different from the Impression 2008, namely

- the revised Exposition of the Gesangsperiode (now b. 75–92),
- the revised Recapitulation of the Gesangsperiode (now b. 403–418), and
- the Chorale Recapitulation, revised Chorale Epilogue and revised Coda (now b. 495–647).

**APPENDIX:**

**EXTRACTS FROM THE  
CONCLUSIVE REVISED EDITION 2012**



85

Solo

riten.

1. Fl.

2.3. Fl.

1. Ob.

2.3. Ob.

1. in B Klar.

2.3. in B Klar.

1. Fag.

2.3. Fag.

1.2. in F Hrn.

3.4. in F Hrn.

T.-Tb. 1.2. in B

B.-Tb. 1.2. in F

1. in F Trp.

2.3. in F Trp.

A., T. Pos.

B.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

*p*

*cresc. sempre*

*mf*

*hervortretend*

*p*

*cresc. sempre*

*cresc. sempre*

85

riten.

Viol. 1

Viol. 2

Vla.

Vc.

Kb.

*p*

*hervortretend*

*p*

*gezogen*

*p gezogen*

*p*

Q

403

1. Fl.

2.3. Fl.

1. Ob.

2.3. Ob.

1. in B Klar.

2.3. in B Klar.

1. Fag.

2.3. Fag.

1.2. in F Hrn.

3.4. in F Hrn.

T.-Tb.

1.2. in B B.-Tb.

1.2. in F B.-Tb.

1. in F Trp.

2.3. in F Trp.

A., T. Pos.

B. Pos.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

Q

403

Viol. 1

Viol. 2

Vla.

Vc.

Kb.

riten.

411

1. Fl.

2.3. Fl.

1. Ob.

2.3. Ob.

1. in B Klar.

2.3. in B Klar.

1. Fag.

2.3. Fag.

1.2. in F Hrn.

3.4. in F Hrn.

T.-Tb.

1.2. in B B.-Tb.

1.2. in F B.-Tb.

1. in F Trp.

2.3. in F Trp.

A., T. Pos.

B. Pos.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

riten.

411

Viol. 1

Viol. 2

Vla.

Vc.

Kb.

U

495

1. Fl.

2.3. Fl.

1. Ob.

2.3. Ob.

1. in B Klar.

2.3. in B Klar.

1. Fag.

2.3. Fag.

Detailed description: This section contains the first five systems of the score. Each system has two staves. The first system is for Flute (1. and 2.3.), the second for Oboe (1. and 2.3.), the third for Clarinet in B (1. and 2.3.), and the fourth for Bassoon (1. and 2.3.). The music is mostly rests, with some initial notes in the first measure of each system.

1.2. in F Hrn.

3.4. in F Hrn.

5.6. in F Hrn.

7.8. in B (tief) Hrn.

1. in F Trp.

2.3. in F Trp.

A., T. Pos.

B. Pos.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

*fff*

*dim.*

*p*

*hervortretend*

Detailed description: This section contains the sixth through eleventh systems of the score, all for brass instruments. The first system is for Horns (1.2. in F and 3.4. in F), the second for Horns (5.6. in F and 7.8. in B), the third for Trumpets (1. in F and 2.3. in F), the fourth for Trombones (A., T. Pos. and B. Pos.), and the fifth for Euphonium/Tuba (K.-Btb.) and Percussion (Pk.). The music features long, sustained notes with dynamic markings from *fff* to *p* and the instruction *hervortretend*.

U

495

Viol. 1

Viol. 2

Vla.

Vc.

Kb.

*fff*

*p*

*gestrichen*

*div.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Detailed description: This section contains the twelfth through nineteenth systems of the score, all for string instruments. The first system is for Violin 1, the second for Violin 2, the third for Viola, the fourth for Violoncello, and the fifth for Kontrabaß. The music consists of rhythmic patterns with dynamic markings from *fff* to *p* and the instruction *gestrichen*. The Viola part includes the instruction *div.* (divisi). The systems are numbered 1 through 8 at the bottom.

503

1. Fl.  
2.3. Fl.  
1. Ob.  
2.3. Ob.  
1. in B Klar.  
2.3. in B Klar.  
1. Fag.  
2.3. Fag.

1.2. in F Hrn.  
3.4. in F Hrn.  
5.6. in F Hrn.  
7.8. in B (tief) Hrn.

1. in F Trp.  
2.3. in F Trp.  
A., T. Pos.  
B.  
K.-Btb.  
Pk.

503

Viol. 1  
Viol. 2  
Vla.  
Vc.  
Kb.

1 [9]    2 [10]    3 [11]    4 [12]    5 [13]    6 [14]    7 [15]    8 [16]



519

1. Fl. *ff*

2.3. Fl. *ff*

1. Ob. *dim.* *ff*

2.3. Ob. *dim.* *ff*

1. in B Klar. *dim.* *ff*

2.3. in B Klar. *dim.* *ff*

1. Fag. *dim.*

2.3. Fag. *dim.*

1.2. in F Hrn. *ff*

3.4. in F Hrn.

5.6. in F Hrn. *p dim.*

7.8. in B (tief) Hrn.

1.2. Tenor-Tuba in B

1.2. Bass-Tuba in F

1. in F Trp.

2.3. in F Trp.

A., T. Pos.

B.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

519

Viol. 1 *dim.* *ff*

Viol. 2 *dim.* *ff*

Vla. *dim.* *ff*

Vc. *dim.* *ff*

Kb. *ff*

525

1. Fl.

2.3. Fl.

1. Ob.

2.3. Ob.

1. in B Klar.

2.3. in B Klar.

1. Fag.

2.3. Fag.

1.2. in F Hrn.

3.4. in F Hrn.

T.-Tb.

1.2. in B B.-Tb.

1.2. in F B.-Tb.

1. in F Trp.

2.3. in F Trp.

A., T. Pos.

B. Pos.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

Viol. 1

Viol. 2

Vla.

Vc.

Kb.

[3] [4] [5] [6] 7 8

531

1. Fl.

2.3. Fl.

1. Ob.

2.3. Ob.

1. in B Klar.

2.3. in B Klar.

1. Fag.

2.3. Fag.

1.2. in F Hrn.

3.4. in F Hrn.

T.-Tb.

1.2. in B B.-Tb.

1.2. in F B.-Tb.

1. in F Trp.

2.3. in F Trp.

A., T. Pos.

B. Pos.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

*hervortretend*

Viol. 1

Viol. 2

Vla.

Vc.

Kb.





549

1. Fl.  
2.3. Fl.  
1. Ob.  
2.3. Ob.  
1. in B Klar.  
2.3. in B Klar.  
1. Fag.  
2.3. Fag.  
1.2. in F Hrn.  
3.4. in F Hrn.  
T.-Tb.  
1.2. in B B.-Tb.  
1.2. in F B.-Tb.  
1. in F Trp.  
2.3. in F Trp.  
A., T. Pos.  
B. Pos.  
K.-Btb.  
Pk.

Detailed description: This block contains the musical score for woodwinds and brass instruments from measure 549 to 554. The instruments listed are Flute (1, 2.3), Oboe (1, 2.3), Clarinet in B (1, 2.3), Bassoon (1, 2.3), Horn in F (1.2, 3.4), Trumpet (1 in F, 2.3 in F), Trombone (T.-Tb., 1.2 in B, B.-Tb., 1.2 in F), Trumpet (1 in F, 2.3 in F), Alto Saxophone (A., T. Pos.), Bass Saxophone (B. Pos.), Contrabassoon (K.-Btb.), and Percussion (Pk.). The score features various rhythmic patterns, including eighth and sixteenth notes, and rests. Dynamic markings such as *ff* are present. Rehearsal marks are indicated by a vertical line and the number 3 above the staff.

549

Viol. 1  
Viol. 2  
Vla.  
Vc.  
Kb.

Detailed description: This block contains the musical score for string instruments from measure 549 to 554. The instruments listed are Violin 1, Violin 2, Viola, Violoncello (Vc.), and Kontrabaß (Kb.). The score features rhythmic patterns, including eighth and sixteenth notes, and rests. Rehearsal marks are indicated by a vertical line and the number 3 above the staff.

555

1. Fl. *fff*

2.3. Fl. *fff*

1. Ob. *fff*

2.3. Ob. *fff*

1. in B Klar. *fff*

2.3. in B Klar. *fff*

1. Fag. *fff*

2.3. Fag. *fff*

1.2. in F Hrn. *fff*

3.4. in F Hrn. *fff*

T.-Tb. 1.2. in B *fff*

B.-Tb. 1.2. in F *fff*

1. in F Trp. *fff*

2.3. in F Trp. *fff*

A., T. Pos. *fff*

B. *fff*

K.-Btb. *fff*

Pk. *fff*

Viol. 1 *fff*

Viol. 2 *fff*

Vla. *fff*

Vc. *fff*

Kb. *fff*

[1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6]



569

1. Fl.

2.3. Fl.

1. Ob.

2.3. Ob.

1. in B Klar.

2.3. in B Klar.

1. Fag.

2.3. Fag.

1.2. in F Hrn.

3.4. in F Hrn.

T.-Tb.

1.2. in B B.-Tb.

1.2. in F B.-Tb.

1. in F Trp.

2.3. in F Trp.

A., T. Pos.

B. Pos.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

569

Viol. 1

Viol. 2

Vla.

Vc.

Kb.

accel. poco a poco

577

1. Fl. *p cresc. poco a poco*

2.3. Fl. *p cresc. poco a poco*

1. Ob. *p cresc. poco a poco*

2.3. Ob.

1. in B Klar. *p cresc. poco a poco*

2.3. in B *p cresc. poco a poco*

1. Fag. *p cresc. poco a poco*

2.3. *p cresc. poco a poco*

1.2. in F Hrn. *p cresc. poco a poco* *mf cresc. poco a poco*

3.4. in F *p cresc. poco a poco*

T.-Tb.

1.2. in B

B.-Tb.

1.2. in F

1. in F Trp.

2.3. in F

A., T.

Pos.

B.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

accel. poco a poco

577

Viol. I *cresc. poco a poco*

Viol. II *cresc. poco a poco*

Vla. *cresc. poco a poco*

Vc. *cresc. poco a poco*

Kb.

accel. sempre

583

1. Fl.  
2.3. Fl.  
1. Ob.  
2.3. Ob.  
1. in B Klar.  
2.3. in B Klar.  
1. Fag.  
2.3. Fag.  
1.2. in F Hrn.  
3.4. in F Hrn.  
T.-Tb.  
1.2. in B  
B.-Tb.  
1.2. in F  
1. in F Trp.  
2.3. in F Trp.  
A., T.  
Pos.  
B.  
K.-Btb.  
Pk.

accel. sempre

583

Viol. 1  
Viol. 2  
Vla.  
Vc.  
Kb.

**X** Feierlich

589

1. Fl. *fff*

2.3. Fl. *fff*

1. Ob. *fff*

2.3. Ob. *fff*

1. in B Klar. *fff*

2.3. in B Klar. *fff*

1. Fag. *fff*

2.3. Fag. *fff*

1.2. in F Hrn. *fff*

3.4. in F Hrn. *fff*

T.-Tb. hervortretend

1.2. in B T.-Tb. *fff*

B.-Tb. 1.2. in F *fff*

1. in F Trp. *fff*

2.3. in F Trp. *fff*

A., T. Pos. *fff*

B. Pos. *fff*

K.-Btb. *fff*

Pk. *fff* 3 3 3 3 3 trem. 3 3 trem.

**X** Feierlich

breit

589

Viol. I *fff* breit

Viol. II *fff*

Vla. *fff*

Vc. *fff*

Kb. *fff*

595

1. Fl.  
2.3. Fl.  
1. Ob.  
2.3. Ob.  
1. in B Klar.  
2.3. in B Klar.  
1. Fag.  
2.3. Fag.  
1.2. in F Hrn.  
3.4. in F Hrn.  
T.-Tb.  
1.2. in B B.-Tb.  
1.2. in F B.-Tb.  
1. in F Trp.  
2.3. in F Trp.  
A., T. Pos.  
B. Pos.  
K.-Btb. Pos.  
Pk. trem.

595

Viol. I  
Viol. II  
Vla.  
Vc.  
Kb.

601

1. Fl. *fff*

2.3. Fl. *fff*

1. Ob. *fff*

2.3. Ob. *fff*

1. in B Klar. *fff*

2.3. in B Klar. *fff*

1. Fag. *fff*

2.3. Fag. *fff*

1.2. in F Hrn. *fff*

3.4. in F Hrn. *fff*

T.-Tb. *fff*

1.2. in B T.-Tb. *fff*

B.-Tb. *fff*

1.2. in F B.-Tb. *fff*

1. in F Trp. *fff* hervortretend

2.3. in F Trp. *fff* hervortretend

A., T. Pos. *fff*

B. Pos. *fff*

K.-Btb. *fff*

Pk. *fff*

601

Viol. I *fff*

Viol. II *fff*

Vla. *fff*

Vc. *fff* lang gezogen

Kb. *fff* lang gezogen

Y

608

1. Fl.  
2.3. Fl.  
1. Ob.  
2.3. Ob.  
1. in B  
Klar.  
2.3. in B  
1. Fag.  
2.3. Fag.  
1.2. in F  
Hrn.  
3.4. in F  
T.-Tb.  
1.2. in B  
B.-Tb.  
1.2. in F  
1. in F  
Trp.  
2.3. in F  
A., T.  
Pos.  
B.  
K.-Btb.  
Pk.

dim. p cresc. sempre

Y

608

Viol. 1  
Viol. 2  
Vla.  
Vc.  
Kb.

dim. p cresc. sempre

immer gezogen



621

1. Fl.  
2.3. Fl.

1. Ob.  
2.3. Ob.

1. in B  
2.3. in B Klar.

1. Fag.  
2.3. Fag.

1.2. in F  
3.4. in F Hrn.

T.-Tb.  
1.2. in B  
B.-Tb.  
1.2. in F

1. in F  
2.3. in F Trp.

A., T.  
Pos.  
B.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

621

Viol. 1  
Viol. 2

Vla.

Vc.

Kb.

5 6 7 8 1 2

627

1. Fl. 2.3.

1. Ob. 2.3.

1. in B Klar. 2.3. in B

1. Fag. 2.3.

1.2. in F Hrn. 3.4. in F

T.-Tb. 1.2. in B B.-Tb. 1.2. in F

1. in F Trp. 2.3. in F

A., T. Pos. B.

K.-Btb.

Pk.

Viol. 1 Viol. 2

Vla.

Vc.

Kb.

*cresc. sempre*

*trem.*

3 4 5 6 7 8

**633** Z

1. Fl. *fff*

2.3. Fl. *fff*

1. Ob. *fff*

2.3. Ob. *fff*

1. in B Klar. *fff*

2.3. in B Klar. *fff*

1. Fag. *fff*

2.3. Fag. *fff*

1.2. in F Hrn. *fff*

3.4. in F Hrn. *fff*

T.-Tb. 1.2. in B *fff*

B.-Tb. 1.2. in F *fff*

1. in F Trp. *fff* hervortretend

2.3. in F Trp. *fff* hervortretend

A., T. Pos. *fff*

B. *fff*

K.-Btb. *fff*

Pk. *fff*

Viol. 1 *fff*

Viol. 2 *fff*

Vla. *fff* breit gezogen

Vc. *fff* breit gezogen

Kb. *fff*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8



riten.

649

1. Fl.  
2.3. Fl.  
1. Ob.  
2.3. Ob.  
1. in B Klar.  
2.3. in B Klar.  
1. Fag.  
2.3. Fag.  
1.2. in F Hrn.  
3.4. in F Hrn.  
1.2. in B T.-Tb.  
1.2. in F B.-Tb.  
1. in F Trp.  
2.3. in F Trp.  
A., T. Pos.  
B. Pos.  
K.-Btb.  
Pk.

riten.

649

Viol. 1  
Viol. 2  
Vla.  
Vc.  
Kb.