

DERYCK COOKE

The Bruckner Problem
Simplified

THE MUSICAL NEWSLETTER

DERYCK COOKE

The Bruckner Problem Simplified

The Musical Newsletter

654 Madison Avenue, Suite 1703, New York, NY 10021, USA

© The Musical Newsletter Inc., New York USA 1975

Revised Edition prepared for The Musical Newsletter, New York

PRINTED BY NOVELLO & COMPANY LIMITED, BOROUGH GREEN, SEVENOAKS, KENT

The Bruckner Problem Simplified

The textual problem presented by the different versions of Bruckner's symphonies is one of the most vexatious in all musicology, and the person ultimately responsible was Bruckner himself. Had he only possessed the normal self-confidence of the great composer, he would have produced, like Beethoven or Dvorák, a single definitive score of each of his nine symphonies; and we should have had a simple list of works and dates¹ as follows:

No 1 (1866) **No 4** (1880) **No 7** (1883)
No 2 (1872) **No 5** (1876) **No 8** (1887)
No 3 (1877) **No 6** (1881) **No 9** (unfinished 1896)

This would have been an absolutely straightforward situation, with the single exception that nos 3 and 4 did not reach their definitive forms until after no 5 had been completed.

We can only regret that Bruckner did not stick to these first definitive forms (No 8 excepted). If he had, we should have been perfectly happy to accept them as what they were, without any idea that they stood in need of drastic revision. But it was not to be. After the premiere of no 2 in 1873, Johann Herbeck persuaded Bruckner to make considerable alterations for the next performance in 1876; and so began that sorry business of the composer's revising his symphonies under the influence of well-meaning colleagues who wanted to make them more easily accessible to the public. In 1883, Josef Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe persuaded him to revise the orchestration of no 7, even making certain changes themselves; and in 1887 Hermann Levi's adverse reaction to no 8 induced him to revise the work altogether (which he did in collaboration with Josef Schalk). After that, Bruckner himself became afflicted with the revising mania: he had slightly revised no 4 in 1886, and between 1888 and 1891 he entirely recomposed nos 1 and 3 (the latter with the assistance of Franz Schalk). As Robert Simpson has said, it is a sobering thought that if none of this had happened, Bruckner would almost certainly have completed no 9; indeed, he might possibly have composed a no 10 as well.

Even worse, Bruckner's colleagues interpreted his malleability as giving them *carte blanche* to produce 'revisions' of their own. In 1890, no 4 appeared in a first edition with the orchestration and the actual texture remodelled in Wagnerian style by Franz Schalk and Löwe, and with cuts probably stemming from Richter's performances. In 1896, no 5 appeared in a first edition even more drastically cut, reorchestrated and recomposed by Franz Schalk alone. The original editions of all the other symphonies were also tampered with, by the Schalk brothers, Löwe, or others. They con-

tain, at the very least, unstylish alternations to the phrasing and dynamics, and unwarranted indications of expression and of tempo changes; some of them have cuts, or suggestions for cuts, and changes in the orchestration and the music itself, as well as occasional rebarrings. The worst case is Löwe's first edition of no 9, made in 1903, seven years after Bruckner's death.

Bruckner had made muted protests against such things. He refused to ratify the Schalk-Löwe score of no 4 with his signature; he begged Weingartner not to allow his alterations to no 8 to get into the printer's copy, whatever he might do in performance; and he preserved all his original scores 'for future times'. But it was to no avail. Instead of the ideal situation postulated by our imaginary simple list, a sadly complicated one materialized:

- No 1** completed 1866; recomposed by Bruckner, 1890-1; spurious 1st edn 1893.
- No 2** completed 1872; revised (with Herbeck's assistance) 1876; spurious 1st edn 1892.
- No 3** completed 1877; spurious 1st edn 1878; recomposed (with Franz Schalk's assistance) 1888-9; spurious 1st edn (Schalk) 1890.
- No 4** completed 1880; revised 1886; spurious 1st edn (Franz Schalk and Löwe) 1890.
- No 5** completed 1876; never revised; spurious 1st edn (Franz Schalk) 1896.
- No 6** completed 1881; never revised; spurious 1st edn (Cyril Hynais) 1899.
- No 7** completed 1883; orchestration revised (with the assistance of Josef Schalk and Löwe) 1883; spurious 1st edn (Schalk and Löwe) 1885.
- No 8** completed 1887; revised (with Josef Schalk's assistance) 1888-90; spurious 1st edn (Schalk) 1892.
- No 9** left unfinished 1896; spurious 1st edn (Löwe) 1903.

Thus by 1903 there were in existence no less than 25 different scores of the nine symphonies; moreover, the 10 published ones did not represent Bruckner's own intentions, whereas the 15 unpublished ones were either authentic or at least nearly so. It was to rectify this wretched state of affairs that the International Bruckner Society was founded in Leipzig in 1927, with the aim of replacing the spurious first editions with Bruckner's own 'original versions'. Between 1934 and 1950, nine publications were issued—seven edited by Robert Haas, and one each by Alfred Orel and Fritz Oeser²—which represented Bruckner's own original definitive scores of his symphonies—with one exception. This was no 8: Haas accepted the manifest compositional improvements of the 1888-90 revision, but incorporated material from the

²The last of these—Oeser's edition of no 3—was actually issued by the Brucknerverlag; but although not commissioned by the Bruckner Society, it belongs to the complete edition in spirit, and is accepted by the Society.

¹Each date indicates the completion of the basic score, irrespective of slight later retouchings.

first definitive version of 1887 which he believed that Bruckner had excised only under the influence of Josef Schalk. The ethics of this proceeding will be discussed later; but one immediate result was that it raised the total of existing versions to 26. On the other hand, apart from this, the muddle had been entirely cleared up. The ideal situation postulated by our imaginary simple list had been practically recreated; we now had a published score of each symphony as first definitively completed by Bruckner himself, except for no 8, and we had what was arguably the best possible score of that.³

But this happy ending was promptly annulled by fresh confusion. In 1945, for non-musical (political) reasons, Haas was deposed, and replaced by Leopold Nowak, who between 1951 and 1973 has brought out a new set of Bruckner Society publications, edited entirely by himself. In the cases of nos 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8, he published more or less authentic editions of the *revised* versions as drawn up by Bruckner himself, plus the hitherto unpublished original 1887 version of no 8, thereby not adding to the total of existing scores. With nos 1, 5, 6, and 9, on the other hand, he reissued Bruckner's original definitive versions as already published under the Haas regime, but with slight divergences which made his editions, from a strict point of view, different scores. And so the total was raised to 30.

Meanwhile, Bruckner scholars had been insisting that a full list must take into account the fact that, in the cases of nos 3 and 4, Bruckner's first definitive versions had been preceded by earlier scores (four in all) which remained unpublished; and so the list finally reached its present intolerable state of complexity:

- No 1** (1) 1866, ed Haas; (2) 1866, ed Nowak; (3) 1891, 1st edn of 1893; (4) 1891, ed Haas (Critical Collected Edition).
- No 2** (1) 1872, ed Haas; (2) 1876, 1st edn of 1892; (3) 1876, ed Nowak.
- No 3** (1) 1873, unpubd; (2) 1874, unpubd; (3) 1877, 1st edn of 1878; (4) 1877, ed Oeser; (5) 1889, 1st edn of 1890; (6) 1889, ed Nowak.
- No 4** (1) 1874, unpubd; (2) 1878, unpubd; (3) 1880, ed Haas; (4) 1886, ed Nowak; (5) F. Schalk and Löwe version, 1st edn of 1890.
- No 5** (1) 1876, ed Haas; (2) 1876, ed Nowak; (3) F. Schalk version, 1st edn of 1896.
- No 6** (1) 1881, 1st edn of 1899; (2) 1881, ed Haas; (3) 1881, ed Nowak.
- No 7** (1) 1883, 1st edn of 1885; (2) 1883, ed Haas; (3) 1883, ed Nowak.
- No 8** (1) 1887, ed. Nowak; (2) 1890, 1st edn of 1892; (3) 1890, ed Haas, with material restored from 1887 version; (4) 1890, ed Nowak.
- No 9** (1) 1896, ed Orel; (2) 1896, ed Nowak; (3) Löwe version, 1st edn of 1903.

Thirty-four different scores in all, and most of them published, liable to be used at any time! The 'Bruckner problem' has become sheer purgatory for the non-specialist musician or music-lover who

³Haas also published (in the Society's Critical Collected Edition, not for performance) the 1890-1 score of no 1, as being a revision undertaken entirely by Bruckner himself.

simply wants to enjoy his Bruckner symphonies. But it has only become so, really, because it is such a paradise for Bruckner scholars, who are delighted to have as many versions as possible to compare, contrast, and classify. In fact, the extreme complexity of the above list is entirely illusory. More than half of those 34 'versions' are not versions at all in any real sense: the total can be reduced to a considerably smaller number if we only concentrate on those scores which are more or less authentic and at the same time significantly different from one another.

To begin with, we may ignore, for all practical purposes, the early unpublished scores of nos 3 and 4. These are not alternative performing versions, but scores which Bruckner discarded on the way to his first definitive versions. They are never likely to be published outside a critical collected edition, and are of interest only to students of Bruckner's creative development. The same really applies to the first score of no 8, though since this was actually Bruckner's first definitive score of the work, which he improved only on the advice of others, it is interesting to have a published score of it. However, setting it aside with the rest, we reduce the total to 29.

Next, the first editions should be simply repudiated. These are not 'versions' either—not versions by Bruckner, that is. The monstrous distortions of nos 5 and 9, by Franz Schalk and Löwe respectively, seem mercifully to have been dropped by everybody; but one still occasionally hears the first edition of no 4, in which both men collaborated in misrepresenting Bruckner's intentions, and some of the others are liable to turn up from time to time. The rejection of these ten original editions (including the two of no 3) shrinks the total further to 19.

Finally, faced with the two different Bruckner Society scores of each symphony issued under the Haas and Nowak regimes, we need not talk about two different 'versions' where they show no structural divergencies at all but only a number of subsidiary differences in texture and/or orchestration and/or phrasing. With nos 1, 5, 6, 7 and 9, the two Bruckner Society scores represent, not different 'versions', but one and the same Bruckner score in two slightly different editions. So the list finally shrinks to 14, and the 'Bruckner problem' at last assumes manageable proportions:

- No 1** (1) 1866, ed Haas or Nowak
(2) 1891, ed Haas (Critical Collected Edition)
- No 2** (1) 1872, ed Haas
(2) 1876, ed Nowak
- No 3** (1) 1877, ed Oeser
(2) 1889, ed Nowak
- No 4** (1) 1880, ed Haas
(2) 1886, ed Nowak
- No 5** (1) 1876, ed Haas or Nowak
- No 6** (1) 1881, ed Haas or Nowak
- No 7** (1) 1883, ed Haas or Nowak
- No 8** (1) 1887/90, ed Haas
(2) 1890, ed Nowak
- No 9** (1) 1896, ed Orel or Nowak

These are the only scores that anyone need consider in clarifying his mind about the Bruckner problem. In what follows, I shall discuss the

textual situation of each symphony in turn, after giving briefly the facts about the two uncanonical early symphonies. For the lists of publishers of the first editions, in all cases I am indebted to the comprehensive list issued by Arthur D. Walker.

*

Symphony in F minor

This first symphonic attempt is known as the 'Studiensymphonie'—best translated as 'Study Symphony', and not, as one sometimes finds, 'Student Symphony', since Bruckner was 39 when he completed it in 1863. A mainly impersonal exercise by which he set no store, it was not performed in his lifetime, though occasional performances have been given since. The full score is available on hire from Universal Edition.

*

Symphony no 0 in D minor

By dubbing this more mature symphony 'Die Nullte' (The Nought), Bruckner indicated that it was not to be included in the canon. It received no performance in his lifetime; the premiere took place in his centenary year, 1924. The fact that it clearly reveals Bruckner's musical personality is due to its not having reached its definitive form until 1869, three years after no 1, though it was originally composed in 1864—that is, two years before no 1. There is only the one (1869) version, which is available in two published editions, that of Joseph Wöss, issued in 1924 by Universal (also by Philharmonia), and that of Leopold Nowak, issued in 1969 by the Bruckner Society. The latter must be taken as replacing the Wöss edition, which, although entirely faithful to the MS from the structural point of view, contains a lot of editorial phrasing, dynamics and tempo and expressive markings, plus a few misreadings of notation. However, one thing is worrying in the Nowak edition—the addition of a flat against the B for the second violins in bar 4 of the trio of the scherzo: it sounds improbable, and does not correspond with the equivalent note in bar 40, which is B natural. Could it be a misprint?

*

Symphony no 1 in C minor

(a) versions

I ORIGINAL VERSION, completed in 1866 in Linz, and usually known as the 'Linz version'. It was first performed in Linz in 1868, with Bruckner conducting; the score was not published in his lifetime.

2 REVISED VERSION, completed in 1891 in Vienna; and usually known as the 'Vienna version'. This is Bruckner's own radical recomposition of the symphony: retaining the general layout, he recast the music in multifarious detail, altering bar-periods, melodic lines, harmony, texture and orchestration, and even rewriting the material completely in places; he also added extra indications of tempo-changes. This version was first performed in Vienna in 1891, under Hans Richter, and was published two years later: see (b) below.

(b) first edition

REVISED VERSION, anonymous edition published in 1893 by Doblinger (later by Eulenburg, Peters,

Philharmonia and Universal). This score, still the only available performing edition of the revised version, must be rejected as unauthentic, since it differs in many details from Haas's reproduction of Bruckner's own score in the Bruckner Society's Critical Collected Edition (see (c)2 below). The differences are in orchestration, dynamics, phrasing, tempo-indications, and even time-signatures (in the first movement Bruckner's C is changed to C with a stroke, with certain passages changing back to 4/4).

(c) Bruckner Society editions

1a ORIGINAL VERSION, ed Haas: a reproduction of Bruckner's own score.

1b ORIGINAL VERSION, ed Nowak: a very slightly different reproduction of Bruckner's own score.

2 REVISED VERSION, ed Haas: a reproduction of Bruckner's own score (in the Critical Collected Edition only, not available for performance). Nowak has not yet published an edition of this.

With regard to Bruckner's own two different versions of the symphony, most Brucknerians favour the original; even Nowak, who in all other relevant cases preferred the revised versions, settled for the original version of this work.⁴ The argument is that, in the revision, Bruckner largely obscured the bold originality of his first conception by squaring off bar-periods, rewriting some of the material in his more complex later style, and generally blurring the texture and orchestration.⁵ However, since both versions are authentic Bruckner scores, conductors are at liberty to perform either, according to taste. But if choice falls on the revised version, the score and parts of the first edition should be brought into line with the edition of Haas (c) 2 above.

If choice falls on the original version, however, the question arises, as it so often will, 'Haas or Nowak?'. In this case the answer is that it hardly matters, since the two editions offer practically the same score. As with all the other symphonies (except no 3, published by the Brucknerverlag) Nowak reprinted from the plates of the first Bruckner Society edition, making such alterations as his view of the MS necessitated: here they affect only 16 bars of the whole work.⁶ Nowak gives no chapter and verse for these discrepancies, but they would seem to be different interpretations of difficult readings in the same MS that Haas used. They are as follows:

I 68, ff; 89, ob, bn; 86-93, str.

II 72. *Eiwas zurückhaltend*, and 75, *A tempo*, both in Haas but not in Nowak; also 150, va.

III Nil

IV 2, vn 1; 4, vn 1 and 2, va; 5 va; 391, va.

Of these 10 discrepancies, the two affecting tempo are quite unimportant, since any sensitive conductor might well act spontaneously in the way the Haas edition indicates, even if using the Nowak edition. Another four (I, 89; II, 150; IV, 5

⁴Hermann Levi actually advised Bruckner *against* revising this symphony—a unique reversal of the usual situation!

⁵The differences are too far-reaching to be listed here.

⁶I am leaving phrasing and dynamics out of account, since such differences as there are do not affect Bruckner's general style. In particular, I am not bothering with editorial emendations, such as where Haas has supplied a patently missing slur or accent, and Nowak has bracketed it to indicate that it is not in the MS.

and 391) are tiny adjustments of inner parts which are completely unnoticeable in performance; and with one of them (IV, 391) it looks as if Haas may have corrected a slip on Bruckner's part, while Nowak preferred the faulty MS reading. A further difference (I, 86-93) is slightly more important: in this string unison, Haas has unrelieved quavers (minims or crotchets with strokes), whereas Nowak has straight minims or crotchets some of the time.

The other three differences are the most significant, since they affect thematic lines. In I, 68 Nowak gives the first two flute notes in dotted rhythm, whereas Haas has even quavers—but this is a mere fleeting moment. The different string readings in IV are as follows: bar 2 (vn 1), the last four notes are *c'' -g' -e' flat-g'* in Haas, *c'' -g'' -e'' flat-d''* in Nowak; bar 4 (upper strings), the 2nd note is *d'''* in Haas, *f'''* in Nowak. The Nowak readings are certainly the stronger, but in any case the strings here are no more than a seething background to the powerful main wind and brass theme, so the differences are hardly noticeable.

Summing-up. The original version may be performed in either the Haas or the Nowak edition without making any real difference. The revised version, if desired, should be performed according to the Haas edition. But since the Haas and Nowak editions of the first version are so nearly identical, and since Haas's edition of the revised version simply reproduces Bruckner's own score, it seems pointless to bother with editors' names when designating which version of the symphony is to be performed. The only distinction to be made is between Bruckner's own two different versions, viz:

Symphony no 1 in C minor
(Linz version, 1866)

or

Symphony no 1 in C minor
(Vienna version, 1891)

*

Symphony no 2 in C minor

(a) versions

1 ORIGINAL VERSION, completed in 1872 (in Vienna, as with all the remaining symphonies). It was first performed in 1873, with Bruckner conducting (also in Vienna, as with all the remaining symphonies, except where stated otherwise). The score was not published in his lifetime.

2 REVISED VERSION (BRUCKNER AND HERBECK), completed in 1876 and performed that year, again with Bruckner conducting. At Herbeck's persuasion, Bruckner made cuts in the first, second and fourth movements, eliminated the repeats from both Scherzo and Trio, and altered bar-periods in all four movements; he also made an important change in the orchestration of the coda of the second movement. This version was published in 1892: see (b) below.

(b) first edition

REVISED VERSION (BRUCKNER AND HERBECK), anonymous edition published in 1892 by Döblinger (later by Eulenburg, Peters, Philharmonia and Universal). This score must be considered unauthentic, since it differs in several respects

from Nowak's Bruckner Society edition of Bruckner's own score: see (c) 2 below.

(c) Bruckner Society editions

1 ORIGINAL VERSION, ed Haas. Despite Nowak's statement in the preface to his own edition that 'Haas confused the two versions', it seems certain that Haas reproduced Bruckner's first score exactly. He did, however, indicate with '*Vi-de*' signs the passages that Bruckner marked there for cutting in the revised version; thus he left it to the conductor to act according to his own inclination.

2 REVISED VERSION (BRUCKNER AND HERBECK), ed Nowak. This is described on the title-page as '1877 version', which is merely different nomenclature (Bruckner made a few further alterations in 1877, after the performance of the version). Nowak again reprinted from Haas's plates, making the necessary alterations and indicating in his preface that the passages marked '*Vi-de*' must be cut to represent the revised version. He also printed separately, after the slow movement, its original coda from Haas's edition, as an interesting but not-to-be-used alternative (pp.73 *bis* and 74 *bis*). The complete list of differences between Haas and Nowak (and of the cuts in both editions) is as follows:

I Tempo marking, *Ziemlich schnell* in Haas, *Moderato* in Nowak; 460, Haas has no marking, Nowak *Langsamer*; 488, Haas no marking, Nowak *Tempo I*; Cut, 488-519, *Vi-de*, both scores; 566, in Nowak this is followed by an extra bar (timpani roll only), before Haas's 567.

II Title, *Adagio* in Haas, *Andante* in Nowak, but both have the same tempo marking, *Feierlich, etwas bewegt*; Cut, 49-69, *Vi-de*, both scores; 179 to end, slightly different bar-periods; 200 to end, solo instrument, horn in Haas, clarinet in Nowak.

III Tempo marking, *Schnell* in Haas, *Mässig schnell* in Nowak; Haas has repeat marks for both halves of Scherzo and Trio—none at all in Nowak; 123, this bar is repeated by Nowak, before Haas's 124. Coda, Nowak has two extra bars of general pause at the beginning.

IV Slight alterations in subsidiary voices, 95 cb, 349, 351, 361, trb 2; Cuts, 540-562 and 590-651 (the latter 590-655 in Nowak), *Vi-de*, both scores; 647 and 649 (Haas's numbering), in each case two bars of general pause follow in Nowak.

simply the choice between the original version and the revised version; and only one decision seems possible. As the whole purpose of the founding of the Bruckner Society was to get back to Bruckner's own intentions, and to get rid of elements originating in the influence of his colleagues, it seems curious that Nowak should have counteracted Haas's fulfilment of that purpose by publishing for performance revisions in which the influence of Bruckner's colleagues is unmistakable. Here it is not even in dispute, as Nowak himself admits. To quote his preface:

Johann Herbeck . . . advised Bruckner to make alterations, and this was to be the first instance of the well-meaning persuasion that Bruckner was to be subjected to for the rest of his life . . . we know that it was only with the greatest reluctance that Bruckner accepted these suggestions . . .

With that statement, Nowak condemns his own edition. The truth is that if Bruckner had refused to listen to Herbeck, and the symphony had come down to us in its original version only,

nobody today would have imagined that any cuts were necessary (why did Haas indicate them, one wonders?), or that any repeats needed omitting, or that the coda of the slow movement needed rescoring. Indeed, anyone suggesting the cuts that Herbeck wished on to Bruckner would surely have been regarded as a crank, since they upset the proportions of the structure, reducing the nicely judged codas of the first and last movements by half, and giving the second theme of the slow movement no time to establish itself properly before the return of the first. And anyone suggesting that the clarinet should replace the horn at the end of the slow movement would surely have been thought insensitive to a stroke of genius. The latter change was probably made because the high horn solo gave trouble at the first performance, but it can be brought off today by a really good player, and it is exquisite, whereas the clarinet is comparatively colourless. Even Nowak, by printing the original passage separately, showed his reluctance to lose it altogether.

The change of title for the slow movement and the different tempo indications for the first and third movements hardly matter, nor do the slight alterations in subsidiary voices in the finale. On the other hand the rearrangements are mainly damaging, the one at the end of the first movement being particularly irritating. Whereas in the original version the last note comes at the very end of the final 16-bar period, in the revised version it comes at the beginning of an imaginary new period, in the orthodox traditional way. No doubt Bruckner's delightfully unrhethorical conclusion worried Herbeck, and he persuaded him to change it to the more banally emphatic procedure. The anonymous editor of the first edition of 1892, incidentally, demanded an entirely inflated emphasis. The three versions can be compared (ex. 1; note-values halved):

Ex. 1

Haas: $\overset{(\uparrow)}$ $\overset{(\uparrow)}$
bars: 13 14 15 16

Nowak: $\overset{(\uparrow)}$ $\overset{(\uparrow)}$ $\overset{(\uparrow)}$ $\overset{(\uparrow)}$
bars: 13 14 15 16 1 2

1892: $\overset{(\uparrow)}$ $\overset{(\uparrow)}$ $\overset{(\uparrow)}$ $\overset{(\uparrow)}$ $\overset{(\uparrow)}$ $\overset{(\uparrow)}$
bars: 13 14 15 16 1 2 3 4

(upward stems, c''' ; downward, c''')

Summing-up. It seems incontrovertible that only Haas's edition of the original version should be performed; but some conductors will still no doubt prefer the revised version, in which case they should certainly use the Nowak edition, not the first edition of 1892. And so again, the two different versions can be designated simply, without editor's names—but definitely, I would say, with a mention of Herbeck, to exonerate Bruckner from total responsibility for the revised version:

Symphony no 2 in C minor
(original version, 1872)

or

Symphony no 2 in C minor
(Bruckner-Herbeck revision, 1876)

*

Symphonies 1 and 2 represent Bruckner's first period, in which his full individuality had yet to flower; no 3 marks the start of his maturity, which simply continued throughout his life without dividing into the usual second and third periods. And it was with this work, in which he first attempted the new monumental type of symphony he was to cultivate from then on, that his difficulties began—his *own* difficulties, that is, as distinct from those forced on him by his colleagues. Whereas each of the first two symphonies was soon built up into a single definitive score, it proved necessary to make three shots at no 3: the dates are 1873, 1874, and 1876-7.

To call the first two of these 'Versions 1 and 2' and the 1877 score 'Version 3', as some Bruckner students insist on doing, is pure pedantry. The first two scores were mere discarded attempts, which have never been published or performed; they were superseded by the 1877 score, which can only be regarded as the first definitive version.⁷

Symphony no 3 in D minor

(a) versions

1 FIRST DEFINITIVE VERSION, completed in 1877, and first performed that year with Bruckner conducting. It was published in 1878: see (b) I below.

2 REVISED VERSION (BRUCKNER AND FRANZ SCHALK), completed in 1889, and first performed the following year under Hans Richter. This is a partly cut and partly recomposed transformation of the 1877 score, carried out by Bruckner in collaboration with Franz Schalk; it was published in 1890: see (b) 2 below.

(b) first editions

1 FIRST DEFINITIVE VERSION, anonymous edition published in 1878 by Rättig. I have not seen this score, but since it has never been reissued, and has been superseded by the Brucknerverlag edition of Oeser (see (c) 1 below), the question of its reliability is purely academic. According to Oeser, it differs in certain respects from Bruckner's own score, so it may be regarded as unauthentic.

2 REVISED VERSION (BRUCKNER AND FRANZ SCHALK), ed. Franz Schalk and published in 1890 by Rättig (later by Eulenburg, Peters and Philharmonia). This must also be considered unauthentic, since it differs in many small details from Nowak's edition of the same score (see (c) 2 below). These differences (in texture, orchestration, phrasing, dynamics, expression markings and tempo indications) are due to further editing by Schalk.

(c) Bruckner Society editions

1 FIRST DEFINITIVE VERSION, ed Oeser (Brucknerverlag): a reproduction of Bruckner's own

⁷Hans-Hubert Schönzeler (to whom I am grateful for many suggestions) has pointed out to me that Bruckner did at least consider the 1874 score definitive enough to show it to Wagner, who accepted its dedication; and in his book on Bruckner he designates this 1874 score the 'original version'—the *Urfassung*. However, as we are concerned here only with possible *performing* versions, we have to ignore it.

score of 1877. It is described on the title-page as 'version of 1878', which is merely different nomenclature (Bruckner made a few more alterations that year).

2 REVISED VERSION (BRUCKNER AND FRANZ SCHALK), ed Nowak: a reproduction of the Bruckner-Schalk score of 1889, without the alterations made by Schalk for the first edition of 1890.

So again we are faced with a straight choice between two alternatives—the first definitive version and the revised version; and here there are three separate reasons for choosing the former. In the first place, as with no 1, Bruckner partly *recomposed* the work for the revision, rewriting certain passages in his more complex later style, which seems out of place in the comparatively simple world of the original.⁸ Also, as with no 2, he let a colleague persuade him to make cuts; and further, in this case, he allowed that colleague to do some of the cutting for him, *and by means of recomposition*. Here, for a second time, Nowak condemns his own edition by what he says in his preface:

The finale . . . was copied by Franz Schalk in a shortened version of his own, approved by Bruckner and used by him as the basis for his revision. Two of Schalk's shortened passages were accepted by the master . . . Bruckner approved those changes not made by himself . . . Josef [Schalk] wrote to his brother [Franz]: 'Your cuts and transitions, by the way, were adhered to'.

Again, we can only wonder why, after Oeser's edition of the first version of 1877 had perfectly fulfilled the intentions behind the founding of the Bruckner Society, Nowak should have thought it necessary to issue for performance a revision so indisputably interfered with by one of Bruckner's colleagues. No 3 is certainly the least perfect of Bruckner's nine symphonies (though not the least magnificent), but his attempt to improve it with the assistance of Schalk actually made it less perfect still. There may be two opinions about the passages completely recomposed by Bruckner himself, but there can surely be only one about the ruinous cuts which Schalk forced on the finale, and about such a clumsy piece of reworking as occurs in bars 155-60 in the first movement (ex 2).

This passage gives an idea of what is meant by Bruckner's 'recomposing'. The raising of the pitch by a 3rd in bars 3 and 4 of this passage may seem an improvement, but the sudden augmentation of the characteristic three-plus-two figure at the fifth bar can only be called a minor calamity: it breaks up the lyrical flow of the second group, and at the same time introduces a most uncharacteristic note of bombast. No doubt

⁸As with no 1, the differences are too far-reaching to be listed here in full.

Ex 2

The image shows two staves of musical notation for the first movement of Bruckner's Symphony No. 3. The top staff is labeled '(1877)' and the bottom staff is labeled '(1889)'. Both staves show a melodic line with a three-plus-two rhythmic figure. The 1877 version starts with a forte (ff) dynamic and a marcato (marc.) tempo. The 1889 version starts with a forte (f) dynamic and a crescendo (cresc. sempre) tempo. Both versions feature a pitch change in bars 3 and 4, and a three-plus-two rhythmic figure in bar 5. The 1889 version has a more complex and bombastic character in the later part of the passage.

Bruckner perpetrated this 'improvement' himself; but we have to remember that it was only due to the influence of Schalk that he ever started tinkering with the original work at all.

However, as with the other symphonies which Bruckner was persuaded to revise, some conductors will no doubt prefer the revision. In which case, it may be said that it scarcely matters whether they use Nowak's edition of the Bruckner-Schalk score of 1889 or Schalk's own edition of 1890, which was reissued by Eulenburg in 1961, in a new edition by Hans Redlich, freed from misprints. Since the 1889 score is itself unauthentic, in that it contains many elements stemming from the ideas of Schalk, why should a few more Schalkisms matter?

Incidentally, Arthur D. Walker has called Schalk's 1890 score a 'fifth version' (the Bruckner-Schalk 1889 one being the 'fourth'); and Redlich, in his preface, even made the total six (taking into account the Rätting publication of 1878). Moreover, Redlich looked forward to a possible 'seventh version, which will unite the achievements and characteristics of each of its predecessors'. If Bruckner himself could not make the symphony a perfect work of art, no-one else can now: merely to suggest such a possibility opens up the appalling prospect of an infinite number of different and equally useless 'versions' made by editors who think themselves free to pick and choose as they like.

Summing-up. Bruckner brought the symphony as near to perfection as he could in his first definitive version of 1877, and he never improved on it: this is surely the one that should be performed (in the Oeser edition, of course, which is anyway the only one now available). If the 1889 revision is preferred, the Nowak edition or Redlich's edition of Schalk's 1890 score can be used without making much difference. In designating the different versions, there is again no need of editors' names, but the three main scores should be clearly differentiated and a mention of Schalk seems essential:

- Symphony no 3 in D minor
(first definitive version, 1877)
- or
- Symphony no 3 in D minor
(Bruckner-Schalk revision, 1889)
- or
- Symphony no 3 in D minor
(Bruckner-Schalk revision, ed. Schalk, 1890)

*

With no 4, Bruckner again found it necessary to make three shots before arriving at his definitive score. The first was in 1874, the second in 1877-8 (in this he composed a new scherzo—the present one—and a new finale); and the third was simply

a recasting, in 1880, of the 1878 finale into its present form. As with no 3, there is no need to talk of three different 'versions': the score arrived at in 1880 was Bruckner's *first definitive version* of the work.⁹

Symphony no 4 in E flat

(a) versions

1 **FIRST DEFINITIVE VERSION**, completed in 1880, and first performed the following year under Richter; Bruckner made slight modifications for a second performance that year under Felix Mottl in Karlsruhe. The score was not published in his lifetime.

2 **REVISED VERSION**, made in 1886, for a performance in New York under Anton Seidl; the revision is concerned entirely with minor modifications of the orchestration, except for one important formal modification, which is discussed below. This score was also not published in Bruckner's lifetime.

(b) first edition

COMPLETELY SPURIOUS SCORE, drawn up during 1886-7 by Franz Schalk and Löwe, with cuts and with the texture and orchestration recast in Wagnerian style: it was first performed in 1888 under Richter, and published in 1890 by Gutmann (later by Eulenburg, Peters, Philharmonia and Universal).

(c) Bruckner Society editions

1 **FIRST DEFINITIVE VERSION**, ed. Haas: a reproduction of Bruckner's score of 1880.

2 **REVISED VERSION**, ed. Nowak: a reproduction of the score which Bruckner prepared for Seidl in 1886 (reprinted from Haas's plates, with the necessary modifications).

The first edition of 1890 was prepared and published with Bruckner's permission, but he withheld his ultimate sanction by refusing to sign the copy sent to the printer. It was reissued by Eulenburg in 1954 in a new edition by Hans Redlich, freed from misprints: in his preface, he calls it 'the fourth version', but he admits the spurious nature of some of the orchestration:

It is difficult to believe that Bruckner could have sanctioned the blatant sonorities of piccolo-flute and cymbals, suddenly and erratically introduced for the first time in movement 4, bar 76 . . . Both instruments introduce an element of theatricality, totally alien to Bruckner's world of sonorities. Equally suspicious are the *pp* cymbals (à la *Lohengrin*) at bar 473 (movt 4) and the effect of muted horns in the same movement's bar 147, to which significantly enough the 'aperto' sign is missing at bar 155.

Elsewhere Redlich finds 'felicitous touches'; but the truth is that the whole score is more than suspicious. Even worse than the Wagnerian orchestration, which blurs Bruckner's stark outlines, is the recasting of the actual texture, which works more fatally to the same purpose. A typical example occurs in bars 87-92 of the first movement, where the firmly punching trombone rhythm, so 'As with no 3, Hans-Hubert Schönzeler prefers to regard the 1874 score as the 'original version'—the *Urfassung*—but again as we are concerned with possible performing versions, we must ignore it here.

characteristic of Bruckner's musical personality, is toned down, not only by removing the accents and changing the *f* marking to *mf*, but by actually altering the note-values (see ex 3, which gives the outline only).

EX 3 (BRUCKNER)

Things like this, not to mention the pointless cuts in the Scherzo and finale, invalidate the Löwe-Schalk score. So when Redlich suggests that 'in a more distant future conductors will try to coalesce versions II/III and IV into an ultimate "practical version", embodying the best solutions, taken from all existing versions of the symphony', it is surely as unrealistic as to hope for a 'seventh version' of no 3. There are only two genuine versions of no 4: Bruckner's own first definitive version of 1880, and his own revision of 1886.

But how genuine is the revision? It seems that the MS used by Haas for his edition of the first definitive version of 1880 was a copy of it made by Bruckner himself in 1890;¹⁰ and the fact that Bruckner made a copy of it at this time could be considered not only (as Redlich admits) a 'silent protest' against the publication of the Löwe-Schalk score in 1890, but also an annulment of the revision made (in what circumstances we do not know) for Seidl's performance of 1886. It seems undeniable that Bruckner's final decision was to abide by his first definitive version of 1880.

In any case, there is really little difference between the two versions. The divergences in orchestral detail affect only 140 bars (about 7%), of the work, and they are quite unimportant, being almost entirely minor adjustments of the woodwind and brass parts which are scarcely noticeable in performance. They are too numerous to list here in full; the most interesting are as follows.

- I 19, ob; 459-62 ob
- II 21, db; 105-8, tpt; 193, brass; 201-3, hn; 217-8, tpt
- III (Trio) 44-52, cl; 51-3, ob
- IV 19-22, ob; 51-5, ww; 187-92, hn; 249-52, ob; 449, hn

There are also several changes, in the finale, from C with a stroke to 4/4, which do not really matter, since these passages could only be conducted in four anyway. The really important difference, referred to in (a) 2 above, occurs in the last nine bars of the finale: in the 1886 revision, the trombone-and-tuba reiteration of the rhythm of the symphony's opening horn-motive is backed by repetitions of that motive itself on the third and fourth horns, whereas in the definitive version of 1880 these two instruments merely support the general tutti texture of the repeated tonic chord.

¹⁰Pointed out by Redlich in the preface to his Eulenburg edition of the Löwe-Schalk score. In Robert Haas's book *Anton Bruckner* (Potsdam 1934), Plate 4 reproduces the first page of Bruckner's definitive score, and the date at the head of it is clearly January 18th, 1890 (i.e. Bruckner made that year a fair copy of his first definitive score of 1880).

It is not in fact very easy to hear the motive in most performances of the revised version, since conductors too often allow the two horns to be drowned by the *ff* brass and the other two horns; but in so far as it *can* be heard, it does represent a formal difference affecting the conception of the whole work.

Summing-up. The Löwe-Schalk score should be rejected altogether as a falsification of Bruckner's intentions. Ideally, the Haas edition should be used, as representing Bruckner's final adherence to his first definitive version,¹¹ though some conductors will no doubt opt for the Nowak edition of the revised version, with its return of the opening horn motive at the end of the work. Since both represent scores drawn up by Bruckner himself, they can be differentiated quite simply, without using editors' names:

Symphony no 4 in E flat
(first definitive version, 1880)

or

Symphony no 4 in E flat
(revised version, 1886)

After nos 3 and 4, the growing-pains of Bruckner's new monumental type of symphony were over, and he had no further difficulties, except with no 8. So, with this one exception, there is no longer any need to tabulate versions and editions.

Symphony no 5 in B flat

Bruckner completed the work in 1876 and never revised it (though he slightly retouched it, up to 1878). This single definitive score was neither performed nor published in his lifetime; but in 1893 Franz Schalk made a version of his own, with cuts and with a comprehensive transformation of the texture and orchestration, for his first performance of the work in Graz the following year.¹² In this score, which was published as the first edition of 1896 by Doblinger (later by Eulenburg, Peters and Philharmonia), Bruckner had no part at all: he was too ill to attend the performance and was on his deathbed when the score was published.

His own score was brought out by the Bruckner Society, edited by Haas; and Nowak's edition followed—a reprint from Haas's plates with scarcely any alterations. The significant differences are as follows.

- I 309 va; 314, tpt 2
- II Nil
- III 71-4, bass trb, tuba
- IV 589, vn 1 and 2

Of these four differences, three seem to be mere corrections by Nowak of misreadings by Haas, and are practically unnoticeable in performance.

¹¹Hans-Hubert Schönzeler has drawn my attention to the curious fact that the two different printings of the Haas edition (1936 and 1944) show slight differences of orchestration in the Trio of the Scherzo: the most important is that the theme of the first eight bars, given to flute and clarinet in the 1936 printing, is given to *oboe* and clarinet in the 1944 one. The reason for this change is obscure, since Haas offered no explanation of it; however, it is so small a detail in the vast conception of the whole work that there is no need to differentiate between the two printings, even though conductors who favour the Haas edition will no doubt prefer one to the other, according to taste. (The 1944 Haas printing is the only published score of the work which has this feature; it can be heard on Klemperer's recording.)

¹²For an instance of how Schalk even recomposed passages of the work, see Redlich, *Bruckner and Mahler*, pp 45-7, where the Bruckner and Schalk forms of bars 1-16 of the finale are quoted and compared.

The other (III, 71-4) is a case where both editors are patently wrong: the bass trombone should obviously have a staccato crotchet *A* on the first beat of each bar, and the tuba should be tacet (a good conductor would naturally sort this out at rehearsal). It may be added that in both editions a large cut is suggested (bars 270-374 in the finale are marked 'Vi-de'), and that this, as with all other cases in the symphonies, should be simply ignored. Since the cut would completely upset the proportions of the movement, it could hardly have been thought of by Bruckner himself.

Summing-up. The spurious Schalk score has been abandoned by everybody, and it does not matter whether the Haas or the Nowak edition of Bruckner's own score is used for performance. So there is no need to mention editors' names or 'versions' when designating the work, which stands simply as:

Symphony no 5 in B flat (1876)

*

Symphony no 6 in A

Bruckner completed the work in 1881, and never revised it. Only two movements (the second and third) were performed in his lifetime—in 1883 under Wilhelm Jahn; the first performance of the work (heavily cut) took place in 1899 under Mahler. That same year the first edition, edited by Cyril Hynais, was published by Doblinger (later by Eulenburg, Peters, Universal and Philharmonia); this must be considered unauthentic, as it contains alterations to dynamics and phrasing, unwarranted extra tempo indications, and suggestions for cuts.

Bruckner's own score was brought out by the Bruckner Society, edited by Haas; and Nowak's edition followed—a reprint from Haas's plates with a number of small modifications. Most of the discrepancies are manifest corrections by Nowak of misprints in Haas; many of them would be picked up anyway in rehearsal, since they are cases where two instruments are doubling each other but do not have the same note or accidental. In any case there are places where Nowak has failed to correct Haas (eg I, 96, cl 2; 181, db; and IV, 301, vn 2; 351, vn 1). The actual differences in texture, covering six bars of the first movement, are as follows:

- I 29, hn 3, 4; 32, trb 2; 121, vn 2; 138, ob; 212, vn 2; 279, db

All these discrepancies are entirely or practically unnoticeable in performance, except only Nowak's extra two double-bass notes in bar 279, and these look rather curious (one would have expected Bruckner to stop this *pizzicato* pedal a bar earlier, as in the Haas edition).

Summing-up. The first edition seems to have dropped out now, as it should have done, and it does not matter whether the Haas or the Nowak edition of Bruckner's own score is used for performance, provided that the misprints in both are corrected. Again the work needs no more than its title and date for its correct designation:

Symphony no 6 in A (1881)

*

Symphony no 7 in E

Bruckner completed the work in 1883 and never

revised it. That same year, however, he was persuaded (and helped) by Josef Schalk and Löwe to recast the orchestration of a few passages, for the first performance in Leipzig the following year under Nikisch. It was in this form—but with further editorial retouchings by Schalk and Löwe and with additional tempo indications stemming from Nikisch—that the symphony was first published in 1885 by Gutmann (later by Eulenburg, Kalmus, Peters, Philharmonia and Universal).

The Bruckner Society brought out Bruckner's own score, edited by Haas; and Nowak followed with his edition of the same score, reprinted from Haas's plates but modified to include the orchestral alterations. There is no need to make a great deal of these, since they cover no more than 29 bars of the whole work, as follows:

- I 103-4, hn; 123-30, ob, hn, tpt, trb, tuba; 148-9, cl, bn; 154, 156, vn I; 319-22, ob
- II 177-81, timp, trgl, cym; 192, trb; 216, str (*pizz* in Nowak, not till 217 in Haas)
- III Nil
- IV 337-9, tpt

These discrepancies affect the sound of the work very little. As regards the really striking one, the famous cymbal clash and triangle-roll at II, 177, I cannot say I am worried: even if it is a Schalk-and-Löweism, Bruckner's climax is so pure as to ennoble these dangerously flashy weapons in the romantic orchestral armoury. (But it is a pity we should have to make such personal decisions.) In any case, much worse than things like this, in Nowak's edition, is the reintroduction (in brackets) of the extra tempo indications of the first edition. They have no place in Bruckner's score, being simply Nikisch's 'conductor's markings': Bruckner is supposed to have sanctioned them, but surely only for Nikisch's own performances. The *Alla breve* and *Molto animato* markings at I, 233, and the plentifully scattered *ritard* markings in the finale, are particularly harmful, since if observed carefully (*cf* Klemperer's recording) they destroy the natural flow of the music (who can say how much or how little Nikisch meant by them?).

Summing up. The first edition and Nowak's edition differ very little, and in view of their unwarranted tempo indications should surely be rejected in favour of Haas's edition, which is a clean reproduction of Bruckner's own definitive score. Again, whichever score is used, the work can be designated by its title and date alone:

Symphony no 7 in E (1883)

*

Symphony no 8 in C minor

(a) versions

1 ORIGINAL VERSION, completed in 1887.¹³ The score has been issued by the Bruckner Society (1973), ed Nowak.

2 REVISED VERSION (BRUCKNER AND JOSEF SCHALK), completed in 1890, and first performed two years later under Richter. This is a recom-

¹³The statement in the lists issued by Arthur D. Walker, that there was a first version in 1885, and that the score of 1887 is a second version, is incorrect. The 1885 MS—as confirmed in the monumental Bruckner biography of Gollerich (completed by Auer), IV 2, 532-537—is a full-length *sketch*, partly in pencil, partly in ink, partly in short score, partly in full score; the 1887 MS is a full-score realization of this, and thus the first genuine version of the work.

posed and partly cut transformation of the 1887 score, carried out by Bruckner in collaboration with Josef Schalk; it was published in 1892 as the first edition: see (b) below.

(b) first edition

REVISED VERSION (BRUCKNER AND JOSEF SCHALK), edited by Josef Schalk and published in 1892 by Schlesinger (later by Eulenburg, Haslinger, Peters and Philharmonia). This must be considered unauthentic, since it differs in a number of respects from Nowak's edition of the Bruckner-Schalk score of 1890; see (c) 3 below.

(c) Bruckner Society editions

1 ORIGINAL VERSION, ed Nowak; a reproduction of Bruckner's score of 1887.

2 REVISED VERSION (WITH MATERIAL RESTORED FROM THE ORIGINAL VERSION), ed Haas.

3 REVISED VERSION (BRUCKNER AND JOSEF SCHALK), ed Nowak. This was largely reprinted from Haas's plates, but with considerable modifications to make the score a reproduction of the Bruckner-Schalk score of 1890 (without the alterations made by Schalk for the first edition of 1892).

Here we face the most awkward problem of all. It was Hermann Levi's negative reaction to the original version of 1887 that led Bruckner to revise the work; and in doing so, he went through it with a fine toothcomb: in particular, he composed a new ending to the first movement and a new Trio for the Scherzo, as well as redispersing the tonal perspective of the Adagio. These manifest compositional improvements¹⁴ Haas felt obliged to accept as such; but Bruckner had also made cuts in the Adagio and finale, and Haas felt these to be damaging, and almost certainly due to the influence of Schalk. So he restored the missing material from the 1887 score. Nowak, in his preface, declared Haas's procedure to be impossible, since 'different sources, according to the principles for the working out of a critical complete edition, can never be intermingled'; and so, for his own edition, he simply reproduced the Bruckner-Schalk revision of 1890 in a clean score.

Nowak may have musicological rectitude on his side, but this is a unique case, in which human ethics play at least as large a part as the musicological variety. Josef Schalk's interference in the revision must itself be considered unethical; and so Haas's conjectural restoration of what Bruckner's own revision would probably have been, if he had been left to himself, could be regarded as the setting right of a wrong. We may consider a single example, a passage in the second group of the finale, as it appears in the exposition (leading up to letter F) and in the recapitulation (leading up to letter Oo). This passage, which contains a reference to the Seventh Symphony, is followed in both cases by a completely new section in a slower tempo; ex 4 shows how it appears in the exposition in both the original version of 1887 and the revised version of 1890 (the example breaks off at letter F). In the original version Bruckner restated this passage in full in the recapitulation, with a climactic extension of two

¹⁴But was it the originals of these passages that worried Levi? Most unlikely—it seems that he was puzzled by the whole work.

bars (ex 5, which breaks off at letter Oo). But in the Bruckner-Schalk revision of 1890, this recapitulatory passage is drastically and crudely truncated (ex 6, which also breaks off at letter Oo). And in the Schalk first edition of 1892 alone, the passage in the exposition is truncated as well (ex 7).

Nowak, musicologically faithful to the Bruckner-Schalk revision of 1890, has ex 4 in the exposition and ex 6 in the recapitulation, and gives his reasons as follows: 'Josef Schalk wrote in his letter of August 5, 1891, to Max von Oberleithner [who saw the edition through the press] that he wanted this abbreviation [the cut in the exposition, as in ex 7], since the "reminiscence of the Seventh" seemed "quite unfounded to him". He was not quite wrong, because the abbreviation before letter Oo [the cut in the recapitulation as in ex 6], made by Bruckner himself, eliminated the same passage in the reprise. Thus the balance of motives in the second version is disturbed, nevertheless, following Bruckner's decisions nothing is to be changed . . .'

In fact, this is one more case of a Nowak preface condemning a Nowak edition—or rather condemning a score that Nowak has edited. Bruckner could not possibly have made 'decisions' which 'disturbed the balance of the motives', since he was always eager for his full-length scores to be published, if possible. It can only have been that he made the cut in the recapitulation (ex 6) to satisfy Schalk (and made a botch of it as can be seen), but that he overlooked the equivalent passage in the exposition (ex 4). And in 1891, when the score was being prepared for printing, Schalk must have realized—the old man had forgotten! Hence his letter to Oberleithner, asking for the truncation in the exposition (ex 7). In spite of Nowak, Schalk was 'quite wrong' in tampering with Bruckner's score at all, either by influencing Bruckner or by altering it himself. Nevertheless, in making the cut in the exposition he did show that he cared about the 'balance of the motives', whereas Nowak, by leaving out what Bruckner and Schalk had cut in the recapitulation and keeping in what Schalk had cut of his own accord in the exposition, achieved only a piece of musicological pedantry which makes no structural sense at all. How much wiser was Haas, in restoring the situation of the original version (indicated by exx 4 and 5), and thus shaking off the influence of Schalk altogether!¹⁵ The same may be said of his other

¹⁵Nowak offers a technical argument against Haas's restorations—that material cannot be incorporated from the original version because that is a score with two of each woodwind and the revised version is a score with three; but it is quite invalid, since there are still many passages in Bruckner's revised version where only two of each are used.

restorations, in this movement and in the Adagio. The cuts in the revised version are as follows:

Apart from these, there are many other discrepancies between the Haas and Nowak editions, concerning texture and orchestration, because Haas restored more than material—what he considered felicities, which had been spoiled in the revision. A dangerous undertaking, no doubt, and yet his score always seems the more Brucknerian. The differences are too many to list in full here; the following are the most significant.

In any case, these differences matter very little compared with the cuts.

Summing-up. The Nowak edition of the original version of 1877 is of purely musicological interest. No doubt there will always be controversy over the merits of the Haas and Nowak scores of the revised version of 1890: although my own vote goes unreservedly to the Haas, since it makes the best of both versions, there are still musicians who stand by the Nowak. Actually, as with no 3, the Nowak and the first edition are so near to each other that it makes little difference which is used; as said above, the first edition is more logical in one respect at least. Whichever score is used, it should be clearly designated, and this is a case where editors' names should certainly be mentioned:

Symphony no 8 in C minor
(1887/90, ed Haas)

or

Symphony no 8 in C minor
(Bruckner-Schalk revision, 1890, ed Nowak)

or

Symphony no 8 in C minor
(Bruckner-Schalk revision, ed Schalk, 1892)

*

Symphony no 9 in D minor

Once more, there is no need to tabulate. Bruckner left the work unfinished (lacking the finale) when he died in 1896, and his score was not published for 38 years. The first edition, issued in 1903 by Doblinger (later by Eulenburg,¹⁶ Peters, Philharmonia and Universal) was of a 'version' made by Löwe, with cuts and alterations to the texture and orchestration, for his first performance of

¹⁶Not to be confused with Eulenburg's 1963 publication of Bruckner's own score, ed Hans-Hubert Schönzeler.

Ex 4

Ex 5

Ex 6

Ex 7

the work that year. This score is entirely unauthentic, and is never used today.

Bruckner's own score was brought out by the Bruckner's Society, edited by Alfred Orel, and Nowak's edition followed—an identical reprint from Orel's plates, except for a correction of one or two misprints. So the symphony stands simply as:

Symphony no 9 in D minor (unfinished, 1896)

*

To conclude this investigation of the 'Bruckner problem', I should like to offer my own personal list of the versions which I believe should be used for performance, as being the purest. It is in complete agreement with the conclusions of Robert Simpson,¹⁷ and practically with those of Hans-Hubert Schönzeler—and it takes us back to the imaginary simple list with which we began.

1 Linz version, 1866 (Haas or Nowak)

2 Original version, 1872 (Haas)

3 First definitive version, 1877 (Oeser)

4 First definitive version, 1880 (Haas)

5 Definitive version, 1876 (Haas or Nowak)

6 Definitive version, 1881 (Haas or Nowak)

7 Definitive version, 1883 (Haas)

8 Revised version, 1890, with material restored from original version of 1887 (Haas)

9 Definitive version, 1896 (Orel, Nowak, or Schönzeler)

Scores and orchestral parts of all the Bruckner Society editions of the symphonies are available as follows:

Britain: Haas's editions of nos 1-2 and 4-8, and Orel's of no 9, from Breitkopf & Härtel; Oeser's edition of no 3 and Nowak's editions of nos 0-9, (plus the 1887 score of no 8), from Bärenreiter.

USA: Haas's editions of nos 1-2 and 4-8, and Orel's of no 9, from Associated Music Publishers; Oeser's edition of no 3 and Nowak's editions of nos 0-9, (plus the 1887 score of no 8), from Schirmer.

¹⁷in *The Essence of Bruckner*

copyright music examples by permission of the copyright owners

ADDENDA

On Page 6, list in first column, No. 4:

after "(1) 1874, unpubd" ADD "Now pubd., ed. Nowak (1975)"

On Page 11, ADD at the end of footnote 9: "It is now published, ed. Nowak (1975)"

On Page 14, second column, ADD after "The cuts in the revised version are as follows:"

III 209-18

IV 211-30, 253-6, 584-98, 609-15, 671-4

On Page 14, second column, ADD after "the following are the most significant."

I 101, hn; 164-72, vn 1 + 2, bn, hn

III 24-5 and 41-2, bn, brass; 60 fl, cl; 66-7, cl;

141-2, 151-2, vn 2; 160, vn, vn 1; 260-1, brass