#### SYMPHONY HALL, BOSTON

HUNTINGTON AND MASSACHUSETTS AVENUES

Telephones STicket Office Branch Exchange Administration Offices Back Bay 1492

## Boston Symphony Orchestra

THIRTY-SIXTH SEASON, 1916-1917

Dr. KARL MUCK, Conductor

### Programme of the

# Fifth Afternoon and Evening Concerts

WITH HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE NOTES BY PHILIP HALE



FRIDAY AFTERNOON, NOVEMBER 17
AT 2.30 O'CLOCK
SATURDAY EVENING NOVEMBER 18

SATURDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 18 AT 8.00 O'CLOCK

COPYRIGHT, 1916, BY C. A. ELLIS

PUBLISHED BY C. A. ELLIS. MANAGEI

A biography of Anton Bruckner written by Rudolf Louis was published by Georg Miller in 1905. The volume is an octavo of two hundred and thirty-four pages, illustrated with portraits, silhouette caricatures of the composer, facsimiles of manuscripts, and two or three views of places. Soon after Bruckner's death it was announced that August Gollerich, of Linz, would write the life of his master, who before his last sickness had requested him to do this. Gollerich's biography, which will be in two stout volumes, is said to be nearing completion. Dr. Louis in the preface to his work disclaimed any intention of competing in any way with Gollerich or of anticipating him. He therefore used chiefly material that was already at hand: only when there was absolute necessity, as in ascertaining facts about the early life of Bruckner, did he make personal inquiry and research. His aim was to paint a character portrait of a singular personality in whose life there was no romance,—and to many in Vienna the composer to the day of his death merely an unsympathetic peasant.

Bruckner's early years were years of quiet work and uncomplaining poverty. His father and his grandfather were country school-teachers; his mother was the daughter of a tavern-keeper. There were twelve children. Anton was the oldest, and two survived him. In villages of Catholic Austria the school-teacher, on account of the service of the churches expected to be a musician. Anton took his first music lessons from his father, who, as soon as he recognized the talent of the boy, put him at the age of twelve years into the hands of a relation, J. B. Weiss, a teacher at Horsching, and Bruckner took his first organ lessons of this man.

The father of Bruckner died in 1837, and the widow moved to Ebelsberg, not far from St. Florian, and in the old and famous abbey of St. Florian Anton was received as a choir boy. The abbey had a celebrated library of seventy thousand volumes and a still more celebrated organ of four manuals and about eighty speaking stops, and this organ was more important than the library in Bruckner's eyes. At St. Florian he studied harmony with Michael Bogner, organ and pianoforte with Kattinger, singing and violin playing with Gruber, who should not be confounded with Bruckner's pupil, Josef Gruber, from 1878 to 1904 the chief organist at St. Florian. This teacher Gruber was a pupil of Schuppanzigh, the violinist associated with

Beethoven. Bruckner also attended the school classes; for he was expected to follow the family tradition and be a school-teacher. The course included religious instruction, grammar, penmanship, arithmetic, geometry, drawing, singing, organ playing, and some lessons in landscape gardening. Geography, history,—with the exception of some Biblical history,—natural history, were not taught.

The first experience of Bruckner as a school-teacher was as a subordinate at Windhag, a village of four hundred inhabitants, and he was extremely uncomfortable. His salary was two florins (seventyfive cents) a month. He was obliged to play the organ, lead the choir, perform the duties of sexton, and teach school. He was more than half starved. To gain a little money, he played for weddings and fiddled for dances. With no opportunity of playing good music with others, he nevertheless kept alive his musical ambition, and constantlymade notes for compositions, to be worked out at some future time. (His first manuscript, "Abendklange," for pianoforte and some other instrument, was written when he was thirteen years old.) Profoundly unhappy, he was not understood by the villagers, but was looked on as a sort of crazy person. In 1843 he was sent by way of punishment to Kronstorf, where there were only one hundred and fifty inhabitants, but he was fortunately soon transferred to Steyr, and here there was a fairly good organ and considerable attention was paid to church music. Bruckner had a pleasant recollection of this village, and in after-years, when he would make excursions from Vienna, he would go either to Steyr or to St. Florian. Toward his end he prayed that, if he could not be buried under the great organ at St. Florian, he might rest in the churchyard at Steyr.

In 1845 Bruckner was appointed a teacher at St. Florian. He was happy there, and he was in a somewhat better pecuniary condition. As a teacher he received thirty-six florins a year, and as an organist eight florins and free living. He said that he used to practise at that time ten hours a day on the pianoforte and three on the organ. He was undeniably industrious. In 1853 he visited Vienna to prove his ability before three then celebrated musicians, Simon Sechter, Ignaz Assmayer, Gottfried Preyer. He .showed them his prowess as an organist and made a brilliant showing. At St. Florian Bruckner studied physics and Latin, and long afterward regretted that he had not

studied more earnestly and with a broader view; for at last famous in Vienna as a musician and as an eccentric, he had little or no comprehension of anything in science, art, literature, politics. He was a musician and only a musician.

Bruckner in 1856 was appointed organist of the old cathedral at Linz. Bishop Rudiger of that city took a warm interest in him and gave him the time to take lessons in Vienna.

Simon Sechter (1788-1867) was one of the most famous of all theorists and pedagogues. Bruckner chose him for his master. The pupil was then thirty-two years old, already an organist, improviser, ecclesiastical composer of some reputation, but he felt the need of a more thorough technical training. Sechter was a teacher of the technic of composition. His own works, masses and other music for the church, preludes, fugues and other pieces for the organ, two string quartets, variations for pianoforte, and, mirabile dictul a burlesque opera, "Ah Hitsch-hatsch" (1844), were as dismally dry as his treatise on composition in three volumes. He had no imagination, no poetry in his soul, but he could be humorous at the expense of his pupils. He was incredibly fussy about detail in a composition; he would spend hours in the elaboration of a petty contrapuntal device and forget the importance of the general structure. So enamoured was he of brushwood that he did not see the imposing forest. He prized Sebastian Bach, thought well of Mozart and Haydn, accepted the earlier works of Beethoven; but of the more modern composers the only one whom he tolerated was Mendelssohn.

From 1856 to i860 Bruckner went to Vienna to take lessons of this man. One of the most interesting discussions in Dr. Louis' biography is the discussion of the question whether Sechter was the proper teacher for Bruckner, whether Sechter did not do him harm. Did not Bruckner need a master who would insist on the value of proportion, moderate his volubility, repress his desire to over-elaborate an idea? Furthermore, were not Bruckner's habits of thought too deeply rooted at the time he sought Sechter's tuition? Bruckner's contrapuntal skill, as displayed in improvisations on the organ, has passed into a tradition, but there is comparatively little of it revealed in the greater number of his symphonies. Dr. Louis insists that certain brave features

of Bruckner's art, as his pure harmonic writing and the euphony of passages for the brass choir when the progressions are in the manner of a choral, are due not so much to any skill in orchestration as to Sechter's indefatigable training. On the other hand, a grand and noble effect in any one of the symphonies may be followed by fatiguing and apparently interminable pages of sheer pedantry. For neither Sechter nor Bruckner seemed to have the slightest idea of the necessity of a practical knowledge of architectonics in music. The reproach made against pages in Bruckner's symphonies—that they are formless, illogical, fragmentary, episodic—is not always without foundation. The zeal of Sechter exaggerated the inherent faults of the pupil.

Yet Bruckner profited in a way by Sechter's training, so that he astonished his master, Hellmesberger, Herbeck, Dessoff, and Becker, when he submitted himself to them for an examination- in counterpoint. Herbeck, who had even then some idea of Bruckner's skill. proposed that, if the applicant were able to develop in fugued style, on pianoforte or organ, a theme then given, the result should be considered as proof of his ability more than any display of knowledge by word of mouth. Bruckner accepted the offer, and they all went to a church. Sechter gave a theme of four measures. Herbeck asked Dessoff to add four more; and, when Dessoff refused, Herbeck lengthened the theme by eight measures, at which Dessoff exclaimed, "O you monster!" Bruckner studied the theme for some time, and he seemed anxious, so that the examiners were merrily disposed. At last he began his introduction, which was followed by a master fugue, then by an improvisation. All wondered, and Herbeck said, "He should examine us."

When Bruckner was thirty-seven years old, he studied theory and instrumentation with Otto Kitzler (born in 1834 at Dresden: he retired into private life in 1898), then opera conductor at Linz. Kitzler was a modern of the moderns, and from him Bruckner learned much about the music of Wagner, whom he worshipped with a childlike devotion. Whether this worship were favorable to the development of Bruckner's own individuality is a question that may be argued by those who have no ordinary waste-pipe for intellect. Bruckner met Wagner for the first time at the performance of "Tristan and Isolde" at Munich in 1865. It was Bruckner's ambition to carry out Wagner's theories

about opera in absolute music, to utilize his theories for orchestral advantage. In 1862 he wrote a symphony in F minor. Three movements were completed. See later the list of his works.

Bruckner's fame began to grow as a composer. The Mass in D minor (1864), the Symphony in C minor of 1865-66, a cantata, and the "Germanenzug," for male voices with brass instruments gave him local and provincial reputation, but later in the sixties his name began to appear in the Viennese journals, and in the fall of 1868 he moved to Vienna. Johann Herbeck, conductor and composer, did not lose sight of Bruckner after the memorable examination. As a conductor, Herbeck had done much for composers of the modern and romantic school of his period by producing their works. He was the first in Vienna to appreciate the talent or genius of Bruckner, though he was not a blind enthusiast. In 1867 he produced Bruckner's Mass in D minor, and when Sechter died Herbeck at once thought of the organist in Linz as the legitimate successor to the chair of organ and counterpoint in the Vienna Conservatory of Music.

Bruckner was not persuaded easily to leave Linz. He appreciated the honor of the invitation; but what had he in common with Viennese life? He consented finally, and was enrolled as teacher of harmony, counterpoint, and organ. Three years later he was made a professor, and after a service of twenty-three years he retired in the course of the season 1891-92. In 1878 he was appointed organist of the Royal Orchestra, and three years before this he was appointed lecturer on musical theory of the University of Vienna, in spite of the active opposition of Eduard Hanslick, his sworn foe. At last he was honored. At last he was comparatively free from pecuniary embarrassment, for his manner of life was simple.

Friends of Bruckner have deplored for his own sake his departure from Linz. They have said that, as a composer, in that town he would have written more spontaneous, richer, and more individual music. This question is discussed by Dr. Louis at length, although he admits the futility in general of reasoning on the premise, "What might have happened if—?" Bruckner heard more music at Vienna, that of his own and that of other composers. The performance of his

First Symphony at Linz was eminently unsatisfactory. In Vienna there was the brilliant orchestra, there were well-trained choruses. No doubt in his private life he would have been happier at Linz. The Viennese public is musicaUy a peculiar one. Dr. Louis' characterization of it is elaborate and at the same time sharp. It has been commonly reported that this public was antagonistic to the music of Bruckner; that it would not listen to it; that it yawned or left the hall. Dr. Louis asserts that the report is without foundation; that the attitude of this public was warm and sympathetic from the very-beginning; that there was also a "Bruckner public," which grew in size and influence year by year.

Even Hanslick was obliged in his reviews to acknowledge constantly the enthusiasm of the audience whenever a work by Bruckner was performed. As early as 1873 a Viennese audience welcomed the Second Symphony with enthusiasm. For, as Dr. Louis remarks, the Viennese are stirred by the charm of euphony and by compelling rhythm. Whether this public is truly musical is another question, and it is discussed by Dr. Louis.

Furthermore, Bruckner's cause was maintained by the partisans of Wagner, who put the former in opposition to Brahms. The opposition was unnecessary; it embittered Hanslick against Bruckner, but it was of much consequence to the latter, whose peculiar, almost clownish appearance and manners would easily have prejudiced many against him. Hanslick wielded a great influence. Other critics followed him in opinion and aped his style. Only a few espoused Bruckner's cause, and of these Hugo Wolff and Theodor Helm were the most conspicuous of the comparatively uninfluential. It has been said that Brahms himself had no prejudice against Bruckner, at whose funeral he was a sincere mourner.

There are allusions in the "Herzogenberg Correspondence "f to Brahms' disposition toward Bruckner, the composer, but there is no direct, frank statement! Elisabet von Herzogenberg wrote to Brahms apropos of a performance of Bruckner's seventh symphony conducted by Mr. Nikisch from manuscript at Leipsic, December 30, 1884: "Our friend Hildebrand will have . . . told you of the Bruckner excitement here, and how we rebelled against having him thrust upon us—like

compulsory vaccination. We had to endure much stinging criticism insinuations as to our inability to detect power under an imperfect exterior, or admit a talent which, though not perhaps fully developed, still exists, and has a claim to interest and recognition. We are not to consider artistic results everything, but to admire the hidden driving power, whether it succeeds in expressing itself satisfactorily or no. That is all very well in theory, but in practice it all depends on the value of this driving power. . . . We wished we had you to back us up, and could hear your sound views, which are based on superabundant experience, and are therefore worth more than all the theories of the wise, all the mere instincts of the simple. And, who knows? You may agree with us, the simple." She wrote again: "Breathe one word about Bruckner. You are not afraid of our leading you on, and then proclaiming abroad: Brahms says we are right! We will he quite low about anything you say, but a word we do crave for our own peace of mind." Brahms at last answered: "Your delightful letter" —the first from which I have quoted—"expresses most lucidly all that can be said—all that one has said oneself or would like to have said so nicely. You will not mind when I tell you that Hanslick shares your opinion, and read your letter with pious joy! But one symphony\* and one quintet of Bruckner's have been printed." (This was written January 12, 1885.) "I advised you to get them to look at, with a view to steeling your mind and your judgment. You will not want me!" A row of asterisks follows the last sentence. Did Brahms speak more plainly in the omitted passage against Bruckner's music? It would seem so; for Mrs. von Herzogenberg answered two days afterward: "It has done us a world of good, inducing a state of sudden placidity which enables us to listen to the most extravagant nonsense about poor Bruckner, so strengthened are we by the approval of one on whom we 'invincibly depend,' as Holderlein (whom I am reading) says of Schiller. But although we can arm ourselves with placidity at a pinch, no one can console us for the fact that, in this world of so-called culture, there are so many, many people ready to be imposed upon by any inflated windbag, if its appearance is made with due pomp. One or two not quite impossible motifs, like greasespots swimming on the top of weak soup, and there we have 'Meister' Bruckner's whole stock-in-trade, while those who do not make immediate obeisance are stamped as unbelieving Thomases, who want signs and wonders to convince them. I should just like to know who

started the Bruckner crusade, how it came about, and whether there is not a sort of freemasonry among the Wagnerians. It certainly is rather like a game of taroc, or rather that form of whist, in which, when 'misery' is declared, the lowest card takes the trick." In 1886 she wrote to Brahms: "It always makes me furious to hear facts so grossly misrepresented, just as it does to watch the growing Bruckner craze, and I admire you for keeping a cool head."

From this it will be seen that in all probability Brahms did not conceal his dislike for Bruckner's music; that Elisabet, daughter of Freiherr Bodo Albrecht von Stockhausen and wife of Heinrich Picot de Peccaduc, Freiherr von Herzogenberg, was a woman of prejudices and a good hater.

Hans von Biilow had little to say about Bruckner in his voluminous correspondence. Whenever he mentioned his name, it was with a sneer. Thus, writing to Richard Strauss from Petrograd, December 19, 1885, he spoke of "the prejudicial bearing of the asiatic Bruckner." Two years later in a note to Hermann Wolff, the manager, von Biilow wrote as an apostrophe, "Holy Anthony, that is to say, Bruckner!" In 1890 he wrote to Brahms from Hamburg that in a moment of doubt and mental disturbance he had spawned letters of the alphabet as Bruckner spawned notes.

\* \*

Bruckner made short journeys in Austria and pilgrimages to Bayreuth. He visited Leipsic, Munich, and Berlin, to hear performances of his works. In 1869 he went to Nancy to compete with other organists at the dedication of a new organ in the Church of St. Epore. Dr. Louis has much to say about his then driving his competitors from the field; but whom did Bruckner have as rivals? Rigaun, Renaud de Vilbac, Stern, Girod, Oberhoffer, and others whose very names are almost forgotten. He visited Paris, and made the acquaintance of Auber and Gounod. In 1871 he gave an organ recital, or two or three recitals, in Albert Hall, but it was then said that he was awkward in handling the mechanical devices of the instrument, and that he showed an imperfect knowledge of the art of registration. Dr. Louis does not mention this adverse criticism, but any one acquainted with organs in Austria and Germany at that time would easily believe the criticism to be well founded.

As a teacher at the Conservatory, Bruckner was a singular apparition, yet his classes were crowded by those who respected his ability and character while they wondered at his ways. There was a clique against Wagner in the Conservatory. Bruckner was known as a Wagnerite, and the young romanticists among the students gathered around him, and so Felix Mottl, Arthur Nikisch, Emil Paur, Josef Schalk, Ferdinand Lowe, were not only his pupils, they were his long and tried friends.

Bruckner saw nothing, remembered nothing, learned nothing from travel or by his life in Vienna. Nothing broadened his horizon. He passed in Vienna as an "original." He was without manners or graces of any kind. His personal appearance and his dress provoked the smiles of those who did not know him, but the sterling worth of the man within won all hearts, save that of Hanslick. As Dr. Louis says: "A man of fine feelings might smile at Bruckner's appearance: he would not laugh at it." With Bruckner's simplicity was mingled "peasant shrewdness." He was extravagant in his expressions of gratitude; he was distressingly grateful, so surprised did he appear to be when any one showed him a slight kindness.

It has been said that Brahms was a born bachelor. Bruckner should have married, but poverty forbade him a wife until it was too late for him to think of it, nor was he ever drawn toward light o' loves. He was a man of a singularly modest and pure nature, and what is related of Sir Isaac Newton may truly be said of Bruckner: his life was absolutely without the pleasure or the torment of love in any one of its forms or disguises.

He liked good cheer in moderation, and one of his petty passions was the enjoyment of Pilsner beer, which he gave up with extreme unwillingness when the physician ordered a rigorous diet for his dropsy. "But," says Louis, "in this he was not given to excess, although, a true German, he could carry a large amount."

He was dependent on his salary, for his compositions brought him scarcely anything. He received one hundred florins for his " Te Deum," but his first six symphonies were published at his own expense and at that of some of his friends.

A few years before his death he was honored in a manner that consoled him for many disappointments. Brahms had been given by the University of Breslau an honorary degree, and Bruckner desired a like recognition. In 1891 the University of Vienna gave to him the honorary degree of Doctor, and the rector professor, Dr. Exner, paid in the presence of the public a glorious tribute to him, ending with these words: "I, the rector magnificus of the University of Vienna, bow myself before the former assistant teacher of Windhag." Nor were these words merely an official compliment, for Exner, a man of fine musical taste, was an ardent admirer of Bruckner's talent. . Bruckner's health was robust until about 1890, when symptoms of dropsy were unmistakable. He had begun his Ninth Symphony in 1890, and he hoped earnestly to complete it, for he dreaded the rebuke given to the unfaithful servant. That he died before the finale was written is to Dr. Louis symbolical of the tragedy of the composer's career.

To sum up this career, Dr. Louis quotes a Latin sentence that Bruckner, with his slight knowledge of Latin, could have put into German. It is one of the most consoling sentences in the New Testament, and Bruckner had the faith that brings the blessing: "Beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum."

\* \*

It is not the purpose of these Programme Books to speak concerning the technical or aesthetic worth of pieces performed at the concerts; yet it may help to a better understanding of the music itself if light be thrown on the personal nature and prejudices not only of the composer, but of his contemporaneous partisans and foes. This simple man, who had known the crudest poverty and distress, and in Vienna lived the life of an ascetic, made enemies by the very writing of music.

Bruckner was unfortunate in this: he was regarded, justly or unjustly, as a musician pitted by the extreme Wagnerites against Brahms, the symphonist. The friends, or rather the idolaters, of Brahms, claimed that the Wagnerites had no symphonist among them; that, disturbed by the prominence of Brahms in the realm of absolute music, they hit upon Bruckner as the one to put Brahms and his followers to confusion. As though there could be rivalry between an opera-maker and a symphonist! But the critic Eduard Hanslick was a power in

Vienna. For some reason or other—unworthy motives were ascribed to him by the Wagnerites—Hanslick fought Wagner bitterly, and some said that his constant and passionate praise of Brahms was inspired by his hatred of the man of Bayreuth. Bruckner was an intense admirer of Wagner; his own symphonies were certainly no ordinary works; therefore he was attacked bitterly in the journals and in society by Hanslick and his friends.

There appeared in Vienna in 1901 a little pamphlet entitled "Meine Erinnerung an Anton Bruckner." The writer was Carl Hruby, a pupil of Bruckner. The pamphlet is violent, malignant. In its rage there is at times the ridiculous fury of an excited child. There are pages that provoke laughter and then pity; yet there is much of interest about the composer himself, who now, away from strife and contention, is still unfortunate in his friends. We shall pass over Hruby's ideas on music and the universe, nor are we inclined to dispute his proposition (p. 7) that Shakespeare, Goethe, Beethoven, Wagner, were truer heroes and supporters of civilization than Alexander, Casar, Napoleon, who, nevertheless, were, like Hannibal, very pretty fellows in those days. When Hruby begins to talk about Bruckner and his ways, then it is time to prick up ears.

As a teacher, Bruckner was amiable, patient, kind, but easily vexed by frolicsome pupils who did not know his sensitive nature. He gave each pupil a nickname, and his favorite phrase of contentment and disapproval was "Viechkerl!"—"You stupid beast!" There was a young fellow whose name began "Sachsen"; but Bruckner could never remember the rest of it, so he would go through the list of German princes, "Sachsen — Sachsen — Sachsen-Coburg-Gotha, Sachsen-Hildburgshausen, Sachsen-Teschen, Sachsen,"—and at last the name would come. Another pupil, who now is a harp virtuoso, was known to his teacher only as "Old Harp." Bruckner had a rough, at the same time sly, peasant humor. One of his pupils came into the class with bleached and jaded face. Bruckner asked what ailed him. The answer was: "I was at the Turnverein till two o'clock." "Yes," said Bruckner, "oh, ves, I know the Turnverein that last, till two a.m." The pupil on whom he built fond hope was Franz Nott, who died young and in the mad-house. When Bruckner was disturbed in his work, he was incredibly and gloriously rude.

Bruckner was furious against all writers who discovered "programmes" in his music. He was warmly attached to the ill-fated Hugo Wolf, and was never weary of praising the declamation in his songs: "The fellow does nothing all day but compose, while I must tire myself out by giving lessons"; for at sixty years Bruckner was teaching for three guldens a lesson. Beethoven was his idol, and after a performance of one of the greater symphonies he was as one insane. After a performance of the "Eroica," he said to Hruby,—would that it were possible to reproduce Bruckner's dialect,—"I think that if Beethoven were alive, and I should go to him with my Seventh Symphony and say, 'Here, Mr. Van Beethoven, this is not so bad, this Seventh, as certain gentlemen would make out,' ... I think he would take me by the hand and say, 'My dear Bruckner, never mind, I had no better luck; and the same men who hold me up against you even now do not understand my last quartets, although they act as if they understood them.' Then I'd say to him, 'Excuse me, Mr. Van Beethoven, that I have gone beyond you in freedom of form, but I think a true artist should make his own forms for his own works, and stick by them." He once said of Hanslick: "I guess Hanslick understands as little about Brahms as about Wagner, me, and others. And the Doctor Hanslick knows as much about counterpoint as a chimney-sweep about astronomy."

Hanslick was to Bruckner as a pursuing demon. (We are giving Hruby's statement, and Hanslick surely showed a strange perseverance and an unaccountable ferocity in criticism that was - abuse.) Hruby likens this critic to the Phylloxera vastalrix in the vineyard. He really believes that Hanslick sat up at night to plot Bruckner's destruction. He affirms that Hanslick tried to undermine him in the Conservatory and the Imperial Chapel, that he tried to influence conductors against the performance of his works. And he goes so far as to say that Hans Richter, thus influenced, has never performed a symphony by Bruckner in England. As a matter of fact, Richter produced Bruckner's Seventh in London, May 23, 1887.

He was never mean or hostile toward Brahms, as some would have had him. He once said that Brahms was not an enemy of Wagner, as the Brahmsites insisted; that down in his heart he had a warm admiration for Wagner, as was shown by the praise he had bestowed on "Die Meistersinger."

Just before his death Bruckner's thoughts were on his Ninth Symphony: "I undertook a stiff task," he said. "I should not have done it at my age and in my weak condition. If I never finish it, then my 'Te Deum' may be used as a Finale. I have nearly finished three movements. This work belongs to my Lord God."

Although he had the religion of a child, he had read the famous book of David Strauss, and he could talk about it reasonably. Some one asked him about the future life and prayer. "I'll tell you," he replied. "If the story is true, so much the better for me. If it is not true, praying cannot hurt me."

### \*\*\*\*

Performances of Bruckner's symphonies at these concerts in Boston:

1887, February 5, No. 7, in E major.

1899, February 11, No. 4, in E-flat major, "Romantic."

1901, March 9, No. 3, in D minor.

1901, December 28, No. 5, in B-flat major.

1904, April 2, No. 9, in D minor (unfinished).

1906, December 1, No. 7, E major.

1907, November 2, No. 9, D minor (unfinished).

1909, March 13, April 24, No. 8, in C minor.

1910, February 12, No. 7, in E major.

1912, January 6, Symphony, E major, No. 7.

1913, January 4, Symphony, E major, No. 7.

1914, January 17, Symphony, No. 9, D minor (unfinished).

The "Te Deum" was performed in Boston by the Cecilia Society,

December 12, 1905, B. J. Lang conductor. Quartet: Mrs. Rider-

Kelsey, Miss Lilla Ormond, Ellison Van Hoose, Charles Delmont.

The Adagio from the String Quintet was played at a Kneisel Quartet Concert, November 23, 1886: Franz Kneisel, Emanuel Fiedler, Louis Svecenski, Fritz Giese, assisted by Max Zach.

\*

### List of Bruckner's Works.

Bruckner's first symphony was in F minor. He wrote it in 1862 when he was a pupil of Kitzler, who tells us that it was mere student work, uninspired, and that he did not praise Bruckner for it at the time. This symphony was found by C. Hynais, among Bruckner's manuscripts, in Vienna in the spring of 1896. The first and fourth movements were in F minor; the second, in E-flat major, Andante molto; the Scherzo was missing. See the Signale of October 22, 1913, pp. 1561-1563, "Ein unbekannter Symphonie Satz von Anton Bruckner," by C. Hynais. The movement in E-flat major was performed at a concert of the Konzert-Verein in Vienna, conducted by Ferdinand Lowe, in November, 1913. The following dates of first performances are given, subject to correction. There is as yet no biography of Bruckner that is authoritative in matters of detail, and in the books and pamphlets about Bruckner that are already published there are contradictory statements.

Symphony in C minor, No. 1. Composed in 1865-66 at Linz. First performed in Linz, May 9, 1868. The orchestra made a sad mess of its task. First performance in Vienna at a Philharmonic Concert, December 13, 1891. Bruckner completed the Scherzo, May 25, 1865, while he was sojourning in Munich to see the first performance of "Tristan und Isolde." In 1890-91 he revised thoroughly the symphony and dedicated it to the University of Vienna in gratitude for the bestowal of the degree upon him: "Universitati Vindobonensi primam^suam symphoniam d. d. venerabundus Antonius Bruckner, doctor honorarius."

At Vienna from February to September, 1869, he worked on a symphony in D minor. This was never performed or published, and the composer expressly annulled it.

Symphony in C minor, No. 2. Composed in 1871-72 and dedicated to Franz Liszt. First performed under the direction of the composer in Vienna, October 26, 1873. Herbeck conducted it in Vienna in 1876, and it was performed at a Philharmonic Concert in that city in 1894. Herbeck said to Bruckner after the rehearsal: "I have not yet paid you any compliment, but I tell you that, if Brahms were able to write such a symphony, the hall would be demolished by the applause." Symphony in D minor, No. 3. Bruckner composed it in 1873, asked for Wagner's judgment on it, and dedicated it to "Master Richard Wagner in deepest reverence." The first performance was at Vienna under Bruckner's direction, December 16, 1877. There were performances of it in Vienna in 1891 and 1892, as there have been since 1892. Bruckner revised this symphony twice, in 1876-77 (this score was published in quarto) and in 1888-89 (new score in octavo).

Symphony in E-flat major, No. 4. The "Romantic," composed in 1874, revised

in 1878, and the Finale rewritten in 1879-80. It is dedicated to the Prince Constantin Fursten zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfurst, the Lord Marshal to the Emperor of Austria and the husband of the daughter of Liszt's friend, the Princess Caroline Wittgenstein. "The first performance was in Vienna, February 20, 1881." Yet Franz Brunner says the first performance in Vienna was at a Philharmonic Concert led by Richter in 1886. There have been many performances of this symphony.

Symphony in B-flat major, No. 5. Composed in 1875-78, it was dedicated to Karl von Stremayr, who as Minister of Public Instruction had been influential in the appointment of Bruckner as a lecturer to the University of Vienna. The score was published after Bruckner's death and the dedication was then omitted. The first performance was led by Franz Schalk at Graz, April 8, 1894. The symphony was performed at Budapest, December 18, 1895.

Symphony in A major, No. 6. Composed in 1879-81, it bears no dedication. It is said that Bruckner intended to dedicate it to R. von Oelzelt, his landlord. The Adagio and Scherzo were first performed in Vienna, February 11, 1893, under the leadership of Wilhelm Jahn. The whole symphony was performed in Vienna in 1899 under the leadership of Gustav Mahler.

Symphony in E major, No. 7. Composed in 1881-83 an(i dedicated to Ludwig II., King of Bavaria, it was published in 1885. See remarks at the beginning of this article.

Symphony in C minor, No. 8. Composed in 1885-90 and dedicated to the Emperor of Austria. First performance in Vienna, December 18, 1892. First performance in the United States by the Boston Symphony Orchestra, Mr. Fiedler conductor, March 13, 1909.

Symphony in D minor, No. 9. The first movement was composed in 1891-93, the Scherzo in 1893-94, and the Adagio was completed November 30, 1894, but according to some on October 31 of that year. There are only sketches for the finale, and Bruckner, feeling his strength waning, suggested that his "Te Deum" might be used as the finale in performances of the symphony. There is a tradition that Bruckner purposed to dedicate the work "to the dear Lord." The first performance was by the Vienna Academic Wagner Society and the Vienna Concert Society at Vienna, February 11, 1903. Ferdinand Lowe conducted, and the "Te Deum" was added as the finale. The first performance in the United States was at Chicago, by the Chicago Orchestra, Theodore Thomas conductor, February 20, 1904.

\* \*

### Bruckner also composed:—

"Tantum ergo." Four settings for four mixed voices and one for five-voiced mixed chorus with organ accompaniment were written in 1846. A Requiem Mass was composed in 1849, performed at St. Florian, and never published.

"Ave Maria," for four voices and organ accompaniment, was composed in 1856. In 1861 he turned the work into a seven-voiced a capella chorus, and it was performed at Linz as an offertory, May 12 of that year.

Mass in D minor. Composed in 1864 and performed that year in the Linz Cathedral, afterward in concert. It was revised in 1876.

Mass in E minor. Eight-voiced chorus with brass instruments, 1868, performed at Linz, September 30, 1869.

Mass in F minor. Performed at Vienna in 1872.

"Te Deum," for solo voices, chorus, orchestra, and organ ad lib. First performed at Vienna with accompaniment of two pianofortes in 1885. Performed in 1886 at Vienna for the first time with orchestra. First performance in the United States at St. Louis in December, 1891.

"150th Psalm," for solo voices, chorus, and orchestra, composed expressly for concert use and for a festival of the German Music Societies. First performed at Vienna in 1892 and led by Mr. Wilhelm Gericke.

"Pange lingua" and "Tantum ergo" (1868), now known as "Tantum ergo"; antiphon, "Tota pulchra es," for mixed chorus and organ; "Ave Maria," for soprano, two altos, two tenors, and two basses; Graduale (1879); four graduales, for four voices,—"Christus factus est," "Locus iste," "Os justi meditabitur" (1879), and "Virga Jesse flourit" (1885); "Ave Maria," for alto with organ accompaniment (1882).

"Helgoland," for male chorus and orchestra, first performed at Vienna, October 8, 1893-

"Germanenzug," for male chorus and orchestra. This took the prize at the Upper Austria Sangerbundesfest in 1865.

"Das hohe Lied," for two tenors, a solo baritone, four- and afterward eight-voiced male chorus (with bouche fermee), and orchestra, composed in December, 1876. The work was revised, and the "Brummchor," on account of its difficulty, was replaced by strings. The original score is lost.

"Um Mitteraacht," male chorus with humming accompaniment; "Traumen und Wachen," male chorus with tenor solo, performed in Vienna, January 15, 1891; "O konnt' ich dich beglucken!" tenor and baritone solos with male chorus; "Der Abendhimmel," tenor solo, male chorus, and pianoforte accompaniment. String Quintet in F major, performed by the Hellmesberger Quartet, January 8, 1885.

"Erinnerung," for pianoforte, published after the composer's death.

The singer Rosa Papier once asked Bruckner why he did not write songs like those of "Doktor Brahms." "He answered,' I konnt's schon, wenn i wollt', aber i will nit'" (I could do it if I wanted to, but I won't). The few songs of Bruckner that are known and published are almost puerile,—"Amaranths Waldeslieder" and "Im April."