

CHAPTER 4

Bruckner in Vienna: The First Ten Years (1868-1877)

Bruckner's move to Vienna in the early autumn of 1868 came at a time when both Austria and its capital city were experiencing profound changes. After Austria's defeat by Prussia at Königgratz in 1866 there was a half a century of comparative freedom from warfare. An uneasy political alliance between Austria, Germany and Russia was sealed in October 1873 by the *Dreikaiserbund* and renewed in June 1881, at Bismarck's instigation, as the *Dreikaiserbündnis*, the signatories agreeing to remain neutral if one of them went to war with another nation. Although this '>'Three Emperors' Alliance' broke down in the mid-1880s when Austria and Russia almost went to war over trouble in the Balkans, Bismarck again attempted to patch up differences by negotiating a '>'Reinsurance Treaty'. By the beginning of the 1890s, however, Russia was developing a relationship with France, while Austria and Germany maintained an alliance which ">somehow developed into a relationship of special indissolubility, as between brothers who may fret against their blood-tie but have to accept the fruit of its existence".¹

Within her own territories Austria negotiated a '>'Compromise' with Hungary in 1867 which resulted in the establishment of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, Franz Josef and his pro-Hungarian

¹ C.A. Macartney, *The House of Austria* (Edinburgh: EUP, 1978), 175.

wife Elisabeth being crowned with much pomp and ceremony in Budapest on 7 June.² The new era of political and economic liberalism, in which the ordinary citizen took advantage of the loosening of governmental control, and growth in capital and an expansion of credit facilities were encouraged, was rudely interrupted by the stock market crash of 'Black Friday', 9 May 1873. The crash came as a particular shock, happening as it did only a week after Franz Josef had opened, with several foreign rulers and dignitaries present, Vienna's World Exhibition, a monument to the splendours of industrial growth. Shares dropped by up to 70 per cent, many small businesses were ruined, a large number of small investors were demoralised, thousands lost their jobs and there were many suicides. Bruckner, who had his own personal insurance policy, must have viewed the situation with some alarm:

Bruckner's anxiety to ensure financial security for himself in Vienna, which clearly exasperated Herbeck during the negotiations in 1868 for Bruckner's appointment to the staff of the Conservatory of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde and which may well have been founded on memories of 1857 [American/European financial crisis] and perhaps even folk-memories of the virtual state bankruptcy of 1811, proved to be all too justified.³

In December 1857, during the period when Bruckner was making regular visits to Vienna to pursue his course in Harmony and

² Liszt wrote his *Coronation Mass* for this occasion.

³ Paul Banks, '>Vienna: Absolutism and Nostalgia', in Jim Samson, ed., *The Late Romantic Era* (London: Macmillan, 1991), 84.

Counterpoint with Simon Sechter, Franz Josef issued a decree that the city walls be removed. The main sections were removed by 1864 and in 1865 the *Ringstrasse*, a spacious boulevard, 82-foot wide, which follows the outlines of the old ramparts of the city, was ready for use. Public buildings as well as private dwellings were gradually built along this magnificent road. The private dwellings belonged to financiers, factory owners, important businessmen and the *nouveaux riches*. The public buildings, in a variety of architectural styles, celebrated the political, educational and cultural life of Vienna:

The contrast between the old inner city and the Ring area inevitably widened as a result of the political change. The inner city was dominated architecturally by the symbols of the first and second estates: the Baroque Hofburg, residence of the Emperor; the elegant palais of the aristocracy; the Gothic cathedral of St. Stephen and a host of smaller churches scattered through the narrow streets. In the new Ringstrasse development, the third estate celebrated in architecture the triumph of constitutional *Recht* over imperial *Macht*, of secular culture over religious faith. Not palaces, garrisons and churches, but centres of constitutional government and higher culture dominated the Ring.⁴

The first of the new buildings to be completed was the Opera House which opened in 1869 with a performance of Mozart's *Don Giovanni*. Two museums in a neo-Renaissance style, one for the History of Art, the other for Natural History, were built further along but on the opposite side of the *Ringstrasse* between 1872 and

⁴ Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 4/1979), 31.

1881. Still further along and more or less directly opposite the old Hofburg is the neo-Classical *House of Parliament*, an imposing white edifice completed in 1883 by the Danish architect, Theophil Hansen.⁵ The *Rathaus* (Town Hall), a neo-Gothic structure, was also completed in 1883. In front, but towards the right of the *Rathaus*, the new University building was constructed in a neo-Renaissance style between 1872 and 1884.⁶ Across from the *Rathaus* and the University and next to the *Volksgarten* is the *Burgtheater*, also in a neo-Renaissance style. It took sixteen years to build (1872-1888).

The threefold increase in the population of Vienna from the mid-1860s to 1900, including the dramatically huge immigration of almost 700,000 people from Bohemia, Moravia and Hungary in the final years of the century necessitated a proportionate increase in health and safety facilities. The ruling Liberal party was responsible in the 1860s and 1870s for such measures as the re-channelling of the Danube to prevent flooding, the development of an excellent water supply and a first-rate public health system, the opening (in 1873) of the first city hospital, and the provision of spacious public parks. In his great novel *Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften*, Robert Musil captures something of the labyrinthine quality of social life in the capital, the seeds of rebellion underneath the surface glitter, as he paints a satirical picture of late nineteenth-century Vienna, describing it as ‘this

5 Hansen was also responsible for the concert hall of the *Musikverein* (1869), the *Stock Exchange* building (1877), the *Academy of Fine Arts* and the *Evangelical School*.

6 Its architect was Heinrich von Ferstel who also built several of the private dwellings along the Ring. His outstanding achievement, however, is the neo-Gothic *Votivkirche*, completed and dedicated on 1879 on the silver anniversary of Emperor Franz Joseph and his wife Empress Elizabeth.

vanished Kakania':

All in all, how many amazing things might be said about this vanished Kakania! Everything and every person in it, for instance, bore the label of *kaiserlich-königlich* (Imperial-Royal) or *kaiserlich* and *königlich* (Imperial *and* Royal), abbreviated as "k.@ k." or "k.& k,"@ but to be sure which institutions and which persons were to be designated by "k.k." and which by "k.@& k." required the mastery of a secret science. On paper it was called the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, but in conversation it was called Austria, a name solemnly abjured officially while stubbornly retained emotionally, just to show that feelings are quite as important as constitutional law and that regulations are one thing but real life something else entirely. Liberal in its constitution, it was administered clerically. The government was clerical, but everyday life was liberal. All citizens were equal before the law, but not everyone was a citizen. There was a Parliament, which asserted its freedom so forcefully that it was usually kept shut; there was also an Emergency Powers Act that enabled the government to get along without Parliament, but then, when everyone had happily settled for absolutism, the Crown decreed that it was time to go back to parliamentary rule. The country was full of such goings-on, among them the sort of nationalist movements that rightly attracted so much attention in Europe and are so thoroughly misunderstood today. They were so violent that they jammed the machinery of government and brought it to a dead stop several times a year, but in the intervals and during the deadlocks people got along perfectly well and acted as if nothing had happened. And in fact, nothing really *had* happened.⁷

Be that as it may, there is no doubt that Vienna came to

⁷ Robert Musil, *Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften* (Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag GmbH, 1978); English translation by Sophie Wilkins as *The Man without Qualities* (London: Picador, 1995, 2/1997), 29-30

assume the position of musical capital of Europe in the last 30 years of the century, a position which she had held at the beginning of the century but which had been ceded to Paris in the intervening period. It was the permanent home of both Brahms and Bruckner, and many other leading musicians resided in the city for long or short periods of time. Both Gustav Mahler and Hugo Wolf came to study at the Vienna Conservatory in the mid-1870s. While Wolf remained in the city and established a reputation as a composer of *Lieder* and a virulent anti-Brahms music critic, Mahler occupied various conducting posts throughout the Habsburg Empire and Germany before returning triumphantly to Vienna as the director of the Opera in April 1897, six months after Bruckner's death.⁸

Brahms came to Vienna initially in 1862 and made his first public appearance in the city on 16 November when he played the piano part in his own Piano Quartet in G minor op. 25 (with the Hellmesberger Quartet). In May 1863 he was asked to become the conductor of the *Singakademie*, a mixed-voice choir, and he remained in this post for a year. In the mid-1860s, however, he went on several concert tours either alone or with Joseph Joachim (violin) and Julius Stockhausen (singer) and travelled extensively throughout Germany and Austria and to the main musical centres of Hungary, Switzerland, Denmark and the Netherlands. He was also hoping for some kind of recognition from his own native city of Hamburg, specifically the post of conductor of the Hamburg Philharmonic concerts, but was passed over on two occasions - in

⁸ In his article 'Bruckner und Wien: Der soziokulturelle Kontext einer Stadt', in *Anton Bruckner's Wiener Jahre* (Vienna, 2009), 65-86, Moritz Csáky argues persuasively that the musical creativity of not only Mahler and Schoenberg but also Bruckner was certainly affected by Vienna's heterogeneity during this period of great social and political upheaval and artistic and cultural

1863 and 1867. Although he spent a good part of each year in Vienna from 1862 onwards, he had not bought an apartment of his own, preferring to stay at hotels or with friends. In May 1869 his father wrote to him that Vienna was 'too important to exchange... for Hamburg where everybody's mind is only on business' and suggested that he finally settle there - a city where he was understood and recognized. Brahms appears to have taken his advice. He moved into an apartment in the Prater and then two years later, in December 1871, rented some rooms from the Vogl family at Karlsgasse 4. These rooms were situated near the *Karlskirche* and not far from the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* building, and Brahms stayed here for the rest of his life. In 1872, after the death of his father and his acceptance of the directorship of the *Gesellschaft* concerts, he put his roots firmly down in the city.

Brahms and Bruckner moved in different social circles. Brahms was 'gladly received by well established society',⁹ was deeply involved in Vienna's concert life, had friendships with several members of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* and fairly secure relationships with well-established publishers such as Breitkopf & Härtel and Simrock. Bruckner's involvement in Vienna's concert life was, by dint of his employment as a Harmony and Counterpoint teacher at the Conservatory and, later, at the University and his appointment as an organist at the *Hofkapelle*, more restricted. Although, thanks largely to successful visits to Nancy, Paris and London as a performer in the late 1860s and early 1870s, he had an international reputation as an organ

transformation.

⁹ Franz Endler, transl. L. Jecny, *Vienna. A Guide to its Music and Musicians* (Portland, Oregon: Amadeus Press, 1989), 56.

virtuoso, he had to struggle for many years to gain recognition as a symphonist. Devoted pupils like Joseph Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe gave performances of their own piano arrangements of the symphonies in the somewhat rarefied atmosphere of the *Akademischer Wagner-Verein* meetings in Vienna.¹⁰ The only publisher who took any interest in him initially - and rather surprisingly, after the disastrous first performance of the second version of Symphony no. 3 in 1877 - was Theodor Rättig, by no means in the 'same league' as Breitkopf & Härtel or Simrock. Later Emperor Franz Josef subsidised the publication of two of his symphonies, the third version of Symphony no. 3 and the second version of Symphony no. 8.

Although quite different temperamentally and in their backgrounds and aspirations, Brahms and Bruckner seem to have maintained a distant but respectful relationship. We know, for instance, that Bruckner played the organ part in a performance of Handel's *Te Deum* conducted by Brahms in the *Musikvereinssaal* on 10 November 1872 and that he had a high regard for Brahms's technical skill as a composer while sometimes criticising what he found to be a dearth of musical invention in his works. Brahms possessed scores of Bruckner's Seventh and Eighth Symphonies and the piano score of the *Te Deum*, a work which he particularly admired. Nevertheless he was of the opinion that Bruckner had 'no idea of what constituted an ordered musical structure.'¹¹ Both Brahms and Bruckner had

10 The Vienna branch, one of several European branches of the Society, was founded in 1872 by Felix Mottl, Guido Adler and Karl Wolff. See Helmut Kowar, 'Vereine für die Neudeutschen in Wien', in *BSL 1984* (Linz, 1986), 81-90.

11 See Brahms's references to Bruckner in various conversations recorded by Max Kalbeck, in his *Johannes Brahms* (Berlin, 3/1912-20), 403-10, Elisabeth von Herzogenberg's exchange of letters with Brahms apropos the Leipzig

their own favourite *Gasthäuser* but they met socially on at least one occasion.¹² Unfortunately the rival claims of their '>supporters' or '>disciples' as to the supremacy of programme or absolute music led at the time to an unnatural and overblown emphasis on the obvious stylistic differences between the composers. As Hilde Spiel observes:

During the 1880s the musical world of the capital was riven by the conflict between Wagnerians and Brahmsians - inadequately described as believers in progressive forms of this art on the one hand and established ones on the other... In fact, despite the deep gulf and acrimonious controversies which at that time divided Vienna's music-lovers... no strict boundaries can be discerned between one school and the other.¹³

premiere of Bruckner's Seventh Symphony on 30 December 1884 in G-A IV/2, 239-41, and a letter to Clara Schumann, written on 22 February 1893, in Berthold Litzmann, *Briefwechsel Clara Schumann-Johannes Brahms II* (Leipzig, 1927), 501-02. Two of Bruckner's pupils from the 1880s recalled some of his opinions of Brahms's music. According to Franz Marschner, one of his University students, Bruckner once said that '>he who wants to be comforted by music will be a follower of Brahms, but he who wants to be stirred will not be satisfied with his music.' In response to a question from Anton Meißner, Bruckner said: '>You know, Anton, that the two of us are Catholics and have fiery temperaments. Brahms is for cool temperaments and Protestants'; see G-A 4/2, 131-32 and 135. See also Stephen Johnson, *Bruckner Remembered* (London: Faber and Faber, 1998), 153ff.

12 See Friedrich Klose, *Meine Lehrjahre bei Bruckner* (Regensburg, 1927), 147, and August Stradal's reminiscence as reported in G-A 4/2, 690. See also Stephen Johnson, op.cit., 151ff.

13 Hilde Spiel, *Vienna's Golden Autumn* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987), 161-62. For further discussion about stylistic similarities and differences between Brahms and Bruckner, see Guido Adler, '>Johannes Brahms. Wirken, Wesen und Stellung', in *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* xx (1930), 26; Hans Gal, *Johannes Brahms* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963), 151-54; Werner Korte, *Bruckner und Brahms. Die spätromantische Lösung der autonomen Konzeption* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1963); Constantin Floros, *Brahms und Bruckner. Studien zur musikalischen Exegetik* (Wiesbaden, 1980); idem, '>Zur Gegensätzlichkeit der Symphonik Brahms und Bruckners' in *BSL 1983* (Linz, 1985), 145-53.

Bruckner's deep admiration for Wagner was no secret and this >'deep gulf' became even more pronounced after the latter's death in 1883. Bruckner now became unwittingly the standard-bearer of the pro-Wagner faction. During the last twenty years of his life Wagner made several extended visits to Vienna. In the early 1860s he conducted concerts including excerpts from his operas at the *Theater an der Wien* and supervised rehearsals for the planned premiere of *Tristan und Isolde* at the Opera, a project that was abandoned in March 1864. In the 1870s, however, several of his operas had their Viennese premieres - *Die Meistersinger* (late February 1870), *Die Walküre* (early March 1877), *Das Rheingold* (end of January 1878), *Götterdämmerung* (February 1879) and the complete *Ring* (May 1879). In May 1872 Wagner came to Vienna to conduct a concert sponsored by the newly-formed *Wagner Society* to help raise funds for his Bayreuth project. According to Göllicher, Wagner went out of his way to greet Bruckner who was one of the deputation to meet him at the station.¹⁴ During Bruckner's visit to Bayreuth in 1873 Wagner accepted the dedication of the Third Symphony. The two composers met again in Vienna at the end of February 1875 when Wagner returned to the city to raise more money for Bayreuth. On March 1, he conducted a performance of his own works - the *Kaisermarsch* and excerpts from *The Ring* - and received a very warm reception. During his stay Wagner invited Bruckner to a soirée. According to Göllicher, he sang through the whole of the final act of *Götterdämmerung*, and then made a point of thanking Bruckner for the dedication of the symphony, describing him as a

14 See G-A IV/1, 199.

worthy successor of Beethoven.¹⁵ Wagner was in Vienna again from the end of October until mid-December 1875 to attend performances of his *Tannhäuser* and *Lohengrin* at the Opera. He was so impressed by the singing of the chorus that he returned to Vienna in May of the following year to conduct a performance of *Lohengrin* himself.

The two leading artistic directors in Viennese musical life in the second half of the nineteenth century were Johann Ritter von Herbeck and Josef Hellmesberger. We have already encountered Herbeck as the man largely responsible for persuading Bruckner to move from Linz to Vienna in 1868. He continued to encourage the composer up to his untimely death in 1877. As director of the *Singverein* attached to the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* he introduced several new works to the repertoire, including Schumann's *Manfred*, *Der Rose Pilgerfahrt* and *Szenen aus Goethe's Faust*, Liszt's *Legende von der heiligen Elisabeth* and parts of Brahms's *German Requiem*. He became court music director during the first period of Bruckner's stay in Vienna.¹⁶

15 See G-A IV/1, 358-59.

16 Johann Ritter von Herbeck (1831-77) came from a singing background. A former choirboy at the *Heiligenkreuz* monastery, he became choir director at the *Piaristenkirche* in Vienna and then obtained the more prestigious post of conductor of the Vienna *Männergesangverein* in 1856. His other appointments included the posts of conductor of the *Gesellschaft* concerts (from 1859), associate conductor of the Opera (from 1863) and director of the Opera (1870-75). For further information about Herbeck, see Ludwig Herbeck, *Johann Herbeck. Ein Lebensbild* (Vienna: Gutmann, 1885; Othmar Wessely, 'Johann Herbeck' in *The New Grove*, Second Edition (2001), 11, 400-01; Uwe Harten (Leopold Nowak), 'Johann Herbeck', *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (MGG) 8 (2002), cols. 1357-9, William Hettrick, 'Johann Herbeck (1831-1877) and the Singverein of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna: His Legacy as Conductor and Composer', paper given at the *15th International Conference on 19th-Century Music*, University College Dublin, June 2008, and Crawford Howie, 'Johann Herbeck (1831-1877): an important link between Schubert and Bruckner', in *BJ 2006-2010* (Linz, 2011), 165-87.

Hellmesberger was also involved with Bruckner on many occasions, both before and after he succeeded Herbeck as court music director in 1877. As leader of a fine string quartet, he extended the public's awareness of the chamber music repertoire to include the late Beethoven and the Schubert quartets, not to mention works by Brahms and the Bruckner Quintet in F.¹⁷

The new Opera House on the Ring was the focal point of musical activities in Vienna from 1870 onwards. Its directors were Franz von Dingelstedt (1867-70) who successfully negotiated the transfer from the old *Kärntnertortheater*, Johann Herbeck (1870-75) who put on fine productions of Wagner's *Der fliegende Holländer* and *Rienzi*, Verdi's *Aida* (1874) and Goldmark's *Königin von Saba* as well as performances of Mozart's *Così fan Tutte*, Weber's *Oberon* and Schumann's *Genoveva*, and Franz Jauner (1875-1880), a non-musician who engaged Wilhelm Gericke to conduct French and Italian operas and Hans Richter to conduct German operas. Highlights of Jauner's directorship were productions of *Carmen* in 1875, Verdi's visit to Vienna and the performances of his *Requiem* and *Aida* in 1875, as well as productions of Beethoven's *Fidelio*, a Mozart cycle which included the rarely performed *Idomeneo* and *La Clemenza di Tito*, and the

17 Josef Hellmesberger (1828-1893) came to conducting from an instrumental background. His first important appointment was director of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* (from 1849). He also conducted the *Gesellschaft* concerts from 1851 to 1859 and in the years 1870-71 and was leader of the court opera orchestra from 1860. He founded the *Hellmesberger String Quartet* in 1849 and remained its leader until 1891. Both his father Georg (1800-1873) and his son Josef (1855-1907) were distinguished violinists. For further information, see R.M. Prosl, *Die Hellmesberger* (Vienna: Gerlach & Weidling, 1947); O. Strasser, '>Joseph Hellmesberger (1828-93): eine philharmonische Vaterfigur', *Musikblätter der Wiener Philharmoniker* xlviii/4 (1993), 117-24; Richard Evidon, '>Joseph Hellmesberger', in *The New Grove*, Second Edition (2001), 11, 350; Marion Linhardt, '>Hellmesberger Familie', *MGG, Personenteil* 8 (2002), cols. 1259-63.

complete *Ring* (1877-79). During the 1880s, thanks largely to Richter, Wagner's popularity soared in Vienna.¹⁸ Wilhelm Jahn, director from 1881 to 1897, was an excellent conductor of French and Italian opera and a perfect foil for Richter. He brought productions of Massenet's *Manon* and *Werther* to Vienna in the early 1890s. *Verismo* opera was also popular in Vienna during this period. Mascagni came to conduct his *Cavalleria Rusticana* in 1891 and Leoncavallo's *Bajazzo* was produced. National operas like Moniuszko's *Halka*, Smetana's *The Bartered Bride* and *Dalibor* were also popular. Vienna became the focal point of the musical world in 1892 when it hosted the *International Exhibition of Theatre and Music*. The Opera assumed a major role in this Exhibition.

The Viennese operetta, essentially a transplant of the French *opéra bouffe* as developed by Offenbach, was enormously popular. Its home was the *Theater an der Wien* where thirteen of Johann Strauss's fifteen operettas had their first performances between 1871 and 1897. Strauss's *Die Fledermaus*, first produced there in 1874, achieved the distinction of being the first operetta to be performed in the Opera 20 years later. Berlioz, Wagner, Liszt, Brahms, Bruckner, Mahler and Schoenberg all had the highest regard for the '>'waltz king' whom they recognised as encapsulating the spirit of Vienna. Brahms, frequently a guest at Strauss's home, gave the most eloquent testimony to his

18 For further information about Hans Richter (1843-1916), see Richard Schaal, '>'Hans Richter' in *MGG* 11 (1963), cols. 460-61; M. Eger, *Hans Richter: Bayreuth, Wien, London und zurück* (Bayreuth, 1991); Christopher Fifield, *True Artist and True Friend. A Biography of Hans Richter* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); idem, '>'Hans Richter', *The New Grove, Second Edition* (2001), 21, 341-42; Clemens Hellberg, 'Homage an Hans Richter', in *IBG Studien & Berichte* Mitteilungsblatt 88 (June 2017), 5-11.

admiration in the two sets of *Liebeslieder* waltzes opp. 52 and 65. Strauss, in the audience at the first Vienna performance of Bruckner's Symphony no. 7 on 21 March 1886, sent the composer a telegram of congratulations and invited him to one of his soirées. Reluctant to go at first, Bruckner was finally persuaded when he was reassured that one or two of his friends would also be present. Bruckner greeted Strauss as a 'great composer' and Strauss returned the compliment, describing himself modestly as 'only a suburban composer' in comparison with the creator of the 'wonderful' Seventh Symphony.¹⁹ The two main concert-giving institutions in Vienna were the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, founded in 1812 but reorganized after 1848, and the *Philharmonische Konzerte*, instituted in 1842, but there were a number of fairly new concert-giving bodies, for instance the *Akademischer Gesangverein*, the *Singakademie*, the *Schubertbund*, the *Kaufmännischer Gesangverein* and the *Orchesterverein für klassische Musik*. The differences between *Hofoper*, *Hofkapelle*, *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* and *Philharmonische Konzerte* concerned function, internal structure, funding and sponsorship. Although there was a clear distinction between those activities which were court-sponsored and those which were *Gesellschaft*-sponsored, there was very little to choose between them artistically, as many of the most prominent musicians were active in all of them, Otto Dessoff, for instance, was conductor of the Philharmonic Concerts from 1860 to 1875 and was also active as a conductor at the Opera, as an occasional conductor at the *Gesellschaft* concerts and as a

19 See G-A IV/2, 433 and 467-68. For further information about the popular culture of the period, see Camille Crittenden, *Johann Strauss and Vienna: operetta and the politics of popular culture* (Cambridge, 2000).

professor of harmony and counterpoint at the Conservatory. Hans Richter, who succeeded him as Philharmonic conductor (1875-1898), was one of the principal conductors of the Opera and was artistic director of the *Musikverein* from 1884 to 1890. In addition, he was assistant director of music at the court from 1877 to 1893 and became principal music director from 1893 to 1900. The Philharmonic Orchestra was also the Opera orchestra and most of its members additionally played in the *Gesellschaft* concerts.

Although the first concert to be given in the newly constructed *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* building in 1870 was a fairly conservative affair,²⁰ there was, generally speaking, more openness to novelty at the *Gesellschaft* concerts than at the Philharmonic concerts.²¹ A number of works for chorus and orchestra were performed, for instance Beethoven's Symphony no. 9 and *Missa solemnis*, Brahms's *German Requiem*, Liszt's *Christus* and Bruckner's *Psalm 150*. The *Gesellschaft* had its own large chorus - the *Singverein* - to participate in these large-scale works. Brahms directed the *Gesellschaft* concerts during the 1872-73 season.

On the lighter side, a distinctive type of popular music was offered by the Schrammel brothers (Josef and Johann) from 1877 onwards. The '>Schrammel Quartet' consisted of two violins, bass guitar (later a '>button concertina') and a small, high-pitched clarinet. The Schrammel brothers usually played music they had

20 The concert, which took place on 6 January, was conducted by Herbeck and included works by Bach, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert.

21 A situation that still existed at least well into the 20th century, when one compares the type of concert given by, for instance, the Vienna Symphony Orchestra or at the *Konzerthaus* with the Vienna Philharmonic Concerts at the *Musikverein* which were by subscription only.

written themselves and their quartet was frequently called upon to provide musical entertainment for the nobility and the royal family. It was admired by serious musicians and, as time went on, almost all Viennese light music for a small ensemble was simply called *Schrammelmusik*. An orchestral player did not think it beneath him to join with a colleague involved in light music entertainment to form such a folk music group. One of Bruckner's social pursuits, certainly during his first years in Vienna, was to attend balls in the pre-Lenten carnival period. In his 1877 diary - the *Krakauer Schreibkalender für das Jahr 1877* - not only did he jot down *inter alia* the times of his lectures at the Conservatory and University and the times of lessons given to private pupils, but he also recorded the names of the ladies with whom he had danced at three balls he attended in January and February 1877! Bruckner, whose eye for feminine beauty often led him into bizarre situations and occasioned several rash proposals of marriage, had obviously been suitably impressed. The music at those balls would no doubt have been provided by a dance orchestra or an early form of the 'Schrammel quartet'.

No survey of the musical scene in Vienna during the second half of the 19th century is complete without some mention of Eduard Hanslick who was without doubt the city's most formidable music critic. He contributed music reviews to several papers, for instance the *Allgemeine Wiener Musikzeitung* and the *Wiener Zeitung*, until 1864 when he became the music critic of the prestigious *Neue freie Presse*, a newspaper that affirmed strongly liberal views. Hanslick's major book on musical aesthetics, in which he espoused the cause of autonomous absolute music as distinct from heteronomous programme music, was entitled *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen (The Beautiful in Music, 1854)*. It was highly

regarded and went through several editions in his lifetime. On the strength of it he received an honorary readership from the University of Vienna in 1856 and was appointed a full professor of music history and aesthetics in 1870. Hanslick's relationship with Brahms was somewhat cool initially (in the 1860s) but he later became one of his stoutest advocates. On the other hand, while welcoming Bruckner's appointment to the Vienna Conservatory in 1868, he took a strong stand against his later applications for a similar appointment at the University and was one of a group of reviewers, the other two being Gustav Dömpke and Max Kalbeck, who regularly castigated the composer for his Wagnerian leanings.²²

Other important music critics who contributed to the >reception history of Bruckner's music both during his time in Vienna and posthumously were Ludwig Speidel who worked for the *Fremdenblatt* and was a >'mild and modest man, a critic who would rather remain on friendly terms with the actors of the *Hofburgtheater* than treat them harshly when they had failed in their parts' and whose dictum was >'a feuilleton is the immortality of one day',²³ Robert Hirschfeld who worked for the *Wiener Abendpost*, Theodor Helm, Viennese correspondent for the

22 Eduard Hanslick (1825-1904) was born in Prague and trained as both a musician and a lawyer. He eventually settled in Vienna in the late 1840s. His main critical writings are embodied in the *Geschichte des Concertwesens in Wien* (Vienna, 1869) and *Die moderne Oper* (1875-1900). English translations of some of them are contained in Henry Pleasants, ed., *Eduard Hanslick. Music Criticisms 1846-1899* (London: Penguin Books, 2/1963). For further information, see Sandra McColl, *Music Criticism in Vienna 1896-1897* (Oxford, 1997); Thomas Grey, >'Eduard Hanslick', *The New Grove, Second Edition* (2001), 10, 827-33; Werner Abegg, >'Eduard Hanslick', *MGG, Personenteil 8* (2002), cols. 667-72. Bruckner attended Hanslick's history lectures at the University during his first years in Vienna.

23 Spiel, op.cit., 103.

German music periodical, *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* and music critic for the *Deutsche Zeitung* from 1884 onwards, Richard Specht who worked for *Der Merker*, Max Kalbeck and Ernst Decsey, both of whom worked for the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, Max Graf who worked for *Die Zeit* and Hugo Wolf who deliberately adopted a polemical anti-Brahms and pro-Wagner stance in his reviews for the *Salonblatt*.²⁴ Recent Bruckner scholarship has helped to provide a more balanced view of Bruckner's treatment by the Austrian press. While critical opinion concerning his music may have been divided, he was an established musical figure by the beginning of the 1880s:

Bruckner took about ten years to be established as a 'very important person' in the Austrian press. During that time there were the occasional articles which were concerned essentially with events such as organ concerts and first performances, and there were also a few caricatures (for instance, in the Viennese comic paper *Die Bombe* on 22 October 1872) as well as the friendly if occasionally scandal-mongering mention of Bruckner in provincial papers, particularly regarding the question of his dismissal or non-dismissal from the *Staatsanstalt*

24 For a general coverage of musical journalism in Vienna during the period, see Margaret Notley, *Lateness and Brahms. Music and Culture in the Twilight of Viennese Liberalism* (Oxford, 2007) and David Brodbeck, 'Dvořák's Reception in Liberal Vienna: Language Ordinances, National Property, and the Rhetoric of *Deutschtum*', in *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 60/1 (2007), 71-131. For further information about Theodor Helm's reviews of Bruckner's symphonies and his gradual change of stance, see Michael Krebs, '>Vom Gegner zum Befürworter. Die Symphonien Anton Bruckner in der Beurteilung von Theodor Helm', in *BJ 1887-2000* (Linz, 2002), 289-319. For accounts of Max Kalbeck's activities as a critic, see Sandra McColl, op.cit.; idem, '>Max Kalbeck and Gustav Mahler', in *Nineteenth-Century Music* 20/2 (1996), 167-83, and idem, '>Karl Kraus and Musical Criticism: The Case of Max Kalbeck', in *The Musical Quarterly* 82/2 (Summer 1998), 279-308. Hugo Wolf contributed reviews to the *Salonblatt* from 1884 to 1887. An English translation of several of these reviews can be found in Henry Pleasants, transl. and ed., *The Music Criticism of Hugo Wolf* (London and New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978).

für Bildung von Lehrerinnen in Vienna in 1871.

From 1880, however, the composer was well enough known for his name to be found frequently in reports, commentaries and reviews not only on the occasion of performances of his works but also independently of those...²⁵

How much Bruckner would have imbibed of the cultural atmosphere in Vienna is uncertain. Most of his time seems to have been spent teaching and composing and he used his vacations to visit Bayreuth, Steyr, St. Florian (where his brother Ignaz worked), the Kremstal region and Vöcklabruck (where his sister Rosalie lived with her husband and two sons).²⁶ There is no record of his showing any particular interest in dramatic productions at either the *Burgtheater* or the *Volkstheater* or of his being aware of the major developments in painting and sculpture which led to the Vienna Secession in the mid-1890s. On the other hand, an entry in his *Akademischer Kalender der Österreichischen Hochschulen für das Studienjahr 1880* reveals that he still kept up to date with an event which had gripped the public interest in the

25 Manfred Wagner, >'Bruckner in Wien', *ABDS* 2 (Linz, 1980), 41. A typical example of a writer well-disposed towards Bruckner is the >'C.B.' who wrote an article entitled >'Porträt eines Wiener Musikers' in the *Deutsche Zeitung*, 4 February 1880. It is reprinted in full in *ABDS* 2, 41-44. See also Norbert Tschulik, >'Anton Bruckner in der Wiener Zeitung. Ein Beitrag über die zeitgenössische Bruckner-Berichterstattung', *BJ* 1981 (Linz, 1982), 171-79. Margaret Notley (op.cit.,16) also points out that during the 1880s Bruckner began to receive 'ardent support...from an unexpected journalistic source: the press of the Pan-Germans and the Christian Socialists, the most important of the right-wing anti-Liberal parties formed during that decade.'

26 For further information about Bruckner's connections with the Kremstal region, see Andrea Harrandt's report of the ABIL Conference held at Schloss Kremsegg on 2/3 June 2016 – 'Musik im Kremstal und Bruckner' – in *IBG Studien & Berichte Mitteilungsblatt* 86 (June 2016), 22-23.

27 See *MVP* 1, 152 and *MVP* 2, 134.

mid-1870s - the Austrian North Pole expedition.²⁷

Bruckner took some time to settle and establish himself in Vienna. The contrast between life in the city and life in a provincial town like Linz was much greater than that between life in Linz and life in St. Florian. He was no longer in a quite sheltered church music environment. His occasional organ duties at the *Hofkapelle* were but a small part of his weekly routine. One suspects that his organ tours at the beginning of his time in Vienna were an attempt to impress his more cultured colleagues and to make his name known in the city. He may have been naive in some matters but he was shrewd enough and had a sufficient amount of '>peasant cunning' to survive the particularly difficult early years and to sustain him thereafter. Much has been made of his lack of social graces which did not mix well with the etiquette of Viennese high society, the court circle in particular. But it would seem that, in general, Bruckner's occasional unsocial behaviour was not a deterrent to his being accepted as a fine musician, and that he had his advocates in court circles after Herbeck's death in 1877. The Lord Chamberlain, Prince Constantin zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, to whom he dedicated his Symphony no. 4, was a keen music-lover and well-disposed towards him. Prince Constantin's wife, Princess Marie zu Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg, whose mother was Liszt's lover and companion for many years, was convinced, however, that Bruckner was frequently >'economical with the truth' in his accounts of his relationship with the court:

... My husband made a clear distinction between

Bruckner the artist to whom as an indigenous composer he wished to give due recognition, and Bruckner the man who was very popular in some court circles. This was in keeping with certain traditions from the >'good old days' of the patriarchal Emperor Franz - when an artist's little gaucheries met with more approval than his elegant, gentlemanly bearing... my husband and I also discovered that Bruckner knew how to promote himself well in his court relationships. Many of his comments about this which were voiced publicly lack any semblance of truth... Excuse me if our point of view is at variance with your admiration for the composer. You will naturally have had the opportunity of seeing him at his most unaffected - and such a mighty talent must also have had its earthy side. Unfortunately, we saw him in nasty disguise - a certain amount of calculated, self-satisfied clumsiness lay behind his court etiquette.²⁸

This is a necessary corrective to the apocryphal accounts of Bruckner as a beleaguered figure and a >'fish out of water' in Vienna. The many difficulties and setbacks must not be minimized but his strong faith helped him to surmount them.²⁹ The reminiscences of his friends and pupils show that he had the healthy respect and loyalty of many young amateur and professional musicians.³⁰ Towards the end of his life Bruckner

28 From Princess Marie's letter to August Göllerich. See G-A IV/2, 506-07.

29 See Johannes-Leopold Mayer, '>Musik als Gesellschaftliches Ärgernis...' , *ABDS* 2, 75-156, 109ff. in particular, for a revealing sociological study of Bruckner's Vienna years.

30 Of the many reminiscences, the most important are Friedrich Eckstein, *Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1923); Carl Hruby, *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner* (Vienna: Friedrich Schalk, 1901); Friedrich Klose, *Meine Lehrjahre bei Bruckner. Erinnerungen und Betrachtungen* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1927); Max v. Oberleithner, *Meine Erinnerungen an Bruckner* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1933); Lili Schalk, ed., *Franz Schalk. Briefe und Betrachtungen* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1935); August Stradal, '>Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner' in *Neue Musik-*

gradually obtained the more substantial recognition he so richly deserved. In November 1891 the honorary degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred on him by the University of Vienna in recognition of his achievements and, from July 1895 until his death, Emperor Franz Josef, to whom he dedicated his Symphony no. 8 and from whom he received the *Franz Josef Order* in July 1886, put at his disposal the *Kustodenstöckl*, a sort of porter's lodge in the grounds of the *Schloss Belvedere*.

Other long-held views of Bruckner's life-style have been challenged recently. Manfred Wagner, for instance, counters the typical statement that 'he retained his baggy country clothes' when in Vienna by referring us to oil paintings and photographs of the composer which reveal that he had a good sartorial sense.³¹ His preference for trousers which were wide and did not quite reach his ankles was purely a convenience measure - to facilitate organ playing! Manfred Wagner's conclusion that 'no representation, either photographic or artistic, reveals anything that can be ridiculed' can hardly be disputed.³² Bruckner's eating and drinking habits were by no means unusual. He had a hearty but hardly intemperate appetite for beer. The timing of his meals was determined, of course, by his teaching hours which on some

Zeitung 34 (1913), 125-28 and 165-68; idem, '>Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit' in *Zeitschrift für Musik* 99 (1932), 835-60, 971-78 and 1071-75.

31 This '>typical' statement can be found in Deryck Cooke, '>Bruckner', *The New Grove Late Romantic Masters* (London: Macmillan, 1985), 24. Copies of some of the paintings and photographs mentioned by Wagner can be found throughout the Bruckner literature. The most useful and informative collection is provided by Renate Grasberger, '>Bruckner-Ikonographie. Teil 1: Um 1854 bis 1924', *ABDS* 7 (Linz, 1990).

32 Wagner, loc.cit., *ABDS* 2, 22.

days stretched to mid-evening. Finally, his lodgings were of above-average comfort for a person of his social standing at the time. His first apartment, for which he paid an annual rent of nearly 200 florins, was at Währingerstrasse 41, 3rd floor, in the ninth district. He chose it deliberately because of its good view and its proximity to both the *Hofkapelle* and the Conservatory.³³ In 1877 he moved to an apartment on the fourth floor of Hessgasse 7 near the Schottenring and commanding a fine view of the Kahlenberg. His landlord was Dr. Anton Oelzelt von Newin, a young philosopher who attended some of Bruckner's Harmony and Counterpoint classes while studying at the University and was a great admirer of his organ playing.³⁴ Bruckner had been promised this apartment at the end of 1876 but the removal was delayed owing to difficulties raised by some of Oelzelt von Newin's relatives. Oelzelt von Newin wrote to Bruckner in February 1877 to apologize for the delay and to assure him that the promise would be fulfilled.³⁵ The composer was immensely grateful to his young friend for allowing him to have the apartment at a very reasonable rent, and later gave tangible expression of his gratitude by dedicating his Sixth Symphony to him.³⁶ Friedrich Eckstein provides us with a vivid

33 Bruckner probably moved here from Linz no later than 30 September 1868, as the Conservatory term began at the beginning of October, and it is possible that either Rudolf Weinwurm or Johann Herbeck helped him to find this accommodation. His landlord was Johann Höhne and he paid a quarterly rent of 45½ florins. See Maier, *ABDS* 15 (2009), 96.

34 See *G-A* IV/1, 460ff. for details of Bruckner's organ playing at Klosterneuburg on 4 October 1876 which Oelzelt von Newin heard.

35 See *HSABB* 1 (2nd rev. edition, Vienna, 2009), 175 for the text of this letter. It was printed for the first time in *G-A* IV/1, 463-64.

description of this apartment:

How vividly I can still recall the beautiful, bright and spacious apartment in the Hessgasse near the Schottenring. That latticed anteroom with dark green curtains near the staircase and the large tidy kitchen which Bruckner probably never used. Then the brightly painted study near the street with the huge pedal harmonium at the window which was permanently closed and served only as a book stand. Opposite this, in the middle of the room, was the huge, long and ancient Bösendorfer piano with its thin, whirring spinet-like tone, also buried beneath scores, piles of manuscripts and music paper, either empty or covered with sketches and workings-out.

In the middle of this study stood the small, unassuming, thin-legged little table, painted green but worn at the edges and covered with numerous ink splashes, at which Bruckner worked many hours each day, often until late at night, and where he also gave lessons - the pupil sitting opposite him, eager to complete the set exercises and then to have them returned after the master had taken the utmost care to correct them. Most of the time here was spent discussing in painstaking detail all the conceivable workings of an exercise - first of all, strictly according to the rules; and then, finally, very free methods of treatment were carefully examined. Next to Bruckner's study was his bedroom in which there was no other furniture apart from his bed. The floor was painted in brown enamel varnish and the walls in a deep ultramarine blue, a colour combination which I encountered later only in Scandinavian and Russian farm cottages. On the floor piled high against the walls were quantities of

36 Bruckner paid more or less the same rent (about 200 florins) that he had paid for the apartment in Währingerstrasse. See *HSABB* 1, 175-76 for Bruckner's reply to von Newin's letter, dated Vienna, 7 February 1877. Several other letters from Bruckner to Oelzelt von Newin have survived. In one of them, dated 15 June 1891, he again expressed gratitude to his "patron" and mentioned that he had just returned from Berlin where his *Te Deum* was successfully performed. See *HSABB* 2, 142. An undated visiting card and the originals of his letters to Oelzelt von Newin, dated 7 February 1877, 11 June 1877, 19 November 1891, New Year 1892, 11 June 1892 and 13 June 1894, can be found in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library. They are printed in *HSABB* 1 and 2.

music, music paper, sketches, books, correspondence etc., and frequently, whenever a sketch, a letter or an important document went missing, I had to crawl along the floor on all fours in order to find what I was looking for.³⁷

Bruckner's favourite sister Anna, or Nani as he affectionately called her, moved with him to Vienna to act as his housekeeper. When she died in January 1870, nearly ten years after the death of their mother, Katherina Kachelmayr was recommended to him. Her duties included house cleaning, making the occasional meal, and being at the apartment at 7 a.m. most mornings to brew him some coffee. As she remained with him as a faithful housekeeper for the next 26 years, she was often the confidante of his numerous brief "affairs of the heart". Their relationship was cordial but had its inevitable tensions. When composing he would often lose all sense of time, and she was under strict instructions neither to clean nor to admit any visitors to his study during these periods. He frequently left a lovingly prepared dish uneaten, preferring to keep working until late in the evening when he would go to a local inn and enjoy a substantial supper. When his health gradually declined in the last three or four years of his life, "Frau Kathi" helped to nurse him through various illnesses. In July 1895, when Bruckner was no longer able to cope with the exertion of climbing up and down stairs, she was at hand when he moved to the *Kustodenstöckl* in the Belvedere grounds. During the final months of his life when he required round-the-clock help, she brought her daughter to assist her and cared for the ailing

³⁷ Friedrich Eckstein, op.cit. See also Friedrich Klose, op.cit., 10 - there are English translations of this in Paul Banks, loc.cit., 85 and Stephen Johnson, op.cit., 43-44 - and G-A IV/1, 465-67.

composer with great devotion.³⁸

Bruckner remained at the Conservatory for 23 years and stayed in the same post during that time.³⁹ Although the possibility of an organ-teaching post had been mooted in the mid-1860s, Bruckner was the first to give organ lessons at the Conservatory. In fact there was no organ available initially; a piano and then a pedal harmonium were put at his disposal. When an organ was finally installed Bruckner bought the

38 Katherina Kachelmayr died in 1911. Towards the end of her life when she was in a mental institution in Vienna, she received some financial help from Bruckner's brother Ignaz.

As well as the books and articles already cited, the following will provide a more detailed account of Vienna and musical life in the city during Bruckner's time there:

A. Böhm, *Geschichte des Singvereins der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien* (Vienna, 1908); R.V. Perger and R. Hirschfeld, *Geschichte des k.k. Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien*, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1912); Heinrich Kralik, *Die Wiener Philharmoniker und ihre Dirigenten* (Vienna, 1960); Arthur J. May, *The Hapsburg Monarchy 1867-1914* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1960); Ilsa Barea, *Vienna. Legend and Reality* (London: Secker and Wartburg, 1966); Alfred Orel, 'Wien VII. Das 19. Jahrhundert' in *MGG* 14 (1968), cols. 611-15; F. Hadamowsky, *Die Wiener Hoftheater (Staatsoper), Part 2: Die Wiener Hofoper (Staatsoper) 1811-1974* (Vienna, 1975); R.A. Kahn, *A History of the Habsburg Empire 1526-1918* (Berkeley, 1977); R. Flotzinger and G. Gruber, eds., *Musikgeschichte Österreichs II. Vom Barock zur Gegenwart* (Graz, 1979); Mosco Carner and Rudolf Klein, 'Vienna 5: 1830-1945' in *The New Grove* 19 (1980), 723-36; John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1981); H. Herrmann-Schneider, *Status und Funktion des Hofkapellmeisters in Wien (1848-1918)* (Graz, 1981); D.J. Olsen, *The City as a Work of Art: London, Paris, Vienna* (New Haven and London, 1986); Alfred Planyavsky, 'Die Wiener Philharmoniker im Rückblick', in *ÖMZ* 47/2-3 (February-March 1992), 86-110, 95-96 and 98ff. in particular; Andrew Wheatcroft, *The Habsburgs* (London: Viking, 1995). The following two articles: Moritz Csáky, 'Bruckner und Wien: Der soziokulturelle Kontext einer Stadt' and Peter Urbanitsch, 'Anton Bruckner, das liebe Geld, die Wiener Gesellschaft und die Politik', in Renate Grasberger, Elisabeth Maier and Erich Wolfgang Partsch (ed.), *Anton Bruckners Wiener Jahre. Analysen – Fakten – Perspektiven* (Vienna, 2009), 65-86 and 301-330 also provide important information about the extent to which social, political and financial matters in Vienna impinged on Bruckner's life.

39 The original 1868 contract obliged him to teach theory for six hours a week and organ for six hours a week. This was changed in 1869 to nine hours of theory and three hours of organ tuition. Bruckner retired on 15 January 1891 after taking six months' leave because of illness.

harmonium for his own use. Significantly, Bruckner never taught composition at the Conservatory.⁴⁰ According to the reminiscences of many of his pupils, Bruckner brought to his theory teaching the same rigid discipline that he had experienced during his studies with Sechter; but he frequently introduced a lighter touch to proceedings by using a colourful illustration to underline the point he wished to make. His text books were the same ones that he himself had used, namely Dürrnberger's *Elementar-Lehrbuch der Harmonie- und Generalbasslehre* (1841) and Sechter's *Grundsätze der musikalischen Komposition* (1853).⁴¹ The following account of Bruckner's teaching - by the

40 Composition was taught by Otto Dessoff (1861-1875), Franz Krenn (1869-1891), Robert Fuchs (1874-1909), Hermann Grädener (1875-1909) and Johann Nepomuk Fuchs (1888-1894).

41 See G-A IV/1, 43-62 for Viktor Christ's notes on his theory lessons at the Conservatory, and Erich Wolfgang Partsch, 'Viktor Christ – Anton Bruckner's Schüler und Kopist', in Renate Grasberger, Elisabeth Maier und Erich Wolfgang Partsch (eds), *Anton Bruckners Wiener Jahre* (Vienna, 2009), 259-72, for further information about Christ. Further details of Bruckner's teaching methods at the Conservatory, later at the University, and on a one-to-one basis with his private pupils is provided by the following: Friedrich Eckstein, op.cit. (1923) [Eckstein was a private pupil from 1881 to 1884 as well as attending Bruckner's University lectures from 1884 to 1886. His notes on Bruckner's teaching are preserved in the ÖNB - Mus. Hs. 28.443-47 and Miscellanea 70]; Friedrich Klose, op.cit. (1927) [Klose was a private pupil from 1886 to 1889]; Alfred Orel, *Ein Harmonielehrekolleg bei Bruckner* (Berlin-Vienna-Zurich, 1940) [containing Carl Speiser's notes on the harmony lectures during the winter semester 1889/90]; Ernst Schwanzara, ed., *Anton Bruckner. Vorlesungen über Harmonielehre und Kontrapunkt in der Universität Wien* (Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1950) [covering the period 1891-94]; William Waldstein, 'Bruckner als Lehrer', in Franz Grasberger, ed., *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1964), 113-20; Erich Schenk and Gernot Gruber, 'Die "ganzen Studien" zu Josef Vockners Theorieunterricht bei Anton Bruckner', in Othmar Wessely, ed., *Bruckner Studien* (Vienna, 1975), 349-77 [Vockner was a private pupil from 1876 to 1888]; Rudolf Flotzinger, 'Rafael Loidols Theoriekolleg bei Bruckner 1879/1880' in Wessely, op.cit., 379-431, Thomas Aigner, 'Carl Kratzls Abschlussprüfung bei Anton Bruckner', in *Anton Bruckners Wiener Jahre*, 9-17 [Kratzl was one of Bruckner's Conservatory students in the early 1870s] and Gerhard Baumgartner, 'Aus dem Kontrapunktunterricht bei Anton Bruckner. Eine Mitschrift von Lorenz Ritter', in *Anton Bruckners Wiener Jahre*, 31-6 [Ritter was also one of Bruckner's Conservatory students, in the 1881/1882 academic

philosopher Dr. Franz Marschner, one of his Counterpoint pupils at the Conservatory from 1883 to 1885 - is typical of many:

In his teaching he was a strict technician but kindly as a person. I already had the impression that he was an excellent teacher of Counterpoint. In order to understand his teaching method, however, one had to be adequately trained; fortunately, that was the case as far as I was concerned. He presented the vast material of Sechter's theories in a simple and cogent manner and could be held up as a model teacher, enabling his pupil to keep on assimilating a relatively limited number of maxims and rules in a logical manner... He told me himself that he had studied Counterpoint seven hours a day for seven years, but under the personal supervision of his teacher Sechter only during holiday periods. I ascribed his abnormal nervous condition to this extended period of highly concentrated study. To write counterpoint in the way that he was accustomed to was an extremely strenuous undertaking even for someone with the greatest aptitude and facility. He worked alone with us, proceeding at a very slow pace but as thoroughly as possible. We often brought him only a couple of lines of work.

'>People work far too quickly for me', he once said; '>'I work very slowly, much more slowly than they do, but I also reflect upon everything that I am considering.' His own contrapuntal inventions, particularly his counter-themes, were wonderful. The time devoted to the teaching of Harmony and Counterpoint at the Conservatory seemed to him to be far too short. When I asked him once how he would plan the teaching, his expressed opinion was that a harmony course should certainly last three years, whereas a few months would be sufficient for

year]. See also Theophil Antonicek, 'Bruckner's Universitätsschüler in den Nationalien der Philosophischen Fakultät' in Wessely, op.cit., 433-87 for a complete list and some biographical details of the students who attended the University music lectures given by Bruckner and his colleagues, including Hanslick and Guido Adler, from 1875 to 1897.

Composition teaching as Composition was not really a subject that could be taught. As a teacher Bruckner had the excellent habit of playing corrections on the piano and of using them as aural tests for us to write down.⁴²

From the outset of his time in Vienna Bruckner was particularly concerned that he would have enough material resources to enable him to devote more time to composition, and he made several requests for financial aid to the Ministry of Culture and Education. At the end of 1868 he was given a grant of 500 florins to enable him to produce '>large symphonic works'.⁴³

Although Bruckner's duties at the *Hofkapelle* were initially no more than those of an unpaid supernumerary organist, in which he alternated with the other two organists, Rudolf Bibl and Pius Richter, he occasionally received fees for '>services rendered'. On 13 July 1869 he confided to his friend Moritz von Mayfeld in Linz that Herbeck had promised he would receive some holiday money from the court (treasury); he received official notification of the payment of 60 florins a fortnight later.⁴⁴ Almost 18 months later, in November 1870, Bruckner was granted a sum of 100 florins.⁴⁵

42 From *G-A IV/1*, 70ff. See also Stephen Johnson, *op.cit.*, 82-100 for other reminiscences of Bruckner's individual teaching methods (Ernst Decsey, Friedrich Klose, Ferdinand Löwe, Friedrich Eckstein, Max von Oberleithner, Gustav Mahler, Felix von Kraus and Guido Adler).

43 '>zur Herstellung grösserer symphonischer Werke.' The money was made available officially on 20 December and the letter of corroboration, dated Vienna, 28 December 1868, was addressed to '>Mr Anton Bruckner, composer and professor at the Vienna Conservatory.' See *G-A IV/1*, 79-80.

44 See *HSABB 1*, 115 for Bruckner's letter to Mayfeld, and *ABDS 1*, 52ff. for the official letter from the court treasury, dated Vienna, 27 July 1869. The originals of both letters are in the *ÖNB*.

45 See *ABDS 1*, 56-57. The money was officially released on 18 November

Bruckner's activities as an organist were not confined to the Hofkapelle. He also played the organ at the court parish church of St. Augustin where Leopold Eder was director of music. He was active there from 1870 to the late 1880s and, under Eder's direction, played for an average of two services each month. It has not yet been established whether Bruckner played during the whole mass or only at the end. The repertoire consisted mainly of works by the Viennese Classical composers, particularly Joseph Haydn. Other composers represented were Mercadante, Schubert, Führer, Diabelli, Gyrowetz, Weiss and Preindl. The inserted solo pieces for the Gradual and Offertory were mainly by contemporary composers. The performances were advertised in the local press and there was often an indication that Bruckner would play a large fugue at the end of the service. On special occasions, for instance the 25th anniversary of Franz Josef's coronation (2 December 1873) and the Emperor and Empress's silver wedding celebrations (27 April 1879), Bruckner used the melody 'Gott erhalte' (the Emperor's hymn: the theme of the slow movement from Haydn's String Quartet op.76 no.3) as the basis for his improvisations.

Bruckner also worked as an organist occasionally at other Viennese churches - the *Minoritenkirche* in the Alservorstadt (about twice a year on average), the parish church in Währing (at the Mass to celebrate the founding of the *Währinger Liedertafel* of which Bruckner was an honorary member), the church of *Maria am Gestade*, the *Minoritenkirche* in the inner city 1st district and

and Bruckner informed on 23 November; the original of the letter to Bruckner is privately owned.

the *Karlskirche*.⁴⁶ As well as playing the organ regularly during his summer vacation visits to St. Florian and, later, Steyr, he was also a welcome guest and visiting organist at the monasteries of Kremsmünster and Klosterneuburg.⁴⁷

The *ex gratia* payment of 60 florins by the court authorities to Bruckner in July 1869 was possibly in recognition of Bruckner's success in representing Austria as an organist in Nancy and Paris at the end of April and beginning of May. A new Merklin organ had been installed in the church of St. Epvre in Nancy and the Hapsburg court had been invited to send an organist to participate in a kind of organ festival. Rudolf Bibl had been approached first but had declined, and Bruckner was the next choice. Moritz von Mayfeld had already alluded to this '>Nancy opportunity' and the possibility of '>triumphs in foreign parts' in a letter to Bruckner in November 1868, and Bruckner himself referred to his imminent departure for France in a letter to Dr. Rudolf Prohaska on 15 April 1869.⁴⁸ On the same day he wrote to the Conservatory to

46 For further information about Leopold Eder and Bruckner's involvement as an organist in other Viennese churches, see Walburga Litschauer, '>Bruckner und die Wiener Kirchenmusiker', *BSL 1985* (Linz, 1988), 95-101.

47 Bruckner's regular cab driver for his journeys between Vienna and Klosterneuburg was Anton Schatz and he also enjoyed visiting the Schatz family in Klosterneuburg and would often play dances on the piano for the daughters of the family. See Christine Zippel, 'Anton Bruckners Chauffeur nach Klosterneuburg: der Stellfuhrwerker Anton Schatz', in *BJ 2001-2005* (Vienna, 2006), 283-88 for further details of the family, and Wolfgang Bäck, 'Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner in Klosterneuburg', *idem*, 289-92 for details of the memorial plaques to Bruckner and the street named after him in the town.

48 See *HSABB 1*, 104-05 for Mayfeld's letter to Bruckner, dated Linz, 14 November 1868, and *HSABB 1*, 108 for Bruckner's letter to Prohaska; the originals of both letters are not extant. Dr. Rudolf Prohaska (1839-1909) was a lawyer in Linz and chairman of the *Musikverein*. He had asked Bruckner for some information about a piece of music and Bruckner was able to tell him that it would be cheaper for him to order it directly from Gotthardt in Vienna than indirectly through a music dealer in Linz.

obtain official permission for time off to travel to Nancy, promising to make up the teaching hours that he would miss.⁴⁹ Bruckner left Vienna on 24 April and played the organ in Nancy on Wednesday 28 April and Thursday 29 April.⁵⁰ On the first day he played a Prelude and Fugue by Bach and a free improvisation and, on the second day, he improvised on the >'Emperor's hymn'.⁵¹ Bruckner was pleased with his performances and reported to Herbeck that the audience reaction had been extremely favourable:

... The concerts are over... There was a lot of ceremony. During my first days here and even at the first concert a Parisian organist (Mr. Vilbac) seemed to me to be the clear favourite with the Germans among us. But I had the connoisseurs on my side already at the first concert. I couldn't fail to be moved by the reception given to my playing at the second concert (yesterday, 29th April); I cannot begin to describe it. The aristocrats, the Parisians, the Germans and the Belgians vied with each other in paying me their respects, and this was all the more surprising after Vilbac (a very dear, fine French artist and a friend of Thomas) played some French pieces extremely well. There is no doubt that he has an extremely sympathetic following in Nancy as he comes here frequently. I have no idea what will be reported in the papers - unfortunately, I won't be able to understand it! I have only the

49 Bruckner was granted leave of absence from 24 April to 3 May. In the letter from Leopold Zellner, the secretary general of the Conservatory, Bruckner was also informed that his request for his weekly organ teaching to be reduced by three hours and his harmony and counterpoint teaching to be increased by three hours had been granted. He had also been successful in his request for a pedal harmonium to be made available for organ lessons. See *HSABB* 1, 108-09 for Bruckner's letter and Zellner's reply, dated Vienna, 23 April 1869; the originals of both letters can be found in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library.

50 There were previews of the Nancy concerts in the *Revue et gazette musicale* 36 (18 April 1869), 135, *Le ménestrel* 37 (18 April 1869), 158 and *La France musicale* 33 (25 April 1869), 131.

51 See *G-A* IV/1, 85ff. for the programme of the concert which included soprano solos and choral pieces.

verbal opinions of experts - modesty compels me to be silent about those - and the reception and applause of the public. Amiable young ladies from the highest nobility even came up to the organ to show their appreciation...⁵²

None of the newspaper reports of the two concerts went into any detail about the individual performances. The reviewer for *L'Espérance*, however, had the following to say about Bruckner's contributions to the two concerts:

... Mr. Bruckner, organist of His Majesty the Emperor of Austria and Professor of Organ at the Conservatory of Music in Vienna, ended the concert [on 28 April] in a suitable manner with an elegant and skilful improvisation in which the most serious qualities of the true artist were revealed. On the following day, 29 April, a large and sympathetic number of people re-gathered for another concert in the beautiful nave of St. Epvre. The Viennese artist, Mr. Bruckner, developed the Austrian national hymn with an uncommon richness of harmony and vigour of execution.⁵³

The reporter for the *Journal de la Meurthe et des Vosges* described Bruckner as '>'one of the best organists we have ever heard, a man of the highest taste, of the most comprehensive and most prolific knowledge' and added that the Austrian court was fortunate to possess such an artist.⁵⁴

52 Extract from Bruckner's letter to Herbeck, dated Nancy, 30 April 1869. See *HSABB* 1, 109-10 for the complete letter, the original of which is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library. Alphonse Charles Renaud de Vilbac (1829-1884) was a composer and organist at the church of Saint-Eugène-Sainte-Cécile in Paris from 1855. The 'Thomas' mentioned was the French composer and teacher, Ambroise Thomas (1811-1896).

53 From a report in the edition of 2 May; see *G-A IV/1*, 90-91 for a German translation. There was also a general report of the official installation of the organ and the organ concerts two days earlier in *L'Espérance* (on 30 April).

54 From a report in the edition of 1 May; see *G-A IV/1*, 92 for a German translation.

In the letter to Herbeck mentioned earlier Bruckner also requested three days' extension to his leave, as the '>'gentlemen who are paying for me' were insistent that he travel to Paris and try out a new organ there. Bruckner asked Herbeck to pass this information on to his students. The organ-building firm of Merklin-Schütze clearly wanted to make as much use of Bruckner as possible in the short time available, and Bruckner for his part saw it as an opportunity not to be missed!⁵⁵

On Monday 3 May Bruckner gave a concert to an invited audience in Merklin-Schütze's own building. He improvised on a theme from his First Symphony. His most ambitious playing, however, was reserved for a concert in Notre Dame Cathedral in which he played the five-manual Cavaillé-Coll organ, improvising on a theme submitted by the Parisian organist, Charles-Alexis Chauvet, and evidently impressing some of the leading French composers who were present and who congratulated him warmly after the concert. While in Paris he also played on the organs of the churches of St. Sulpice and St. Trinité, where Chauvet was titular organist, and visited Auber, Gounod and the firm of Cavaillé-Coll.⁵⁶ As his concerts in Paris were not advertised widely and were private rather than public affairs, there were very few reviews, but a report of the first concert in the *Revue et*

55 See footnote 52. In 1867 Merklin-Schütze's grand organ built for the Basilica of St. Epvre in Nancy received a gold medal at the *Exposition Universelle* in Paris.

56 See *HSABB* 1, 115 for a letter from August Neuberger, the managing director of the firm, offering Bruckner assistance in any future tours. The originals of both this letter, dated Paris, 23 June 1869, and Bruckner's letter to Cavaillé-Coll referred to by Neuberger, dated Vienna, 7 June 1869, have been lost.

Gazette musicale drew attention to the high quality of his playing which combined '>enormous skill' with '>much taste' and '>great vigour'.⁵⁷

Bruckner broke his return journey to Vienna by stopping off at Wels where he was elected an honorary member of the *Male Voice Society* and, in a gesture of gratitude, gave an organ recital at the parish church.⁵⁸ On his return to Vienna he wrote to his friend Schiedermayr in Linz describing his successful visit and giving a more detailed account of his '>triumph' at Notre Dame where '>one of the greatest organists in Paris' gave him a theme for improvisation which he duly developed in three sections. He also suggested that rehearsals for the premiere of his E minor Mass in Linz later in the year commence immediately.⁵⁹

Bruckner's French successes naturally aroused great interest in both Linz and Vienna and there were several newspaper reports. The reviewer for the *Linzer Zeitung* regarded these successes as an honour not only for Bruckner himself but also:

57 From a report in the *Revue et gazette musicale* 36 (9 May 1869). There were further reports in *Le ménestrel* 37 (9 May) and *La France musicale*. For further information about Bruckner's French visit, see Josef Burg, '>Anton Bruckners Begegnungen mit der zeitgenössischen Orgel- und Musikwelt in Frankreich', *Musica sacra* 98 (1978), vol. 2, 80-94; idem, '>Anton Bruckners musikalische Begegnungen in Frankreich', *MIBG* 14 (1978), 2-19 and 15 (1979), 2-23. For later French critical reaction to Bruckner as a composer, see Josef Burg, '>Der Komponist Anton Bruckner im Spiegelbild der französischen Musikpresse seiner Zeit', *BJ 1987/88* (Linz, 1990), 95-112. See also footnote 61.

58 Bruckner was sent official confirmation of this honour by August Göllerich senior, the father of Bruckner's later biographer, who was president of the society. See *HSABB* 1, 111 for Göllerich's letter, dated Wels, 23 May 1869; the original is in St. Florian abbey.

59 See *HSABB* 1, 110-11 for this letter, dated Vienna, 20 May 1869; the original is privately owned. Bruckner was given the theme for improvisation by Charles-Alexis Chauvet, the organist of St. Trinité.

... for the land and place where this affable and unassuming artist was born. The mayor of St. Florian sent Mr. Bruckner the following note to mark this occasion: '>With our heartiest congratulations on your most prestigious successes in Nancy and Paris which are an enduring credit not only to you and your Austrian fatherland but also to Upper Austria, where you were born, and St. Florian in particular.'⁶⁰

On 20 May there was a short report by Ludwig Speidel in the *Wiener Fremdenblatt*, and on 13 June Hanslick's article, '>Erfolge eines österreichischen Organisten in Frankreich' appeared in the *Neue freie Presse*. As it was Bruckner's intention at this time to pursue his organ-playing career both in Germany / Austria and further afield, he used the opportunity to send a copy of Hanslick's article, in which his organ playing was described as having '>made a huge impression, putting almost all the other performances in the shade' to Barthold Senff, the editor of the *Signale für die musikalische Welt*, in Leipzig.⁶¹ Senff duly obliged and Bruckner's successes were reported in the *Signale* on 24 June. There was a further report in the June issue of J.E. Habert's *Zeitschrift für katholische Kirchenmusik*.⁶²

The solo organ recital was not a normal occurrence in Vienna

60 Extract from report of Bruckner's visits to Nancy and Paris in the *Linzer Zeitung* 118 (26 May 1869), 501. See G-A IV/1, 99-102 for full report. See HSABB 1, 112 for the letter from Andreas Schlager, the mayor of St. Florian (dated '>before 26 May 1869' by Harrandt).

61 See G-A IV/1, 104-05 for the complete text of Hanslick's report.

62 For other general information about Bruckner's visits to Nancy and Paris in 1869 and London in 1871, see Mosco Carner, '>Anton Bruckner's Organ Recitals in France and England', *The Musical Times* 78 (1937), 117ff.; Franz Grasberger, '>Anton Bruckners Auslandsreisen', *ÖMZ* 24 (1969), 630-35; A.C. Howie, '>Bruckner - the travelling virtuoso', *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 299-316.

during Bruckner's time. Hanslick lamented this fact in 1870 when he wrote an article about Bruckner's skill as an organist and recommended more opportunities to hear organists of his calibre outside the framework of a church service.⁶³ There was the occasional exception, of course; later in the same year Eduard Schelle provided a brief report of a recital given by Bruckner to a gathering of teachers in the *Piaristenkirche*. Schelle mentioned that the programme included the C sharp minor fugue from Bach's '48', a Prelude of Bruckner's own and a freely improvised Fantasia, and praised his technique, especially his skilful pedal playing.⁶⁴ On several occasions Bruckner participated as an organ soloist in concerts given by the *Wiener Männergesangverein* and his playing would occasionally be reported in press reviews. It was as a recitalist in London in 1871, however, that Bruckner was to make his mark as an organist of international stature.

It must have given Bruckner great pleasure to be unanimously elected an honorary member of the *Frohsinn* choral society in June 1869. He was informed of this honour on 9 June and replied a week later with a letter of thanks in which he looked forward to occasions in the future when he would be able to give personal expression to his gratitude.⁶⁵ Later in the year, about a month after the first performance of his E minor Mass in Linz, he was also elected an honorary member of the Linz *Diözesan-*

63 Hanslick, '>Concerte', *Neue freie Presse* (11 January 1870), 2.

64 Schelle, '>Oper', *Die Presse* (14 June 1870), 2.

65 See *HSABB* 1, 112-13 for the official letter from *Frohsinn*, signed by Dr. Mathias Weißmann and Dr. Wilhelm Habild, and for Bruckner's reply, dated Vienna, 16 June 1869. The original of the former is not extant; the original of the latter is in the *Frohsinn* archive of the Linz *Singakademie*.

Kunstverein.⁶⁶

The performance of the E minor Mass, part of the consecration ceremony of the Votive Chapel of the new cathedral in Linz on 29 September, was the second major event of the year for Bruckner. But its significance was quite different. While the organ-playing successes marked the beginning of a new chapter in which national and, eventually, international recognition were the end results, the performance of the Mass in E minor WAB 27, completed three years earlier in November 1866 and dedicated to Bishop Rudigier, signalled the end of an old chapter.⁶⁷ In spite of the occasional longing glances he cast backwards to Linz in 1869 and in spite of the immense trouble he took over the preparations for this performance, he knew that he had taken a decisive step and that his future lay in Vienna.

Bruckner also provided a new work for the consecration ceremony, the gradual *Locus iste* WAB 23 for unaccompanied mixed voices. It was composed on 11 August 1869 and later dedicated to his friend and pupil Oddo Loidol.⁶⁸ The motet, a setting of the text from the Mass for the Dedication of the Church, begins with Mozartian phrases but soon introduces characteristic Brucknerian progressions, for instance a striking sequence at the words >'inaestimabile sacramentum' which ends with a descending melodic gesture reminiscent of some phrases in the *Gloria* and

66 See *HSABB* 1, 119 for the letter from the Diocesan Society to Bruckner, dated Linz, 26 October 1869; the original is in St. Florian.

67 See Chapter 3 (3.3.2) for detailed information about the Mass, including its performance and subsequent revisions.

68 The gradual was first published as no. 2 of *Vier Graduale* by Theodor Rättig in Vienna in 1886. For a modern edition, see *ABSW XXI/1*, 98-99. Further information about this piece is provided in *G-A IV/1*, 108ff. and *ABSW XXI/2*, 86-89.

Agnus movements of the E minor Mass.

Bruckner's third major undertaking of the year was the composition of his Symphony no. "0" WAB 100. Although the dates on the autograph are quite clear, the earliest date being 24 January 1869 and the finishing date 12 September 1869, the accepted view among scholars until the late 20th century was that the work was originally conceived in Linz between October 1863 and May 1864, that is before Symphony no. 1, and that the autograph dates refer to Bruckner's revision of the work during his first year in Vienna.⁶⁹ This view appears to have been strengthened by the critical report of the symphony in the Complete Edition which did not appear until thirteen years after the publication of the work in this particular edition.⁷⁰ In the past a few commentators had doubts about this chronology, doubts confirmed by more recent studies of the manuscript which have shown that the autograph is not a fair copy of earlier work but represents work carried out in 1869 and, unlike Symphonies 1-4, not revised subsequently.⁷¹

69 See, for instance, the discussion of the symphony in *G-A III/1*, 226-45 and *IV/1*, 112. The autograph is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*, Linz, A-LImMusHs 517, and there is also a copy score in the Austrian National Library, Mus.Hs.3189. There are facsimiles of pages from the first movement and final movement in *ABSW XI/2*, 6 and 9.

70 Leopold Nowak, ed., *Symphonie D-Moll ANullte@*, *ABSW XI/2* (Vienna, 1981) and *XI/1* (Vienna, 1968). Nowak, however, seems to have come to accept the later dating of the symphony.

71 See Alfred Orel, *Anton Bruckner. Das Werk - Der Künstler - Die Zeit* (Leipzig, 1925), 136-37; Hans F. Redlich, '>Bruckner's Forgotten Symphony No."0"', *Music Survey 2* (1949), 14-20; Paul Hawkshaw, '>The Date of Bruckner's Nullified@ Symphony in D minor', *19th-Century Music* vi/3 (1982-83), 252-63; Ludwig Finscher, '>Zur Stellung der Nullten@ Symphonie in Bruckners Werk', in Christoph-Hellmut Mahling, ed., *Anton Bruckner. Studien zu Werk und Wirkung. Walter Wiora zum 30. Dezember 1986* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1988), 63-79; Bo Marschner, '>Die chronologischen Probleme der Nullten@ Symphonie Bruckners', *BJ 1987/88* (Linz, 1990), 53-62; Constantin Floros, '>Zu

Bruckner referred to the steady progress he was making on the symphony in a letter to Mayfeld. He also indicated that he had revised the entire middle section of the Andante in accordance with Mayfeld's suggestions. As we know that Bruckner spent Easter in Linz, it is possible that he played the completed parts of the work, including the slow movement, to his friend at that time. A significant amount of work on the symphony was undertaken in Linz during the summer vacation.⁷² Bruckner had the score and parts of the work copied in 1870 and he presented it to the Ministry of Culture and Education when he wrote to them in May requesting a grant.⁷³ Bruckner also showed the work to the court music director, Otto Dessoff, before the end of 1872 and there was possibly a 'private' performance. Dessoff is reported to have been astounded by the opening of the symphony and to have commented, 'Where is the main theme then?' His reaction was probably one of the reasons, if not the main one, for Bruckner's setting the work aside at the time and 'nullifying' it later when he organized his manuscripts in 1895. Paul Hawkshaw provides another possible explanation:

Even though there is no doubt that the opening

Bruckners frühen symphonischen Schaffen', *BSL 1988* (Linz, 1992), 178-90; Dermot Gault, *The New Bruckner* (Ashgate; Farnham, 2011) [*GaultNB*], 39-40; William Carragan, *Anton Bruckner Eleven Symphonies* (Windsor: Bruckner Society of America, 2020) [*CarraganRB*], 37-40.

⁷² See *HSABB* 1, 115 for the text of Bruckner's letter to Mayfeld, dated Vienna, 13 July 1869; the original is in the *ÖNB*. In a postscript to his letter to Herbeck, dated 13 September 1869 (see *HSABB* 1, 116-17), Bruckner wrote that he had 'just finished' his D minor Symphony.

⁷³ See *HSABB* 1, 123 for the text of this letter, dated Vienna, 11 May 1870; the original is in the *Österr. Verwaltungsarchiv*, Vienna

movement of the Third Symphony [in D minor, begun October 1872] is quite a different work from its counterpart in the nullified D minor symphony, it is certainly possible that the similarity between the two movements has a bearing on the question of when Bruckner decided to reject the earlier one. This similarity may even have been part of his reason for making that decision.⁷⁴

Just as there are echoes of this symphony in later works, the Third, Fifth and Sixth in particular, so no. "0" also draws on ideas from the E minor and F minor Masses and some of the shorter sacred works of the 1860-68 period. Hans Redlich draws attention to one of these reminiscences to bolster his argument that the Symphony was conceived in 1869:

... perhaps the most convincing proof, albeit adduced only from internal evidence, of the Symphony's late origin is the twice-repeated quotation (in the Andante) of a mournful motive sung to the words '>Qui tollis peccata mundi' in the *Gloria* of the E minor Mass (composed in 1866). This quotation, surely, would lose much of its significance if it were merely anticipated in an early sketch of 1863-64, i.e. long before the Mass was composed; on the other hand it is very significant if understood as the outcome of Bruckner's spiritual and mental crisis during 1866-7. Indeed, the after-effects of that crisis may have determined the conceptual pattern of the whole work which, if composed after Symphony 1 and the E minor and F minor Masses, appears in many respects like a retrograde step after the boldness of Symphony no. 1...⁷⁵

74 Paul Hawkshaw, op.cit., 263.

75 Hans F. Redlich, *Bruckner and Mahler, The Master Musicians series* (London: Dent, rev. ed. 1963), 83.

Allusions to the *Benedictus* of the F minor Mass can be found in the coda of the first movement and the beginning of the slow movement; the latter also contains references to the 'Et incarnatus est' from the *Credo*.

No sooner had Bruckner put the finishing touches to the D minor Symphony than he began work on a Symphony in B flat major WAB 142. A page of sketches for a first movement, dated 29 and 31 October 1869, has survived. On the reverse side, dated 1 February 1870, there are other sketches, probably preliminary sketches for the Finale of the Symphony no. 2 in C minor. The sketches of the projected B flat major symphony first movement, which go some way into the second theme group, also show some similarity to the first movement of this C minor symphony to which Bruckner began to give serious attention in October 1871.⁷⁶

1870 did not begin happily for Bruckner. His sister Anna, who had been acting as his housekeeper, died of tuberculosis on 16 January. A week earlier Bruckner wrote to his other sister Rosalie in Vöcklabruck asking her to come to be with Anna as she did not have long to live:

... NB. Nani longs to see you. Don't be put off by the cost of travelling. Ignaz and I will do all we can to help you. If you don't come immediately, it will be too late and you will go through the same torment that you experienced when our dear mother died...⁷⁷

⁷⁶ These sketches, located in the ÖNB (A-WnMus.Hs. 6018) are discussed and transcribed in *G-A IV/1*, 112-18. There is a facsimile of both sides of the sheet between pages 112 and 113. See also *GaultNB*, 41-43 and *CarraganRB*, 43-46 for further discussion of the sketches.

⁷⁷ See *HSABB 1*, 120 for this letter, dated Vienna, 9 January 1870; the original is owned privately.

We do not know if Rosalie made the journey from Vöcklabruck. On 16 January Bruckner wrote to her again to give her the sad news of Anna's death and to tell her that the funeral would be two days later, on Tuesday 18 January.⁷⁸ Bruckner was able to express something of his grief when he wrote to Johann Schiedermayr, the dean of Linz Cathedral, a few days later:

... I am greatly to blame for having allowed her to do all the housework. If I had suspected this, under no circumstances would I have brought my sorely missed dear sister with me to Vienna; I would have preferred to remain in Linz. As Your Grace is aware of my nervous condition, you will be able to understand better than anyone what I have suffered. If only I could now spend some time away from Vienna...⁷⁹

When Bruckner contacted Schiedermayr later in the year to send him name-day greetings, he was in a much better frame of mind. He looked forward to spending some time with him in Linz after the end of July when the Conservatory term ended.⁸⁰

There was a considerable improvement in Bruckner's financial

78 This letter can be found in *HSABB* 1, 121; the original is privately owned. Maria Anna Bruckner (1836-70) was buried in the Währinger Friedhof, Vienna. Her body was transferred to St. Florian on 18 May 1901. In her article '>Bruckneriana in Vöcklabruck', in *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 42 (Tutzing, 1993), 283-322, Elisabeth Maier mentions two photographs of Maria Anna owned by the Hueber family in Vöcklabruck; there is a reproduction of the second photograph on p. 322.

79 See *HSABB* 1, 121-22 for this letter, dated Vienna, 23 January 1870; the original is privately owned.

80 See *HSABB* 1, 124 for this letter, dated Vienna, 21 June 1870; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

position in 1870. On 11 May he wrote to the Ministry of Culture and Education requesting a grant to enable him to devote more time to composition:

... The applicant earlier completed a long period of study without any [financial] support. He was fortunate to receive a grant for the first time when he came to Vienna two years ago. A long-lasting nervous illness three years ago, a more recent illness and the death of his youngest sister has burdened him with substantial financial liabilities which that small grant has not cleared. In addition, your humble servant (who has the great honour of being Sechter's successor at the Conservatory) does less private teaching, particularly in the spring, summer and autumn months, because he feels a great urge to compose. Consequently, he ventures to make, albeit with a heavy heart, another urgent request for a grant like the first one. He also takes the liberty of humbly presenting you with his attempt at a new symphony and of respectfully drawing your attention to his recent successes at the organ contest in Nancy and at concerts in Paris.⁸¹

Karl von Stremayr, who had been appointed Minister of Education in 1870, seems to have been well-disposed towards Bruckner. He allocated him a grant of 400 florins on 7 November, and Bruckner received the money a week later. On 18 October, possibly on Stremayr's recommendation, Bruckner was appointed teacher of theory, piano and organ at the *St. Anna Teacher Training Institute for Men and Women* in Vienna.⁸² This resulted

81 See footnote 73.

82 Bruckner's impending appointment is mentioned by Moritz Anton von Becker, who was on the board of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, in a letter sent to a friend on 9 July 1870; the original of this letter is in the *ÖNB*. See *HSABB* 1, 122.

in an increase in Bruckner's annual income of 540 florins. Thanks to Herbeck, Bruckner received another 100 florins' remuneration the following month for his services to the *Hofkapelle*.⁸³

Bruckner also considered that an improvement in the teaching arrangements at the Conservatory could possibly result in an increased income. Towards the end of the academic year he wrote to the administration asking them to create a second year for the teaching of Harmony (which had been the case previously), because, in his opinion, it was impossible to get through the syllabus satisfactorily in one year. He also asked that prospective Counterpoint students be allocated to him from the outset and the Counterpoint syllabus be changed so that simple, double, triple and quadruple counterpoint was taught in the first year, and canon and fugue in the final year. Finally, in a postscript, he recommended an increase in the organ teaching hours, using the Berlin Conservatory as a representative example (six hours per week over three years).⁸⁴

Although Bruckner had been made an honorary member of the *Dommusikverein und Mozarteum* in Salzburg in 1868 after his second unsuccessful application for the musical directorship, the promised performance of his Mass in D minor did not materialize until 11 September 1870. According to Auer, some of the annotations in the instrumental parts of the work used for the performance provide an interesting glimpse of players' typical reactions to music they had never seen or heard before, but

83 Herbeck informed Bruckner of this extra income on 20 November; see *ABDS* 1, 54-57.

84 See *HSABB* 1, 123-24 for Bruckner's letter to the Conservatory, dated Vienna, 4 June 1870; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library.

hardly amount to what Auer described as a 'lack of understanding, indeed hostility with which some of the musicians accompanied the performance under Bruckner's direction.⁸⁵ Auer was also incorrect in asserting that there was 'no review whatsoever of the performance in the Salzburg papers.'⁸⁶ Gerhard Walterskirchen quotes from a newspaper report which was by no means negative:

... Although the work as a whole is obviously written from the standpoint of the current direction of modern music and favours the dramatic interpretation and rendering of the sacred mass text throughout, its stylistic unity and, in part, concise musical language are to be praised. As the outstanding parts of the Mass in every respect we would single out the *Kyrie* with its dark, brooding and mysterious atmosphere, the powerful *Credo*, the 'Incarnatus' of which appears to us to be suffused with truly divine inspiration, and the gripping *Agnus Dei* in which the whole of sinful mankind pleads for redemption. The instrumentation of the work requires the full dedication of the entire orchestra, and the performance of this exceedingly difficult Mass was extremely laudable in the short time available in which, to our knowledge, only one rehearsal was possible.⁸⁷

85 See G-A IV/1, 132. According to Auer, Schimatschek wrote a set of parts in 1867 specifically for Salzburg, and these were no doubt used in 1870. The instrumental parts with annotations 'Linz 1867/68' by the Viennese double bassists Franz Braun and Franz Simandl were those used for the original Linz performances in 1864, the Viennese performance in February 1867 and the Linz performance in January 1868 and were then kept in the *Hofkapelle* for later performances there. The parts used for Salzburg have not been located. My thanks to Paul Hawkshaw for helping to clarify this.

86 See G-A IV/1, 132-33.

87 This extract from a review of the Mass which appeared in the *Salzburger Zeitung* 205 (12 September 1870) is quoted by Walterskirchen in 'Bruckner in

Bruckner had also been active earlier in the year as organist at a concert given by the *Wiener Männergesangsverein* in the *Augustinerkirche* on 14 April, and at concerts in the Vienna *Piaristenkirche*, Linz and Wels.⁸⁸ His reply to a letter sent by Theophil Mann at the beginning of September is of particular interest because it corroborates information we are able to glean from his recitals in France in 1869 and London in 1871, namely that his recitals consisted largely of improvisations on given themes. Mann, an organist from North Germany, had evidently written to Bruckner for details of the concert he had given in the *Piaristenkirche* on 10 June. Bruckner began by apologizing for not replying sooner - he had just returned from holiday:

.. Apart from the five-part Fugue in C minor by Sebastian Bach, I improvised everything and so wrote nothing down. First, I attempted to improvise an introduction from the theme of the Bach fugue, then the Andante in a free style in which I used quiet registration; finally, at the request of many teachers, I improvised a further two movements, the first in free style, the other contrapuntal and fugue-like. That was all. I usually do not prepare anything beforehand but have the theme given to me; this procedure brought me success at the organ congress in Nancy last year as well as in the concerts in Paris, in Notre Dame...⁸⁹

Salzburg - Bruckner - Erstaufführungen in Salzburg', in *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 16 (1979), 16. Walterskirchen also quotes from a favourable review (in the *Salzburger Chronik* 106, 14 September 1870) of an organ recital which Bruckner gave in the Cathedral on 12 September.

88 See *HSABB* 1, 122 for Bruckner's letter to the *Wiener Männergesangsverein*, dated Vienna, 29 March 1870, in which he thanked the male voice choir for their invitation to participate in the concert; the original is in the *Germanisches Nationalmuseum*, Nuremberg.

89 See *HSABB* 1, 125 for Bruckner's letter to Mann, undated but probably written towards the end of September; the originals of Mann's letter, dated 8 September, and Bruckner's reply are not extant.

At the request of his friend Karl Waldeck, who had been appointed provisional organist of Linz Cathedral when Bruckner left in 1868, Bruckner formally resigned from the post which had been kept open for him.⁹⁰ His last official connection with Linz was now severed but he still visited the town regularly. Indeed, his only composition of the year was written in response to a request from the *Liedertafel Frohsinn* for a choral piece for the anniversary celebrations in 1870. In November 1869 Bruckner had written to the choir committee thanking them for their invitation and informing them that Rudolf Weinwurm had helped him to find a suitable text, a poem by Joseph Mendelssohn.⁹¹ Bruckner provided *Frohsinn* with a highly effective piece for male voices and piano accompaniment, *Mitternacht* WAB 80, which was given its first performance in Linz on 15 May.⁹² Bruckner complemented the atmospheric words - flowers and trees bathed in moonlight, and a gentle breeze - with a pulsating repeated quaver right-hand part in the accompaniment.

On 22 November Bruckner received the news from Ansfelden

90 See *HSABB* 1, 125 for Bruckner's letter to the diocesan authorities in Linz - dated Vienna, 18 July 1870 - in which he thanked them for holding the post open; the original is not extant. See also *HSABB* 1, 125-26 for a letter from Bruckner probably to Waldeck on his name-day; it is dated Vienna, 4 November 1870, and the original can be found in the *National Museum*, Prague.

91 See *HSABB* 1, 120 for this letter, dated Vienna, 24 November 1869. The originals of this letter and the initial invitation from Brosch and Weißmann, dated Linz, 13 August 1869, are in the Linz *Singakademie* library. Bruckner was mistaken in believing that Joseph Mendelssohn (1817-56) was Felix Mendelssohn's grandfather.

92 The autograph of this choral piece, which bears the dedication 'gewidmet der Liedertafel >Frohsinn in Linz zur Jubiläumsfeier von ihrem Ehrenmitgliede Anton Bruckner', is in the Linz *Singakademie* library. It was first published in 1903 by Doblinger, plate no. D. 2861; there is a modern edition in *ABSW* XXIII/2, 95-107. The first performance was reviewed in the *Linzer Zeitung*.

that he had been granted honorary citizenship of his native village. The letter from the village council referred to his increasing European reputation, some of the lustre of which shone 'in that place where your esteemed father worked tirelessly and conscientiously as a teacher... where you passed the happy days of your youth.'⁹³ A fortnight later Bruckner received an invitation from the *Währinger Liedertafel* to attend an anniversary meeting of the choir at the *Zum wilden Mann* inn where he would receive a certificate of honorary membership.⁹⁴ And so a year which had begun tragically for Bruckner ended on a much happier note.

For Bruckner the main event of 1871 was undoubtedly his visit to London. First, he had to take part in a competition to determine who would represent Austria in a series of demonstration concerts of the newly installed Willis organ in the Albert Hall. Although it was probably a foregone conclusion that he would win this competition, Bruckner had to abide by the rules. The competition took place on 18 April and he was informed on 24 April that he had been successful. A further official letter from the Chamber of Trade and Industry reminded Bruckner that, starting on 2 August, he would be required to perform '>two programmes each of at least one hour's duration daily between 10 in the morning and 6 in the evening at times specified by the committee.' The fee would be , £50 which was inclusive of travel and accommodation costs

93 See *HSABB* 1, 127 for this letter, dated '>Ansfelden, am Feste der hl. Caecilia, 1870'; reference is also made to a visit to Ansfelden by Bruckner the previous year. The original is in St. Florian.

94 See *HSABB* 1, 128 for this letter, dated Währing [a suburb of Vienna], 6 December 1870; the original is in St. Florian. For many years Bruckner played the organ at the special Mass held every year in Währing Parish Church to commemorate the founding of this choral society.

and would be given to him at the end of his concerts.⁹⁵ Although Auer specifies that Bruckner 'received his travelling expenses from Herbeck who had given him advice about the journey', there is no record of this money coming from the *Hofkapelle*. The Lord Chamberlain granted him official leave from the middle of July until the end of September, however.⁹⁶ When Bruckner wrote to his former teacher, August Dürnberger, to inform him that he was using his theory book, *Elementar-Lehrbuch der Harmonie-und Generalbaß-Lehre*, in his new teaching post at St. Anna's Teacher Training Institute, he took it for granted that Dürnberger would have heard that he was going to London.⁹⁷

Bruckner could not speak a word of English, but he knew that a prominent Linz businessman, Anton Reißleitner, was intending to travel to England and he wrote to him on 13 July, suggesting that they travel together. Bruckner planned to leave Vienna on Thursday 20 July, spend an overnight in Linz and travel from there at 9.00 pm on Friday 21 July:

... My organ playing in London is scheduled to begin on 2 August. I must be there a week before this, of course, and so I intend to travel from here to Linz next week, Thursday at the latest, and to continue

95 See *HSABB* 1, 128-30 for three letters from the Chamber of Trade and Industry (*Handels- und Gewerbekammer für Österreich unter der Enns*) to Bruckner, dated Vienna, 28 March, 24 April and 10 July 1871 resp. The originals of the first two are in St. Florian; the original of the third is in the *ÖNB*.

96 See *ABDS* 1, 57ff.

97 See *HSABB* 1, 129-30 for this letter, dated Vienna, 16 May 1871 [and not 16 March 1871, as stated in both *ABB*, 114 and *GrBB*, 28]; the original, owned by the Hueber-Theuer family in Vienna, has been loaned to the Anton Bruckner Institut Linz for research purposes. See Andreas Lindner, 'Das ABIL erhält zwei autographe Briefe Bruckners', in *ABIL Mitteilungen* no. 18 (December 2016), 17-19. There is a facsimile of the first page of the letter on page 18.

my journey from Linz the following day at 9 in the evening. Please be certain to come and travel with me. I can usually be found on Sundays at the organ in the *Musikverein*. We will be able to make a splendid return journey through Switzerland...⁹⁸

But Reißleitner did not accompany him to England. Bruckner changed his itinerary and travelled to Nuremberg to visit the Zimmermann family whose acquaintance he had made ten years earlier during the 1861 Choir Festival. One of the family, Franz Zimmermann, became his travelling companion and they arrived in London on Saturday 29 July, booking in at Seyd's Hotel in Finsbury Square. The Austrian ambassador in London, Count Apponyi, was contacted about Bruckner's visit and asked to provide all the support necessary.⁹⁹

On the evening of his arrival in London Bruckner went to the Royal Albert Hall to practise. Although work had finished for the day and the steam engines working the bellows could no longer be heated, the manager of the hall allowed Bruckner to play for as long as there was enough steam left. The manager was evidently so impressed when he heard Bruckner playing and experimenting with the different stops that he gave orders for the engines to be heated again. A number of people apparently gathered round the organ to listen to Bruckner who played on until late evening.

We have very little idea of what Bruckner thought of the Albert Hall organ or how it compared, in his judgment, with the magnificent St. Florian organ.¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, the organ

⁹⁸ See *HSABB* 1, 131; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

⁹⁹ The rough draft of the letter from the Lord Chamberlain's office to Apponyi, dated Vienna, 5 August 1871, is printed in *ABDS* 1, 59-60.

¹⁰⁰ The new Albert Hall organ, with a specification of 111 stops, was built by

recitals at the Royal Albert Hall received a fair amount of coverage from the leading music journals. The following paragraph appeared in the 'Table Talk' column of *The Musical Standard* on 5 August:

Herr Anton Bruckner, court organist at Vienna, and Professor in the Conservatorium of that city, has arrived in London to play on the great organ of the Royal Albert Hall. Herr Bruckner is celebrated for his classical improvisations on the works of Handel, Bach and Mendelssohn.¹⁰¹

The Choir included details of the concerts and programmes from the end of July to the end of September. In the edition for 19 August there is a full list of concerts and programmes from Monday 31 July to Wednesday 16 August, including Bruckner's recitals which contained a mixture of pieces by Bach, Handel and Mendelssohn and a number of improvisations as already intimated in *The Musical Standard*. The details are as follows:

First recital, Wednesday 2 August, 12.00

- 1 Bach: Toccata in F major
- 2 Improvisation upon the foregoing
- 3 Handel: Fugue in D minor
- 4 Improvisation (original)

Henry Willis (1821-1901), one of the leading English organ builders in the 19th century. Willis, who also supplied organs for the Alexandra Palace, St. Paul's Cathedral (1872), Salisbury Cathedral (1877), Truro Cathedral (1887), Hereford Cathedral (1893) and Lincoln Cathedral (1898), was a great admirer of Cavaillé-Coll whom he met in the late 1840s, and there is a certain amount of French influence in his organs, for instance use of pneumatic levers (in spite of his preference for tracker action), vents and a predominance of reeds in the full choruses.

¹⁰¹ *The Musical Standard*, vol. I, New Series, no. 366 (London, Saturday 5 August, 1871), 167. There was a similar preview in *The Musical World* 49 / 22 (5 August 1871).

- 5 Bach: Improvisation on Fugue in E major
- 6 Improvisation on English melodies

Second recital, Thursday 3 August, 3.00

- 1 Mendelssohn: Sonata no. 1
- 2 Improvisation upon the foregoing
- 3 Improvisation (original)
- 4 Bach: Fugue in C sharp minor
- 5 Improvisation upon the Austrian national anthem
- 6 Improvisation upon the >'Hallelujah Chorus'

Third recital, Friday 4 August, 3.00

- 1 Bach: Concerto in A minor
- 2 Improvisation
- 3 Improvisation on Weber's 'Freischütz'
- 4 Bach: Fugue in G minor
- 5 Improvisation
- 6 Improvisation on the English national anthem

Fourth recital, Saturday 5 August, 12.00

- 1 Bach: Concerto in C major
- 2 Improvisation
- 3 Improvisation on the song '>Lorelei'
- 4 Bach: Fugue in G minor
- 5 Improvisation on Schubert's song 'Fremd bin ich eingezogen'
- 6 Improvisation upon the >'Hallelujah Chorus'

Fifth recital, Monday 7 August

- 1 Bach: Toccata
- 2 Improvisation
- 3 Improvisation on a theme of Mendelssohn
- 4 Improvisation on melodies of Schubert
- 5 Improvisation on Mendelssohn's 'Hunter's Farewell'

Sixth recital, Tuesday 8 August

- 1 Bach: Fugue in E
- 2 Improvisation
- 3 Improvisation on a German melody
- 4 Improvisation on a theme of Schubert
- 5 Fugue, improvised

6 Improvisation on the '>Hallelujah Chorus'¹⁰²

All six programmes have a similar shape - no more than two original pieces, and a preponderance of improvisation on well-known melodies. Significantly, Handel's 'Hallelujah Chorus' appears three times. It is revealing to compare a programme such as this (and it was typical of the English organ recital of the time, in which the emphasis was on both instruction and entertainment and a wide range of transcriptions of orchestral, instrumental, vocal and choral music was juxtaposed with original organ music) with a modern organ recital! There is no doubt that Bruckner had a small and fairly limited repertoire, which, according to Erwin Horn, was a '>shocking limitation for an organist who was acknowledged as Austria's most important representative of his instrument.'¹⁰³ But this was a deliberate choice on Bruckner's part. Seven years earlier, when he was contemplating giving organ recitals in Dresden and Leipzig, he had made his position absolutely clear in a letter to Rudolf Weinwurm. There was no point, he said, in going to any particular trouble to prepare a repertoire - '>organists are always poorly paid... it's best to play for nothing and to perform only fantasias etc. without having to memorise anything'.¹⁰⁴

There is no reason to believe that Bruckner changed his attitude in the intervening years. On the other hand, it would be wrong to assume that Bruckner did not make the necessary

102 *The Choir* xii / 247 (Saturday 19 August, 1871), 116.

103 Erwin Horn, '>Zwischen Interpretation und Improvisation. Anton Bruckner als Organist', *BSL 1995* (Linz, 1997), 112.

104 From letter dated Linz, 1 March 1864. See *HSABB* 1, 46-47

technical preparations for his London concerts. Even for his improvisations Bruckner would not have relied completely on the inspiration of the moment. Several of the themes were chosen regularly and the improvisations would have adhered to a similar overall structure each time, although the details would have changed from performance to performance. The *Fugue in D minor* WAB 125, one of the contrapuntal exercises which Bruckner submitted to the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* ten years earlier, in November 1861, gives us some idea, albeit in embryonic form, of what one of Bruckner's typical improvised fugues would have been like, containing as it does examples of '>false entries', diminution, augmentation, inversion and organ points.

The only English organist to play during this recital series was William T. Best who, like Bruckner, was renowned for his improvisations and virtuoso playing and was greatly admired for his impressive pedal technique particularly in Bach's organ works. In fact, Best gave the inaugural recital on 18 July.¹⁰⁵ Other foreign organists included Wilhelm Heintze, Johann Lohr, Alphonse Maily, Camille Saint-Saëns, Ludvig Matthias Lindeman, Friedrich Lux and Eduard Adolphe Tod.¹⁰⁶

105 The recital by William Best (1826-1897), which included Bach's Prelude and Fugue (>'St. Anne's') BWV 552, Best's arrangement of Handel's Organ Concerto no. 1, Mendelssohn's Organ Sonata no. 1, and pieces by S.S. Wesley, Edward Hopkins and Henry Smart, was reviewed in *The Musical Times* xv / 342 (1 August 1871), 171. The report of the same recital in *The Choir* xii / 245 (Saturday 5 August, 1871), 88, referred to a review in the *Guardian* – '>... though it evidently afforded extreme pleasure to a tolerably numerous audience in the low-priced parts of the hall, from a musical point of view, it would have been more satisfactory had Mr. Best thought more of the music before him than upon the instrument upon which he was playing...'

106 Details of their programmes can be found in *The Choir* xii / 248, 249, 251 and 254 (Saturday 26 August, Saturday 2 September, Saturday 16 September and Saturday 7 October, 1871).

It is clear that Bruckner was misinformed when he was advised that he would have to play twice daily. Although there is no mention in the English press of an organ competition being held as part of this recital series, Bruckner's later report to Göllicher suggests that there must have been some kind of unofficial improvisation contest.¹⁰⁷ There is a high degree of chauvinism in the press reports of the recitals. The main criticism, understandably, concerned the lack of any British representative apart from Best. In his review of the first series of recitals, the reporter for *The Musical Standard* was extremely critical of the foreign organists, although Bruckner fared better than Heintze or Löhr:

Upon the completion of Mr. Willis's organ at the Albert Hall we were promised a series of performances by professors of high standing, both British and foreign. To what extent this promise has been fulfilled we propose now to print out. In the first place, the inaugural performance was given nearly a month ago, yet the sole representative of our native professors has been Mr. W.T. Best. It is hardly necessary to state that a better could not be found, nor that the most refined taste could take the least exception to any part of Mr. Best's ten or twelve programmes. Nevertheless, England can boast of other performers of deservedly high repute, men who have in some cases made a certain branch of the art their 'speciality'. Will the London amateurs and the foreign visitors to the Exhibition have no opportunity of hearing the renowned improvisations of one professor or the equally celebrated fugue playing of another before the season quite dies out and no auditors are left for any music but the dash of the waves on the shingle or the sound of the wind through the pine branches? To this extent the Council has failed to

107 See G-A IV/1, 147-48.

fulfil its organ programme. Another part of the scheme, however - the presentation of foreign organ-players - has been carried out to the letter if not in the spirit. Recitals have been given by Mr. G.W. Heintze from the Conservatorium, Stockholm, by Herr Johann Löhr [sic] of Pesth and by Herr Anton Brückner [sic], court organist at Vienna. Of these performances it may be said that, if they failed to satisfy the critic, they must have gladdened the heart of the true born Briton. Unfortunately, in England artistic sympathies cannot always blend with patriotic feelings, but we confess to have experienced emotions of thankfulness, not to say glorification, at hearing a performance by Mr. Best at 3 o'clock, after attending a recital by one of his continental rivals at 12. Modest mediocrity may be briefly passed over - we advert therefore no more definitely to Mr. Heintze or Herr Löhr [sic] - but the playing of Herr Anton Brückner [sic] deserves a word or two. We were advised by the official programme that Herr Brückner's [sic] 'strong points were classical improvisations on the works of Handel, Bach and Mendelssohn.' We were therefore not altogether unprepared to find that the playing of Mendelssohn's No. 1 Sonata was a 'weak point', and such indeed was the case. It is only charitable to suppose that Herr Brückner [sic] had not the advantage of a previous trial of the organ, especially as he evinced rather more control over the instrument in his succeeding improvisations. But in the course of our struggles after musical experience we have been present at more than one competitive performance for a church organistship; to the exhibitions of certain of the candidates there may be likened more or less the recitals of the eminent foreign professors at the Albert Hall. We trust the authorities will not disregard these remarks - that they will bring forward some of our good English organists, and a more careful selection from those eminent in other countries.¹⁰⁸

108 From the article 'Organ Recitals at the Albert Hall' in *The Musical Standard*, vol. I, New Series, no. 367 (London, Saturday 12 August, 1871), 188-89. See earlier, however, for a report of Bruckner's earlier practice on the

In the 'Table Talk' column in the same issue of *The Musical Standard* the following report appeared:

The foreign organists of note who have given performances on the Albert Hall instrument are Herr J. Lohr, from Pesth, Herr C.W. Heintze, from Stockholm, Herr A. Bruckner, from Vienna, and M. Mailly, from Belgium. Bach's preludes and fugues have formed an important item in all the programmes.¹⁰⁹

organ. The reviewer for *The Musical World* 49 / 33 (August 1871) was equally unfriendly. Michael Musgrave remarks that 'Bruckner was clearly a victim of anti-German feeling'; see his *The Musical Life of the Crystal Palace* (Cambridge, 1995), 256, footnote 19.

109 Ibid., 197.

110 From the 'Table Talk' column in *The Musical Standard* vol. I, New Series,

In the following issue of *The Musical Standard*, the reporter renewed his attack on the choice of foreign artists in the 'Table Talk' column:

It is stated that the selection of organists for the public performances on the organ at the Albert Hall is made by the Hon. Seymour Egerton, the well-known conductor of the Wandering Minstrels. Whether this gentleman possesses any aptitude for this special duty is a matter of serious doubt, when the *fiasco* of the foreign organists who have already played is taken into consideration. The so-called 'International Congress of Organists' will, we fear, be an entire failure.¹¹⁰

The reporter had not got his facts right, however. A letter in *The Orchestra* from Col. Henry Y.D. Scott, the secretary of the Royal Commissioners specially appointed by Queen Victoria to supervise the International Exhibition in London, was specifically intended to correct faulty information and clear up misunderstandings:

... Her Majesty's Commissioners did not, as you imagine, issue any advertisement inviting foreign organists to play. It was the wish of the Commissioners that the opening of the organ should be signalled by performances by artists representing the various musical schools of Europe. With this view they requested each foreign Government taking part in the International Exhibition to name an organist to represent his country on the occasion, and all the gentlemen with whom engagements have been made were

no. 368 (London, Saturday 19 August, 1871), 209.

nominated by their respective Governments in compliance with this request.¹¹¹

In any case one has to put a question mark against the musical judgment of *The Musical Standard* reporter. While he had more positive things to say about Lux's recitals,¹¹² he failed to mention Saint-Saëns's recitals. The writer of a letter to the editor in the >'Correspondence' column of the September 30th issue of *The Choir* also suggested that a >'congress of *English organists* would... have yielded more satisfactory results' but conceded that the foreign organists had not had the same opportunity as Best of becoming acquainted with the organ:

... it must be mentioned that their only chance of making themselves acquainted with the organ, or preparing for their performances, has been during an hour or two after six o'clock in the evening...¹¹³

The reporter for *The Orchestra*, on the other hand, spoke of these recitals in glowing terms.¹¹⁴ In an earlier article he provided a much more sympathetic account of the respective merits of Heintze, Lohr and Bruckner and showed that he had some knowledge of the organ:

111 From *The Orchestra* xvi / 412 (Friday 18 August, 1871), 315.

112 >'Reports' in *The Musical Standard* Vol. I, New Series, no. 371 (London, Saturday 9 September, 1871), 239.

113 This letter, dated London, 20 September 1871 and signed >'A Lover of Justice', was printed in *The Choir* xii / 253, 214.

114 Article in *The Orchestra* xvi / 413 (Friday 25 August, 1871), 329-30.

... The first who has played was Herr Heintze of Stockholm, a young man still *in statu pupillari*. He executed some of the masterpieces of Sebastian Bach, some of the sonatas by Mendelssohn, some fugues and fantasias by Topfer, Merkel, Hesse, Kohler [sic], Kuhmstedt, Markul [sic] and others of the modern German school. His performances were marked by much truth and considerable precision; but he failed in that iron, *staccato* touch which is essential for clear part-playing in the Albert Hall...

In Herr Johann Lohr, of Pesth, we meet with a good musician and a player of considerable power. He is a combination of the new and the old schools. He gave us extracts from the symphonies of Liszt, marches by Chopin, songs by Schubert, pieces by Gottschalk, Markul [sic], Pitoch and many others, interspersed with compositions by Beethoven and Mozart, together with the more distinctive organ music of Handel and Bach. Herr Lohr had great executive capabilities, and his ambitious attacks on the sonatas of Beethoven, and more especially so on the monstrous vagaries of the Abbé Liszt, proved in the end more astonishing than pleasing. He suffered from the same disadvantages as Herr Heintze, and certainly did not meet the requirements of the Hall, nor those of the instrument. There was much good playing, but nothing perfect.

The Court Organist of Vienna, Anton Bruckner, was third at the organ, and announced specially as great in '>extemporaneous performances'. We were told that 'Herr Bruckner's strong points are classical improvisations on the works of Handel, Bach and Mendelssohn.' He has given us a grand extempore Fantasia, which although not very original in thought or design, was clever, remarkable for its canonic counterpoint, and for the surmounting of much difficulty in the pedal passages. There can be nothing said extemporaneously upon the National Anthem of Austria, and still less upon the Hallelujah Chorus of Handel, nor do we think any improvisation with any effect can be given upon the toccatas of Bach or the sonatas of Mendelssohn. Great composers exhaust their themes. Nothing can be

added to the Hallelujah Chorus, nothing to a toccata of Sebastian Bach...¹¹⁵

According to Göllerich, a letter sent from the Austrian embassy in London to the Chamber of Commerce in Vienna after Bruckner's third concert spoke of the 'extraordinary successes of the court organist Professor Bruckner sent by you.'¹¹⁶ Professor Paul Stöving, who carried out some research on Bruckner's organ recitals in London for another of Bruckner's biographers, Franz Gräflinger, made the point that 'none of the important newspapers - *Times*, *Standard*, *Daily News*' - mentioned the composer or even the recitals, but added that this was hardly surprising since '>August is the quietest month for music in London, and the newspapers and people were concerned with more important matters - political controversies, the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War.'¹¹⁷ Bruckner seems to have been sufficiently concerned about the lack of a report in the leading newspaper, *The Times*, whose music critic was in Germany at the time, to make an approach through the vice-consul, Dr. von Pinsio, to the exhibition committee with the purpose of rectifying this '>anomaly'. When Dr. von Pinsio replied, inviting him to submit an article of his own, Bruckner clearly had second thoughts.

Bruckner's visit to London included some engagements at the Crystal Palace. He did some sight-seeing in his '>free' week

115 From article '>Concert-Organ Playing at the Royal Albert Hall' in *The Orchestra* xvi, 411 (Friday August 11, 1871), 297-98.

116 See *G-A* IV/1, 157.

117 See *GrBL*, 78.

between the Albert Hall and Crystal Palace concerts and particularly enjoyed travelling on the large London buses.

The Crystal Palace had been erected by Joseph Paxton for the Great Exhibition in Hyde Park in 1851 and had then been removed to a new site at Sydenham, about ten miles away, and officially >'re-opened' there by Queen Victoria on 10 June 1854. The 14 organs which had been built specifically for the 1851 Great Exhibition had also been relocated elsewhere. The instrument played by Bruckner when he gave his recitals there in the second half of August 1871 had been built by Gray and Davison for the first of the annual Handel Festivals in 1857. Some new stops were added in 1871 and 1882. Like the Royal Albert Hall organ, the influence of Cavallé-Coll was clearly discernible, in the use of combination pedals, the introduction of modern French stops and the employment of several mixtures and reeds. According to Anthony Bird,

The purpose of the rebuilt Crystal Palace was to combine recreation with education in a manner which the late twentieth century might consider daunting. A vast concert hall with room for an audience of 4,000, and almost as many performers, dominated by a huge organ... occupied the central space at the intersection of nave and main transept.¹¹⁸

In his description of the organ in 1857 George Macfarren

118 Anthony Bird, *Paxton's Palace* (London, 1976), 130-31. The specification of the large organ, first published in *The Musical World* 35 (1857), 391ff., is also printed in Nicholas Thistlethwaite, *The making of the Victorian organ* (Cambridge, 2/1993), 477ff. and Musgrave, op.cit., 148-49. The specification of a second, smaller but still substantial, instrument installed by J.M. Walker and Sons in the Concert Room of the Crystal Palace in 1868 is given in Musgrave, op.cit., 156ff. It was evidently intended for participation in choral and orchestral music, also as a solo and concerto instrument.

commented that the aim of the organ builders 'has been to produce an instrument, the varied qualities of which should combine all desirable musical beauty with force and grandeur of tone sufficient to qualify it for the part it is specially designed to bear in this great commemoration.'¹¹⁹

Bruckner's recitals in the Crystal Palace on 19, 21, 22, 23 and 28 August were in the context of lengthy popular concerts. A report of the final concert (28 August) in *The Musical Standard* mentions a recital by 'Herr Anton Bruckner, Court Organist of Vienna, who has already played in the Albert Hall. One of Mendelssohn's sonatas opened the programme, which included Bach's Fugue in E major and an improvisation on Handel's "Hallelujah@...'¹²⁰

The second Crystal Palace concert, on 21 August, took the form of a 'Great National German Festival'. It began at 2 pm with Weber's *Oberon* overture, continued with songs by Abt, Meyerbeer, Handel, Speyer, Mozart and Schubert, after which Bruckner played an improvisation on Schubert's song 'Leise flehen meine Lieder' and, by popular request, an improvisation on the popular German song, 'Nacht am Rhein' which, according to Bruckner's own account, resulted in a tumultuous reception and even a proposal of marriage from an admiring female member of the audience!¹²¹

119 G.A. Macfarren, *Programme of Arrangements for the Handel Festival, 1857*; quoted by Musgrave in op.cit., 145f.

120 From 'Reports' in *The Musical Standard*, Vol. I, New Series, no. 370 (London, Saturday 2 September, 1871), 229.

121 See G-A IV/1, 162. See also Käthe Braun-Prager, 'Mei liebe Lady, dös ist nix!', *Neues Österreich*, 4 August 1957, and 'Anton Bruckner in London', *Wiener Zeitung*, 15 August 1958. Evidently the lady in question asked Bruckner to return soon but to learn English in the meantime. Bruckner's retort

There was an estimated audience of 70,000 at his third recital on Tuesday 22 August. After his fourth recital, on Wednesday 23 August, Bruckner wrote to his Linz colleague, Moritz von Mayfeld, from Seyd's hotel:

... Just finished. Have given ten concerts, six in the Albert Hall, four in the Crystal Palace. Tremendous applause, always unending. Encores required, i.e. often I had to play two extra improvisations at the end... Many compliments, congratulations, invitations. Manns, the conductor of the Crystal Palace concerts, told me that he was amazed and that I must come again soon and send him some of my compositions. Dr. Spinsio [sic] sends his greetings. I will soon be returning by way of Brussels, but I will not be playing any more as I am too tired and overwrought. I will keep Germany, Berlin, also Holland and Switzerland for later...

As a postscript he added:

Yesterday I played to an audience of 70,000 and had to give an encore, at the Committee's request. I wanted to give due respect to such great applause. On Monday I played with similar success in the concert...

NB Unfortunately, the >*Times*' critic is in Germany, with the result that hardly anything has been written about me yet. Please be so good as to inform the >Linzer Zeitung, i.e. Dr. Dutschek.¹²²

Although Bruckner informed Mayfeld that he did not intend to give any more concerts, the report in *The Musical Standard*

was that he was too old to learn English and that, if she wished to speak to him again, she should learn German!

122 See *HSABB* 1,132 for this letter. There is a facsimile of the original (which is not extant) in *G-A* IV/1, between pages 160 and 161.

alluded to above makes it clear that he played for a fifth time at the Crystal Palace on Monday 28 August. A programme of this 'Popular Ballad Concert' which consisted of ballads and duets mainly by English composers includes the following:

At Three o'clock,
Performance on the Festival Organ
By Herr Anton Bruckner
(Court Organist of Vienna)

1. SonataMendelssohn
2. ImprovisationBruckner
3. Fugue, E major.....Bach
4.
Improvisation, 'Hallelujah'Handel
- 5 Improvisation.....Bruckner¹²³

From Bruckner's own recollections as related to Göllerich, it would appear that he might even have played a sixth time at the Crystal Palace - but there is no reference to this in any programme. It was suggested that he undertake a concert tour throughout England either then or the following year. At that point, however - as his letter to Mayfeld makes clear - he was understandably exhausted and his only wish was to return to Vienna. During his time in London he made several English friends and obviously earned the respect of several English organists including W.T. Best, who gave him a copy of his *Collection of Organ Pieces composed for Church Use* as a gift,

¹²³ A copy of this programme as well as a copy of Mendelssohn's F minor Sonata with an indication of the registration in the Adagio and the additional note 'Kryst.' were part of Bruckner's estate. See G-A IV/1, 164-65.

and James Coward, the resident Crystal Palace organist, who presented him with a copy of his *Ten Gleees and a Madrigal* with the dedication '>Anton Bruckner from James Coward with best wishes. Organist of the Crystal Palace and Sacred Harmonic Society.'¹²⁴ He was most impressed with the friendliness of his English hosts and showed a great interest in English organs with their concave pedal arrangement.

At the end of his series of English recitals there was an extremely complimentary review in *The Morning Advertiser*.

Professor Bruckner from Vienna.

When the International Exhibition and Royal Albert Hall were opened, the Council issued an invitation to artists of all nations to come over and test the excellence of the great organ. Amongst those who accepted this invitation was Herr Anton Bruckner, Court Organist and Professor at the Conservatoire. The executions by this disciple of art are truly excellent, and quite worthy of the father-land of Haydn and Mozart. Herr Bruckner executes the classical compositions of Bach, Mendelssohn and others with great easiness which leaves the hearer nothing to desire, and which would certainly even satisfy the composers themselves in the highest degree. But where Herr Bruckner excels is in his improvisations, in which you will find a great easiness and abundance of idea, and the ingenious method by which such idea is carried out - grave or solemn, melodious or charming, brilliant or grand - is very remarkable. The London public has fully acknowledged Herr Bruckner's perfect execution, and many have expressed a hope that this first visit may not be the last. We join in. Bruckner may publish some of his most successful compositions for the benefit and enjoyment of the musical public

124 According to G-A II/1, 338 and 340 and IV/1, 157 and 160, these gifts from Best and Coward were part of Bruckner's estate.

who, we are sure, would be very pleased to become better acquainted with the works of this thorough artist.¹²⁵

In its report of Bruckner's successful London visit, the *Linzer Zeitung* reproduced *The Morning Advertiser* review as a typical example of the friendly reception of Bruckner on the part of the English press.¹²⁶

Pursuing Manns' suggestion that he send some of his own music to be performed in London, Bruckner wrote an exploratory letter to the Committee of the International Exhibition on 3 January 1872. In his reply, Colonel Henry Scott, the secretary of the Committee, asked Bruckner to send the score and parts of one of his works so that it could be considered for performance at the opening of the Exhibition.¹²⁷ Bruckner decided to send the D minor Mass to England. Although the score was accessible (in St. Florian), the parts were still in Salzburg where the Mass had been performed two years earlier. Bruckner had no option but to write to the *Dom-Musikverein und Mozarteum* to request the return of the parts.¹²⁸ On 30 April Bruckner informed the Exhibition's Executive Committee that he had sent the score of the Mass to England, and its receipt was acknowledged by J.A. Wright, the

125 From *The Morning Advertiser* (1 September, 1871); reprinted in G-A IV/1, 168-69.

126 *Linzer Zeitung* (16 September, 1871); see G-A IV/1, 170ff.

127 See HSABB 1, 138 for Scott's reply to Bruckner's letter, dated 12 March 1872; it was first published in G-A IV/1, 173. The originals of both letters are not extant. Bruckner noted down Manns' London address in his *Krippen-Kalender für das Jahr 1872*. See MVP 1, 16.

128 See HSABB 1, 138-39 for this letter, dated Vienna, 23 March 1872; the original is in the *Konsistorialarchiv*, Salzburg. It was first published in the *IBG-Mitteilungsblatt* 16 (December 1979).

Committee secretary.¹²⁹ But the work was not performed and there are no records of any preliminary rehearsals. Four (!) years after his London recitals Bruckner eventually received a medal from the Exhibition Committee (via the Austrian consulate in London) in belated recognition of his efforts.¹³⁰ Reports that he had been awarded a prize by Queen Victoria were totally unfounded.

Bruckner maintained contact with his travelling companion, Franz Zimmermann, for some time. Zimmermann wrote to him on 1 December 1871, recalling their stay in London and mentioning that, on a recent business trip, he had opened a copy of the *Illustrierte Zeitung* by chance and read an article on the Albert Hall organ in which Bruckner's name was mentioned.¹³¹ In another letter to Bruckner the following year, Zimmermann thanked him for his kind invitation to stay in his apartment during the forthcoming Vienna World Exhibition and wished him every success with his plans to undertake a concert tour of England. There is no indication that the correspondence between them continued beyond August 1873 when Zimmermann wrote again in response to a letter from Bruckner, who was intending to visit him and his family on his way back to Vienna from Bayreuth.¹³²

129 See *HSABB* 1, 139-40 for Wright's letter, dated 10 June 1872; it was first published in *G-A IV/1*, 174. The originals of both letters are not extant.

130 See *HSABB* 1, 157 for the letter from the Austrian Chamber of Commerce, dated 13 July 1875, enclosing the medal; it was first published in *G-A IV/1*, 167-68. The original is not extant.

131 See *HSABB* 1, 137-38. The original of this letter has not survived; it was first printed in *G-A IV/1*, 174-75. The article appeared in the 18 November 1871 issue of the Leipzig paper.

132 See *HSABB* 1, 142 and 144. for Zimmermann's letters to Bruckner, dated Nuremberg, 19 September 1872 and 7 August 1873; they were first printed in *G-A IV/1*, 176ff. Bruckner's letters to Zimmermann have not survived and the

At the end of his exhausting but stimulating visit to London Bruckner returned to Vienna by way of Brussels, not Switzerland as originally planned. Part of September was spent at St. Florian, a haven of peace and quiet after his busy concert schedule, and he resumed his duties at the Conservatory and the *Hofkapelle* at the end of the month. The remaining months of 1871 were clouded by the repercussions of what appears to have been an innocent remark Bruckner had made to one of the young women students at St. Anna's in Vienna earlier in the year. He had evidently addressed her as 'lieber Schatz', stroked her hand gently and praised her work. Her colleague whom he had allegedly scolded in a fit of bad temper had spitefully reported the matter to the school authorities. Disciplinary action was commenced and there were moves to dismiss him and allow Eduard Kremser, who was already employed by the Institute, to take his classes.¹³³ He was completely exonerated, however, and Stremayr, the Minister of Education, made it clear that there was no reason why 'the well-known organist Bruckner' should be dismissed from organ and piano teaching. There is an implied rebuke of Vernaleken, a director of the Institute, in the postscript of Stremayr's letter:

originals of Zimmermann's letters are not extant.

133 See G-A IV/1, 180ff. for a letter, possibly from Moritz Alois von Becker (1812-1887), the school superintendent, to Karl von Stremayr, dated 5 October 1871. See also Elisabeth Maier's article 'Bruckner und die "Affaire St. Anna"', in *Anton Bruckners Wiener Jahre* (Vienna, 2009), 219-58, in which she makes use of a considerable amount of archival evidence, including official documents and newspaper reports to describe the accusation of improper behavior, including the suggestion of some behind-the-scenes political manoeuvres, and also clarifies some misapprehensions that have arisen in Bruckner scholarship as a result of the erroneous suggestion (with thinly disguised anti-Semitic undertones) in G-A IV/1, 178-79 that the young lady who reported the alleged incident to the authorities was from a Jewish family and had apparently done so in a fit of pique.

With the removal of Bruckner, a leading organ celebrity and reliable teacher at the Conservatory, nothing would be accomplished as it is most probable that his teaching duties would be transferred to Kremser. It is not even known if he [Kremser] can play the organ. Vernaleken appears to have made light of the whole matter.¹³⁴

Bruckner seems to have felt it necessary to procure a reference from Josef Hellmesberger, the director of the Conservatory, while this matter was being investigated. Hellmesberger's reference underlined Bruckner's fine teaching, the first-rate examination results of his pupils and the excellent discipline he maintained in his classes.¹³⁵

Unfortunately, the "St. Anna affair" was reported in several newspapers, for instance the Linz *Morgenpost* on 12 October, the Linz *Tagespost* on 13 October and the Steyr *Alpen-Bote* on 15 October, without any indication that Bruckner had been completely exonerated of any wrongdoing. As he was understandably concerned that the whole picture should be presented, he wrote to the editor of the *Tagespost*, enclosing a copy of a testimonial he had received from Robert Niedergesäß, another director of the Institute:

The directors have pleasure in declaring that in the Training Institute for Women Teachers during the school year 1870/71 Mr. Anton Bruckner, the imperial court organist, fulfilled his piano teaching

134 Theodor Vernaleken (1812 - c.1897) worked for the Ministry of Education until 1870 and was responsible for the organization of secondary schools. He was appointed a director at St. Anna's in 1870. See G-A IV/1, 186ff. for the text of Stremayr's letter, dated Vienna, 17 October 1871.

135 See G-A IV/1, 191 for the text of this reference, dated Vienna, 12 October 1871.

duties with outstanding success, demonstrated excellent teaching skills and distinguished himself at all times in maintaining a strict code of moral behaviour, demonstrating a devotion and enthusiasm for the job and revealing those qualities which bring credit to artists and teachers.¹³⁶

This appeared in the *Tagespost* on 17 October and was reprinted in the Steyr *Alpen-Bote* five days later. The original article in the Linz *Tagespost* also contained an erroneous assertion that Bruckner, anxious about his future, had written to the King of Bavaria enquiring about a position at a Munich Institute. Writing to his friend Schiedermayr in Linz on 21 October, Bruckner stated categorically that he had not “petitioned Munich” and, on the same day, the *Welser Anzeiger*, clearly supportive of Bruckner, suggested that this unfounded rumour was no more than a joke perpetrated by the Czech faction in the Viennese press.

Herbeck had also been working ‘behind the scenes’ on Bruckner’s behalf. Although Alois von Hermann, the Privy Councillor, wrote to Herbeck to make it perfectly clear that Bruckner had been completely exonerated and had already been informed that he could resume teaching in the male section of the Institute, Bruckner had no desire now to continue teaching in the female section as a result of what had happened, in spite of the loss of income. He had informed the Minister of Education accordingly.¹³⁷

In a letter to another Linz friend, Karl Waldeck, also written on

136 This testimonial is dated Vienna, 17 October 1871. See G-A IV/1, 182-85 for extracts from the newspaper articles and for the testimonial. See HSABB 1, 135 for the text of Bruckner’s letter to the *Tagespost* (undated) which also appeared in the *Alpen-Bote* on 22 October.

137 See HSABB 1, 132-33. for Bruckner’s letter to Schiedermayr; the original is in the *ÖNB*. Also see HSABB 1, 134 for von Hermann’s letter to Herbeck, dated Vienna, 21 October 1871; the original is also in the *ÖNB*.

21 October, he thanked him for his support during what had been an extremely difficult time and added: 'better 500 florins less than to have to put up with such villainy.'¹³⁸ A week later Bruckner wrote again to Waldeck to reassure him that, in spite of what had happened, he had no intention of returning to Linz with a view to becoming cathedral organist again!¹³⁹

At the beginning of November Bruckner gave a fuller account of the whole affair to Moritz v. Mayfeld, providing the more recent information that

... yesterday Herbeck told me he had received a second letter from Privy Councillor Hermann which states that the Ministry has not dismissed me from the female section of the Institute and hopes that I will keep my position there, although I have made it clear that I have lost all desire to stay.

The events of October had demoralized him, teaching at the present time was a greater strain than usual, and the need to do so much teaching in order to make ends meet left him little time to compose.¹⁴⁰

The events of 1871 stimulated great interest within church music circles in Germany and Austria. Franz Xaver Witt, the leading figure in the German Caecilian reform movement in Catholic church music, considered that Bruckner's organ success in London had overshadowed the contribution made by the

138 See *HSABB* 1, 133-34. for this letter; the original is not extant. It was first printed in the *Neue musikalische Presse* 14 (1905), no. 17.

139 See *HSABB* 1, 135 for this letter, dated Vienna, 28 October 1871; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

140 See *HSABB* 1, 136 for this letter, dated Vienna, 2 November 1871; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

equally fine German representative, Eduard Tod from Stuttgart, and wished to scotch the rumour that Queen Victoria had granted first prize to the Austrian organist. He also mentioned the St. Anna affair in the first of two articles. J.E. Habert, the founder of the Austrian Caecilian Society but, incidentally, not on good terms with Witt, said that he had no part in the rumour of Bruckner's 'prize-winning' exploits and chided Witt for not making it clear that Bruckner had been completely exonerated of any misdemeanour. Witt, to his credit, did this in a second article. Ignaz Traumihler from St. Florian, a keen Caecilian, had sent him a copy of Niedergesäß's testimonial which had already been printed in Austrian newspapers.¹⁴¹

It is hardly surprising that Bruckner wrote very little, if anything at all, during the first nine months of 1871. A performance of the F minor Mass had not yet materialized and the St. Anna affair had clouded what had otherwise been a very successful year for him as an organ virtuoso.¹⁴² The fact that he was still feeling somewhat raw emotionally would explain his reaction to a caricature of himself which appeared in a Viennese cartoon paper, *Die Bombe*, on 22 October and caused some amusement among his colleagues, including Herbeck.¹⁴³ Nevertheless he began work, or resumed work if one regards an earlier sketch dated 1

141 Witt's two articles appeared in the *Fliegende Blätter für katholische Kirchenmusik*, vols. 2 and 5 (1872), and Habert's article in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Kirchenmusik* (February 1872). See Elisabeth Maier, 'Bruckner und die "Affaire St. Anna"', 248-50 for Witt's first article and Habert's article.

142 In the first part of his letter to Mayfeld (see footnote 140 above), Bruckner stated that the *Singverein* would not be able to rehearse the Mass before 21 November.

143 Bruckner also makes reference to this in his letter to Mayfeld (see footnotes 140 and 142).

February 1870 as the first workings of the Finale, on his Symphony no. 2 in C minor WAB 102 in October, commencing with the first movement on the 11th of the month. This symphony occupied him for the best part of a year. In the meantime, he had to settle once again into the regular routine of a Conservatory teacher and occasional *Hofkapelle* organist. His reputation as an organist had grown enormously, of course, and a letter sent to him by the Moravian organ builder, Franz von Pistrich, in October/November is probably typical of many others he would have received soliciting his advice and opinion. His reply suggests that he was either not particularly impressed or had other more pressing matters on his mind:

... I did not return to Vienna until October. Perhaps you should approach the Vienna Musikverein with your new artistic invention. In my opinion, it would be more advantageous to make contact with the general secretary, Julius Zellner. I would also be able to see it there...¹⁴⁴

At the end of the year, on 31 December, Bruckner played the organ part in a performance of the first part of Liszt's oratorio, *Christus*, conducted by Anton Rubinstein in the large *Musikverein* hall. Liszt was present and, according to remarks allegedly made to G \ddot{o} llerich, was not happy with Bruckner's playing.¹⁴⁵

One of the highlights of 1872 for Bruckner was undoubtedly Richard Wagner's visit to Vienna in May to raise funds for his

144 See *HSABB* 1, 137 for this letter, dated Vienna, 3 November 1871. It was first published in *BJ 1980* (Linz 1980), 129, where there is also a facsimile of the original (located in the *Moravian Museum*, Brno). Pistrich's letter to Bruckner is not extant.

145 See August G \ddot{o} llerich, *Franz Liszt* (Berlin, 1908[?]), 152-53.

Bayreuth project. Bruckner was a member of the deputation which met Wagner at the *Westbahnhof* station on 6 May and, accompanied by Otto Kitzler and Ignaz Dorn,¹⁴⁶ attended the concert given by Wagner on 12 May which included performances of Beethoven's "Eroica" Symphony and excerpts from *Die Walküre*, *Tannhäuser* and *Tristan*. The following month, on the 16th, Bruckner conducted the first performance of his F minor Mass in the *Augustinerkirche*. He had to pay the cost involved, 300 florins, out of his own pocket and experienced many difficulties in rehearsal but no doubt considered all the effort and money well spent in view of the favourable critical and public reaction.¹⁴⁷

Bruckner spent the rest of the summer working on his Second Symphony and completed it in St. Florian in September.¹⁴⁸ He

146 Dorn died about a fortnight later. A special memorial service was held in the *Bürger-Versorgungshaus Kapelle* in Vienna on 25 June. See *HSABB* 1, 141 for Bruckner's letter to Eduard Kremser, dated Vienna, 25 June 1872, in which he thanks Kremser for his obituary of Dorn in *Vaterland* (20 June 1872). See also Chapter 3 for further information about Dorn and his relationship with Bruckner.

147 See Chapter 3 (3.3.2) for further details about the composition, performance and critical reception of the F-minor Mass. Bruckner conducted a second performance of the Mass in the *Hofkapelle* later in the year, on Sunday 8 December.

148 The autograph of the score is in the *ÖNB* (Mus.Hs. 19474) and it provides a clear picture of the progress made on the work. The first movement was begun on 11 October 1871 and completed on 8 July 1872 in Vienna. The Scherzo and Trio were sketched next and completed on 18 July. The Adagio was begun on 18 July, the rough draft was completed on 19 July and the orchestration completed a week later, on 25 July. Work on the Finale was begun in Vienna on 26 July, continued in Linz and completed at St. Florian on 11 September. Bruckner also made a revision of the Adagio during the summer, expanding the structure from ABAB + coda to ABABA + coda. See *G-A IV/1*, 208-09 for a facsimile of a page from the Adagio, and 206-225 for a discussion of the work. See also Franz Grasberger, 'Anton Bruckners Zweite Symphonie' in Othmar Wessely, ed., *Bruckner-Studien* (Vienna, 1975), 303-21 which includes facsimiles of two pages from the autograph between pp. 308 and 309. Bruckner also arranged for two copy scores of the symphony to be made during the summer of 1872, the first by Tenschert who finished writing out

also visited the Mayfelds' country home in Schwanenstadt during the summer vacation. He and Betty v. Mayfeld played through the work at the piano and the composer was delighted with his partner's contribution. After the parts had been copied, the Vienna Philharmonic conducted by Otto Dessoff, with some assistance from Bruckner, gave the symphony a trial run. The reaction among the players was mixed. The cellist David Popper was enthusiastic, but there was a hostile response from the conductor and the majority of the musicians and the work was not accepted for performance in the 1872/73 season. Bruckner later made a note of this as '>'1st rejection' (>'1. Ablehnung') in his copy of the *Neuer Krakauer Schreib-Kalender 1877* which he used as a diary-cum-organizer at the time.¹⁴⁹

On 10 November Bruckner and Brahms made a rare joint appearance in the large *Musikverein* hall when the newly installed organ was heard for the first time in a concert which included Handel's *Te Deum*. Brahms conducted and Bruckner played Brahms's realisation of the basso continuo part on the organ.

the score of the first movement, the scherzo and original form of the Adagio before Bruckner left Vienna for St. Florian in early August (Mus.Hs. 6035, including later revisions, in the *ÖNB*), the second by Carda (Mus.Hs. 6034). For further information about the 1872 version, see William Carragan's foreword in his edition of the score in the Complete Edition: *II. Symphonie C-Moll Fassung 1872* (Vienna, 2005).

149 According to Carl F. Pohl, the librarian of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, who wrote to Josef Seiberl in St. Florian in November, Franz Liszt may have been present at this rehearsal as he was '>'quite delighted' with the symphony. See G-A IV/1, 224. The copy score used in this trial run, begun by the Viennese copyist Tenschert and completed by the Linz copyist Carda, is in the *ÖNB* (Mus. Hs. 6035). The manuscript parts are located in St. Florian abbey library (Bruckner-Archiv 19-14). See William Carragan, '>'The early version of the Second Symphony' in Howie, Jackson and Hawkshaw, eds., *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 69-92, for more detailed information about the sources. For the diary entry – '1. Ablehnung Herbst 1872 C moll Sinf[onie] N 2' – see *MVP* 1, 53 and *MVP* 2, 59. See also *GaultNB*, 45-48, 69-72 and *CarraganRB*, 49-64.

Five days later, on 15 November, Bruckner improvised on the organ for 30 minutes and Brahms conducted the *Singverein* in performances of unaccompanied choral pieces by Eccard and Isaac.¹⁵⁰

At the beginning of 1873 Bruckner made a further attempt to secure funding so that he could reduce his teaching load. He wrote to Stremayr, requesting an annual subsidy that would enable him to do less teaching (both institutional and private) and devote more of his time to composition. To strengthen his case, he added that Liszt had encouraged him to pursue his compositional career. He was grateful for Stremayr's help in the past but was concerned that his 30-40 hours' teaching each week was >'significantly paralysing' his creative activity.¹⁵¹ There is no record of Stremayr's reply to the request. Indeed, it is more than likely that he felt that he had done enough already to help Bruckner.

Although he was now working on the Symphony no. 3 in D minor WAB 103, Bruckner's immediate concern was to organize a performance of his Symphony no. 2. At the end of March he wrote to the directorate of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, requesting the use of the large hall for a concert on 8 June at midday. His intention was to >'perform a new symphony' and play some pieces on the organ,¹⁵² but the first performance of the

150 This concert was reviewed by several critics, including Ambros in the *Wiener Zeitung* (17 November), Hanslick in the *Neue Freie Presse* 2960 (19 November) and Pyllemann in the *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* vi (27 November), 771.

151 See *HSABB* 1, 142-43 for this letter, dated Vienna, 27 January 1873. The original is not extant; it was first printed in the *Neues Wiener Journal*, 16 June 1933. See also *G-A* IV/1, 227ff.

152 See *HSABB* 1, 143 for this letter, dated Vienna, 30 March 1873; the

symphony was postponed until October, probably so that it would coincide with the end of the World Exhibition in Vienna and the beginning of a new concert season. Bruckner had to arrange the concert himself and wrote once again to the *Gesellschaft* directorate and the police department, seeking permission to hold the concert on Sunday 26 October at 12.30.¹⁵³ He reckoned that the total cost of the enterprise, which included the hiring of the Philharmonic orchestra for rehearsals and performance and the copying of parts, amounted to 700 florins. Fortunately, he received some financial assistance from a sympathetic patron, Prince Johann Liechtenstein.¹⁵⁴

After playing a Bach Toccata and Fugue in C major and a free improvisation on the organ, Bruckner conducted the first performance of his C minor symphony. The critical reaction was mixed. In his review in the *Neue Freie Presse*, Hanslick commented on the many fine details but what he perceived to be the overall structural weakness. Nevertheless, it had made a very favourable impression on the public:

... We content ourselves today with the report of this

original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library.

153 See *HSABB* 1, 146-47 for the texts of these letters, both dated Vienna, 18 October 1873, and for the permission granted by the *Gesellschaft* and the police department, 18 October and 21 October respectively; the originals are in St. Florian. Bruckner also wrote to the *Gesellschaft* committee on 17 November to thank them for the use of the hall. See *HSABB* 1, 150; the original is in the *Gesellschaft* library.

154 For further information about Prince Johann Liechtenstein's financial support on this and other occasions, see Franz Scheder, 'Bruckner und Fürst Liechtenstein', *BJ 1997-2000* (Linz, 2002), 253-78. See also William Carragan, foreword to 'Symphony no. 2. Version of 1877' (Vienna, 2007) for details of changes introduced by Bruckner before the first performance and entered into the copy scores and parts by Carda.

splendid public success which we heartily concede to this unassuming but energetic and ambitious composer. Mr. Bruckner received loud and continuous applause after his organ pieces and each movement of the symphony. The Philharmonic Orchestra gave a masterly performance of this unusually difficult composition (under the personal direction of the composer).¹⁵⁵

Ludwig Speidel, writing in the *Fremdenblatt*, made similar comments but was more specific in his criticism, contrasting the beauties of the Andante movement with the lack of structural cohesion in the outer movements:

...The motives follow each other rather than being organically set off one against the other; the development of the motives lacks the necessary clarity; the movements do not have overall cohesion but are disjointed. There is often some wonderful detailed work, and the first part of the Scherzo - the least original section as far as content is concerned - is artistically shaped with a secure hand. As regards the stylistic direction of the symphony, there has been an attempt to fuse the new and most recent musical achievements with classical tradition. In this sense Bruckner's work contains some really splendid passages, even if one cannot say that the whole piece presents a successful solution to the problem set. Nevertheless, in this symphony we encounter a musical personality whose shoe-laces the numerous opponents that have emerged are not worthy to untie. He can smile at his antagonists because in knowledge and ability he leaves them infinitely far behind...¹⁵⁶

155 *Neue Freie Presse* 5298 (28 October 1873), 6. Quoted in G-A IV/1, 245-46.

156 *Fremdenblatt* (28 October 1873). Quoted in G-A IV/1, 246ff.

The reviewer for the *Wiener Sonn- und Montags-Zeitung* also praised the originality of the score and singled out '>details full of... artistic nobility' and the masterly '>blending of tone colours.'¹⁵⁷ Speidel's observation that Bruckner had many detractors, on the other hand, is borne out by an extremely unfavourable review of the symphony, written by one of his Conservatory colleagues, the historian A.W. Ambros, whose main criticism was that the composer's obvious devotion to Wagner had led him astray, particularly in the outer movements:

...It would be worth the trouble to count the number of general pauses in the work, a device that the great composers quite correctly have used only infrequently. Where we desire and expect a musical language that is coherent, well-organized and motivically inter-connected, we hear nothing but suspensions, interjections, musical question- and exclamation-marks and parentheses which are neither preceded nor followed by anything of substance. Where we expect a firm musical structure, we are harried until we are made breathless by sound patterns that are strung together in a random fashion...

Ambros argued that a true measure of the composition's worth would be gauged not from performing it in front of a partisan Viennese audience but from playing it to an unprejudiced, objective audience in Berlin or Leipzig. If it succeeded there it would truly have survived the test of fire. Ambros showed his true arch-conservative colours in the final paragraph of his review, however:

We have found in the new work features which cause us deeply to regret that a man of such

¹⁵⁷ *Wiener Sonn- und Montags-Zeitung, Beilage zu Nr. 89* (2 November 1873), 5.

talent, instead of taking the path to the temple of fame boldly and courageously on his own two feet, prefers to jump on to the mounting-board of the Wagnerian chariot of triumph and allow himself to be carried along - provided that the chariot does not throw him off along the way... If we could presume that he would not close his ears to a sincere (but perhaps unwelcome) voice, we would say to him: moderation, restraint, self-control... Our contemporary music suffers from lack of moderation... In the present circumstances it appears that we are not on the threshold of a glorious new musical epoch but have arrived at the end of all music.¹⁵⁸

Bruckner appears to have been more than satisfied with the performance. On 27 October he wrote an official letter of appreciation to the Philharmonic committee in which he made the rather quaint statement that, 'just as a >father seeks the best possible place for his child,' so he would like to dedicate the symphony to the orchestra; a week later he thanked the *Liedertafel Frohsinn* for their congratulatory letter, saying that the Philharmonic musicians had >'played like gods' and that he had received a tremendous ovation.¹⁵⁹ The orchestra evidently did not accept the dedication and, 11 years later, Franz Liszt, who had shown interest in the work initially, was asked to be its dedicatee.¹⁶⁰ Liszt eventually replied in the affirmative and hoped for an early opportunity of

158 *Wiener Abendpost*, the evening edition of the *Wiener Zeitung* (28 October 1873); quoted in *G-A* IV/1, 249-54. Ambros provided another review of the Second Symphony in the *Wiener Abendpost* on 26 February 1876. For further information about August Wilhelm Ambros (1816-1876), see Norbert Tschulik, '>August Wilhelm Ambros und das Wagner-Problem. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Musikkritik und der Wagner-Rezeption', *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 29 (1979), 155-69. Tschulik has also provided a survey of reviews of Bruckner in the *Wiener Zeitung* in *BJ* 1981 (Linz, 1982), 171-79.

159 See *HSABB* 1, 147 and 148 for these two letters, dated Vienna, 27 October and 4 November 1873 respectively. The original of the former is in the *Vienna Philharmonic Archive*; the original of the latter is in the *Linzer Singakademie, Frohsinn-Archiv*.

160 A letter accepting the dedication was in fact drafted at the beginning of October 1875, but it appears that it was not sent to Bruckner. It can also be found in the *Vienna Philharmonic Archive*.

hearing the work again, but his lack of real interest can be gauged from the fact that he did not take the score with him when he left Vienna to visit Budapest and apparently forgot all about it!¹⁶¹ When Bruckner came across the dedication score by chance again a year later, he withdrew his dedication, and the work was eventually published by Doblinger without dedication in 1892.¹⁶² Between its first performance in October 1873 and its publication in 1892, Bruckner made several cuts and alterations in scoring, albeit not as extensive as the changes made in some of the later symphonies. He also eliminated some of the general pauses which he included in the original version in order to make the musical architecture clearer and thus avoid one of the criticisms directed at the First Symphony, namely that it was shapeless and structurally incoherent.¹⁶³ The Second Symphony marks a significant development in Bruckner's symphonic thinking. There is a much closer thematic / motivic relationship within and between the movements. Significantly,

161 See *HSABB* 1, 238 for Liszt's letter to Bruckner, dated Vienna, 29 October 1884. There is a facsimile of this letter in *ABB*, between pages 272 and 273.

162 The work was published in score (D.1769) and parts (D.1770), also in a piano reduction for four hands, edited by Josef Schalk (D.1806).

163 The Finale contains the most changes. Some of them were evidently suggested by Herbeck and made before the second performance of the symphony conducted by Bruckner in a *Gesellschaft* concert on 20 February 1876. There was a more thorough revision in 1877 and some important pre-publication changes were made in 1892. For further information, see Robert Haas, ed., *ABSW 2: II. Symphonie C-Moll* (Leipzig, 1938) [including critical apparatus]; Leopold Nowak, ed., *ABSW 2: II. Symphonie C-Moll, Fassung von 1877, 2., revidierte Ausgabe* (Vienna, 1965); Franz Grasberger, 'Anton Bruckners Zweite Symphonie', op.cit. (Vienna, 1975), 309; Timothy L. Jackson, 'Bruckner's Metrical Numbers', *19th-Century Music* xiv/2 (1990), 107-14; idem, 'Bruckner's Rhythm. Syncopated Hyperrhythm and Diachronic Transformation in the Second Symphony', *BSL 1992* (Linz, 1995), 93-106; idem, 'Schubert as John the Baptist to Wagner-Jesus@', *BJ 1991/92/93* (Vienna, 1995), 61-107; William Carragan, 'The early version of the Second Symphony' in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (Aldershot, 2001), 69ff., William Carragan, ed., *ABSW II/1: II. Symphonie C-Moll, Fassung von 1872* (Vienna, 2005); idem, ed., *ABSW II/2: II. Symphonie C-Moll, Fassung von 1877* (Vienna, 2007); idem, ed., *ABSW II: II. Symphonie C-Moll, Revisionsbericht*.

the close proximity in time between the gestation of the symphony and the first performance of the F minor Mass is underlined by quotations from the latter in the slow movement and Finale.¹⁶⁴

On the strength of the successful first performance of the symphony on 26 October Bruckner felt justified in renewing his request for an annual grant. In his official letter he mentioned not only the enthusiastic public response and the favourable press reviews but also his successes as an organ virtuoso in Nancy, Paris and London as well as Liszt's and Wagner's high estimation of his works. He also pointed out that Wagner, for instance, had recently accepted the dedication of his Symphony no. 3 in D minor. As in his previous letter he ended by stressing that he 'lost >much precious time and energy' for composition because he was obliged to supplement his Conservatory income by giving private lessons.¹⁶⁵ Once again he was unsuccessful.

Wagner's acceptance of the dedication of Symphony no. 3 in September crowned a year of fairly extensive work on the symphony which was begun, according to Josef Kluger, in October 1872 with the >'Andante' section of the slow movement and the theme of the following >'Misterioso' section.¹⁶⁶ Dates on

164 There are references to the *Benedictus* in the slow movement and to the *Kyrie* in the Finale. For further discussion, see Constantin Floros, '>Die Zitate in Bruckners Symphonik', *BJ 1982/83* (Linz, 1984), 7-18. Floros goes so far as to say that the *Benedictus* quotations '>have an extremely personal significance' and are of autobiographical importance.

165 See *HSABB* 1, 149 for this letter, dated Vienna, 9 November 1873. The original is not extant; it was first published in the *Neues Wiener Journal*, 16 June 1933. Bruckner entrusted his letter to Dr. Franz Gross (1815-1890), mayor of Wels and a member of parliament.

166 Josef Kluger (1865-1937), a young friend of the composer, was a priest and, later, provost at Klosterneuburg abbey. In a later conversation with Kluger, Bruckner recalled that the Andante was written on 15 October in memory of his mother Theresia whose name-day it was, and the >'Misterioso'

the autograph score and on some separate autograph folios clearly indicate that Bruckner was occupied with the first version of the symphony throughout 1873, completing it literally at the end of the year.¹⁶⁷

During August 1873 Bruckner spent some of his summer vacation at Carlsbad and Marienbad before going to St. Florian. The Finale of the symphony was begun in sketch form before he left Vienna. An outbreak of cholera in the city prompted him to make a quick departure. The sketches of the Finale were completed on 31 August just before Bruckner travelled to Bayreuth to visit Wagner and ask him which of the two symphonies - the Second or the Third - he would prefer to have dedicated to him. Several years later Bruckner recalled the occasion when he made a contribution to Hans von Wolzogen's reminiscences of Wagner:

It was about the beginning of September 1873 when I asked the Master if I could let him see my 2nd (C minor) and 3rd (D minor) symphonies. He was unwilling because of lack of time (the building of the theatre) and said that he would not be able to examine the scores then as he had even had to put *The Ring* on one side. When I replied, '>Master, I have no right to take up even a quarter an hour of

came to him the following day. See G-A IV/1, 260-61.

167 When preparing the '>second version' in 1877 Bruckner used the original autograph (Mus.Hs. 19.475 in the *ÖNB*), making alterations and discarding those sheets which he did not need. Hence there is no '>clean' autograph of the original version, apart from the Adagio and Scherzo movements. According to Bruckner's annotation at the end of the Finale, the work was completed during the night of 31 December. For a thorough survey of the source material and a revision report of the three printed versions of the symphony in the *Gesamtausgabe*, see Thomas Röder, ed., *ABSWIII/1-3: III Symphonie D-Moll Revisionbericht* (Vienna, 1997). See also *GaultNB*, 48-53, 73-87, 132-41 and *CarraganRB*, 67-93.

your time. I thought that with your quick eye a glance at the themes would be sufficient for you to get some idea of the music,' the Master said, slapping me on the shoulder, '>'Come with me into the drawing-room.' He looked at the 2nd Symphony and pronounced it '>'really good', although it seemed to him to be too tame. He then began to look at the 3rd Symphony and, with the words, '>'Ah, this is really something', examined the whole first section (he mentioned the trumpet in particular). '>'Leave the work here,' he said, '>'and I will examine it more closely after lunch (it was twelve o'clock).' '>'Should I make my request,' I thought to myself, whereupon the Master encouraged me. Very timidly and with my heart pounding, I spoke to my dearly loved Master: '>'Master, I have something on my heart which I dare not say.' The Master replied, '>'Out with it. You must know how fond I am of you.' Then I made my request, but only in the event of the Master being completely satisfied, as I did not wish to bring dishonour to his illustrious name. Then the Master said, '>'You are invited to Wahnfried for 5 o'clock in the evening. You can meet me there and, after I have been able to examine the D minor symphony thoroughly, we can talk more about this.' No sooner had I come to Wahnfried from the theatre at 5 o'clock than the Master of all masters met me with open arms, embraced me and said, '>'Dear friend, I accept the dedication; you give me enormous pleasure with the work.' I stayed with the Master for two and a half very happy hours. He spoke to me about the musical situation in Vienna, plied me with beer, took me into the garden and showed me where he would be buried!!!¹⁶⁸

168 From Hans von Wolzogen, *Erinnerungen an R. Wagner* (2/1891). The texts of Wolzogen's letter requesting information, dated Bayreuth 11 February 1891, and Bruckner's undated reply can be found in *HSABB2*, 118-120. The original of the former is in St. Florian, and the latter was first published in *ABB*, 166ff. and *G-A IV/1*, 239-40. For Göllicher's account of the same episode, see *G-A IV/1*, 232-36 and Stephen Johnson's English translation in *Bruckner Remembered* (London: Faber and Faber, 1998), 131-34.

There is an amusing independent account of this episode by the sculptor, Gustav Kietz, who was at Bayreuth at the time working on a bust of Cosima. According to Kietz, Bruckner was so overwhelmed by the occasion and by the excess of beer that he was unable to remember the following morning which symphony Wagner had chosen for dedication!¹⁶⁹ The piece of notepaper on which Bruckner scribbled a message to Wagner to clarify matters - >'Symphony in D minor, where the trumpet begins the theme' - and Wagner jotted down, >'Yes! Yes! Best wishes!' is, of course, a well-known piece of Bruckner memorabilia.¹⁷⁰

October marked the beginning of a new teaching session for Bruckner. He had a narrow escape on a return journey from Linz to Vienna at the beginning of the month. The train in which he was travelling was involved in an accident just outside the *Westbahnhof* station. Fortunately for Bruckner, his carriage was not affected in the impact of the collision with a spare locomotive, and he was unhurt.¹⁷¹

In October Bruckner was accepted into membership of the Vienna branch of the *Akademischer Wagner-Verein* and, in his letter of thanks, intimated that he would be delighted to belong to a society in which >'intelligence and enthusiasm for the truly noble are so famously represented.'¹⁷² Work on the realization of the sketches of the Finale of

169 See G.A. Kietz, *Richard Wagner in den Jahren 1842-49 und 1873-75* (Dresden, 1905), quoted in G-A IV/1, 236ff. Translated by Stephen Johnson in op.cit., 135-36. On pp. 134-35 Johnson also provides a translation of Max von Oberleithner's account (from *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*).

170 See *HSABB* 1, 144. There is a facsimile in G-A IV/1, between pages 480 and 481. The original is in the *Stadtbibliothek*, Vienna.

171 Bruckner mentioned this accident in a letter to Ignaz Pollmann, mayor of Tulln. Bruckner had played at the successful inauguration of the new organ on 19 January and had been sent a silver tobacco tin as a gift during the summer vacation. He wrote to Pollmann from Vienna on 8 October, apologizing for the lateness of his reply. See *HSABB* 1, 144-45.; the original is in the *Heimatmuseum*, Tulln.

172 See *HSABB* 1, 145 for this letter, dated Vienna, 15 October 1873; the original is in the *Stadtbibliothek*, Vienna. The Vienna branch of the *Wagner-*

the D minor Symphony occupied him during the autumn and early winter months, and his prediction in a letter to the *Liedertafel Frohsinn* that >'the Wagner-Symphony (D minor)' would be completely finished in two months' time proved to be correct.¹⁷³

With Bruckner's Symphony no. 3 we are confronted, perhaps more perplexingly than in any other of his symphonies, with the complex question of different >'versions'. Three examples from the last 50 or 60 years clearly illustrate the particular confusion which surrounds this symphony. In his foreword to the Eulenburg miniature score of the work,¹⁷⁴ Hans Ferdinand Redlich specified no less than six versions of the work, namely the original version of 1873, a second version which was the result of some revision carried out in 1874, a third version which was the product of the thorough '>rhythmical' revisions undertaken in the years 1876/77 as embodied in the manuscript sources, a fourth version: the first edition of 1879, a fifth version which incorporated Bruckner's further revisions made in 1889/90 as embodied in the manuscript sources, and a sixth version: the second edition of 1890. In his foreword to the first edition of the 1873 original version of the symphony,¹⁷⁵ Leopold Nowak cited five different versions which correspond with Redlich's first, third, fourth, fifth and sixth versions. A few years later, however, in his foreword to the edition of the >'1877 version',¹⁷⁶ Nowak distinguished between the

Verein was founded on 20 February 1873.

173 See *HSABB* 1, 148 for this letter, dated Vienna, 4 November 1873; the original is in the *Linzer Singakademie, Frohsinn-Archiv*.

174 E.E.4553 (1961).

175 *ABSW III/1: III Symphonie d-Moll, 1. Fassung 1873* (Vienna, 1977).

176 *ABSW III/2: III Symphonie d-Moll, 2. Fassung 1877* (Vienna, 1981).

1873 original version, a complete revision of the symphony towards the end of 1876 which included a new version of the slow movement which had been discovered,¹⁷⁷ the second version of 1877 which included a third version of the slow movement and a new coda to the Scherzo movement, and the third version of 1889 incorporated in the 1890 second edition.¹⁷⁸ By reducing the number of actual '>versions' to three, Nowak was no doubt adhering to the important conclusions agreed at a Bruckner symposium held in Linz in September 1980. The Austrian scholar, Manfred Wagner, was one of the leading contributors to this symposium and provided a clear appraisal of what exactly constitutes a separate '>version'.¹⁷⁹ This was later re-worked as an essay in a booklet accompanying the recordings of the original versions of the Third, Fourth and Eighth Symphonies.¹⁸⁰ Wagner's succinct summing-up is as follows:

... '>version' is now accepted as each preparation by Bruckner himself of the work as a whole. Thus Symphonies nos. 1-4 and no. 8 exist in at least two versions, whereas there is only one version each of Symphonies 5, 6, 7 and 9. In 1980, the term '>improvement' [Germ. '>Verbesserung'], which had

177 Published separately as a supplement to *ABSW III/1 - Adagio Nr. 2 1876* (Vienna, 1980).

178 See also Leopold Nowak, ed., *ABSW III/3: III Symphonie d-Moll, 3. Fassung 1889* (Vienna, 1958), Preface; Arthur D. Walker, '>Bruckner's Works. A list of the published scores of the various versions', in *Brio III/2* (1966); Nigel Simeone, '>Bruckner's Publishers, 1865-1938', in *Brio 36* (1999), 19-38.

179 Manfred Wagner, '>Bruckners Sinfonie-Fassungen - grundsätzlich referiert', in *BSL 1980: >Die Fassungen*' (Linz, 1981), 15-24.

180 The three symphonies were performed by the Frankfurt Radio Symphony Orchestra, conducted Eliahu Inbal, and recorded on Telefunken 635 64201-4 (1983).

been commonly used in relation to the new versions, was firmly rejected. The use of this term had resulted in summary aesthetic judgment being passed on the original versions, declaring them to be preliminary works and lumping together necessary corrections with alterations that had entirely different objectives. It also neglected the possibility that later changes in the symphonic design might have expressed different compositional conceptions, viz. alternative approaches to structural unity, a new view of dynamics in relation to climax building and contrasts, or a departure from organ texture in the direction of more idiomatic orchestral writing... Naturally, >'accommodation' [Germ. >'Anpassung'] played a significant part in the motivation that prompted the later versions, primarily accommodation to Bruckner's own compositional style at the time. It is important to bear in mind in this connection that until he was approaching the age of 40 his handling of orchestral texture had been based almost exclusively on theoretical studies; in contrast to many famous composers of his day, he had not grown up in the orchestra-pit, but had acquired his first-hand experience, whether as a conductor or as a visitor to the musical world of Vienna, quite late in life. We do not know, and will probably never discover, just how far his personal opinion of that world differed from that of his friends and whether the influence of friends and interpreters was the deciding factor in the alterations which he made, or whether he himself made a conscious decision to conform with contemporary musical practice. It is not easy to determine what Bruckner truly felt about friends like the Schalk brothers, Löwe and Mahler, who were the elite of the musical establishment.¹⁸¹... He may

181 He welcomed their suggestions but was not always happy with the end-results. For further comments on the editions and on the participation of others in the editing process, see Deryck Cooke, >'The Bruckner Problem Simplified', in *Vindications. Essays on Romantic Music* (London, 1982); Robert Simpson, >'The 1873 Version of Bruckner's Third Symphony', *BJ 1982/83* (Linz, 1984), 27ff.; *LBSAB* (Tutzing, 1988); Benjamin M. Korstvedt, >'The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity',

have considered the solo piano and piano duet arrangements made by the Schalk brothers and Löwe to be new versions of or corrections to his own work which he could reluctantly accept (Symphonies 4 and 5) and probably did accept provided that they helped him to achieve public success and recognition, but which subsequently gave him cause for concern when he considered the possibility that they might be handed down to posterity. I imagine that the presentation of his works to the Austrian National Library was less an act of devotion on his part to the Austrian state than a final act of self-defence for the future, a means of countering the danger that conceptions of his works which did not agree with his own might later become accepted or valid.

The chronology of Bruckner's methods of composition is the main evidence in support of the fact that he brought different conceptions to bear on identical thematic ideas. Each bout of creativity was typically followed first by a fallow period and then by a phase of examination and revision. The first spurt of activity resulted in the three Masses and Symphony no. 1, punctuated by exhaustion culminating in a nervous collapse,¹⁸² the second (1871/76) produced Symphonies nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 in a row, and the third (1880/87) saw Symphonies nos. 6, 7 and 8, but the intervals between these periods of compositional activity were devoted not only to a re-orientation in Bruckner's professional commitments but also to a revision of these works which had evidently been created under

in *19th-Century Music* xx/1 (Summer 1996), 3-26; Paul Hawkshaw, '>The Bruckner Problem Revisited', in *19th-Century Music* xxi/1 (Summer 1997), 96-107; Korstvedt's response, '>The Bruckner Problem Revisited (A Reply)' in *ibid.*, 108-09, 43-71, particularly 46 and 55-58; Thomas Leibnitz, '>Anton Bruckner and German Music@. Josef Schalk and the establishment of Bruckner as a national composer', in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 328-40; and Benjamin M. Korstvedt, '>Bruckner editions: the revolution revisited', in *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*, 121-37.

182 This '>first spurt of activity' is dated 1867/68 by Wagner but is more accurately 1863/64 - 1868.

tremendous pressure.¹⁸³

The original version of the D minor Symphony undoubtedly contains a much greater number of quotations, both from Wagner's *Tristan* and *Die Walküre* and his own music, than any other of his works. While both Auer and Oeser describe these Wagnerian quotations as an act of 'naive homage' to Wagner, Constantin Floros inclines more to the view that Bruckner's

183 From essay entitled 'The Concept of the First Versions of Bruckner's Symphonies' in the booklet. English translation by Lindsay Craig with some of my own amendments and additions. Other articles and books dealing *inter alia* with the original and subsequent versions of Symphony no. 3 include: J. Tröller, *Anton Bruckner, III Symphonie d-Moll [Meisterwerke der Musik 13]* (Munich, 1976); Manfred Wagner, *Der Wandel des Konzepts. Zu den verschiedenen Fassungen von Bruckners Dritter, Vierter und Achter Sinfonie* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1980); Rudolf Stephan, 'Zu Anton Bruckners Dritter Symphonie' and '>Anton Bruckner: Dritte Symphonie d-Moll, erste und dritte Fassung in Ausschnitten einander gegenübergestellt', *BSL 1980* (Linz, 1981), 65-73 and 91-6; Harry Halbreich, 'Bruckners Dritter Symphonie und ihre Fassungen' in *ibid.*, 75-83; Constantin Floros, 'Die Zitate in Bruckners Symphonik', *BJ 1982/83* (Linz, 1984), 12ff.; Thomas Röder, *Auf dem Weg zur Bruckner Symphonie* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1987); Gertrud Kubacsek-Steinhauer, '>Die vierhändigen Bearbeitungen der Dritten Symphonie von Anton Bruckner', in *BJ 1987/88* (Linz, 1990), 67-78; Bo Marschner, '>Die letzte (1889) Fassung von Anton Bruckners 3. Sinfonie. Ein Problemfall in der kritischen Gesamtausgabe', *Neue berlinische Musikzeitung* viii/3, suppl. (1993), 22-32 [originally published in Danish: '>Anton Bruckners 3. symfoni i dens seneste version (1889)', *Otte ekkoer af musikforskning i Arhus* (Aarhus, 1988), 135-57]; Gunnar Cohrs, '>Die Trompetenstimme in der Adagioklimax der Letztfassung der Dritten Symphonie' and Wolfgang Kühnen, '>Die Botschaft als Chiffre. Zur Syntax musikalischer Zitate in der ersten Fassung von Bruckners Dritter Symphonie', in *BJ 1991/92/93* (Vienna, 1995), 25-9 and 31-43; Gunnar Cohrs, '>Bruckner-Premiere in Bremen', *MIBG* xlv (December 1995), 24-25 (a discussion of the world premiere of the original version of the Third played on instruments of the period by the London Classical Players conducted by Roger Norrington, 15 September 1995); Thomas Röder, '>Zu Bruckners Scherzo: der responsoriale Thementyp, die Kadenz, die Coda und der Zyklus', in *BJ 1994/95/96* (Linz, 1997), 67-77; Elisabeth Reiter, '>Nochmals: Die Wagner-Zitate - Funktion und Kontext', *BJ 1994/95/96* (Linz, 1997), 79-89; Thomas Röder, '>Die Dritte Symphonie – unfaßbar', *BSL 1996* (Linx, 1998), 47-64; idem, '>Master and disciple united: The 1889 Finale of the Third Symphony', *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 93-113. In his *Anton Bruckner III Symphonie d-Moll Revisionsbericht* (Vienna, 1997), Röder has provided not only a substantial 'omnibus' volume of critical apparatus, identifying the many textual changes with commendable clarity, but also an extremely useful 'chronology' or compositional history of the symphony from October 1872 to 10 February 1895, the date of the last known performance of the work during the composer's lifetime.

intention was anything but naive as he would have thought it self-evident that a >'Wagner Symphony' should include Wagner quotations.¹⁸⁴ After his visit to Bayreuth in September 1873 Bruckner inserted the *Tristan* and *Walküre* motives carefully and discreetly without interrupting the flow of the music. When he revised the symphony in 1876/77, he eliminated all but one of the Wagner quotations which he retained in the Adagio because it was woven organically into the musical texture. The self-quotations (the >'miserere' phrase from the *Gloria* of the D minor Mass; the head-motive from the first movement of the Second Symphony), on the other hand, were retained for the most part.

A sacred work, *Christus factus est* WAB 10, formerly dated 1879 by Auer, has been shown to belong to the latter part of 1873.¹⁸⁵ Scored for eight-part mixed-voice choir, three trombones and strings, it was notated on the same type of manuscript paper which Bruckner used for the Finale of his Symphony no. 3. There is also an entry in the *Hofkapelle* schedule for 8 December 1873 – "Messe in F. Graduale: Christus factus est, Offertorium: Ave Maria" which clearly refers to this work: hence Nowak's dating "vor dem 8. Dezember 1873".¹⁸⁶

184 See Max Auer, *Anton Bruckner. Sein Leben und Werk* (Vienna, 2/1934), 184, Fritz Oeser, introduction to his edition of *Anton Bruckner 3. Symphonie in D-Moll, 2. Fassung von 1878* (Wiesbaden: Brucknerverlag, 1950), iii, and Constantin Floros, >'Die Zitate in Bruckners Symphonik', *BJ* 1982/83, 12.

185 See G-A IV/1, 591ff.

186 See *ABSW XXI/1*, viii, 185, 188 and *ABSW XXI/2*, 89-98; for musical text, see *ABSW XXI/1*, 100-06. It was first performed outside the *Hofkapelle* at a *Wagner Society* concert in Vienna on 20 April 1912. See also Imogen Fellinger, 'Die drei Fassungen des *Christus factus est* in Bruckners kirchenmusikalischen Schaffen', *BSL* 1985 (Linz, 1988), 145-53. In December 2009 the original manuscript of this motet was purchased by the ÖNB Musikabteilung at an auction in Sotheby's, London. See Thomas Leibnitz, Foreword to *IBG Studien & Berichte Mitteilungsblatt* 74 (June 2010), 4.

A throat infection confined Bruckner to his apartment over the Christmas period. But he did not forget to send Herbeck name-day greetings in a letter that combines sentiments of deep respect and great affection.¹⁸⁷

At the beginning of January 1874 Bruckner's petition to the Upper Austrian Parliament for an "annual endowment for life" was rejected, despite support from Dr. Alois Bahr. The Finance Committee treated Bruckner's request sympathetically in view of his reputation but considered that his salary from the Conservatory should be sufficient to meet his needs.¹⁸⁸ Undeterred, Bruckner made an official application for a teaching post at the University of Vienna. An earlier application in 1867 had been unsuccessful, but Bruckner now hoped that his achievements since then would carry sufficient weight to impress the authorities. In his application to the Ministry of Education and Culture he began by referring to his successful visits to France and England, the encouragement of Liszt, Wagner and other important contemporary composers, and the performances of his F minor Mass and Symphony no. 2 which had been well received by the public and by the members of the Philharmonic who had given him 'a great ovation after the public had left.' He continued:

Your obedient servant is already in his fiftieth year,
and time for composition is very precious. In order
to fulfil the task in front of him, to gain time and

187 See *HSABB* 1, 150 for this letter, dated Vienna, 27 December 1873; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

188 See *HSABB* 1, 151 for the reply (signed by Moritz Ritter von Eigner, the party leader), dated Linz, 10 January 1874; see also *G-A* III/1, 564ff. and *G-A* IV/1, 287. Alois Bahr was a member of the Liberal party and a keen supporter of the *Liedertafel Frohsinn*.

leisure for musical composition and be able to remain in his dear native Austria, the undersigned takes the liberty of making his humble petition for the establishment of a regular teaching post, with accompanying salary and pension facility, in the Theory of Music, Harmony etc. at the University, if possible, and open to all students at colleges, grammar schools etc.

As the History of Music and Singing are taught at the University and a similar position was established recently at the University of Berlin for one colleague...and at Paris for another colleague, your obedient servant is confident that his petition to the highest state authority in his home country will not be without success because he is convinced that this highest authority which is headed by such a distinguished friend and connoisseur of art as Your Excellency [Stremayr] is a great supporter of art as well as of science.

Because the objection that this is not a University subject has been dealt with elsewhere and, furthermore, it should be taught at all Universities, because those students taking the subject would almost certainly be the most serious and the most industrious (and there would be no need to fear that they would neglect their principal subject), because many very talented people are encouraged in this manner and are steered away from useless and harmful entertainments, and because the majority of students normally do not have either the means or the time to attend the Conservatory, your obedient servant believes that he will not be knocking at the door of the Imperial Ministry in vain.¹⁸⁹

Bruckner's letter was forwarded to the Faculty of Philosophy at

189 See *HSABB* 1, 152-53 for this letter, dated Vienna, 18 April 1874; the original is in the Vienna University Library. See also Robert Lach, *Die Bruckner-Akten des Wiener Universitäts-Archives* (Vienna: Strache, 1926) for a thorough account of Bruckner's relationship with the University, including the relevant documentation. There is also a concise discussion of Bruckner's applications for a lectureship in Ernst Schwanzara, *Anton Bruckner. Vorlesungen über Harmonielehre und Kontrapunkt an der Universität Wien* (Vienna: Österr. Bundesverlag, 1950), 40-47.

the University on 21 April. Dr. Edward Sueß, the Dean of the Faculty, then gave it to Hanslick for his comments which he made to the Faculty on 4 May. Hanslick recalled a similar request for the establishment of a Harmony and Counterpoint teaching post at the University made in the early 1860s and the decision reached by the Faculty then that the University was not the place for such a post, particularly as Vienna was well supplied with music schools in which the subject could more fittingly be taught. It had been agreed in 1862 that Rudolf Weinwurm, the conductor of the *Akademischer Gesangverein*, could give singing lessons and provide enough basic theoretical instruction as was necessary for his students.¹⁹⁰ In Hanslick's opinion there was nothing in Bruckner's request to warrant a change in the earlier decision. But there was a 'sting in the tail' of Hanslick's submission to the Faculty:

Bruckner's personality provides even less justification for the establishment of such a subject, as his conspicuous lack of any intellectual background would appear to render him not in the least suitable for a University. I need touch on this point no further than to request the Faculty to observe the peculiar drafting of Bruckner's request...

Hanslick ended his submission by recommending that Bruckner's request be declined. Almost a week later Bruckner wrote directly to the Faculty of Philosophy. His opening statement that he had not pursued University studies himself, did not possess a doctorate and was not seeking a professorship but a teaching position in Musical Theory at the University suggests that he had some

¹⁹⁰ See Schwanzara, *op.cit.*, 36-39.

knowledge of the main drift of Hanslick's submission. He continued by stressing the point that there was an obvious need for such a position at the University. Many University students who did not have the opportunity at school to learn theory (only singing was an obligatory subject) and did not have the time to attend the Conservatory would welcome the opportunity of attending classes and, furthermore, it would be a very useful preparation for the study of the History of Music!¹⁹¹ Sueß, the Dean of the Faculty, passed the letter on to Hanslick whose conclusion was that there was nothing in it to make him alter his earlier recommendation.¹⁹²

Following Stremayr's advice that he strengthen his case by submitting certificates and examples of his own works to the Faculty, Bruckner wrote again on 15 July, enclosing scores of his F minor Mass, Symphony no. 2 and the first and second movements of his Symphony no. 4. He was unable to include the score of Symphony no. 3 because it had been sent to the Philharmonic for rehearsal purposes. He described the University as his 'last resort'; as the result of a change in the curriculum at St. Anna's, piano was no longer an obligatory subject and Rudolf Weinwurm had been appointed to oversee the music teaching there. 'As fencing and singing are taught [at the University],' he concluded, 'all the more reason for not rejecting my subject which aids the understanding of music history and, moreover, is of practical use.'¹⁹³

191 See *HSABB* 1, 154 for Bruckner's letter to the College of Professors of the Faculty of Philosophy, dated Vienna, 10 May 1874; the original is in the Vienna University Library. Hanslick's submission is dated 4 May; see *G-A* IV/1, 292ff.

192 Hanslick's verdict is dated 15 May 1874; see *G-A* IV/1, 298.

193 See *HSABB* 1, 157 for this letter to the Faculty of Philosophy, dated

At a meeting of the Faculty on 31 October Bruckner's request was formally declined (13 for, 21 against). Hanslick's opposition is understandable to a certain extent. It was not simply a case of spiteful antagonism because Bruckner happened to mention the encouragement of Liszt and Wagner - like a red rag to a bull? - in one of his letters of application. He felt strongly that Music Theory / Harmony was not a University subject. Bruckner for his part did not help his case by drawing undue attention to his material needs and by resorting occasionally to undiplomatic turns of phrase such as the suggestion that the University was his '>last resort' as a source of income. What about his Conservatory earnings and the income from his private pupils? But Hanslick did use one unfortunate underhand tactic in his attempt to block Bruckner. He tried to drive a wedge between him and his old friend Rudolf Weinwurm. Weinwurm told Halatschka, a member of the *Akademischer Gesangverein*, that Hanslick had approached him with the suggestion that it would be to his benefit if he used his influence to dissuade Bruckner. Weinwurm's reply was that he would have nothing to do with it.¹⁹⁴ In a later letter to Dr. Adolf Weiß, Weinwurm provided further details:

It was in 1875 [sic] that Hanslick asked me to visit him one day. He greeted me with the words: '>Bruckner is doing his utmost to get himself appointed as a music teacher at the University. He already has the Minister on his side, and he is putting pressure on all the professors and Senate members and tormenting the life out of them. As you have worked at the University for such a long

Vienna, 15 July 1874; the original is in the Vienna University Library.

194 See G-A IV/1, 313-14.

time, the only way of holding him back is for you to make an application to teach the subjects in question.' I took my leave of him with a bow but without saying a word. Of course I did not apply. There was no question of my being party to such deviousness or even of allowing myself to be used against another artist in this way...¹⁹⁵

In the midst of all this intrigue Bruckner attempted unsuccessfully to persuade the Conservatory authorities that Fugue was too difficult a discipline to learn in the first year of a Counterpoint course and that the course should be changed accordingly.¹⁹⁶

Bruckner also tried to solicit help and support outside Austria and, recalling his successful visits to Nancy and Paris in 1869 and London in 1871, wrote to Baron Schwarz von Senborn:

... In order to obtain time to compose it is necessary to find a patron. Lord Dudley would perhaps not be averse to supporting art. The applicant would naturally place himself and his works at his [Lord Dudley's] disposal in return for a guaranteed fixed annual income.

The applicant would also be happy with a position provided that the inability to speak English and French was not a hindrance. If Lord Dudley cannot be persuaded, perhaps there is someone else in England or America. But it would have to be officially guaranteed and for life even if the support proved to be very small...¹⁹⁷

195 Letter dated Prague, 27 January 1883; quoted by J. Friebe, *Rudolf Weinwurm* (unpublished typewritten thesis, Vienna, 1960).

196 See *HSABB* 1, 155 for Bruckner's letter to the Conservatory, dated Vienna, 28 May 1874; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library.

197 See *HSABB* 1, 155 for this letter, dated Vienna, 22 June 1874; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library. Wilhelm Freiherr Schwarz von

Although Bruckner's position at the *Hofkapelle* was secure, it was unpaid apart from the occasional disbursements made at the court's discretion. On 28 June, however, he was informed by Herbeck that he was next in line for a paid organist's post.¹⁹⁸ This did not materialize for some time and, not surprisingly, his letter to Schwarz von Senborn did not produce any tangible results. A letter from Bayreuth, however, must have brought him considerable pleasure. Cosima Wagner, writing on behalf of her husband, acknowledged receipt of the dedication score of Symphony no. 3 which Bruckner sent to Wagner in May. Cosima said that Wagner had gone through the score with Hans Richter and was delighted with both the symphony and its dedication. As a gesture of thanks, he invited Bruckner to the projected performances of *The Ring* in Bayreuth in 1876 when he hoped to have an opportunity of spending a few moments with him.¹⁹⁹

Bruckner spent a large part of the summer vacation in St.

Senborn (1816-1903), the Austrian government's chief representative at the second London World Exhibition in 1862, was in charge of the Vienna World Exhibition in 1873, and was the Austrian ambassador in Washington from September 1874 to the beginning of 1875.

198 See *G/A IV/1*, 316-17, *ABDS* 1, 66 and *HSABB* 1, 156-57. Herbeck was instrumental in introducing some necessary changes to the '>promotion system' in the *Hofkapelle*; see *ABDS*, 64-65 for further details.

199 See *HSABB* 1, 156 for this letter from Cosima Wagner, dated Bayreuth, 24 June 1874; the original is in St. Florian. We do not know exactly when Bruckner sent this score, as its accompanying letter is not extant. The dedication page was engraved by Josef Maria Kaiser, an engraver and sign writer who taught at the Linz *Staatsgymnasium*, and Bruckner wrote to him on 14 February 1874 to give precise instructions as to the layout of the dedication. His own name was to be engraved simply but Richard Wagner's name was to be engraved '>with grandeur (but without detracting from the noble simplicity' of the whole. See *HSABB* 1, 151-52 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*. Bruckner drafted the dedication in the *Krippen-Kalender für das Jahr 1872*. See *MVP* 1, 23 and *MVP* 2, 17.

Florian and used some of the time to complete the sketch of the Finale of his Symphony no. 4. He also paid a short visit to his sister Rosalia and her family in Vöcklabruck and attended a rehearsal of the *Liedertafel* whose president, Dr. Alois Scherer, was a friend of his.

The change of teaching arrangements at St. Anna's resulted in a substantial loss of income, 1000 shillings per annum, for Bruckner. He communicated his concern to Bishop Rudigier in Linz who replied immediately to sympathise with the composer. Bruckner's former employer also took the opportunity to recall his achievements as a cathedral organist in Linz, and expressed the hope that the Minister for Education would be in a position to help.²⁰⁰

During a year in which his attempts to gain 'more time and leisure' to compose received further setbacks, Bruckner nevertheless worked on another symphony, the Symphony no. 4 in E flat major WAB 104, and wrote a small occasional piece, the motto *Freier Sinn und froher Mut* WAB 147, for the Grein *Liedertafel*.²⁰¹

Bruckner completed the original version of his Symphony no. 4 in 11 months. The sketch of the first movement was begun on 2 January 1874 and the complete score was finished on 22 November.²⁰² The symphony was substantially altered in

200 See *HSABB* 1, 158 for Rudigier's letter, dated Linz, 7 October 1874; there is a copy (not the original) in St. Florian. Bruckner's letter of 6 October is not extant.

201 This piece is dated Vienna, 21 March 1874 and was first published in Linz in 1905 as one of a collection of *Wahl- und Sängersprüche* sung by *Frohsinn*. For further information, see the *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 10 (December 1976), 9. There is a modern edition in *ABSW* XXIII/2, 108.

202 The autograph of the first version is in the *ÖNB* (Mus.Hs. 6082). It was

subsequent years, the most significant changes being a new Scherzo which was added in 1878, a second Finale, entitled *Volksfest*, written in August and September 1878,²⁰³ and a third Finale (1879/1880).²⁰⁴ Further changes were made after the first performance in 1881; others were introduced, not all by Bruckner, prior to the publication of the first edition of the symphony by Gutmann in Vienna in September 1889 and again early in 1890 to correct printing errors that had crept into the 1889 edition.²⁰⁵ The chequered history of the work is paralleled only by that of Symphony no. 3. The original versions of both symphonies are considerably longer than subsequent versions. This is particularly true of the outer movements which underwent much structural tautening, with smooth transitions taking the place of

published for the first time, ed. Leopold Nowak, as *IV. Symphonie Es-Dur, 1. Fassung 1874*, ABSW IV/1 (Vienna, 1975) and first performed in the *Brucknerhaus*, Linz on 20 September 1975 by the Munich Philharmonic conducted by Kurt Wöss. It is discussed in *G-A IV/1*, 321-53 and in the foreword to ABSW IV/1. See also footnote 203 below.

203 Mus.Hs. 3177 in the *ÖNB*, originally published by Haas in the appendix to the earlier Complete Edition IV (Vienna, 1936) and reissued, with some small corrections, ed. Nowak, as an Appendix to ABSW IV/2 (Vienna, 1981).

204 The autograph of the first three movements of the second version and the third Finale - Mus. Hs. 19.476 in the *ÖNB* - was published, ed. Nowak, as *IV. Symphonie Es-Dur, 2. Fassung 1878 mit Finale 1880*, ABSW IV/2 (Vienna, 1953). The first performance of the symphony in this form was given by the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra under Hans Richter in Vienna on 20 February 1881.

205 This '>version' was first performed by the VPO under Richter in Vienna on 22 January 1888. The score was reissued in 1895 and was later published by Universal Edition and Eulenburg (E.E. 3636, including H.F. Redlich's edition of 1954). The principal source for *IV. Symphonie Es-Dur. Fassung von 1888 (Stichvorlage für den Erstdruck von 1889)*, ed Benjamin Korstvedt (ABSW IV/3, Vienna, 2004) is the engraver's copy (*Stichvorlage*) for the 1889 edition which was presumed lost until it came to light again in 1939 after Haas had published his edition of the symphony in the *Gesamtausgabe*. It is a manuscript score 'initially prepared by copyists [almost certainly Ferdinand Löwe and Josef and Franz Schalk] that contains numerous subsequent revisions and emendations made by Bruckner himself.' (foreword to ABSW IV/3, xix).

abrupt pauses and caesuras, and textural '>thinning' in which over-elaborate inner parts and florid violin figuration were avoided. These 'improvements' are more convincing in the Fourth Symphony than in the Third where some of the grandeur of the original is undoubtedly lost. Bruckner himself sub-titled the symphony '>The Romantic' in its original version but there was no programmatic '>spelling out' of the term until later.²⁰⁶

At the beginning of 1875 Bruckner was in a state of deep depression. He could see no way out of his difficult financial

206 For further information, see the forewords to *ABSW* IV/1, IV/2, IV/2 Appendix, IV/3 (2004), and H.F. Redlich's Eulenburg edition. See also Leopold Nowak, '>Anton Bruckner, der Romantiker', in *Mitteilungsblatt der IBG* 8 (1975), 2-10, repr. in *Über Anton Bruckner* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1985), 153-59; Theodor Wünschmann, '>Zur Partitur der 4. Symphonie Anton Bruckners in der Fassung von 1874' (Vaduz, 1979); Leopold Nowak, '>Das Finale von 1878 zur IV. Symphonie von Anton Bruckner', in *Mitteilungsblatt der IBG* 18 (1980), 27ff., repr. in *Über Anton Bruckner* (Vienna, 1985), 225-26.; Constantin Floros, '>Das Programm der Romantischen@ Symphonie', *Brahms und Bruckner. Studien zur musikalischen Exegetik* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1980), 171-81; Manfred Wagner, '>Zu den Fassungen von Bruckners Vierter Sinfonie in Es (Romantische)' in *Der Wandel des Konzepts. Zu den verschiedenen Fassungen von Bruckners Dritter, Vierter und Achter Sinfonie* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1980), 21-38; Cornelis van Zwol, '>Bruckners Vierte Symphonie: nicht nur eine ARomantische@', in *BSL 1980. Die Fassungen* (Linz, 1981), 25-38; Leopold Nowak, '>Die drei Final-Sätze zur IV. Symphonie von Anton Bruckner', in *ÖMZ* 36 (Vienna, 1981), 2-11, repr. in *Über Anton Bruckner* (Vienna, 1985), 233-42; Thomas Röder, '>Motto und symphonischer Zyklus. Zu den Fassungen von Anton Bruckners Vierter Symphonie', in *Archiv f. Musikwissenschaft* xlii (1985), 166-77; Rudolf Stephan, '>Bruckners Romantische Sinfonie', in C-H Mahling, ed., *Anton Bruckner. Studien zu Werk und Wirkung* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1988), 171-87; Benjamin M. Korstvedt, *The First Printed Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception* (doctoral thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1995); idem, '>The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity', in *19th-Century Music* xx/1 (Summer 1996), 3-26; Bo Marschner, '>Schema und Individualität in der Formbildung Bruckners anhand seiner Reprisenkonzeption an der Vierten Symphonie', in *BSL 1996* (Linz, 1998), 17-24; Edward Laufer, '>Continuity in the Fourth Symphony (first movement)', in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 114-44; Robert S. Hatten, '>The expressive role of disjunction: A semiotic approach to form and meaning in the Fourth and Fifth Symphonies' in *ibid.*, 145-84; *Gault NB*, 54-60, 92-103, 128-32; *CarraganRB*, 95-124.

situation and, although positive things were being said about his Third Symphony which he had offered to the Vienna Philharmonic for rehearsal in the autumn of 1874, there was no immediate prospect of a performance. Bruckner was in downcast mood when he wrote to Moritz von Mayfeld:

My 4th Symphony is finished. I have also made significant improvements to the Wagner Symphony (D minor). Hans Richter, the Wagner conductor, was in Vienna and let it be known in several circles how glowingly Wagner speaks about it. It is not going to be performed. Dessoff held some rehearsals in the holidays and raised my hopes but later announced (breaking the promise he made me at the beginning of October) that the programme was full.

... Brahms appears to have blocked my Symphony no. 2 in C minor in Leipzig. Richter is reported to have said that he would like to perform the D minor Symphony in Pest. What Hanslick has done to me can be read in the old >'Presse' of 25 December.

Even Herbeck suggested that I should see whether I could get any help from Wagner. Now I have only the Conservatory and it is impossible for me to live on my income from there. Last September and again later I had to withdraw some money (700 shillings) so that I did not go hungry.

No one is coming to my assistance. Stremayr makes promises - and does nothing. Fortunately, a few foreigners have come to have lessons from me - otherwise I would have to beg.

Now listen! I asked all the principal piano teachers to pass over some teaching to me. Each one promised to do so but I got nothing apart from a few hours of theory. You can see, Sir, how serious the matter is. I would gladly go abroad if only I could obtain a position which would provide me with a good living. Where should I turn? Under no circumstances would I have allowed myself to be brought to Vienna had I suspected this. It would be an easy matter for my enemies to push me out of the Conservatory. It surprises me that this has not happened yet. The Conservatory students and even the domestic staff are shocked at how I am being treated. My life has lost all joy and motivation - for

no reason. How gladly I would return to my old posts! When I think of the time I spent in England! This is how things stand... *What should I do?*²⁰⁷

A month later, Bruckner wrote again to Mayfeld who had replied to his first letter. In the meantime, he had spoken at the court to Salzmänn-Bienenfeld, hoping that a position might be vacant. But nothing had moved since Herbeck had written to him the previous June:

I have just returned from speaking with Councillor Salzmänn after so many requests and delays. Although Herbeck had told me what the outcome would be a long time ago, I went ahead in compliance with your wish. Salzmänn recited the old formula - as soon as something was free, he would draw Herbeck's attention to me. In any case I already broached the matter with Herbeck a year ago. The post has been designated by Hohenlohe for Riedel [sic] for four years now.

I think I could have written a symphony in the time that I have used up in such an unprofitable way pursuing this matter. There were only two paths open to me - organ playing in England or musical director of a theatre in Austria. I did not understand what either entailed and I have never been sufficiently informed to pursue one of the two paths. Linz at least would have offered an opportunity so far as the latter is concerned.

I cannot ask Wagner for anything as I do not want to lose his goodwill.

207 See *HSABB* 1, 159-60 for this letter, dated Vienna, 12 January 1875; the original is in the *Archiv der Stadt Linz*, Linz. Earlier in the letter Bruckner refers to an unsigned report of the Faculty meeting held on 31 October 1874 - entitled '>Der Generalbass im philosophischen Professoren-Collegium' - which appeared in the *Presse* and was sympathetic to Bruckner; see *G-A IV/1*, 302-05 for a copy of this report. Bruckner also mentioned his difficult financial situation in a letter to Julius Gartner, a Linz teacher and member of *Frohsinn*. See *HSABB* 1, 159 for this letter, dated Vienna, 31 December 1874. The original is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesbibliothek*, Linz.

And so only Liszt and Dönhoff[f] remain. I would like to throw the latter into the fire. Shouldn't the nobility be ashamed of themselves? So far as Wiesbaden is concerned, I have made enquiries through a pupil from Frankfurt; but no answer yet. I have asked Richter about Pest, but he told me there was no money available.

My deepest gratitude for showing such interest and expending so much effort on my behalf!

It is all too late. To run up debts diligently and then to enjoy the fruits of my diligence and lament the stupidity of my move to Vienna in a debtors' prison - that could be my ultimate fate. I have lost 1000 shillings in annual income and, as yet, there has been nothing to compensate for it, not even a grant. I am not able to have my Fourth Symphony copied.

If only I had my Linz lessons here. How gladly I would give piano lessons. If I had remained in Linz, I would certainly have been appointed to Zappe's position as well as a teaching post at the Teacher Training Institute...²⁰⁸

It was during this state of depression, however, that Bruckner began work on his Symphony no. 5 in B flat, WAB 105, commencing with the Adagio movement on 14 February. Wagner's visit to Vienna at the end of February and beginning of March must have helped to lift Bruckner's depression. He was invited to attend a soiree during which Wagner sang through the third act of *Götterdämmerung* with Rubinstein at the piano. Wagner is said to have given Bruckner a particularly warm welcome, referring to him as Beethoven's true successor as a

208 See *HSABB* 1, 160-61 for this letter, dated Vienna, 13 February 1875. The original is in the *ÖNB*. Rudolph von Salzmänn-Bienenfeld was an official in the court chancellery. Countess Marie Dönhoff (1848-1929) was the wife of Karl Dönhoff, the secretary of the German embassy in Vienna. Karl Zappe died in 1871. He was succeeded as music director of Linz Cathedral by his son Karl Zappe jr. (1837-1890). When mentioning Riedel, Bruckner no doubt meant Hans Richter.

symphonist.²⁰⁹ There was an improvement in Bruckner's financial situation during the year. Rudolf Bibl's promotion to a salaried court organist's post left his former position as assistant librarian of the court chapel and singing teacher of the choirboys vacant. On 16 June Herbeck informed Bruckner that he had secured Bibl's former position and would receive an annual honorarium of 300 shillings, commencing 1 July.²¹⁰ Bruckner remained in this position until January 1878 when he was appointed a permanent member of the *Hofkapelle*. Of the several anecdotes about his kindly and not particularly strict attitude towards the choirboys under his charge, the following is typical:

My father came from Salzburg to Vienna in 1874 and was also a soloist in the Vienna choirboys. Every Sunday the children were brought from the Piarist school to the *Hofkapelle* in the imperial court coach. Whenever Bruckner, for whom my father, Max Keldorfer - himself an outstanding organist and composer - had the greatest respect, rehearsed one of his Masses with the boys and then performed it, he always had a gift ready for the boys when the time came for the return journey in the coach - a huge cake from Demel's. It happened once that the boys made some mistakes during the performance and went to the coach shamefacedly. The cake was there as always but Bruckner threw open the door defiantly and said, 'So, rascals, you don't sing correctly but you eat my cakes!'²¹¹

209 See G-A IV/1, 358-59.

210 See *ABDS* 1, 68-71 for Herbeck's correspondence with the Chancellery, 31 May and 10 June, and 71-72 for Herbeck's letter to Bruckner.

211 Grete Pietschmann (née Keldorfer) - reminiscence recorded by Austrian Radio as part of a special project in 1977.

Bruckner made another attempt to secure a lectureship at the University. He was encouraged to do so by August Göllerich sen., a member of parliament and a friend of both Stremayr, the Minister of Education, and Nikolaus Dumba, the president of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*. Bruckner's letter to the Ministry of Culture and Education, written in July, was more cogent and precise than his earlier applications and there may have been, as Maier suggests, 'a helping hand involved.'²¹²

As it is of particular importance to me that the subjects of Harmony and Counterpoint are represented in our Universities just as they are in foreign Universities and as I have endeavoured for some years to bring this about, I take the liberty of making this humble request to the Ministry: that in view of the fact that the importance of these aforementioned subjects for education in general and musical education in particular - considering that they constitute almost the most vital elements without which all artistic understanding of and deep involvement in music are impossible - is not to be undervalued, a lectureship in Harmony and Counterpoint be established in the Faculty of Philosophy of this University, and I be appointed on the basis of my acknowledged expertise in these two subjects. If such a lectureship were to be established, those less well-off students who possess great talent but are not able to attend the Conservatory of Music would have the opportunity of receiving a complete musical education - which must be the purpose of a University.²¹³

212 Elisabeth Maier, loc. cit., *ABDS* 2, 196.

213 See *HSABB* 1, 162 for this letter, dated Vienna, 12 July 1875; the original is in the Vienna University Library.

In October this application was forwarded to the Faculty for the consideration of its members. They were asked if '>lectures in Harmony and Counterpoint as a partial supplementation of Professor Hanslick's lectures in theory' could be recommended, and if '>there was any objection to Bruckner's appointment as a lecturer in these subjects.'²¹⁴ Hanslick was now under pressure to state categorically that '>there was no objection to the appointment of Herr Bruckner as unpaid teacher of Harmony and Counterpoint at the University of Vienna' and to bring this recommendation to the meeting of the Faculty on 29 October. On 18 November Bruckner was informed officially of the appointment by Dr. Schneider, the Dean of the Faculty.²¹⁵ A week later he had already drafted the text of his inaugural lecture although it was apparently not delivered until 24 April 1876.²¹⁶

At the beginning of June Bruckner wrote, in response to a letter from his former teacher, Otto Kitzler, that he was working on his Fifth Symphony. He added:

Wagner has declared that my D minor Symphony is a very important work. He invited me and Countess Dönhoff to supper and gave me a remarkable welcome. Liszt likewise.
... Could you not perform my C minor Symphony

214 See *G-A IV/1*, 365-66.

215 See *G-A IV/1*, 366ff.

216 Theophil Antonicek suggests that Bruckner may have given some lectures during the winter semester of 1875. See Antonicek, '>Bruckners Universitätsschüler in den Nationalien der Philosophischen Fakultät', in Othmar Wessely, ed., *Bruckner-Studien* (Vienna, 1975), 442.

[no. 2] sometime? ²¹⁷

Bruckner spent his summer vacation in Steyr and St. Florian.²¹⁸ On Thursday 26 August and Friday 27 August respectively he gave organ recitals in Steyr Parish Church and Linz Parish Church and, the following day (St. Augustine's day), played the organ as usual at St. Florian. Just before leaving Vienna at the beginning of August he made a further request to the Vienna Philharmonic committee that his D minor symphony be included in the 1875/76 season. No doubt wishing to add weight to his request, he mentioned its dedication to Wagner and the fact that both Wagner and Liszt considered it to be among the most important contemporary works. Bruckner was even prepared for the symphony to be performed piecemeal (half in one concert, half in another).²¹⁹ Although a few players disagreed with the official verdict and Hans Richter, now at the helm of the orchestra, was well disposed towards him, his request was turned down. Bruckner noted the rejection later in one of his diaries, the *Neuer Krakauer Schreibkalender* for 1877 - >'2te Ablehnung durch die Philharmoniker im Herbst 1875 (Sinfonie Nr. 3).²²⁰

217 See *HSABB* 1, 161 for this letter, dated Vienna, 1 June 1875; the original is privately owned. It was printed for the first time in *Deutsches Volksblatt*, 25 October 1899.

218 He applied as usual to the Lord Chamberlain's department for official permission to be excused *Hofkapelle* duties. See *ABDS* 1, 73-74. Bruckner directed a performance of his D minor Mass (together with *Christus factus est* [probably WAB 10] and *Ave Maria* [WAB 6]) in the *Hofkapelle* on Sunday 18 July. There was a review of this performance by Eduard Schelle in the *Presse* on 31 July.

219 See *HSABB* 1, 163 for this letter, dated Vienna, 1 August 1875; the original is in the archives of the Vienna Philharmonic.

220 See *HSABB* 1, 164 for the draft of a letter, dated 3 October 1875, which Hans Richter planned to send to Bruckner to thank him for his intended

Bruckner returned to St. Florian in October. Several alterations were made to the main organ between 1873 and 1875, and Bruckner was invited to attend the dedication ceremony, no doubt because of his connections with the abbey and because he had an advisory role in the alterations which were carried out by Josef Mauracher.²²¹ He practised on the new organ at the abbey on Sunday 17 October, and both he and Josef Seiberl performed at the official ceremony which took place on Abbot Ferdinand Moser's name-day, 19 October. There was a glowing report of both Bruckner's and Seiberl's playing in the *Linzer Volksblatt*.²²²

As well as sketching a good part of Symphony no. 5 during the year, Bruckner began to write a *Requiem in D minor* WAB 141. The 18-bar sketch on three staves, dated 'Vienna, 18 September 1875', is probably the beginning of the instrumental opening of the *Introitus*. There is no external evidence to suggest that Bruckner was intending the work for a particular occasion,

dedication of the Symphony no. 2 to the Philharmonic. This draft is in the Vienna Philharmonic archives. There is no indication that a fair copy was ever sent to Bruckner.

221 Bruckner had a high opinion of Mauracher and had already played an advisory role in the installation of another new organ by this organ builder in the St. Stephen's parish church in Tulln between October 1872 and January 1873. He received a silver snuff box from the town council and sent a letter of thanks on 8 October 1873. See *HSABB* 1, 144-45 for this letter, the original of which can be found in the Tulln Heimatmuseum. See also Karl Schnürl, 'Ein "schwaches Zeichen dieser Dankes". Die Akten zur Widmung einer Tabakdose an Anton Bruckner im Tullner Stadtarchiv', in *BJ 2001-2005* (Vienna, 2006), 277-82, for information about the deliberations that resulted in Bruckner eventually being sent this snuff box!

222 See *G-A II/1*, 253-57 for the specification of the organ and 258-59 for the report. Mendelssohn's *Lobgesang* was performed. Bruckner played a Bach Toccata and Fugue and an improvisation on Handel's *Hallelujah Chorus*. Ferdinand Moser (1827-1901) became the new abbot of St. Florian on 27 November 1872.

and no other sketches are extant.²²³

1876 is often called Bruckner's '>'year of revisions'. This does not imply that other years were not characterized by intensive amendment to his first, second, even his third thoughts, but the zeal with which Bruckner applied himself to metrical studies of Beethoven's Third and Ninth Symphonies and Mozart's *Requiem* and '>'rhythmical regulation' of some of his own works, including the D minor, E minor and F minor Masses and the Third and Fourth Symphonies, testifies to unusual activity in this area during 1876 and the year following..²²⁴

Bruckner exercised a similar type of scrupulousness in religious matters. A letter which he wrote to the Archbishop of Vienna in February 1876 provides one of the clearest illustrations of this. We know from entries in many pages of his diaries that he prayed regularly. It was a discipline which he maintained throughout his life, mainly in private but occasionally in public as some trustworthy anecdotes reveal. The diary entries in the *Akademischer Kalender der Österreichischen Hochschulen* (1879, 1880 and 1882), the *Neuer Krakauer Schreib-Kalender für das Jahr 1883*, *Fromme's Österreichischer Hochschulkalender*

223 The autograph of the sketch is in the ÖNB (Mus. Hs. 2105); see Robert Haas, *Anton Bruckner* (Potsdam, 1934), 59 for facsimile and G-A IV/1, 361-62 for realization.

224 There are indications of his metrical study of the two Beethoven symphonies and Mozart's *Requiem*, as well as a detailed study of the periodic structure of the Fourth Symphony in two of Bruckner's diaries which he used as workbooks or notebooks, namely the *Oesterreichischer Volks- und Wirtschaftskalender für das Schaltjahr 1876* and the *Neuer Krakauer Schreibkalender für das Jahr 1877*, both of which are in the ÖNB (Mus.Hs. 3181 and 3182/1). Bruckner's annotated scores of the '>'Eroica' and the Ninth can be found in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library. See MVP 1, 24-29, 51-52 and 55-57 and corresponding pages in MVP 2, viz. 31-35, 57-58 and 62-63.

für Professoren und Studierende für das Studienjahr 1885/86, *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender* (1886/87 - 1890/91, 1893-94 and 1894/95), and an undated notebook (with prayer entries from 1887), the majority of which are located in the Austrian National Library, include lists of daily prayers from 25 September 1880 until 10 October 1896.²²⁵ The only days for which there are no entries are those in which Bruckner was elsewhere - on holiday or travelling - or handicapped by illness. The *Reise-Notizbüchlein 1876-1889*, however, contains several prayer lists compiled by Bruckner when he was away from Vienna on short periods, for instance early April 1886 when he travelled to Munich for a performance of the *Te Deum* conducted by Hermann Levi. The normal 'shorthand' symbols used are the capital letters R, V, A, S, G and the sign I with horizontal lines below the capital letters.²²⁶ Although Bruckner's deeply religious nature was conditioned to some extent by his education and early surroundings, this was not the main reason for his lifelong devoutness. It was essentially something inborn which informed both his sacred works and his symphonies. There was no other 19th-century composer 'for whom prayer, confession, the sacraments and the creed were essentials of life to such a great extent.'²²⁷ In his letter to the Archbishop he made it clear that, as a devout Catholic, he wished to observe fast

225 The shelf nos. are S.m. 3178a, 3178b, 3179, 3182 and 3183.

226 For further information, see Franz Kosch, 'Der Beter Anton Bruckner', in *Bruckner-Studien* (Vienna, 1964), 67-73; Leopold M. Kantner, 'Die Frömmigkeit Anton Bruckners', in *ABDS* 2 (Vienna, 1980), 229-69; and Erich W. Partsch, 'Der Musikant Gottes - Zur Analyse eines Stereotyps', in *ABDS* 8 (Vienna, 1991), 235-55. For information of a more anecdotal nature, see *ABDS* 8, 59-68. These prayer entries can be studied in *MVP* 1 and 2.

227 Friedrich Blume, 'Anton Bruckner', in *MGG* 2 (1952), col. 359.

days but was not always able to avoid eating meat because he had most of his meals in inns and restaurants where a fish dish was not always available. He requested dispensation or excusal from the observance of fast days other than Christmas Day, Good Friday and one of the three Ember days. The dispensation was granted by the Archbishop, as was its renewal in 1884, 1885 and 1887. Pope Leo XIII earmarked 1886 as a year of spiritual renewal for the Catholic church and Bruckner's prayer entries for 25 September - 21 December 1886 in the *Akademischer Kalender der Österreichischen Hochschulen für das Studienjahr 1879* reveal how conscientiously he kept fast days, maintained a strict diet and regularly attended two or three churches in the inner-city area during this period.²²⁸

On 20 February 1876 Bruckner conducted a performance of his Symphony no. 2 as part of the Vienna Philharmonic's third *Gesellschaft* concert.²²⁹ Between the earlier first performance in October 1873 and this performance Bruckner followed Herbeck's advice, albeit with some reluctance, and made some changes which particularly involved shortening the work in places.²³⁰ In spite of a less than perfect performance and, according to Herbeck's son, Bruckner's inadequate conducting, the symphony

228 See *HSABB* 1, 165 for Bruckner's letter to the Archbishop (Johann Rudolf Kutschker), dated Vienna, 23 February 1876. The original is in the *ÖNB*. There is a facsimile of this letter between pages 424 and 425 in *G-A IV/1*. See also *MVP* 1, 126-35 and 2, 119-23.

229 Johann Herbeck conducted the other items in the concert, including Beethoven's Triple Concerto in which Josef Hellmesberger, Friedrich Grützmaker and Julius Epstein were the violin, cello and piano soloists.

230 See William Carragan, 'foreword to >Version of 1877' (Vienna, 2007) and *CarraganRB*, 52-64 for details of changes, particularly in the Finale.

was applauded after each movement and at the end.²³¹ Hanslick's review in the *Neue Freie Presse* drew attention more to the rivalry between different factions in the audience than to the quality of the work itself:

Each movement was applauded without opposition; at the end, however, when an enthusiastic faction in the hall carried its clapping and shouting to an excess and kept starting up again, the other part of the audience protested loudly and hissed repeatedly.²³²

In April Bruckner finally had the satisfaction of giving his inaugural lecture at Vienna University. He stressed the importance of Harmony and Counterpoint as academic subjects:

As you will know from various sources there have been colossal developments in music in the last two centuries. Its internal organization has been expanded and perfected to such an extent that today, as we cast a glance over this rich material, we stand in front of an already complete artistic edifice in which we can recognize both a clear structural regularity and a correspondence between its constituent parts and the whole. We see how the one grows out of the other, one cannot exist without the other, and yet each is self-sufficient. Just as each branch of science is responsible for arranging and sifting through its material by imposing rules

231 Ludwig Herbeck, op.cit., 398.

232 From Hanslick's review in the *Neue Freie Presse* 4128 (22 February 1876); quoted in *G-A IV/1*, 392. There were also reviews by Franz Gehring in the *Deutsche Zeitung* (22 February 1876), Laurencin d'Armond in the *Illustriertes Musik- und Theater-Journal* 1 (1875/76), col. 691, Eduard Kremser in *Vaterland* (24 February 1876) and A.W. Ambros in the *Wiener Abendpost* (26 February 1876), as well as a reference to the performance in the French journal, *Revue et Gazette musicale* (12 March 1876).

and regulations, so the science of music - if I may take the liberty of describing it as such - has broken down its entire structure into atoms and has then grouped the elements together according to certain principles, thereby creating a discipline which can be called - to use another description - musical architecture. In this discipline the distinguished subjects of Harmony and Counterpoint form its foundation and its heart.

In view of what I have said, gentlemen, you will concede that a full understanding of what I have described as the musical architecture and of the foundation of this discipline is necessary for a proper appreciation and an exact assessment of a piece of music, first an evaluation of how and to what extent these rules are complied with, and then how the separate musical ideas serve to give life to the compositional process.

You may infer from this that the subjects >'Harmony' and >'Counterpoint' should find an essential place in intellectual life which has reached such an advanced stage of development; there they can be cultivated and taught as autonomous subjects and not with the exclusive aim of educating artists, because they belong - and rightly so - to the sustaining forces of our intellectual education. By means of them we are in the position of being able to give legitimate musical expression in an aesthetic manner to our thoughts and feelings.

The need to include these subjects in the curricula of universities in Germany, France, Russia etc. has already been recognized for several years, and this has emphasized, in the most eloquent manner possible, the importance of finding a place for them in intellectual life.

I would be going too far if I mentioned other factors which underline the importance of these subjects, but I believe I must draw attention to the fact that, through the knowledge of Harmony and Counterpoint, one can often arrive at the pleasant position of awakening public interest even with occasional compositions and, as a result, derive great benefit for oneself.

Having spoken about the importance and the

significance of Harmony and Counterpoint, I will now turn briefly to the way in which I believe these subjects should be treated here.

As a result of my many years of study, the experience I have gained as a professor of these subjects in the Conservatory here and my knowledge of the relevant literature, I have decided not to restrict myself to any one of the currently available textbooks in my lectures so that, in the short time available, I will be able to present a true and clear picture to you by drawing on the best basic principles from the wealth of material extant. In the lectures I will continually strive to make myself understood by presenting my material clearly and by making the elements of theory interesting with the help of lucid examples, bearing in mind Goethe's words,

'All theory is grey.
Only the golden tree of life is green.'

I shall minimise many difficulties through practical exercises, thereby intimately combining theory and practice and steering you safely through this realm of knowledge from one boundary to the other where I will then leave you at the threshold of life with all its struggles, my one request being that you make faithful use of what you have learned and remember me with goodwill.

Although I have gone to great pains to create a space for these subjects at the University, it is my duty to express my gratitude publicly to the staff of the Faculty of Philosophy and to the Ministry of Education and Culture for their support in enabling the idea which I have long cherished to come to fruition at last.

In conclusion, esteemed gentlemen, may I make this request to you: make your own powerful contribution with your young and fresh minds so that these subjects may be properly acknowledged in the future here and musical learning may grow, blossom, and prosper throughout the University. *Dixit.*²³³

²³³ There is some uncertainty as to the date of this lecture - possibly 24 April 1876, but see earlier, footnote 212. For the text, see *ABB*, 131-34 and *G-A IV/1*, 369-74.

Bruckner's University lectures took place on Mondays from 5 to 7 pm (later from 6 to 8 pm). The winter semester was devoted to Harmony and the summer semester to Counterpoint. From the outset they were well attended.²³⁴ In later years students often took the opportunity of appearing at the lectures and applauding him after a successful concert. Bruckner for his part seems to have relished his contact with the >'Herrn Gaudeamus' as he was fond of describing them. As he pointed out in his inaugural lecture, he did not have the time to teach the subjects as thoroughly as he did at the Conservatory and in his private lessons. Nevertheless, all those who recalled the lectures later were unanimous in agreeing that he had the ability to breathe life into potentially very dry material by way of an apt or, occasionally, very drastic illustration. He would also provide progress reports on his own compositions, sometimes playing extracts on the

There is a facsimile of a page from this handwritten speech between pp. 376 and 377 in G-A IV/1.

234 Although only a few enrolled officially each semester, it seems that several others attended regularly as observers. See Elisabeth Maier, 'Anton Bruckner und die Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften', in *Studien & Berichte* 69 (2007), pp.33-34. See also Andrea Singer, 'Bruckner-Hörer an der Juristischen Fakultät der Universität Wien', in IBG *Studien & Berichte* Mitteilungsblatt 89 (December 2017), 5-12 for information about DEMOS (Daten zur Erforschung der Musik in Österreich), which includes a research project headed by Christian K. Fastl: 'Studierende der Musikwissenschaft an der Universität Wien' that provides the names of those students (arranged in alphabetical order) in four faculties who attended Bruckner's lectures in the semesters 1876-1894 (Bruckner gave his final University lecture in December 1894). Information about the students in the Faculty of Philosophy who attended during this period is provided by Theophil Antonicek in his article 'Bruckners Universitätsschüler in den Nationalen der Philosophischen Fakultät. Mit einem Verzeichnis der Hörer von Vorlesungen über musikalische Gegenstände vom Sommersemester 1875 bis zur Wintersemester 1896/97', in Othmar Wessely (ed.), *Bruckner-Studien* (Vienna, 1975), 433-487. In Singer's article, the names of those students in the Faculty of Law who attended Bruckner's lectures, including the dates of their enrolment, can be found on pp. 7-12.

piano, and comment on recent performances of his works both at home and abroad. After his lectures he would invariably go to one of his favourite restaurants for an evening meal, accompanied by a few of his favourite students.

Bruckner made two further attempts to improve his financial circumstances and professional status during 1876. The position of assistant music director at the *Hofkapelle* had become vacant because of the retirement of Gottfried Preyer and Bruckner sent a letter of application to Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, the Lord Chamberlain, at the end of April, stressing in particular his knowledge of the church music repertoire and the favourable reception of his works by Wagner, Liszt, Herbeck and Hellmesberger.²³⁵ His application was unsuccessful. Joseph Hellmesberger was appointed to the position and Ludwig Rotter was also given the nominal title of 'assistant music director' in recognition of his 'excellent achievements in the realm of church music.'²³⁶ Three months later Bruckner wrote an extremely polite, almost obsequious, letter to Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, asking for his unpaid lectureship at the University to be 'upgraded' to an associate professorship with an annual income.²³⁷ Again Bruckner was unsuccessful, but in September he was granted a

235 See *HSABB* 1, 166 for this letter, dated Vienna, 29 April 1876; the original is in the court archives, Vienna.

236 See *ABDS* 1, 77 for Hohenlohe-Schillingfürst's recommendation (1 May 1876) and the Emperor's approval (3 May 1876). See earlier and footnote 17 for information about Joseph Hellmesberger (1828-1903).

237 See *HSABB* 1, 166-67 for this letter, dated Vienna, 26 July 1876; the incomplete original of this letter is in private possession in Vienna.

provisional sum of 200 shillings from the *Hofkapelle*.²³⁸

Despite these discouragements Bruckner would have derived a great amount of satisfaction from conducting the first Viennese performance of his choral piece *Germanenzug* on 3 July in an open-air concert given in the *Volksgarten* by the *Akademischer Gesangverein*.²³⁹ The choir's regular conductor, Richard Heuberger, directed the other works in the programme. Theodor Helm, the critic of the *Deutsche Zeitung*, provided a very objective review:

... The first half ended with the first performance [in Vienna] of Professor Bruckner's '>Germanenzug' conducted by the composer himself. The composition received loud applause and an encore was demanded and given.²⁴⁰

Bruckner was granted leave from his *Hofkapelle* duties from 15 August until 15 September. He travelled to Bayreuth, arriving there on 23 August if not earlier, and probably attended some of the rehearsals and certainly the third complete performance of Wagner's *Ring* (27-30 August). The second part of his vacation was spent at St. Florian and he returned to Vienna in mid-September to resume his *Hofkapelle* commitments. During his stay at Bayreuth Bruckner made the acquaintance of Wilhelm Tappert, a German music journalist, who evidently expressed great interest in his music and held out the prospect of a

238 See *ABDS* 1, 79-80 (26 September 1876).

239 The concert was advertised in two editions of the *Wiener Zeitung*, 2 June and 1 July 1876.

240 See *G-A* IV/1, 413.

performance of his Fourth Symphony in Berlin.²⁴¹ Shortly after returning to Vienna Bruckner wrote the first of several letters to Tappert apropos the symphony. The Bruckner-Tappert correspondence is a source of important and extremely interesting information about many details of the symphony. On 19 September he informed Tappert that a copy of the Fourth had just been completed and the parts were also ready. He hoped that Tappert would use his great influence to have the work performed >'in the residence of our great fatherland.'²⁴² Tappert was able to interest Benjamin Bilse, the music director of the so-called *Bilse'sche Kapelle* which gave concerts at the *Konzerthaus* in Berlin, in performing the symphony, and when Bruckner wrote again a fortnight later, he enclosed a copy of the score (in two volumes). Although Hans Richter had requested that the score be returned the following March as there was a possibility of the symphony being performed in Vienna in April 1877, Bruckner's view was that 'a performance in Berlin would be of the greatest importance and a thousand times better than one in Vienna' and he would be >'unbelievably happy' if it came to pass. Tappert had presumably asked Bruckner to send him some biographical details, as a >'curriculum vitae' was enclosed with this second

241 Wilhelm Tappert (1830 - 1907), an enthusiastic Wagnerian, was a music teacher, theorist and journalist and one of the leading figures in Berlin musical life. He edited the *Allgemeine deutsche Musikzeitung* from 1876 until 1880. For further information about his life as a musical journalist and theorist, including his relationship with Bruckner, see Felix Diergarten, 'Wilhelm Tappert out of the shadows', in *The Bruckner Journal (TBJ)* 25/2 (July 2021), 15-21.

242 See *HSABB* 1, 167 for this letter, which was first published in *ABB*, 136. The original is privately owned, but the *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna possesses a photocopy. See also 'Bruckner Autographe' in *ABIL Mitteilungen* no.7 (June 2011), 12, for information about the sale of this letter by Antiquariat Inlibris, Gilhofer Nfg. GmbH.

letter. At the end Bruckner made a point of stressing the difficulties he was experiencing in Vienna. However, there is some suspicion of '>special pleading'!

NB Private notice

And so I have lived in Vienna since 1868 bitterly regretting that I moved here as I do not have any support, recognition or means of subsistence. Because I hold a position at the University as an unpaid lecturer in Harmony and Counterpoint, Dr. Hanslick has become a malicious enemy. I was responsible for introducing these subjects last December. Hanslick was always against it. I receive no salary either as a court organist. NB. When I started teaching my monthly salary was 10 shillings.²⁴³

In his third letter, written at the beginning of December, Bruckner said that he had read out Tappert's reply to his second letter to his Conservatory and University students and their response had been very enthusiastic.²⁴⁴ If a performance did take place in Berlin, he would come to the final rehearsals. Bruckner then mentioned some changes he wished to be made in the score and

243 See *HSABB* 1, 168-69 for this letter, dated Vienna, 1 October 1876; the original is in the Musiksammlung of the Oö. Landesmuseum, Linz, and the *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna possesses a photocopy. Bruckner's caution in having his symphony first performed in Vienna can be compared with Brahms's apropos the first performance of his Symphony no. 1. The heading '>private notice' is presumably an indication that this was not to be published along with the rest of the information provided. For further information about this and how it was acquired for the Landesmuseum, see Theophil Antonicek, Andreas Lindner and Klaus Peteermayr (eds.), "*Anton Bruckner, Hoforganist...*" *Ein Lebenslauf. Kommentierte Faksimileausgabe des Briefes vom 1. 10. 1876 an Wilhelm Tappert* (Vienna, 2010) and Rupert Gottfried Frieberger, 'Wie das Land Oberösterreich in den Besitz einer Bruckner-Handschrift kam...', in *ABIL Mitteilungen* no.8 (December 2011), 7-9.

244 None of Tappert's replies to Bruckner's letters has survived.

hoped that they would not inconvenience Bilse unduly. He enclosed music examples to clarify these changes:

... quaver rests to be added twice at letter C and letter H in the second movement, and the viola part to be slightly changed twice. (The horn part also to be deleted in bars 10-11 after C). To be billed to me, of course, and perhaps inserted in the parts by a member of the orchestra who is a copyist. I will understand, of course, if it does not meet with approval...²⁴⁵

Reference has already been made to Bruckner's close scrutiny of the periodic structure of several of his own works as well as Beethoven's Third and Ninth Symphonies and Mozart's *Requiem*.²⁴⁶ Annotations in the autograph score of the Third Symphony, for instance '>Wien, 17 Juli 1876 letzte Verbesserung geendet' and '>Rhythmisch etc. geordnet 5. November 1876', also suggest intermittent activity on this work. The autograph score of Symphony no. 5 is also metrically numbered.²⁴⁷ While there are

245 See *HSABB* 1, 164 for this letter, dated Vienna, 6 December 1876, which was first published in *ABB*, 140. The original is in private possession, but the *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna possesses a photocopy. There is a facsimile of the music examples in *HSABB* 1, 165.

246 See also Leopold Nowak, '>Metrische Studien von Anton Bruckner an Beethovens III. und IX. Symphonie', in Erich Schenk, ed., *Beethoven-Studien. Festgabe der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum 200. Geburtstag von Ludwig van Beethoven* (Vienna, 1970), 361-71, repr. in Leopold Nowak, *Über Anton Bruckner*, 105-15; idem, '>Anton Bruckners Eroica-Studien', in op.cit., 257-65; and Wolfgang Grandjean, *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner* (Tutzing, 2001). For further discussion of Bruckner's study of Mozart's *Requiem*, concerning voice-leading and octave-doubling in particular, see Timothy Jackson, '>Bruckner's Oktaven. The problem of consecutives, doubling and orchestral voice-leading' in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (Aldershot, 2001), 30-66.

247 See the facsimile of a page of the Adagio movement from the autograph, Mus. Hs. 19.477 fol. 45' in the ÖNB, in *ABSW* 5 (*V. Symphonie B-Dur. Revisionsbericht*), 59.

metrical numbers in the autographs of the original versions of the Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth Symphonies, they are only sporadic and not always accurate. Discussing Bruckner's more frequent use of metrical numbers at this point in his compositional career, Timothy Jackson counters the argument that it is related to Bruckner's numeromania, namely his fondness for counting all manner of things - from the number of leaves on a tree to the frequency of a particular prayer - by suggesting that there were more practical reasons:

Surely the intense scrutiny of hostile critics and friends was a factor in Bruckner's compulsion to revise; ensuring 'metrical >correctness' was part of this process... After 1876 Bruckner's compositional process becomes a complex dialogue oscillating between intuitive and analytical modes of thought - the latter represented by the metrical grid.²⁴⁸

Nevertheless, Bruckner's scrupulousness verging on obsessiveness in his addition of metrical numbers does suggest a compulsive behavioural trait which cannot be dissociated from other instances of fixation in his personal life.

Although the first draft of Symphony no. 5 was completed on 16 May, Bruckner spent the next twenty months making several changes and refinements and did not complete the final draft until January 1878. Nowak explains the genesis of the work as follows:

248 Timothy L. Jackson, '>Bruckner's Metrical Numbers', *19th-Century Music* xiv/2 (1990), 103.

One has spoken of two, even of three versions of the Fifth. It should be pointed out first of all that the first text was revised only insofar as the bass tuba was added later, but this was only within the framework of the first stage of composition which lasted from 1875 until the end of 1877 (or, rather, the first days of 1878). As the musical text took shape in different stages during this almost three-year period, and we have tangible evidence for this in the *Adagio* and *Finale*, we cannot justifiably speak of two different versions. There is no autograph evidence that Bruckner was responsible for the indisputable revision of the text in the first edition...²⁴⁹

Some of the early stages in the compositional process are shown by preliminary workings of parts of the *Adagio* and *Finale*, as indicated by Nowak above.²⁵⁰ Among the secondary source material is a particularly interesting copy of the *Finale* made by a Bruckner enthusiast, possibly Dr. Heinrich Schuster, who added the following comments at the end:

This exceedingly splendid movement appears to me to be the greatest contrapuntal achievement, apart from *Die Meistersinger*, this century - indeed since Bach. An enthusiastic Brucknerian asks 1000 pardons for his impertinence.²⁵¹

249 Leopold Nowak, *V Symphonie B-Dur. Revisionsbericht* (Vienna, 1985), 7. See also Nowak's foreword to the score of the symphony, *ABSW 5* (Vienna, 1951). The first edition was published by Doblinger (D.2080) in 1896. Franz Schalk, who conducted the first performance of the work (with an enlarged brass section in the *Finale*) in Graz in 1894, was largely responsible for this edition.

250 There are sketches of the beginning of the *Finale* (Mus. Hs. 6017) and a more substantial fair copy of bars 503-77 (Mus. Hs. 3162), corresponding to bars 503-70 in the final working, in the *ÖNB*. See *G-A IV/1*, 394-402 and *ABSW 5 Revisionsbericht*, 30-48. There is a facsimile of the first page of Mus. Hs. 6017, dated Vienna 10 May 1875, between pages 392 and 393 in *G-A IV/1*.

251 Mus. Hs. 6030 in the *ÖNB*. See *ABSW 5 Revisionsbericht*, 57 for a complete list of source material. See also *GaultNB*, 60-64, 87-92 and

One work which was completed in 1876 was a piece for male-voice choir (including 'humming chorus') and soloists, *Das hohe Lied* WAB 74, a setting of words by Heinrich von der Mattig.²⁵² The autograph of the chorus has the date '>Vienna, 31 December 1876'.²⁵³ Bruckner had the work copied and dedicated it to the *Akademischer Gesangverein*, possibly out of gratitude for their performance of his *Germanenzug* earlier in the year. Because of the difficulty of the humming chorus, the conductor Richard Heuberger suggested that the parts be doubled by a string quintet consisting of two violas, two cellos and double bass. Bruckner also took the opportunity of supporting the double choir with four horns, three trombones and bass tuba. Although he rehearsed the work in this revised form in December 1879 there is no evidence that it was performed publicly until 1902.²⁵⁴ Bruckner dedicated the revised version of the chorus to the memory of Josef Seiberl, organist of St. Florian abbey.

Seiberl was almost certainly one of the friends he would have met when he spent part of his Christmas vacation at St. Florian.

CarraganRB, 127-39.

252 The pseudonym of Dr. Heinrich Wallmann (1827-1898), an army doctor, writer and journalist who was one of Bruckner's friends and provided him with other texts to set in the following years. An entry in Bruckner's 1876 diary - the *Österreichischer Volks- und Wirthschafts-Kalender für das Schaltjahr 1876* - gives Wallmann's address - '>Wahlman, Kriegsministerium 14 Abth. 3. Stock'. See *MVP* 1, 31 and *MVP* 2, 37.

253 Mus. Hs. 3188 in the *ÖNB*.

254 It was edited for publication (Doblinger D. 2693, 1902) by Hans Wagner who dispensed with the humming parts and retained only one solo part, distributing the material of the other two parts among the chorus. Wagner conducted the first public performance of the work on 13 March 1902. See *G-A* IV/1, 422-27 and Andrea Harrandt, '>Bruckner und das bürgerliche Musiziergut seiner Jugendzeit', in *BSL* 1987 (Linz, 1989), 101-02. Both original and revised forms are printed in *ABSW* XXIII/2, 109-16 and 174-86.

Bruckner would also have relished the opportunity to spend some time with his brother Ignaz.²⁵⁵

On his return to Vienna, Bruckner began 1877 by making yet another attempt to improve his financial circumstances. In a letter to the Lower Austrian Parliament, he made an official application for the vacant position of director of music at the *Am Hof* church, listing five reasons why he was a suitable candidate: his experience as a church musician and Conservatory teacher, his theoretical studies with Sechter, his successes as an organist in Nancy, Paris and London, his growing recognition as a composer and his experience as a conductor. He added that Herbeck would be prepared to provide a reference, if necessary.²⁵⁶ Bruckner had to wait nearly six months for the official reply that the >post applied for had been granted to someone else.²⁵⁷ Bruckner's *curriculum vitae* was impressive, and it is possible that he was simply over-qualified for the post. The successful applicant was Josef Böhm.

Also in January and largely as a result of the consistently good attendances at his University classes in 1876, Bruckner felt justified in making another appeal to the Ministry of Education and Culture for a modest annual income or, failing that, an annual honorarium, pointing out that universities in England and Germany recognised Harmony and Counterpoint as true academic disciplines and drawing a parallel with his friend Weinwurm's

255 A letter from Seiberl to Bruckner, written at the beginning of the year (precise date not given), mentions *inter alia* some difficulties Ignaz had been experiencing because of ill health. See *HSABB* 1, 172-73.; the original is in St. Florian.

256 See *HSABB* 1, 173 for this letter, dated Vienna, 7 January 1877; the original is in St. Florian.

257 See *HSABB* 1, 174 for this letter, dated Vienna, 26 May 1877.

income as a singing teacher.²⁵⁸ Bruckner's request was forwarded to Hanslick who, while stressing that Bruckner's and Weinwurm's posts were not comparable, as remuneration for the latter was principally associated with Weinwurm's activities as conductor of the *Akademischer Gesangverein* and the resultant participation in academic functions, nevertheless recommended to the College of Professors that Bruckner be reimbursed in some way.²⁵⁹ Hanslick's professorial colleagues turned down Bruckner's request, albeit with a rider to the effect that it be left to the discretion of the Minister of Education to decide whether some form of payment should be made on the submission of a further application at the end of the session. There is no evidence to suggest that such a submission was eventually made.

From the *Neuer Krakauer Schreibkalender für das Jahr 1877*, in which Bruckner noted *inter alia* the times of lectures at the University and the Conservatory and the times of lessons given to private pupils, we can derive precise information about Bruckner's teaching responsibilities. In September 1877, at the beginning of a new session, his normal teaching load was two hours at the University, sixteen at the Conservatory and thirteen at home each week. There were also Court Chapel duties on Saturdays and Sundays. In later years, Bruckner re-arranged his timetable so that he would have days completely free for composition. This meant that he would occasionally have up to 11 hours' teaching

258 See *HSABB* 1, 174 for this letter, dated Vienna, 12 January 1877; the original is in the Vienna University library.

259 Hanslick's recommendation is dated Vienna, 18 January 1877. See Robert Lach, *Die Bruckner-Akten des Wiener Universitäts-Archives* (Vienna-Prague-Leipzig, 1926), 48-49 and G-A IV/1, 437-38.

on the same day. We also know, from the reminiscences of Decsey, Eckstein, Klose and others, that Bruckner, after a strenuous day's teaching or composing, preferred to relax in the evenings with a late meal in the company of a select number of his pupils and friends at one of his favourite *Gasthäuser*. The *Krakauer Schreibkalender*, however, affords us an amusing glimpse into one of Bruckner's other social pursuits. In January and February 1877, during the pre-Lenten carnival period, he attended three balls and noted down in his diary the names of the ladies with whom he had danced! Bruckner, whose eye for feminine beauty often led him into bizarre situations and occasioned several rash proposals of marriage, had obviously been suitably impressed.

Bruckner's revision work was just as intense in 1877. As well as revising the Third and Fifth Symphonies, he made '>rhythmical improvements' to his First and Second Symphonies. He entered metrical numbers in ink in the original manuscript of Symphony no. 1 and metrical numbers in both pencil and ink in copies of the score of Symphony no. 2 made by Carda and Tenschert.²⁶⁰ Timothy Jackson describes the rhythmical changes made in the Andante of the Second Symphony as '>fine tuning' in comparison with the large cuts suggested by Herbeck for the 1876 performance.²⁶¹

260 Mus. Hs. 6034 and Mus. Hs. 6035 respectively in the *ÖNB*. See footnote 148. Carda was based in Linz while Tenschert lived in Vienna. In 1877 Franz Hlawaczek also prepared a new copy score of the symphony (M.H. 6781 in the *Wiener Stadtbibliothek*) which includes other significant changes made by Bruckner, particularly in the slow movement and Finale. See William Carragan, foreword to '>Symphony no. 2. 'Version of 1877' (Vienna, 2007).

261 Timothy Jackson, '>Bruckner's Metrical Numbers', in *19th-Century Music* xiv/2 (1990), 114.

During the year Bruckner lost a close friend, Josef Seiberl, and a staunch ally, Johann Herbeck. Seiberl was regarded as a worthy successor to Bruckner at St. Florian and, indeed, Bruckner's equal as an organist. The two friends had participated in the dedication of the renovated St. Florian organ in October 1875. In a letter to Ignaz Traumihler, the director of the St. Florian abbey choir, Bruckner not only expressed his feeling of shock at the tragic news but also took the opportunity of recommending one of his Conservatory pupils, Hans Rott, for the vacant position:

... He is the son of the famous actor at the *Theater an der Wien* and is a highly gifted musician and a most likeable, modest young man who plays Bach excellently and, for an eighteen-year-old, is an astonishing improviser.

You will not find a better young man. He is my best pupil so far. He also studied counterpoint and composition with Krenn who is as fond of him as I am. At present he is the organist at the Piarist church in the Josefstadt...²⁶²

262 See *HSABB* 1, 174 for this letter, dated Vienna, 14 June 1877; the original is in St. Florian. For further information about Josef Seiberl, gleaned from the St. Florian archives, and his relationship with Bruckner, see Andreas Lindner, 'Der Florianer Stiftsorganisten Josef Seiberl (1836-1877) und Anton Bruckner', in *Mitteilungsblatt der IBG* 58 (June 2002), 14-16.

263 Hans Rott (1858-84) was a member of the *Wiener Akademischer Wagner-Verein* from 1875 to 1879 and a keen Wagnerian. He died tragically in a psychiatric hospital in 1884. As a composer he had some influence on his friend, Gustav Mahler. Bruckner felt that Brahms's apparently harsh judgement of Rott's Symphony in E major had been one of the contributory factors to Rott's mental illness. See Franz Marschner's account, as related to Göllerich, in *G-A* IV/2, 131. For further information about Rott, his attempts to obtain a permanent position after leaving the Conservatory, and his music, see Leopold Nowak, 'Die Kompositionen und Skizzen von Hans Rott in der Musiksammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek' in G. Brosche, ed., *Franz Grasberger zum 60. Geburtstag* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1975), 273-340; Paul Banks, 'Hans Rott', in *The Musical Times* cxxv (1984), 483ff.; Helmuth Kreysing and Frank Litterscheid, *Hans Rott. Der Begründer der neuen Symphonie (Musik-Konzepte 103/104)*, ed. Heinz-Klaus Metzger and Rainer Riehn, Munich, 1999; in particular Maja Loehr's chapter, 'Hans Rott, der Lieblingsschüler Anton Bruckners', 9-14, which also includes another hitherto unpublished Bruckner reference for Rott, dated 12 March 1880); Stephen

Bruckner's recommendation was apparently not followed up.²⁶³

McClatchie, 'Hans Rott, Gustav Mahler and the New Symphony: New Evidence for a Pressing Question', in *Music and Letters* 81/3 (August 2000), 392-401; Paul Banks, 'Hans Rott', in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music*, Second Edition (London, 2001), 21, 786-87; Uwe Harten, 'Hans Rott (1858-1884). Alles wird sich erfüllen - 100 Jahre verspätete Reaktion auf Kreativität', in *BSL 2000* (Linz, 2004), 79-88. Further information about the life and works of Hans Rott can be found on the *Internationale Hans Rott Gesellschaft Wien* website: <http://www.hans-rott.org>

Later in the year Bruckner wrote his *Nachruf* WAB 88 for male voices and organ in Seiberl's memory and played the organ part during the unveiling of a memorial plaque for Seiberl at a special memorial service in St. Florian on 28 October.²⁶⁴

264 According to Auer (*G-A* IV/1, 456f.), the first performance was given by the St. Florian Abbey choir conducted by Traumihler. But according to Viktor Keldorfer, the editor of the first edition, *Nachruf* was given its first performance by the Linz *Sängerbund* conducted by Max Brava. See foreword to U.E. 3294 (1939 re-issue). This is corroborated by a letter which Bruckner wrote to Josef Neubauer, a notary's articled clerk and later bookkeeper in a savings bank at St. Florian. In this letter, dated 25 October 1877, Bruckner referred to the preparations being made for the performance of the work by *Sängerbund* and informed Neubauer that he intended to travel to St. Florian on the following Saturday so that he could hold a rehearsal with all the participants on the Sunday. See *HSABB* 1, 176 for a précis of this letter which is owned privately in Vienna. As Bruckner later wished to make this work more widely available, he had the original text (by Heinrich Wallmann, pseud. Heinrich von der Mattig) changed by August Seuffert to one in which the sentiments were less specific. Under its new title, *Trösterin Musik*, it was given its first performance in Vienna on 11 April 1886 by the *Akademischer Gesangverein* conducted by Rudolf Weiwurm. Both versions are printed in *ABSW* XXIII/2, 117-24.

265 Herbeck wrote to Bruckner from Salzburg on 24 August, asking him to

On the same day as this service, Johann Herbeck died. Herbeck had been one of the first to recognize Bruckner's stature, had been instrumental in bringing him from Linz to Vienna in 1868 and, since then, had consistently encouraged him and treated the often depressed and beleaguered composer with great sympathy and tact. Herbeck spent a few days at St. Florian towards the end of August and took the opportunity of visiting Bruckner at the abbey.²⁶⁵ In his letter to Traumihler, Bruckner had intimated that he would be available to play the organ at St. Florian during his summer vacation.²⁶⁶ This help would certainly have been invaluable at a time when the abbey was still seeking a permanent organist to take Seiberl's place.

During his stay at the abbey, Bruckner worked on the revision of his Third Symphony, and one of Herbeck's final acts was to arrange for the symphony, which was rejected by the Philharmonic after a rehearsal on 27 September, to be given a place in the programme of the December concert of the *Gesellschaft* series.²⁶⁷ Bruckner later recalled his final meetings with Herbeck and paid tribute to him in an appreciation written for Ludwig Herbeck's biography of his father:

book two rooms at a guest house in St. Florian for the evening of Sunday 26 August, also to hire a coach and pick him and his family up from Linz. See *HSABB* 1, 175 for this letter; the original is in St. Florian.

266 See footnote 262. Bruckner had no *Hofkapelle* duties between 15 August and 15 September. See *HSABB* 1, 178 for his letter to the *Hofkapelle*, dated Vienna 7 June 1877, requesting leave. The original of the letter is in the *Hofkapelle* archives.

267 See Otto Biba, 'Bruckner und die Wiener Orchester', in *Anton Bruckner. V. Internationales Gewandhaus-Symposium 1987* (Leipzig, 1988), 25.

I shall never forget how he cared for me most affectionately during performances of my Masses and symphonies and how flatteringly he spoke of these works. In September 1877, just before his death, we played through the second movement of my Fourth (Romantic) Symphony, and he made the unforgettable comment: '>'Schubert could have written that; one can have nothing but respect for a composer who can write something like that.' And at the end of August, seven weeks before he passed away, when, at his request, I collected him from Linz and accompanied him to St. Florian for the second time, he said to the abbey authorities after I had played for him on the newly restored great organ: '>'Gentlemen, you should be proud of him.'²⁶⁸

Bruckner's diary entries for October in the *Neuer Krakauer Schreib-Kalender für das Jahr 1877* include a reference to the date and time of Herbeck's death - 9.45 on the morning of 28 October. The date is also underlined on the calendar page. Bruckner also notes that Herbeck conducted Schubert's Mass in E flat major in the *Hofkapelle* on 21 October while he was at Klosterneuburg and rehearsed the *Singverein* for the last time the following day. His funeral was in the early afternoon of Tuesday 30 October.²⁶⁹

Either while he was staying at St. Florian or shortly before travelling there, Bruckner visited Kremsmünster abbey to participate in the 1100th anniversary celebrations. He had written earlier to Georg Huemer, director of the abbey choir, enclosing a copy of his D minor Mass, and it is possible that Huemer's original

²⁶⁸ Ludwig Herbeck, *Johann Herbeck. Ein Lebensbild* (Vienna: Gutmann, 1885), 233, footnote.

²⁶⁹ See *MVP* 1, 54 and 2, 60; also Ludwig Herbeck, *op.cit.*, 410ff.

intention was to perform it during the church service which marked the beginning of the celebrations on 18 August. Perhaps Huemer found it too difficult because, in the event, Beethoven's C major Mass was performed. Bruckner played the organ at the service and later gave a recital to a distinguished audience which included Stremayr, the Minister of Education, and the papal nuncio. It consisted of four improvisations, the first on the horn theme in the *Kyrie* of Beethoven's C major Mass, the second on the >'Hallelujah' chorus from Handel's *Messiah*, the third on the >'Alles was Odem hat' theme from Mendelssohn's *Hymn of Praise*, and the fourth on the *Kaiserlied* (18 August was also the Emperor's name-day).²⁷⁰

As well as seeking to augment his income by applying for the post at the *Am Hof* church and appealing to the Ministry of Education and Culture for a small income at the University, Bruckner also attempted to improve his position in the *Hofkapelle*.

Since his unsuccessful application in April 1876 for the position of assistant musical director which had fallen vacant as a result of Gottfried Preyer's retirement, he had conducted two performances of his F minor Mass - on 30 July 1876 and 17 June 1877.²⁷¹ Assuming quite correctly that Hellmesberger, who had been appointed assistant music director in 1876, would now succeed Herbeck as principal director, Bruckner made a fresh application for the assistant's post a few days after Herbeck's death. He

270 See *HSABB* 1, 176 for Bruckner's letter to Huemer, dated Vienna, 1 March 1877; the original of this letter is in Kremsmünster abbey. See *G-A IV/1*, 454 for further information about Bruckner's visit to Kremsmünster.

271 See earlier and footnote 233.

referred once again to his '>serious financial situation'. His chances of success were rather remote, however. Hans Richter, conductor of the Philharmonic and the Court Opera, was appointed assistant music director, and Pius Richter, a long-standing member of the *Hofkapelle*, was given the nominal title of assistant director in recognition of his services to church music. These appointments were advertised in two issues of the *Wiener Zeitung* and Bruckner, along with six other applicants, including Rudolf Weinwurm, was advised of his lack of success in a brief letter from the Lord Chamberlain's office.²⁷² Two months later, however, Bruckner received more heartening news. His status in the *Hofkapelle* was changed from temporary to permanent and there was a substantial increase in income.

In the autumn Bruckner's move to a larger apartment in Heißgasse 7, made available to him at a very reasonable rent by Dr. Anton Oelzelt von Newin, provided him with more space for his composition work and private teaching activities and offered him quick and easy access to both the Conservatory and the *Hofkapelle*.²⁷³ Bruckner was immensely grateful to his young

272 See *ABDS* 1, 81-89 for Bruckner's application (31 October), the Lord Chamberlain's recommendations (8 and 19 November) and the formal letter to unsuccessful applicants (27 November). Bruckner's application is also printed in *HSABB* 1, 182-83; the original is in the court archives. The two issues of the *Wiener Zeitung* were nos. 262 of 15 November and 270 of 25 November 1877.

273 Anton Oelzelt von Newin (1854-1925) was a young philosopher who had attended some of Bruckner's University lectures and was a great admirer of his organ playing. Bruckner had been promised the apartment at the end of 1876, but the removal was delayed owing to difficulties raised by some of Oelzelt von Newin's relatives. In February 1877, however, von Newin wrote to Bruckner to apologize for the delay and to assure him that the promise would be fulfilled. See *HSABB* 1, 175-76 and 179 for the correspondence between them in 1877. The location of the original of Oelzelt von Newin's undated letter to Bruckner is not known; it was first printed in *G-A* IV/1, 463-64. The originals of Bruckner's two letters to Oelzelt von Newin, dated 7 February and 11 June 1877, are in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*.

friend for allowing him to have the apartment at a very reasonable rent, and later gave tangible expression to his gratitude in dedicating his Symphony no. 6 to him.

For Bruckner the most important musical event in 1877 was undoubtedly the first performance of his Third Symphony, the culmination of five years' work. Bruckner worked on an >'intermediate' version of the second movement of the symphony at some point between Autumn 1876 and 1877. It is 289 bars long, eleven bars longer than the Adagio of the original version and 38 bars longer than the Adagio of the second version, which replaced it. The most significant difference from the original occurs in the final reprise of the main subject material (bars 230ff.) where the syncopated violin figures are replaced by cascading broken chord figures, an undisguised homage to Wagner's *Tannhäuser* overture.²⁷⁴ At the beginning of the year Bruckner began work on the definitive second version, commencing with the Finale on 27 January. Revision was completed on 28 April with the annotation '>ganz neue Umarbeitung fertig'. The autograph score of the second version is a composite of pages from the original version, the 1876 revision and the new sheets inserted in 1877.²⁷⁵ The first movement was substantially cut from

274 In the parts used for the first performance of the symphony on 16 December 1877 two passages in the Adagio were pasted over with the notes of the second version of the work, written by the same copyist as the one who made the copy for the engraving in 1878. When these sheets were removed, this so-called '>intermediate' version of the movement was revealed. This version is described as '>Adagio nr. 2' in the *Bruckner Gesamtausgabe* volume published as a supplement (Vienna, 1980) to Nowak's earlier edition of the original version (*ABSW* 3/1, 1977). See Nowak's foreword and Thomas Röder, *III Symphonie D-Moll Revisionsbericht* (Vienna, 1997), 58.

275 This is located in the ÖNB, Mus. Hs. 19.475. Other material consulted by Nowak in his edition of the '>1877 version' (*ABSW* 3/2, Vienna 1981) include the copy used for the 1878 engraving, the incomplete set of parts used for the first performance (located in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library, XIII 26.428) and an autograph fragment of the Adagio also located in the *Gesellschaft* library (A 173). See also Thomas Röder, *III. Symphonie D-Moll*

746 to 652 bars, the Adagio from 278 (289) to 251 and the Finale from 764 to 638 bars. The Scherzo remained more or less intact until after the unsuccessful first performance of the work. On 30 January 1878 Bruckner composed a coda to this movement which increased its length by 41 bars.²⁷⁶

Bruckner's '>improvements' to the Third Symphony were not sufficient to impress the Philharmonic who rejected it once again after a rehearsal on 27 September.²⁷⁷ Although Herbeck was able to use his influence to programme the work in a *Gesellschaft* concert, the composer was deeply offended by the rejection. He made his feelings abundantly clear when he wrote to Wilhelm Tappert on 12 October. In the earlier part of the letter, he asked Tappert to return the score and parts of the Fourth Symphony which he had sent to Berlin in October 1876 as he had decided to revise the work:

I have come to the firm conclusion that my Fourth (Romantic) Symphony is urgently in need of a thorough revision. In the Adagio, for instance, some of the violin figurations are too difficult, indeed unplayable, and the instrumentation here and there is too cumbersome and finicky. Herbeck, who likes this work very much, has made similar comments and confirmed me in my resolve to carry out fresh revision work on parts of the symphony. Would you

Revisionbericht, 18 and 201ff.

276 It was inserted in the parts but not printed and is also marked '>not to be printed' and '>not in the score'. The copy used for the engraving does not include the coda. It was printed for the first time in *ABSW 3/2* (Vienna, 1981). See Röder, *op.cit.*, 212.

277 A diary entry in the *Neuer Krakauer Schreibkalender für das Jahr 1877* both underlines the date of this rejection (Thursday 27 September) and places it in the context of previous rejections. It reads '>3te Ablehnung meiner Wagner-Sinfonie Nr. 3, >1. Ablehnung Herbst 1872. C moll Sinf[onie] Nr. 2, >2. Ablehnung durch die Philharmoniker im Herbst 1875. Sinfonie Nr 3.' See *MVP* 1, 53 and *MVP* 2, 59.

be so good as to ask Music Director Bilse to return the score and parts together with any bills outstanding.

My *Wagner Symphony*, no. 3 in D minor, is finished, and Herbeck will perform it at a Musikverein concert on 16 December. If Director Bilse is willing, and if you are agreeable, I shall send it to you immediately after the performance in Vienna; this should leave sufficient time. (Our Philharmonic players are totally hostile to the new direction; I will not give them any more of my works, as I have already experienced several rejections). I am completely bewildered by Hans Richter's intimate dealings with Wagner's fiercest enemies. Unfortunately, I have been forced to recognize him as a *generalissimo* of double-dealing. Much of what Wagner said to me is beginning to make sense now...²⁷⁸

Bruckner's criticism of Richter is understandable but not really justified. It was an almost impossible task for any composer in Vienna at the time to steer a middle course between the conservatives and the radicals and Richter did it better than most. Herbeck's sudden death a fortnight after this letter was written placed the performance of the Third in jeopardy. In desperation he turned to August Göllerich sen., the father of his future biographer, and asked him to use his influence with Nikolaus Dumba, the president of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, to have the work retained in the programme. Although he had much more experience as a choral than as an orchestral conductor, Bruckner had no option but to conduct the work himself.

278 See *HSABB* 1, 181-82 for this letter, dated Vienna, 12 October 1877; there is a photocopy of the original in the *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna. Bruckner had written earlier to Tappert that '>I... was shocked to see that I have damaged the work [4th Symphony] by using too many imitations and have frequently destroyed the effectiveness of the best passages.' See *HSABB* 1, 178 for this letter, dated Vienna, 1 May 1877; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

According to eye-witness accounts and Bruckner's later reflections, the orchestral rehearsals were something of a travesty with some of the players openly laughing at the composer. Hellmesberger was allegedly one of the worst offenders.²⁷⁹ The performance on 16 December was a debacle. It is not completely clear what caused the fiasco - whether it was Bruckner's nervous, insecure conducting, or the length of the work (albeit much shorter than the original version!), or sabotage on the part of a group hostile to the composer. The first three movements seem to have been quite well received, but the audience began to drift out during the Finale and, at the end, only a few remained, including Bruckner's enthusiastically supportive young friends, Mahler, Krzyzanowski and Joseph Schalk.²⁸⁰ Bruckner described the public's misunderstanding in a letter to Tappert written ten months later.²⁸¹ Press reaction to the symphony was generally hostile. Writing in the *Neue freie Presse*, Hanslick made a distinction between Bruckner's honourable intentions as a composer and his realization of these intentions that, in his view, were impractical and meaningless:

279 See *G-A IV/1*, 475, including an account by Rudolf Zöllner, one of the viola players in the orchestra, in the footnotes.

280 Rudolf Krzyzanowski (1862-1911) was one of Bruckner's organ pupils at the Vienna Conservatory. His handwritten copy of a *Symphonische Präludium*, made in 1876), has been attributed to both Bruckner and Mahler, but the original from the which the copy was made is no longer extant, thus making it difficult to identify the composer with any certainty. I tend to agree with Franz Scheder who, after discussing the pros and cons of Bruckner authorship from the standpoints of text and musical style in his article 'Bruckner-Incerta' (*Bruckner-Symposion Linz Bericht 2004*, pp.130-37), comes to the conclusion that the *Symphonic Prelude* is probably the work of one (or more) of Bruckner's pupils (Rott, Krzyzanowski, Kralik, Peters, Vergeiner) or circle of friends (Mahler, Wolf etc).

281 See *HSABB 1*, 185-86 for this letter, dated Vienna, 9 October 1878; there is a photocopy of the original in the *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*.

... As we would not wish to hurt the composer whom we esteem as a man and as an artist and whose artistic intentions are honourable albeit handled in an unusual fashion, we dispense with a review and make instead the humble confession that we did not understand his gigantic symphony. We were not able to make sense of his poetic intentions - perhaps a vision in which Beethoven's Ninth is joined in friendship with Wagner's *Walküre* only to come to grief under its horses' hooves at the end - or to comprehend the purely musical argument. The composer, who conducted his own work, was greeted with acclaim and comforted with enthusiastic applause at the end by a fraction of the audience who remained after the flight of the others.²⁸²

Other critics took Bruckner to task for the over-abundance of general pauses, the prolixity of the music and the lack of structural cohesion. Eduard Schelle, who reviewed the symphony in two issues of *Die Presse*, conceded that it 'provided an example of the composer's creative power' and 'contained many interesting ideas' but argued that its total effect was ruined by a 'lack of proportion, clear organization and logical structural development' and that it would benefit from a 'thorough reworking'. Schelle was obviously unaware of the fact that the work had already undergone extensive revision!²⁸³ Franz Gehring, the music critic of the *Deutsche Zeitung* described it as a 'most unusual work which could be called a colourful but shapeless patchwork of shreds of musical ideas rather than being given the potentially harmonious name of

282 Review of 18 December 1877. See *G-A IV/1*, 479-80, *ABDS* 2, 54, and Röder, *op.cit.*, 387.

283 Reviews of 18 and 30 December 1877. See *ABDS* 2, 55, and Röder, *op.cit.*, 386 and 391.

“symphony”²⁸⁴ while J.G. Woerz, the critic of the *Wiener Sonn- und Montagszeitung*, drew his readers’ attention to comments which he had made four years earlier about Bruckner’s use of the general pause in his Second Symphony, implying that the same was true of the Third Symphony, and rebuked the composer for his lack of structural ‘tidiness’:

... If his house had the same appearance as his symphony, a well-bred housewife would not be able to survive there for four days, and the public, who refuse to believe that true genius is to be found in formlessness, were equally unable to survive the four movements of Bruckner’s musical creation...²⁸⁵

The reviewer for the *Wiener Abendpost* described the symphony as a ‘monstrous work whose daring features and peculiarities cannot be adequately described in a few words.’ It was a work in which there was evidence of an ‘unbridled and untutored naturalism where no crudity is too large, no logical leap too wide’ and ‘the most outrageous things are done in a truly childlike good faith.’ Despite this, however, the symphony made a greater effect on him than ‘many a well-designed and well-intentioned symphony written by a dry-as-dust pedant.’²⁸⁶

284 Review of 19 December. See *ABDS* 2, 56, and Röder, *op.cit.*, 387.

285 From review of 24 December 1877. See *ABDS* 2, 56 and Röder, *op.cit.*, 390-91.

286 From review, signed ‘h’, in the edition for 17 December 1877. See *ABDS* 2, 55 and Röder, *op.cit.*, 386. Other reviews, including an extremely favourable one by Theodor Helm, can be found in Röder, *op.cit.*, 387ff. See also Eckhart Roch, “‘Halb Genie, halb Trottel’”. Bruckner-Rezeption im Spannungsfeld ästhetischer Projektionen’, in *Anton Bruckners Wiener Jahre* (Vienna, 2009), 281-99. In this article Roch suggests that, although one of the main reasons for the debacle of the first performance of the Third was the composer’s apparent

A more sympathetic observer of this unfortunate episode was the publisher Theodor Rättig, who was present at virtually all the orchestral rehearsals of the symphony as well as the first performance. In spite of the disastrous premiere, Rättig had sufficient faith in the composer and in the work to publish it at his own expense:

As a member of the *Singverein*, I was present at almost all the orchestral rehearsals. I found it an altogether distressing and shocking spectacle - to witness the younger members of the orchestra ridiculing the clumsy manner of direction adopted by the old man [sic!] who had absolutely no idea of how to conduct and who had to confine himself to giving tempo indications like a jumping jack. The composition itself appeared even more imposing, and I began to be convinced that here was one of the mightiest musical heroes of all times treading on the path of thorns which was the customary, one might say pre-ordained, fate of such spirits. The performance fully confirmed this view. A small group of at the most ten to twenty very young people of both sexes applauded but they were arrayed against a hissing, laughing crowd, and the expert commentators on current 'musical high fashion' gloated maliciously - a splendid topic for amusing conversation at dinner awaiting them at home. When the public had left the hall and the musicians the platform, the small group of his pupils and admirers gathered round the wretched composer to comfort him, but he cried, 'Leave me

alignment with the 'New German' cause in dedicating the symphony to Wagner, thereby more or less ensuring that there would be a negative critical reaction from Hanslick and other conservative critics, there were other factors at work. For instance, in some of the early reviews of the works, there was a 'construct of diametrically opposite projections that had little to do with him as an historical person.' Not only was he taken to task for having one foot in the Wagner camp but he was also lambasted for being nothing more than a poor imitator of Beethoven.

alone, the public don't want to have anything to do with me.' Then I joined the group, expressed my admiration in the warmest terms, and offered to publish the work that had just been hissed at in a manner befitting its importance and at my own expense (c. 3000 florins). And, to the astonishment of the musical world, the work was published - an event which was almost certainly the first positive step towards a wider recognition of the composer. Great and naive spirits are not grateful, however, and probably no one made life more difficult for his closest friends and admirers than Anton Bruckner. When I presented him with the first beautifully printed and bound copy of the 'Third' he smiled and opened it enthusiastically, but then came the retort, 'In heaven's name! It says "dedicated to Master Richard Wagner in deepest admiration"- and should say 'respect'. It was and continued to be very difficult to console him for this terrible mistake.²⁸⁷

Röttig published not only the full score but also a piano-duet arrangement of the symphony. Although only Mahler's name is on the cover and title-page of this arrangement, it is believed that Mahler was responsible for the first three movements and his fellow-student Krzyzanowski for the Finale.²⁸⁸ Julius Epstein,

287 In the original German, the distinction is between 'Verehrung' and 'Ehrfurcht' respectively. See *G-A* IV/1, 477-78. For an alternative English translation of this account, see Stephen Johnson, *op.cit.*, 115-16. For further information about Röttig, see Helene Röttig, 'Ein Wegbereiter Anton Bruckners', in *Gedanke und Tat. Zeitschrift für Freischaffende* 1 (1956), 1-7.

288 Stephen McClatchie mentions a letter from Hans Rott to Heinrich Krzyzanowski, Rudolf's brother (dated 3 October 1878) which 'confirms Rudolf Krzyzanowski's involvement with this arrangement... although Mahler's is the only name that appears on the title-page.' Rott wrote to Heinrich: 'Bruckner sends his greetings to Rudolf and asks him to please hurry along with the symphony; Röttig is pressing him...' (*ÖNB Mus. Hs. 34.247/III/11*). See Stephen McClatchie, 'Hans Rott, Gustav Mahler and the "New Symphony": New Evidence for a Pressing Question', in *Music and Letters* 81/3 (August 2000), 395, footnote 15. The letter is printed in *Musik-Konzepte* 103/104 (1999), 76-79.

piano professor at the Vienna Conservatory and the teacher of both Mahler and Krzyzanowski, evidently edited his pupils' work.²⁸⁹ It was without doubt an extremely generous gesture on the part of Rättig, Mahler and Krzyzanowski.²⁹⁰

Gustav Mahler was never formally Bruckner's pupil at the Conservatory which he attended from 1875 to 1878. Although temperamentally quite different, Mahler obviously had a great respect for the older composer and was one of the first to recognise and appreciate his true stature. In an undated letter to Göllicherich, Mahler later clarified his relationship with Bruckner:

I was never Bruckner's pupil. The general belief that I was is probably attributable to the fact that I was regularly to be seen with Bruckner during my years as a student in Vienna and was always one

289 The original manuscript(s) of the arrangement have been lost. Mahler and Krzyzanowski worked from Bruckner's autograph score of the second version (Mus. Hs. 19.475 in the ÖNB). Both Krzyzanowski and Mahler wrote their names and addresses on the August page of the *Neuer Krakauer Schreib-Kalender für das Jahr 1878* - perhaps an indication that they had borrowed this autograph full score for the purpose of preparing a piano arrangement? See *MVP* 1, 69-70 and *MVP* 2, 76. Krzyzanowski returned the Finale to Bruckner and, on the composer's death in 1896, it formed part of his estate of manuscripts and scores which was bequeathed to the ÖNB. The first three movements, however, had a much more chequered career. They were retained by Mahler (who, according to Alma Mahler, regarded them as a gift from Bruckner). After Mahler's death they remained in Alma's possession until they were sold by auction to the ÖNB in 1948. Ferdinand Löwe and Joseph Schalk were responsible for the later piano-duet arrangement of the third version which was printed in 1890. See the informative article by Gertraud Kubacsek-Steinhauer, 'Die vierhändigen Bearbeitungen der Dritter Symphonie von Anton Bruckner', in *BJ* 1987/88 (Linz, 1990), 67-78. See also Röder, op.cit., 232-40 for a detailed discussion of the arrangement, including the deviations from the autograph full score.

290 There were already concrete plans for printing the symphony by the autumn of 1878. In his letter to Wilhelm Tappert (Vienna, 9 October 1878; see footnote 281), Bruckner concludes by saying that '>Mr. Rättig wishes to have the piano scores of these Symphonies [that is, Symphonies 2,3 and 4], in order to publish them.' The symphony was certainly available in print in the early months of 1880 and was probably published in November 1879. For further information, see Röder, op.cit., 221.

of his greatest admirers and supporters. Indeed, I believe that my friend Krzyzanowski (working in Weimar at present) and I were the only ones at the time. This would have been in the years 1875-1881. The letters which he sent me over several years are of very little interest... My involvement with him lasted until the completion of his Seventh Symphony. I still recall with pleasure that one beautiful morning during a lecture at the University he called to me from the lecture room (much to the astonishment of my colleagues) and played me the marvellous Adagio theme on a very old piano. Despite the great difference in age between us, Bruckner's invariably happy, youthful and almost childlike disposition and his trusting nature made our relationship a real friendship, and so it was natural that as I gradually came to appreciate and understand the trials and tribulations of his life my own development as a man and artist could not fail to be influenced by his. Indeed, I feel that I have more right to call myself his '>pupil' than most of the others, and I shall always do so with respect and gratitude.²⁹¹

From the early 1880s onwards contact between Bruckner and Mahler was restricted to the occasional visit and the occasional letter. An undated postcard sent by an apologetic Mahler to '>my dear, esteemed Master' indicates that he had not been in touch for some time because he had been '>somewhat buffeted by the waves of life' and was '>still on the high seas.' He reassured Bruckner, however, that it was one of his aims in life to contribute to the '>victorious breakthrough of your splendid and masterly art.'²⁹² Apart from a possible visit to Bruckner in 1884, we know for

291 See *G-A IV/1*, 448-49., footnote.

292 Auer suggests early 1891 as a possible date; see *ABB*, 329. Harrandt suggests that this card may have been sent to Bruckner just before Mahler's performance of the *Te Deum* in Hamburg in 1892; see *HSABB 2*, 338.

certain that Mahler met Bruckner on 15 June 1883.²⁹³ Josef Schalk's letters to his brother Franz in June and July 1888 apropos Bruckner's work on the third version of the Third Symphony also hint at another meeting between the two.²⁹⁴ There is no doubt that Mahler kept his promise to 'contribute to the victorious breakthrough' of Bruckner's works and actively proselytized on his behalf. As early as 1886, for instance, he conducted the Scherzo of the Third Symphony in Prague and, while he was chief conductor at the Hamburg Municipal Theatre (1891-97) and conductor of the Hamburg symphony concerts (1894-97), directed performances of Bruckner's Mass in D minor, the *Te Deum* and the Fourth Symphony. In April 1892 he was able to write enthusiastically to Bruckner about an extremely successful performance of the *Te Deum* during the Hamburg Opera's annual Good Friday concert of sacred music, a performance which evidently stirred both the public and the performers by 'the majesty of its architecture and the nobility of its ideas.'²⁹⁵ This success was confirmed by Carl Wilhelm Zinne, music critic for the *Neue Hamburger Zeitung*, who wrote to Bruckner again the

293 A calendar entry on this date - in the *Neuer Krakauer Schreib-Kalender für das Jahr 1883* - indicates that he lent Mahler the score of his Second Symphony. See G-A IV/2, 12; Henry-Louis de la Grange, *Mahler* vol. 1 (London: Gollancz, 1974), 106; MVP 1, 216 and MVP 2, 192.

294 See Lili Schalk, *Franz Schalk. Briefe und Betrachtungen* (Vienna and Leipzig: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1935), Thomas Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1988) [LBSAB] and the Schalk correspondence in the ÖNB, F18 Schalk 158/9/9 in particular.

295 See HSABB 2, 172 for Mahler's letter to Bruckner, dated Hamburg, 16 April 1892; the original can be found in St. Florian.

296 See HSABB 2, 173-74 and 211-12 for Zinne's letters to Bruckner, dated Hamburg, 18 April 1892 and 26 March 1893 respectively. They were first published in ABB, 387ff. and 392ff.; the location of the originals is unknown.

following year to inform him that Mahler was planning to conduct a repeat performance of the *Te Deum* as well as a performance of the D minor Mass as part of the Good Friday concert.²⁹⁶ Bruckner expressed his gratitude to Mahler when he wrote to him in April 1893.²⁹⁷ Mahler's profound admiration for the *Te Deum* led him to

297 The original of this letter from Bruckner to Mahler, dated Vienna, 7 April 1893, is in the University of Western Ontario, Canada, Gustav Mahler-Arnold Rosé Collection E5-CM-261. It was first printed in Andrea Harrant, "O! mögen Sie nur der Meinige bleiben...". Unbekannte Briefe zu zwei Aufführungen von Bruckners *Te Deum* in Hamburg', , in Erich Wolfgang Partsch, ed., *Gustav Mahler. Werk und Wirken. Vierzig Jahre Internationale Gustav Mahler Gesellschaft* (Vienna, 1996), 57-62. My thanks to Dr. Andrea Harrant for kindly supplying me with this information. See also *HSABB* 2, 214.

cross out the words 'for soli, chorus, organ and orchestra' in his copy of the score and replace them with 'for the tongues of heaven-blessed angels, chastened hearts and souls purified by fire.'

After Bruckner's death Mahler continued to perform his symphonies in spite of reservations about their length and structure which he expressed to friends like Natalie Bauer-Lechner who recalled that Mahler was drawn to Bruckner's works by the 'greatness and richness of invention' but was also disturbed and repelled by their lack of continuity.²⁹⁸ Having been engaged as conductor of the Vienna *Hofoper* in May 1897, Mahler was quickly promoted to the position of deputy director in July and chief conductor in October. The following year, he succeeded Hans Richter as conductor of the Vienna Philharmonic. In 1899, Mahler conducted the first complete performance of Bruckner's

298 Natalie Bauer-Lechner, *Erinnerungen an Gustav Mahler* (Vienna: Tal, 1923), 16. In other passages in the *Erinnerungen*, which are not included in the English translation, namely Natalie Bauer-Lechner, *Recollections of Gustav Mahler*, transl. Dika Newlin and edited and annotated by Peter Franklin (London: Faber and Faber, 1980), Mahler is alleged to have expressed exasperation with the uneven quality of a work such as Bruckner's First Symphony and to have stated that Bruckner's cause could only be promoted by substantial abridgement. In a conversation with his brother Otto in 1893, Mahler, in comparing Brahms and Bruckner, remarked that the former's works demonstrated a greater structural coherence, whereas, in the latter's 'you are carried away by the magnificence and wealth of his inventiveness, but at the same time you are repeatedly disturbed by its fragmentary character which breaks the spell.' (*Recollections*, 37)

Sixth Symphony.²⁹⁹ In this performance as well as subsequent performances of the Fourth Symphony in January 1900 and the Fifth Symphony in February 1901 he made several cuts and altered Bruckner's orchestration in several places. The critical reaction was understandably mixed. There were those like Robert Hirschfeld who, although no admirer of Bruckner's music, argued that Mahler's alterations were beneficial, and those like Theodor Helm who could not countenance changes which, in their opinion, destroyed the poetic and musical form of the work.³⁰⁰

While one cannot condone these >'improvements' today, one has to see them in the context of Bruckner performance practice at the beginning of the 20th century. What cannot be disputed, however, is the generosity of Mahler's gesture on Bruckner's behalf when he agreed to forego royalty payments due from the publication of his own works in order to finance Universal Edition's projected publication of Bruckner's works.³⁰¹

299 Sixteen years after the first performance of the middle two movements only in February 1883, conducted by Wilhelm Jahn.

300 Reviewing Mahler's performance of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* in February 1901, Helm accused Mahler specifically of cutting about 200 bars in the first two movements, inverting certain elements in the first movement and cutting the third theme and the characteristic unison passage that follows it, as well as inserting transitions of his own invention, cutting the re-statement of the great 4/4 melody in the Adagio so that the final *crescendo* of the principal theme had come far too early, and, finally, needlessly accelerating certain tempos. See also the comments on Mahler's working copy of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony by Rudolf Stephan in his *Gustav Mahler. Werk und Wiedergabe* (Cologne: Arno Volk, 1979) and further comments by Stephan in his article '>Zum Thema Bruckner und Mahler@', *BJ 1981* (Linz, 1982), 137-43. Concerning Bruckner's influence on Mahler and a comparison between Bruckner's *Te Deum* and the first movement (*Veni Creator Spiritus*) of Mahler's Eighth Symphony, see Constantin Floros, '>Von Mahlers Affinität zu Bruckner', *BSL 1986* (Linz, 1989), 109-17.

301 See Alma Mahler, *Gustav Mahler: Erinnerungen und Briefe* (Amsterdam: Albert de Lange, 1940); English translation by Basil Creighton as *Gustav Mahler. Memories and Letters* (London: John Murray, 1946), 148.

At the end of 1877, exactly a fortnight after the disastrous first performance of Bruckner's Third Symphony, the Vienna Philharmonic under Hans Richter gave the first performance of Brahms's Second Symphony. It was hailed by Hanslick as a '>'great, unqualified success' and an extremely convincing reply to the assertion made by Wagner and his disciples that it was no longer possible to write symphonies after Beethoven, the only exceptions being Lisztian '>'symphonic poems in one movement and with specific poetic programmes.' Comparing the new symphony with Brahms's First Symphony first performed a year earlier, Hanslick concluded:

If the thematic elaboration is less astonishing, the themes are more fluent and fresher, their development more natural and transparent and therefore more effective. I cannot adequately express my pleasure in the fact that Brahms, having given such forceful expression to the emotion of a Faustian struggle in his First Symphony, has turned again to the spring blossoms of earth in his Second.³⁰²

Bruckner would have been all too conscious of the striking difference in the receptions of the two symphonies. But an altruistic labour of love on the part of Rättig, Mahler and Krzyzanowski helped to bring a year which had begun inauspiciously to a much happier conclusion than the events of 16 December would have suggested.

© Crawford Howie (rev. June 2021)

³⁰² Henry Pleasants, transl. and ed., *Eduard Hanslick. Music Criticisms 1846-99* (London: Penguin Books, 2/1963), 159.