

CHAPTER 6

Bruckner in Vienna: The Final Years (1888-1896)

1888 was not a particularly productive year for Bruckner in one respect - there are no original compositions from this year - but his letters and the Schalk correspondence provide glimpses of a considerable amount of revision work undertaken on three symphonies, the Third in particular. There were also several performances of his works outside Austria, the Seventh conducted by Karl Muck in Prague on 15 January and Wilhelm Bayerlein in Nuremberg on 23 January, the Fourth conducted by Anton Seidl in New York on 4 April, and the Te Deum conducted by Otto Kitzler in Brno on 13 April.¹ The review of the New York performance in the *Musical Courier* was complimentary to both Bruckner and the symphony. The reviewer had some reservations about the heavy orchestration at times, which tended to obscure the melodic material, and the undue prominence given to the brass. The performance left something to be desired and the hall was hardly big enough for the work to make its full impact. Nevertheless, there was no question about the originality of the symphony and Bruckner's thematic inventiveness, and the conductor was to be congratulated on his boldness in introducing the work to a public more used to standard fare.²

1 The Nuremberg performance of the Seventh was reviewed in the evening edition of the *Korrespondent von und für Deutschland* 44 (24 January 1888), 1-2, in the *Nürnberger Anzeiger* 25 (25 January 1888), 2, and the *Fränkische Kurier* (25 January 1888); for the texts of these reviews, see Franz Scheder, 'Bruckner-Aufführungen in Nürnberg', in *BJ 1989/90* (Linz 1992), 253ff. There was a report of Kitzler's performance of the Te Deum in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 84, 202; for the text, see Othmar Wessely, 'Bruckner-Berichterstattung in der Neuen Zeitschrift für Musik', in *BSL 1991* (Linz 1994), 139. See also Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 6-7 for details of a congratulatory telegram sent by Muck to Bruckner on 15 January

2 This review of the New York performance (signed '>J.H.') appeared in the *Musical Courier* on 14 April; see *G-A IV/2*, 591-94 for a German translation.

The indefatigable Josef Schalk also played his arrangement of the Fourth Symphony at a so-called '>'Ladies' Evening' of the *Wagner Society* in Vienna on 19 January and he and Ferdinand Löwe played a piano-duet arrangement of the first and third movements of the same symphony at a concert arranged by the Linz branch of the society on 9 April.

Although Levi had very generously arranged for an advance of 1000 florins so that the Fourth could be printed, Bruckner did not sign the contract with Gutmann until 15 May 1888. The *Stichvorlage* was sent to the printer in June but was not published until September 1889. Before its eventual publication Bruckner both made and sanctioned several alterations, some no doubt the result of his experiencing a performance of the work in a special Bruckner concert organized by the *Wagner Society* and played by the Vienna Philharmonic under Hans Richter on 22 January. On 18 January, Bruckner wrote to Leontine Speidel, the wife of the critic, Ludwig Speidel, inviting her to the performance and mentioning in a postscript that, in compliance with her husband's wishes, he had made '>'significant changes' to it.³ In a preview of the concert in the *Wiener Tagblatt* on 20 January, Wilhelm Frey had no hesitation in describing Bruckner as '>'the most important of all living organists and incontestably one of the most significant composers since Beethoven in the realm of absolute music' and in recommending that such an outstanding musical figure should have at least one of his works performed by the Vienna Philharmonic each year.⁴ As the concert, which also included a performance of Bruckner's *Te Deum*, was not part of the regular Philharmonic series, it was not widely reported. There were reviews in *Die Presse* and the *Wiener Abendpost*, however. In the former, the

³ See *HSABB* 2, 28 and *OBB*, 217-18 for the text of this letter; the original of the letter is in the Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Vienna. See also Rudolf Stephan, '>'Bruckners Romantische Sinfonie', in *Anton Bruckner. Studien zu Werk und Wirkung. Festschrift Walter Wiora* (Tutzing 1988), 176.

⁴ See *G-A IV/2*, 585-86.

reviewer considered that the reception of the composer and his works by an enthusiastic audience went some way towards recompensing him for the years of envy and neglect he had been forced to endure, while, in the latter, Hans Paumgartner described the free rein that Bruckner had given to his imagination >'in the magic wood of Romanticism' and said that the symphony represented >'true nature, not a botanical garden with scientific descriptions of plants.'⁵ On the same day as the review in *Die Presse*, 30 January, Bruckner wrote letters of appreciation to the Philharmonic and Hans Richter,⁶ and to Betty v. Mayfeld. In the latter he mentioned that Princess Stephanie had congratulated him after the concert, and he also gave a progress report on other works:

... The 8th Symphony will not be finished for a long time as I have considerable alterations to make and too little time to work... During March the same 4th Symphony is to be performed in Munich. The 7th Symphony had huge successes in London, Boston and Prague...⁷

Bruckner's letter to Betty v. Mayfeld was in response to an encouraging letter which she sent him on 27 January. Although she had not been able to attend the performance, news of its success had obviously reached her, and she sent her apologies for not being there to experience his '>new triumph'.

... At long last our compatriots are beginning to understand your

5 See G-A IV/2, 587 for the first review which appeared in *Die Presse* on 30 January and Norbert Tschulik, op.cit., 176 for the second review which appeared in the *Wiener Abendpost* on 6 February. Theodor Helm also reviewed the concert in the *Deutsche Zeitung* on 27 January - see Ingrid Fuchs, '>Bruckner und die österreichische Presse', in *BSL 1991* (Linz, 1994), 92, footnote 51. Helm also mentioned a performance of Bruckner's Seventh Symphony in Nuremberg conducted by Wilhelm Bayerlein on 23 January.

6 Bruckner described the performances as >'matchless'. See *HSABB*, 2, 29; the original is in the Vienna Philharmonic archives.

7 See *HSABB*, 2, 29. It was first printed in *ABB*, 220; the original is privately owned.

music and the critics are becoming aware of your genius! What a miracle and illumination from above! I am full of pride that I have always recognized you and am sufficiently musical to understand your music and have a feeling for it. Three cheers for you, and may our Beethoven of today continue composing for a long time, so that your music will resound not only in Austria but throughout the world!⁸

Some of Bruckner's friends at St. Florian, including Bernard Deubler, also sent a signed congratulatory letter in the form of a poem to Bruckner.⁹ Between the Vienna and the projected Munich performances of the Fourth Symphony Bruckner carried out further revision work on the score. He informed Levi of these changes when he wrote to him at the end of February. Levi had mentioned 14 March as the date of performance, had invited Bruckner to stay with him in Munich and had asked him to send the score and parts of the symphony by the end of the month.¹⁰ In sending the score to Levi Bruckner pointed out that it had been '>newly scored and tightened up'. He continued:

I will never forget the success in Vienna. Since then, I have taken the initiative and made some further changes. As they have been inserted only in the score, please take care! The pages and instruments that are new are shown in the enclosed sheets of paper...

N.B. The alterations can be seen in the score in any case. It is the only score I possess. The best reviews are also enclosed. Gutmann will send the orchestral parts...

8 See *HSABB* 2, 28 for this letter, dated Linz, 27 January 1888; the original is owned by the *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna.

9 See *HSABB* 2, 30 for this letter, dated St. Florian, 1 February 1888; the original is in St. Florian. A facsimile of the letter is printed on the facing page.

10 See *HSABB* 2, 33 for Levi's letter to Bruckner, dated Munich, 14 February 1888; the original is in St. Florian.

Bruckner also thanked Levi for his invitation to stay with him, but declined, saying that he was not intending to come alone. Presumably he was hoping that one of his friends from Steyr, Carl Almeroth, would join him.¹¹

As mentioned in Chapter 5, Josef Schalk informed his brother Franz in May 1887 that Ferdinand Löwe, with Bruckner's permission, had begun to prepare a new score of the work.¹² Löwe almost certainly copied the first and last movements, while two other copyists – most probably Josef Schalk and certainly Franz Schalk – copied the slow movement and Scherzo respectively. The differences between Bruckner's autograph score and the first edition, published by Gutmann in September 1889, can be explained largely by reference to this score – the engraver's copy (*Stichvorlage*) - which did not come to light until 1939. The copyists not only re-scored parts of the work but also altered dynamics and agogic accents and changed the structure of the Scherzo and the Finale; for instance, the reprise of the first section of the latter, amounting to 48 bars, is omitted.¹³ Bruckner looked

11 See *HSABB* 2, 34-35, for this letter, dated Vienna, 27 February 1888. It was first published in *GrBLS*, 340-41. and *G-A* IV/2, 563 and 589; the original is privately owned. Which score did Bruckner send to Levi? See Franz Scheder, *Anton Bruckner Chronologie I* (*SchABCT*), 550, note to entry for 27.2.88, for a possible explanation.

12 See *HSABB* 2, 12-13 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/8/4.

13 According to Alfred Orel, Ferdinand Löwe was the main copyist of the *Stichvorlage*, but he was one of the first to recognise that it represented Bruckner's 'clearly identifiable final wishes for the textual form of the Fourth Symphony'; see Orel, 'Ein Bruckner-Fund [Die Endfassung der IV. Symphonie]'. *Schweizerische Musikzeitung* 88 [1949], 323. and Christa Brüstle, *Anton Bruckner und die Nachwelt*, 159-68. According to Lili Schalk, Franz Schalk identified the copyists as 'Scherzo Franz gut / sonst mangelhaft Löwe', thereby making a distinction between Franz's good copying of the Scherzo and Löwe's 'inadequate' copying of the rest! See 'Gespräche über Bruckner mit Franz', unpublished typescript in the Lili Schalk *Nachlaß* (*ÖNB* F18 Schalk 360/4/4). As Orel was not willing to follow Haas in categorically dismissing the first published editions of Bruckner's works, Haas was responsible for removing him from the editorial committee of the *Gesamtausgabe* in 1936. Korstvedt argues persuasively that the re-emergence of the *Stichvorlage* of the Fourth in 1939 'offered documentary support' for Orel's stance. See the foreword to Korstvedt's edition in the *Gesamtausgabe*, xxi and *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 65 (November 2005), 16.

through this manuscript at least three times and inserted his own revisions and annotations, including the re-instrumentation of some passages in the first movement (bars 305-29), second movement (bars 201-3 and 217-28) and Finale (bars 479-507), as well as the addition of written comments, with or without dates, performance indications, and sets of metrical numbers.¹⁴ The last date entered by Bruckner is 18 February 1888, almost a month after the Vienna performance and ten days before Bruckner's letter to Levi. Apart from one or two small changes recorded in diary entries in July and August 1888, there is no indication that any further alterations were made between June 1888 and September 1889; one can only agree with Korstvedt that the 'delay was due simply to Gutmann's own tardiness.'¹⁵ Robert Haas, who was not aware of the existence of this engraver's copy when he edited the Symphony for the *Gesamtausgabe* in 1936, has the following to say about the differences between the autograph and the first edition of 1889 in his editorial report:

... the Scherzo, which ends smoothly as a *da capo* section in the autograph, comes to a sudden end in its first appearance in the first edition with a large *diminuendo* plunge before the coda; there is a new short transition to the Trio, and the *da capo* is then shortened by 65 bars and the coda by 2 bars. In the Finale a cut of 48 bars was made, eliminating the beginning of the reprise; instead, the second subject (12 bars) appears at the beginning of the reprise in a new key relationship; in addition there are two instances of phrase extensions (one by two bars).

The Munich performance did not materialize because Levi took ill. Bruckner sent his condolences to Levi >not so much on account of the

14 For a detailed description of the *Stichvorlage*, including Bruckner's own annotations, see Korstvedt, 'The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony', 9-11.

15 Korstvedt, 'The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony', 23 (note 75).

postponement of the programme as on account of 'your damaged health.' He was unsure about Levi's suggestion that the concert could be given in the autumn, because Princess Amalie was never in Munich at that time of year. He complained that he was finding teaching and composing more of a burden. Hellmesberger had been asked for some financial support in 1887 but had refused it. Bruckner asked Levi to convey this information to Princess Amalie, and continued:

...(Last hope the 8th Symphony in Munich.) Would it not be conceivable to arrange an extra concert (as in Vienna) at a time when you have completely recovered?¹⁶

The copy of the score that Bruckner gave to Anton Seidl in the autumn of 1886 and that Seidl used for his performance of the Fourth in New York in April 1888 contains other revisions. In the foreword to the '2. revidierte Ausgabe' (Vienna, 1953), Nowak mentions that this copy, unknown to Bruckner scholars until the mid-20th century and located in the Music Collection of the University of Columbia in New York, includes Bruckner's alterations - not only those of the copyist in the Mus.Hs. 19.476 score in the ÖNB, but also several others which were not subsequently added to the autograph. He argues, therefore, that the New York score - the only one to contain these alterations - is 'the only model for the final, definitive format in which Bruckner wanted his 4th Symphony to be printed and made available to the public.' It contains, for instance, abridgements in the Andante, several additions to the instrumentation and, in the Finale, a change in time-signature from 4/4 to *Tempo primo* already at letter at U (and not a letter V) - all written by Bruckner himself. It also contains alterations inserted in another hand, probably Seidl's, including the re-composition of one or two small sections in

16 See *HSABB* 2, 35 for this letter, dated Vienna, 9 March 1888; the original is in the Taut Collection, University Library, Leipzig.

the Finale. At the front of this New York manuscript there is a single sheet, written by Bruckner himself, bearing the dedication to the Lord Chamberlain, Prince Constantin Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst. Nowak's edition of 1953, then, is a compilation of the first three movements of the second version of the symphony (1878) and the 1880 Finale, but it incorporates Bruckner's alterations in the copy sent to Seidl.¹⁷

Bruckner's diary entries for 1887-88 also include references to revision work on the Fourth. The October 1887, January and August 1888 pages of *Fromme's Oesterreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1887/88* contain references to Bruckner's supervision (for instance 'Die Verkleinerung im 1. Satze der 4. Sinfonie ausbessern / Hr Löwe?' in the latter) and we find the following notes among the prayer entries for March and July 1888 in *Fromme's Oesterreicher Hochschulen-Kalender für Professoren und Studirende für das Studienjahr 1885/86* - '>1. und 2. Satz zugleich gerade u[nd] Gegenb[e]w[egung] u[nd] 2 Tact später Finale einen Tact später ger[ade] u[nd] Gegenb[ewegung]'; ,NB Stimmen neu corrigiren Paur ungerade Tacte Schluß bei 4. Sinf[onie] Gutmann. Überschreitungen - gut sehen - >'; 'Die Verkleinerung im 1. Satze der 4. Sinfonie ausbessern.'¹⁸

17 For further information about Seidl and the New York score, see Leopold Nowak, '>Neues zu Anton Bruckners Romantischer', in *ÖMZ* 8 (1953), 161-64, repr. in *Über Anton Bruckner*, 24ff., and Benjamin Korstvedt, *First Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception* [PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1995], 257-66. Korstvedt argues persuasively that, because the New York score does not constitute a distinct version of the symphony but is essentially a slightly altered copy of Bruckner's autograph, it is not as definitive as Nowak claims. >J.H. (James Huneker?) reviewed the New York performance in the *Musical Courier* on 14 April. A German translation of this review can be found in *G-A* IV/2, 591-94. On 2 May, Josef Schalk informed his brother Franz that Seidl had been in Vienna recently and that he, Löwe, Richter and Seidl had spent 'a couple of >fruitless hours' in a local hostelry. Seidl appeared to be less enthusiastic about the performance of the Fourth than his audience, but he had promised that he would perform the >*Te Deum* and another Bruckner symphony in New York in the future. See *HSABB* 2, 37 for this letter; the original is in the Schalk collection in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 158/9/4.

18 See *MVP* 1, 315, 319, 340-41, 345-46 and 2, 264, 280 and 284. Karl Paur was one of Bruckner's students and copyists.

There are two versions of the published score, both bearing the same plate number, viz. A.J.G. 710; the first appeared in September 1889 and the second, including some corrections and small changes made by both Bruckner and Löwe, in early 1890.¹⁹ Although Bruckner gave his approval to the final printing in September 1889 it was by no means whole-hearted. After looking through the printer's copy he did not sign it with his name or his initials as he usually did. This may have simply been an oversight on Bruckner's part but Nowak's interpretation is that Bruckner, whose confidence was shattered 'after Levi's rejection of his Eighth Symphony in the autumn of 1887, 'was grateful for the helpful idealism of his deeply devoted disciples and accepted their advice, but denied them his confirmation' and that he did not append his signature because >the original was to be valid 'for later times@'.²⁰ In the autograph score, on the title-page of the Finale, he made it abundantly clear (by adding his own signature) that the abridgements were to be indicated in both the full score and piano arrangement by the addition of the symbols >'Vi – de'.²¹ Korstvedt points out, however, that the

19 In his letter to his brother Franz (Vienna, 1 December 1890), Josef Schalk refers to the 'first mistake-ridden version' of the score. Both Fischer and Levi also complained about the discrepancies between parts and score when writing to Bruckner (11 December 1890) after the Munich performance of the symphony.

20 Nowak, op.cit. It also speaks volumes that, when Bruckner wrote to Gutmann in June to ask for the proof copies of the first and fourth movements of the symphony, he made it clear that he would be solely responsible for any changes - >Änderungen mache nur *ich* persönlich.' See *HSABB* 2, 38 for this letter, dated Vienna, 12 June 1888; the original is privately owned.

21 Bruckner's express instructions were not consistently followed in the first edition, however. Nevertheless, a possible cut in the Andante (between bars 139 and 193) was not made - in accordance with Bruckner's instructions: >'N.B. The large cut (at letter H) should only be made if absolutely necessary, as it has an extremely adverse effect on the work.' Although the full score appeared in print in September 1889, the projected performance on 27 November could not take place because the parts were not ready. Bruckner's note: >'125 fl. 2. Druck 4. Sinf[onie] 60 fl. Philharm[oniker?]' on the November page of *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1888/89* may refer to (a) an attempt to expedite the printing of the parts by sending 125 florins to Gutmann; (b) the costs of copying parts for a planned performance of the First Symphony by the Philharmonic.

preparation of the third version of the Fourth was already well in hand before Levi's rejection of the Eighth and, furthermore, Bruckner did not usually sign copyist's scores.²²

Bruckner's Easter vacation (possibly 28 March - 2 April) and part of his summer vacation were spent at St. Florian. A few weeks before his Easter visit to St. Florian, however, the *Kyrie* from his F minor Mass was performed at a *Wagnerverein* concert in Vienna. There was a brief report in the *Wiener Abendpost* on 1 March.²³

On his return to Vienna after his Easter break Bruckner wrote to Josef Gruber concerning five early settings of *Tantum ergo* which he had just revised and which he wished Karl Aigner to copy for publication purposes:

... Immediately on my return to Vienna, I revised these 4 *Tantum Ergo* settings, which belong together, as well as another separate setting. Please convey my respects to Prof. Deubler and ask him if he could arrange for Mr. Aigner to copy the score for St. Florian. And then would you be good enough to make them ready for publication? Please make sure that the 4 *Tantum Ergo* remain together.

I was delighted by the great success enjoyed recently in New York by the Fourth Symphony, conducted by the famous conductor...²⁴

See MVP 1, 375 and 2, 310.

22 Korstvedt, 'The First Published Edition of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony', 20.

23 See Norbert Tschulik, op.cit., 176.

24 See *HSABB*, 2, 37 for this letter, dated Vienna, 24 April 1888. It was first printed in *ABB*, 221; the location of the original is unknown. The five *Tantum Ergo* settings, WAB 41 and 42, date from 1846. See *ABSW XXI/1*, 35-41 and 139-45 for further details, and *ABSW XXI/2*, 41-51 and 150-57 for modern editions of both original and revised versions. The revised versions were published for the first time by Groß of Innsbruck in 1893. See also Johanna Walch, "[...] ein gutes Dupplicat auf meine Rechnung [...]": Unveröffentlichte Briefe zwischen Anton Bruckner und Josef Gruber', in *BJ 2006-2010* (Linz, 2011), 353-58 for details of two as yet unpublished letters from Bruckner to Gruber that are owned privately. The first, dated 25 May 1888, concerns a setting of the Requiem that Gruber has sent Bruckner for his

Bruckner did not have necrophiliac tendencies and so it was not so much a morbid interest in the dead Wagner as a genuine affection for his memory that led him to make an annual pilgrimage to his grave when he visited Bayreuth every summer. The same is true of his high regard for Beethoven and Schubert. The remains of both these composers were exhumed in 1888, on 21 June and 23 September respectively, and moved to specially prepared graves in the *Zentralfriedhof*. Bruckner was present on both occasions and took a particularly keen interest in the removal of Beethoven's body from the Währinger cemetery.²⁵

On 21 July, at the beginning of the summer vacation, Bruckner travelled to Bayreuth with members of the Vienna *Wagner-Verein* (including Eckstein and Hugo Wolf) who had hired a special train. He certainly saw Richter conducting a performance of *Die Meistersinger*, may have been present at a performance of *Parsifal*, conducted by Felix Mottl who was standing in for the indisposed Hermann Levi, and visited the graves of Liszt and Wagner. Apart from the period 12-18 August when he was on *Hofkapelle* duty, he spent the rest of his vacation at St. Florian, Steyr, Linz and Kremsmünster.²⁶ The organ recitals which he gave in St. Florian abbey on 15 and 28 August were reported in the two main Linz newspapers. Much of the time at St. Florian was spent revising the Third Symphony. During his visits to Steyr he enjoyed the company of his three friends, Karl Reder, Carl Almeroth and Isidor Dierkes. Reder, Almeroth and three others formed a kind of cartel which

perusal and the second, incomplete and undated, is Bruckner's guarded but friendly response to Gruber's request that he provide a professional evaluation of his compositions.

25 For further details, see Carl Hruby, *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner* (Vienna, 1901), 20-21; Richard von Perger and Robert Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der k.k. Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien* (Vienna, 1912), 188 and 195; G-A IV/2, 595-96; Kurt Dieman, *Musik in Wien* (Vienna-Munich-Zurich, 1970), 179.

26 A letter from Bruckner to his *Hofkapelle* colleague, Pius Richter, indicates that he had made his customary arrangement for sharing of responsibilities over the summer period. See *HSABB* 2, 39 for the text of this letter, dated Vienna, 9 July 1888; the original is in the *Stadt- und Landesbibliothek*, Vienna.

undertook to pay Bruckner an annual sum of 600 florins until such times as his financial position improved. This arrangement lasted for three years until the pension from Emperor Franz Josef came into force. Bruckner for his part gave a special concert for his friends once a year at St. Florian.

Bruckner's desire to gain further international recognition led him to remind Arthur Nikisch in Leipzig of an earlier promise to perform the Seventh in Berlin. In his first letter he also mentioned that Gutmann had sent the Fourth to Leipzig for printing and that he was revising the Eighth. In his second he asked Nikisch to give him several weeks' prior notice of a possible performance so that the Vienna branch of the *Wagner-Verein* could contact the Berlin branch.²⁷ There were encouraging signs, however, of a growing reputation outside Vienna. Bruckner's former teacher, Otto Kitzler, directed a performance of his *Te Deum* in Brno on 13 April which was reported in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*.²⁸ Two issues of the Parisian music journal *Le Guide Musical* (6 and 13 September) contained an article on Bruckner and his music, entitled 'Un Symphonist d'Avenir Antoine Bruckner', by Jan van Santen Kolff. The main thrust of the article was that, while Brahms, his contemporary, had been worshipped for nearly twenty years, Bruckner had been neglected and was only now being recognized.²⁹ Bruckner wrote to Santen Kolff to thank him, and compared his generosity with the harsh treatment meted out to him in Vienna by Hanslick and others.³⁰

27 See *HSABB* 2, 39 and 44, and Steffen Lieberwirth, '>Anton Bruckner und Leipzig. Einige neue Erkenntnisse und Ergänzungen', in *BJ 1989/90* (Linz, 1992), 285 for these two letters, dated Vienna, 20 June and 23 November respectively. The originals are privately owned. Harrandt suggests that Bruckner meant Mainz rather than Leipzig in the first letter.

28 The report appeared in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 84 (25 April 1888), 202. See Othmar Wessely, 'Bruckner Berichterstattung in der Neuen Zeitschrift für Musik', in *BSL 1991* (Linz, 1994), 139.

29 See *G-A IV/2*, 606-07 for a German précis of this article.

30 See *HSABB* 2, 45 for this letter, dated Vienna, 23 November 1888; the location of the original is unknown. The addressee is given as Dr. W.L. van Meurs, a Dutch librarian and admirer of Bruckner's music, in *G-A IV/2*, 612 and Cornelis van Zwol, 'Bruckner-Rezeption in den Niederlanden und im anglo-amerikanischen Raum', in *BSL 1991* (Linz, 1994), 149. See *HSABB* 2, 43 for an earlier communication with Santen Kolff on 9 November 1888; the

On 2 October Bruckner was an honorary guest of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* at the celebrations of the centenary of Simon Sechter's birth. Sechter's nephew, Moritz, was one of his favourite companions and a member of the small circle of friends (which included Löwe, Schalk, Markus, Vockner, Oberleithner and Lorenz) with whom he would often dine at the 'Zur Kugel' or the 'Gause' or the 'Riedhof' restaurants in the evenings, the restaurant being chosen according to the current quality of the Pilsner beer on offer!

As in 1887 Deubler conducted Bruckner's early *Requiem* (without *Offertorium* and *Benedictus*) in early November at St. Florian. His *Ave Maria*, WAB 6, was performed several times in the latter part of the year, first on 3 October by the Wels branch of the *Wagnerverein*, then on 12 October in Vienna at a Singakademie concert, finally on 8 November in Vienna at a *Wagnerverein* concert conducted by Josef Schalk.³¹

Bruckner spent his Christmas vacation at Kremsmünster abbey at the invitation of the abbot, Leonard Achleutner. He played the organ at some of the services and spent some time with Oddo Loidol. One of the 'secular' attractions may very well have been a young lady he met in the village during the summer vacation, Mathilde Feßl.³² Another young lady from Linz, Martha

original, a postcard, is in the Archiv der Stadt Linz.

31 The performance in the Singakademie concert was the first performance of a Bruckner choral work by the society. See Elisabeth Fritz-Hilscher, 'Bruckner-Pflege an der Wiener Singakademie', in *BJ 2006-2010* (Linz, 2011), 93-110. One of the reviewers of this concert, writing in *Vaterland* on 30 December 1888, pointed to many similarities between Bruckner's *Ave Maria* and Palestrina's motet, *Tu es Petrus*, which was also sung at the concert; see *G-A IV/2*, 617ff. for this review. Laurencin d'Armond also reviewed this concert in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 85 (27 March 1889), 150-51.; see Othmar Wessely, op.cit. (*BSL 1991*), 139. The *Wagnerverein* concert also included performances of another Bruckner motet, *Locus iste*, and some Wolf songs (sung by Ellen Forster). It was reviewed by Laurencin d'Armond in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 84 (5 December 1888), 530-31; see Othmar Wessely, op.cit., 139.

32 On 9 September 1888, Josef Leitenmaier, secretary and music teacher at Kremsmünster, wrote to Bruckner to provide him with some information about Mathilde and her family. See *HSABB 2*, 40-41; the original of this letter is in St. Florian. See also Erwin Horn, 'Bruckneriana zwischen St. Florian und Kremsmünster', 236, for information provided by Oddo Loidol about Bruckner's Christmas visit.

Rauscher, also made an impression on him during the summer. There are two of his letters to her extant. He requests and then acknowledges receipt of her photograph, mentions that he has been ill and is feeling 'rather desperate' because of the amount of work he has to do.³³

Owing to pre-publication work on the Fourth Symphony and further revision of the Third Symphony, Bruckner was not able to devote much time to a thorough revision of the Eighth until March 1889. In his letter to Betty von Mayfeld at the end of January 1888 he intimated that it would take some time to finish it as 'considerable alterations' had to be made and he had too little time to work. In his letter to Santen Kolff in November he wrote that, although the Eighth was finished, cuts were being made here and there and some changes in the orchestration were also necessary.³⁴

Why did Bruckner undertake the revision of Symphony no. 3? It is possible that, after Levi's initial unfavourable reaction to the Eighth, he felt that he would be able to make an earlier work more successful by '>'correcting' parts of it. It could also be argued that he did not have the will and energy to embark immediately on a new work. But the course of events showed that '>'the revision work was characterized more by insecurity and sudden changes of mind than by single-minded purposefulness. (Contrary to the opinion of a substantial part of the Bruckner literature, however, this cannot be cited as evidence of the inferior quality or irrelevance of this 1888/89 version).³⁵ Bruckner's memory was not entirely accurate when he wrote to Wolzogen in January 1889:

I am well again and, since last June, have been working on the

33 See *HSABB* 2, 42 and 44 for these two letters, dated Vienna, 5 and 23 November 1888 respectively. They were first published in *GrBB*, 78-79. and *G-A* IV/2, 620-21; the originals of Martha's letters to Bruckner and his first reply are not extant, but the original of the second reply is in the *ÖNB*.

34 See footnotes 8 and 30.

35 *LBSAB*, 133.

3rd Symphony in D minor which I have thoroughly improved...³⁶

In fact, Bruckner began with the revision of the Finale which seemed to him to require the most radical change. The earliest date which appears in the autograph is 5 March 1888 in bar 314. He completed his revision of this movement on 29 May, but later undertook a second revision of the Finale between 19 July and 30 September. Although he made use of pages from the first edition to insert corrections in the other movements, for the Finale he used a copy made by Franz Schalk which already contained three substantial cuts and new transitions composed by Schalk himself.³⁷ It appears that Bruckner had already discussed the new shape of the Finale with Schalk and the latter had prepared a version to which Bruckner now added the finishing touches.³⁸ Bruckner allowed two of Schalk's cuts to stand but rejected the third (bars 465-586 of the 1877 version) and replaced it with new material (bars 393-440 in the new version). The bridge passage preceding it, almost certainly Franz Schalk's work, remained unchanged.

The Schalk brothers' correspondence from June to the end of the year reveals that, while they agreed in principle with Bruckner's revision work (the cuts in particular), they found the painstaking attention to detail excessive and superfluous. It would appear that Bruckner for his part was not unduly influenced by the Schalks and frequently resisted their objections and rejected their advice. On 10 June Josef informed Franz about progress in the revision work on the Finale and Bruckner's obsessive attention to detail which had effectively prevented him from starting work on the other movements.³⁹ At the end of June / beginning of July, Gustav Mahler, who

36 From Bruckner's letter to Hans von Wolzogen, dated Vienna, 1 January 1889. See *HSABB*, 2, 47 for the text of this letter, which was first printed in *ABB*, 223; the location of the original is unknown.

37 Mus. Hs. 6081 in the *ÖNB*.

38 Bruckner possibly refers to this movement in a letter to Franz Schalk, dated Vienna, 23 February 1888. See *HSABB* 2, 34; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 54/9.

39 See *HSABB* 2, 38 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/9/7.

had been largely responsible for the four-hand transcription of the second version, visited Bruckner as he was passing through Vienna. He advised Bruckner to reject the entire revision plan and to draw on the already existing version for the new edition. Henry-Louis de la Grange refers to this visit, but is certainly wrong in suggesting 1884 as the date:

On June 30, he [Mahler] passed through Vienna on his way to Perchtoldsdorf, where, like the year before, he and Fritz Lohr spent a week of relaxing music sessions and refreshing walking tours. No doubt this was when Mahler, on a visit to Bruckner, persuaded him to give up his idea of revising his Third Symphony. The editor Rättig had in fact persuaded Bruckner to rewrite his work, since none of the many conductors to whom he had sent the score would agree to play it. Bruckner had started work on the revision, and about fifty pages were already engraved. Mahler was firmly opposed to the idea, and the old master asked the editor to destroy the new pages, since an '>orchestral professional' had convinced him that revision was unnecessary.⁴⁰

Josef Schalk possibly saw his position as Bruckner's '>assistant' threatened by Mahler's intervention (passages in letters of a later date reveal that Mahler had very little sympathy for the Schalk brothers), and he wrote to Franz suggesting that publication be delayed until such times as he (Franz) would be in Vienna and able to exert some influence on the composer.⁴¹ Josef wrote to Franz again a week later, suggesting that it would be better to '>let sleeping dogs lie' in case Bruckner discovered that he (Josef) had personally vetoed the reprinting of the old score. Löwe had already told Bruckner what he and the Schalks thought of Mahler's advice.⁴²

40 Henry-Louis de la Grange, *Mahler* vol. 1 (1974), 115. De la Grange bases this on information provided by Auer in his *Anton Bruckner* (Leipzig: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1941), 323. Although Auer does not give the exact date of the alleged visit, he places it between two other incidents dated 5 April and 28 May 1884.

41 See *HSABB* 2, 40 for an extract from this letter, dated Vienna, 13 July 1888; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/9/9.

42 See *HSABB* 2, 40 for this letter, dated Vienna, 20 July 1888; the original is in the *ÖNB*,

Bruckner spent many hours of his vacation at St. Florian preparing the Third for the second edition. Karl Aigner and some of the choirboys were drafted in to help. Ferdinand Edlinger, later an organ student at the Conservatory and a schoolteacher, recalled meeting Bruckner outside the music room of the abbey one day:

Bruckner... asked me if I could play the piano. When I replied modestly that I could certainly play >'a little', he led me to the piano and showed me the two upper staves of a page of full score. We sat down and played a few bars in piano duet. Suddenly he leapt up, clapped his hands with great joy and said to me, his eyes shining with happiness, >'Yes, that is fine. Hanslick can write what he wants.'⁴³

An older student, Franz Wiesner, also reported:

As we were senior students in the high school and already had a basic grounding in harmony - indeed quite a few of us, for instance Aigner, currently music teacher in the abbey, and Müller, director of music at Linz Cathedral, had a more thorough understanding of it - we came into close contact with the master as he was composing. If he had completed one part of a symphony movement, or had to make a choice between two alternatives, he called one of us, usually Aigner. We then played the string parts, for instance, while Bruckner played the other parts as he wished them to be heard. Now and then he asked, >'Which do you prefer?'⁴⁴

When Bruckner was in a good mood and wanted to have a break from composing, he would often play through movements of his symphonies to the

F18 Schalk 158/9/10. In his reply to Josef's earlier letter, Franz said that he would write to Bruckner about the symphony - hence Josef's advice.

43 G-A II/1, 302. Edlinger also reported that Bruckner seldom played the organ in services in later years. However, he was often asked to play a postlude - see G-A II/1, 304-05.

44 G-A II/1, 302.

choirboys, indicating instrumental entries etc. Aigner did not have an easy time. He had to check for parallel fifths and octaves and pay attention to the periodic structure and other details. Almeroth, his friend from Steyr, relates how he took infinite care over scoring and choosing the correct instrumental distribution of the notes of a chord, for instance, and playing the same chord several times until he had found what he felt was the correct choice of instruments.⁴⁵

Josef Schalk's decision to leave things as they were proved a wise one. Before leaving St. Florian for Kremsmünster on 9 September, Bruckner began revising the first movement of the Third. He completed his revision of this movement on 2 December. Josef referred to his work on this movement when he wrote to his brother in October that Bruckner was well but '>sweating away pointlessly.'⁴⁶ The following month Franz wrote to Josef expressing his concern that Bruckner should >overcome his 'suicidal whims.'⁴⁷ Ten days later Josef was able to tell Franz that Bruckner would very much like his opinion about the alterations he was making in both the Third and Eighth Symphonies:

... I am to say to you that, in the Finale, many bars are being omitted between the G major passage and your favourite passage, as he calls it. I doubt if that is of any help. But he must be allowed to hope; the main thing is to keep him in a good mood. At any rate, write him a proper letter...⁴⁸

45 G-A II/1, 303.

46 See *LBSAB*, 137 for an extract from this letter, dated Vienna, 5 October 1888; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/9/17. Josef's observation is corroborated by Bruckner's own words, in a letter to the music dealer Karl Tendler in Graz on the same day: '>I have no time at all to give concerts, and hardly any time even to compose...'; the location of the original is unknown.

47 See *LBSAB*, 137 for an extract from this letter, dated Reichenberg, 16 November 1888; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/9/22.

48 See *HSABB* 2, 45-46 for this letter, dated Vienna, 26 November 1888; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/9/24.

Later in December Franz Schalk wrote two letters, one to his brother Josef, the other – ‘a >proper letter’ - to Bruckner. In the former, he expressed his concern that Bruckner might feel neglected on account of Josef’s enthusiasm for Wolf’s music.⁴⁹ In the latter, he recalled with great pleasure his studies with the composer and regretted that he was no longer in Vienna to witness his work at first hand and give him his personal support. He sent his best wishes for the New Year and hoped that Bruckner would have the necessary energy to complete his Ninth Symphony.⁵⁰

Bruckner began 1889 by sending his best wishes for the New Year to Franz Schalk and Hans von Wolzogen. The Third Symphony had been >‘thoroughly improved’, he wrote to the latter, but he was still experiencing the same opposition from supporters of the >‘Brahms cult’ and Hans Richter was too frightened of Hanslick’s possible reaction to programme one of his symphonies!⁵¹ On 2 January, Josef wrote to Franz about the New Year’s eve celebrations in which he, Löwe, Hirsch, Wolf and Bruckner had participated. Bruckner had been very delighted and touched by Franz’s letter.⁵²

49 See *HSABB* 2, 46 for an extract from this letter, dated Reichenberg, 18 December 1888; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/9/43.

50 See *HSABB* 2, 46 for this letter, dated Reichenberg, 28 December 1888.

51 See *HSABB* 2, 47 for his letter to Schalk, dated Vienna, 1 January 1889; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 54/10. For the letter to Wolzogen, see earlier and footnote 36.

52 See *HSABB* 2, 48 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/10/11. Friction among the membership of the *Wagner-Verein* and Bruckner’s peevishness about the growing popularity of Hugo Wolf are alluded to in an exchange of letters between Josef and Franz at the end of January and beginning of February. See *HSABB* 2, 49 and *LBSAB*, 120ff. for extracts from these letters, dated Vienna, 28 January and Reichenberg, 9 February 1889 respectively; the originals are in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/10/13 and 158/10/14.

Bruckner had been associated with the *Akademischer Gesangverein* for many years. The conductor was no longer his old friend, Rudolf Weinwurm, who resigned from the position in October 1887 because he deplored the increasing anti-semitic tendencies among its members, but Hermann Grädener (1844-1929), one of Bruckner's colleagues at the Conservatory, who was appointed to the post in January 1889. Although a keen Brahmsian, Grädener had the laudable desire to build bridges between the supporters of the rival Brahms and Bruckner factions in his choice of repertoire. Bruckner was elected an honorary member of the society on 22 January. He attended a committee meeting on 12 February to offer his thanks and wrote a letter which was read out at the next choir rehearsal.⁵³

Hans Richter may or may not have been too unsure of critical response to programme one of Bruckner's symphonies in a *Gesellschaft* concert. But he was certainly prepared to conduct the Philharmonic in a concert organized by the *Wagner-Verein* on Sunday 24 February. Both Schalk and Löwe were also active in promoting Bruckner's works in piano performances given at weekly meetings of the *Wagner-Verein* during February.

The Philharmonic concert, held in the large *Musikverein* hall, included the >'March of the Three Kings' from Liszt's *Christus*, the Venusberg music from Wagner's *Tannhäuser* and the second Vienna performance of Bruckner's Symphony no. 7. Bruckner, as usual, wrote a letter to the Philharmonic after the concert to express his gratitude and thanked the *Wagner-Verein* for its support.⁵⁴ Because of the >'private' nature of the performance (as was the

53 See Elisabeth Hilscher, >'Bruckner als Gelehrter - Bruckner als Geehrter', in *BSL 1988* (Linz, 1992), 122. Bruckner's letter has been lost and does not appear in *HSABB 2*.

54 The letters to the Vienna Philharmonic and the *Wagner-Verein* are both dated Vienna, 1

March 1889. See *HSABB 2*, 50 for the texts of both letters. The original of the former is in the Vienna Philharmonic archives; the original of the latter is in the *Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek*. Bruckner for his part received a congratulatory letter, dated Vienna 2 March 1889, from the *Oberösterreichischer Akademischer Verein >'Germania' in Wien*; the original is in St. Florian.

case with the performance of the Fourth in January 1888), many of the leading critics were absent. Those who attended, however, were impressed. In a review in the *Deutsche Zeitung*, Theodor Helm described the performance as a '>'great artistic event' attended by people who were genuinely interested in the composer and his work. Accordingly it made a much greater impact that it had done three years previously at its first performance.⁵⁵ Writing in the *Fremdenblatt*, Ludwig Speidel was honest enough to confess that, although he was not fully able to understand the symphony and had very little time for Bruckner's young supporters, the work had great originality, particularly in the slow movement.⁵⁶ Alfred Gillhofer's review in *Das Vaterland* is very pro-Bruckner, adopting the familiar argument that the composer has had to struggle against difficult odds to gain a hearing. His works could be compared only with the finest, and they displayed a contrapuntal mastery and assured handling of orchestral polyphony. His inventive powers were such that the motivic material in one of his symphonies would furnish any other composer with enough ideas for ten works.⁵⁷

Finally, in his review in the *Deutsches Volksblatt*, August Göllerich argued for the formation of a '>'Bruckner Society' which would provide the composer with the financial security necessary for him to devote all his time and energy to composition.⁵⁸

A week after the performance Josef Schalk informed his brother Franz of the success of the concert. In his reply Franz expressed his pleasure and his

55 See G-A IV/2, 628-29 for an extract from this review, dated 2 March 1889.

56 See G-A IV/2, 629-30 for an extract from this review, dated 7 March 1889.

57 See G-A IV/2, 630-33 for an lengthy extract from this review, dated 3 March 1889.

58 See G-A IV/2, 633-34 for an extract from this review, dated 7 March 1889.

hope that it would lead to a greater understanding of Bruckner's music.⁵⁹

Bruckner's relationship with Kremsmünster was strengthened in March when some of his manuscripts were sent there at the request of his friend, Oddo Loidol, who wrote to him on behalf of a fellow-priest, Father Hugo, who was beginning a manuscript collection. Loidol asked Bruckner if he could pass on any autographs or sketches which he no longer needed or to which he attached no particular importance.⁶⁰

59 See *LBSAB*, 138-39 for extracts from these letters, dated Vienna, 3 March 1889 and Reichenberg, 6 March 1889 respectively. The first letter is also printed in *HSABB* 2, 51; the originals are in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/10/17 and 158/10/18. Leibnitz describes it erroneously as a concert in which the piano four-hand arrangement was played.

60 See *G-A IV/2*, 669 for this letter, dated Kremsmünster, 11 March 1889; the location of the original is unknown. According to a letter sent by Father Georg Huemer, music director at Kremsmünster abbey, to Franz Schaumann on 4 December 1896, Bruckner sent a parcel of sketches to the abbey on 12 April; the location of the original of the accompanying letter is unknown. For further information, see Altman Kellner, *Musikgeschichte des Stiftes Kremsmünster* (Cassel / Basel, 1956), 762-63.

61 See *HSABB* 2, 52 for letters from Bruckner to his sister and Ignaz Bruckner to his brother-in-law, Johann Nepomuk Hueber (dated St. Florian, 16 March 1889); the originals of both letters are in the possession of the Hueber family, Vöcklabruck. See also Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', p.7, for details of the telegram sent by Rosalie to her brother on 12 March to inform him of Johanna's death. Laura Hueber (1884-1904), Johanna's daughter and Rosalie's granddaughter and only 4 at the time, mentioned the death of her mother in the diary that she began to compile in August 1901. For further

As Bruckner was quite close to his sister Rosalie in Vöcklabruck, the death of his niece Johanna must have come as a great shock to him. Writing to Rosalie on 14 March, Bruckner sent his condolences and mentioned that a Mass had been read for her at the *Schottenstift* the day before. He also enclosed 20 florins to help towards funeral expenses.⁶¹

Apart from the Seventh Symphony in February, very few Bruckner works were performed in Vienna during 1889. On 14 March Bruckner attended a performance of his String Quintet by the Hellmesberger Quartet in the small *Musikvereinsaal*. On Maundy Thursday (18 April), Josef Schalk conducted a choir from the *Wagner-Verein* in a sacred concert in the *Minoritenkirche*. The programme ranged from some unaccompanied Palestrina motets to some Wolf songs and included Bruckner's motets, *Locus iste* and *Ave Maria*. In his review of the concert, Hans Paumgartner stressed that it was not only vociferous support from his young friends that ensured success for Bruckner. He was above >'party politics' and everyone who listened to these two motets was genuinely moved.⁶² At a church celebration in Hainburg, a small town on the Danube about 25 miles east of Vienna, on 24 May, at the end of July, and again during its anniversary celebrations in the *Am Hof* church on 26 October the *Ambrosius-Verein* of Vienna conducted by Julius Böhm sang

information about Laura and her father Franz Schwalm, see Erwin Horn, 'Laura – Anton Bruckners Großnichte. Das Tagebuch von Laura Huber', and Franz Zamazal, 'Ein Segment aus Vöcklabrucks Musikgeschichte. Franz Schwalm, der Vater von Bruckners Großnichte Laura Hueber', in *BJ 2001-2005*, ed Erich Wolfgang Partsch (Vienna 2006), 7-128 and 129-175.

62 See G-A IV/2. 670 for an extract from this review.

63 See Erwin Horn, 'Bruckneriana zwischen St. Florian und Kremsmünster', 242-43, for further details of this choral society and its conductors, Josef and Julius Böhm. *Locus iste* was sung on 24 May and 26 October, and the *Tantum ergo* at the end of July.

Bruckner's *Locus iste* and one of the composer's settings of the *Tantum ergo*, possibly the five-part D major setting, WAB 42 (1846).⁶³ On 6 October the *Church Music Society* of the *Votivkirche* conducted by Theobald Kretschmann sang two of Bruckner's graduals for mixed choir at a sacred music concert in the Ehrbar Hall. The reviewer for *Das Vaterland* commented on the ability of both Liszt and Bruckner to combine the old style with modern harmonic developments.⁶⁴

Outside Vienna, performances of Bruckner's works during the year were few and far between. On Sunday 24 March the *Graz Singverein* performed the motet *Tota pulchra es*, WAB 46 and there were short reviews in both the *Grazer Tagespost* and the *Grazer Morgenpost*.⁶⁵ At the beginning of December, Karl Muck conducted the second Prague performance of the *Symphony no. 7*.⁶⁶

Diary entries in the *Professoren - und Lehrer-Kalender* for 1888/89 indicate that Bruckner had *Hofkapelle* duties on certain days in July and August during his summer break. A letter to Bruckner from Pius Richter also provides details of agreed '>'division of labour' during the months of August and September. Richter was happy to accept Bruckner's offer to cover for him from 11 to 17 August, while he would cover for Bruckner from 25 August until 21 September.⁶⁷ It is certain that some days at the end of July and

64 See *G-A IV/2*, 671 for an extract from this review.

65 Karl Savenau was the reviewer in the *Tagespost* (26 March) and '>-ch' was the reviewer in the *Morgenpost* (27 March). For further details, see Ingrid Schubert, '>'Bruckner, Wagner und die Neudeutschen in Graz', in *BSL 1984* (Linz, 1986), 37-38.

66 Muck alluded to this performance and his earlier performances of the symphony in Graz and Prague when he wrote to Bruckner from Berlin on 26 December 1893, asking for information which could be used as pre-performance (6 January 1894) publicity material. See *HSABB*, 2, 241; the original is in St. Florian.

67 See *HSABB* 2, 54-55 for Pius Richter's letter to Bruckner, dated Perchtholdsdorf, 8 August 1889; the original is in St. Florian. In a letter to J.E. Aichinger, parish priest of Steyr, dated Vienna 12 August 1889, Bruckner informed him that he was intending to travel to Steyr

beginning of August were spent at Bayreuth and the rest of his holiday was divided between St. Florian and Steyr.⁶⁸ As in the previous year (and *Hofkapelle* duties permitting) he may have taken advantage of the travelling arrangements organized by the *Wagnerverein* to travel to Bayreuth on a special train which left Vienna on Saturday 20 July. One of Bruckner's travel companions would have been the young Joseph Venantius v. Wöss, who later edited several of his works for Universal Edition. The three operas they attended were *Parsifal* (two performances), *Tristan und Isolde* and *Die Meistersinger*. Wöss tells of an occasion when he and a few others accompanied Bruckner below the theatre stage right to the foundations. Bruckner triumphantly secured a loose piece of brick from the foundations and said that he would use it as a paperweight in his apartment in Vienna!⁶⁹

Bruckner's young friend, August Göllerich, was also in Bayreuth and made use of the opportunity to introduce the Eighth Symphony to the violinist and composer, Alexander Ritter, and Richard Strauss. According to Göllerich, he and Strauss played the piano-duet version of the Adagio movement. Strauss was clearly very impressed but did not have such a high opinion of the first movement.⁷⁰

After his return from Bayreuth, Bruckner asked Göllerich if he could remember what was at the top of the two municipal towers (weathercock,

the following Saturday (17 August). See *HSABB* 2, 55 for this letter; the original is in Steyr Parish Church.

68 A letter from Bruckner to Gutmann on 7 August apropos alterations to the parts of the Fourth Symphony indicates that he was back in Vienna after his visit to Bayreuth. See *HSABB* 2, 54; the original of this letter is in the *ÖNB*. There was advance notice of Bruckner's stay as a 'dear guest' at the Steyr Stadtpfarrhof at the end of August and beginning of September in the *Steyrer Zeitung* (14 August 1889). See Erwin Horn, 'Bruckneriana zwischen St. Florian und Kremsmünster', 240. During his time in Steyr he paid a visit to the Dunkl family. See *HSABB* 2, 56 for Dominik Dunkl's appreciative letter to Bruckner, dated Seitenstetten, 12 September 1889; the original is in St. Florian.

69 See *G-A* IV/2, 673-76 for this account.

70 See *G-A* IV/2, 676.

cross, lightning conductor?) and the Catholic church (weathercock but no cross?).⁷¹ Redlich makes some pertinent comments about this fixation - a kind of numeromania - which was clearly related to his obsession with prayer repetition as noted in his diaries:

... In moments of a more than usually troubled mental and spiritual condition (as, for instance, in the years 1887-89), the obsession with repetition and focussing morbid attention on the number and character of inanimate ornamental objects refused to be canalized into the purely musical or religious sphere alone.

It is possible that this numeromania was accentuated by his intensive work on the Third and, particularly, the Eighth Symphonies during the year. Revision work on the Third was completed in March.⁷² The printing took a long time, perhaps because Bruckner was not absolutely convinced about the rightness of revision. Eberle did not receive the printer's copy until 17 August and the publication of the score was not announced until November 1890. The printing costs were covered by Emperor Franz Josef.

No sooner had Bruckner completed revision work on the Third than he turned his attention once again to the Eighth. The Adagio was revised between 4 March and 8 May. Work on the Finale was completed on 31 July, the Scherzo was revised during August and September, and the opening movement was >'newly restored' between November 1889 and the end of January 1890, further work being undertaken until 10 March when he

71 See *HSABB* 2, 55 for this letter, dated Vienna, 12 August 1889. It was first published in *ABB*, 225; the location of the original is unknown. There is an English translation in H.F. Redlich, *Bruckner and Mahler* (London, 1955), 31.

72 There is an entry in the February 1889 page of *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1888/89* which indicates completion - >'Am 11. F[e]br[uar] 1889 Sinf[onie] in Dmoll Nr 3 ganz fertig' - but this date almost certainly refers to the completed revision of the Trio (the same date appears on the autograph). See *MVP* 1, 368 and 2, 305. Bruckner scrutinized the slow movement between 17 and 27 February and the Scherzo on 3 and 4 March.

declared the movement '>completely finished'.⁷³ When revising the symphony Bruckner prepared new copies of movements 2-4 but used for the first movement an 'unusual mixture of pages from a copyist's manuscript made in 1887, autograph pages from different work phases between 1888 and 1890 as well as pages that are part-autograph and part-copy and could have been written at any time during the conception of the work.'⁷⁴ Bruckner amended it by erasing some passages, pasting over other passages or making insertions in pencil or ink.

We know, from various anecdotes of friends and pupils, that Bruckner was often so totally absorbed in his work that he would disregard visitors to his flat, even those who had appointments. No amount of knocking would arouse him from his labours. One such incident was later recalled by Emil Seling, one of Bruckner's private pupils, during the 1889-90 period:

...'Today I will show you why I left you standing at the door recently. Come here and sit down.' And when I had taken my place beside his Bösendorfer piano, he played to me for almost half an hour the passages in the Eighth Symphony which he had just altered - the symphony which he had written four years earlier and was now thoroughly revising for the purpose of its first performance in Vienna. He drew my attention particularly to the fact that he felt he could not do without the harp in the Adagio, although he had banned this instrument from all his other symphonies because he thought it was too theatrical. He also repeated the passage which he called '>the death watch', making the remark that the '>dear Lord' had inspired him to write it...⁷⁵

While working on this second version of the symphony, Bruckner sent the

73 The 1888/89 diary-notebook (see previous footnote), however, has the following entry among the prayer-lists at the end: '>14.3.90. letzte auswendige Wiederholung v[om] 1. Satz der 8 Sinf [onie]. / '>final repetition by memory of the 1st movement of the 8th Symphony.' See *MVP* 1, 381 and 2, 316.

74 Paul Hawkshaw, "Mein Achte ist ein Mysterium", 16.

75 See *G-A IV/2*, 693ff.

completed manuscripts of the movements to a professional copyist, Leopold Hofmeyr, in Steyr so that a fair copy of the entire work would be available. In a letter accompanying the Trio, Bruckner made a light-hearted reference to 'der Micherl', the Scherzo:

... How is Michael doing? I am now sending you his companion, the Trio, and enclose 10 florins as advance payment until such time as you send me a bill...⁷⁶

Bruckner also referred to Hans Richter's great interest in the First Symphony in this letter. Richter wanted Bruckner to have it copied for future performance. Writing to Franz Schalk at about this time, Josef Schalk also mentioned plans for a performance of the symphony.⁷⁷ Bruckner did not begin serious work on it, however, until after the Eighth was completed, and the concert in which it was performed did not take place until December 1891, more than two years later.

Josef Schalk's letters to his brother in the second half of the year suggest a temporary breakdown of some kind in his relationship with Bruckner. As no reason is given, we can only speculate that it was either connected with the revision of the Third Symphony or with Schalk's advocacy of Wolf (at Bruckner's expense?) Nor is it likely that Bruckner, who held neither political nor social grudges against Jews, would have been caught up in the in-fighting among members of the *Akademischer Wagner-Verein* during 1889 which resulted in some leaving the society for political and anti-Semitic reasons and founding a breakaway *Richard Wagner-Verein* the following

⁷⁶ See *HSABB* 2, 59 for the text of this letter, dated Vienna, 11 November 1889; the original is in Wels and is privately owned.

⁷⁷ See *LBSAB*, 144-45 for an extract from this letter, dated Vienna, 30 October 1889; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/10/40. Richter was evidently much taken with the work when Löwe played it through to him on the piano.

year.⁷⁸ A rift between Schalk and Bruckner is first suggested in a letter to Franz which Josef wrote during his working holiday in Gmunden.⁷⁹ Franz's immediate response was that his brother was over-reacting.⁸⁰ On 25 September, Josef sent a visiting card to Bruckner saying that he would be happy to carry out corrections in the Third Symphony without making any unnecessary changes in the autograph.⁸¹ At the beginning of December Josef was able to report an improvement in his relationship with Bruckner.⁸² In another letter written towards the end of the year, he mentioned to Franz that the score of the Fourth was 'full of printing mistakes' and said that he was enclosing the 'correction sheets of the Finale of the III' in which Bruckner had made a number of changes in the light of Franz's suggestions.⁸³ In the

78 On 19 April the *Deutsches Volksblatt* included an article by August Göllerich in which the author recommended that the *Akademischer Gesangverein* introduce more choruses of a national German nature into their repertoire. See Elisabeth Hilscher, 'Bruckner als Gelehrter - Bruckner als Geehrter', *BSL 1988* (Linz, 1992), 122. In this article (pp. 121-22), Hilscher also refers to Rudolf Weinwurm's earlier resignation from the Society in October 1887 because he was disturbed by the increasing anti-Semitic tendencies; his resignation was reported in the *Wiener Sonn- und Montagszeitung*, 7 November 1887, 4. See also Margaret Notley, 'Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism', in *Bruckner Studies* (Cambridge, 1997), 54-71; Andrea Harrandt, 'Students and Friends as "Prophets" and "Promoters" - The reception of Bruckner's works in the Wiener Akademische Wagner-Verein', in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (Aldershot, 2001), 327-37. For a lucid essay on Bruckner's generally tolerant attitude towards Jews, see Ken Ward, 'Bruckner, Mahler and anti-Semitism', in *TBJ* 16/2 (July 2012), 3-7.

79 See *FSBB*, 55ff. and *LBSAB*, 140ff. for this letter, dated Gmunden, 1 August 1889; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/10/25.

80 See *LBSAB*, 142 for an extract from this letter, dated Reichenberg, 2 August 1889; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/10/26.

81 See *HSABB* 2, 57 for the text of this card, dated 25 September 1889. The original in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 146c, was one of the 'exhibits' in a special exhibition to mark the anniversary of Bruckner's birth in 1974; see Franz Grasberger, ed., *Anton Bruckner zum 150. Geburtstag. Eine Ausstellung im Prunksaal der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (Vienna, 1974), 105.

82 See *HSABB* 2, 59-60 for this letter, dated Vienna, 9 December 1889; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/10/45.

83 See *HSABB* 2, 60-1 for this undated letter; the original is not extant but the *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna, possesses a copy. Gutmann's dilatoriness in printing the parts of the Fourth effectively ruled out a projected performance of the symphony in Munich,

meantime Bruckner's relationship with Franz appears to have remained as cordial as ever. On 1 October he sent name-day greetings to Franz and hoped that he would soon make a full recovery from his illness.⁸⁴

In the autumn Wilhelm Floderer, choirmaster of the *Sängerbund* choir in Linz, informed Bruckner that Karl Kerschbaum had written a new text to replace Wallmann's original text for the male-voice piece *Sängerbund*, WAB 82, composed in 1882. In his reply Bruckner expressed his gratitude that one of his pieces was to be sung.⁸⁵

There is an intriguing diary entry in the October 1889 page of the *Professoren-und Lehrer-Kalender* for 1888/89 - >'25. Okt[ober] mit Brahms b[eim] Igel im freien' - which alludes to a meeting of the two composers in the *Zum roten Igel* inn arranged by friends. There was an Indian summer that year and the weather was warm enough for the composers and their respective entourages to have their evening meal in the open air. Both August Stradal and Friedrich Klose record several meetings of the composers at this hostelry. Evidently the conversation rarely went any deeper than the commonplace. There was a respect for, but no particular understanding of each other's compositions.⁸⁶

planned originally for 27 November and then postponed until 14 February. See *HSABB* 2, 58 and 64 for two letters, dated Munich, 2 November 1889 and 27 January 1890, from Wilhelm Pötzsch, horn player in the *Musikalische Akademie*, to Bruckner, requesting handwritten copies of the parts; the originals are in St. Florian.

84 See *HSABB* 2, 57. No precise dates of the illness are known and the Schalk correspondence does not provide any clues. The original of the letter is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 54/12. Franz reported Bruckner's >'extremely effusive' greetings when he wrote to Josef a week later. See *HSABB* 2, 57, footnote; the original of this letter is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 158/10/35

85 See *HSABB* 2, 58 for the text of this letter, dated Vienna, 11 October 1889. It was printed for the first time in the *Neue musikalische Presse* 14 (1905), no. 3; the location of the original is unknown.

86 See *G-A* IV/2, 687-92 for further information, including Decsey's and Stradal's reports of the meeting. See also Stephen Johnson, *Bruckner Remembered*, 151ff. which includes Max von Oberleithner's second-hand report. Oberleithner (1868-1935) was a music student of Otto Kitzler in Brno before coming to Vienna to study law at the University. He attended some of Bruckner's University lectures and then became one of his private pupils from the

We do not know what prompted Bruckner to apply for the vacant position of music director at the *Burgtheater* in Vienna towards the end of the year. However, the duties were not particularly onerous - the provision of some music at the beginning and between the acts of theatrical performances - and perhaps Bruckner thought that the salary on offer would be sufficient for him to give up some of his teaching commitments and enable him to devote more time to composition. Was there also the question of prestige and the belief that the tenure of a position such as this would carry some weight in Viennese musical circles? After Bruckner had made a formal application to Dr. August Förster, the director of the Burgtheater, Förster wrote to Hermann Levi to ask for a reference. He was obviously sympathetic to Bruckner and wanted to do his best for him but did not know much about him and was certainly surprised that a man of Bruckner's age should wish to apply. In his reply Levi provided a warm appreciation of Bruckner's skill. He considered Bruckner's Seventh Symphony to be the most significant symphonic work to have been written for decades and was unable to explain why the composer had not achieved the breakthrough he deserved.⁸⁷ As Förster died shortly after the exchange of letters we do not know if any additional steps were taken. There is apparently no further correspondence in the *Burgtheater* archives, and Bruckner was not appointed to the post.

During the final months of the year, Dr. Arthur Seidl from Munich was in Vienna to give a lecture on '>Kunstlehre der Wagner'schen Meistersinger' at a meeting of the *Wagner-Verein*. He availed himself of the opportunity to

autumn of 1889 to 1894. He also played a prominent part in the revisions of some of Bruckner's works. An extract from Oberleithner's *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1933) is printed in *G-A IV/2*, 690ff. For the diary entry, see *MVP* 1, 374 and 2, 309.

⁸⁷ See *HSABB* 2, 61 for Förster's letter to Levi, dated Vienna, 14 December 1889; the original is in the *ÖNB*. For Levi's reply, dated Munich, 15 December 1889, see *HSABB* 2, 62; the original is also in the *ÖNB*. Further details can be found in Ferdinand Scherber, '>Eine unbekannte Episode aus Anton Bruckners Leben', in *Signale für die musikalische Welt*, Berlin, 30 April 1913.

attend one of Bruckner's University lectures while he was in Vienna and was somewhat embarrassed when the composer, on learning that Seidl was present, spent about half of the lecture maintaining a two way conversation with him about Wagner, Nikisch, his appreciation of Levi and other matters!⁸⁸

The Schalk correspondence at the beginning of 1890 is concerned *inter alia* with Josef's improved relationship with Bruckner, Bruckner's work on the revision of the Eighth and Josef's plans to carry out his own revision of the F minor Mass.⁸⁹ Bruckner wrote to thank his reliable copyist, Leopold Hofmeyr, for the excellence of his most recent copying work, enclosed five florins, and warned him that he would soon be >'pestering' him again!⁹⁰

While Bruckner was putting the finishing touches to his revision of the Eighth, he was shocked to learn of his brother Ignaz's >'misfortune' - a bout of food poisoning from which he had made a miraculous recovery. He wrote to him with some concern and enclosed a gift of 10 florins.⁹¹

Josef's desire to revise the F minor Mass no doubt stemmed from his plans to perform the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* movements in a *Wagner-Verein* concert in March 1890 (with piano and brass rather than full orchestral accompaniment). When he wrote to Franz towards the end of February, he mentioned not only the forthcoming performance of these two movements and a rehearsal of the *Gloria* attended by a delighted Bruckner, but also

88 See G-A IV/2, 684-85 for an extract from Seidl's later obituary notice of Bruckner in the *Dresdener Deutsche Wacht*.

89 See LBSAB, 147-48 for extracts from Josef's letters to Franz, dated Vienna, 2 January, 18 January and 31 January 1890, and Franz's letter to Joseph, dated Graz, 25 January 1890; the originals are in the ÖNB, F18 Schalk 158/11/10 and 12-14.

90 See HSABB 2, 64 for Bruckner's letter to Hofmeyr, dated Vienna, 2 February 1890; the original is owned privately. Hofmeyr had presumably completed his copy of the Trio which Bruckner had sent him on 11 November 1889; see earlier.

91 See HSABB 2, 65 for Bruckner's letter to Ignaz, dated Vienna, 3 February 1890. It was first printed in ABB, 227-28; the original is not extant.

Levi's recent visit to Vienna during which Löwe had played through Bruckner's First Symphony. Josef was keen for Franz to undertake some >'discreet' revision of the work himself.⁹² Levi was clearly impressed with Bruckner's symphony and Löwe's playing. He wrote to the composer, saying that it '>must be printed and performed', but pleading with him not to alter it too much.⁹³ On 6 March Josef wrote to Franz and enclosed his own copy of the Adagio of the First, including some of Löwe's suggestions, which he asked his brother to peruse. He was also able to inform Franz of the successful performance of the two movements from the F minor Mass at an '>internal evening' of the *Wagnerverein* the previous day.⁹⁴ Löwe played a solo piano arrangement of the Adagio and Scherzo from the Third Symphony at the same concert.⁹⁵

Both partisan Bruckner supporters and non-partisan music lovers were increasingly concerned at the comparative infrequency of performances of his symphonies. Articles in *Das Vaterland* on 27 March and 15 April highlighted this; indeed, the writer of the second article made the assertion that Bruckner had been forced to make alterations in his symphonies so as to guarantee performance.⁹⁶ Writing to Theodor Helm at the end of March, Bruckner went so far as to blame himself. He had 'taken the 1st Symphony

92 See *HSABB* 2, 66-67 for this letter, dated Vienna, 22 February 1890; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/11/17.

93 See *HSABB* 2, 66 for this letter, dated 16 February 1890; the original is in St. Florian.

94 See *HSABB* 2, 68 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/11/18.

95 Löwe was commended for '>achieving the best possible results in making the polyphony clear' by the reviewer of the *Musikalische Rundschau*, 10 March 1890. The concert as a whole was reviewed by Emil v. Hartmann in the *Neue Wiener Musik-Zeitung* 1 (1889-90), 131-32. Hartmann compared Bruckner favourably with Brahms. See Gerold W. Gruber, '>Brahms und Bruckner in der zeitgenössischen Wiener Musikkritik', in *BSL* 1983 (Linz, 1985), 209 and 217.

96 See *G-A* IV/3, 11-12 and extract from the articles in *ABDS*, 40-41. See also Franz Grasberger, '>Das Bruckner-Bild der Zeitung *Das Vaterland* in den Jahren 1870-1900'. in *Festschrift Hans Schneider zum 60. Geburtstag* (Munich, 1981), 124-25.

from them' (the Vienna Philharmonic), the Third Symphony had not yet appeared in print (although Schalk had assured him three months earlier that it would be ready in good time), and Richter was not aware that the Sixth had already been copied.⁹⁷ Nevertheless, he hoped to secure interest in *the* Eighth by dedicating it to Emperor Franz Josef and requested the latter's permission to print the dedicatory notice on the title-page of the score.⁹⁸ Bruckner received a reply in the affirmative,⁹⁹ a gesture which prompted the music critic of *Das Vaterland* to assert that a certain critic [Hanslick is obviously intended] would no longer be able to hinder performances of Bruckner's works.¹⁰⁰ The next step was to find a publisher for the symphony. On 28 April Bruckner wrote to Hermann Levi and asked for his help.¹⁰¹

Outside Austria Bruckner was receiving growing recognition. In America, Bernhard Ziehn, one of the music critics of the *Musical Courier*, took the opportunity, in a review of a piano recital given by Hans von Bülow in Chicago (and with reference to Bülow's edition of Beethoven's piano works), to take him to task for his conservative, pro-Brahms and anti-Wagner stance,

97 See *HSABB* 2, 71 for this letter, dated Vienna, 30 March 1890. It was first printed in *ABB*, 228; the original is lost. From a recently discovered letter dated 19 April 1890, however, in which Bruckner informs Hans Richter that "the score of the D-minor symphony has already been published and the orchestral parts will be available in the coming weeks", we can deduce that the work appeared in print in early April. See Andreas Lindner and Klaus Petermayr, 'Vier unbekannte Briefe Anton Bruckners an Hans Richter', in *BJ 2006-2010* (Linz, 2011), 207-221. The February page of *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1889/90* contains Bruckner's references to Viktor Christ's work on the copies of the Sixth and Eighth Symphonies which he completed during the summer of the year. See *MVP* 1, 391 and 2, 326.

98 See *HSABB* 2, 69 for Bruckner's letter, dated Vienna, 14 March 1890. It was first published in *ABB*, 229; the original is not extant.

99 See *HSABB* 2, 71 for this letter, dated Vienna, 16 April 1890 and written on Emperor Franz Josef's behalf by Count Ferdinand von Trauttmannsdorff-Weinberg; the original is in St. Florian. On 13 January 1893 the Emperor sent Bruckner a letter acknowledging receipt of the 'de luxe score' of the symphony which was now housed in the Imperial library. See *HSABB* 2, 204; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

100 See *G-A* IV/3, footnote 1 for an extract from this article (20 April 1890).

101 See *HSABB* 2, 72 for this letter; the original is owned privately.

and his failure to recognize the true stature of a composer like Bruckner.¹⁰² There was a performance of the Seventh in Hamburg on 27 April and, on the same day, Josef Schalk accompanied Bruckner to Pressburg (Bratislava) to attend another performance of the same work.¹⁰³ Josef wrote to Franz to tell him about the visit and hoped that his brother would come to Vienna at the beginning of June and bring with him the revisions of the *Gloria* of the F minor Mass and the Adagio of the First Symphony.¹⁰⁴

The performance of Bruckner's Seventh Symphony in Pressburg (Bratislava) was given by the orchestra of the Pressburg *Kirchenmusik-Verein* conducted by Josef Thiard-Laforest who had been conductor of the Linz *Musikverein* from 1878 to 1881 and had made the composer's acquaintance during that time. On 14 March Bruckner wrote to Thiard-Laforest to remind him that if he did not have any Wagner tubas available, he would have to use horns (as in the Leipzig performance). A fortnight later, on 28 March, Bruckner advised his friend to hire the Wagner tuba players from the Vienna *Hofoper* orchestra. In the event, Laforest adopted the same compromise as Nikisch in Leipzig and used bass flugelhorn instead of Wagner tubas.¹⁰⁵ The orchestra had about 50-55 players. On the day of the concert the *Pressburger Zeitung* published a long article about Bruckner and his Seventh Symphony. The symphony formed the second part of the

102 See G-A IV/3, 50ff. for extracts from this review, dated 20 April 1890.

103 In a telegram sent to Pressburg (Thiard-Laforest?), Bruckner gives the times of his departure from Vienna (27 April at 8.25) and arrival in Pressburg (9.57). See Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 14.

104 See HSABB 2, 72-73, and LBSAB, 151-52 for this letter, dated Vienna, 1 May 1890; the original is in the ÖNB, F18 Schalk 158/11/22. In a letter to Franz, dated Vienna, 5 May 1890, Bruckner also mentioned work on the First Symphony; see HSABB 2, 73; the original of this letter is in the ÖNB.

105 This is confirmed by Franz Schmidt who, as a sixteen-year-old youth, attended the Bratislava performance. The flugelhornists were brought from a wind band in Kittsee.

concert which began with Berlioz's *Benvenuto Cellini* overture and continued with one of Thiard-Laforest's own works, a cantata for soprano and orchestra. On 28 April, the day after the concert, there was a glowing review of the symphony in the *Pressburger Zeitung*. A week later, Bruckner wrote to Laforest and enclosed the score of his D minor Mass which he asked his friend to have copied with a view to a possible performance in Bratislava. Later in the year or at the beginning of 1891, he was made an honorary member of the Pressburg *Kirchenmusikverein*. He wrote a letter of warm appreciation to the Society on 27 January 1891.¹⁰⁶

Declining health forced Bruckner to request a year's leave of absence from his Conservatory duties (16 hours per week).¹⁰⁷ On 12 July his request was granted. Zellner, the secretary-general of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, informed Bruckner separately that he would have to continue paying his contributions to the pension fund during his absence. However, Bruckner had been assured by a consortium of friends and supporters that he would receive an annual income of 1000 florins to compensate for this

106 See Gabriel Dusinsky, 'Anton Bruckner und die Aufführung seiner Siebenten Symphonie 1890 in Pressburg (Bratislava)', in *BJ 1981* (Linz, 1982), 153 for further details of the Bratislava performance. Both the article in the *Pressburger Zeitung* 127, no. 115 (27 April 1890) and Bruckner's letter of thanks to the *Kirchenmusikverein* are reprinted in Dusinsky's article (the former in facsimile), pp.154ff. In her article 'Anton Bruckner and Slovakia' in the *IBG Studien & Berichte Mitteilungsblatt* 74 (June 2010), 6. Veronika Bakičová also mentions a positive review of the performance in the *Westungarisches Grenzboten* no.5988 (29 April 1890), 4-5. Bruckner's three letters to Thiard-Laforest (14 March, 28 March and 7 May 1890) were first published in the *Pressburger Zeitung* 134, no. 77, *Morgenblatt* (18 March 1897). They are also printed in *HSABB* 2, 69, 70 and 74; the originals are not extant. See also *HSABB* 2, 74-75 for Thiard-Laforest's letter to Bruckner, dated Preßburg, 31 May 1890, in which the score of the D minor Mass is returned and Bruckner is invited to spend a weekend in Preßburg; the original is in St. Florian. See *HSABB* 2, 114 for Bruckner's letter to the *Kirchenmusikverein Preßburg*; the original is in the *Archiv Hlavného Mesta*, Bratislava. In the letter to his brother Franz written on 1 May 1890 (see earlier, footnote 104), Josef Schalk remarked that Bruckner was in good spirits in spite of the shortcomings of the performance.

107 On the March 1890 page of the *Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender* for 1889/90, Bruckner notes the diagnoses of 'chronic catarrh of the throat and larynx' and 'hypertension' made by two of his doctors, Ottokar Chiari and Gustav Riehl. See *MVP* 1, 392 and 2, 327. See *HSABB* 2, 79 for Bruckner's letter, dated Vienna 8 July 1890, to the directorate of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*; the original in the *Gesellschaft* library.

loss of salary.¹⁰⁸ Bruckner was still expected to undertake his organ duties at the *Hofkapelle*, and these duties kept him in Vienna until the end of July.¹⁰⁹

Two letters written during the earlier part of the summer provide an amusing glimpse of Bruckner's keen eye for feminine beauty. He had evidently been embarrassed about information received in letters from Josef Gruber and a priest in St. Florian concerning an 'affair of the heart' with a young lady in Steyr and he asked Franz Bayer to throw some light on the matter. He also made further enquiries in a letter to Leopold Hofmeyr.¹¹⁰

On 31 July Bruckner played the organ at the wedding of Archduchess Marie Valerie, the Emperor's daughter, and Archduke Franz Salvator in Bad Ischl. His improvisation combined the 'Hallelujah' chorus from Handel's *Messiah* and the *Kaiserlied*. He received a fee of 100 ducats and lodged at the presbytery while he was there. He also gave an organ concert in the parish church on the morning of 2 August.¹¹¹ His travelling companion was

108 See *HSABB* 2, 80 for the reply from the directorate, signed by Billing and Zellner, and Zellner's separate letter; the originals of the two letters, both dated 12 July 1890, are in St. Florian. For details of the people involved in the consortium and their contributions, see *G-A* IV/3, 54-58. See also Bruckner's letter later in the year (Vienna, 16 December) to one of his patrons, Prince Johann Liechtenstein, in which he sought assurance that his personal contribution of 300 florins would continue on an annual basis; this letter is printed in *HSABB* 2, 97-98; the original is in the *Stiftung Fürst Liechtenstein* in Vienna. Also in the *Stiftung Fürst Liechtenstein* are a letter, dated 17 July 1890, in which Vinzenz Fürstenberg gives the prince details of the sum of money which the consortium hopes to raise and asks him if he would be willing to make a contribution, details of the decision made by the prince on 30 July 1890 to make a contribution of 300 florins, and confirmation of this decision on 2 August; see *HSABB* 2, 81 and *SchABCT*, 602ff. On 1 October Bruckner received a letter from the *Credit-Anstalt* bank in Vienna advising him that the sum of 1025 florins had been credited to his account. See *ABA* 66/3,101; the original is in St. Florian. Writing to Hermann Levi on 2 October he informed him of his year's leave from the Conservatory and the promise of financial help from his friends. See *HSABB* 2, 85-86; the original of this letter is owned privately.

109 See *HSABB* 2, 81 for Bruckner's letter, dated Vienna 22 July 1890, to his *Hofkapelle* colleague, Pius Richter; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

110 Gruber's letter to Bruckner is not extant, but see *HSABB* 2, 76-77 for Bruckner's letters to Bayer and Hofmeyr, dated Vienna, 21 June and 4 July respectively, and *HSABB* 2, 78-79 for Hofmeyr's reply in which he clarified the situation. The original of the first letter, first published in *ABB*, 230, is not extant; the original of the second is privately owned, and the original of the third is in St. Florian.

111 See *HSABB* 2, 78 for Bruckner's letter to Prelate Franz Weinmayr, dated Vienna, 4

Josef Schalk who was amazed that Bruckner still possessed an impressive pedal technique.¹¹²

Bruckner spent some time with his sister in Vöcklabruck either shortly before travelling to Ischl or immediately afterwards, and it was during this visit that his young grand-niece Laura played a short piece for piano four-hands with her father to him.¹¹³ Two diary entries for August also mention the names of two young ladies in Vöcklabruck, Kamilla Wismar (Wiesmair) and Hedwig Fürthner, who had attracted his attention.¹¹⁴ He also visited two friends in Goisern, Franz Perfahl, who had been a teaching assistant in Ansfelden in the late 1830s and had taught young Bruckner violin and theory before he became a choirboy at St. Florian, and Johann Georg Ernst

July 1890. Bruckner asked Weinmayr to make sure that the organ was tuned. Further details can be found in *G-A IV/3*, 58-62; these include a reminiscence of one of the singers in the church choir and an extract from a report of the wedding in the *Ischler Wochenblatt* 31 (3 August) which contains a review of Bruckner's organ playing. There is a sketch in the *ÖNB* of the original themes for improvisation (first and second themes from the Finale of Symphony no. 1) which Bruckner submitted to the Lord Chamberlain for approval but which were turned down as 'unsuitable'. See *ABA* 81/7, 109; a facsimile was published in *Die Musik* xvi (September 1924).

112 It seems that Bruckner gave an extra concert for some of his friends, including Schalk, Löwe and Nikisch. See *LBSAB*, 152 for a reference to Josef's letter to Franz, dated Vienna, 14 August 1890; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/11/25.

113 See Erwin Horn, 'Laura – Anton Bruckners Großnichte', 20. Laura later became a highly regarded pianist and organist in Vöcklabruck until her untimely death in 1904. She inherited Bruckner's Bösendorfer piano, although she kept it for only two years. At a concert to celebrate the unveiling of a memorial plaque to Bruckner in Vöcklabruck in May 1900, she played the first movement of Beethoven's 'Pathétique' Sonata. Max Auer was her occasional keyboard partner in piano four-hand arrangements. See also Franz Leitner, *Bruckner in Vöcklabruck* (Vöcklabruck, 1996).

114 See *MVP* 1, 397 and 2, 329 for these entries in *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1888/89*. There is also an entry for 'Horky Leopoldine, Blumengeschäft Südbahnhof' (*MVP* 1, 402 and 2, 331), and two letters from this young woman, an assistant in a flower shop at the Südbahnhof in Vienna, the first dated 4 October 1890, the second undated (but, judging from its contents, written shortly after the first) also indicate another short-lived friendship; the second testifies in particular to Bruckner's gentlemanly conduct. See *HSABB* 2, 88 for the first letter and an extract from the second letter. These were first published in *G-A IV/3*, 113-14; the originals of the correspondence are lost.

Fettinger.¹¹⁵ Goisern was one of Bruckner's favourite holiday places during the 70s and 80s and he was usually asked to play the organ in both the Catholic and Evangelical churches there. As he was on sick leave from Conservatory duties, he was able to spend a longer time than usual at Steyr - from 14 August to the end of September. During these weeks he visited a former 'flame', Josefine Lang who, as Mrs. Weilnböck, managed a large guest house in Neufelden. Meeting her daughter, Caroline, seems to have revived something of the passion he once had for Josefine.¹¹⁶

It is significant that Bruckner missed St. Florian out of his holiday itinerary. He had been invited by Deubler to stay there but felt uneasy about taking up the invitation because it had not come from the abbot.¹¹⁷ While in Steyr he played the organ at the parish church on at least two occasions. On 26 September, for instance, he improvised on themes from his *Te Deum* and

115 Fettinger, a schoolteacher and organist at the Evangelical Church in Goisern, is described by Karl Pilz as "a dear friend of Bruckner's". See Karl Pilz, 'Goiserer Erinnerungen an A. Bruckner', in *Salzkammergut-Zeitung* 48, 29.11.1956, 2,d and Sandra Föger, 'Schulmeister Johann Georg Ernst Fettinger – „ein lieber Freund Bruckners“, in *ABIL Mitteilungen* 9 (June 2012), 14-16.

116 See G-A III/1, 354 and 609, as well as Chapter 3, footnote 112. Bruckner was accompanied by his friend Karl Waldeck from Linz. He improvised on the organ of Neufelden parish church on 16 September and, on the same day, received a signed photograph of Josefine's daughter, Caroline; this photograph is now in the library of the *Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität*, Linz. On 21 April 1891, Bruckner wrote to both Josefine and Caroline. He enclosed a photograph in his letter to Josefine and said that he looked forward to receiving her photograph in return; he described Caroline as his 'lieber Ersatz' - the 'dear substitute' for her mother - and, in his letter to her, recalled the happy time he had spent at Neufelden. In her reply (on 24 April), Caroline promised Bruckner that her mother would have her photograph taken and then send a copy to him. See *HSABB* 2, 134 for both letters. There is a facsimile of the second in *ABA*, 41; the originals of both are in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*. See G-A III/1, 612 for a reference to Caroline's letter; the original is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*, Linz. In a letter to Bruckner on 11 November 1891, Waldeck wrote that he had spoken to Caroline's uncle, Anton, who, although he held Bruckner in the highest esteem, felt that he could do nothing on the composer's behalf 'because of the age difference - in a case such as this the decisive factor is the affection of the bride which should take precedence over all other considerations.' See *HSABB* 2, 157; the original is in St. Florian.

117 See *HSABB* 2, 82 for Bruckner's letter to Deubler, dated Steyr, 18 August 1890; the original is in St. Florian.

First Symphony at a special thanksgiving service (for the reconstruction of the church tower which had been badly damaged by a fire in 1876). On 27 September he was present at the unveiling of a Schubert plaque at the house where Schubert stayed with his friend Johann Vogl on two occasions in 1825 and 1827. A festival concert held on the same day began with a performance of Bruckner's *Sängerbund*. His sojourn in Steyr was a 'working holiday', however - he worked on the revision of his First Symphony.

On his return to Vienna, he was no doubt pleased to learn that Richter had decided to include the revised version of the Third Symphony in the concert programme for the coming Vienna Philharmonic season. On 2 October he drafted a letter to Leopold Zellner, secretary of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, informing him that he wished to continue giving Harmony lessons, but not organ lessons, at the Conservatory in the event of a complete recovery.¹¹⁸

Finding a publisher for the revised Eighth Symphony was proving to be a difficult task. Hermann Levi did what he could to assist Bruckner and was even prepared to provide some financial aid, but there appeared to be no interest among the leading publishers.

Although Levi was not well enough to give the first performance of the symphony himself, he recommended Felix Weingartner in Mannheim as a suitable replacement and suggested that the parts be written out as soon as possible. The performance could take place in November or December and

118 This draft is on the October 1890 page of *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1889/90*; see MVP 1, 399 and 2, 330. It is also printed in *HSABB* 2, 87; the fair copy is in the library of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*. See also the references to J.E. Habert's correspondence with Ernst Klinger and Bernhard Deubler concerning the need to find a replacement organ teacher at the Conservatory in *G-A IV/3*, 78-79 and the report of Hermann Häböck, one of his last organ students at the Conservatory, about Bruckner's lack of enthusiasm for organ teaching at this time in *G-A IV/3*, 115-16. The text of Habert's letter to Deubler, dated Gmunden, 22 October 1890, can be found in *HSABB* 2, 89; the original is in St. Florian. Habert also commented somewhat caustically that Bruckner's financial position was more than adequate.

publishers like Schott and Heckel could be invited to attend.¹¹⁹ Although he hoped that Levi would still be able to conduct the work in Munich at a future date, Bruckner took his friend's advice and contacted Weingartner at the beginning of October.¹²⁰ He asked the young conductor if he would consider giving the first performance of the work and mentioned that Nikisch in Leipzig was also interested in performing it.¹²¹ Bruckner wrote again to Weingartner on 11 October to inform him that he had just sent the score of the symphony to Munich where Levi would arrange to have the parts copied.¹²²

At the end of October Bruckner's long-term financial position was made more secure. Largely at the instigation of Bishop Franz Maria Doppelbauer who spoke very warmly of the composer's contribution to the musical life of the region, a decision was made by the Upper Austrian Parliament to grant him an annuity of 400 florins. Bruckner received official notification at the end of October and wrote a letter of heartfelt thanks on 3 November.¹²³

119 See *HSABB* 2, 84 for Levi's letter to Bruckner, dated Munich, 20 September 1890; the original is in St. Florian.

120 See Walter Beck, *Anton Bruckner. Ein Lebensbild mit neuen Dokumenten* (Dornach, 1995), 63 and *HSABB* 2, 85-86 for Bruckner's reply to Levi's letter, dated Vienna, 2 October 1890; the original is in private possession.

121 See *HSABB* 2, 87 for Bruckner's letter to Weingartner, dated Vienna, 2 October 1890. The originals of this and other letters from Bruckner to Weingartner can be found in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library. Felix von Weingartner (1863-1942), an Austrian conductor, composer and pianist, studied in Graz and Leipzig before taking up conducting posts in Königsberg, Danzig, Hamburg and Mannheim. He later held posts in Berlin and Vienna, including directorship of the Court Opera (1907-10) and conductorship of the Vienna Philharmonic.

122 See *HSABB* 2, 88 for Bruckner's second letter to Weingartner. Viktor Christ was responsible for copying the score.

123 Payments were to be made monthly, commencing 1 November. See *HSABB* 2, 90 for this letter from Leonhard Achleutner, head of the provincial government; it was first printed in *G-A IV/3*, 77. The given date of the letter - Linz, 11 November 1890 - must be wrong in view of the date of a telegram sent by Ludwig Edlbacher to Bruckner (30 October 1890) to inform him of the Parliament's decision as well as Bruckner's letter of reply (Vienna, 3 November 1890). See Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 7 for details of the telegram and *HSABB* 2, 90 for this letter; the original is in the Upper Austrian *Landesarchiv*, Linz.

In December Bruckner's Fourth Symphony was performed in Munich, the revised version of his Third was given its first performance in Vienna, and Josef Schalk made plans to give a concert in Graz, conducting the Styrian *Musikverein* orchestra in performances of Bruckner's Fourth and some of Hugo Wolf's orchestral songs. Writing to his brother Franz at the beginning of the month, he mentioned Bruckner's improved financial situation but was particularly concerned to solicit Franz's help and advice:

... The matter is settled, and I am to conduct the concert on the 21st. I have been negotiating with Dr. Zwiedineck, the concert director, whom you will probably know and have written to him that you will oblige by conducting the preliminary rehearsals. First of all I must find out how many days' leave I can get from the Conservatory. I will probably come on the 16th, certainly not any earlier. Please put my mind at rest as soon as possible by letting me know if you can hold a number of rehearsals beforehand. The parts should be obtained from Gutmann immediately. Löwe tells me that it is possible the parts have not yet been printed. In that case, get hold of the handwritten ones. However, to a large extent these do not correspond with the new score. And so you will have some trouble. In any case, will you arrange things so that we can manage three rehearsals? Come to an understanding with Dr. Zwiedineck immediately. There are a few of Wolf's orchestral songs as well, and these too will not be very easy. I cannot tell you how much I am looking forward to seeing you again. You will not be able to use the score of the IVth which I sent you; it is the first, mistake-ridden edition. The second edition, in which Bruckner and Löwe have made alterations, is the authentic one, and so you must obtain it. Everything will be in order when you receive the printed parts.

I have also written to Dr. Zwiedineck to ask him if he would oblige by lending parts to the less proficient, amateur members of the orchestra so that they can practise them at home. I am very concerned about the strings. Nevertheless, under no circumstances do I want to give up the Romantic symphony. Who knows whether I will have another opportunity in my life to conduct an orchestra...¹²⁴

124 See *HSABB* 2, 92 for this letter from Josef Schalk to his brother, dated Vienna, 1 December 1890; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/11/27.

In his reply, Franz informed Josef that two wind and one string rehearsal had already taken place and suggested that he do his utmost to arrange the performance for the 28th of the month. It was possible that Bruckner could accompany him to Graz.¹²⁵ A few days later Josef sent another letter to Franz. He was concerned about discrepancies between the written parts and the revised score of the Fourth and was certain that Franz Fischer in Munich, to whom he had written for the parts, had experienced the same difficulties. And, to make matters worse, Bruckner was not being particularly helpful!¹²⁶ Further preliminary rehearsals that Franz took on his brother's behalf proved so difficult and unrewarding that he now advised Josef to consider postponing the concert. The main problem was the lack of printed parts coupled with the fact that most of the string players were amateurs who did not have sufficient time to practise between rehearsals – 'it would be a great shame if the performance were to founder because of over-hasty preparation.'¹²⁷

The performance of the Fourth in Munich, conducted by Franz Fischer, was successful but both Levi and Fischer mentioned problems with the written parts and difficulties in rehearsal as a result of discrepancies between the parts and the score (thus confirming Josef Schalk's fears). The day after the performance both Fischer and Levi wrote to the composer:

Your 4th Symphony (Romantic) had a sensational success at
its performance in the Music Academy yesterday - I

125 See *HSABB* 2, 93 for this letter from Franz to Josef Schalk, dated 6 December 1890; the original is in the *ÖNB* F 18 Schalk 158/11/28.

126 See *LBSAB*, 154 for an extract from this letter, dated Vienna, 8 December 1890; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/11/29.

127 See *HSABB* 2, 96 for Franz's letter to his brother, dated Graz, 13 December 1890; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/11/30.

congratulate you wholeheartedly! The orchestra played excellently and, as for my own humble part, I can only say that I did all I could to perform the work as well as possible. Unfortunately, the musical material supplied by your publisher was so mistake-ridden that I had to correct mistakes even during the final rehearsal; consequently, the rehearsals were painful affairs. Nevertheless, we did not allow our spirits to droop and we had a huge success which brought us great pleasure.

With cordial greetings from my dear colleague Levi who was unable to attend the performance because of illness...¹²⁸

In his letter to Bruckner, Hermann Levi regretted that he had not been able to attend the performances of both the Symphony and the String Quintet because he had been confined to his house with laryngitis. Friends of his had reported, however, that Fischer's performance of the performance was extremely successful, and the orchestra played most beautifully - all this despite one wasted rehearsal caused by mistakes in the parts which a copyist had to correct:

I would rather remain silent about Gutmann's behaviour. It is a scandal that the parts have not yet been copied and that the written ones are not even correct! He had sent only the string parts here - although I have been dealing with him for a good year! And if another town now wants to perform the symphony, parts are still going to be unavailable!!¹²⁹

128 See *HSABB* 2, 93 for Fischer's letter to Bruckner, dated Munich, 11 December 1890; the original is privately owned. Also performed at this concert were Wagner's 'Faust' overture, Bruch's 'Frithjof' scene, and Brahms's 'Haydn' variations. Franz Fischer (1849-1918) was court music director in Mannheim (1877-79) and Munich (1879-1912). He conducted *Parsifal* at Bayreuth in the years 1882-84 and 1899, alternating with Hermann Levi. Fischer's letter was printed in the *Fremdenblatt* on 13 December and on the same day Gutmann wrote to the editor of the paper to say that the publishers 'whose editions are distinguished by the greatest correctness and highest quality cannot be held responsible for the handwritten parts' used in the Munich performance! See *HSABB* 2, 97 for this letter.

129 See *HSABB* 2, 94 for Levi's letter to Bruckner, dated Munich, 11 December 1890; the original is in St. Florian.

Bruckner was delighted with a letter from an unexpected source, the German writer Paul Heyse, who told him that he had 'taken Munich by storm' and thanked him for making such an unforgettable experience possible. He hoped that the acclaim which he had received would compensate to some extent for the lack of recognition he had been forced to endure for many years.¹³⁰

In his reply Bruckner thanked him for such an enthusiastic letter which he would certainly treasure. He also provided some programmatic details of the work and added that it was not his intention to combine all the main themes of the symphony in the Finale - that only happened in the Eighth:

... In the 4th Symphony (Romantic), what is suggested in the 1st movement is the horn announcing daybreak from the town hall. Then everything comes to life. In the second subject group, the theme is the 'zizipe' sound made by the great tit. 2nd movement: song, prayer, serenade. 3rd movement: the hunt, with the Trio suggesting a hurdy gurdy playing during the midday meal-break in the woods. I am very annoyed that the critic of the 'Neueste Nachrichten' has such a low opinion of the Finale and even considers it to be a failure, and I wish that I had not read the review which has cast a shadow over my happiness. I will never trust this man again. The general opinion here is that the Finale is the best and most outstanding movement. It was by no means my intention to bring all the themes together. That happens only in the Finale of the 8th Symphony...¹³¹

130 See *HSABB* 2, 95 for Heyse's letter to Bruckner, dated Munich, 13 December 1890. There is a facsimile of this letter between pp.144 and 145 in *ABB*; the original is in St. Florian.

131 See *HSABB* 2, 99 for this letter, dated Vienna, 22 December 1890. It was first published in *GrBLS*, 344-45 (where the addressee is given wrongly as Levi); the original has been lost. The critic of the Munich *Neueste Nachrichten* was Heinrich Porges who, in spite of Bruckner's disappointment, appears to have been otherwise very favourably disposed towards the work - according to a letter from Franz Strauss to Richard Strauss on 13 December; see Franz Grasberger, ed., *Der Strom der Töne trug mich fort'. Die Welt um Richard Strauss in Briefen* (Tutzing, 1967), which is cited in *SchABCT*, 615. Paul Johann Ludwig von Heyse (1830-1914) was a distinguished novelist, poet and translator. Born in Berlin, he lived and worked in Munich for most of his life. He was also friendly with Brahms

In spite of what appeared to be a cooling of relations with St. Florian earlier in the year, Bruckner wrote to Josef Gruber on 1 December to ask if any of his friends there would be coming to the performance of his Third Symphony in Vienna on 21 December.¹³² Thanks to the generosity of the Emperor who contributed 1600 florins towards the printing costs, the second edition of the symphony had just been published.¹³³

The concert on Sunday 21 December (the fourth in the *Gesellschaft* subscription series for the year) was conducted by Richter and included performances of Beethoven's 'Leonora' overture no. 2 and Grädener's Violin Concerto. The critical reception of Bruckner's symphony was again predictably divided between the pro- and anti-Wagner factions. In the *Neue freie Presse*, Hanslick praised the Scherzo movement for its unusual (for Bruckner) formal consistency but was extremely critical of the outer movements in which he detected the same faults which marred Bruckner's other compositions, viz. the co-existence of 'interesting, bold and original details' with 'empty, dry, often brutal passages.' He also rather drily observed the enthusiasm of students in the gallery and standing places who were still applauding vociferously long after the hall had been emptied and the lights turned out!¹³⁴

and Kalbeck, and both Robert Schumann and Hugo Wolf set his poetry to music. An article about his letter to Bruckner appeared in the *Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt* on Saturday 20 December 1890.

132 See *HSABB* 2, 91 for this letter; the original is in the *Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek*.

133 The recent publication of the second edition of the symphony was reported in the *Fremdenblatt* (1 November) and the *Neue Freie Presse* (3 November).

134 Review dated 24 December 1890 [but dated 23 December 1890 in some of the Bruckner literature]. See Hanslick, *Aus dem Tagebuche eines Musikers* (Berlin, 1892), 306. See also *G-A* IV/3, 86-90, Manfred Wagner, 'Bruckner in Wien', in *ABDS* 2 (Linz, 1980), 59, and Thomas Röder, *III Symphonie D-Moll Revisionbericht* (Vienna, 1997), 417. That Hanslick bore no personal feelings of animosity towards Bruckner is revealed by the fact that, shortly after this review, he sent the composer a signed photograph of himself with the

Writing in the *Wiener Montags-Revue*, Max Kalbeck also drew attention to the noisy enthusiasm of Bruckner's young supporters. As far as the symphony itself was concerned he could detect no significant difference between it and Bruckner's later works. The composer's veneration for Beethoven and Wagner was obvious – 'if one stands the Allegro of Beethoven's last symphony on its head, the beginning and end of Bruckner's first movement fall out.' There were some original ideas in the 'sultry atmosphere of this oppressive music' but they were short-lived, and it was to be regretted that such a richly talented composer 'could not find the necessary harmonious balance between desiring something on the one hand and being able to accomplish it on the other.'¹³⁵

In his review of the performance in the *Wiener Tagblatt*, Richard Heuberger described the work as one of extreme contrasts. It was difficult to fathom how the individual parts of a Bruckner symphony belonged together:

... A section which apparently depicts the religious pomp of a Corpus Christi procession, and in which one imagines seeing the gilded vestments of the priests is followed by a gently gambolling dance-like idea (for instance, the extremely pretty F sharp major motive in the final movement) which would make a fine piece of ballet music. Bruckner has used his fine instinct to discover a connection between the church and the theatre and to illustrate this musically - no rulebook in the world can deny this ... All in all, we can say that Bruckner's symphony awakens more interest than pleasure; one admires its magnificent sound rather than becoming engrossed in its thematic structure...¹³⁶

dedication 'to my esteemed friend'. Bruckner mentioned this gesture in a letter to August Göllerich at the beginning of 1891 in which he also referred to the highly successful performance of the symphony and the enthusiastic response of the audience. See *HSABB* 2, 106 for this letter to Göllerich, dated Vienna, 1 January 1891; the original is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*.

135 See *G-A IV/3*, 90ff. and Röder, op.cit., 422-23 for this review, dated 5 January 1891.

136 See *G-A IV/3*, 92ff. and Röder, op.cit., 414 for this review, dated 22 December 1890.

In a long article in the *Deutsche Zeitung* Theodor Helm provided a history of the work from its inception and compared the disastrous first performance in 1877 (when Bruckner conducted) with the enthusiastic reception given it thirteen years later under Richter's direction. Although there were a few reminiscences of Wagner, the symphony seemed to be more a 'spiritual child' of Beethoven. However, Bruckner had developed and given new shape to the Beethovenian stimuli to such an extent and had introduced so many original ideas that the first movement of his Third was 'one of the most inspired and most powerful to have been written in our century.' It possessed an impressive organic unity. As far as 'melodic invention' was concerned, the Adagio was one of the most beautiful slow movements since Beethoven. In the Scherzo, Helm imagined he could see a medieval joust with the knights displaying their skills encouraged by beautiful ladies. The Trio, on the other hand, evoked the world of Upper Austria with a peasant couple dancing the Ländler. Bruckner, a child of the people, was well able to depict a scene from German folk-life. The thematic structure of this movement was masterly. Although a unified whole, it was full of delightful surprises - of orchestration and polyphonic writing, to name but two. Helm confessed that he was not able fully to understand the Finale - the most controversial movement. He felt that the polka-like secondary theme, although undeniably charming, did not have sufficient symphonic weight. Nevertheless, there was much to admire in the movement, not least the impressive recall of the main first movement theme towards the end. Helm also mentioned the two different four-hand piano arrangements of the symphony - by Mahler [and Krzyzanowski] and, more recently, by Löwe and Schalk - both published by Th. Rättig.¹³⁷ In a separate review, which

¹³⁷ Helm's complete review, which appeared in the *Deutsche Zeitung* on 23 December 1890, is reprinted in *ABDS* 2, 60-63; see also Röder, *op.cit.*, 415-16. On 30 December

appeared in the Leipzig *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* in January 1891, Helm confessed that he had misunderstood the symphony when it was first performed in 1877. Since then, he had played through the four-hand piano arrangement with friends on several occasions and had '>seen the light.' Nevertheless, he still considered that the Finale was more dramatic than symphonic, and that there were too many undisguised Wagnerian reminiscences.¹³⁸

The reviewer for the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* found the first movement too long-drawn-out and '>more a fantasia than a strongly unified symphonic movement', although it concealed an '>extraordinary fund of motives.' Both the Adagio and the Scherzo were much more tightly organized, while the Finale referred '>once again to the great theme from Beethoven's Ninth, the starting-point for Bruckner's work.'¹³⁹

Robert Hirschfeld, the reviewer for *Die Presse*, was more concerned about the behaviour of Bruckner's supporters, specifically their noisy applause at the end of each movement, and considered this counter-productive and damaging to the composer's cause. The symphony was well able - in spite of some structural weaknesses - to '>hold its own' as a work of art. The last thing Bruckner needed was to be a pawn in the hands of a

Bruckner wrote to Helm to thank him for his excellent article and sent him a New Year's gift (a bottle of Klosterneuburg wine). See *HSABB* 2, 102. The letter was first published in *ABB*, 228f.; the original has been lost. It seems that Bruckner visited Helm at his home in Landstraße Hauptstraße 51 shortly before the performance of the symphony specifically to go through the score of the work with him. Helm's daughter Mathilde recorded her impressions of Bruckner in her diary - see *G-A IV/3*, 105-06 for an extract.

138 See *G-A IV/3*, 95-96 and Röder, *op.cit.*, 424 for extracts from this review, which appeared in the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* 22 (22 January 1891), 47-48. See also Röder, *op.cit.*, 420-21 for an extract from Helm's *Wiener Musikbrief* which appeared in the *Pester Lloyd* on 31 December 1890.

139 See *ABDS* 2, 64 for a reference to this review, which appeared in the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* on 23 December 1890.

political/polemical faction.¹⁴⁰ The review of the performance in the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau*, however, is a good illustration of this. It is written from a nationalistic, pro-German and anti-Semitic standpoint, argues that Bruckner is an absolute musician par excellence and pours scorn on Hanslick and Heuberger for regarding Brahms as the ideal composer of absolute music and Bruckner as a composer who draws inspiration from extra-musical programmes.¹⁴¹

Hans Paumgartner also devoted some space to criticism of the rivalry between the pro- and anti-Bruckner factions in his review of the performance in the *Wiener Abendpost* on 24 December. After his favourable comments on the structure of the Fourth Symphony (on 6 February 1888), it is surprising to find Paumgartner criticising the lack of structural consistency and the rhapsodic nature of the Third; on the other hand he is full of praise for the >'passionate warmth of his musical language, the majestic greatness of his themes' and adds that the composer >'has the greatest things to say to us, and a drop of Beethovenian oil continually trickles down on to his head.' Once again, the distinctive orchestral character of the themes is praised.¹⁴²

Bruckner was pleased to gain the support of Göllerich's successor as music critic of the *Deutsches Volksblatt*, a young man called Hans Puchstein. A meeting between Puchstein and Bruckner had been arranged for 24 December, but Bruckner wrote to Puchstein on the 23rd, regretting that he

140 Review dated 24 December 1890. See *ABDS* 2, 66 and both *G-A* IV/3, 98-101 and Röder, *op.cit.*, 418 for longer extracts. Hirschfeld also wrote an article on the Third Symphony in the *Neue Wiener Musik-Zeitung* 2 (1 February 1891), 85-88.

141 Review dated 11 January 1891. A copy of the complete review, written by Josef Stolzing, a prominent member of the breakaway *Neue Richard Wagner-Verein*, can be found in *ABDS*, 64-65.; there are also extracts in *G-A* IV/3, 96-97 and Röder, *op.cit.*, 423. The review by >'n' in *Das Vaterland*, 22 December 1890, was less strident but emphasized the vociferous public appreciation of Bruckner, >'our great national composer', demonstrated at the concert; see Röder, *op.cit.*, 415.

142 See Norbert Tschulik, >'Anton Bruckner in der Wiener Zeitung', in *BJ* 1981 (Linz, 1982), 171-79, and Röder, *op.cit.*, 419.

would not be able to keep the appointment and asking for another date. Bruckner had heard that Helm had been critical of Richter, and he asked Puchstein not to do the same, reminding him that 'we are aware of the situation.'¹⁴³ In an article on Bruckner in the *Deutsches Volksblatt* on 27 December, Puchstein said comparatively little about the performance of the Third, concentrating instead on discussing the current critical reception of Bruckner in Vienna and stressing the need for more regular performances of the composer's works. He described him as the true successor of Beethoven and Wagner.¹⁴⁴

Two other important reviews appeared in the *Fremdenblatt* and the *Deutsche Kunst- und Musik-Zeitung*. In the former, Ludwig Speidel described Bruckner as the only contemporary composer able to sustain the long musical paragraphs of a slow movement like the Adagio. On the other hand, he did not know how to harness the wealth of musical invention which flowed from his pen; there was sufficient material to satisfy the needs of half a dozen less well-endowed composers!¹⁴⁵ In the latter, the reviewer recalled the first performance of the symphony in 1877, described some of the changes Bruckner had introduced since then, in particular the closing section of the final movement, but concluded that there were no essential differences between the two versions as regards '>the musical ideas or the structure of the individual movements', as even the large cut in the Finale was '>hinted at in the earlier score.' In any case, 'one cannot >approach a Bruckner symphony with expectations of musical logic' as the composer tends to '>lose the thread of musical continuity and to indulge in >fantasy rather than

143 See *HSABB* 2, 100; the original of this letter is privately owned.

144 See *G-A* IV/3, 101-02. and Röder, op.cit., 419-20 for extracts from this article.

145 See Röder, op.cit., 421 for an extract from this review, dated 1 January 1891. Writing in the *Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt*, 23 December 1890, Josef Königstein made the same point but was much harsher in his overall evaluation of the work, which he described as '>fragmented and piecemeal throughout'; see Röder, op.cit., 416.

composition.¹⁴⁶

Reports of the performance appeared in other Austrian and German newspapers,¹⁴⁷ but perhaps the most interesting reaction came from the Finnish composer, Jean Sibelius, who was in Vienna at the time and was present at the concert. In a letter to his fiancée, Aino Järnefelt, he described Bruckner as the '>'greatest living composer' whose symphony had made '>a great impression' on him. Admittedly it had its share of mistakes and miscalculations, the structure was '>'mad' and it was quite '>un-Mozartian'; nevertheless, although the composer was '>'an old man', there was something fresh and youthful about it. The impression Bruckner's Third made on the young Sibelius is certainly reflected in the orchestral textures of some of his early works, the *Kullervo* symphony in particular.¹⁴⁸

Bruckner was extremely pleased with the performance and sent his customary letter of thanks to Richter and the Philharmonic on the day after the concert.¹⁴⁹ At the end of the year he wrote to Wolzogen in Bayreuth to give details of the concert and the favourable reception of the symphony. He had been able to weep with Hugo Wolf and Josef Schalk - but one very important person had been missing, the dedicatee of the symphony!¹⁵⁰

146 See Röder, op.cit., 422 for an extract from this review, signed by '>'D' and dated 1 January 1891.

147 See Röder, op.cit., 425ff. for extracts from reviews in other papers, including the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* (Leipzig).

148 See E. Tawastsjerna, *Sibelius* vol. 1 (London, 1976), 77-78. Sibelius's letter to his fiancée is dated 21 December 1890. See also Peter Revers, 'Wien 1890', in *Jean Sibelius und Wien*, ed. Hartmut Krones (Vienna, 2003), 15-21.

149 See *HSABB* 2, 100 for this letter, dated Vienna, 22 December 1890; the original is in the Vienna Philharmonic archives.

150 See *HSABB* 2, 103 for this letter, dated Vienna, 31 December 1890. It was first printed in *GrBLS*, 357-58 and a facsimile of the letter, the original of which is privately owned, can be found in the '>'Illustrierte Teil' of *GrBLS*, 102ff.

Josef Schalk wrote to Franz to give him the good news of the ‘>colossal success’ of the performance. He added that he was very fearful of the projected performance of the Fourth in Graz, particularly when even the brilliant musicians of the Vienna Philharmonic were not able to overcome all the technical difficulties of the Third. The amateur musicians especially would have to practise their parts diligently. The last thing he wanted was a mediocre performance, especially as several people would be travelling from Vienna to Graz to be at the performance.¹⁵¹

Coincidentally, the first printed version of the Third was performed in Linz on the same evening as the premiere of the new version in Vienna. The performance by the *Musikverein* orchestra conducted by Adalbert Schreyer took place in the *Redoutensaal*. According to the review in the *Linzer Zeitung*, the original intention was to perform the work in its recently printed new version, but, as the older printed parts had been used for rehearsal purposes, there had not been enough time to make the necessary changes.¹⁵²

Those orchestral performances of the Third Symphony helped to raise the composer’s profile both inside and outside Austria. At the same time, piano arrangements of his works continued to be performed at meetings of the *Wiener Akademische Wagner-Verein* and the newly constituted *Richard Wagner-Verein*. On 8 October two movements from the Seventh Symphony were played at a meeting of the latter, and on 28 December Josef Schalk directed a performance of the *Credo* from the F minor Mass (with Ferdinand Foll as pianist, and the solo violin part played by August Duesberg) at a

151 See *HSABB* 2, 101 for this letter, dated Vienna, 23 December 1890; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/11/32.

152 See an extract from the review of this concert (*Linzer Zeitung*, 23 December 1890) in Röder, *op.cit.*, 425-26. In a letter to Ferdinand Krackowizer, provincial librarian in Linz, on 17 December, Bruckner alluded to the possibility of a Linz performance and asked him to ensure that the new second edition was used as the ‘earlier edition had >many defects.’ See *HSABB* 2, 98; the original is in Wels *Stadtmuseum*.

meeting of the former. In writing to Theodor Helm about the performance of the *Credo*, Bruckner emphasised that, when an orchestra was lacking, the accompaniment really required four hands at two pianos and proficient score readers who were able to provide >the basis of the whole piece - the string unison, including the symphonic basses in the 'et resurrexit@'.¹⁵³

Although Bruckner's compositional activities during the year were largely taken up with revision of earlier works and ongoing work on the Ninth, he found time to write a short male-voice chorus with solo tenor part, *Träumen und Wachen* WAB 87. It was composed on 15 December 1890 and dedicated to Dr. Wilhelm Ritter von Hartel, rector of Vienna University and later a government minister. Despite Bruckner's 'very >shaky' conducting at its first performance a month later, the choir had been well rehearsed by the composer and was well received.¹⁵⁴

The five works which underwent revision of some kind or other during 1890 were the Mass in F minor and the First, Third, Fourth and Eighth Symphonies. Bruckner was directly involved in some of these, but only indirectly in others.

In a letter to his brother Franz on 18 January, Josef Schalk mentioned that Bruckner had almost completed revision work on the Eighth and that he (Josef) was rehearsing the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* of the F minor Mass with the *Wagner-Verein* choir.¹⁵⁵ Franz was planning to undertake a revision of the

153 See *HSABB* 2, 102 for this letter, dated Vienna, 30 December 1890. It was first printed in *ABB*, 228-29; the original is not extant.

154 A sketch of the work, formerly owned by Löwe and now in the *ÖNB*, contains the note >'Entwurf 15/12 90 3/4 11 bis 1/2 Uhr' and a later addition: '>4 Febr. 92'. Hartel lived in the same apartment block (Hessgasse 7) as Bruckner for many years; see *G-A* IV/3, 129-30, footnote 2 for his portrayal of Bruckner's personality. The chorus was published by Rättig (T.R.223) in 1891, and by Adolf Robitschek Musikverlag, Vienna, in 1954. There is a modern edition in *ABSW* XXIII/2, 154-57. See Karl Lorenz's and Leopold von Schroeder's accounts of the first performance (part of the University celebrations to mark the centenary of Grillparzer's birth on 15 January 1891; Bruckner conducted the *Akademischer Gesangverein*) in *G-A* IV/3, 131ff.

155 See earlier and footnote 89.

Mass, and when Josef wrote to him again about a fortnight later, he asked if he could have the revised material in time for the final rehearsals at the end of February which Bruckner was going to attend.¹⁵⁶ But Franz did not have time to proceed with the revision at this point. In fact, during the summer of 1890, Josef decided that he would take it upon himself to proceed with the revision. In the meantime, he informed Franz about the rehearsals of the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* movements which had met with Bruckner's approval. He hoped that the enthusiasm which he had succeeded in engendering in the singers would remain until the performance on 5 March. He regretted not having an orchestra at his disposal, however - >'then it would really go like a bomb.'¹⁵⁷ The 'private' performance of the two movements in which the choir was accompanied by piano and brass was not to everyone's taste. Some people left during the performance. Nevertheless, Josef was even more keen to conduct it in a church with full orchestra. The most important thing was that Bruckner was delighted.¹⁵⁸

In August Josef wrote to Franz to tell him about his visit to Bad Ischl in the company of Bruckner and asked him to look at the *Credo* of the Mass with a view to revising it.¹⁵⁹ He had attempted to revise the *Kyrie* himself but had not got very far because of his lack of orchestral experience. It would be far better if Franz could do the whole thing. As soon as Franz returned the *Credo*, he would send him his attempt at scoring the *Kyrie* to look at.¹⁶⁰

In his letter to Franz on 22 February Josef mentioned Hermann Levi's recent visit to Vienna during which Ferdinand Löwe had played through Bruckner's First Symphony. It appears that, although Bruckner intended to

156 See earlier and footnote 89.

157 See earlier and footnote 92.

158 See earlier and footnote 94.

159 He had already asked his brother to look at the *Gloria* in May. See earlier and footnote 103.

160 See earlier and footnote 112.

revise it thoroughly, neither Schalk nor Levi felt that the symphony required a major revision. Indeed, Levi wrote to Bruckner to express his admiration for the work, saying that it must be printed and performed, but begging him not to alter it too much.¹⁶¹ Josef mentioned that he had taken the opportunity of copying out the Adagio quickly before the 'threatened revision'. He was keen, however, that his brother rather than Bruckner should undertake a 'discreet' revision of the symphony.¹⁶²

Bruckner was not to be dissuaded, however, and he began his own revision of the Symphony in March. Josef continued with his own independent revision plans and sent the Adagio to his brother:

... The small notes in pencil are Löwe's suggestions. I would be delighted if you could find the time to undertake the revision yourself. I am convinced that you will certainly steer clear of the too modern, so to speak comical, treatment of the orchestra and will proceed as reverently as possible. At all events there are passages which urgently require revision...¹⁶³

On 1 May Josef recalled his time in Pressburg with Bruckner. He hoped that Franz would be able to come to Vienna at the beginning of June and bring with him the revised *Gloria* of the F minor Mass as well as the Adagio of the First Symphony. A few days later, Bruckner wrote to Franz and referred to his own revision work on the First. 'The little besom has to be swept up', he said. He was obviously unaware of Josef's plans - or perhaps chose to ignore them?¹⁶⁴ Reference has already been made to Bruckner's letter to Theodor Helm at the end of March in which he sought to divert blame from the Vienna Philharmonic to himself (and, by implication, those assisting him?)

161 See earlier and footnote 93.

162 See earlier and footnote 92.

163 See earlier and footnote 94.

164 See earlier and footnote 103.

for the recent lack of performance of his works. After all, he had >'taken the "impudent little rascal"@ [reference to the First Symphony] away from them', the revised version of the Third Symphony had not yet been published (in spite of Josef Schalk's assurance three months earlier that it would be ready in good time), and Richter was not aware that the Sixth Symphony had been copied.¹⁶⁵ In his preface to the edition of the third version of the Third Symphony in the *Gesamtausgabe*, Leopold Nowak mentions differences between the second edition of 1890 and the printer's copy (Mus. Hs. 6081) upon which it was based, attributing them to the >'master's pupils who edited the work.' Nowak also specifies some of the differences between the second and third versions as regards dynamics, orchestration, and the cuts in the slow movement and Finale.¹⁶⁶

Finally, revision work on the Eighth was completed early in the year, a dedicatee was sought and found, and some progress was made in the attempts to find a publisher. The first movement of the symphony was >'newly restored' between November 1889 and the end of January 1890. On 18 January Josef Schalk reported to his brother that Bruckner >'will be finished with the Eighth in a few days' time and is very enthusiastic about his work.'¹⁶⁷ At the end of the month, when Josef wrote again to his brother, specifically about a revision of the F minor Mass, he added:

... Bruckner finished the new revision of the VIIIth the day before yesterday. The first movement now ends *pianissimo* as we all wished it would. He would undoubtedly be extremely pleased if you could use this opportunity to write to him...¹⁶⁸

165 See earlier and footnote 97.

166 *Anton Bruckner Gesamtausgabe* III/3 (Vienna, 1959).

167 See earlier and footnote 89.

168 See earlier and footnote 89.

Further work on the first movement was undertaken until 10 March when he declared that it was '>completely finished', and a diary entry for 15 March reads '>14.3.90 letzte auswendige Wiederholung v[om] 1 Satz der 8. Sinf[onie].'¹⁶⁹

As soon as he had received confirmation from the Lord Chamberlain that the Emperor would accept the dedication of the symphony, Bruckner wrote to Hermann Levi, asking him to lend his personal support to the efforts of the *Wagner-Verein* in Vienna to persuade Schott in Mainz to publish the work. Bruckner's unhappy experiences with the quality of Gutmann's work, the printing of the Fourth Symphony in particular, almost certainly persuaded him to look elsewhere for a publisher:

Vienna is ruled out, as I have already given away three symphonies and the Quintet for nothing at all. N.B. I received 50 florins for the Te Deum... The publishing firm that offers the most will get it. If no one offers anything, the foreign firm which can print it the most cheaply will get it. Perhaps the dedication to the Emperor will help a little...¹⁷⁰

Bruckner's correspondence with Levi and Weingartner in the autumn includes references to some of the alterations he had made to the Eighth. On 2 October, for instance, he contacted Levi to inform him that he had written to Weingartner, adding in a postscript:

The Finale has been greatly shortened. Because of its length, I

¹⁶⁹ '>14.3.90 final play-through by memory of the 1st movement of the 8th symphony.' This entry was made amongst prayer entries in *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1888/89*. See MVP 1, 381 and 2, 316.

¹⁷⁰ See earlier and footnote 101.

have recommended to Mr. Weingartner that he make cuts...¹⁷¹

The illness which had already forced Levi to give up his conducting duties temporarily also prevented him from replying immediately to Bruckner. When he eventually wrote in December, there was very little fresh information he could provide. Weingartner had not been in touch, but the orchestral parts were now being written out in Mannheim as the only competent copyist in Munich had been too busy to take on further work. Levi regretted that his recent illness after more than fifteen years of almost non-stop activity would effectively debar him from conducting in the immediate future, a task which he would have undertaken gladly under normal circumstances. Indeed, ill-health had even prevented him from attending recent Munich performances of the Fourth Symphony and the Quintet.¹⁷²

At the end of the year *Hofkapelle* duties kept Bruckner in Vienna during the Christmas period and prevented him from making his seasonal visits to Steyr and St. Florian. An entry in his diary: '>26. Dez[ember] [1]890. H[err].H[ofkapellmeister] "So schön hat noch Keiner gespielt wie Bruckner heut in der Hofkapelle"' indicates that Hellmesberger, the court music director, had been very complimentary about his playing at High Mass.¹⁷³ Bruckner's financial position, invariably a source of concern to the composer, was in a healthy state at the beginning of 1891 - so much so that Viktor Boller, one of the organizers of the special pension fund for Bruckner, was able to inform Prince Fürstenberg, who had just promised a gift of 500 florins,

171 See earlier and footnote 120.

172 See earlier and footnote 129.

173 Entry in the December 1890 page of *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1889/90*; see MVP 1, 401 and 2, 331.

that no more payments would be necessary in the immediate future.¹⁷⁴ Although Prince Liechtenstein's annual contributions of 300 florins were only temporary and were made on the condition that they would cease as soon as Bruckner's future security was secured, the composer requested that they continue until his death.¹⁷⁵ In addition, during the years 1890-91 Bruckner began to benefit from the generosity of four other benefactors – his private pupil Friedrich Eckstein; Carl von Oberleithner, the father of Max Oberleithner, another private pupil; the industrialist Albert Böhler; and Gustav Riehl, a Viennese doctor - who were willing to enter into contracts for life annuity payments. The total sum promised amounted to 700 florins.¹⁷⁶

Bruckner now had sufficient financial backing to enable him to retire from his teaching position at the Conservatory, and he sent a letter of resignation to the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* directorate at the beginning of January 1891.¹⁷⁷ On 15 January he received two letters from the *Gesellschaft*, the first an official letter from the administration (one of the signatories being

174 See G-A IV/3, 125 for Boller's letter to Fürstenberg, dated 4 January 1891. See also G-A IV/3, 125, footnote for details of contributions; between 1 October 1890 and 20 May 1891 these amounted to nearly 4000 florins! Bruckner himself travelled from St. Florian to Ennsegg at the beginning of April to thank Fürstenberg personally. See *HSABB* 2, 129 and 130 for Bruckner's letters to Fürstenberg, dated 31 March and 1 April; the originals are in the *ÖNB*. On 8 April, Bruckner received 500 florins from Alfred von Kogerer, Fürstenberg's lawyer; see *HSABB* 2, 130. On his return to Vienna from St. Florian, Bruckner wrote a third letter to Fürstenberg, dated 15 April, in which he thanked him for his gift of 500 florins and provided him with news of a forthcoming performance of the *Te Deum* at the Berlin Music Festival on 31 May. See *HSABB* 2, 132; the originals of these letters are also in the *ÖNB*.

175 See letter to Bruckner from the Liechtenstein court chancellor, Franz Zipfl, dated 12 January 1891, and a letter from M. von Kempelen to the court chancellor, dated 20 February 1891. Bruckner's request was granted. The first letter is printed in *HSABB* 2, 108 and the original is in St. Florian. The second letter is also printed in *HSABB* 2, 123-24 and the original is in the *Stiftung Fürst Liechtenstein*, Vienna; see also *SchABCT*, 625-26 and 632.

176 See Erich Wolfgang Partsch, 'Vier unveröffentlichte Leibenrentverträge für Anton Bruckner', in *BJ 2001-2005* (Vienna, 2006), 267-271 for further details. The information provided in G-A IV/3 (1936), 125 footnote 1 is inaccurate.

177 See *HSABB* 2, 104 for Bruckner's letter, dated '>Wien. Anfangs Jänner 1891'; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*.

Hellmesberger) accepting his resignation and thanking him for his 22 years' invaluable service to the institution, the second from the Conservatory's pension association informing him that his pension would be 440 florins per annum payable in quarterly instalments of 110 florins.¹⁷⁸ On the same day the administration of the *Gesellschaft* gave official recognition to Bruckner's contribution to the musical life of Vienna by electing him an honorary member.¹⁷⁹

Bruckner's friend, the music critic Gustav Schönaich, an admirer of both Bruckner and Brahms and one of the very few writers on music in Vienna who refused to adopt a partisan stance, wrote to the composer on 15 January to ask if it would be possible for Karl Frank, music director of the Nuremberg town theatre, to borrow the orchestral material of the Third Symphony for a performance of the work [on 27 March]. He also took the opportunity of thanking Bruckner for the '>'unforgettable' and '>'overwhelming' experience of the recent Vienna performance and for creating a work of such great spiritual richness.¹⁸⁰

A repeat performance of the Third Symphony, organized by the *Wagner-Verein*, took place in the large *Musikverein* hall on Sunday 25 January at 12.30. Josef Schalk wrote to his brother in advance, inviting him to come and adding that Bruckner would be overjoyed to see him. But Franz was

178 The texts of both letters can be found in *HSABB 2*, 108-09; the originals are in St. Florian.

179 Hans Richter was also elected an honorary member. Bruckner wrote a letter of thanks to the *Gesellschaft* on 18 February. See *HSABB 2*, 122; the original is in the *Gesellschaft* library.

180 See *HSABB 2*, 110 and Andrea Harrandt, '>Gustav Schönaich - ein Herold der Bruckner'schen Kunst@', in *BSL 1991* (Linz, 1994), 70. Schönaich wrote again to Bruckner to congratulate him on being elected an honorary member of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*; he also promised to make sure that the matter of the pension from the *Hofkapelle* was discussed in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*. See *HSABB 2*, 103-04 and Harrandt, loc.cit., 71 (where the letter is dated 1892) for this undated latter. The originals of both letters are not extant.

unable to come because of difficulties at work. Josef sympathised with him in his next letter, mentioned that Bruckner had written to him, and added that he was still looking forward to conducting Bruckner's Fourth in Graz, describing it as 'the greatest musical event in my life up to now.'¹⁸¹

The day after the repeat performance of the Third, Bruckner wrote to Hermann Levi and expressed his delight at the enthusiasm of both the public and Hans Richter who had evidently promised to perform the work at a forthcoming London concert.¹⁸² On 27 January Bruckner also informed Felix Weingartner about the successful repeat performance of the Third. He was more concerned at this point, however, about the planned first performance of the revised version of the Eighth and asked Weingartner if there had been any rehearsals of the work, reiterating his request that the cuts in the Finale be observed.¹⁸³ This letter, with its performance directions and programmatic references, is of primary importance in any discussion of the two versions of the Eighth:

... How is the Eighth going? Have you held any rehearsals yet? How does it sound? Please strictly observe the cuts in the Finale as indicated; otherwise, it would be far too long, and is valid only for later times, and for a circle of friends and connoisseurs. You may alter the tempi as you wish (and as you need for purposes of clarity). Please tell me what I owe you for the copying expenses.

Do you have a sympathetic critic in Mannheim? Will Schott

181 See *LBSAB*, 157-58 for extracts from these two letters, dated Vienna, 12 and 15 January 1891; the originals are in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/12/4 and 158/12/5. On 30 December 1890 Franz wrote to Bruckner to convey his best wishes for the New Year. See *HSABB* 2, 102; the original is in the *ÖNB* - F 18 Schalk 20a.

182 See *HSABB* 2, 113 for Bruckner's letter to Levi, dated Vienna, 26 January 1891; the original is owned privately.

183 According to Hugo Wolf, Bruckner was furious about the apparent unnecessary delays in performing the Eighth. In a letter to Oscar Grohé in Mannheim (14 January, 1891), Wolf said that he had done his best to reassure Bruckner that Weingartner was acting from the best of motives; see *SchABCT*, 626.

come from Mainz? Is there any hope of having it printed? The symphony is dedicated to the Emperor, and I would prefer the good Emperor not to have to pay the publication costs for this work at least. Hans Richter has already been pestering me about the symphony.

To repeat, please tell me how the Eighth sounds.

In the first movement, the passage for trumpets and horns based on the rhythm of the theme is the pronouncement of death which gets gradually louder during its sporadic appearances and is finally very prominent; at the end - resignation. Scherzo: main theme - called '>German Michael'; the fellow wants to go to sleep in the second section but, in his reverie, cannot find his little song; finally, it is inverted plaintively. Finale: at that time our Emperor was visited by the Tsar in Olmütz [sic]; hence strings: ride of the Cossacks; brass: military music; trumpets: fanfares as their Majesties meet. All the themes at the end; (humorous) there is great pomp when German Michael returns from his travels, just as when the king appears in the second act of *Tannhäuser*. There is also the death march and then (brass) transfiguration in the Finale...¹⁸⁴

Although Bruckner was invited by Franz Schalk to attend the Graz performance of the Fourth conducted by Josef on 1 February, he had to decline because of ill health and the additional complication of a fall on the ice which caused him to limp badly and forced him to cancel some *Hofkapelle* duties.¹⁸⁵ The orchestral concert was preceded by a concert of

184 See *HSABB* 2, 114 for this letter, dated Vienna, 27 January 1891; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library. Auer's transcription of the letter in *ABB*, 237-38 contains two mistakes - '>endlich klagend kehrt er selber um' (referring to '>German Michael' turning himself round) instead of '>endlich klagend kehrt es selbes um' (referring to an inversion of the musical material) - which distorts the meaning of the programme of the Scherzo movement. The '>meeting of the Emperors', to which Bruckner alludes, was the meeting of Emperor Franz Josef, Tsar Alexander III and Kaiser Wilhelm I of Germany at Skierniewice in September 1884. For fuller discussion, see Constantin Floros, '>Die Fassungen der Achten Symphonie von Anton Bruckner', in *BSL* 1980 (Linz, 1981), 6, footnote 7; idem, *Brahms und Bruckner. Studien zur musikalischen Exegetik* (Wiesbaden, 1980), 191-92 and 227-28 (facsimile of the original), and Benjamin Korstvedt, *Bruckner Symphony no. 8* (Cambridge, 2000), 24 and 51-52.

185 See *HSABB* 2, 116 for Bruckner's letter of response to Franz Schalk, dated Vienna, 31 January 1891; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 54/17. When he wrote to Max von

the Graz *Wagner-Verein* on 30 January; Josef Schalk played his solo piano arrangement of the first and second movements from the Fourth Symphony and the Adagio from the String Quintet was also performed.¹⁸⁶ There was high praise for Schalk's conducting of the symphony on 1 February in the *Grazer Volksblatt*, and the possibility of his assuming the vacant position of musical director of the Steiermark *Musikverein* was mooted - but this did not materialize.¹⁸⁷

In a letter to Puchstein, music critic of the *Deutsches Volksblatt*, Bruckner mentioned the '>brilliant' repeat performance of the Third in Vienna and the acclaimed performance of the Fourth in Graz.¹⁸⁸

On 11 February, von Wolzogen wrote to Bruckner and congratulated him on the successful performances of his works in Vienna and Munich. His main purpose in writing, however, was to ascertain that the details of an anecdote about Bruckner's dedication of the original version of the Third to Wagner were correct. He was intending to include this anecdote in a new edition of his *Erinnerungen an Richard Wagner*.¹⁸⁹ In his reply Bruckner provided an account of his friendship with Wagner, the dedication of the

Oberleithner on 29 January about the successful first rehearsal of the Fourth in Graz, Josef Schalk was hopeful that Bruckner would be able to attend. See *HSABB* 2, 115 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

186 This concert was reviewed (probably by Theodor Helm) in the morning edition of the *Grazer Tagespost* (1 February 1891); see Ingrid Schubert, '>Bruckner, Wagner und die Neudeutschen in Graz', in *BSL* 1984 (Linz, 1986), 38 and 58.

187 See *LBSAB*, 158-59 for the review in the *Grazer Volksblatt* (6 February 1891). There was also a review by Theodor Helm in the morning edition of the *Grazer Tagespost* (3 February 1891) and an article on the Fourth Symphony by '>Dr. G.' in the *Grazer Morgenpost* (4 February 1891); see Schubert, loc.cit., 38 and 58. A performance of Bruckner's *Germanenzug* by the *Grazer Männergesangverein* on 1 March 1891 was also reviewed in the *Grazer Morgenpost* and *Grazer Tagespost*; see Schubert, loc.cit., 37-38 and 58.

188 See *HSABB* 2, 116 for this letter, dated Vienna, 5 February 1891. It was first printed in *ABB*, 238-39.; the original has been lost.

189 See *HSABB* 2, 118 for this letter which was sent from Bayreuth; the original is in St. Florian.

Third, and his final visit to the ailing master.¹⁹⁰ A few days later Bruckner also received a letter from Theodor Helm. Helm mentioned the Graz performance of the Fourth, Hirschfeld's analysis of the Third in the *Neue Wiener Musik-Zeitung* and the Vienna Philharmonic's performance of the Third the previous December, but he also congratulated Bruckner on a more recent successful performance of the Third in Prague and informed him of a projected performance of the same work in Warnsdorf.¹⁹¹ Bruckner alluded to this Prague performance when he provided his friend with more information about current activity. He mentioned that Richter was going to perform the Third in London, he had completed his revision of the First Symphony and had re-commenced work on the Ninth.¹⁹² He had already conveyed similar information to Hermann Levi a few days earlier:

... I have only three pages of performance directions to complete, then I will turn my attention to the Ninth (D minor); I have already written down most of its themes...¹⁹³

190 See *HSABB* 2, 119-20 for the text of this undated letter. Auer suggests a much earlier date - 1884 - but its content, in particular the reference to stomach problems in a postscript, points to February 1891 as the proper date. We know that Bruckner was unwell with stomach trouble at the time; see *HSABB* 2, 123 for his letter to his brother Ignaz, dated Vienna, 19 February 1891, in which he encloses 10 florins and thanks his brother for sending him some meat but asks him not to send any more until the autumn because of his stomach problems. The text of Ignaz's reply, dated St. Florian 22 February 1891, can also be found in *HSABB* 2, 125; the original is in St. Florian. See Franz Scheder, '>Zur Datierung von Bruckners Brief an Wolzogen (Auer nr. 137)', in *BJ* 1984/85/86 (Linz, 1988), 65ff. The originals of Bruckner's letters to Wolzogen and Ignaz Bruckner have been lost. The former was first printed in *ABB*, 166ff. and there is a copy of the original of the latter in *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna.

191 See *HSABB* 2, 121 for Helm's letter to Bruckner, dated Vienna, 17 February 1891. It was first printed in *ABB*, 297-98; the original has been lost. The Prague performance of the Third took place on 14 February and was conducted by Karl Muck. The review in the *Prager Tagblatt* (16 February) criticized the lack of cohesion in places but was otherwise complimentary; see Röder, op.cit., 428.

192 See *HSABB* 2, 122-23 for this letter, dated Vienna, 18 February. It was first printed in *ABB*, 239; the original is not extant.

193 See *HSABB* 2, 117 for this letter, dated Vienna, 10 February 1891; the original is privately owned. Bruckner's work on the Ninth at the time is corroborated by an account of a visit to Bruckner at the beginning of March by J.L. Nicodé, a conductor and composer from Dresden, one of whose works was to be performed in Vienna by the *Männergesangverein*.

Bruckner's hopes of a first performance of the Eighth in Germany were short-lived. Levi had written to Weingartner to ask for a performance date and to suggest that he send the bill for the cost of copying to him and not to Bruckner. Levi included this information in a letter to Bruckner written on 7 February.¹⁹⁴ In his reply to Levi, Weingartner was able to provide him with two important pieces of information: the performance of the Eighth had been scheduled for 26 March, and neither Levi nor Bruckner would have to incur the expense of copying the parts, as a consortium in Mannheim had provided the sum of 300 marks for this purpose.¹⁹⁵

On 6 March Josef Schalk informed his brother of the projected performance of the Eighth in Mannheim as well as Bruckner's hard work on the Ninth - encouraged by Hugo Wolf who visited him frequently.¹⁹⁶ Eventually, on 20 March, Weingartner wrote to Bruckner with the information that a performance of the Eighth had been put back from Thursday 26 March to Thursday 2 April; he asked the composer's permission to alter the instrumentation at some points as the Mannheim orchestra did not have as many string players as the Vienna Philharmonic and he feared that the wind instruments would dominate the strings:

...Yesterday I held the first orchestral rehearsal of your Eighth Symphony. Strings only at first, then wind. The sound effect will be a powerful one.

According to Nicodé, Bruckner's work-desk was covered with manuscript paper, most of it belonging to the Ninth. Bruckner played extracts from the work to Nicodé and his wife, and Nicodé recalls the composer saying that, in the event of the fourth movement not being completed, the *Te Deum* should be substituted. See *G-A IV/3*, 144-47.

194 See *HSABB 2*, 117 for Levi's letter to Bruckner; the original is in St. Florian.

195 See *HSABB 2*, 120 for an extract from this letter, dated Mannheim, 13 February 1891.

196 See *LBSAB*, 160-61; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/12/9.

You obviously had the large Viennese string section in mind when you scored the work. As the large number of wind players in our orchestra here frequently has an overpowering effect on the relatively small string section, I would ask your permission to remove the woodwind and horn doublings in a few passages. You may rest assured that I will make these reductions, which, of course, are only necessary when small string sections are involved, in an artistic manner and perhaps in such a way that you will not even be aware of them.

I should be very grateful if you would be so kind as to send me a few biographical details about yourself which I can use for an introductory article in the local newspapers.

As we are having a performance of the St. Matthew Passion on the 27th (Good Friday), I have had to postpone the VII. Academy Concert until the 2nd of April (Thursday) which... will have no effect on the attendance, as these Academy Concerts are completely sold out from the beginning of the season.¹⁹⁷

Eager to have his work performed, Bruckner willingly gave his consent and made further reference to the cuts in the Finale:

... As I have been suffering from throat and stomach problems for a long time, I have been advised to spend some time in the country; and so I find myself now at St. Florian abbey in Upper Austria, 1 hour 30 minutes' journey from my birthplace, Ansfelden (1824). I undertook my more extensive studies with Prof. Sechter in Vienna from 1855 to 1861; I then studied composition until 1863.

Of course, you should make the necessary changes for your orchestra, but please do not alter the full score; and also leave the orchestral parts unchanged when preparing them for print - that is one of my most ardent requests.

If Schott was willing to publish the work, the purpose would then be fulfilled, and I would be extremely happy. It is a great comfort to me that a highly gifted man like yourself should take so much trouble to help me and my work gain recognition!

Please observe the cuts in the Finale, as the movement would be too long otherwise and would have a most detrimental

¹⁹⁷ See *HSABB* 2, 126-27 for this letter; the original is in St. Florian.

effect.¹⁹⁸

Bruckner also provided August Göllerich with news about the planned first performance, appending in a footnote to a letter >'2. April in Mannheim 8. Sinf.¹⁹⁹ During his vacation at St. Florian Bruckner was invited by Bishop Doppelbauer to play the organ at Linz Cathedral during the Easter Sunday service which included a performance of Haydn's >'Nelson' Mass. He had an audience with the bishop after the service and lunched with his friends at the *Kanone* restaurant.²⁰⁰ There were also two performances of the Third Symphony during this period. The first was conducted by Karl Frank in the Nuremberg Stadttheater on 27 March ²⁰¹; the second was conducted by Joseph F. Hummel as part of the 'II. Vereins- und Abonnement-Concert der Internationalen Stiftung Mozarteum' in Salzburg.²⁰²

At this point in time all was set fair for a performance of the Eighth in Mannheim. But there was disappointing news - Weingartner would not be able to conduct the work as he had been promoted to a new post as musical director of the court opera and royal orchestral concerts in Berlin. In any

198 See *HSABB* 2, 128 for this letter, dated St. Florian, 27 March 1891; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*. The date is given erroneously as 17 March in *ABB*, 241.

199 See *HSABB* 2, 127 for this letter, dated St. Florian, 27 March 1891. It was first printed in *ABB*, 242; the original is not extant.

200 See *HSABB* 2, 127 for a letter to his old friend Karl Waldeck, dated St. Florian, 27 March 1891, in which Bruckner mentioned that he hoped to see him while he was in Linz. It was first printed in the *Neue musikalische Presse* 14 (1905), no. 3; the original is not extant.

201 See Franz Scheder, >'Frühe Bruckner-Aufführungen in Nürnberg', in *BJ* 1989/90 (Linz, 1992), 246-47 for extracts from reviews of the performance, including those in the *Nürnberger Stadtzeitung* (31 March 1891), the *Fränkische Kurier* (31 March 1891) and the *Nürnberger Anzeiger* (1 April 1891); see also Röder, *op.cit.*, 429.

202 See Gerhard Walterskirchen, '>Bruckner in Salzburg - Bruckner-Erstaufführungen in Salzburg', in *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 16 (1979), 17 for extracts from reviews of the concert in the *Salzburger Zeitung* (10 April 1891) and the *Salzburges Volksblatt*; see also Röder, *op.cit.*, 429-30. On 10 April Bruckner sent a card to Helm to inform him of the '>sensational success' of the Salzburg performance; see *ABB*, 240; the original has been lost.

case the tuba players would certainly have required more rehearsals:

...You have no idea how truly sorry I am that I can no longer perform your symphony. The call to Berlin came so suddenly and my change of position was so unexpected that I could not even complete the series of subscription concerts here but had to leave the final one to my successor. I am under extreme pressure at the theatre at present. I am obliged to conduct almost every second day, and that leaves me little time to prepare for concerts. Only a large number of rehearsals can do full justice to a work like yours, and I would no longer be able to hold them. There was also another factor, viz. that the brass players whom we engaged from the military band, which supplies us with our reinforcements, to play the tubas had never even blown the instruments. I had already held three special rehearsals of your symphony with the four tuba players without being able to achieve a reasonable sound. In my despair I contacted you by telegram, but you had left Vienna, as I discovered from your letter which arrived from St. Florian the next day. I console myself with the knowledge that your work perhaps would not have achieved the desired effect with our small string section (we have only eight first violins) and that this will be better realized elsewhere. Rest assured, dear Bruckner, that I am a sincere admirer of your musical gifts and will perform one of your works in Berlin as soon as possible. Do not be angry with me. Not I, but circumstances beyond my control have prevented a performance of your symphony here.²⁰³

At first Bruckner was not entirely convinced by Weingartner's explanation and, in a letter to Levi, expressed his suspicion that the symphony had '>not pleased Mr. Weingartner or sounded bad.' He was also concerned about the costs incurred in copying the parts. Should he send Levi the appropriate amount? ²⁰⁴ Levi confirmed that Weingartner had been called to Berlin; as

203 See *HSABB*, 2, 131 for this letter, dated Mannheim, 9 April 1891; the original is in St. Florian.

204 See *HSABB* 2, 132 for Bruckner's letter to Levi, dated Vienna, 18 April 1891. It was first printed in *GrBLS*, 347-48; the original was formerly in the *Staatsbibliothek*, Berlin, but

far as payment was concerned, he (Levi) would now foot the bill:

... I was most disappointed to learn that your 8th Symphony is not to be performed in Mannheim. Weingartner assured me repeatedly that it would be performed on 26 March, and I had already arranged to have leave for that day. It seems that Weingartner has lost his bearings somewhat because of his call to Berlin and has not been able to acquire the necessary composure and concentration - which is understandable, of course. It can all be put down again to your old enemy - misfortune!! As far as the copying costs are concerned, please leave this in my hands. I had already asked Weingartner earlier to send me the bill, but he replied as follows on 8 February:

>'Neither Bruckner nor you needs to pay for the copying costs, because a consortium here has put 300 marks at my disposal specially for this concert.'

Now I will send the money immediately to Mannheim. Weingartner wrote to me that Richter will perform the 8th in London. Is that true?...²⁰⁵

In replying to Levi, Bruckner made it clear that he (Levi) would still be the ideal conductor of the symphony and, if truth be told, he was relieved that >'the small orchestra with the military tubas' in Mannheim had not been able to perform it.²⁰⁶

was lost during the 1939-45 war. Bruckner had received a copy of the bill and, on telegraphing Mannheim, was informed by Weingartner that payment should be made to Schuster, the leader of the Mannheim orchestra. See Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 7, for details of this telegram, dated 13 April 1891.

205 See *HSABB* 2, 133 for this letter, dated Munich, 19 April 1891; the original is in St. Florian. It seems that the performances of both Hugo Wolf's *Christnacht* and Bruckner's Eighth had already been put back another week before (?) Weingartner's call to Berlin. In the event, Wolf's piece was performed at a concert on 9 April and Bruckner's symphony was replaced (?) by Liszt's *Faust* symphony. It was Bruckner's Third, not his Eighth, which was mooted for performance in London. The first performance of the Eighth in London did not take place until 1908.

206 See *HSABB* 2, 135 and Walter Beck, *Anton Bruckner. Ein Lebensbild mit neuen Dokumenten* (Dornach, 1995), 65 for this letter, dated Vienna, 22 April 1891. There is a facsimile of the first page of the letter in Beck, 64; the original is owned privately. It is

There were two performances of Bruckner's *Te Deum* outside Austria in the first half of the year, the first in Christiania (Oslo), Norway, the second in Berlin as part of the 28th *Composers' Convention*. The Norwegian performance was given on 21 February by the *Musikforeningen* under the direction of Iver Holter and was widely reported in the Norwegian newspapers.²⁰⁷

At the beginning of May, Bruckner was contacted by Otto Leßmann, editor of the Berlin *Allgemeine Musikzeitung*, and asked to send some biographical details and a photograph for a preview of the performance of the *Te Deum* at the end of the month; Bruckner sent an immediate reply.²⁰⁸ On 11 May, he wrote to Göllerich, describing him as his 'chosen, authorized biographer', and adding that he looked forward to seeing him in Berlin at the end of the month.²⁰⁹ Ten days later he wrote to Dr. Richard Sternfeld, president of the Philharmonic Choir in Berlin, to acknowledge receipt of his letter and to enquire about the location and time of the *Te Deum* rehearsal.²¹⁰ On the

incorrectly dated 22 April 1892 in *GrBLS*, 352.

207 For further information and extracts from the reviews in the *Aftenposten*, *Dagbladet*, *Morgenposten*, *Morgenbladet* and *Norske Intelligenssedler* (22 - 24 February), see Bo Marschner, '>Aufführungen größerer Werke von Anton Bruckner in den nordischen Ländern 1891-1991. Teil 1: Norwegen', in *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 37 (1991), 30, and '>100 Jahre Bruckner-Rezeption in den nordischen Ländern', in *BSL 1991* (Linz, 1994), 185 and 199.

208 Leßmann's letter to Bruckner, dated Berlin, 3 May 1891, is mentioned in *G-A IV/3*, 156; Bruckner's reply, dated Vienna, 5 May 1891, is cited in Renate Grasberger, *>Bruckner-Bibliographie*, *ABDS* 4 (Graz, 1985), 17, and is printed in *HSABB* 2, 136. The original of the first has been lost, and the original of the second is in the *Bibliothek des Stadtrats*, Munich.

209 See *HSABB* 2, 136; the original is owned privately. Bruckner's words are '>berufener, autorisierter Biograf.'

210 See *HSABB* 2, 137 for Bruckner's letter, dated Vienna, 21 May 1891; the original is privately owned. Sternfeld's letter to Bruckner has been lost. Dr. Richard Sternfeld (1858-1926) was a history professor, music journalist, president of the Philharmonic Choir in Berlin and prominent Wagnerian.

same day, Siegfried Ochs, the conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Choir, wrote to Bruckner to invite him to both the last choral rehearsal and final full choral and orchestral rehearsal of the work as he wished to discuss some 'details of >tempi and dynamic nuances.'²¹¹ Bruckner was accompanied to Berlin by his pupil, Max von Oberleithner, and stayed at the *Kaiserhof* hotel.²¹² He received a very enthusiastic welcome, was well-looked after by friends and, to cap all, the performance on 31 May was a great success, von Bülow (not known for his love of Bruckner!) was extremely complimentary, and there were promises of further German performances of his symphonies and the *Te Deum* in the future.²¹³ Bruckner was clearly delighted and

211 See *HSABB* 2, 137 for Ochs's letter to Bruckner, dated Berlin, 21 May 1891; the original is in the *ÖNB*. Siegfried Ochs (1858-1929) was a prominent choir director. He founded his own choir in 1882 and this became the Philharmonic Choir in 1887.

212 Bruckner had received an invitation to stay with Weingartner but had declined. See *G-A IV/3*, 156.

213 See *G-A IV/3*, 150-51 for Ochs's reminiscence of the final rehearsal (29 May), and 156ff. for Oberleithner's reminiscences of the visit; see also Stephen Johnson's translation in his *Bruckner Remembered*, 62ff. Oberleitner wrote to Ferdinand Löwe about the successful rehearsals and even more successful reception of the work, although the performance itself was '>not bad but not very good either'; see *HSABB* 2, 138 for this letter, dated Berlin, 1 June 1891. A repeat performance of the *Te Deum* was planned for later in the year; there is no firm evidence that an extra performance took place at the beginning of June.

did not fail to mention his Berlin success in letters written at this time.²¹⁴ In his first letter to Helm he reported that all the Berlin newspaper reviews of the performance were favourable, particularly those of Leßmann and Tappert. Leßmann, in his review, noted that there was greater appreciation of Bruckner 'on the slow-moving Spree than on the quickly-flowing Danube' and described the triumphant performance as 'probably the most impressive and remarkable event in the entire festival.'²¹⁵ In the *Kleines Journal* Tappert described the three main ingredients in the *Te Deum* as 'Gregorian chant, Beethoven's symphonic language and Wagner's dramatically intensified expression' and reported that the difficulties of the work had been magnificently surmounted in the performance.²¹⁶ Wilhelm Blanck, reviewing the performance for the *Berliner Fremdenblatt*, remarked that the style of the work was fundamentally different from that of the extracts

214 On 12 June Bruckner wrote to both Hermann Levi and Theodor Helm and mentioned the performance and the possibility of other performances of his works in Berlin, Dresden and Stuttgart the following winter. He asked Helm to provide a report in the *Deutsche Zeitung*. See *HSABB* 2, 139 for the letter to Helm and *HSABB* 2, 140 for the letter to Levi. The original of the former is in the *Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek* and that of the latter is privately owned. On 15 June Bruckner thanked Helm for his support and promised to send him a gift of wine - see *HSABB* 2, 141; the letter was first printed in *ABB*, 248-49 but the original has been lost. On 15 June he also sent name-day greetings to his landlord, Dr. Oelzelt von Newin, and referred to the Berlin success; see *HSABB* 2, 142; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library. On 14 June Bruckner wrote to Bernhard Deubler in St. Florian, expressing concern about the health of his brother and requesting medical attention for him. The Berlin experience had been 'absolutely indescribable', he said, and there were to be further performances of his works later in the year; see *HSABB* 2, 141; the original is in St. Florian.

215 See *G-A* IV/3, 154 for an extract from this review in the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* (28 June); Leßmann also provided an earlier review (12 June) for his own *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung*; there is a reference to it in Mathias Hansen, 'Anton Bruckner in Norddeutschland', in *BSL* 1991 (Linz, 1994), 109. Bruckner's *Te Deum* was part of a three-hour programme on 31 May. D'Albert and Weingartner also conducted works by Bach, Bruch, Dvorák, d'Albert, Cornelius, MacDowell and Draeseke.

216 See *G-A* IV/3, 155 for an extract from Tappert's review of 2 June 1891.

from a Mass by Max Bruch which opened the concert. The overwhelming elemental power of the choral unison passages was particularly memorable.²¹⁷

While in Berlin Bruckner befriended a young parlour maid called Ida Buhz who worked at the hotel where he was staying. There was probably never any serious intention on Bruckner's part of becoming engaged to the girl but, always a stickler for convention, he introduced himself formally to Ida's parents. Bruckner received ten letters from Ida between his first and second (1894) visits to Berlin. All were of a factual, conversational nature, expressing concern for his health and well-being.²¹⁸

Bruckner and Oberleithner returned to Vienna by way of Dresden and attended a performance of the play *Die Welt, in der man sich langweilt*, in which one of Bruckner's favourite actresses, Clara Salbach, had a leading role. Ernst von Schuch, music director of the Court Opera, also arranged for

217 See G-A IV/3, 155-56 for this review, and 153 for an extract from the review in the Berlin *Börsen-Courier*, both dated 2 June 1891.

218 On 16 October 1891, for instance, Ida wrote to Bruckner to say how delighted she was that the photograph of herself which she had sent him had brought him pleasure; see HSABB 2, 152 for an extract from this letter; it was printed for the first time in G-A IV/3, 161. On 20 December Bruckner mentioned Ida in a letter to Karl Waldeck and said that 'she >wants to have me at any price'; see HSABB 2, 160 for this letter; there is a copy of the original in *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna. A year later (26 November 1892), Josef Leitenmayr, a friend in Kremsmünster, wrote to Bruckner about another girl who had attracted his attention and asked about his '>Berlin girl' (no doubt, tongue in cheek) - was it true that '>Dr. Bruckner will be getting married?' See HSABB 2, 196-97 for this letter; the original is in St. Florian. Apart from two letters in St. Florian, the originals of Ida's letters to Bruckner have been lost. Also see Max von Oberleithner's reminiscences and Stephen Johnson, op.cit., 64ff. for Bruckner's friendship with Ida and his relationships with women in general. The information about Bruckner's relationship with Buhz, in particular her own intentions, provided in G-A IV/3, 161-62, should be treated with caution. She was genuinely fond of him. The most accurate information about the relationship is provided by Elisabeth Maier, who has been able to study Leopold Nowak's notes on Ida Buhz. See Maier, '>Die Preussin ist nicht ächt@. Ida Buhz und Anton Bruckner', in *Studien & Berichte (IBG Mitteilungsblatt)* 62 (June 2004), 5-28. This article contains, *inter alia*, photographs of Ida in 1890, 1892 and 1898, on her 80th birthday in 1953 and a passport photograph in 1959 (a year before her death). It also contains transcripts of three letters written to the IBG by Ida's niece, Elisabeth. According to the latter, Ida had fond memories of Bruckner and kept his letters to her until late in life when she destroyed them during a serious illness.

them to see two Wagner operas, *Das Rheingold* and *Die Walküre*. According to Oberleithner, Bruckner was tired and overwrought, there was a recurrence of some of his nervous problems, and it was not until they were on their way back to Vienna that normality began to return!²¹⁹

Nevertheless, there was no doubt that Bruckner's *Te Deum* had made a significant impression in Berlin. On 15 June, Siegfried Ochs wrote to send greetings from several of his Berlin admirers who wished to receive a signed photograph. More important from Bruckner's point of view, however, was the information that a Berlin publishing house, Raabe and Plothow, had expressed interest in publishing the Eighth Symphony. An 'up front' payment of 1200 florins would be required. Ochs said that he would be prepared to supervise the printing and asked Bruckner to send the full score and piano score of the work.²²⁰ In his reply Bruckner said that he would accept Raabe and Plothow's offer and sent his best wishes to his Berlin friends. He thanked Ochs once again for his inspired direction and hoped that he and von Bülow would perform some of his symphonies in the future.²²¹

Compared with the various problems Bruckner experienced in having his symphonies published, negotiations with the Innsbruck firm, Johann Groß, concerning the publication of the D minor Mass and several early short sacred pieces (5 settings of *Tantum ergo*, a setting of the *Pange lingua* and the 1856 setting of *Ave Maria*) were extremely uncomplicated thanks to the

219 See Oberleithner's reminiscence, as printed in *G-A IV/3*, 158ff, and Stephen Johnson, *op.cit.*, 67-68.

220 See *HSABB 2*, p.142.; the original is in St. Florian

221 See *HSABB 2*, 146 for Bruckner's letter, dated Vienna, 26 June 1891. It was first printed in *ABB*, 249-50; the original is not extant. On 31 July Joseph Schalk wrote to Oberleithner concerning corrections to the Eighth Symphony which he felt were necessary to 'save' the work; see *ABA*, 105, and original in the *ÖNB*, F32 Oberleithner 168. A few days later, on 5 August, Schalk wrote to Oberleithner again about the corrections and advised him to 'chase up' the publishers; see *ABA*, 33 (facsimile), 105 (text) and original in the *ÖNB*, F32 Oberleithner. Bruckner noted Ochs's address on the May page of *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1890/91*. See *MVP* 1, 430 and 2, 350.

help of the industrialist Theodor Hämmerle, an admirer of the composer and son-in-law of Simon Reiß who owned the firm. A contract was signed at the end of June and Bruckner entrusted Oberleithner with the responsibility of preparing the scores and checking the proofs.²²²

At the end of June (Monday 29th), concertgoers in London heard the first British performance of the Third Symphony. It was the last item in a concert conducted by Hans Richter in the St. James's Hall and was preceded by Haydn's Symphony no. 101 in D and some excerpts from Wagner's operas (one of Elisabeth's arias from *Tannhäuser*, the *Vorspiel* and *Liebtestod* from *Tristan und Isolde*, and Senta's ballad from *Der fliegende Holländer*). In a review of the symphony in *The Guardian*, the author recalled Richter's performance of the Seventh in London in 1887, describing that symphony as 'little more than a sonorous medley of Wagnerian reminiscences'. Discussing the Third, he avoided any mention of Wagnerian influence, but compared it unfavourably with Beethoven and took both Richter and the Viennese to task for a lack of critical judgment:

...Herr Bruckner, with all his learning - or, perhaps, because of all his learning - has not escaped perpetrating one of the naïvest 'cribs' on record. He starts away in D minor, and with one of the most characteristic themes from the Choral Symphony of Beethoven also in the same key. The theme is diluted, but it is unmistakable, and it is brought back in the finale. Other Beethovenish reminiscences abound. For the rest the symphony is, to use a favourite word of the author of the analytical programmes, extremely 'strepitous'. Herr Bruckner here has the advantage of Beethoven; he has a

²²² See *HSABB* 2, 105, 111-12 and 165 for four letters from Hämmerle to Oberleithner, the first three written in January 1891, the fourth probably at the beginning of 1892; the originals of all four are in the *ÖNB*, Oberleithner collection. There are also two letters from Hämmerle to Bruckner, the first dated 30 June 1891, the second (to congratulate him on his 70th birthday) dated 6 September 1894. See *HSABB* 2, 147-48 and 286. See also Nowak's preface to *ABSWXVI* and *ABSWXXI*, *Revisionbericht*. The full score and piano score (arr. Ferdinand Löwe) of the Mass appeared in print in the spring of 1892. The shorter pieces were published in 1893.

bigger band, and he makes all possible use of it. The work is not dull; it is a strange mixture of learning and frivolity, like a professor masquerading as a pierrot. But it is one of the most remarkable examples of which we are aware of the giant's robe in music. The Viennese must be strangely forgetful of their greatest composer. As for Dr. Richter, we can only explain the anomaly on the supposition that the immense amount of music he has produced has tended to blunt his critical faculties...²²³

Bruckner had cherished the ambition of securing an honorary doctorate for some time and had written to several foreign universities without success. Now, at last, some of his friends sensed that the time was right to obtain testimonials from prominent musicians with a view to putting his name forward in Vienna. Indeed Bruckner himself sent a telegram to Hermann Levi to ask him for a testimonial; but Levi, in his reply, suggested that it would be better and more diplomatic if one of his friends or colleagues approached him.²²⁴ After a formal approach had been made, Levi sent a testimonial to Professor Simon Reinisch, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University, warmly supporting Bruckner's application and describing him as '>the most important symphonist of the post-Beethoven period.'²²⁵ Hanslick

223 From review in *The Guardian* (8 July 1891), signed 'C.L.G.' See Röder, op.cit., 430-31.

224 See *HSABB* 2, 143 for the text of Bruckner's telegram, dated Vienna, 17 June 1891 and Levi's reply, dated Munich, 16 June 1891 (obviously a mistake as it refers to the telegram and must have been written after its receipt); another possibility, of course, is that Bruckner's telegram is wrongly dated (7 June?) See also Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 14-15. The original of Bruckner's telegram is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* and that of Levi's reply is in St. Florian.

225 See *HSABB* 2, 145 for Levi's testimonial, dated Bayreuth, 24 June 1891. It was drafted the day before, however, and Felix Mottl suggested some changes. See *ABA*, 4 (facsimile of original in the *ÖNB*) and 95, also *HSABB* 2, 144 (text of draft). See also Franz Grasberger, *Anton Bruckner zwischen Wagnis und Sicherheit. Ausstellung im Rahmen des Internationalen Brucknerfestes* (Linz, 1977), 98 for the text of the corrected form; the original is in the *Österreichisches Staatsarchiv*. Bruckner wrote to Levi on 23 October to inform him that the Emperor had confirmed his honorary doctorate and to thank him again for the part he had played in providing a reference. He also recommended Franz Schalk for a vacant post in Munich. See *HSABB* 2, 154; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library.

declined to give his support, but Hellmesberger provided a very positive testimonial in which he said that it was:

... a real pleasure to have the opportunity of expressing his conviction as a musician that Bruckner is one of the most important, if not the most important, contemporary composer of the symphony whose works in this genre as well as in the realms of church music and chamber music bear the stamp of originality and of technical mastery.²²⁶

At a professorial meeting on 4 July, Bruckner's name was officially proposed by Professor Josef Stefan, Professor of Physics. The proposal was accepted and confirmed by Senate on 10 July, and the Ministry for Education and Culture was officially informed on 11 July. Imperial sanction was given on 29 September and the Senate was informed of the Emperor's approval on 2 October.²²⁷ On 19 October Bruckner asked Reinisch to ensure that the certificate of his honorary doctorate included a reference to him as a 'symphonist'.²²⁸

226 See *HSABB* 2, 144 for Hellmesberger's testimonial, dated Vienna, 18 June 1891; it was first printed in *G-A IV/3*, 179-80. On 31 October, Bruckner was a guest at a special ceremony to mark Hellmesberger's completion of forty years' service at the Conservatory. See *HSABB* 2, 155 for the invitation to this event, dated Vienna 27 October 1891, sent by Leopold Zellner; the original is in St. Florian.

227 See Robert Lach, *Die Bruckner-Akten des Wiener Universitäts-Archives* (Vienna, 1926), 54ff., *G-A IV/3*, 183-86, Schwanzara, op.cit., 72, and *ABA*, 111; the originals of these documents can be found in the Vienna University library and the *Österreichisches Staatsarchiv*. On the May page of *Fromme's Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1890/91*, Bruckner has noted not only the date and time of the meeting but also the exact time when he received a postcard from Wilhelm Hartel, the Rector, informing him of the proposal! See *MVP* 1, 430 and 2, 350.

228 See *ABA*, 95, *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 15 (Vienna, June 1979), 34, and *HSABB* 2, 153. There is a facsimile in Renate Grasberger et al. eds., '>@Symphoniker... mein Lebensberuf@. Die Entfaltung des Schöpferischen bei Anton Bruckner', in *Ausstellung des Anton Bruckner Institutes Linz Schwäbisches Hall 1990*, 11; the original is in the *ÖNB*. Reinisch was asked to contact Professor Julius Hann, the new Dean of the Faculty. The October page of the *Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender* for 1890/91 contains the names of other members of the Faculty, viz. Professor Wiesner and Professor Hartel, as well as the name and address of Professor Exner, Hartel's successor as Rector. See *MVP* 1, 435 and 2, 352. On 20 October, Bruckner received a letter from Professor Julius Wiesner to confirm that he would be granted an honorary doctorate and that the certificate would include a reference to him as '>symphonist'. See *HSABB* 2, 153 for this letter; the original is in St.

From 15 to 17 July Bruckner attended the Fourth Music Festival of the International *Stiftung Mozarteum* in Salzburg and gave an organ improvisation after a performance of Mozart's Requiem in the collegiate church.²²⁹ He then travelled to Bayreuth to attend performances of *Parsifal*, *Tannhäuser* (the Bayreuth premiere of the Paris version was on 22 July) and, possibly, *Tristan*. He spent most of August in Steyr where he worked on his Ninth Symphony and played the organ at some services in the parish church.²³⁰ He was at St. Florian from 27 to 31 August,²³¹ stayed with his sister at Vöcklabruck for a few days and then spent a short time (5-7 September) at the home of the Reischl family in Altheim, Upper Austria. Mina, the daughter of the house, attracted his attention, but the eventual outcome was predictable!²³² Bruckner returned to Steyr via Linz on 9

Florian.

229 See G-A IV/3, 168 for further details of the visit.

230 On 25 July he wrote from Vienna to Johann Aichinger, the Steyr parish priest, to inform him that he would be travelling to Steyr soon after his final *Hofkapelle* duty for the summer the following day. See *HSABB 2*, 149; the original is in Steyr. Two days later, on 27 July, he sent name day greetings (enclosing 10 florins) to his brother Ignaz, informing him that he was intending to leave Vienna for Steyr the following day and would see him later at St. Florian. See *HSABB 2*, 150; the original is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv*, Linz. On 8 August, he wrote from Steyr to Weingartner to thank him for his congratulations (no doubt about his successful application for a doctorate) and to urge him to perform some of his works in Berlin. See *HSABB 2*, 150.; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library.

231 See *HSABB 2*, 151 for an exchange of letters between Bruckner and his *Hofkapelle* colleague, Pius Richter, 28 and 30 August 1891. Bruckner, writing from St. Florian, thanked Richter for standing in for him and said that he would be back in Vienna by 19 September when he would certainly be able to reciprocate the arrangement; the original of Richter's letter to Bruckner is in St. Florian and the original of Bruckner's letter to Richter is in the *Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek*.

232 For further details of his stay at Altheim, see G-A III/1, 614. Minna Reischl's name and address are noted (but not in Bruckner's handwriting) on the September page of the *Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender* for 1890/91; see *MVP 1*, 434 and 2, 352. On 16 September Mina wrote to Bruckner, regretting that she could not accept his '>most flattering proposal' and stressing that he should not '>entertain any future hopes'; but she wrote to him again at the beginning of October, enclosing her photograph; this photograph is now in the library of the *Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität* in Linz. Bruckner replied, enclosing a photograph, on 23 October. On 7 November, the day of Bruckner's '>graduation', she wrote

September and stayed there until 18 September, During this time, he played the organ in the parish church and in the neighbouring Benedictine monastery at Admont, as well as renewing his acquaintance with Franz Bayer, the new organist and choir director at Steyr.²³³

At the end of October Göllerich secured wider German interest in Bruckner's music when he conducted a performance of the Fourth Symphony in Nuremberg.²³⁴ Bruckner was delighted with the success and, in his letter of thanks to Göllerich, asked him to enlighten Porges in Munich who had written to him in 1890 about the Finale of the work, viz. it was not his intention to combine all the themes as he had done in the Finale of the Eighth Symphony.²³⁵

another letter, thanking him for his photograph and renewing her request for a >'Tantum ergo' which he had promised to compose for her. See *HSABB* 2, 152 for Mina's first letter to Bruckner; the original is in St. Florian. See *HSABB* 2, 154 for Bruckner's letter to Mina; the original is privately owned. Bruckner and Mina kept in touch for a few years. On 6 December 1892, he wrote to her to say how pleased he was that she had now recovered from illness. See *HSABB* 2, 197; the original is privately owned. On 12 October 1893 Mina wrote to the composer that, although there was not yet a certain '>Yes', she hoped to get her parents' agreement eventually. See *HSABB* 2, 235; the original is in St. Florian. Bruckner replied two days later, on 14 October - '>... Today I am supposed to travel to Berlin for the performance of my D minor Symphony, but the doctors won't allow me as I am still not well enough...' See *HSABB* 2, 236; the letter is privately owned.

233 See *G-AIV/3*, 172-77; see also Renate Grasberger and Erich W. Partsch, '>Bruckner – skizziert', in *ABDS* 8 (Vienna, 1991), 47-48 for an anecdote about the excursion to Admont. Writing to his brother Franz on 21 September, Josef Schalk mentioned that Bruckner had just returned to Vienna from his summer vacation; see *LBSAB*, 163-64 and F18 Schalk 158/12/23 for the original in the *ÖNB*. Franz Bayer (1862-1921) was appointed choir director of both parish churches in Steyr in 1888. He was also choirmaster of the male-voice choir >*Kränzchen* from 1894 to 1918 and artistic director of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* in Steyr from 1889 to 1918. For further biographical information about Bayer, see Erich Wolfgang Partsch, '>Anton Bruckner und Steyr', in *ABDS* 13 (Vienna, 2003), 269-86.

234 The concert, which took place on 28 October, also included performances of Liszt's symphonic poem *Mazeppa* and E-flat Piano Concerto. It was thoroughly previewed and reviewed in the local press. There were also reports in other papers, including the *Musikalische Rundschau* (10 November), the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* (10 November) and the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 87 (25 November). See Franz Scheder, '>Frühe Bruckner-Aufführungen in Nürnberg', in *BJ* 1989/90 (Linz, 1992), 237-44.

235 See *HSABB*, 2, 155 for this letter, dated Vienna, 31 October 1891; the original has been lost, but there is a copy in the *ÖNB*.

On 7 November Bruckner and a small circle of invited friends gathered in the senate hall of the University for the official degree ceremony. Professor Adolf Exner, the rector of the University, and Professor Josef Stefan, the Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, both spoke of his signal contribution to the teaching and composition of music. Bruckner for his part said that he would have been able to provide a more eloquent response if an organ had been available!²³⁶ Nevertheless, Bruckner did provide a meaningful response - the dedication of the revised version of his First Symphony to the University. On 14 November, Professor Exner wrote to Bruckner to thank him on behalf of the University for this dedication.²³⁷

Bruckner almost certainly received a substantial number of congratulatory letters. Although some of these, and his replies, have been lost, several are extant.²³⁸ More telegrams and good wishes were sent on and before Friday 11 December when the *Akademischer Gesangverein* organized a special

236 Bruckner underlined the date of his doctorate on the November calendar page as well as mentioning it on the right-hand page in the *Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender* for 1890/91; see *MVP* 1, 436-37 and 2, 353. See *G-A IV/3*, 186-92 and Carl Almeroth, *Wie die Bruckner-Büste entstand* (Vienna: Engel, 1899; repr. Vienna, 1979) for details of Bruckner's sittings for the sculptor Viktor Tilgner during this time. See also *ABDS* 7 (Graz, 1990), 157-58.

237 See Robert Lach, *op.cit.*, 59 and *G-A IV/3* for the text of what is probably the draft of this letter, and *HSABB* 2, 158 and *ABA*, 112 for what is probably the text of the fair copy; the original of the former is in the Vienna University library and that of the latter is in the *ÖNB*.

238 These include letters from (a) the Steyr *Liedertafel* (undated - see *HSABB* 2, 156; the original is in St. Florian); (b) the Viennese lawyer, Oskar Berggruen (10 November, 1891 - see *HSABB* 2, 157; the original is in St. Florian); (c) Karl Kranzl, member of the Vöcklabruck *Liedertafel* (10 November 1891) - see Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', p.15; (d) Karl Waldeck (11 November 1891 - see *HSABB* 2, 157; the original is in St. Florian); (e) the Währing *Liedertafel* 16 November 1891 - see *HSABB* 2, 158; the original is in St. Florian; (f) the Vienna Philharmonic (18 November 1891 - see *HSABB* 2, 159; the original is in St. Florian); (g) one of Bruckner's former students, Rudolf Dittrich (Tokyo, 6 January 1892 - see *HSABB* 2, 167; the original is in St. Florian) and letters to (a) Anton Ölzelt von Newin (19 November 1891 - see *HSABB* 2, 159; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*); (b) Karl Waldeck (20 November 1891 - see *HSABB* 2, 160; there is a copy of the original in the *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*); (c) the *Frohsinn* choral society (20 November 1891 - see *HSABB* 2, 160; the original is in the Linz *Singakademie* archive); (d) the Vienna Philharmonic - 25 November 1891; see *HSABB* 2, 161; the original is in the Vienna Philharmonic archives); (e) Otto Kitzler (a visiting card, November [no date given]; see *ABB*, 254 and *GrBB*, 54-55; the original has been lost).

celebration of Bruckner's achievement in the *Sophiensaal*. An estimated 3000 friends, students and colleagues attended to pay tribute to the composer, music by Wagner, Weber, and Bruckner himself (his choral piece, *Germanenzug*) was performed, and several speeches were made. Bruckner was particularly moved by Professor Exner's speech which ended with the memorable sentence – '>I bow before the former assistant teacher in Windhaag.' He must have felt that the years of struggle and tribulation were now at an end and his achievements as a musician were at long last being given due recognition.²³⁹

One of Bruckner's friends who was presumably absent was Hans von Wolzogen who wrote to the composer regretting that he would not be able to attend forthcoming performances of his works in Vienna. He congratulated Bruckner on his honorary doctorate and enclosed a little book - *Erinnerungen an Richard Wagner* - in which Bruckner was mentioned.²⁴⁰

The performances alluded to by Wolzogen were that of the revised version of the First Symphony by the Philharmonic conducted by Richter on 13 December and the *Te Deum* by the Philharmonic orchestra and chorus conducted by Wilhelm Gericke a week later, on 20 December. There was

239 See G-A IV/3, 196-201, which includes an extract from the Annual Report of the *Akademischer Gesangverein*; see also Schwanzara, op.cit., 76-79, Elisabeth Maier, 'Anton Bruckners Arbeitswelt', in *ABDS 2* (Graz, 1980), 201ff., and Elisabeth Hilscher, '>Bruckner als Gelehrter - Bruckner als Geehrter', in *BSL 1988* (Linz, 1992), 123-24. Bruckner's own copy of the programme is in the *ÖNB*, and the Annual Report of the *Akademischer Gesangverein* can be found in the Vienna University library. In G-A IV/3 Auer makes specific mention of the fact that Göllicher was not asked to give a speech, no doubt because of his strong nationalistic and anti-Semitic views and his tendency to make controversial statements. He was present at the celebration, however. Bruckner wrote to him on 5 December, mentioning forthcoming performances of his works in Vienna and looking forward to a possible reunion with his friend - see *HSABB 2*, 162.; the original of this letter is privately owned. The entries '>22.11 beim Minister' and '>26.11 beim Kaiser (äußerst huldvoll)', also on the November page of the 1890/91 diary, are references to a meeting with Dr. Paul Gautsch, Minister of Education at the time, and an audience with Emperor Franz Josef. See *MVP 1*, 437 and 2, 353.

240 See *HSABB 2*, 163 for this letter, dated Bayreuth, 9 December 1891; the original is in St. Florian. The book was essentially a printed version of some lectures Wolzogen had given in different places, including Vienna. It also contained a reference to Bruckner's relationship with Wagner. See also earlier, footnotes 189 and 190.

also a performance of the *Te Deum* in Amsterdam at the beginning of the month.²⁴¹

The presence of almost 70 different dates in the autograph score between 12 March 1890 and 18 April 1891 testifies to Bruckner's intensive revision work on the First Symphony.²⁴² It is more than likely that Bruckner was present at rehearsals of the work and even took an active part in them.²⁴³ After the concert, which also included works by Beethoven and Spohr, Bruckner wrote his customary letter of thanks to conductor and orchestra.²⁴⁴

There was the usual wide range of reactions in the press reviews. Writing in the *Deutsche Zeitung*, Theodor Helm, who had been given the opportunity of getting to know the work prior to its performance, spoke of its historical interest, viz. the fact that its original version was composed at a time when Bruckner had very little knowledge of Wagner. The first movement exhibited a rich variety of ideas often combined in ingenious polyphonic combinations; their motivic inter-connection would only become clear after several hearings. While many composers would have been content to write

241 The performance in Amsterdam on 3 December was given by the *Excelsior* choral society and the Concertgebouw Orchestra conducted by Henri Viotta. See Nico Steffen, 'Die Bruckner-Tradition des Königlichen Concertgebouw-Orchesters - Teil 1', in *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 39 (December 1992), 9 for further details, including an extract from the review of the concert in the *Algemeen Handelsblad* (6 December).

242 The important dates in the autograph (Mus.Hs. 19.473 in the *ÖNB*) are Finale, 12 March - 29 June 1890, Scherzo and Trio, 5 July - 17 August (in Steyr); Adagio, 18 August (also in Steyr) - 24 October; first movement, 25 November 1890 - 18 April 1891.

243 There is an entry by Bruckner himself - '>nach Belieben des P.T.H. Hofkapellmeisters' ('>in accordance with the court music director's wishes') - at letter K in the Finale in an accurate copy of the autograph score in the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra library (IV/24); other pencilled entries in this score are probably by Hans Richter. See Gunter Brosche's foreword to the edition of the Vienna version of the symphony - *ABSW 1/2* (Vienna, 1980) - in which he refers to two earlier editions of this version, viz. the 1893 Doblinger edition of the score and parts (as well as a piano score arranged by Ferdinand Löwe) which should be treated with caution as it often differs from Bruckner's autograph and the copy used for engraving cannot be identified, and Robert Haas's much more accurate (but not always entirely reliable) 1935 score as part of the earlier Complete Edition.

244 See *HSABB 2*, 163 for this letter, dated Vienna, 16 December 1891; the original is in the Vienna Philharmonic archives.

just one of the melodies in the slow movement, Bruckner presented us with two equally delightful themes. This rich seam of melodic invention, combined with exceptional instrumental awareness, resulted in a movement of great originality – ‘>no Adagio of greater depth and significance has been written since Beethoven.’ The rhythmically vital Scherzo and *Ländler*-like Trio movement was a worthy successor to the ‘>Lustiges Zusammensein der Landleute’ (‘Merry gathering of country folk’) movement in Beethoven’s *Pastoral* symphony. In the finale, Bruckner made exhaustive use of a trill figure reminiscent of a similar figure in the third variation of Beethoven’s String Quartet in C sharp minor op. 131, 4th movement, a work which he almost certainly did not know in 1865. As in the first movement there were also some >‘Wagnerisms’.²⁴⁵

In his review for *Die Presse*, Robert Hirschfeld remarked that the Vienna Philharmonic should have chosen a work already known to the public - the Third, Fourth or Seventh Symphonies - as a way of celebrating Bruckner’s doctorate. The work was essentially a work from Bruckner’s *Sturm und Drang* period, and it would have been better to reserve it for a *Wagner-Verein* concert. While many characteristic features of the later Bruckner symphonies were present in the work there was not the same organic unity and, particularly in the outer movements, too many subsidiary contrapuntal ideas got in the way of the main themes.²⁴⁶

245 Helm also points out that Bruckner heard *Tristan und Isolde* for the first time in Munich in June 1865, just a month after the completion date of the first movement of the symphony in its original version - >‘Linz, 14 Mai 1865’. See G-A IV/3, 206-10 for the text of Helm’s review (17 December 1891). Helm also provided a review for the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* 23 (1892), 4-5 and 16-17.

246 See Rudolf Louis, *Anton Bruckner* (Munich: Müller, 1918), 325ff. for this review, dated 24 December 1891; there is an extract in G-A IV/3, 210-11. There was a solo piano performance of the second and fourth movements of the symphony at a *Wagner-Verein* concert on 30 December. Ferdinand Löwe was described as a ‘>peerless interpreter of Bruckner’s music’ who played the two movements >from memory ‘with thrilling effect.’ I am grateful to Dr. Andrea Harrandt for providing this information.

Max Kalbeck described the symphony as '>all fantasy and hardly any reality' - a work that began 'beautifully' but ended 'horribly' - and conceived a rather bizarre programme for it. The only movement that gave him any pleasure was the Scherzo which was reminiscent of a Breughel painting in its earthiness.²⁴⁷ In his equally scathing review in the *Illustriertes Wiener Extra-Blatt*, Josef Königstein wrote that the symphony demonstrated '>the composer's characteristic helplessness in constructing his large-scale works.' It lacked organic unity. Its best movement, in his opinion, was the Scherzo, the first half of which showed '>reasonable flow and harmonic logic.'²⁴⁸

Richard Heuberger had several reservations about the work - the last movement did not provide a satisfactory end to the symphony and, despite many original and inventive ideas, the first movement contained a lot of monotonous patches - but found its orchestration brilliant and sonorous, albeit often too ornate and sumptuous. Bruckner had never been able to transfer the frugality of his private life to his organ playing and orchestral scoring!²⁴⁹ Felix von Warteneck, the music critic for the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, also found the Scherzo the most approachable movement. Because of their disjointedness, lack of proper thematic development and usually too noisy orchestration, the other movements would probably bring pleasure only to Bruckner's friends and admirers.²⁵⁰

Finally, Hans Paumgartner described the symphony as an '>interesting work' with a particularly successful Scherzo; the slow movement and Finale,

247 See Louis, op. cit., 324-25 and G-A IV/3, 211ff. for this review which appeared in the *Wiener Montags-Revue*, 21 December 1891.

248 See Louis, op.cit., 323-24 for this review, dated 14 December 1891.

249 See Louis, op.cit., 328-29 and G-A IV/3, 213-14 for Heuberger's review which appeared in the *Neue Musik-Zeitung* 13/1 (1892), 3.

250 See Louis, op.cit., 329 and Othmar Wessely, '>Bruckner-Berichterstattung in der Neuen Zeitschrift für Musik', in *BSL 1991* (Linz, 1994), 141-42 for this review in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 88 (6 April 1892), 163.

however, had structural deficiencies and Bruckner tended to wander away from the straight path of formal consistency.²⁵¹

One of Bruckner's friends, Gustav Schönaich, was eloquent in his appreciation of the work. Writing to Bruckner '>almost a week' after the performance, he said that it had greatly impressed him. He called it '>a doctorate for eternity ... a new mountain... and the gates of hellish criticism will never prevail against it.'²⁵²

Both Hirschfeld and Paumgartner were more positive in their reviews of the *Te Deum* which was performed a week after the First Symphony. Hirschfeld felt that the obvious constraint of words prevented Bruckner from allowing his musical ideas to ramble. The work was clearly inspired by deeply held religious convictions and its full effect may have been better realised in the wider spaces of a church building.²⁵³

There is nothing to suggest that Bruckner spent his Christmas vacation away from Vienna. Perhaps he was too exhausted to visit St. Florian or Steyr. 1891 had been a successful and fulfilling year. 1892 was to bring the first performance of the revised version of the Eighth and the composition of three choral pieces, the motet *Vexilla Regis* WAB 51, the secular choral piece *Das deutsche Lied* WAB 63 and the setting of *Psalms 150* WAB 38 for choir and orchestra.

At the end of 1891 Richard Heuberger, a member of the committee

251 This review appeared in the *Wiener Abendpost* on 18 December 1891. See Norbert Tschulik, '>Anton Bruckner in der Wiener Zeitung', in *BJ 1981* (Linz, 1982), 171-72.

252 See *HSABB* 2, 164 and Andrea Harrandt, '>Gustav Schönaich - ein Herold der Bruckner'schen Kunst@', in *BSL 1991* (Linz, 1994), 70 for this letter, dated 20 December 1891. It was first printed in *ABB*, 359-60.; the original is not extant.

253 Hirschfeld's review of the work followed his review of the First Symphony in *Die Presse*, 24 December 1891; see Louis, op.cit., 327-28. Paumgartner's review appeared in the *Wiener Abendpost*, 23 December 1891; see Tschulik, op.cit., 177. In a review of the 1891 Vienna concert season in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 88 (1892), 139, Felix von Warteneck referred to the 'very small audience' at the concert on 20 December; see Othmar Wessely, loc. cit., 141.

planning the *Musik- und Theater-Ausstellung (Music and Theatre Exhibition)* in Vienna in 1892, asked Bruckner if he would be prepared to compose a hymn or cantata for mixed choir and orchestra to be performed at the opening concert. He enclosed Psalm 98 as a possible text. Bruckner, unaware of the fact that Brahms had also been approached but had declined, wrote to Heuberger on 2 January 1892, confirming that he would be willing to fulfil this request.²⁵⁴

The score of the D minor Mass was now in print and Siegfried Ochs, who had just received a copy, wrote to Bruckner with immense enthusiasm. He hoped to be able to perform the *Te Deum* the following season and the Mass at a later date.²⁵⁵ Bruckner was delighted with Ochs's interest in the two works and informed him of the recent successful performance of the *Te Deum* in Vienna. He described Ochs as his 'second artistic father' [Levi was his first] and recommended his First Symphony and other symphonies for future performance. The First Symphony was his 'most difficult and best'. Although it was 'difficult to understand after one hearing', it made a 'considerable impression'.²⁵⁶

In Steyr plans were in train for a performance of the *Te Deum* on 26 May 1892. On 7 February Johann Aichinger wrote to Bruckner to ask him to send the parts if he was happy to give his permission for the performance to take place.²⁵⁷

254 See *HSABB 2*, 164 for this letter, dated Vienna, 23 December 1891; see also Franz Grasberger, foreword to the score in the Complete Edition, *ABSWXX/6* (Vienna, 1964); the original of Heuberger's letter to Bruckner is in St. Florian, but the location of the original of Bruckner's reply is unknown.

255 See *HSABB 2*, 167-68 for Ochs's letter to Bruckner, dated Berlin, 20 January 1892; the original is in St. Florian.

256 See *HSABB 2*, 168 for Bruckner's letter, dated Vienna, 3 February 1892. It was first printed in *ABB*, 255-56; the location of the original is unknown.

257 See *HSABB 2*, 169-70 for two letters from Aichinger to Bruckner, dated 7 and 18 February respectively; the originals are in St. Florian. The projected performance did not take place; the Phrygian *Pange lingua* WAB 33 was performed instead.

The first new composition of the year was the motet *Vexilla Regis*. It is Bruckner's last smaller sacred work and was written between 4 and 9 February, possibly in response to a request from Deubler in St. Florian for a hymn for the Good Friday liturgy, but more probably from an 'inner urge'.²⁵⁸ On 7 March he enclosed the motet with a letter to Deubler:

... I have composed it following the dictates of a pure heart. May it find grace! My request would be that Mr. Aigner rehearse it very slowly and thoroughly with the choirboys!...²⁵⁹

The first performance of the motet was in St. Florian abbey on Good Friday (15 April). Bruckner was unable to attend because of swollen feet. He wrote to Deubler on 14 June to thank him for the performance and to apologize for his absence.²⁶⁰

On 7 March Bruckner informed Heuberger that he had decided to set *Psalms 150* 'because it was particularly majestic' and on 31 March he added that he would prefer to think in terms of the closing concert of the Exhibition for the performance of the work because he would not have it ready in time for the opening:

... So far as I can judge at the present time, it will be impossible for me to have the 150th Psalm ready for the opening in spite of

258 See *ABSW XXI/1* (Vienna, 1984), 186 and full critical report in *ABSW XXI/2*, 148-58. The autograph score (Mus. Hs. 24.262) and sketches (dated 4 February 1892; Mus. Hs. 28.228) are in the *ÖNB*. The motet was first published in 1892 by Weinberger Verlag in an *Album der Wiener Meister* specially produced for the *Music and Theatre Exhibition*. For a modern edition, see *ABSW XXI/1*, 159-64.

259 See *HSABB 2*, 170; the original is in St. Florian.

260 See *HSABB 2*, 179 for this letter, and *G-A IV/3*, 219-20 for further discussion; the location of the original of the letter is unknown. Timothy Jackson subjects the work to detailed harmonic and rhythmical analysis in his article 'Bruckner's Metrical Numbers', in *19th-Century Music* xiv/2 (1990), 114-27; there is a facsimile of the first of two pages of sketches on page 118.

the capacity for work which I - an old man - still possess (the closing ceremony would be a better proposition). But the problems of rehearsal!!!²⁶¹

Composition of the psalm was also mentioned in letters to Theodor Helm and Oddo Loidol.²⁶²

In 1877-78 Gustav Mahler was largely responsible for a four-hand arrangement of the second version of Bruckner's Third Symphony. Now, fifteen years later, in his capacity as music director in Hamburg, he arranged for Bruckner's *Te Deum* to be performed in the Good Friday concert there. He was obviously taking a risk, as Hamburg was a Brahms stronghold and a previous attempt by Julius Bernuth to schedule the work in a *Singakademie* programme had been unsuccessful. One of Bruckner's pupils, William Sihal, rehearsed the choir and his obvious enthusiasm for the work and Mahler's excellent conducting on the day of the concert guaranteed a success. The day after the performance Mahler wrote to Bruckner to say that the work had been received with tumultuous applause and he had made a definite '>'breakthrough' in the city. He would send some newspaper reviews in due course.²⁶³ Wilhelm Zinne wrote to Bruckner two days later, describing

261 See *HSABB* 2, 171 for the texts of both letters. They were first printed in their entirety in the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 13 March 1936; the location of the originals is unknown.

262 He also told Helm that the writer of a recent article in the Berlin *Börsen-Courier* (on 17 March) had recommended the performance of his Fourth Symphony in the city; see *HSABB* 2, 171 for Bruckner's letter to Helm, dated Vienna, 26 March 1892; the location of the original is unknown. Bruckner wrote to Loidol in Kremsmünster to say how delighted he was to receive an invitation from the abbot to spend the Whit holiday period at the abbey. Unfortunately work on the Psalm might prevent him from taking up the offer - in which case he hoped that the invitation could be postponed until the summer vacation; see *HSABB* 2, 174 for this letter, dated Vienna, 26 April 1892. In fact, on 1 June, Bruckner wrote again to Loidol, complaining about the heat and saying that swelling of his feet, particularly the right one, prevented him from playing the organ and getting about much. He would not be able to travel to Kremsmünster for the Whit period; see *HSABB* 2, 177; the originals of the letters to Loidol are in Kremsmünster abbey.

263 See *HSABB* 2, 172 for this letter, dated Hamburg, 16 April 1892. There is a facsimile in Auer, *Bruckner* (Zurich/Leipzig/Vienna, 1923), supplement; the original is in St. Florian abbey.

Mahler as a 'true admirer of your works.' He enclosed some newspaper reviews and mentioned Hermann Kretzschmar's hostility and von Bülow's lack of understanding.²⁶⁴

In his review of the *Te Deum* in the *Hamburger Korrespondent*, Josef Sittard detected the same characteristics which were hallmarks of the symphonies, namely the sudden juxtaposition of 'often completely heterogeneous episodes which are harmonically self-sufficient', the 'sharply delineated subdivision in periodic structure', and the 'rich harmonic language.' Although a master of instrumentation, Bruckner only used thick colours where they were necessary.²⁶⁵ In the *Hamburger Tageblatt*, Louis Bödecker wrote that the work deserved to be ranked alongside Berlioz's *Te Deum* and Liszt's *Graner Festmesse*. From beginning to end its expressive power was overwhelming.²⁶⁶ Emil Krause's review in the *Fremdenblatt* 'damned with faint praises' - an attitude which, according to Zinne, was not surprising in view of his negative opinion of the Seventh Symphony.²⁶⁷

The *Te Deum*, with its combination of religious fervour, choral splendour and striking orchestral colours, was fast becoming Bruckner's 'most exportable' work. Another performance - in the USA at the end of May - had

264 See *HSABB* 2, 173-74 for Zinne's letter, dated Hamburg, 18 April 1892; the location of the original is unknown. Later in the year (in July), on the way to Italy for a holiday, Zinne and his wife visited Bruckner, and the two men met on another occasion during the Exhibition. See *G-A* IV/3, 246-56 for Zinne's recollection of the visit, his description of Bruckner's apartment, Bruckner's playing to him of extracts from his works, the Eighth and Ninth Symphonies in particular, etc. On 6 August, Zinne wrote to Bruckner to send him holiday greetings from Naples; see *HSABB* 2, 186. The letter was originally printed in *ABB*, 391-92; the location of the original is unknown. Hermann Kretzschmar's hostility is not surprising in view of his negative criticism of Bruckner's Seventh in vol. 1 of his three-volume *Führer durch den Konzertsaal* (Leipzig, 1887-90). On the other hand, von Bülow's alleged 'lack of understanding' is more surprising in view of his positive attitude towards the symphony after the Berlin performance in May 1891.

265 See *G-A* IV/3, 224ff. for this review, dated 16 April 1892.

266 See *G-A* IV/3, 226-27 for this review, dated 17 April 1892.

267 See *G-A* IV/3, 227-28 for this review, dated (perhaps erroneously) 15 April 1892.

an enormous choir of about 800 singers and attracted a huge crowd of almost 7000.²⁶⁸

In the meantime, plans for a performance of the Eighth in Vienna were making slow progress. At the end of January Josef Schalk wrote to Franz in somewhat pessimistic terms about this projected performance and foresaw more 'bitter experiences' for the composer.²⁶⁹ The appearance of the symphony in print - published by the Berlin firm, Robert Lienau (represented by Robert Haslinger in Vienna) - in March, however, meant that a major obstacle had been removed.²⁷⁰ Bruckner referred to the symphony in his letter to Helm at the end of March; he pointed out that the '>'deutscher Michel' of the Scherzo was '>'certainly not a joke - the Austrian/German character is intended...'²⁷¹ By the time he wrote to Loidol a month later he knew that the Eighth would be performed in Vienna during the following concert season.²⁷²

After its highly successful Bruckner evening in December 1891, the *Akademischer Gesangverein* was probably confident that the composer would respond positively to a request for a choral piece to be composed specially for the *Deutsch-akademisches Sangerfest* in Salzburg at the beginning of June 1892. Bruckner duly obliged with *Das deutsche Lied* for male voices, four horns, three trumpets, 3 trombones and tuba. The words

268 The performance took place in Cincinatti on 26 May and was conducted by Theodor Thomas. In his letter to Loidol (26 April; see above, footnote 262), Bruckner mentioned both the Hamburg and forthcoming '>'St. Louis' performances of the *Te Deum*; it is more than likely that he was confusing St. Louis with Cincinatti.

269 See *LBSAB*, 166 for an extract from this letter, dated Vienna, 29 January 1892; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/13/4.

270 Emperor Franz Josef also arranged for 1500 florins to be given towards the printing. The work was published both in full score and in a piano-duet arrangement made by Josef Schalk.

271 From Bruckner's letter to Helm, dated Vienna, 26 March 1892; see footnote 262.

272 He provided this information in his letter, dated Vienna, 26 April 1892; see footnote 262.

were provided by Erich Fels (Professor Aurelius Polzer) of Graz, and, according to the date on the autograph, the piece was composed on 29 April.²⁷³ Seventeen choirs took part in the festival and Bruckner's work was given its first performance by three massed choirs (including the *Wiener Akademische Gesangverein*) in the *Aula academica*, Salzburg on Pentecost Sunday, 5 June. As in *Sängerbund*, written for the *Oberösterreichisch-Salzburgischer Sängerfest* in Wels ten years earlier, Bruckner quoted deliberately from Kalliwoda's well-known male-voice chorus, *Das deutsche Lied*.²⁷⁴

The International Music and Theatre Exhibition took place in the Prater district of Vienna. It opened on Saturday 7 May and ran for five months, ending on 9 October. The *Akademischer Wagner-Verein* was responsible for several of the concerts. One of the aims of the Exhibition was to make the symphony more popular in Vienna and to persuade members of the public who would not normally attend concerts to do so. There were several 'popular concerts', all of which ended with the performance of a symphony. Admission charge was minimal, and food and drink were provided.²⁷⁵ On the

273 See *HSABB* 2, 175 for a letter from the *Wiener Akademischer Gesangverein* to Bruckner, dated Vienna, 12 May 1892; the original is in St. Florian. The autograph of *Das deutsche Lied* is in the ÖNB, Mus. Hs. 3187, and the sketches are in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library.

274 Bruckner was present when this choral piece was performed again in Vienna on 2 July. For further information, see *G-A* IV/3, 235-36.; Theodor Helm, '>Anton Bruckner als Männerchor-Componist', in *Festblätter zum 6. deutschen Sängerbundesfest in Graz 1902*/no. 3, 86; and Andrea Harrandt, '>Bruckner und das bürgerliche Musiziergut seiner Jugendzeit', in *BSL* 1987 (Linz, 1989), 97-98. Harrandt provides short extracts from three reviews of the piece - in the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* (10 July 1892 and 10 June 1899) and the *Jahrbuch des Wiener akademischen Gesang-Vereins* 1891/92, 53. See also Elisabeth Hilscher, '>Bruckner als Gelehrter - Bruckner als Geehrter', in *BSL* 1988 (Linx, 1992), 120-21 for the reviews of the work in the *Deutsches Volksblatt* (8 June and 7 July 1892) and *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* (12 June 1892). *Das deutsche Lied* WAB 63, edited by Viktor Keldorfer, was first published in 1911 by Universal Edition (U.E. 3300). There is a modern edition of the chorus in *ABSW* XXIII/2, 158-71. The *Akademischer Gesang -Verein* also performed Bruckner's *Germanenzug* during the Festival. It was reviewed by Josef Stolzing in the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* (5 June 1892).

275 For more detailed information about the Exhibition, see Theophil Antonicek, 'Oberösterreichisches auf der Internationalen Ausstellung für Musik- und Theaterwesen

evening of 15 June, an Exhibition Orchestra specially assembled by Hermann Grädener and conducted by Josef Schalk gave a performance of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony.²⁷⁶ Hans Puchstein provided a comprehensive review in the *Deutsches Volksblatt* and was extremely critical of Hanslick's failure to recognize Bruckner's stature. Schalk's conducting also received warm praise.²⁷⁷ The *Wiener Männergesangverein* under Eduard Kremser performed *Germanenzug* on 20 June and Ferdinand Löwe made his debut as a Bruckner conductor when he conducted the Exhibition Orchestra in a performance of the Third Symphony on 9 July.²⁷⁸

Siegfried Ochs made further contact with Bruckner in June.²⁷⁹ He said that he was willing to conduct the *Te Deum* during the Composers' Convention in Vienna later in the year. He then alluded to plans for performing other Bruckner works in Berlin as well as his intention of broaching the subject of the Eighth once again with Weingartner:

... Next winter I intend to perform your Mass or give a repeat performance of the *Te Deum* here. We want to perform

Wien 1892', in *ABIL Mitteilungen* no.9 (June 2012), 19-22.

276 On 28 May Josef wrote to Franz and referred to this concert which included music by Wagner and Liszt as well as Wolf's *Das Fest auf Solhaug* for chorus and orchestra. The original date was Sunday 12 June, but it was put back three days. See *LBSAB*, 167 for an extract from this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/13/8. See also Bruckner's letter to Deubler, dated Vienna, 14 June 1892, in which he mentioned the performance of the symphony the following evening and added that his Third Symphony and perhaps also his Seventh would be performed later. See *HSABB* 2, 179 (*ABB*, 259).

277 See *G-A* IV/3, 237-42 for this review, dated 29 June 1892; there is also an extract in *LBSAB*, 168. Bruckner had written to Puchstein earlier in the year, mentioning that Speidel had confused his Second Symphony, first performed in 1873, with his First. See *HSABB* 2, p.166 for this letter, dated Vienna, 3 January 1892; the original is owned privately. The performance of the Fourth was also reviewed in other papers, including the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* (Theodor Helm) and *Vaterland*.

278 See Erich Schenk, 'Ferdinand Löwe', in *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 26 (October 1985), 5-11; also *LBSAB*, 167-68.

279 Hugo Wolf wrote to Ochs after the performance of the Fourth and described it as 'nothing less than a cannibalistic success.'

Berlioz's Requiem and, as it lasts only one hour and a quarter, a second work would fit in very well. Weingartner is coming to see me tomorrow evening and I will use the opportunity to broach the subject of the Eighth Symphony. Richter is conducting three concerts here, however. Could he not bring one of your symphonies?

I only wish that I had the opportunity; then I would perform them one after the other. I now possess the scores of the E major, E flat major, D minor and Eighth Symphonies. How blind the conductors of our symphony concerts are to allow such magnificent works to escape their attention! But rest assured that I am doing what I can to prevail upon others to perform your works when, unfortunately, I am not able to conduct them myself.²⁸⁰

Bruckner still clung to the hope that Levi would be able to conduct the Eighth Symphony in Munich, however.²⁸¹ But this was not to be.

280 See *HSABB* 2, 179-80 for the full text of this letter, dated Berlin, 18 June 1892; the original is in St. Florian.

281 This is made clear in his letter to Levi, dated Vienna, 24 July 1892, in which he also mentions his ill health, the completion of Psalm 150 etc. See *HSABB* 2, 182; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library, Vienna.

282 This contract was signed by both parties on 14 July 1892. See *G-A* IV/3, 259-62 for details of the contract; there is a copy of this contract in the private possession of the Hueber family in Vöcklabruck.

During the summer Bruckner increased his future financial security by finalising a contract with the Viennese publisher, Josef Eberle, which gave the latter the exclusive right to print the First, Second, Fifth and Sixth Symphonies, the E minor and F minor Masses, Psalm 150, some male voice compositions, and any works that Bruckner would compose in the future. Bruckner was guaranteed a percentage of receipts as well as an annual payment of 300 florins, commencing 1893.²⁸²

It was also during his summer vacation that Bruckner visited Bayreuth for the last time. He travelled on the special train chartered by the *Wagner - Verein* and was warmly greeted on his arrival. Unfortunately, because he was surrounded by so many well-wishers, he temporarily lost contact with his porter and discovered that he did not have his suitcase when he arrived at his hotel. Much to his relief, the honest porter had taken it to the local police-station where he was able to retrieve it.²⁸³ After returning to Vienna,²⁸⁴ he spent a few days with his pupil Cyrill Hynais in Klosterneuburg and then a short time in Steyr before going to Carlsbad for the cure.²⁸⁵

In his letter to Bruckner on 18 June, Ochs had intimated that he would be prepared to conduct the *Te Deum* in Vienna during the Composers' Convention in Vienna in the autumn and suggested that Bruckner contact

283 The whole episode is recounted in *G-A IV/3*, 262ff.

284 See *G-A IV/3*, 246-52 for Wilhelm Zinne's reminiscences of time spent in Vienna with Bruckner in late July.

285 On 27 July Bruckner wrote from Vienna to his brother Ignaz in St. Florian, sending him name-day wishes and enclosing a gift of 10 florins. He mentioned that he had to go to Carlsbad to take the cure. See *HSABB 2*, 183; the original of the letter is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library. It was during this period that Bruckner wrote to the Lord Chamberlain's office requesting retirement from *Hofkapelle* duties on the grounds of ill-health and enclosing a medical report (dated 11 July 1892) signed by three doctors, which provided details of his medical condition; see *ABDS 1*, 116-19, and Manfred Wagner, *Bruckner* (Mainz, 1983), 206-07.

Hans August Alexander Bronsart von Schellendorf, president of the *Allgemeiner deutsche Musikverein* about the possibility. It appeared, however, that the *AdM* was considering a performance of his Psalm 150 and not one of his symphonies. In letters to von Schellendorf and Adolf Koch von Langentreu, vice-president of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, Bruckner pointed out that the Psalm was already earmarked for the closing concert of the *Music and Theatre Exhibition* and expressed his surprise that, in Vienna of all places, one of his symphonies had not been selected for performance. After all, as he made clear to Langentreu, Levi had been prepared to perform either the Seventh or Eighth Symphony in Munich.²⁸⁶ Bruckner learned on 1 August, however, that only a quarter of an hour was being allotted to each composer in the Convention concerts and that Brahms and Goldmark, for example, were only having short overtures played.²⁸⁷ Writing to Hynais from Steyr on 11 August he asked him to negotiate with Gutmann about his fee (for providing a piano/vocal score of the Psalm), to find out whether Gericke or Richter was conducting the work at the closing concert of the Exhibition, and to give him the dates of the final three rehearsals so that he

286 The location of the Convention had been moved from Munich to Vienna. Bruckner's letter to Bronsart von Schellendorf is dated Vienna, 8 July 1892; see *HSABB* 2, 354-55; the original is in the *Stiftung Weimarer Klassik*, Weimar. In his letter to Langentreu, dated Vienna, 27 July 1892, Bruckner also mentioned that he was about to leave for Steyr; from there he would go to Carlsbad. See *HSABB* 2, 184 for this letter, which was first printed in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 84 (1917), 7; the location of the original is unknown. Bruckner also informed Albert Gutmann on the same day (27 July) that Bronsart von Schellendorf, the president of the *Allgemeiner deutsche Musikverein*, would prefer a performance of the shorter Psalm instead of the longer Seventh Symphony; a facsimile of this letter can be found in Albert Gutmann, *Aus dem Wiener Musikleben. Künstlererinnerungen* (Vienna, 1914); the original of this letter is owned privately.

287 He wrote to Bronsart von Schellendorf again on 5 August to say that he would certainly be prepared to place his '>newest composition', viz. Psalm 150, at his disposal. See *HSABB* 2, 355; the original is in the *Stiftung Weimarer Klassik*, Weimar. On the same day he also wrote to Langentreu to inform him that he had received a friendly letter from von Schellendorf. He asked who would be conducting the performance, made it clear that he would attend the final choral rehearsals, and mentioned that Cyrill Hynais would be responsible for writing out the choral parts which would have to be ready by the end of August. See *HSABB* 2, 185; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*.

could attend them if necessary. The performance of the work at the Composers' Convention could be regarded as a sort of dress rehearsal for the Exhibition concert.²⁸⁸

While he was in Steyr Bruckner also wrote with some concern to his friend Oddo Loidol who had been ill. He mentioned his own illness and the need to take a cure, adding that he had finished composing Psalm 150.²⁸⁹ He wrote to *Frohsinn* in Linz, probably in response to a request from the choral society, and said that he had written *Das deutsche Lied* for the *Wiener Akademische Gesangverein* for performance at the Salzburg Choir Festival.²⁹⁰ During his time in Steyr he took the opportunity of visiting Kronstorf to search for the manuscripts of the sacred works he had written while a student teacher there. Unfortunately, because the schoolmaster was not at home, he had to leave empty-handed! His poor health probably prevented him from taking up Johann Burgstaller's invitation to play the organ in Linz.²⁹¹ When he sent name-day greetings to Deubler in St. Florian on 18 August, he wrote:

... I am in Steyr with swollen feet and am not able to play the

288 Bruckner was making the point that the Composers' Convention was, to all intents and purposes, part of the *Music and Theatre Exhibition*. See *HSABB 2*, 186 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

289 See *HSABB 2*, 185 for this letter, dated Steyr, 2 August 1892; the original is in Kremsmünster. He had been informed of Loidol's illness in June when Father Georg Huemer wrote to him, regretting that he would not be able to spend Whitsuntide at Kremsmünster. See *HSABB 2*, 178 for this letter, dated 10 June 1892; it was first printed in Altman Kellner, *Musikgeschichte des Stiftes Kremsmünster* (Cassel-Basle 1956), 755.

290 See *HSABB 2*, 184 for this letter, dated Steyr, 2 August 1892. Later in the year Bruckner sent the score of this choral piece to *Frohsinn*; see *HSABB 2*, 193 for the accompanying letter, dated Vienna 18 October 1892. The originals of both letters are in the *Singakademie* archive in Linz.

291 See *G-A IV/3*, 267. Franz Bayer accompanied him on his visit to Kronstorf. Burgstaller had asked him to play at a special Pontifical Mass.

organ; I need the Carlsbad cure. I must return to Vienna for the German Music Festival in September. According to letters from Weimar, they want to perform my newest composition, Psalm 150.²⁹²

On the same day he informed Hynais that the first rehearsal of his Psalm 150 would be in Vienna on 5 September and that Wilhelm Gericke would conduct. He asked him to use a piano score or, if one was not yet available, to play from the full score at the rehearsal or ask Löwe to do so.²⁹³ He also wrote to Gericke to give him Hynais', Schalk's and Löwe's addresses, and recommended Hynais in particular.²⁹⁴

Once again there was some romantic interest of an innocent nature during the summer months, the first episode concerning a Hungarian waitress called Aurelie Stolzar whom he had met at the *Music and Theatre Exhibition* in Vienna in July. He sent her his photograph, received a letter of thanks from her with photograph enclosed on 17 August, and wrote to her again from Steyr on 23 August.²⁹⁵ The second episode, concerning Anna Rogl, a young lady he met during a brief sojourn in St. Florian in August or September, is described in some detail in Göllrich-Auer. He wrote to Anna from Steyr on 1

292 See *HSABB* 2, 187; the original is in St. Florian.

293 See *HSABB* 2, 188 for Bruckner's letter to Hynais, dated Steyr, 18 August 1892; the original is in the *ÖNB*. Bruckner wrote to Hynais again on 23 August and 1 September to give him information about Gericke's request for the availability of score and parts before the rehearsal on 5 September. See *HSABB* 2, 189-90 for these two letters. The original of the former is in the *ÖNB*; there is a copy of the original of the latter in *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna.

294 See *HSABB* 2, 187-88 for this letter, dated Steyr, 18 August 1892; the original is in Harvard University, USA.

295 See Walter Beck, op. cit., 73 for this letter and a facsimile of the dedication and photograph; the original of the photograph is in the Beck Collection, Munich. See *ABA*, 80 for Aurelie's letter to Bruckner; the original of her photograph is in the library of the *Anton Bruckner Privatuniversität*, Linz. See *HSABB* 2, 189 for Bruckner's second letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*. The appearance of Aurelie's name and the address of the coffee-house where she worked among prayer entries for December 1890 in the *Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender* for 1889/90, however, suggests an earlier meeting. See *MVP* 1, 407 and 2, 336.

October, enclosing a photograph and suggesting a meeting at Amstetten on 5 October.²⁹⁶ On 19 September Bruckner also received another letter from Ida Buhz in Berlin.²⁹⁷

Bruckner stayed in Upper Austria until the beginning of October. The Composers' Convention was cancelled in early September because of exaggerated rumours of a cholera outbreak, and it was felt that it would not be suitable to conclude the *Music and Theatre Exhibition*, which had run into severe financial problems, with a work like Psalm 150. He spent the period 19-25 September in Kremsmünster where he visited the indisposed Oddo Loidol and continued work on his Ninth Symphony.²⁹⁸

While he was on holiday at Adalbert von Goldschmidt's villa in Grundlsee during the summer, Franz Schalk informed Josef for the first time about his revision of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony the first performance of which he

296 See G-A II/1, 311ff. for further information, and HSABB 2, 193 for Bruckner's letter; the original is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*, Linz. The meeting took place at the home of Baron Lederer where Anna Rogl was a chambermaid.

297 See HSABB 2, 192 and 196 for extracts from this letter and another letter, dated Berlin, 17 November 1892; these extracts were first printed in G-A IV/3, 270-71. In both letters, Ida expresses concern for Bruckner's health and interest in performances of his works; the originals of the letters have been lost.

298 Bruckner decided to prolong his stay in Steyr in view of the cancellation. See (a) HSABB 2, 190 and 191 for two letters to Hynais on 3 and 6 September; the original of the former is in the *ÖNB* and there is a copy of the original of the latter in *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*; (b) HSABB 2, 191 for a letter to his housekeeper, Katharina Kachelmaier, dated Steyr, 3 September 1892; the original is owned privately; (c) HSABB 2, 192 for a letter to Max von Oberleithner, dated Steyr, 6 September 1892 (in which he congratulated Oberleithner on his forthcoming marriage); the original is in the *ÖNB*. See also G-A IV/3, 268-69 for Loidol's record of Bruckner's stay in Kremsmünster. On 18 October, Bruckner wrote to Loidol from Vienna, and enclosed two pieces which he had promised to send to the Kremsmünster *Gymnasium* pupils, viz. the plainchant harmonization *Iam lucis* WAB 18 (1868) and his '>favourite *Tantum ergo*', the *Pange lingua* WAB 33 (1868; publ. 1885). See HSABB 2, 194; the original is in Kremsmünster abbey. In November, the *Gymnasium* pupils wrote to Bruckner to thank him for his gift. See HSABB 2, 194 for this undated letter, which was first printed in *GrBL*, 68; the original is not extant. On 26 November, the organist at Kremsmünster abbey, Josef Leitenmayr, provided Bruckner with some information about a young lady who had attracted his attention during his stay, and also informed Bruckner about Loidol's poor state of health. See HSABB 2, 196-97; the original is in St. Florian.

wanted to give in Graz:

... My work on the Vth progresses very slowly but I am moving forwards. I have now arrived at the final bars of the first movement. I had enormous difficulty with the development section. Löwe will find little to please him there, as my chief concern was to retain all the subsidiary contrapuntal motives as far as possible... Goldschmidt goes to Carlsbad next week. Consequently, I hope to take gigantic strides forward and even bring my work to its conclusion during the holidays...²⁹⁹

On 23 September Franz asked Josef to enquire whether the publisher Eberle would cover the cost of printing the new parts for the Fifth. So far as his own involvement with the symphony was concerned, he had done a lot of preparatory work on the Finale >'in his head' without writing it down as yet. Nevertheless, he hoped that everything would be finished in time for a performance either in November or March.³⁰⁰ A month later Josef wrote to Franz to report that Bruckner was well and was hoping to hear from him about the performance of the Fifth. He himself (i.e. Josef) was continuing his revision work on the orchestration of the F minor Mass which he was finding difficult because of lack of experience. There was no question of any crisis of conscience concerning these unauthorized tinkering with Bruckner's original intentions. Both Josef and Franz had an idealistic view of their efforts, seeing them as acts of friendship.³⁰¹ On 9 December Franz asked Josef to send him [the first] three movements of the Fifth,³⁰² and Josef replied that he would

299 See *HSABB* 2, 181 and *LBSAB*, 168 for this extract from Franz Schalk's letter to Josef, dated Grundlsee, 14 July 1892; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/13/9.

300 See *LBSAB*, 168-69.; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/13/11. Nowak dates this letter 25 November 1892 in the *Revisionsbericht* of his edition of Symphony no. 5 (Vienna, 1985), 69.

301 See *LBSAB*, 169 for an extract from Josef's letter to Franz, dated Vienna, 25 October 1892; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/13/13.

302 Mentioned by Nowak in Symphony no. 5 *Revisionsbericht*, 70.

send them >'as soon as you wish.'³⁰³

Bruckner resumed his University teaching at the beginning of October but his long period of service at the *Hofkapelle* came to an end. His resignation on grounds of ill-health was accepted in October and Hellmesberger wrote a formal letter to Bruckner to advise him of the decision.³⁰⁴

Towards the end of the year there were performances of Bruckner's Third Symphony in Amsterdam and The Hague,³⁰⁵ and two important Bruckner premieres in Vienna - Psalm 150 in the first of the season's *Gesellschaft* concerts conducted by Wilhelm Gericke on 13 November, and the revised version of Symphony no. 8 in a Philharmonic concert conducted by Hans Richter on 18 December. The first edition of the Second Symphony, supervised by Cyrill Hynais, was also published at around the same time as Psalm 150.³⁰⁶

Dates in the autograph score of the Psalm indicate that Bruckner

303 See *LBSAB*, 169-70 and Nowak, op.cit., 70 for this letter, dated Vienna, 11 December 1892; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/13/15.

304 Letter dated Vienna, 28 October 1892. See *G-A IV/3*, 273 and fuller details of the relevant documentation in *ABDS* 1, 120-24, including (1) Hellmesberger's letter to the Lord Chamberlain's office, dated 21 October, in which he recommends that Bruckner's resignation be accepted, 'all the more so as the artistic quality of his organ playing has been less than acceptable for several years'; (2) the draft of the letter from the Lord Chamberlain's office to the *Hofkapelle*, dated 24 October; (3) the draft of Hellmesberger's letter to Bruckner. The formality of the draft of the latter is very surprising. There are no expressions of gratitude for Bruckner's long period of service. Perhaps these were added in the fair copy?

305 The performances were given on 13 October in Amsterdam and 21 December in The Hague by the Concertgebouw Orchestra conducted by Willem Kes and Richard Hol respectively. See Cornelis van Zwol, 'Holland: ein Brucknerland seit 1885', in *BJ* 1980 (Linz, 1981), 137; Nico Steffen, *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 39 (December 1992), 9-10; Thomas Röder, op.cit., 432. For further information about Willem Kes (1856-1934), see Cornelis van Zwol, 'Willem Kes – Ein früher Bruckner-Interpret in den Niederlanden', in *BJ* 2006-2010 (Linx, 2011), 369-79.

306 The copy made by Tenschert (Mus.Hs. 6035 in the *ÖNB*) was used as the printer's copy (Stichvorlage). See William Carragan, foreword to 'Symphony no. 2. Version of 1877' (Vienna, 2007), for information about the final details, supervised by Bruckner, made before printing. The symphony was published by Doblinger (full score, D. 1769; parts, D. 1770; piano score, arr. J. Schalk, D. 1806).

completed it on 29 June but made subsequent corrections on 7 and 11 July. It was published by Doblinger in November 1892.³⁰⁷ A gap of nearly thirty years separates Psalm 150 from Bruckner's previous psalm setting. It is his last sacred composition for chorus and orchestra and embodies the fruits of a lifelong struggle for perfection, all 'ad maiorem Dei gloriam'. Together with the *Te Deum*, with which it has many features in common, it bears eloquent testimony to the composer's religious inspiration and displays a monumental, almost primitive strength of expression. Unfortunately, it was not well received at its first performance. It appears that there were too few rehearsals of what is by no means an easy work, particularly for singers, and its placing in the programme - after a Schubert overture and before Liszt's Piano Concerto in E flat - militated against a favourable reception. Writing in *Die Presse*, Robert Hirschfeld accepted that the work had the richness of sound one would expect from a Bruckner composition. Unfortunately, however, the composer had not taken the limitations of the human voice into account, with the result that there were some impossible choral passages.³⁰⁸ Hans Paumgartner was if anything more critical. It was one thing for Beethoven to stretch his voices to the limit in the Finale of the Ninth - this was the natural 'outflow and outward expression of the artist's vast inner life.' But it was quite another for Bruckner to attempt the same thing - in his case it was simply 'unsingable and ugly.'³⁰⁹ Hanslick had very little to say

307 The autograph is in the *ÖNB*, Mus. Hs. 19.484. The plate number of the full score is D. 1859, and Cyrill Hynais was responsible for much of the preparation of this score, for the writing out and checking of the choral and orchestral parts (see Bruckner's letter to Hynais, 3 September 1892), and for the edition of the piano score (D. 1780). Editions of the work since then include those by Universal Edition (U.E. 2906; 1910), Wiener Philharmonischer Verlag (W.Ph.V.205;1924), Eulenburg (E.E.4599; ed. Redlich,1960) and Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag (*ABSW* XX/6; ed. Grasberger, 1964).

308 See Louis, *op.cit.*, 330-31 for this review, dated 19 November 1892; there is also a brief extract in *G-A* IV/3, 275.

309 See Louis, *op.cit.*, 329-30 and *G-A* IV/3, 275-76 for this review, dated 18 November 1892, in the *Wiener Abendpost*.

in his review in the *Neue Freie Presse*, but he criticised the Psalm's '>nasty chromatic progressions.'³¹⁰ Max Kalbeck thought that Bruckner had interpreted the Psalm to mean '>Praise the Lord in all keys and make Him a sacrifice of a dozen choristers, a solo soprano and a first violinist. A change of fundamental meaning, albeit an enharmonic one!...' ³¹¹

The reviews in the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau*, *Wiener Extrablatt* and *Vaterland*, on the other hand, were much more positive and complimentary.³¹² Theodor Helm and Hans Puchstein showed the greatest understanding of the work. Helm felt that the choir and orchestra had not done justice to it. In some places Gericke had adopted far too fast a tempo with the result that the vocal ensemble became blurred; in other places he had allowed the orchestra to drown the voices.³¹³ Puchstein also noted that the performance of what was admittedly an extremely difficult work had not been totally convincing, and yet there was no doubt that Gericke had devoted a considerable amount of time to rehearsing it.³¹⁴

Josef Schalk's performance of his solo piano arrangement of the first movement from the Eighth Symphony during an 'internal evening' of the *Wagner-Verein* on 22 November was described by one reviewer as a 'commendable preparation' for the forthcoming orchestral performance of

310 Hanslick's article, which appeared in the *Neue Freie Presse* on 17 November 1892, is mentioned briefly in *G-A IV/3*, 276; there is an extract from it in Norbert Tschulik, *Anton Bruckner im Spiegel seiner Zeit* (Vienna, 1955), 50-51.

311 See Louis, op. cit., 331-32 and *G-A IV/3*, 276 (brief mention) for this review, dated 21 November 1892, in the *Wiener Montags-Revue*.

312 Josef Stolzing's article in the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* (20 November 1892) is mentioned in Ingrid Fuchs, '>Bruckner und die österreichische Presse (Deutsch-nationale Blätter)', in *BSL 1991* (Linz, 1994), 91. The *Extrapost* review (14 November 1892) is quoted and the *Vaterland* review is briefly mentioned in *G-A IV/3*, 277.

313 See *G-A IV/3*, 277ff. for Theodor Helm's review, dated 18 November 1892, in the *Deutsche Zeitung*.

314 See *G-A IV/3*, 279ff. for Hans Puchstein's review, dated 25 November 1892, in the *Deutsches Volksblatt*.

'this most remarkable work.'³¹⁵ Other reviewers were more critical, however. One remarked that difficult works of this nature demanded 'a four-hand performance at the very least' and even then were of interest only to those who already knew them. For those who were not acquainted with the work, a piano performance was of 'very little practical use.'³¹⁶ Another made the point that, even in the hands of accomplished pianists who were able to produce an orchestral sound on the piano, there was something 'extremely incomplete' about the piano arrangements of the 'most recent orchestral works written by German composers.'³¹⁷ Josef Schalk and others continued to give piano (two-hand and four-hand) performances of Bruckner's works, but comments of this nature suggest that they were no longer fulfilling their original purpose - or were no longer necessary now that orchestral performances of the symphonies were becoming more frequent.

The orchestral performance of the Eighth on 18 December was undoubtedly one of Bruckner's greatest triumphs in Vienna. Brahms, Johann Strauss, Hugo Wolf and Siegfried Wagner were but four of the important musical figures who attended. Emperor Franz Josef was not able to come but he was represented by Crown Princess Stephanie and Archduchess Valerie. Bruckner had an unusual reward for Hans Richter - 48 hot doughnuts! - and wrote his customary letter to the Philharmonic to thank the players and the conductor for their 'masterly performance'.³¹⁸ Apart from

315 From review in the *Deutsche Zeitung* (by Theodor Helm?), dated 24 November 1892.

316 From review in the *Deutsches Volksblatt* (by Hans Puchstein?), dated 7 December 1892.

317 From review in the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* (by Josef Stolzing?), dated 18 December 1892.

318 See *HSABB* 2, 198 for this letter, dated Vienna, 21 December 1892; see also Otto Schneider, 'Anton Bruckners Briefe an die Wiener Philharmoniker', in *ÖMZ* 29 (1974), 188. There is a facsimile of the letter in Wilhelm Jerger, *Briefe an die Wiener Philharmoniker* (Vienna, 1942), 44; the original is located in the Vienna Philharmonic archives. Six weeks before the performance - on 8 November 1892 - Bruckner wrote to Richter, expressing his apprehension about the possibility of another piece being performed before the symphony

Hanslick who made the usual comments about the ‘transference of Wagner’s dramatic style to the symphony’, hoped that this ‘nightmarish, confused music’ was not destined to be the music of the future, and took Josef Schalk to task for his over-elaborate programmatic account of the work in the printed programme,³¹⁹ and, to a lesser extent, Heuberger and Kalbeck, the critical reviews of the performance were extremely favourable.³²⁰ Heuberger considered that it did not have the same melodic freshness as Symphonies 1, 3, 4 or 7 and yet there were many passages of great inventiveness in the first three movements, the slow movement in particular – ‘one of the most beautiful that Bruckner has written up to now.’ On the other hand, there was lack of coherence and inspiration in the Finale, although the orchestration here and in the other movements was extremely rich and colourful.³²¹ Max Kalbeck admitted that it was by far the best of the composer’s works that had been performed thus far, surpassing the earlier works ‘in >clarity of layout, succinctness of expression, precision of detail and logic of ideas.’ Nevertheless, it was by no means a model symphony - many cuts could profitably have been made, particularly in the prolix Finale. But he

which, he reckoned, would take nearly 90 minutes to perform or 75 minutes with cuts and recommended that the work either be performed first before the usual ‘detestable virtuoso piece’ or the latter be omitted altogether. It is much to Richter’s credit that Bruckner’s wish was granted and the customary Philharmonic concert programme altered accordingly. See Andreas Lindner and Klaus Petermayr, ‘Vier unbekannte Briefe Bruckner an Hans Richter’, in *BJ 2006-2010* (Linz, 2011), 207-21, incl facsimile of letter on pp. 214-17. For further information about the performance of the Eighth and its aftermath, see *G-A IV/3*, 283-86.

319 This programme is reprinted in *G-A IV/3*, 288ff. and *LBSAB*, 170ff.; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 415/2. In a letter to Franz on 11 November Josef mentioned the forthcoming performance of the Eighth. See *HSABB 2*, 195 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 158/12/26. Hanslick’s article in the *Neue Freie Presse* (23 December 1892) is reprinted in *G-A IV/3*, 290-94.

320. See, however, Felix Warteneck’s review in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 89 (26 July 1893), 324, which has nothing good to say about the work, except for the Scherzo. This review is reprinted in Wessely, *BSL 1991*, 143; there is also an extract in Louis, op.cit., 336.

321 See *G-A IV/3*, 294ff. for Heuberger’s review, dated 19 December 1892, in the *Wiener Tagblatt*.

would gladly listen to the first three movements again, if only to experience the '>magnificent orchestral sound.'³²²

In his review of the work in the *Österreichisches Volkszeitung*, Balduin Bricht described it as '>the pinnacle of contemporary music', while the reviewer in *Das Vaterland* referred to Bruckner's symphonic output in general as representing a new phase in the development of the symphony.³²³ The indisposed Paumgartner was unable to attend the performance but his stand-in was well-disposed towards the composer.³²⁴ In *Die Presse*, Robert Hirschfeld prefaced his favourable review of the work with a lengthy discussion of the contemporary state of music criticism. Like most of the other reviewers, he found the Finale to be the weakest movement of the four. In compensation, however, there was the wonderful conclusion of the first movement, the '>unspeakably beautiful' slow movement, and the orchestration throughout. But Hirschfeld was, if anything, even more severe than Hanslick in his criticism of the programmatic description of the symphony.³²⁵ Bruckner was particularly pleased with Theodor Helm's review in the *Deutsche Zeitung* but, in writing to him, was at pains to point out that all four main themes of the symphony were combined in the Finale at letter Zz in the score, a detail which he thought that Helm had overlooked.³²⁶ In his

322 See G-A IV/3, 297-300 for Kalbeck's review, dated 19 December 1892, in the *Wiener Montags-Revue*.

323 See G-A IV/3, 301 for short extracts from the reviews in these two journals, both dated 21 December 1892.

324 See Tschulik, op.cit., 177-78 for this review, dated 30 December 1892.

325 See Louis, op. cit., 332-36 for this review, dated 23 December 1892.

326 See Manfred Wagner, '>Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte von Anton Bruckner Achter Symphonie', in *BJ* 1991/92/93 (Linz, 1995), 115 for this review, dated 28 December 1892, in the *Deutsche Zeitung*; see also Renate Grasberger et al., '>Bruckner-Rezeption', in *ABIL-Informationen* 4 (Linz, 1991), 5 for a reference to Helm's earlier review, dated 21 December 1892, in the *Pester Lloyd*, and *SchABCT* for a reference to Helm's review in the *Leipzig Musikalisches Wochenblatt* (29 December 1892). Bruckner's letter to Helm, dated Vienna, 3 January 1893, is printed in *HSABB* 2, 200. It was first printed in *ABB*, 267; the original is not

reply, Helm thanked Bruckner for the '>mighty impression created by your sublime Eighth Symphony' and added that he was aware that '>not only the main themes of the three earlier movements but also the principal theme of the last movement was combined in the magnificent [conclusion of the] Finale', apologizing that he had not made this clear in his review.³²⁷ In a letter to Levi in January 1893 Bruckner mentioned a report of the Philharmonic players that they '>had never experienced such jubilation in any of their previous concerts as they had with the Eighth Symphony.' Evidently Hans Richter had called him the symphonist and was continually whistling motives from the work. '>Whence this change?', asked Bruckner, and added '>Woe is me if Hanslick hears of it.'³²⁸

Apart from the critical reviews of the first performance of the symphony,³²⁹ we are fortunate to have two eye-witness accounts, those of Amand Loidol and Hugo Wolf. Writing to his brother Oddo in Kremsmünster the day after the performance, Amand provided details of the occasion - the work lasted from 12.30 until 2.00, the large hall was completely full, Crown Princess Stephanie was in the royal box, Wagner's son Siegfried was in the audience, Bruckner received a wreath after each movement (the first evidently paid for by the Emperor) - and of the performance:

extant.

327 See *HSABB* 2, 201-02 for this letter, dated Vienna, 5 January 1893. It was first printed in *ABB*, 298-301; the location of the original is unknown.

328 See *HSABB* 2, 205 for this letter, dated Vienna, 14 January 1893; the original is owned privately.

329 See Renate Grasberger, *ABIL-Informationen*, 5, Ingrid Fuchs, in *BSL* 1991, 91, Manfred Wagner, *BJ* 1991/92/93, 111 and 115, and *SchABCT*, 700 for references to and quotes from reviews or articles by Camillo Horn in the *Deutsches Volksblatt* no. 1425 (20 December 1892), Wilhelm Frey in the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* (20 December 1892), Josef Stolzing in the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* (25 December 1892), Hans Puchstein in the *Deutsches Volksblatt* [?] (28 December 1892), Eusebius Mandyczewski in the *Deutsche Kunst- und Musikzeitung* 20 (1 January 1893), 3; and Max Graf in the *Musikalische Rundschau* (1 January 1893).

... in the grandest style: 10 double basses etc., also two harps which participated in a particularly lively fashion in the 2nd and 3rd movements. The highlight is the Adagio. It begins in D flat major, then G flat, A flat, and ends in C major!...

In a second letter, Amand enclosed a friendly review of the work by Camillo Horn in the *Deutsches Volksblatt* and mentioned the generally favourable reception of the symphony as well as the fine conducting and orchestral playing.³³⁰

Hugo Wolf enthused about the symphony in two letters to Emil Kauffmann. In the first he described the highly successful reception of the work:

... This symphony is the creation of a giant and surpasses all the composer's other symphonies in spiritual dimension, fecundity, and greatness. The success was almost unparalleled, despite the mischievous Cassandra-like predictions even among Bruckner's own supporters. It was a total victory of light over darkness, and a storm of applause broke forth with elemental power at the end of each movement. In short, it was a triumph which would not have disgraced a Roman emperor. What feelings Brahms must have had as he witnessed the work and its electrifying effect from his seat in the director's box! I would not like to have been in his shoes for all the tea in China.³³¹

In his second letter, Wolf had more pertinent things to say about the structure of the work:

330 For texts of both letters, dated Vienna, 19 and 28 December respectively, see *GrBLS*, 252-56; the location of the originals is unknown.

331 The date of this letter is given incorrectly as 25 December in *G-A IV/3*, 286-87, but correctly as 23 December by Nowak in his foreword to the 1955 edition of the second version of the symphony (*ABSW VIII/2*); the original is privately owned.

... Your enthusiasm for Bruckner's Eighth fills me with great joy. I share your view entirely concerning the profoundly moving Adagio. In fact, nothing similar can be placed alongside it; certainly not, as far as content is concerned. On the other hand, it is not entirely successful structurally, probably on account of its excessive breadth and scope. In this respect Bruckner is inferior to Beethoven. However, the first movement in its highly energetic, concise version is entirely unique and perhaps the most accomplished of its kind. The effect of this movement is simply overwhelming, negating all attempts at criticism.

Sadly, the composer has been ill with an incurable complaint for a long time now and, even under the most favourable circumstances, has only a few years to live. It is to be hoped that he will complete his Ninth and thus, like another Titan, complete the victory procession of his imperishable creations.³³²

Early in the New Year, one of Bruckner's admirers, Louis Nicodé, who had already conducted a performance of the Seventh Symphony in Dresden, wrote to him about the possibility of a Dresden performance of the Eighth and about the availability of score and parts. In his reply Bruckner pointed out that the symphony was now available in print:

... My Eighth is published in Berlin by Lienau and Schlesinger (their representative here in Vienna is Haslinger). I am not able to do any more. Under no circumstances would I want to pester the Philharmonic who, together with Richter and the public, are very enthusiastic about the work.³³³

Nicodé eventually conducted the third performance of the Eighth in Dresden exactly three years after its Viennese premiere - on 18 December

332 See E. Hellmer, ed., *Hugo Wolf. Briefe an Emil Kauffmann* (Berlin, 1903), 87ff. for the text of this letter, dated Vienna, 10 March 1893; there is also an extract in *G-A IV/3*, 287.

333 See *ABB*, 334-35 for Nicodé's letter (undated) to Bruckner from Dresden, and *HSABB* 2, 202 and *ABB*, 268 for Bruckner's reply, dated Vienna, 9 January 1893; the location of the originals is unknown.

1895.³³⁴ It was nearly ten years before the symphony was heard in Vienna again, in a performance conducted by Ferdinand Löwe on 3 March 1902. Two months earlier, on 13 January 1902, Weingartner in Berlin belatedly fulfilled his promise to conduct the work.³³⁵

Although he was in poor health Bruckner was able to spend Christmas at St. Florian. It was from St. Florian that he sent New Year greetings to Otto Kitzler. Kitzler had written to Bruckner to invite him to conduct his Fourth Symphony and give an organ recital in Brno, but he had to decline because of the state of his health and because he would have to expend a lot of nervous energy in performing one of his own works.³³⁶

Bruckner's Christmas vacation brought him only temporary respite from his deteriorating health. Shortly after returning to Vienna, he wrote to Oddo Loidol and expressed the hope that he would soon recover from his illness.³³⁷ He himself was far from well, however, and he continued to suffer from oedema, cardiac insufficiency and breathlessness. His condition worsened so much during January that he consulted one of the leading Viennese medics of the time, Professor Leopold Schrötter von Kristelli. According to

334 The second performance was in Olmütz, conducted by Vladimir Labler, on 22 October 1893.

335 Before this, Weingartner conducted performances of the Fourth in Berlin (1895, 1897) and Munich (1900), and the Fifth also in Berlin (1900) and Munich (1900). Later in 1902, Weingartner conducted Bruckner's Sixth Symphony in Berlin. He gave five performances of the Seventh in October and November 1904 (Munich, Frankfurt, Berlin, Stuttgart and Nuremberg).

336 See *HSABB* 2, 199 for Bruckner's letter to Kitzler, dated St. Florian, 27 December 1892; the original is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*, Linz.

337 See *HSABB*, 2, 196 for an earlier letter to Loidol, dated Vienna, 15 November 1891, in which Bruckner also expressed concern about his health, and *HSABB* 2, 200 for this letter to Loidol, dated 4 January 1893; the original of the former is in Kremsmünster, but the original of the latter, first printed in *GrBL*, 69, is not extant. Loidol, unfortunately, did not recover from his illness and died on 31 January. Bruckner sent condolences to the abbot and the rest of the Kremsmünster community on 1 February; his own illness prevented him from attending the funeral. See *HSABB* 2, 206 and Altman Kellner, *op.cit.*, 759 for Bruckner's letter to Father Sebastian Mayr; the original is in Kremsmünster.

Schrötter's assistant, Dr. Alexander von Weismayr, who had already met Bruckner in Steyr and whose father was an old friend of the composer, Bruckner was confined to bed and put on a strict milk diet for a fortnight. There was a marked improvement in his condition, and he was able to get up at the end of this period. From this time onwards, however, Dr. Weismayr made regular house calls.³³⁸

During his illness Hermann Levi wrote to him, apologizing for his long silence but giving him the good news that he hoped to perform one of his symphonies, either the Third or the Seventh in February, and another - the Seventh - during the Composers' Convention in May.³³⁹ In his reply Bruckner recommended to Levi that he use the 1890 edition of the Third which was '>incomparably better' than the first edition for which he no longer had any time. He also took the opportunity of informing Levi of the very successful performance of the Eighth in Vienna and of his own rather frail condition.³⁴⁰ Levi conducted the Third at an *Akademie-Konzert* in Munich on 3 February and wrote to Bruckner that, although the public reception was not particularly enthusiastic, the orchestral players were delighted with the work.³⁴¹ The

338 See G-A IV/3, 304ff. for Professor Schrötter's and Dr. Weismayr's diagnosis of his condition. See also G-A IV/3, 307 for an extract from Hans Richter's letter to Bruckner's sister, Rosalie Hueber, dated Vienna, 22 February 1893. Rosalie was so concerned about her brother's health that she had written to Richter. He was able to reassure her that '>thanks to his strong constitution and the skill of the doctors', Bruckner was now out of danger and on the road to recovery. See also HSABB 2, 209 for Bruckner's letter, dated Vienna, 26 February 1893, to Valerie von Pistor, a piano recitalist and teacher who had apparently asked him to compose a piano piece for her. Bruckner mentioned that, although he had been seriously ill, he had attended her concert against medical advice! Bruckner wrote to her again on 19 June to thank her for sending him her portrait and to inform her of the improvement in his health and recent successful performances of his works. See HSABB 2, 225; the originals of both letters are in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, Vienna.

339 See HSABB 2, 203 for this letter, dated Munich, 12 January 1893; the original is in St. Florian.

340 See earlier and footnote 328 for this letter from Bruckner, dated Vienna, 14 January 1893; the original is privately owned.

341 See HSABB 2, 206 for this letter, dated Munich, 6 February 1893; the original is in St. Florian. See also Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', p.8, for the texts of two

composer replied immediately, thanking both Levi and the orchestra and mentioning that he was now feeling much better.³⁴²

During his illness Bruckner felt isolated. This was no doubt because his doctor had instructed Kathi, his housekeeper, not to allow any visitors. When Bruckner complained to Levi on 14 January that 'even Schalk and Löwe have forsaken me' and to Göllerich on 10 March that '>'no one wants to come or, at most, very infrequently. The Wagner Society is everything to them! Even Oberleithner is there all the time...', he was perhaps unaware of his doctor's orders.³⁴³ But he received a very sympathetic letter from Ida Buhz in Berlin. She wished she could be with him to look after him and she looked forward to seeing him again soon and hearing some of his music.³⁴⁴

Although Bruckner was well enough to attend a performance of his male-voice piece *Tafellied* WAB 86 by the *Akademischer Gesangverein* on 11 March,³⁴⁵ he was not prepared to venture any further than Vienna so soon

telegrams, one (undated) from Mary Fiedler, and the other (dated 4 February) from Levi, both concerning the success of the concert. This concert was reviewed in the *Münchner Allgemeine Zeitung* (evening edition, 4 February 1893) and the *Münchner Neueste Nachrichten* (5 February 1893). Levi also conducted the Berlin Philharmonic in a performance of the same work on 16 October 1893. This concert was reviewed in the *Neue Preußische Zeitung* 488 (17 October 1893), 2, the *Vossische Zeitung* (evening edition, 17 October 1893), the *National-Zeitung* (morning edition, 18 October 1893) and the *Neue Berliner Musik-Zeitung* (19 October 1893). See Röder, op.cit., 433-36 for extracts from the reviews of both concerts. Levi conducted the Adagio from the Seventh in Munich on 27 May.

342 See *HSABB* 2, 207 and Walter Beck, op.cit., 76 for this letter, dated Vienna, 8 February 1893. There is a facsimile of the first page of the letter in Beck, op.cit., 75. The original is privately owned.

343 See *HSABB* 2, 210 for Bruckner's letter to Göllerich; the original is privately owned.

344 See *G-A IV/3*, 313 for extracts from both this letter, dated Berlin, 15 March 1893, and another letter written two months later - dated Berlin, 6 May 1893; the originals have been lost.

345 The performance was conducted by Raoul Mader, with whom Bruckner had some disagreement about the proper tempo of the piece. See *G-A I*, 237ff. and *G-A IV/3*, 314 for further details, including extracts from Theodor Helm's review in the *Deutsche Zeitung* and Puchstein's (?) in the *Deutsches Volksblatt*.

after his illness. He made this clear in a letter to Otto Kitzler who was probably still clinging on to the hope that Bruckner would be able to play the organ, even although he had already ruled out conducting his Fourth Symphony in Brno in an earlier letter.³⁴⁶

In his letter to Göllerich, Bruckner complained that, although he had heard a few months previously from friends that Josef Schalk was going to perform his F minor Mass, Schalk himself had only told him about it 'a few days ago.' Six years earlier, Schalk had also left it rather later to inform Bruckner of his intention of giving a performance (with Franz Zottmann) of his four-hand piano arrangement of the Fifth Symphony. On this occasion, there were some unpleasant scenes at the final rehearsals which Bruckner attended. Despite his self-doubts, Josef completed his revision of the orchestration of the Mass but sent his work to Franz for correction. Franz made several corrections at the beginning but less and less from that point onwards, and Josef was concerned that his brother may not have taken so much care with his supervision as he had hoped.³⁴⁷ The performance, under the auspices of the *Wagner-Verein*, took place in the large *Musikverein* hall on 23 March. Schalk conducted the Eduard Strauss Orchestra and the *Wagner-Verein* choir supplemented by members of the *Akademischer Gesangverein*. Bruckner was delighted with the performance, and it is reported that Brahms, who was present, visibly joined in the applause. Theodor Helm wrote that, 'as an apostolically inspired singer for the Lord', Bruckner had achieved 'a triumph no less brilliant than the one secured as

346 See *HSABB* 2, 210 for Bruckner's letter, dated Vienna, 14 March 1893; the original is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*, Linz. See also earlier and footnote 341. Kitzler conducted the Fourth in Brno on 21 April and informed Bruckner of the acclaimed performance in a telegram and letter to the composer, dated Brno, 22 April 1893. See *HSABB* 2, 219-20 and Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 15; the original of the telegram is in the ÖNB, and the original of the letter is in St. Florian.

347 See *HSABB* 2, 208 and 209 for two letters from Josef to Franz, dated Vienna, 25 February and 1 March 1893 respectively; the originals are in the ÖNB, F18 Schalk 158/14/8 and 158/14/10.

a bold, mighty symphonist in the fourth Philharmonic Concert on 18 December.³⁴⁸ In his review for the *Fremdenblatt*, Ludwig Speidel pointed out that the Mass text had acted as a restraining influence on the composer with the result that there was a well-judged balance between the old and the new. Of the many fine passages in the work the most successful were those depicting the Passion and the Last Judgment in the *Credo* where the composer's inventive powers were at their greatest.³⁴⁹

In reporting to his brother, Josef Schalk mentioned Hans Richter's complimentary reference to his conducting and Bruckner's seemingly unbearable behaviour at the final rehearsals.³⁵⁰ This was almost certainly due to two factors – Bruckner's ill-health and the reservations he must have had about Schalk's re-scoring of the work.

Bruckner spent Easter partly at St. Florian and partly at Steyr, returning to Vienna probably on 6 April.³⁵¹ He stayed at St. Florian until Easter Saturday, and heard his motet, *Vexilla regis*, for the first time on Good Friday. On Easter Sunday (2 April) his D minor Mass was performed at Steyr Parish Church. Franz Bayer, the choir director, took no less than 26 rehearsals in preparing the work and augmented the church choir with singers from the

348 See *G-A IV/3*, 315ff. and *LBSAB*, 176-77 for extracts from Helm's review, dated 24 March 1893, in the *Deutsche Zeitung*. Helm followed this up with another review on 28 March; see extract in *G-A IV/3*, 317.

349 See Paul Hawkshaw, 'Messe F-Moll Revisionsbericht', 252-53 for this review, dated 23 April. See also Louis, op.cit., 336-37 and Othmar Wessely, *BSL 1991*, 143-44 for Felix Wartenegg's equally complimentary review in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 89 (27 September 1893), 400. Other reviewers of the performance included Max Graf in the *Musikalische Rundschau* 8/7, 58-59, Luigi von Kunits in the *Österreichische Musik- und Theaterzeitung* 5 (1892/93) 13/14, 4, Camillo Horn in the *Deutsches Volksblatt* (25 September), and Richard Heuberger in the *Deutsche Kunst- und Musikzeitung* 20 (1 April 1893), 82. The texts of Graf's and Heuberger's reviews are printed in Hawkshaw, op. cit., 249-52.

350 See *HSABB 2*, 215 for Josef's letter, dated Vienna, 15 April 1893; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/14/12.

351 Klaus Petermayr and Franz Scheder suggest that 6 April 1893 is the date of a telegram that Bruckner sent from Steyr to Hans Richter, whose 50th birthday was on 4 April. See *ABIL*

local choral society.³⁵² Bruckner was well enough to play the organ and improvised on themes from the Mass during the service; he also played excerpts from his Eighth Symphony at an evening celebration in his honour, when Bayer was also presented with an ebony baton.³⁵³ There were reports of the performance in the *Linzer Morgenpost* (4 April), *Linzer Zeitung* (5 April) and in the *Alpen-Boten* and *Steyrer Zeitung* (6 April) and, when Bruckner wrote to Franz Bayer on 22 April recalling the excellent performance of the Mass, he mentioned his annoyance at the comparison made between his use of organ points and Brahms's use of a similar device in the *German Requiem* in a review in the Steyr paper; he insisted that 'counterpoint was nothing more than a means to an end.'³⁵⁴ Nevertheless, he was particularly pleased to be elected an honorary member of the Steyr *Musikverein*, as the honour had been granted him by a 'native town'.³⁵⁵

Mitteilungen (December 2011), 5-7.

352 When he wrote to the Steyr parish priest, Johann Aichinger, to thank him for his invitation to spend the Easter weekend at Steyr, Bruckner registered his astonishment that Bayer had been able to prepare a performance of the Mass. See *HSABB* 2, 212-13 for Aichinger's invitation to Bruckner, dated Steyr, 27 March 1893 and Bruckner's reply, dated St. Florian, 31 March 1893. The original of the former is in St. Florian, and of the latter in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, Vienna. Bruckner also invited Therese Peteler, a friend of his deceased sister Nani, to the performance of the Mass. See *HSABB* 2, 213 for this letter, dated Steyr, 31 March 1893. It was first printed in *ABB*, 270; the location of the original is unknown.

353 See *G-A* II/1, 318-19 and *G-A* IV/3, 320ff. for further information. Martin L. Fiala has also provided details of some of Bruckner's friends in Steyr, including Johanna Scholz, whose reminiscences of the performance of the Mass and other highlights of the composer's 1893 visit were recorded in a diary, in "Meine Primadonna". Neues zu Anton Bruckners Freundeskreis in Steyr'. *ABIL Mitteilungen* no.13 (May 2014), 10-13. Fiala also includes an extract from August Riener's article in the *Alpen-Boten*.

354 See *HSABB* 2, 217-18 for Bayer's letter to Bruckner, dated Steyr, 21 April 1894 and Bruckner's reply. The original of the latter is in St. Florian. A facsimile of the original of the latter, which is in the *ÖNB*, can be found in *GrBLS* between pages 58 and 59; see also H.F. Redlich, *Bruckner and Mahler*, 63.

355 Bruckner was officially notified of the honour on 25 April; see *HSABB* 2, 220-21. The original of the letter from the Steyr *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* is in St. Florian. For Bruckner's letter of thanks, dated Vienna 27 April 1893, see Erich W. Partsch, *IBG*

On Good Friday (31 March), two days before the Steyr performance of the D minor Mass, Gustav Mahler performed the same work (and the *Te Deum*) in the Hamburg city theatre. Wilhelm Zinne, who had visited Bruckner in 1892, wrote to the composer on 26 March to tell him of Mahler's decision to perform these two works in preference to the Eighth Symphony which he had also considered.³⁵⁶ Bruckner wrote to Mahler on 7 April to thank him once again for his heroic effort and to recommend the Fourth Symphony for future performance.³⁵⁷ He also made sure that Helm was kept up to date with news of recent performances of his works outside Vienna, including those in Steyr and Hamburg, as well as performances of the Fourth in Brno and Troppau.³⁵⁸

There was a recurrence of Bruckner's illness in mid-April, and he had to go on a strict milk diet once again. On 4 May he wrote to Viktor Christ, one of his pupils, asking him to convey his thanks to Christ's sister who had sent him some flowers and his father who had evidently sent him good wishes.³⁵⁹ He was certainly heartened by the news of successful performances of his

Mitteilungsblatt 35 (1990), 10, and *HSABB* 2, 222. The location of the original is unknown, but it was printed in the *Festschrift Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Steyr 1838-1963*, 68.

356 See *HSABB* 2, 211-12 for this letter. It was first printed in *ABB*, 392ff.; the location of the original is unknown. On 1 April Bruckner received a telegram from Theodor Hämmerle in Vienna who had heard that the performance of the Mass had been a striking success; see Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 8. See also *G-A* IV/3, 324ff. for a review of the Mass in the *Hamburgische Korrespondent* which is critical of the lack of structural unity.

357 See *HSABB* 2, 214 for Bruckner's letter to Mahler, in which he enclosed a card for Zinne. The original is in the Gustav Mahler-Arnold Rosé Collection, University of Western Ontario; there is also a copy in the *Internationale Gustav Mahler Gesellschaft*, Vienna.

358 See *HSABB* 2, 219 for Bruckner's letter to Theodor Helm, dated Vienna, 22 April 1893; the original is in the *Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek*. The Troppau performance of the Fourth, conducted by Friedrich Keitel who had visited Bruckner in Vienna and had been given some practical advice, was on 19 April. The following day the *Troppauer-Männergesang-Verein 1846* sent a congratulatory letter to Bruckner. See *HSABB* 2, 216; the original is in St. Florian.

359 In this visiting card Bruckner told Christ that he had been ill again >'for three weeks.' See *ABB*, 272 and *G-A* IV/3, 329-30; the location of the original is unknown.

works in Düsseldorf, Dresden and Leipzig in May and June.³⁶⁰ The fact that his brother Ignaz sent him some of his favourite meat from St. Florian in May probably indicates that he had recovered from his recent setback.³⁶¹ And he was certainly well enough to enjoy a visit on 27 May from Dr. Wilhelm Schmid, a professor of Philology at Tübingen University who had become a great admirer of his music after being introduced to it by Hugo Wolf.³⁶²

During this time Bruckner was working on his choral and orchestral piece, *Helgoland* WAB 71, commissioned by Eduard Kremser and the Vienna *Männergesangverein* for their 50th anniversary, and Franz Schalk was making slow progress in his revision of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony. When he wrote to Josef on 11 April, he complained of a nervous condition resulting from the pressure of work and indicated that he would not be able to devote

360 The *Te Deum* was performed at the *Lower Rhenish Music Festival* in Düsseldorf on 21 May, Psalm 150 made such an impression in Dresden that it was performed twice, and the Seventh was performed for the second time in Leipzig on 6 June - see Lieberwirth, *ABDS* 6, 68-75 for further details, including reviews in the *Leipziger Zeitung* (7 June) and *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten* (8 June). Writing to Emil Fink in Linz on 1 July, Bruckner recommended the Psalm for performance and mentioned the two recent Dresden performances. See *HSABB* 2, 225. The letter was first published in *ABB*, 274; the location of the original is unknown. A fortnight earlier, in a letter to Bernhard Deubler, in which he sent condolences on the death of Deubler's father, he mentioned some recent performances of his works and said that Richter intended to perform the *Te Deum* with 4000 (!) singers. See *HSABB* 2, 224 for this letter, dated Vienna, 14 June 1893; the original is in St. Florian. Deubler had written to him two days earlier. See *HSABB* 2, 223; the original is also in St. Florian. 350

361 See *HSABB* 2, 221 for Bruckner's letter to Ignaz, dated Vienna 25 May 1893, in which he enclosed seven florins to pay for the 'smoked meat' that he had been sent. He also complained about the '>terrible heat' in Vienna. This letter was first published in *ABB*, 273; the location of the original is unknown. Ignaz sent Bruckner name-day wishes on 11 June and thanked him for the payment. See *HSABB* 2, 222; the original is in St. Florian.

362 See Wilhelm Schmid, '>Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner', in *Neue Musik-Zeitung* 23 (1902), 168ff; see also *G-A* IV/3, 334-38.

363 See *LBSAB*, 178-79.; the original of Franz's letter is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 158/14/11.

any more time to the Finale of the symphony until the summer break.³⁶³ Josef encouraged him to press forward with the work:

... Bruckner talks about the score of the Vth. Not surprisingly he has become distrustful because no performance has taken place...³⁶⁴

During the summer months Josef took a five-week cold water cure for his asthma at a spa near Graz but did not visit his brother who spent his holiday again at the Goldschmidt villa in Grundlsee. Before leaving for Graz, Josef wrote to Franz to find out how his work on the Fifth was progressing. Franz replied from Grundlsee that he had started from scratch again with his revision of the Finale and would soon finish it.³⁶⁵ On 27 July Franz was able to inform Josef that he had just got to know the Finale thoroughly for the first time.³⁶⁶

Dates on the autograph of *Helgoland* and references to it in his letters give us some indication of Bruckner's progress on the work from April to August. The sketches were completed on 27 April, the choral parts on 24 May, the string parts on 18 June, the woodwind parts on 7 July, the brass parts on 23 July; the work was completed by 7 August while Bruckner was still in Vienna, but he continued to add '>finishing touches' until the end of the month.³⁶⁷ On 14 August he invited Eduard Kremser, the conductor of the

364 See *LBSAB*, 179 for Josef's letter, dated Vienna, 17 May 1893; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 158/14/15.

365 See Nowak, *ABSW V Revisionsbericht* for reference to these two letters, dated Vienna 6 July and Grundlsee 21 July respectively.

366 See *LBSAB*, 179 for an extract from Franz's letter written from Grundlsee; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/14/22.

367 The autograph full score (Mus. Hs. 19.485) and most of the sketches (Mus. Hs. 6038 and 29.304) are in the *ÖNB*. In a letter to Viktor Christ, dated Vienna, 18 July 1893, he

Männergesangverein, to visit him the following day or the day after to discuss the work. As Cyrill Hynais had taken on the task of copying the full score and preparing a piano reduction, he was also asked to come.³⁶⁸ A fortnight later Bruckner wrote from Steyr to Hynais, mentioned some corrections he had made in the work and asked him to prepare a second score for Kremser and ensure that the final corrections were also inserted in the score already prepared.³⁶⁹ Exactly a month later Bruckner asked Hynais for confirmation that the corrections had been inserted in the score. He was also keen to know how the work sounded and was concerned that the tempi should not be too quick. He was surprised that Kremser had not written to him and asked Hynais to ensure that the work was given sufficient rehearsal time and all necessary corrections were put at Kremser's disposal.³⁷⁰ Bruckner obviously heard that the work had been well rehearsed because he mentioned this specifically when he wrote to Kremser at the beginning of October, asking him the date of the final rehearsal which he would attend if his health permitted.³⁷¹ Bruckner was elected an honorary member of the *Männergesangverein* on 22 September,³⁷² and *Helgoland* was given its first

mentioned that a recurrence of his illness had prevented him from completing the work so far. See *HSABB* 2, 226; the original of the letter is privately owned.

368 See *HSABB* 2, 229 for this letter. It was first printed in *GrBB*, 64f.; the location of the original is unknown.

369 See *G-A* IV/3, 331 and 341 for extracts from this letter, dated Steyr, 28 August 1893; the location of the original is not known and it does not appear in *HSABB* 2. Amidst the prayer entries for the period 22-25 August 1893 in *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1890/91* are some voice-leading checks almost certainly for *Helgoland*; see *MVP* 1, 450 and 2, 370.

370 See *HSABB* 2, 233 for this letter, dated Steyr, 28 September 1893; the location of the original is unknown, but *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna possesses a copy. Bruckner also referred to another bout of illness which had incapacitated him for almost two weeks.

371 See *HSABB* 2, 234 for this letter, dated Steyr, 2 October 1893. It was first printed in *GrBB*, 66; the location of the original is unknown.

372 Bruckner wrote to the *Männergesangverein* on 14 October, thanking them for this

performance in the *Winter-Reitschule* of the *Hofburg* during the Society's 50th anniversary concert on 8 October. The words, by August Silberstein, narrate the story of the imminent invasion of the island of Heligoland by a Roman fleet and the miraculous intervention of a wild storm which throws the Roman ships on the rocks and saves the islanders. In common with many male voice choruses of this period, there are strong German nationalist overtones in the text. Bruckner's setting has the same kind of '>primitive' grandeur that is found in parts of the *Te Deum* and Psalm 150, and the harmonic gestures and orchestral colour of the Seventh and Eighth Symphonies are frequently recalled.³⁷³

Bruckner, who had been in Steyr from 25 August until 6 October,³⁷⁴ attended the performance of *Helgoland* and was warmly applauded. The newspaper reviews were mixed, the most frequent criticism being that, while the orchestral depiction of the tempestuous elements was successful, the

honour. See HSABB 2, 236 and ABA, 111 for the text and ABA, 43 for facsimile of the end of the letter; the original is in the archives of the *Wiener Männergesangverein*.

373 See G-A IV/3, 330-34 for a discussion of the music. For an evaluation of the '>appropriateness' of Bruckner's setting, viz. the combination of traditional and novel stylistic features, see Johannes-Leopold Mayer, '>Die Zweilichtigkeit des Erfolges Anton Bruckners "Helgoland"@ im historischen Umfeld des Wiener Männerchorwesens', in *BJ* 1980 (Linz, 1980), 21-26; for a discussion of the symphonic aspect of the piece, see Wolfgang Grandjean, '>Anton Bruckners " Helgoland"@ und das Symphonische', in *Die Musikforschung* 48 (1995), 349-68; and for comments on the specifically '>German qualities' of the work, see Alexander L. Ringer, '>Germanenzug bis Helgoland: Zu Bruckners *Deutschtum*', in Albrecht Riethmüller, ed., *Bruckner-Probleme. Beiheft zum Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 45 (Stuttgart, 1999), 25-34. *Helgoland* was dedicated to the *Wiener Männergesangverein* - '>Dem Wiener-Männer-Gesang-Verein zur Feier seines 50jährigen Bestandes gewidmet.' It was first published by Doblinger, Vienna (Hynais's piano arrangement and the choral parts in 1893, the full score [D.2334] and the orchestral parts in 1899). There is a modern edition in *ABSW XXII/2* (Vienna, 1987), 214-76, and this edition contains the dynamic and agogic marks added by Kremser with Bruckner's approval.

374 He did not feel well enough to spend any time in St. Florian during the summer months. On 7 August he wrote to Franz Bayer in Steyr and mentioned the '>up and down' state of his health, and he probably left Vienna for Steyr around 16 August (after his meeting with Kremser). See HSABB 2, 228 for Bruckner's letter; the original is in Steyr presbytery.

voices were over-stretched.³⁷⁵

At the beginning of September, while he was in Steyr, he received a letter from G[ertrud] Bollé-Hellmund, an admirer of his music, offering to provide him with an opera libretto of a religious nature which, she was sure, would be suitable.³⁷⁶ In his reply, Bruckner said that the libretto should be >'à la Lohengrin, Romantic, religious, mysterious and, above all, free from all impurities.' He also mentioned his ongoing work on the Ninth which, because of his present ill-health, would probably take him another two years to complete.³⁷⁷ A fortnight later Franz Bayer wrote, on Bruckner's behalf, to Bollé-Hellmund to inform her that, owing to ill-health, the composer would be unable to give serious consideration to an opera project at the present time.³⁷⁸

375 The concert, which was attended by Emperor Franz Josef, included choral works by Max Bruch, Herbeck, Kremser, Schubert, Schumann, and Wagner. Extracts from reviews in *Vaterland* (9 October), *Fremdenblatt* (9 October), by Hanslick in the *Neue Freie Presse* (11 October 1893) and Robert Hirschfeld in *Die Presse* (12 October 1893) can be found in Louis, op.cit., 337, G-A IV/3, 355ff., and Johannes-Leopold Mayer, loc.cit., 22.

376 See *HSABB 2*, 231 for this undated letter written from Berlin. It was first printed in *ABB*, 295-96; the location of the original is unknown. The libretto was >'Astra', based on Richard Voß's *Toteninsel*. By identifying herself as >'Schriftsteller' rather than >'Schriftstellerin', she concealed the fact that she was a woman.

377 See *HSABB 2*, 232 for this letter, dated Steyr, 5 September 1893; the location of the original is unknown, but *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna possesses a photocopy. Thinking that he was writing to a man, Bruckner began his letter >'Euer Hochwolgeboren!'. He also alluded to the uncertain state of his health when he wrote to Philipp Wolfrum at the end of August, regretting that he would not be able to travel to Heidelberg during the winter season for a performance of his Third Symphony. Wolfrum, director of the *Bach-Verein* in Heidelberg had written to Bruckner on 5 August to say that he was planning to perform one of his symphonies, possibly the Fifth. See *HSABB 2*, 227 for Wolfrum's letter; the original is in St. Florian. See also *HSABB 2*, 230, Walter Beck, op. cit., 76 (and Scheder's comments in *SchABCT*, 716) for Bruckner's reply, dated Steyr, 29 August 1893; the original is in the Beck Collection, Munich. It was the Third Symphony that was performed in Heidelberg on 12 December; a review of this concert in the *Heidelberger Zeitung* (14 December 1893) can be found in Röder, op.cit., 436-37.

378 See *HSABB 2*, 232 for an extract from this letter, dated Steyr, 21 September 1893. It was first printed in *GrBLS*, 226-27; the location of the original is unknown. Bruckner had no idea at this juncture that Bollé-Hellmund was none other than the woman he had met on several occasions in Vienna about six years before. See Bollé-Hellmund's account in G-A IV/3, 346-52.

In the meantime, Franz Schalk was continuing work on his version of the Fifth. Leibnitz comments that the whole episode of the Graz performance of this symphony, which can be reconstructed from the Schalk correspondence, is quite astonishing, almost unbelievable:

... In brief Josef and Franz Schalk deceived Bruckner quite deliberately, ostensibly with the best of intentions and with a good conscience. They led him to believe that his own version was to be performed in Graz and did not inform him of the revisions being made. On the other hand, they wanted him to be present at the performance. The primary intention was one which had already been in evidence in Josef's performance of the F minor Mass. Bruckner was to be presented with a *>fait accompli* and was to be persuaded through hearing it and through success with the public that the improvements made sense. The Bruckner literature had remained unaware of the brothers' behaviour hitherto, because Lili Schalk suppressed the crucial passages of the correspondence in her book and, furthermore, attempted by means of misinformation to eliminate every appearance of 'suspicion' of her dead husband...³⁷⁹

The unexpurgated letters tell a different story, however. On 23 November, Franz wrote to Bruckner requesting the parts of the Fifth so that he could begin rehearsals of the work.³⁸⁰ In his *Revisionsbericht* of the symphony, Nowak has this comment to make:

... It cannot be ascertained which parts are being referred to here. Schalk could only make use of parts which tallied with his revision of the Fifth.³⁸¹

The explanation, however, is that after Bruckner had given the parts to

379 *LBSAB*, 179-80.

380 See *HSABB* 2, 238 for the text of this letter; the original is in St. Florian.

381 Nowak, *op.cit.*, 70.

Josef and asked him to send them on to Franz, Josef held on to the parts and asked Franz to write to Bruckner confirming receipt so that the composer would be under the impression that they had arrived safely in Graz.³⁸² The problem now was to have the parts copied from the revised score. The brothers hoped that Oberleithner would be able to help. In an undated letter from Franz to Josef, 13 February 1894 is given as the projected date of the performance of the symphony.³⁸³

The decline in his health forced Bruckner to give serious consideration to his last will and testament. He completed it on 10 November and his signature was witnessed by Ferdinand Löwe, Cyrill Hynais and Dr. Theodor Reisch; the latter was appointed as executor. A month earlier his brother Ignaz wrote to him from St. Florian concerning the wish he had expressed to be buried in the abbey; the abbot would be prepared to grant this wish if he mentioned it specifically in his will.³⁸⁴ And so Bruckner made his wishes clear, namely that he should be buried underneath the great organ and financial provision should be made for four Masses to be said during the year, one on his birthday, one on his name-day, one on the anniversary of the day of his death, and one for his parents, brothers and sisters. His estate was to be divided equally between his brother Ignaz and his sister Rosalie. They were to have equal shares in the proceeds from the sale of his music which, he hoped, would be much greater after his death than during his lifetime when they had yielded very little. The original manuscripts of his works – ‘the symphonies of which there are eight so far, and the Ninth will soon be completed, God willing, the three great Masses, the Quintet, the Te

382 See *LBSAB*, 180-81 for Josef's letter to Franz, dated Vienna, 4 December 1893; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/14/25.

383 See *FSBB*, 61 and *LBSAB*, 181 for this undated letter. Nowak (*Revisionsbericht*, 70) suggests autumn 1893 as the date. The original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/14/3.

384 See *HSABB2*, 234-35 for Ignaz's letter, dated St. Florian, 9 October 1893; the original is in St. Florian.

Deum, Psalm 150 and the choral work Helgoland' - were to be given to the Imperial Court Library. Permission was to be given to the publishers Jos. Eberle to borrow these manuscripts for a specified time for printing purposes. 400 florins was to be given to his housekeeper, Katharina Kachelmayr, in recognition of her faithful service over many years. In the event of her still being his housekeeper at the time of his death, this legacy was to be increased by from 400 to 700 florins.³⁸⁵

There were successful performances of Bruckner's Third Symphony in Berlin on 16 October and the Eighth Symphony in Olmütz on 22 October.³⁸⁶ Bruckner then received the good news that Ochs and Weingartner were planning performances of some of his works in Berlin early in 1894. Siegfried Ochs invited him to come. In his reply Bruckner suggested to Ochs that the *Te Deum* and Seventh Symphony be performed. As far as his own attendance was concerned, he would have to follow his doctor's advice - he had only recently recovered from another bout of illness.³⁸⁷ As a result of an improvement in his health during December his doctor gave him the 'all clear' for a visit to Berlin in January but suggested that he spend Christmas in Vienna rather than over-exerting himself by travelling to St. Florian. Conveniently, his young friend, Josef Kluger, arranged for him to spend Christmas at Klosterneuburg,³⁸⁸ but he was certainly back in Vienna to attend

385 See *ABB*, 276ff., *GrBB*, 148-51 and *G-A IV/3*, 359ff. for the complete text of the will; there is a facsimile of the original, which can be found in the Vienna *Stadt- und Landesbibliothek*, in Rolf Keller, 'Die letztwilligen Verfügungen Anton Bruckners', in *BJ* 1982/83 (Linz, 1984), 111-12.

386 See Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 8-9, for details of telegrams sent to Bruckner by Levi on 12 and 15 October and Ochs on 18 October or, perhaps, 18 November 1893 (concerning rehearsals and performance of the Third and choir rehearsals for the *Te Deum* in January), and by the Olmütz Musikverein on 22 October (concerning the extremely well received performance of the Eighth conducted by Vladimir Labler).

387 See *HSABB* 2, 237 for Bruckner's letter to Ochs, dated Vienna, 8 November 1893; the original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library.

388 On 30 December, Bruckner wrote from Vienna to Deubler in St. Florian to say that he had spent Christmas at Klosterneuburg and that he was about to set off for Berlin to attend

a performance of his Quintet on 28 December.

There was no doubt that the concerts in Berlin were going ahead. Unfortunately, Weingartner, who was to perform the Seventh on 6 January, had taken ill, but Karl Muck stepped into the breach. In the second of two letters he sent to Bruckner during the Christmas period, he asked the composer to supply him with information about the composition and performance of the Seventh, together with a thematic analysis of the work.³⁸⁹

Despite the frequent recurrences of ill-health during 1893, which made it difficult or well-nigh impossible for Bruckner to devote sustained periods of attention to his Ninth, he forged ahead with work on the symphony. During his ten-year involvement with the Ninth, Bruckner discarded and replaced a considerable amount of preliminary work on all movements of the symphony. This is particularly true of the Trio section of the Scherzo. Whereas there is only one version of the latter extant, there are three quite different versions of the Trio, the first and second of which have parts for solo viola. During 1893 and 1894 Bruckner worked on the Adagio, completed the scores of the first movement and the Scherzo, and produced the second (in F sharp major) and

performances of his Seventh Symphony, *Te Deum* and Quintet. See *HSABB* 2, 243 for this letter; the original is in St. Florian. He also informed his sister Rosalie of the improvement in his health, imminent departure for Berlin, and the forthcoming performances of some of his works in Vienna and elsewhere, when he wrote to her from Vienna on 23 December. See *HSABB* 2, 239. This letter was first printed in *ABB*, 279; the location of the original is unknown. There is also an undated letter to Franz Bayer in Steyr, obviously written at this time, in which Bruckner mentions the forthcoming Berlin performances and a performance of his Second Symphony in Vienna on 14 January [1894]. See *HSABB* 2, 243; the original is in the *Heimathaus*, Steyr. See also *HSABB* 2, 242 for Bruckner's letter to Hans Richter, dated Vienna 28 December 1893, conveying New Year greetings and including information about his Berlin visit; the original is in the University library, Basle. There is also a letter to Siegfried Ochs, dated Vienna, 28 December 1893, in which he indicates that his Berlin visit hinged on his doctor's advice which would not be given until the last minute. See *HSABB* 2, 241-42; the original is not extant but there is a copy in the *ÖNB*.

389 See *HSABB* 2, 240-41 for these two letters, dated Berlin, 23 and 26 December respectively; the originals are in St. Florian. Muck also reminded Bruckner that he had conducted the symphony three times before, once in Graz in March 1886 and twice in Prague in January 1888 and December 1889. On 28 December, Siegfried Ochs sent a telegram to Bruckner to inform him that there would be a repeat performance of the *Te Deum* on 11th January; see Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 10.

third versions of the Trio.³⁹⁰

390 The majority of the source material can be found in the *ÖNB*, but important sketches can also be located in other libraries, including the *Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek* and the *Biblioteka Jagiellonska* in Cracow. The key dates are: 21 September 1887 (completion of first draft score of the first movement), 4 January 1889 (sketch of first Scherzo), February 1891 (references to work on the Ninth in letters to Levi and Helm), end April 1891 (date at beginning of the score of the first movement; Mus. Hs. 19.481 in *ÖNB*), 14 October 1892 (date at end of the score of the first movement), 2 January 1893 (date in sketch of the Adagio), 27 February 1893 (date at the end of the score of the Scherzo, including Trio no. 2), 28 February 1893 (date on a sketch of the Adagio), 23 December 1893 (completion of score of the first movement), 15 February 1894 (date at the end of the Scherzo, including the third, definitive version of the Trio), March - September 1894 (various dates in sketches of the Adagio), 31 October 1894 (first date at end of score of the Adagio), 30 November 1894 (last date at end of score of the Adagio). See later for details of Bruckner's work on the Finale of the symphony from May until his death in October 1896. For further details of the first three movements of the Ninth in particular, see: Ferdinand Löwe, ed., *Anton Bruckner: IX Symphonie D moll* (Vienna: Doblinger, 1903) [the first edition of the symphony, including full score: D.2895, four-hand piano arrangement by Löwe and Schalk: D.2910, and Löwe's two-hand piano arrangement: D.3115]; Karl Grunsky, *Anton Bruckner. 9. Symphonie in d-Moll. Erläutert* (Leipzig: Seeman, 1903); Max Auer, '>Anton Bruckners IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung' in *Zeitschrift für Musik* 99 (1932), 861-64; Alfred Orel, *Anton Bruckner: IX Symphonie D moll (Originalfassung)*, vol. IX of *Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Vienna, 1934); idem, '>Zur Entstehung von Bruckners 9. Symphonie', in *Bruckner-Blätter* 6/1-2, 2-7; Max Auer, '>Die IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung', in *Bruckner-Blätter* 6/3 (1934), 40ff.; Louis Biancolli, '>Bruckner's Ninth Symphony', in *Chord and Discord* 2/4 (1946), 36-40; Robert Simpson, '>The Ninth Symphony of Anton Bruckner', in *Chord and Discord* 2/6 (1950), 115ff.; Leopold Nowak, ed., *IX. Symphonie in D moll. Originalfassung. 2. Revidierte Ausgabe, ABSW IX* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1951); Charles L. Eble, '>The Ninth Symphony of Bruckner' in *Chord and Discord* 2/7 (1954), 19-20.; Harold Truscott, '>The Ninth@ in Perspective', in *The Monthly Musical Record* 88 (1958), 223-28; Leopold Nowak, '>Symphonie Nr. 9 in d-Moll', in *Musikblätter der Wiener Philharmoniker* 15 (1960/61), 133-47; Hans F. Redlich, foreword to Eulenburg score of Symphony no. 9 (E.E. 6437), ed. Hans-Hubert Schönzeler (Autumn 1963); Michael Adensamer, '>Bruckners Einfluss auf die Moderne (mit Beispielen aus dem Adagio der 9. Symphonie)', in *BJ* 1980 (Linz, 1980), 27-31; Constantin Floros, '>Zur Deutung der Symphonik Bruckners. Das Adagio der Neunten Symphonie', in *BJ* 1982 (Linz, 1982), 89-96; Robert Schollum, '>Umkreisungen. Anmerkungen zum Beginn des Adagio der Neunten Symphonie Bruckners', in *BJ* 1982 (Linz, 1982), 97-102; Mariana Sontag, *The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner: A study of the sketches and drafts for the first movement of the IX. Symphony* (doctoral thesis, University of Chicago, Illinois, 1987); Hans-Hubert Schönzeler, *Zu Bruckners IX. Symphonie: die Krakauer Skizzen* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1987); Peter Gülke, '>Bruckner von seiner Neunten Sinfonie aus gesehen', in *Brahms-Bruckner. Zwei Studien* (Bärenreiter: Kassel-Basel, 1989); Franz Scheder, '>Zur Datierung zweier Autographen Anton Bruckners: 1. Skizzenblätter zur Neunten Symphonie 2. Bruckners Brief vom 31. Oktober 1894' in *BJ* 1987/88 (Linz, 1990), 63ff.; Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs, '>Zahlenphänomene in Bruckners Symphonik. Neues zu den Strukturen der Fünften und Neunten Symphonie' in *BJ* 1989/90 (Linz, 1992), 35-75; Mariana Sontag, '>A New Perspective on Anton Bruckner's Composition of the Ninth Symphony', in *BJ* 1989/90 (Linz, 1992), 77-114; John A. Phillips, '>Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren', in *BSL* 1992 (Linz, 1995), 153-78; Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs, '>Der Mikofilm der Krakauer

Before leaving for Berlin Bruckner sent visiting cards to Karl Aigner and Göllerich and his wife.³⁹¹ Josef Schalk informed Franz that there was a slight improvement in Bruckner's medical condition and he was being tended by a nurse who had been recommended by Professor Schrötter; Ignaz Bruckner, >a 'poor copy of the original', had also spent some time with his brother.³⁹²

On the evening of 3 January, Bruckner, in the company of Prince Karadjordjevic and Hugo Wolf travelled overnight from Vienna to Berlin. The two composers intended to be present at performances of their works, namely Bruckner's Seventh Symphony, *Te Deum* and String Quintet and Wolf's *Elfenlied* (for solo soprano, women's chorus and orchestra), the choral version of Mörike's *Der Feuerreiter*, an elaboration of the song for voice and piano, composed originally in 1888, and the orchestral versions of two other solo songs – Margit's song from the music to Ibsen's *Fest auf Solhaug*, and Goethe's *Anakreons Grab*.

Bruckner attended the final rehearsal of his symphony on the morning of Saturday 6 January. In the evening concert it shared the programme with works by Mendelssohn (*Fair Melusine* overture), Haydn and Mozart. There

Bruckner-Skizzen in der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek', in *BJ 1994/95/96* (Linz, 1997), 191ff.; idem, '>Die Problematik von Fassung und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner, erläutert anhand der drei Trios zum Scherzo der Neunten Symphonie', in *BSL 1996* (Linz, 1998), 65-84; idem, ed., *IX. Symphonie D-Moll Scherzo und Trio. Älteres Trio mit Viola Solo, ABSW [zu Band IX/2]* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftliches Verlag, 1998); idem, *IX Symphonie D-Moll (1. Satz - Scherzo & Trio - Adagio). Kritische Neuausgabe unter Berücksichtigung der Arbeiten von Alfred Orel und Leopold Nowak. (ABSW zu Band IX)* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2000) and *Kritischer Bericht* (Vienna, 2001); B. G. Cohrs, Heinz-Klaus Metzger und Rainer Riehn, eds., *Bruckners Neunte im Fegfeuer der Rezeption, Musik, Musik-Konzepte 120 / 121 / 122* (Munich, 2003), Dermot Gault, *The New Bruckner. Compositional Development and the Dynamics of Revision [Gault NB]* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 188-91 and 204ff; William Carragan, *Anton Bruckner Eleven Symphonies; A Guide to the Versions* (Bruckner Society of America, 2020) [Carragan RB], 175-86.

391 In his card to Aigner, dated 1 January 1894, he asked him to send him a bill (for copying?). See Beck, op.cit., 770; the original is in the Beck Collection in Munich. He sent New Year's greetings to Göllerich and his wife and mentioned his impending trip to Berlin. See *ABB*, 254 for this undated card; there is a facsimile in Schneider Musikantiquariat, Catalogue 236 (Tutzing, 1979), 10; the location of the original is unknown.

392 See *LBSAB*, 181 for an extract from this letter, dated Vienna, 2 January 1894; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/16.

were reviews in several papers, including the Berlin *Börsen-Courier*, the *Vossische Zeitung*, the *Neue Preußische Zeitung* and the *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung*. The reviewer for the *Börsen-Courier* remarked that the main weakness of the symphony was the lack of sufficient organic connection between the different themes and motives, but this was more than compensated for by 'the ravishingly beautiful themes, the burning, holy fervour which glows through all the movements and the marvellous instrumentation.' The reviewer went on to say that the public reception of the work was 'very friendly on the whole, albeit by no means commensurate with the significance of the work - which, of course, is normally the case.'³⁹³

On 7 January both Bruckner and Wolf attended the final rehearsal of their choral works by the Philharmonic Choir, and, on the evening of the same day, Bruckner is reported to have celebrated his 'engagement' to Ida Buhz with her family.³⁹⁴ Ida had accompanied Bruckner to the performance of the Seventh the previous evening and she was also with him when his *Te Deum* was performed on 8 January. Two of Wolf's pieces - *Elfenlied* and *Der Feuerreiter* - were particularly well received, as was Bruckner's piece which was performed in the second half of the concert.³⁹⁵ Ochs later recalled

393 See G-A IV/3, 367ff. for this review, dated 7 January 1894 and signed 'O. E.', in the *Börsen-Courier*. See also HSABB2, 244 for a note Karl Muck sent to Bruckner, regretting that he had not been able to meet the composer and enclosing tickets for the concert on the 6th. The original is in St. Florian.

394 As Bruckner attended a performance of Wagner's *Fliegende Holländer* on the evening of the 7th, however, it is more likely that this 'celebration' took place earlier in the day. Indeed Ochs, in his *Geschehenes, Gesehenes* (Leipzig, 1922), 318f. recalls that it was in the afternoon and reports that his wife went to the *Kaiserhof* hotel, where Bruckner was staying, to try to have this 'engagement' cancelled! The names of Siegfried Ochs, Karl Muck, Richard Sternfeld and Ida Buhz all appear in *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1893/94* which was formerly owned by Prof. Franz Mairecker, leader of the Vienna Philharmonic but is no longer extant. Maier surmises that it contains entries for the years 1893-94; she also prints Julius Biströn's 'Das Notizbuch Anton Bruckners. Ein musikhistorischer Fund', an article that first appeared in the *Neues Wiener Journal* (12 April 1925) and is the only source providing some information of the contents of the diary. See MVP 1, 465-71.

395 See G-A IV/3, 370-71 for the review of the concert in the *Börsen-Courier* (9 January

Bruckner's delighted reaction to the rehearsal and performance of the *Te Deum*. Evidently he gave a 20-mark coin to Ochs after the rehearsal and, when the no doubt somewhat embarrassed conductor refused to take it, suggested that he pass it on to the timpanist for his outstanding contribution, in particular his drum roll on the note B near the beginning of the work, an addition made by Ochs and approved by the composer.³⁹⁶ Bruckner also sent a telegram to his friend Theodor Helm in Vienna to reassure him of the successful performances of his two works.³⁹⁷

Hugo Wolf provided detailed information about the visit to Berlin in three letters to Melanie Köchert. In the first he referred to the performance of Bruckner's Seventh conducted by Muck:

... The performance of Bruckner's Symphony no. 7 was a masterly achievement by Muck. The first two movements did not make much of an impression. It wasn't until after the Scherzo and the Finale that Bruckner was applauded. He also appeared on the podium at the end. Bruckner is very happy with his success.

1894). See also Ernst Decsey, *Hugo Wolf* (Berlin, 1921), 99 for a reference to Wilhelm Tappert's review of the concert in the *Kleines Journal*. Reports of the Berlin performances of the Seventh Symphony and *Te Deum* also appeared in French papers - *Le Monde artiste* (21 January 1894), *Ménestrel* (21 January 1894) and *Guide musical* (21 January 1894); see Josef Burg, '>Der Komponist Anton Bruckner im Spiegelbild der französischen Musikpresse seiner Zeit', in *BJ 1987/88* (Linz, 1990), 105 for German translations of extracts from these reports.

396 See Ochs, op.cit., 321-22., G-A IV/3, 371-72, and Günter Brosche, '>Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf', in *Bruckner-Studien*, ed. O. Wessely (Vienna, 1975), 183. Bruckner made further reference to this when he wrote to Ochs on 14 April. See *HSABB 2*, 257. The letter was first printed in *ABB*, 282; the original is not extant. On 15 April Ochs wrote to Bruckner in support of a request by Mrs. Sommerfeld for a photograph of the composer and a few bars of music [from the *Te Deum*] for inclusion in the journal *Über Land und Meer*. See *HSABB 2*, 257 for the text of this letter; the original is in St. Florian. On 18 April Bruckner wrote to Annie Sommerfeld, enclosing the >items she had requested; the original of this letter is in the *ÖNB*.

397 The original of this telegram, dated Berlin, 9 January 1894, is in the *ÖNB*. Later in January (on Tuesday 23) Theodor Helm and his son visited Bruckner in his apartment. He talked to them about the Adagio of his Seventh Symphony and played an extract from the Adagio of his Ninth. See Ernst Decsey, *Bruckner. Versuch eines Lebens* (Stuttgart, 1922), 223.

In the next letter Wolf compared the reception given to the performance of his vocal works with the more enthusiastic reception accorded to Bruckner's works. Although he by no means begrudged Bruckner his success, he was not particularly pleased to be playing 'second violin' to Bruckner's 'first violin' and he recalled the words from the Old Testament that Saul slew 1,000 but David slew 10,000. Wolf stayed on in Germany and visited Mannheim, Stuttgart and Tübingen before returning to Vienna. In his third letter he refers to another of Bruckner's rash proposals of marriage.³⁹⁸

Wolf is alluding here to Bruckner's 'engagement' to Ida Buhz, of course. Despite this, another lady, Margarethe Boucher, attracted his attention while he stayed in Berlin. On his return to Vienna, he sent her his photograph and she reciprocated by sending Bruckner her photograph on 30 January.³⁹⁹ Although there was obviously no future in his 'relationship' with Ida Buhz, it is evident that she was genuinely fond of him. Her letter to him on 13 February, in which she recalled the Berlin performances of his works and regretted not being able to accompany him to the station when he left Berlin to return to Vienna, makes this clear.⁴⁰⁰ But the fact that she was a Protestant and not prepared to convert to Catholicism was an insurmountable stumbling-block for Bruckner, and so marriage was out of the question.⁴⁰¹

398 These three letters, dated 8, 9 and 17 January respectively, can be found in Grasberger, ed., *Hugo Wolf. Briefe an Melanie Köchert* (Tutzing, 1964), 77ff.

399 See *G-A IV/3*, 373-74 for references to this brief correspondence, including another letter from Margarethe Boucher, dated 20 February 1894, in which she mentioned that Bruckner had not acknowledged receipt of her photograph; the location of the originals of these letters is unknown.

400 See *HSABB 2*, 248 for this letter; the original is in St. Florian.

401 Her last recorded letter to Bruckner is dated Berlin, 21 July 1894. See *HSABB 2*, 263 for this letter; the original is in St. Florian. A facsimile of part of this letter can be found in Maier, '...Ida Buhz und Anton Bruckner', *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 62 (June 2004), 17. In September 1894 Anita Muck wrote to her husband to inform him that she had tried unsuccessfully to contact Ida. See extract from this letter, dated Wiesbaden, 20 September 1894, in *G-A IV/3*, 415; the original is not extant.

There was a performance of Bruckner's String Quintet on 10 January, provided by the Waldemar Meyer Quartet with Adalbert Gülzow taking the 2nd viola part, at a concert arranged by the Berlin *Wagner-Verein*. Bruckner returned to Vienna shortly afterwards and may not have been present at the second performance of his *Te Deum* on 11 January. Ochs, who was unwell, was able neither to conduct nor to accompany Bruckner to the station for his return journey.⁴⁰² Bruckner, whose own delicate health had withstood a week of exciting events, did not feel well enough, however, to accept an invitation to attend a performance of his *Te Deum* in Mainz on 17 January.⁴⁰³

Gertrud Bollé-Hellmund contacted Franz Bayer in Steyr, enclosed some reviews, and informed him of the favourable critical and public reaction to Bruckner's works in Berlin. Unable to meet Bruckner after the performance of the *Te Deum*, she tried to contact him at his hotel, but her letter arrived there after Bruckner had left and was forwarded to him in Vienna. Her main concern was that he should now know her by her real name and not her 'male pseudonym'.⁴⁰⁴

A performance of Bruckner's Second Symphony, conducted by Hans Richter, had been scheduled for the Philharmonic concert on 14 January but the composer asked for it to be postponed until later in the year.⁴⁰⁵ The

402 In a letter written to Ochs on his return to Vienna, Bruckner thanked the conductor and his excellent choir for the performance of the *Te Deum*. See *HSABB* 2, 246 for this letter, dated Vienna, 16 January 1894; this letter is owned privately. In his reply, Ochs mentioned that he had been ill since the day of the composer's departure; he hoped, however, to rehearse the F minor Mass for a possible performance the following season. See *HSABB* 2, 249-50 for this letter, dated Berlin, 23 February and Frankfurt, 27 February 1894; the original is in St. Florian.

403 Bruckner received this invitation from Dr. Ludwig Strecker, chairman of the *Mainzer Liedertafel*. See *HSABB* 2, 244 for this letter, dated Mainz, 13 January 1894; the original is in St. Florian. The Mainz performance was conducted by Fritz Volbach.

404 See *HSABB* 2, 245 for Bollé's letter to Bayer, dated Berlin, 15 January 1894. It was first printed in *G-A* IV/3, 378-81; the location of the original is unknown. See *HSABB* 2, 246 for Bollé-Hellmund's letter to Bruckner, dated Berlin, 16 January 1894. It was first printed in *ABB*, 296-97; the location of the original is unknown.

405 On 3 January 1894 and before setting off on his trip to Berlin, Bruckner contacted Hans Richter to request a postponement and to ask the conductor to take a slower tempo in the

Berlin performances in January, the first French performance of a Bruckner symphony in Paris on 18 March and the performance of his String Quintet in Copenhagen on 24 March must have encouraged the composer and convinced him that his reputation as a composer was no longer confined to German-speaking countries.⁴⁰⁶ Charles Lamoureux, who conducted the Third Symphony in Paris, had been introduced to Bruckner's music by his pupil, Ludwig Oblat, who reported the success of the performance in the Viennese journal, *Musikalische Rundschau*. In a letter to Oblat, Bruckner asked him to thank Lamoureux and suggested other works for the conductor's consideration, giving details of those works which had been printed.⁴⁰⁷

Bruckner's doctor gave him permission to spend Holy Week and Easter at St. Florian; this was to be his last visit to the abbey. He played the organ at some services, including High Mass on Easter Sunday (25 March), improvising on original themes and the fugal theme from Psalm 150. Johann Hayböck, a teacher in St. Florian, recalled a meeting with Bruckner, his brother Ignaz, and Karl Aigner on Maundy Thursday when Bruckner once again mentioned his desire to be buried underneath the organ in the abbey

first movement and 'not to ignore the cut in the Finale.' See Andreas Lindner and Klaus Petermayr, 'Vier unbekannte Briefe Bruckners an Hans Richter', in *BJ 2006-2010* (Linz, 2011), 207-21, incl. facsimile of the letter on pp. 218-21. When Bruckner wrote to Siegfried Ochs again on 10 March, he recalled the Berlin performance of the *Te Deum* with gratitude and mentioned the postponement of the performance of the Second Symphony as well as a recent visit from Hermann Levi. See *HSABB 2*, 251. This letter was first printed in *ABB*, 280-81; the original is not extant.

406 See Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 10 for details of a telegram sent by the players after the Copenhagen performance. Their leader was Axel Gade, son of the composer Niels Gade and leader of the Royal Copenhagen Orchestra.

407 See *HSABB 2*, 256 for Bruckner's letter to Oblat, dated Vienna, 13 April 1894. The letter was first printed in *ABB*, 281; the original is not extant. See also Josef Burg, *BJ 1987/88*, 101-02. for further information including a facsimile of two pages of the programme, and 103-04 for extracts from reviews of the symphony in *Art Musical* (22 March), *Ménestrel* (25 March) and *Monde artiste illustré* (25 March).

or, if permission was not forthcoming, in Steyr or Vienna.⁴⁰⁸ On 14 April Bruckner supplied a testimonial for Aigner, testifying to his abilities as a violinist, organist, pianist and music teacher.⁴⁰⁹

The Schalk correspondence during the first four months of the year is largely taken up with the preparation for and the eventual performance of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony in Graz. Josef succeeded in obtaining Oberleithner's financial help for the copying of the parts of the symphony. However, Franz was encountering various difficulties in rehearsing the symphony. The first movement was proving particularly intractable. Moreover, rehearsals for the forthcoming performance of *Tristan* were consuming a lot of his time and energy.⁴¹⁰ On 10 February Franz reported that the performance of the symphony would have to be delayed. He himself was exhausted with the effort put into *Tristan* and was seeing the doctor regularly on account of his nervous condition which was not improving. He asked how Bruckner was and if it was possible that he would come to Graz. He also asked if Josef had taken care of the payment to the copyist and requested one or two printed articles about Bruckner which he could arrange to have reproduced in Graz if necessary.⁴¹¹ Josef was incensed about the postponement of the concert and asked his brother if he had considered what

408 See G-A II/1, 321ff. and G-A IV/3, 384. The two themes which Bruckner used for improvisation at St. Florian on 25 March are notated in *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Studienjahr 1893/94*, with the words 'Schluss des h. Hochamtes, mit freiem Satze abgewechselt. Am Anfang des Hochamtes aus meinem 150. Psalm.' See *MVP* 1, 469.

409 This is the date provided by Elisabeth Maier in 'Bruckneriana in Vöcklabruck', *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 42 (Tutzing, 1993), 297, footnote 27. The testimonial is printed in G-A II/1, 262-63 where it is given the date 4 April; the original is owned by the Hueber family in Vöcklabruck.

410 This is the gist of an undated letter, quoted in *FSBB*, 62 and *LBSAB*, 181-82; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/5.

411 See *HSABB* 2, 247 for an extract from this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/17. See also *HSABB* 2, 250 for an undated letter from Franz to Josef (from its content written either late February or early March); the original is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 158/15/1.

effect an unsuccessful performance would have on Bruckner.⁴¹² Until the middle of March there were still doubts about the performance of the work. Josef was annoyed that Oberleithner had wasted his money paying for the copying of parts which might not now be needed, and it looked as if Bruckner's original score would be used for the first edition (Bruckner was asking for it as Eberle wanted to start printing).⁴¹³

Although there were some setbacks, the Fifth went through several sectional and full rehearsals and was performed in Graz on 9 April. An announcement in the morning edition of the *Grazer Tagblatt* of 8 April provided the erroneous information that Bruckner would be coming to Graz to attend the performance.⁴¹⁴ The symphony came second in the programme, after Beethoven's overture *The Consecration of the House*.⁴¹⁵ Bruckner was unaware of the several changes Franz had made. All that he knew was that twelve extra wind instruments were to be added to the orchestra for the repeat of the chorale at the end of the Finale. Franz had asked for his permission to do this, and Bruckner had readily granted it. In its revised version, the Finale was shortened by 122 bars. In addition to two smaller cuts (bars 13-14, 622-25), the development was reduced by 30 bars (bars 324-353) and the reprise of the main and subsidiary themes was deleted (bars 374-459). As a result, the clearly recognizable sonata form in Bruckner's original version loses its symmetry. The development does not have the breathing-space of the extended second theme-group but proceeds directly to the final climactic process which culminates in the triumphant

412 See *HSABB* 2, 248-49 for this letter, dated Vienna, 18 February 1894; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/18.

413 See *HSABB* 2, 252 for Josef's letter to Franz, dated Vienna, 20 March 1894; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/19.

414 See Nowak, Symphony no. 5 *Revisionsbericht*, 71.

415 The second half of the concert consisted of Liszt's Piano Concerto in E flat and the Prelude to Wagner's *Die Meistersinger*. There is a copy of the concert programme in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*, Linz. See also *LBSAB*, 184.

return of the wind chorale. This interference in the structure is even more remarkable, when one considers that Bruckner suggested his own substantial abridgement for practical use, albeit at a different point in the movement, viz. bars 270-373 (letters L-Q), resulting in the omission of a large part of the fugal development.⁴¹⁶

In the event the performance was a great success and Franz informed Bruckner of this in a letter written on 10 April.⁴¹⁷ The critical reaction was also favourable. Writing in the *Grazer Volksblatt*, Carl Seydler pointed to the obvious stylistic similarities between Wagner and Bruckner but made a distinction between Wagner the >'dramatist' and Bruckner the >'lyricist'.⁴¹⁸ Franz Petrich, reviewing the concert for the *Grazer Tagespost*, had nothing but praise for the conductor and the orchestra and drew particular attention to the work's >energetic rhythms, impressive abundance of ideas... outstanding melodic beauties, incomparable polyphony, bold harmony, surprising modulations, excellent organ points, overpowering climaxes, immense contrapuntal technique, humour, deep feeling and a dazzling display of instrumental colours.⁴¹⁹ Julius Schuch, the *Grazer Tagblatt* reviewer, recalled Josef Schalk's performance of the Fourth in Graz. In the Fifth, as in the Fourth, Bruckner displayed his deep admiration for Wagner - but without compromising his own individuality. The work could be likened to the >'musical diary of an inspired artist who provides interesting glimpses of his

416 In his analysis of the work, Göllicher mentions the added brass instruments in the Finale but there is not enough detail for the reader to determine whether he is referring to the original version or Schalk's revised version; see *G-A IV/3*, 395-411.

417 See *HSABB 2*, 253 and Nowak, *ABSW V Revisionsbericht*, 71-72; the original is in St. Florian.

418 This review appeared in the *Grazer Volksblatt* 81 (11 April 1894). See Nowak, *ABSW V Revisionsbericht*, 77-78 for complete review and *G-A IV/3*, 389-90 for extract.

419 See *G-A IV/3*, 390-94 and *LBSAB*, 185ff. for this review in the *Grazer Tagespost* (10 April 1894). See also Ingrid Schubert, *BSL 1984*, 58.

different moods...⁴²⁰

On returning to Vienna after being present at the performance, Josef wrote a letter of gratitude to Franz, informing him that Bruckner, who was still confined to bed, had been very excited to hear of the successful performance and would write to him soon. Bruckner's wish was that Franz would conduct the Vienna Philharmonic in a performance of the Fifth the following autumn. Josef asked Franz to return the score of the symphony and several copies of the Graz reviews.⁴²¹

This request to return the full score as well as the piano reduction of the symphony was repeated in another letter to Franz on 16 April.⁴²² In the meantime, on 12 April, Bruckner wrote a letter of thanks to Franz from his sick-bed and mentioned the possibility of his conducting the work in Vienna; he had already recommended this to the *Wagner-Verein*.⁴²³ Josef mentioned the '>receipt of scores' - obviously a reference to those he had requested - when he wrote to Franz a month later.⁴²⁴ During the second part of the year Josef worked on a piano arrangement of the revised symphony, using the score which Franz had sent him. On 6 August he wrote to his brother that, as well as recovering from illness, he had made a '>completely new arrangement of the first movement of the Fifth.'⁴²⁵ On 27 September,

420 See Nowak, *ABSWV Revisionsbericht*, 76-77 for this review in the *Grazer Tagblatt* 97 (10 April 1894). There was also a review by a '>Dr. G.' in the *Grazer Morgenpost* on 11 April. Bruckner also received a congratulatory letter from Elsa Absbabs who had attended the concert with her father Hugo, secretary of the *Trabrenn-Verein* in Graz. See *HSABB 2*, 253-54 for this letter dated Graz, 11 April 1894; the original is in St. Florian.

421 See *HSABB 2*, 254-55 and Nowak, *ABSWV Revisionsbericht*, 72 for this letter, dated Vienna, 11 April 1894; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/20.

422 See Nowak, *ABSWV Revisionsbericht*, 73; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

423 See *HSABB 2*, 255-56 and Nowak, *ABSWV Revisionsbericht*, 73; the original is in the *Bergbau- und Heimatmuseum Reichenau an der Rax*.

424 See *HSABB 2*, 258 and Nowak, *ABSWV Revisionsbericht*, 73 for this letter, dated Vienna, 24 May 1894; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/22.

425 See Nowak, *ABSWV Revisionsbericht*, 73 for a reference to this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/27.

however, Franz wrote to Josef advising him not, under any circumstances, to have the score of the Fifth published for performance purposes.⁴²⁶ As Leibnitz points out, Bruckner would have been confronted with the reality of which he was unaware - namely that Franz had altered the score of the work in many places - if a performance of the symphony in Vienna had materialized during his lifetime.⁴²⁷

The recurrence of illness confined Bruckner indoors until the middle of May when he was able to attend Mass on Whit Monday (14 May).⁴²⁸ By the end of May he was clearly well enough for the *Wiener Akademischer Gesangverein* to write to him with good wishes on his recovery.⁴²⁹ Earlier in the month there were performances of *Germanenzug* and the first movement of the Fourth Symphony in Troppau. During the summer, Bruckner spent two months in Steyr (26 July - 30 September).⁴³⁰ A fortnight before his vacation,

426 See Nowak, *ABSWV Revisionsbericht*, 73 for a reference to this letter; the original is in the ÖNB.

427 See *LBSAB*, 191. The parts used for the Graz performance and Franz Schalk's copy of the score (engraver's copy for the first edition) have been lost. The first edition was published by Doblinger in 1896 (full score: D. 2080; Josef Schalk's four-hand piano arrangement: D. 2062). For further details, see Nowak, *ABSWV Revisionsbericht*.

428 He was accompanied by Anton Meißner. See the latter's account in *G-A IV/3*, 411-12.

429 See *HSABB 2*, 259 for this letter, dated Vienna, 26 May 1894; the original is in St. Florian.

430 See *HSABB 2*, 259-60 for Aichinger's invitation to Bruckner, dated Steyr, 2 June 1894, to stay in the presbytery; the original is in St. Florian

431 There was a report of this honour in the *Linzer Tagespost* 158 (13 July 1894). See *HSABB 2*, 261-62 for Poche's letter to Bruckner, dated 15 July 1894. It was first printed in *G-A IV/3* where there are also details of the diploma. The original of the letter is not extant; Andrea Harrandt suggests that the original of the certificate is probably in St. Florian. Bruckner received a congratulatory letter from the Troppau *Männergesang-Verein*. See *HSABB 2*, 262 for this letter, dated Troppau, 17 July 1894; the original is in St. Florian.

however, he received the pleasing news from Franz Poche, the mayor of Linz, that he had been granted honorary citizenship of the town. He was sent a certificate prepared by Professor Leitner and signed by Poche and two members of the town council, Franz Schober and Rudolf Prohaska.⁴³¹

As Bruckner was not able to visit St. Florian he sent his brother Ignaz greetings on his name-day, enclosed 10 florins, and said that Kathi, his housekeeper, would send on some clothes that he could no longer use. He also asked his brother to pass on his good wishes to Karl Aigner and Josef Gruber.⁴³² Is there a suspicion of envy or even of >resentment in Ignaz's birthday greetings to his brother at the beginning of September; or perhaps no more than an acknowledgment of the inevitable? Ignaz wrote that the only reason that he (Ignaz) was treated with any consideration at St. Florian was because of the reputation of his famous brother!⁴³³

Bruckner celebrated his 70th birthday on 4 September while he was in Steyr. He received more than 200 letters and telegrams from musical organizations (for instance, the *Akademischer Wagner-Verein*, the *Wiener Männergesangverein*, the *Singverein* of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde*, *Frohsinn*, the *Linzer Sängerbund*, and Hans Richter and the Vienna Philharmonic) students and student organizations, old friends, former pupils, admirers and important dignitaries, including the Prince Bishop of Vienna,

432 See *HSABB 2*, 264-65 for this letter to Ignaz, dated '>Steyr, Ende Juli 1894'; the original is not extant but *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna possesses a copy. Bruckner also mentioned that his doctor would be coming to Steyr. In a letter to Aichinger, Alexander von Weismayr provided details of Bruckner's diet, said that all exertion (including organ playing) should be avoided, and confirmed that he would be coming to Steyr on 1 August. See *HSABB 2*, 264 for this letter, dated Vienna, 25 July 1894; a copy of the original is in the *Museum der Stadt Steyr*.

433 See *HSABB 2*, 270 for Ignaz's letter, dated St. Florian, 3 September 1894; the original is in St. Florian. Ignaz also wrote to Bruckner a month earlier to thank him for the money and the clothes. See *HSABB 2*, 265 for this letter, dated St. Florian, 4 August 1894; the original is in St. Florian.

the mayor of Vienna, the governor of Upper Austria, and Princess Lobkowitz. There were also various tributes in newspapers and journals, a testimony to the high esteem in which Bruckner was now held.⁴³⁴

One of his oldest friends, Rudolf Weinwurm, described him as a '>modern Hercules of art conquering the world' and recalled the days when he belonged '>only to me and a few other friends'; now, however, he '>belonged to the world which would never grow tired of esteeming and admiring him...'⁴³⁵ Of particular interest is a congratulatory letter sent by the *Wiener Tonkünstlerverein* which has several signatories, including Johannes Brahms, Ignaz Brüll and one or two other noted anti-Wagnerians. It highlights his great popularity with the Conservatory and University students and assures him that he can '>look back to a long life and think with satisfaction of the recognition and honours' he had received for his '>serious and lofty ambitions.'⁴³⁶ It was fitting that a delegation from the Steyr town

434 These include Theodor Helm in the *Deutsche Zeitung* 8147 and 8148, 3 and 4 September 1894; Ludwig Speidel in *Fremdenblatt*, 4 September 1894 (see Manfred Wagner, *Bruckner*, 213-17), Ludwig Hevesi in *Fremdenblatt*, 4 September 1894 (see G-AIV/3, 423-27 and Wagner, op.cit., 217ff.); Camillo Horn in *Deutsches Volksblatt*, 4 September 1894; Gustav Schönau in the *Wiener Tagblatt*, 4 September 1894; articles in the evening edition of the *Neue Freie Presse*, *Die Presse*, *Linzer Volksblatt*, *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung* (all 4 September 1894), *Wiener Zeitung*, 5 September 1894, *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 5 September 1894, *Neue Freie Presse*, 6 September 1894, *Linzer Tagespost*, 8 September 1894; Hans von Wörz in the *Wiener Sonn- und Montagszeitung*, 10 September 1894 (see extract in Louis, op. cit., 339) and Hans Paumgartner in the *Wiener Abendpost*, 15 September 1894 (see extract in Tschulik, op.cit., 178); also *Schweizerische Musik-Zeitung* 34 (1894), 164, *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* 21 (1894), 468, *Neue Berliner Musikzeitung* 48 (1894), 399. See also Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner in der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. 1. Teil: Die Signatur Mus.Hs.28.252, in *Studien & Berichte* 67 (December 2006), 5-16 and '2. Teil: Die Signatur Mus.Hs. 28.251 in *Studien & Berichte* 69 (December 2007), 6-32 for details of nearly 70 birthday telegrams sent to Bruckner by various organisations and individual well-wishers, including Guido Adler, Albert Gutmann, Theodor Helm, Otto Leßmann, editor of the *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* in Berlin, Hermann Levi, Moritz and Betty Mayfeld, Max von Oberleithner, Siegfried and Lotte Ochs, Johann Strauss, Hans Richter, and Franz Schalk.

435 See *HSABB* 2, 279 for this letter from Weinwurm, dated Vienna, 3 September 1894; the original is in St. Florian.

436 See *HSABB* 2, 294 for this letter, dated Vienna, October 1894; the original is in St. Florian. See also *HSABB* 2, 296 for Bruckner's reply, dated Vienna, 31 October 1894; the

council, including the mayor, should visit Bruckner and present him with official greetings from the town which had almost become his second home during the summer months.⁴³⁷

Towards the end of his memorable stay in Steyr, Bruckner added a codicil to his will; financial provision of 4000 florins was to be made towards the upkeep of his grave and, in the event of his wish to be buried under the great organ of St. Florian not being fulfilled, he was to be buried in Steyr. However, assurances had already been given that he could be buried at St. Florian. On 9 September Johann Aichinger, the parish priest, had written to Johann Breselmayr, master of the novices and dean at St. Florian, conveying Bruckner's wishes that he be laid to rest beneath the great organ, and Breselmayr's letter of reply contained a postscript in which Ferdinand Moser, the provost of the abbey, reassured him that Bruckner's wish would be fulfilled. Bruckner obviously needed a lot of convincing!⁴³⁸

On 26 September Bruckner wrote to his housekeeper to inform her of his

original is in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* library. See *HSABB 2*, 267 for a letter from his sister Rosalie; *HSABB 2*, 269 for a letter from Franz Schalk; *HSABB 2*, 273 for a letter from Ferdinand Löwe; *HSABB 2*, 292 for belated greetings from Hugo Wolf, dated Traunkirchen, 15 September 1894 - there is a facsimile of the original, which is located in the *ÖNB*, in *ABB*, after p. 336; *HSABB 2*, 293 for Bruckner's reply to this letter, dated Steyr, 23 September 1894 - there is a facsimile of this letter, which is privately owned, in Franz Grasberger, *Hugo Wolf. Persönlichkeit und Werk. Eine Ausstellung zum 100. Geburtstag* (Vienna, 1960), after page 76. See *HSABB 2*, 266-94 for several of these birthday greetings; the originals of most of them are in St. Florian. On 11 September, Bruckner inserted a small advert in the *Neue Freie Presse*, thanking all those who had sent him birthday greetings; he also replied to several personally.

437 See *G-A IV/3*, 416ff. Bruckner was also elected an honorary member of the Steyr *Liedertafel* and the Vienna *Schubertbund*. See *HSABB 2*, 296 for a letter from the Steyr *Liedertafel* to Bruckner, dated Steyr, 6 November 1894; the original is in St. Florian. Bruckner's brief reply, dated Vienna 8 November 1894, can also be found in *HSABB 2*, 297; the original is in the *Museum der Stadt Steyr*.

438 See *G-A IV/3*, 427-30 and Rolf Keller, *BJ 1982/83*, 105-06 for further details of the codicil, signed by Bruckner on 25 September and witnessed by Bayer and two others. See *ABA*, 117-18 for extracts from Aichinger's letter to Breselmayr and the latter's reply, dated St. Florian, 11 September 1894; see also *HSABB 2*, 291 for the full text of the latter, including the postscript. The originals are in St. Florian and the Vienna *Stadt- und Landesbibliothek* respectively.

impending return to Vienna.⁴³⁹ It seems that he had not deemed it necessary to follow his doctor's advice to return to Vienna earlier if the weather did not improve.⁴⁴⁰

The events leading up to the performance of Bruckner's F minor Mass at a *Gesellschaft* concert on 4 November again illustrate the thin dividing-line between well-intentioned '>meddling' and dishonest distortion on the part of Bruckner's friends. Oberleithner, who was preparing the proof copy of the work with Josef Schalk, hoped to include certain of his own revisions in the printed version. Both had already collaborated in the printing of the Eighth and certain '>corrections' had been made which had not been noticed by Bruckner. In the case of the F minor Mass, however, there was an altercation between Bruckner, Schalk and Oberleithner, as Josef made clear when he wrote to Franz on 24 May:

... The cause of it was a sudden outbreak of anger on Bruckner's part that something could have been altered without his knowledge in the F minor Mass which is now at the printing stage. With the greatest impetuosity he demanded back his score which is in Oberleithner's safe keeping at present. Fortunately, the printed score has not yet been published and it can only be hoped that Bruckner will forget the whole matter in the meantime - otherwise there will be a terrible fuss. The agitation has made him ill again, and he won't permit any of us to visit him...⁴⁴¹

In his reply a few days later Franz thanked his brother for his favourable

439 See *HSABB* 2, 293 for this letter to Katharina Kachelmaier and *ABA*, 100 for a facsimile of the original which is in the *ÖNB*.

440 See *HSABB* 2, 290 for Leopold Schrötter's letter to Bruckner, dated Vienna, 11 September 1894; the original is in St. Florian. See also *HSABB* 2, 292 for Bruckner's reply, dated Steyr, 16 September 1894; the original is in the *ÖNB*. Bruckner wrote to Schrötter again on 31 October 1894 to congratulate him on his silver wedding. See *HSABB* 2, 295; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

441 See earlier and footnote 424.

comments on the Graz performance of the Fifth, alluded briefly to Josef's problems with Bruckner and provided information about a new position in Prague he was to take up in the autumn of 1895.⁴⁴²

According to the Göllicher-Auer biography this was the final break between Bruckner and Josef Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe, although there is a footnote to the effect that 'J. Schalk informed his brother of several visits', which suggests that some contact was maintained.⁴⁴³ This is corroborated by the Schalk correspondence which reveals that, after an interruption, relationships with Bruckner gradually returned to their former amicable level. There is no mention of Bruckner in Josef's letters to Franz written during June and July 1894. On 1 August, however, Josef reported that Bruckner was in Steyr and that he intended to travel there on 4 September to congratulate him on his 70th birthday. Whether he would also travel to Munich depended on recovery from illness and progress made in his piano arrangement of Bruckner's Fifth.⁴⁴⁴

We do not know if Josef visited Bruckner in Steyr as he had planned to but, on 3 October, he mentioned his intention of visiting Bruckner, now back in Vienna, within the next few days.⁴⁴⁵ Bruckner himself wrote to Josef on 6 October (albeit with the formal greeting '>'Hochverehrter H. Professor'), asking him if he would act as his representative in rehearsals of the F minor Mass and, before that, play through the work for Wilhelm Gericke, as he was

442 See *FSBB*, 63-64 and *LBSAB*, 192-93 (extracts) for this letter, dated Graz, 27 May 1894; the original has been lost.

443 *G-A IV/3*, 527.

444 See *LBSAB*, 194 for an extract from this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/26.

445 See *LBSAB*, 194 for a reference to this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/15/31.

too ill to leave his apartment.⁴⁴⁶

With the regular fluctuations in Bruckner's health from the end of the year until his death, the composer presumably never got round to comparing the 1894 first edition of the Mass with his own original autograph and so a 'terrible fuss' was averted!⁴⁴⁷ Josef, however, maintained contact with Bruckner and kept Franz regularly informed of his condition.⁴⁴⁸ He also repeatedly tried to get Franz to come to Vienna with the Prague Opera Orchestra to give a performance of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony - but without success.⁴⁴⁹

Bruckner was able to resume teaching duties at the University on 29 October,⁴⁵⁰ and was well enough to attend both the final rehearsal (3 November) and performance (4 November) of his F minor Mass, as well as a performance of Mozart's *Requiem* in the *Hofkapelle* on 2 November.⁴⁵¹ He was accompanied by Karl Waldeck from Linz on all three occasions. Hanslick reviewed the performance of the Mass in the *Neue Freie Presse* on 13 November. The main points of his criticism were that the work belonged to the church and not to the concert hall, and the same weaknesses evident

446 See *HSABB* 2, 295; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 151/2/5/1.

447 The F minor Mass was published in 1894 by Doblinger (full score: D. 1866; piano score arr. Josef Schalk: D. 1861).

448 See, for instance, Josef's letter to Franz, dated Vienna 21 November 1894, in *HSABB* 2, 298; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 158/15/33.

449 Ferdinand Löwe and the Munich Kaim Orchestra had the distinction of giving the symphony its first performance in Vienna on 1 March 1898. During the 1898/99 concert season the first truly Viennese performance of the work was given by Gustav Mahler and the Vienna Philharmonic.

450 See *G-A* IV/3, 432-37 and Ernst Schwanzara, *Anton Bruckner Vorlesungen*, 94ff. for Theodor Altwirth's report (incomplete) of the lecture in the *Linzer Montagspost* on 5 November.

451 Hugo Wolf referred to the final rehearsal and performance of the Mass in a letter to Hugo Faißt. He had already mentioned in a letter to Melanie Köchert (mid-October?) that he intended to travel to Vienna on 20 October as he did not want to miss the performance of the Mass.

in the symphonies were also present in the Mass, viz. lack of musical logic and stylistic inconsistency - >'Albrechtsberger arm in arm with Wagner.'⁴⁵²

At Bruckner's University lecture on 5 November he told his students that he was very pleased with the performance, although he felt that Gericke had taken the *Kyrie* and the first part of the *Gloria* too quickly. He also mentioned that Waldeck had been at the performance and explained how Waldeck had been responsible for a complete revision of the '>Et incarnatus est' section in the *Credo* over 25 years earlier. Bruckner was particularly pleased that Brahms had joined in the applause at the end of the performance; it is reported that Bruckner made a point of thanking him. His lecture on 12 November was his last. He referred to his work on the Ninth Symphony, saying that the first three movements were now complete, although he still had to put some finishing touches to the third. The *Te Deum* was to be used as the fourth movement if he was unable to complete the work before his death. Towards the end of November Bruckner's health deteriorated rapidly. Josef Schalk was so concerned that he asked Franz to write to Bruckner immediately '>since the catastrophe could happen any day.'⁴⁵³ But Bruckner was able to attend the postponed performance of his revised Second Symphony on 25 November in a Philharmonic concert conducted by Hans Richter. There was a warm reception from the audience and Bruckner was cheered after each movement; but the reviews were mixed. Helm, writing in the *Deutsche Zeitung*, was complimentary, Heuberger, writing in the *Wiener Tagblatt*, less so. In his last large-scale review of a Bruckner work, Hans Paumgartner described the Second as the most genial of all the

452 See Hawkshaw, op.cit., 254-56 for Hanslick's review in the *Neue Freie Presse* 10857 (13 November 1894), 1-2. Hawkshaw, op.cit., 253-54 and 256-57 also provides the texts of Max Kalbeck's review in the *Montags-Revue* (19 November 1894) and Hans Paumgartner's review in the *Wiener Abendpost* (6 November 1894, 5-6.

453 See footnote 448 for an earlier reference to this letter, dated Vienna, 21 November 1894.

symphonies.⁴⁵⁴

Earlier in the year Bruckner's salary as a University lecturer was increased from 800 to 1200 florins.⁴⁵⁵ Almost certainly some adjustment would have been made for the 1894-95 academic year after Bruckner's retirement on health grounds. At the end of November, however, he received a letter from the Lower Austrian Parliament informing him that he had been granted an honorarium of 600 florins for 1895 and a subsidy of 150 florins for 1894 'for composition purposes.'⁴⁵⁶

Bruckner was so ill at the beginning of December that he received the last rites on 9 December. But his health improved to such an extent that he was able to spend Christmas at Klosterneuburg and even play the organ at High Mass on 26 December. There was a relapse immediately afterwards, Bruckner contracted pleurisy, and his condition became so serious again that his brother Ignaz came from St. Florian to be with him and to assist his housekeeper. Ignaz stayed for six weeks until there was another improvement in Bruckner's condition.⁴⁵⁷ During this period, a 'Bruckner celebration' that had been arranged by the *Wagner-Verein* and was to include a performance of his Seventh Symphony conducted by Ferdinand

454 See G-A IV/3, 449ff. for extracts from Helm's review in the *Deutsche Zeitung* (30 November 1894) and Heuberger's in the *Wiener Tagblatt*, Andrea Harrandt, *BSL* 1991, 66ff. for reference to Schönaich's review in the *Extrapost* (26 November 1894), and Norbert Tschulik, *BJ* 1981, 178 for reference to Paumgartner's review in the *Wiener Abendpost* (4 December 1894). Paumgartner also reviewed Ferdinand Löwe's performance of his solo piano arrangement of the first movement from Bruckner's Sixth Symphony at a *Wagner-Verein* concert on 29 November. On 18 December, both concerts were reviewed in the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* 347; see Nowak, *ABSW VI Revisionsbericht* (Vienna, 1986), 62.

455 See Robert Lach, op.cit., 60ff. for texts of the internal University correspondence (19 and 24 February, 2 March) ratifying this.

456 See *ABA*, 102 for this letter, dated 28 November 1894. It is also mentioned in G-A IV/3, 447; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

457 On 1 January 1895 Ignaz wrote to Johann Nepomuk Hueber in Vöcklabruck that another improvement in Bruckner's condition had astonished his doctors. See *HSABB* 2, 299 for the text of this letter; the original is in the possession of the Hueber family in Vöcklabruck.

Löwe was postponed indefinitely.

At the end of January 1895 Bruckner followed the advice of his doctor, Professor Schrötter, and wrote to Prince Liechtenstein to enquire if there were any suitable ground-floor or first-storey apartments to rent.⁴⁵⁸ Prince Liechtenstein replied in the negative,⁴⁵⁹ but Anton Meißner, Bruckner's secretary, learnt from one of his friends, a chaplain in Belvedere, that there was a house standing empty in the grounds of the palace and made a formal approach to Archduchess Marie Valerie.⁴⁶⁰ By the middle of May this lodge - the 'Kustodenstöckl' - was placed at Bruckner's disposal on Emperor Franz Josef's recommendation. Bruckner moved to his new spacious home, with the help of Meißner and Kathi Kachelmayr, on 4 July.⁴⁶¹

458 See *HSABB 2*, 299-300 for the text of this letter, dated Vienna, 28 January 1895; the original, which has Bruckner's signature but was written by Meißner, is in the library of the *Stiftung Fürst Liechtenstein*, Vienna.

459 See *G-A IV/3*, 501-02 for this letter, dated Vienna, 6 February 1895; the original is in the library of the *Stiftung Fürst Liechtenstein*, Vienna.

460 For the text of this letter, written on Bruckner's behalf by Meißner and dated Vienna, 19 February 1895, see *HSABB 2*, 301 and Erich W. Partsch, 'Anton Meißner, der letzte "Sekretär" Bruckners', in *BJ 1984/85/86* (Linz, 1988), 59 and 60 (facsimile); the original of the letter is in the *Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv*, Vienna. The Archduchess's lady-in-waiting, Baroness Marie Vécsey-Hajnacskè, informed the Lord Chamberlain, Prince Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, that she wished Bruckner's request to be granted. See *HSABB 2*, 302 for this letter, dated Lichtenegg, 11 March 1895; the original is in the *Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv*, Vienna.

461 Bruckner mentioned his imminent move to the Belvedere in a letter, dated Vienna, 19 June 1895, written to his sister Rosalie who had been ill. See *HSABB 2*, 309; the original is in the *Heimathaus*, Vöcklabruck. Auer reports that, at Bruckner's request, Meißner had to destroy quite a number of manuscript pages during the preparations for the move, for instance the scores of Psalm 146, Psalm 112 and Symphony no. '0'. However, although the autograph score of Psalm 146 is incomplete, the autographs of Psalm 112 and the Symphony are available. There is no doubt that a substantial amount of sketch material was destroyed at the time. Entries in *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrerkalender für das Schuljahr 1894/95* reveal that Bruckner clearly made an inventory of his music manuscripts before his move. On the March 1895 page he noted 'NB Helgoland habe ich keine vollst[ändige] Part[itur]'; on the April page he noted: 'Eberle Part[itur] 5. Sinf[onie] (3. Messe, die zum Drucke verwendet wurde)' - presumably a reference to scores of his works published by Eberle; on the May page he wrote '24 Mai [1]895. 1.mal Finale neue Scitze' (a reference to the first sketches for the Finale of the Ninth), and in another hand (probably Meißner's) there is a reference to scores which are missing ('the original score of the F minor Mass', 'the score of the F minor Mass which was used for printing', 'the score of

Another bout of severe ill-health in April and May prevented Bruckner from visiting St. Florian at Easter and from attending the 50th anniversary celebrations of *Frohsinn* in Linz that culminated in the unveiling of a memorial plaque on Bruckner's birth house in Ansfelden on Sunday 12 May. *Frohsinn* sang several pieces, including Beethoven's *Ehre Gottes* and Floderer's *Bruckner-Hymne*, a setting of words by Karl Kerschbaum.⁴⁶² Ill health also prevented him from having a summer break in Steyr, but he wrote to his friend Franz Bayer on three occasions. On 26 June he asked him for some news from Steyr and mentioned his imminent move to a house in the Belvedere. On 9 July he told Bayer that it was unlikely that he would be able to travel for some time, and on 22 July, in a reply to a letter from Bayer, he said how shocked he was to hear of the illness of another Steyr friend, the

the 5th Symphony which is now being used for printing, the score of Helgoland'); on the June page he noted that the printer probably collected the full score of the F minor Mass from Dr. Ludwig Speidel 'immediately after the performance', viz. on 4 November 1894; on the July page, Josef Schalk, who helped Bruckner to put his music in order for the move to the Belvedere apartment, noted 'Original scores (in sealed package): 1st Symphony old and new version (complete), no. 2 in D minor (nullified), 1st movement only, Wagner symphony (old) Finale and Adagio (of which sheets 2,3,4,5,7 and 8 are missing), Quintet complete, 8th Symphony Scherzo (old), 8th Symphony (new) complete, 5th Symphony Scherzo and Finale'; on the October 1895 page, Josef Schalk noted that he has taken the 'first 10 pages of the first movement of the Ninth Symphony for arrangement.' Maier makes the point, however, that it is doubtful if this is the fair copy, as Karl Muck had already taken it to Berlin at the beginning of 1895 – "Bruckner entrusted this work to him in order to save it from the (well-intentioned, but fatal) intrusion of the Schalk brothers." See *MVP* 1, 480-85 and 2, 399-403. See also later, footnote 475. In his article: 'Bruckner im Belvedere. Akten des Obersthofmeisteramtes', in *Anton Bruckners Wiener Jahre* (Vienna, 2009), 19-30, Theophil Antonicek thoroughly explores the documentary material, beginning with Bruckner's letter to the Archduchess Marie Valerie in February 1895, that records Bruckner's move to the Belvedere five months later.

462 See *HSABB* 2, 309 for the letter from *Frohsinn* to Bruckner, dated Linz, 8 April 1895, expressing disappointment that the composer would not be able to attend the unveiling ceremony, and enclosing a special brochure written for the occasion by Franz Brunner; and *ABA*, 119 for the good-wish telegram from *Frohsinn*, dated Ansfelden, 12 May 1895. See also Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 11, for further details of the latter. The original of the letter is in St. Florian, and the original of the telegram is in the *ÖNB*. See also *HSABB* 2, 305 for two letters of thanks from Bruckner, dated Vienna, 24 April and 19 May 1895 resp. There is a facsimile of the original of the latter in Walter Abendroth, *Bruckner. Eine Bildbiographie* (Munich, 1958), 116; the originals of both letters are in the *Frohsinn Archiv* of the *Linzer Singakademie*.

parish priest Aichinger.⁴⁶³

Bruckner's former landlord, Dr. Oelzelt von Newin, wrote to him on two occasions. In the first, a card dated 2 July, he sent Bruckner good wishes for the move to the Belvedere, and in the second, a letter dated 11 July, he agreed to become, in effect, a member of the consortium which provided the composer with financial help.⁴⁶⁴ Gertrude Bollé-Hellmund also persisted with her efforts to interest Bruckner in an opera subject and offered to send him a libretto if he wished to read it. Meißner replied on Bruckner's behalf, hinting that the composer would not undertake any fresh composition projects until he had finished the Ninth, but promising to read some excerpts to Bruckner if she sent the libretto. On 6 July, two days after Bruckner's move to the Belvedere, Meißner acknowledged receipt of the libretto of *Astra* and conveyed Bruckner's thanks but offered little hope of Bruckner being able to make use of it.⁴⁶⁵

Bruckner made a partial recovery at the end of the summer and even felt well enough to contemplate resuming his weekly University lectures, but his doctors advised against it. Given his physical frailty by now, a relapse in his condition was more than likely; and, in any case, it appears that applications

463 See *HSABB 2*, 310-11 and 313-14. for Bruckner's three letters to Bayer and two responses from the latter, dated 1 July and 12 July resp. The original of Bruckner's first letter is in the *ÖNB*, the originals of the second and third are in the *Museum der Stadt Steyr*; there is a facsimile of the final two pages of the first letter in Gräßlinger, *Anton Bruckner. Sein Leben und seine Werke* (Regensburg, 1921), after p.128. The originals of Bayer's two letters are in Vöcklabruck and St. Florian resp. Aichinger died later in the year, and Bruckner's *Requiem* was sung at his funeral service in Steyr on 4 December. See *HSABB 2*, 324 for Bruckner's letter to Bayer, dated Vienna, 10 December 1895; the original is in the *ÖNB*.

464 See *G-A IV/3*, 519 and 521 for reference to the former and extracts from the latter. Oelzelt von Newin had rented the apartment in the Hessgasse to Bruckner at very reasonable terms, and this new arrangement was no doubt meant to take the place of the old. The originals have presumably been lost and they are not mentioned in *HSABB 2*.

465 See *HSABB 2*, 306-07 for Bollé-Hellmund's letter to Bruckner, dated Berlin, 5 May 1895, Meißner's first reply (date not known), and second reply; dated Vienna, 6 July 1895. They were first printed in *G-A IV/3*, 528-32 and *GrBB*, 14-15. Also see earlier, footnotes 376 and 404.

were already being sought for a replacement.⁴⁶⁶

There were several performances of Bruckner works during the year. The Third Symphony was conducted by Erich W. Degner in Graz on 10 February, the Fourth Symphony was conducted by Mahler in Hamburg on 18 February and by Weingartner in Berlin on 9 March, and Levi conducted one of the symphonies (possibly No. 2) in Munich.⁴⁶⁷ There were also performances of the *Te Deum* in Warnsdorf,⁴⁶⁸ *Germanenzug* in Linz (17 March; *Frohsinn* conducted by Floderer) and Chicago (15 December), the String Quintet in Leipzig (Prill Quartet, 16 November),⁴⁶⁹ Symphony

466 Earlier in the year, on 30 April, Bruckner wrote a letter to the Faculty of Philosophy at the University in support of Franz Ludwig Marschner's application for a University lectureship. At a faculty meeting on 15 May, Bruckner's letter was read out, but the general feeling was that his reference was not sufficiently detailed. See *HSABB* 2, 304 for Joseph Karabacek's letter to Bruckner, dated Vienna 22 April 1895, and Theophil Antonicek, '>'Anton Bruckner als akademischer Gutachter', in *BJ* 1982/83 (Linz, 1984), 82ff which also includes facsimiles of Bruckner's original draft and the fair copy written by Meißner and signed by Bruckner; the originals of these documents are in the Vienna University library.

467 See Ingrid Schubert, *BSL* 1984, 39 and 58 and Röder, *III. Symphonie Revisionbericht*, 439-40. for reference to and extracts from Julius Schuch's review of the performance in the *Grazer Tagblatt* (11 February 1895) and the review by '>'V.P.' in the *Grazer Morgenpost* (12 February 1895). Weingartner sent Bruckner a telegram on the day of the Berlin performance - '>'the first three movements were applauded enthusiastically, the last made a deep impression...'; see *G-A* IV/3, 507, however, for Auer's comment that Weingartner had '>'mutilated' the symphony by making cuts and that the Berlin reviews were, with a few exceptions, very unkind. Meißner wrote on Bruckner's behalf to thank him for the Berlin performance; see *ABB*, 283 for this letter (undated) and see also Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', 11 for details of the telegram and another telegram from Hans Herrmann concerning the performance. Neither the telegram nor Bruckner's letter, which is not extant, is mentioned in *HSABB* 2. Bruckner wrote to Richard Sternfeld, however, to thank him for his review of the Berlin performance - see *HSABB* 2, 305 for this letter, dated Vienna, 24 April 1895; the original is in private possession.

468 On 21 January 1896, Anton Scholze, a teacher and composer, wrote from Graslitz to inform Bruckner that there had recently been a lecture on the composer's life and works organised by the Teachers' Association in the town. Scholze also mentioned that he had been privileged to take part in two performances of the *Te Deum* in Warnsdorf. See *HSABB* 2, 327 for Scholze's letter; the original is in St. Florian.

469 This was the first performance of the work in the city. It was given in the small hall of the Gewandhaus. For further information and reviews of the performance in *Signale für die musikalische Welt*, *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten* and the *Leipziger Zeitung*, see Steffen Lieberwirth, in *ABDS* 6, 76-81. On 4 December, Bruckner sent greetings to Nikisch in Leipzig. See *HSABB* 2, 324. The letter was first printed in *ABB*, 288; the original is not extant.

no. 7 in Frankfurt (18 December; conducted by Ludwig Rottenberger),⁴⁷⁰ Symphony no. 8 in Dresden (18 December, conducted by Louis Nicodé)⁴⁷¹ and two further performances of the Fourth in Linz (25 October, conducted by Adalbert Schreyer) and Dresden (15 November, conducted by Adolf Hagen).⁴⁷² Eighteen months after Franz Schalk's performance of the Fifth in Graz, another of Bruckner's pupils, Ferdinand Löwe, conducted the work in Budapest on 18 December. There is some discrepancy between Auer's report of a relatively successful performance and Josef Schalk's less sanguine report to his brother of a revolt among the orchestral musicians being averted thanks to the intervention of some of the more level-headed members of the orchestra.⁴⁷³

At the beginning of May, Archduchess Gisela of Bavaria informed

470 See G-A IV/3, 539 for an extract from Engelbert Humperdinck's favourable review of the Frankfurt performance in the *Fremdenblatt* (20 December 1895); also, Othmar Wessely, in *BSL* 1991, 146 for another review of the performance, signed '>hs', in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 92 (29 January 1896), 52.

471 See extracts from reviews by Karl Söhle (*Deutsche Wacht*, 20 December 1895) and Alphons Maurice (*Österreichische Musik- und Theater-Zeitung* 8/8-9, 11, 1 January 1896) in G-A IV/3, 537-38. On 27 August Nicodé invited Bruckner to attend the performance (which was planned originally for 27 November), but Bruckner had to decline because of his poor health. See *HSABB* 2, 317-18 and 328 for Nicodé's letter, Bruckner's first reply, dated 30 August 1895, and belated letter of thanks to Nicodé, dated Vienna, 24 February 1896; the original of Nicodé's letter is in St. Florian, but the originals of Bruckner's letters, first printed in *ABB*, 287-88 and 291-92, are not extant.

472 On 4 December Bruckner sent Schreyer a reference in which he recommended him for a conducting position on the strength of several excellent performances of his works he had directed in Linz. See Othmar Wessely, '>Ein unbekanntes Bruckner Dokument', in *Oberösterreichischer Kulturbericht* 20 (14 May 1948); the original is in the library of the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum* in Linz. Bruckner received letters from his brother Ignaz and two of his friends, Karl Waldeck, and Karl Aigner, about the Linz performance. See *HSABB* 2, 322-23 for Ignaz's letter, dated St Florian, 27 October 1895, Waldeck's letter, dated Linz, 27 October 1895 and Aigner's letter, dated St. Florian, 29 October 1895. *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna possesses a copy of the original of Ignaz's letter; the originals of the other two are in St. Florian. See G-A IV/3, 534ff. for Karl Söhle's appreciative review of the Dresden performance in the *Deutsche Wacht* (17 November)

473 See G-A IV/3, 540 for Auer's comments and *LBSAB*, 202-03 for an extract from Josef's letter, dated Vienna, 28 December 1895; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/32. Six weeks earlier, on 13 November, Josef informed Franz that Löwe had been invited to conduct a performance of the symphony in Budapest. See *LBSAB*, 202 for an extract from this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/27.

Bruckner that she had recommended to her friend, the Princess of Monaco, that one of his symphonies be included in a series of classical concerts there; she suggested that Bruckner send one of his works. In his reply Bruckner thanked her and mentioned his fragile physical condition. At the end of July, he wrote to her again to reassure her that, in compliance with her wish, he had instructed Gutmann to send the score and parts of the Seventh Symphony to Monaco; he was also able to tell her that, thanks to the kindness of her father, Emperor Franz Josef, he had just moved to a house in the grounds of the Belvedere.⁴⁷⁴

Work on the Ninth continued at an understandably slow pace. During the year Bruckner entrusted the autograph manuscripts of the symphony to Karl Muck.⁴⁷⁵ The first references to the Finale occur in May. Writing to Franz on 13 May, Josef said that Bruckner had made a remarkable recovery and was >'now intending to take up the Finale of the Ninth.'⁴⁷⁶ A note in Bruckner's 1894/95 notebook: >'24. Mai 895. 1.mal Finale neue Scitze' and the date >'8. Juni' on a page of these preliminary sketches clearly indicate the completion of a certain amount of work on the Finale before his move to the lodge in the Belvedere at the beginning of July. In mid-July an article in the Steyr newspaper, *Der Alpenbote*, reported on Bruckner's move to the Belvedere

474 See *HSABB* 2, 308 and 315 for Bruckner's two letters to the Archduchess, dated 10 May and 31 July 1895. They were first printed in *ABB*, 284 and 288; the originals are not extant, but a copy of the draft of the first letter is owned privately. On 22 October, Viktor Tilgner wrote to Bruckner to recommend that he have his portrait painted by Heinrich Schönchen. Evidently Archduchess Gisela had expressed particular interest. See *HSABB* 2, 321; the original is in St. Florian.

475 It is possible that Bruckner did this because he did not trust his friends. See *LBSAB*, 191ff. for a discussion of Bruckner's strained relationships with his younger Viennese colleagues during this time. Josef Schalk's note in Bruckner's *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Schuljahr 1894/95* on 4 October 1895: >'Die ersten 10 Bogen des ersten Satzes der neunten Symphonie zum Arrangement erhalten' suggests that he received some discarded sheets or part of Meißner's copy [Mus. Hs. 29.305 in the *ÖNB*] which includes some of Schalk's insertions. See *MVP* 1, 485 and 2, 403. See also John Phillips, >'Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie', in *BJ* 1989/90 (Linz, 1992), 130.

476 See *FSBB*, 64 and *LBSAB*, 199 for extracts from this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/10.

and referred to his completion of the first three movements of the Ninth and the existence of sketches for the fourth movement.⁴⁷⁷ As we have seen, Meißner, in acknowledging receipt of an opera libretto for Bruckner, thanked Gertrude Bollé-Hellmund and confirmed that the composer was working slowly on the Ninth which he would want to complete, in any case, before even contemplating writing an opera.⁴⁷⁸ The reminiscences of one of Bruckner's doctors, Dr. Richard Heller, who seems to have had some knowledge of music, can be regarded as being fairly reliable. Although Heller suggested to Bruckner that he write down the principal ideas of the last movement, the composer persisted in writing everything out (>'the complete instrumental development') laboriously page by page. Progress was slow because Bruckner's hands trembled so much. There were inevitable blots and mistakes which had to be carefully erased and pasted over.⁴⁷⁹ Bruckner adopted his usual practice of beginning with a particell or short-score sketch (sometimes no more than a single line), each bar numbered metrically within a periodic scheme. By the end of 1895 he had already begun writing the fugal section of the movement.

The Schalk brothers' correspondence during the final 18 months or so of Bruckner's life contains reports of his failing health as well as references to the printing of the Fifth Symphony (based on Franz Schalk's revision), and to the E minor Mass. According to Josef, the latter also needed some correction, and he suggested that his brother peruse it. All this was done without or with very little reference to Bruckner. On 18 February Josef wrote to his brother:

477 See John Phillips, *BJ* 1989/90, 131 for the text of this report in *Der Alpenbote* 56 (14 July 1895), 4.

478 See earlier and footnote 465 (letter dated Vienna, 6 July 1895).

479 See G-A IV/3, 526ff. and Max Auer, '>Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt', in Karl Kobald, ed., *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner. Festschrift zum 100 Geburtstag Anton Bruckners* (Zurich-Vienna-Leipzig, 1924), 26-27.

... Bruckner's infirmity goes on and on. There is no cure for it. He sits in his easy-chair each day from 4 to 6 and 8.30 to 11.30 and can now eat only milky foods because the swelling has started up again. As you can imagine, he is very depressed.⁴⁸⁰

In April 1895 the score of Symphony no. 5 was sent to Eberle for printing. There is a reference to this in Bruckner's 1894/95 calendar - '>Eberle Part[itur] 5. Sinf[onie].'. Also in the calendar are comments by Anton Meißner: ',>Die Partitur der V. Symphonie die jetzt zum Druck verwendet wir[d]' (May) and '>Original-Partituren (im gesiegelten Paquet ... 5 Symphonie Scherzo u[nd] Finale' (July); there is also a reference here to other scores which were '>sealed' in preparation for the move to the Belvedere.⁴⁸¹ Writing to Franz on 6 July, two days after Bruckner's move, Josef mentioned that he had not yet received the proofs of the symphony from the printer.⁴⁸²

On 13 May Josef was able to report to Franz that Bruckner's health had improved to such an extent that he was considering resuming work on the Finale of the Ninth.⁴⁸³ Franz replied that he was very pleased to hear this news and added that he had always regarded Bruckner as his '>musical father' and tried as far as possible to be a '>good son.'⁴⁸⁴

Josef's letter to Franz on 6 July was mainly concerned with the score of the E minor Mass which he regarded as being in '>great need of revision', a

480 See *FSBB*, 64 and *LBSAB*, 198-99 for extracts from this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/8.

481 See *MVP* 1, 481-83 and 2, 400-01; also earlier, footnote 461.

482 See *HSABB* 2, 312 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/14. See also Nowak, *Symphony no. 5 Revisionsbericht*, 73. Also see earlier, footnote 461.

483 See earlier and footnote 475.

484 See *LBSAB*, 199 for an extract from this letter, dated Graz, 16 May 1895; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/11.

task which he hoped that Franz would be willing to take on.⁴⁸⁵ Almost a week later Josef wrote to Franz again to report that he had visited Bruckner who was still in reasonably good health although very weak.⁴⁸⁶

Franz was willing to take on the task of revising the score of the Mass and was able to report to Josef at the end of July that he had almost completed the *Credo* movement.⁴⁸⁷ In August Franz moved to Prague to take up the position of music director at the *Deutsches Landestheater*. Josef was keen to know what his brother thought of the Mass as he was hoping to include it in the *Wagner-Verein* programme for the following season.⁴⁸⁸ The date of the second proofs of the Fifth was stamped '>27 August 1895' by Eberle. Two days later Josef contacted Franz again and asked if he would be prepared to check these proofs.⁴⁸⁹

At the beginning of September Franz Schalk reassured Josef that the E minor Mass was well worth performing; the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus* movements would have a particularly powerful effect on a wider audience. But there were some considerable difficulties in the vocal parts. As far as his new appointment was concerned, the first concert was scheduled for October and he was still vacillating between Berlioz's *Harold in Italy* symphony and Bruckner's Fifth. He intended to telegram birthday greetings to Bruckner the following day.⁴⁹⁰ On 19 September Josef wrote again to Franz and asked

485 See above and footnote 482.

486 See *FSBB*, 64 for an extract from this letter, dated Vienna, 12 July 1895; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 158/16/15.

487 See *LBSAB*, 199 for an extract from this letter, dated Graz, 31 July 1895; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/16.

488 See *LBSAB*, 199-200 for extracts from Josef's letters to Franz, dated Vienna, 7 August and 24 August 1895; the originals are in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/17 and 158/16/19.

489 See *HSABB* 2, 317 for this letter, dated Vienna, 29 August 1895. There is also a reference to it in Nowak, *Symphony no. 5 Revisionsbericht*, 73; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F 18 Schalk 158/16/20.

490 See *LBSAB*, 200 for an extract from this letter, dated Prague, 2 September 1895; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/21.

him to send the corrected Mass as soon as possible so that parts could be prepared. Regarding the Fifth, it was important that Franz take an hour of his time to proof-read the score and check particularly the time- and tempo-markings. Eberle's own proof reader had transferred all the markings from the piano score to the full score and he [Josef] had deleted several of these, but had retained others. If Franz wished to make any more changes, he should use a blue pencil so that they could be identified easily.⁴⁹¹ In his next letter to Franz, Josef asked him to return the proofs of the Fifth as soon as possible as Eberle required them. He also mooted the possibility of Franz and the Prague orchestra performing the symphony in Vienna – 'otherwise it will, unfortunately, fall into the hands of Richter.' Three days later, Josef repeated his request for a speedy return of the proofs and enclosed a congratulations' card from Bruckner; he also mentioned that there was no improvement in Bruckner's health.⁴⁹² Writing again on 14 October, Josef once more raised the possibility of a performance of the Fifth in Vienna, provided that Neumann, the chief conductor of the orchestra in Prague, was willing to free his players for a couple of days for this purpose.⁴⁹³ Franz replied that it would be impossible at present to bring the Prague orchestra to Vienna for a performance of the Fifth. Neumann was certainly sympathetic to the idea but was currently experiencing difficulties in arranging even the orchestra's own '>domestic' concerts in Prague! In any case, extra forces would have to be found to provide a large enough orchestra to perform the symphony in Vienna. He was hoping, however, to perform the work at the second *Gesellschaft* concert in Prague.⁴⁹⁴ In the meantime, Löwe had been

491 See *HSABB* 2, 318 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/22.

492 See *LBSAB*, 201 and Nowak, *Symphony no. 5 Revisionsbericht*, 74 for extracts from these two letters, dated Vienna, 3 and 6 October 1895; the originals are in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/23 and 158/16/24. The '>congratulations' were either for Franz's name-day or for his new appointment.

493 See *HSABB* 2, 319 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/16/25.

494 See *LBSAB*, 210-11 for an extract from this letter, dated Prague, 15 October 1895; the

invited by the Philharmonic in Pest to conduct a concert there on 18 December, and he was hoping to include the Fifth in the programme. Josef was certain that this would prompt Richter to programme the work in Vienna during the season.⁴⁹⁵ Franz's suggestion that he and his brother collaborate in a joint Bruckner concert in Vienna met with Josef's enthusiastic approval.⁴⁹⁶ When Josef wrote to Franz again at the end of the year to report *inter alia* on recent performances of Bruckner's works including the Fifth in Pest, he asked him not to forget to '>write a couple of lines to Bruckner in the New Year.'⁴⁹⁷

Bruckner spent Christmas in his house in the Belvedere. A man of routine, he would have faithfully maintained his daily religious devotions and, weather and health permitting, gone for daily walks in the park in the company of his housekeeper and Anton Meißner.⁴⁹⁸ On 10 December he sent his customary Christmas and New Year greetings to his sister Rosalie in Vöcklabruck and his brother Ignaz in St. Florian, enclosing 10 florins in both letters as usual.⁴⁹⁹ On the same day he wrote to Franz Bayer in Steyr and

original is in the ÖNB, F18 Schalk 158/16/25a.

495 See earlier and footnote 473 re Josef's letter to Franz, Vienna, 13 November 1895.

496 See *LBSAB*, 202 for an extract from Josef's letter to Franz, dated Vienna, 17 December 1895; the original is in the ÖNB, F18 Schalk 158/16/31.

497 See earlier and footnote 473 re Josef's letter to Franz, Vienna, 28 December 1895.

498 See *G-A IV/3*, 513-17 and 523ff. for Meißner's and Heller's accounts. See also Anton Albert's letter to Ernestine Korda (the Korda family were Bruckner's neighbours in his former apartment in Heißgasse 7), dated 16 October 1895, in *HSABB 2*, 320-21, in which he described his visit to Bruckner in the Belvedere; the original of this letter is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*, Linz. Bruckner wrote to Ernestine Korda on 30 October - see *HSABB 2*, 324; the original of this letter is also in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*, Linz.

499 See *HSABB 2*, 325 for the texts (almost identical) of both letters. The original of his letter to Rosalie is not extant; it was first published in *ABB*, 290. The original of his letter to Ignaz is in St. Florian. Bruckner also sent greetings for the New Year to Ignaz on 1 January 1896. See *HSABB 2*, 327. It was first published in *ABB*, 291; the original is not extant. Another (as yet) unpublished letter from Bruckner to his brother, dated Vienna, 30 October 1895, has recently come to light. It includes name day wishes to Ignaz, as well as greetings to Karl Aigner and 'Hochwürdigsten H. Praelaten'. See Klaus Petermayr, 'Unbekannter

Ernst Lanninger in Hörsching. In his letter to Bayer, he enclosed 25 florins, presumably his contribution to the expenses of Aichinger's funeral at which his Requiem was sung, and a reference in which he testified to Bayer's skills as conductor and organist.⁵⁰⁰ His letter to Lanninger, the parish priest of Hörsching, was probably in response to a request for information. He confirmed that his cousin, J.B. Weiß, had given him his first organ lessons in the years 1835-37 and made a particular request that Weiß be remembered during prayers in Mass.⁵⁰¹

A special '>Bruckner edition' of the *Österreichische Musik- und Theater-Zeitung* on 15 December must have brought the ailing composer particular pleasure. There were biographical contributions from Victor Boller, Theodor Helm and Victor Joss and articles on the Eighth Symphony by Helm and the F minor Mass by Brzetislav Lvovsky.⁵⁰² Bruckner was invited to attend the Christmas celebrations of the *Wiener Männergesangverein*, but we do not know if he was well enough to attend.⁵⁰³

On 5 January 1896, however, he was able to attend a Philharmonic concert in which his Fourth Symphony was performed. Most of the reviews were positive, but Max Kalbeck, writing in the *Wiener Tagblatt*, described the

Bruckner-Brief wurde versteigert', in *ABIL Mitteilungen* no.11 (June 2013), 14-15.

500 See also earlier reference to this letter (footnote 463). The text of Bruckner's reference can be found in *HSABB* 2, 325 and Carl H. Watzinger, '>Franz Bayer, ein Freund Anton Bruckners', in *Brucknerland. Mitteilungen des Brucknerbundes für Oberösterreich* 2/1975, 22. The original of this reference is in the *Kulturamt der Stadt Steyr*; there is a facsimile in Hans Hubert Schönzeler, *Bruckner* (Vienna, 1974), before p. 97.

501 See *HSABB* 2, 326 for Bruckner's letter to Lanninger; the original is in the *Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum*, Linz. An article, almost certainly by Lanninger, appeared in the *Linzer Volksblatt* 288 (14 December 1895). It concerned Bruckner's time in Hörsching and Johann Baptist Schiedermayr's high opinion of Weiß. The text can be found in 'Franz Zamazal, >Zeitgenössische Notizen über Anton Bruckner, Ludwig Edlbacher und Georg Huemer', in *BJ* 1991/92/93 (Linz, 1995), 200. See also Klaus Petermayr, 'Lanninger, Weiß und Bruckner', in *ABIL Mitteilungen* no.14 (December 2014), 16-17.

502 Extracts from some of the articles can be found in Claudia C. Röthig, '>Studien zur Systematik des Schaffens von Anton Bruckner', in *Göttinger musikwissenschaftliche Arbeiten* 9 (Göttingen/Kassel, 1978), 78-79, 104 and 119.

503 See *HSABB* 2, 326 for the invitation; the original is in St. Florian.

work as a >'product of fantastic arbitrariness, effusiveness and egotism, an ecstatic revelry of unclear feelings, a flood of frenzied thoughts alternating with fixed ideas...'⁵⁰⁴ Bruckner heard one of his own works – the *Te Deum* – for the last time at a *Gesellschaft* concert on 12 January which included works by Brahms and Herbeck.⁵⁰⁵ His final public appearance was at a special Palm Sunday concert given by the Philharmonic and the *Wiener Männergesangsverein* conducted by Hans Richter on 29 March.

As in 1895 there were several performances of his works inside and outside Austria during 1896. In Graz, Erich W. Degner repeated the success of 1895 (Third Symphony) with a performance of the First Symphony on 11 April.⁵⁰⁶ There were four performances of the Second Symphony (in Innsbruck, conducted by Josef Pembaur; in Brno, conducted by Otto Kitzler, 25 March; in Prague, conducted by Felix Dorfner, March; in Heidelberg, conducted by Philipp Wolfrum, 25 November), one of the Third (conducted by Joseph F. Hummel at a *Mozarteum* concert in Salzburg, 16 December), four of the Fourth (in Linz, conducted by Adalbert Schreyer, 25 March; in Frankfurt, 30 October; in Munich, conducted by Franz Fischer, November; in Leipzig, conducted Hans Sitt, 9 November), seven of the Seventh (in Stuttgart, conducted by Alois Obrist, 16 February [Adagio only]; in Troppau, conducted by Ludwig Grande, June; in Berlin, conducted by Nikisch, 26 October [Adagio only]; in Dresden, conducted by Louis Nicodé, 28 October

504 See G-A IV/3, 549-50 for extracts from this review, dated 8 January 1896. See also Theophil Antonicek, *BSL 1991*, 82ff. and Andrea Harrandt, *BSL 1991*, 68-69 for extracts from Josef Scheu's review in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (10 January) and Gustav Schönauich's review in the *Neue musikalische Presse* (12 January).

505 The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra and Chorus were conducted by Richard von Perger. Theodor Helm's review of the concert appeared in a supplement to the *Österreichische Musik- und Theater-Zeitung* 8 / 12-13, 10; see Gerold W. Gruber, *BSL 1983*, 214 for an extract. Hanslick devoted a single sentence to the *Te Deum* in his review in the *Neue Freie Presse* 11273 (17 January); see Theophil Antonicek, 'Wagner, Bruckner und die Wiener Musikwissenschaft', in *BSL 1984* (Linz, 1986), 72.

506 See Ingrid Schubert, *BSL 1984*, 39 for references to a review in the *Grazer Extrablatt* (13 April), Friedrich von Hausegger's review in the *Grazer Tagblatt* (13 April) and Victor Prochaska's review in the *Grazer Morgenpost* (14 April).

[Adagio only]; in Vienna, conducted by Hans Richter, 8 November; in Helsingfors, conducted by Robert Kajanus, 12 November; in Lucerne, conducted by Peter Fassbaender, 21 November [without the Adagio]), two performances of the String Quintet (both in Vienna - by the *Böhmisches Streichquartett*, 27 March,⁵⁰⁷ and the *Duisburg Quartet*, 23 November), two performances of the D minor Mass (in Steyr, conducted Franz Bayer, early April; in Graz, 22 December), a performance of two movements from the E minor Mass (the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, in a *Wagner-Verein* concert in Vienna, 19 March),⁵⁰⁸ three performances of the Requiem (in Steyr, conducted Franz Bayer, 23 May; in St. Florian, conducted Bernhard Deubler, 16 October; in Vienna, conducted Julius Böhm, 2 November) and another Viennese performance of the *Te Deum* (given by the *Laibacher Musikverein*, conducted by Matej Hubard (23 March). Several of these performances as well as others of the smaller sacred and secular works were occasioned, of course, by Bruckner's death in October and were a memorial tribute to him. Nevertheless, the undeniable increase in the number of performances reflects the willingness of conductors and orchestras to take advantage of the fact that more of Bruckner's works were now available in print. During 1896, for instance, the full score, parts and Joseph Schalk's four-hand piano arrangement of the Fifth Symphony and the score and, possibly, the vocal parts of the E minor Mass were published for the first time.⁵⁰⁹

Bruckner was unable to take up Kitzler's offer to attend the performance of his Second Symphony in Brno on 25 March. On hearing of the success of

507 According to Josef Suk, one of the members of the Quartet, he and Dvorák visited Bruckner and invited him to the performance (string sextets by Brahms and Dvorák were also included in the concert) - but he declined, because he was working on the Finale of the Ninth.

508 This is mentioned by Karl Pfannhauser in the second part of his article 'Zu Anton Bruckners Messe-Vertonungen', in *IBG Mitteilungsblatt* 26 (October 1985), 18. We can assume that Josef Schalk conducted these two movements with piano accompaniment (by Cyrill Hynais, whose piano score of the Mass was published by Doblinger in 1899?)

509 The forthcoming publication of the Fifth by Doblinger was advertised in Hofmeister's *Monthly Report of Music and Literature* in April 1896. The orchestral parts of the E minor Mass, also published by Doblinger, did not appear until 1899, however.

the performance, however, Bruckner wrote to his former teacher, congratulating him and mentioning that his health was deteriorating gradually.⁵¹⁰

In April Franz Bayer not only conducted a performance of Bruckner's D minor Mass in Steyr but took the composer's place at a baptismal service. Bruckner had agreed to become a godparent to his cousin Eduard Zachhuber's young son Anton but was not well enough to attend. Bruckner wrote to thank Bayer, enclosing five florins and sending his best wishes to young Anton and congratulations to Zachhuber.⁵¹¹ On 10 May the *Steyrer Zeitung* reported a visit by Bayer to Bruckner at the latter's specific request. Although out of bed, Bruckner spent most of the time in his armchair. Bayer also provided the information that Bruckner had probably sketched the last movement of the Ninth Symphony in full but no longer held out any hope of his being able to 'fully elaborate' it.⁵¹² Bruckner wrote to Bayer again at the end of May to thank his friend for performing his Requiem at the funeral service of Archduke Karl Ludwig on 23 May.⁵¹³

By the middle of May visits of friends and well-wishers were now strictly limited on his doctor's advice.⁵¹⁴ His housekeeper, Kathi Kachelmayr, had

510 See *HSABB* 2, 329 for Kitzler's invitation, dated Brno, 20 March 1896, and Bruckner's letter to Kitzler, dated Vienna, 27 March 1896; the original of Kitzler's letter is in St. Florian, but the original of Bruckner's letter, first published in *ABB*, 292 (with the addressee given erroneously as Bayer) is not extant. Kitzler visited Bruckner during the last months of his life; see *G-A* IV/3, 566.

511 See *HSABB* 2, 331 for this letter, dated Vienna, 17 April 1896. It was first published in *ABB*, 292-93; the original is not extant.

512 *Steyrer Zeitung*, 'Lokalnachrichten' 38/3; also published in the *Linzer Volksblatt* (12 May 1896). See John Phillips, *BJ* 1989/90, 136 for reference to this article.

513 Mentioned in *G-A* IV/3, 557; no date given.

514 See footnote 507 for reference to a visit from Dvorák and Suk at the end of March. Grieg was also in Vienna at about the same time. He attended a concert of the *Männergesangverein* on 22 March and gave a recital on 24 March. See *G-A* IV/3, 555 for details of a short visit to Bruckner in the company of Julius Epstein.

been staying overnight for some time and she was now assisted by her daughter, Ludowika Kutschera. Ignaz also came from St. Florian to spend some time with his brother. On 9 May, Josef Schalk informed his brother that he had visited Bruckner the previous day. Although terribly emaciated, Bruckner had enough spirit to send his best wishes to Franz.⁵¹⁵ In spite of his deteriorating physical condition Bruckner seems to have been genuinely pleased to see his visitors.⁵¹⁶

At the beginning of July serious pneumonia took its toll on Bruckner. He was confined to bed and, on Ignaz's advice, took the last rites on the 17th. Bruckner rallied again and began to show clear signs of improvement. On 30 July he sent his best wishes to Ignaz on his name-day. A fortnight later he wrote with some concern to Josef Gruber at St. Florian to ascertain why Ignaz, who was now back in St. Florian, had not replied to his letter and another two letters sent to him.⁵¹⁷

There was another noticeable improvement in Bruckner's condition during August. He was able to spend longer periods out of bed and even to go for short walks. Dr. Heller was confident enough to go on holiday >with an 'easy conscience'. But there was a relapse during September and by the end of the month he was in a critical condition. On the 24th Josef Schalk reported to Franz that the composer was extremely ill and increasingly afflicted with religious mania. He dared not enter Bruckner's room because of the

515 See *LBSAB*, 203 for a reference to this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/17/17.

516 See *G-A IV/3*, 567, note 1 for a list of friends who visited Bruckner during this period; *G-A IV/3*, 569 for Eckstein's account of a visit by Hugo Wolf; *G-A IV/3*, 564 and 570-71 for extracts from Dr. Heller's letters to his wife (9 July - 14 August) in which the composer's ailing health is mentioned; and *G-A IV/3*, 569 for the 'certificate of health' which Heller prepared for Bruckner on 20 July as a means of reassuring him.

517 See *HSABB* 2, 332 for Bruckner's first letter to Ignaz and his letter to Gruber, dated Vienna, 11 August 1896; the original of the former, first published in *ABB*, 293, is not extant, and the original of the latter is in the *ÖNB*.

distressing effect it would have on him. He asked his brother to make sure that he performed the Fifth in Prague before Weingartner in Berlin and Richter in Vienna.⁵¹⁸

Bruckner's last letter, a very brief >'farewell', was sent to his brother Ignaz and Karl Aigner in St. Florian.⁵¹⁹ His final diary entry of prayers, in *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- u. Lehrer-Kalender für das Schuljahr 1894/95*, was for 10 October, the day before his death.⁵²⁰ On 11 October worked on the Finale of his Ninth during the morning and even planned to take a short walk in the afternoon, but he passed away peacefully at 3.00.⁵²¹ An obituary speech was given by the Mayor of Vienna at the beginning of a council meeting on Tuesday 13 October. The council resolved to pay the costs of the funeral cortege which took place the following day and was followed by a service at the *Karlskirche*.⁵²² Bruckner's wish to be buried underneath the great organ at St. Florian was fulfilled on 15 October. Ferdinand Moser, the

518 See *HSABB* 2, 334 for this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/17/25. See also *HSABB* 2, 335 for an anonymous account of a visit to Bruckner during the last days of his life; the original is owned by the Hueber family.

519 See *HSABB*, 337 for this letter, dated Vienna, 7 October 1896. There is a facsimile of this letter between pages 328 and 329 in *G-A II/1* and a facsimile of part of the letter in *ABA*, 47; the original is privately owned.

520 There is a facsimile of Bruckner's prayer entries from 28 September to 10 October 1896 in *G-A IV/4*, after page 24. See also *MVP* 1, 496 and 2, 414.

521 See *G-A IV/3*, 574-75 for an account of Bruckner's last day, drawn from the reminiscences of Anton Meißner and Kathi Kachelmayr.

522 See *G-A IV/3*, 579-93 for details of the many individuals and organizations at the funeral as well as the music sung and played which included an excerpt from Bruckner's *Germanenzug* (*Akademische Gesangverein* and a horn quartet from the Vienna Philharmonic, conducted by Josef Neubauer) and the Adagio from Bruckner's Seventh Symphony (arranged for brass by Löwe and played by the brass section of the Vienna Philharmonic, conducted by Hans Richter). See also Steffen Lieberwirth, *ABDS* 6, 82ff. for reports in the *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten* and *Leipziger Tageblatt* (15 October), Manfred Wagner, *Bruckner*, 221 and *passim* for reports and references to reports in several newspapers, including the *Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt*, *Reichspost*, *Linzer Tagespost*, *Linzer Volksblatt*, and Renate Grasberger, >'Bruckner-Bibliographie', in *ABDS* 4 (Graz, 1985) for references to many other reports.

provost of St. Florian, officiated at the service, Josef Gruber played the organ, the abbey choir, conducted by Deubler, sang Bruckner's *Libera me* WAB 22 and *Frohsinn* from Linz performed a choral piece by Mendelssohn.⁵²³

Obituary notices in Austrian and foreign papers testify to the high esteem in which the composer was held.⁵²⁴ There are also letters written by friends that refer to Bruckner's death.⁵²⁵ Perhaps the most poignant is Wolf's letter to Hugo Faißt in which he relates how he stood at the door of the *Karlskirche* so that he could join the funeral procession, but was turned away because he could not prove that he was a member of the *Singverein*.⁵²⁶

523 See G-A II/1, 329-32 for the report in the *Linzer Volksblatt* (15 October) and Manfred Wagner, *Bruckner*, 225-28 for the report in the *Linzer Tagespost* (16 October). Facsimiles of this report and another report the following day (17 October) in the *Linz Tagespost* can be found in Franz Zamazal, '>Familie Bruckner: Biographische Konturen aufgrund von Pfarrmatrikeln', in *BJ 1997-2000* (Linz, 2002), 204-07.

524 Only a few can be mentioned here. They include the obituaries in *Die Presse* (Gustav Schönaich [?], 12 October), the *Deutsches Volksblatt* (Camillo Horn, 12 October; see Manfred Wagner, *Bruckner*, 324-25), *Neue Freie Presse* (Richard Heuberger, 13 October; see Manfred Wagner, *Bruckner*, 313-16), *Leipziger Volkszeitung* (>'H.M.', 13 October; see Lieberwirth, *ABDS* 6, 82-83), *Linzer Tagespost* (13 October; see Manfred Wagner, '>Die Nekrologe von 1896: rezeptionstiftend? - oder Wie Klischees von Anton Bruckner entstanden', in *Musik-Konzepte* 23/24 [Munich, 1982], 120ff.), *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung* (Albert Kauders, 13 October; see Wagner, *Musik-Konzepte*, 134f-35), *Deutsche Zeitung* (Theodor Helm, 13 October), *Wiener Zeitung* (Robert Hirschfeld, 13 October) and *Fremdenblatt* (Ludwig Speidel, 16 October; see Wagner, *Bruckner*, 319-20 for extract). Theodor Helm also contributed a biographical article to the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* on 17 December and Robert Hirschfeld was responsible for subsequent Bruckner articles in both the *Wiener Zeitung* and the *Wiener Abendpost*, for instance a lengthy article in the latter on 21 November in which he assessed Bruckner's place in the history of music and said that his music represented a 'fusion of the >strictly Classical, extravagantly Romantic and modern dramatic influences.' Josef Schalk paid his own personal tribute in his Annual Report for the *Wagner-Verein*; see G-A IV/3, 601-02. In his obituary notice in the *Musical Times* xxxvii / 645 (1 November 1896), 742, the writer alluded to Bruckner's lack of recognition in Britain, contrasting this with the situation in Austria and Germany where the composer's name was one >'around which some fierce, if bloodless, battles have been fought.'

525 See Scheder, 'Telegramme an Anton Bruckner', p.12 for details of a telegram dated 16 October 1896 sent by Hans von Wolzogen in Bayreuth.

526 This letter to Faißt is dated Vienna, 25 October 1896. In an earlier letter to Heinrich Potpeschnigg, dated Vienna, 12 October 1896, Wolf claims that people still have no

A particularly fitting student memorial gathering in honour of Bruckner was held by the *Wiener Akademischer Gesangverein* on 28 October. Speeches in tribute to Bruckner were given by the president, Franz Schaumann, and the rector of the University, Professor Simon Reinisch.⁵²⁷

There is a gap in the Schalk brothers' correspondence in October, so we have no record of their initial reaction to his death. Josef wrote to Franz on 8 November, mentioning the wreath he had bought on Franz's behalf, another wreath which Cosima Wagner had sent to St. Florian, and referring to the memorial concert given earlier that day by Hans Richter and the Philharmonic (a performance of Bruckner's Seventh), which had been acclaimed by all accounts, but he had been unable to attend himself because of his '>continuing poor state of health.' Josef was concerned that this was the only memorial concert which had been planned - neither the *Singverein* nor the *Wagner-Verein* was offering anything - and hoped that the old idea of Franz and the Prague orchestra performing the Fifth in Vienna could be revived - '>in January, if possible, as the Berlin Philharmonic is coming later.'⁵²⁸ But it was Ferdinand Löwe, who had already conducted the work in Budapest and Munich, who gave the first Viennese performance on the Fifth on 1 March 1898. Franz Schalk conducted the work in Prague during 1898 but did not perform it in Vienna until 28 November 1909.

Right up until a few hours before his death Bruckner worked slowly and fitfully on his Ninth Symphony. The amplification of particell material into full score seems to have happened quite quickly. For his full score Bruckner

conception of Bruckner's importance; see *ABA*, 99. The *Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek* owns the originals of two letters sent to Theodor Helm, the first dated Dresden, 14 October 1896 (sent by Louis Nicodé), the second dated Vienna, 27 October (sent by Oskar Beggrün).

527 See *G-A* IV/3, 603ff. for an extract from the Annual Report of the *Akademischer Gesangverein*.

528 See *LBSAB*, 204 for an extract from this letter; the original is in the *ÖNB*, F18 Schalk 158/17/28.

used a *Bogen* or double sheet of 24-stave paper, numbering the right-hand corner of the top page and proceeding from one *Bogen* to the next rather than >'interleaving' them. Each page usually has four bars, and thus each *Bogen* sixteen bars. For the first few *Bogen* Bruckner himself ruled the pages into bars and listed the instruments in the left-hand margin. The preparation of later *Bogen* was carried out by someone else, probably Meißner.⁵²⁹ The first 1896 date to appear in the material is >'14 Jänner' on Mus. Hs. 6085 / 77r. There are no other dates until May which suggests that the obvious decline in Bruckner's health between January and May inevitably slowed down the creative process. There are three sketches, probably for the coda, which almost certainly date from the end of May. On one of them, a particell sketch of a 24-bar passage, three dates appear, >'21. Donnerstag, 22. Freitag, 23. Samstag'; underneath, beside what is probably an earlier draft of the same passage, is the note '>Nacht von Don[nerstag] auf Fr[ei]tag.' On the last date to be recorded in the manuscript material – '11 August' - Bruckner was obviously well enough to draft some bars in the development section. By this point, however, he had certainly resigned himself to the fact that he would never complete the movement. To those who visited him a month or so before his death, for example Carl Almeroth and Adalbert von Goldschmidt, he invariably suggested that the *Te Deum* would form the best conclusion under the circumstances; and, indeed, there are indications in the score of possible >'entry points' for the *Te Deum*. It was not until a week after Bruckner's death that any attempt was made to bring some order into the somewhat chaotic state in which the manuscripts had been left. According to Richard Heller, both the >'authorized and unauthorized had swooped down like vultures upon their prey'⁵³⁰ and

529 Most of these *Bogen* are in the ÖNB, sign. nos. Mus. Hss. 6085, 6087 and 19.645.

530 Quoted by Auer, >in 'Anton Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt', 35.

had removed various manuscripts, including some sheets from the Finale. This made it well-nigh impossible for the executors of Bruckner's estate to make a proper inventory. According to a deposition made on 18 October and signed by Theodor Reisch, Ferdinand Löwe and Josef Schalk, Schalk was given the task of sifting through the existing 75 double sheets of Finale sketches and putting them in order.⁵³¹

531 See G-A IV/3, 608 for the text of this deposition. Ill health prevented Schalk from completing this task. It was not until 1934 that an attempt was made by Alfred Orel (see below) to publish some of the drafts and sketches of the Finale. As more sketches have come to light since then, other attempts have been made by Bruckner scholars, notably William Carragan (see below) and John Phillips (see below) to create performing versions of the movement. For further information, consult the following: Alfred Orel, >Skizzen zum 4. Satz von Bruckners 9. Symphonie, in *Der Merker* 12 (1921), 411-19; idem, ed., *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie* (Vienna, 1934); Oskar Lang, >'Die Entwürfe zum Finale der IX. Symphonie Anton Bruckners', in *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 61 (1934), 445ff.; H.F. Redlich, >'The Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony', in *The Monthly Musical Record* 79 (1949), 143-49; Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca (transl. Katherine S. Wolfthal), *Introduction to the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony* (Milan, 1986); William Carragan, foreword to his completion of the Finale of the Ninth [1983] (New York: Bruckner Archive, 1987; revised 2003, 2006, 2007, 2010 and 2017)); Hartmut Krones, >'Symposium zur AFertigstellung@ von Bruckners IX. Symphonie im Österreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rom', in *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 42 (1987), 521f.; Frank J. Plash, >'Zur Aufführung des rekonstruierten Finale von Bruckners Neunten Sinfonie', in *BJ 1984/85/86* (Linz, 1988), 154 [report of a performance of William Carragan's reconstruction from the sketches of the Finale of the Ninth in the Carnegie Hall, New York on 8 January 1984]; Cornelis van Zwol, >'Der Finalsatz der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners. Ein Referat in Utrecht (15. November 1986). Ein Symposium in Rom (11. bis 12. Mai 1987)', in *BJ 1987/88* (Graz, 1990), 31-38 [a survey of various attempts at the reconstruction of the movement since the publication of the sketches by Alfred Orel in the first Complete Edition (1934), with particular reference to Carragan's and Samale / Mazzuca's]; idem, >'Die Vollendung bei Anton Bruckner - Der Finalsatz seiner IX. Symphonie, *Fragment or Completion*', in *Proceedings of the Mahler X Symposium Utrecht 1986* (Rotterdam, 1991), 193-205; John A. Phillips, >'Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners', in *BJ 1989/90* (Vienna, 1992), 115-203; idem, >'Zum leidigen Thema "Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners"', in *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 47/1 (1992), 22-25; Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Giuseppe Mazzuca (and with the assistance of Gunnar Cohrs), *Anton Bruckner IX. Symphonie D-Moll Finale. Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen. Aufführungsfassung. Studienpartitur* (Adelaide, 1992; revised 1996, 2005, 2007 and 2012); John A. Phillips, ed., *IX Symphonie D-Moll Finale (Unvollendet). Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen. Studienpartitur. ABSW zu Band IX* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1994); John A. Phillips, ed., *IX. Symphonie D-Moll Finale. Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten, ABSW zu Band IX* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1996); William Carragan, >'Structural Aspects of the Revision of Bruckner's Symphonic Finales', in *BSL 1996* (Linz, 1998), 177-88; William Carragan, Gunnar Cohrs, John A. Phillips, Herbert Vogg, Franz Zamazal, >'Round-table: 'Zum Finale Neuausgabe der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners', in *Mitteilungsblatt der IBG* 55 (December 2000), 18-

In his will Bruckner made gifts of 4000 florins to St. Florian, 300 florins to Steyr Parish Church, and 700 florins to Kathi Kachelmayr. The original manuscripts of most of his works were entrusted to the Imperial Court Library, but some were given to institutions and individuals. The lack of a proper inventory meant that no distinction could be made between the 'authorized' and the 'unauthorized', an unfortunate situation which led to many problems later. The rest of Bruckner's estate was divided between Ignaz Bruckner and Rosalie Hueber and her heirs. At the end of the year, Ignaz wrote to Rosalie concerning the division of the estate and said that she should hold on to some documents that were of no interest to either Linz or Vienna, because 'a time would probably come when they would be of some value', a prophetic comment and one which has inspired many, including the author of this documentary study, to investigate further and learn more about Bruckner the man and the musician. *Ad maiorem Dei gloriam.*

© Crawford Howie rev. September 2021

20; John A. Phillips, 'The facts behind a "legend": the Ninth Symphony and the Te Deum' in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 270-81; idem, *Anton Bruckner IX. Symphonie D-Moll Finale (Unvollendet). Dokumentation des Fragments* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1999/2002); idem, *Bruckner's Ninth Revisited. Towards the Re-Evaluation of a Four-Movement Symphony*. Ph.D. thesis (Adelaide University, 2002); Rainer Boss, 'Symphonische Gestaltung und Fuge. Zum Finale-Fragment der Neunten Symphonie', in *BJ 1997-2000* (Linz, 2002), 7-15; John A. Phillips, *ibid.*, 17-29. Other completions of the Finale have been provided by Ernst Märzendorfer (1969), Nors Josephson (1992), Jacques Roelands (2003; rev. 2014), Roberto Ferrazza (2017) and Gerd Schaller (2015; rev. 2018). See also various articles on the Ninth, the Finale in particular, by Benjamin Cohrs, John A. Phillips, Constantin Floros, Hartmut Krones, Cornelis van Zwol, Franz Zamazal, Manfred Wagner and Nicolaus Harnoncourt, in *Bruckners Neunte im Fegefeuer der Rezeption*, ed. B.G. Cohrs, Heinz-Klaus Metzger and Rainer Riehn (Munich, 2003).