

FOREWORD

(Thou shalt respect the Lord's word, but thou shalt not cling to words.)

Martin Luther.

It has been about 70 years since Bruckner's Symphonies have been published in the so called 'Original Versions'. The First Prints, used until that time, are now nearly completely forgotten in musical practice. The editing of the Old Bruckner Complete Edition (OBCE) by Robert Haas and Alfred Orel began in 1929 and ten years, in a very fluent manner, all the Symphonies (except Symphonies 7 and 3) were already published. Even during World War II, in spite of great difficulties, the Symphony No. 7 and the E Minor and F Minor Masses were printed.

The delay in editing the Third Symphony had many reasons. The main reason was that Bruckner's manuscripts were dispersed all over the world. Alma Maria Mahler-Werfel had taken a manuscript when she emigrated (1938); Franz Schalk's widow Lilly Schalk, refused to allow an inspection of the 'Stichvorlage' (Engraver's Copy) until 1954 when this very important score was finally given to the Austrian National Library. Thus the first Version, the Ur-Version should become engraved after Wagner's Dedication Copy, found very surprisingly in 1938 at the Bayreuth Archives. After the war, only a few proof-reading copies survived, but in 1946 Joseph Keilberth conducted the first performance in Dresden. In 1950, under very hard circumstances associated with the post war era, Fritz Oeser published a carefully prepared new edition of the First Print (2nd Version). Now, wider circles could learn about this important score of Bruckner's 3rd Symphony. In 1950 Oeser unfortunately still had no access to the manuscript sources, therefore the Coda, originally found in the Scherzo, remained omitted; for Bruckner himself had cut the coda in 1878 before printing. Oeser's edition is a good 'working score' and he himself regarded his own edition as 'provisory'.

In 1958 the 3rd Version was printed by the New Bruckner Complete Edition (NBCE), the 1st and 2nd Version followed respectively in 1977 and 1980. This Edition included for the first time the recently found Coda of the Scherzo, but Bruckner himself had not wanted the Coda to be printed since the coda is seen as being musically more 'pale'.

I should add that in 1961, Eulenburg published a new edition of the 3rd Version's First Print that contained a nice foreword by the editor, Hans Ferdinand Redlich.

All editions, mentioned above are of the highest quality. Only a few very small differences exist between the two editions of 2nd Version (Oeser 1950 and Nowak 1980) but Nowak did not accept that Bruckner's changes, made for the 1878/79 printing are an authentic 'last version'; and the New Complete Edition should supersede it. Also, it was clearly shown that the differences between Bruckner's Stichvorlage (engraver's copy) (ed. Nowak 1958) and the 3rd Version's First Print, differed very slightly. Probably Bruckner himself accepted the final changes and they are very helpful.

Soon after the publication of the first Original Versions, the 3rd Symphony became regarded with great scepticism; the well known 1889/1890 Version didn't please any more. The Finale is in some details not written by Bruckner himself, but many conductors still prefer this version. In spite of great concerns and objections it seems to have more verve. The 2nd Version, accepted mostly by connoisseurs, has wonderful details, but the length of the Adagio and Finale, lacking real musical tension, are not convincing. This Version sounds a little bit like the 2nd Symphony, and too many 'Generalpauses' remain its weakest point.

Hans Ferdinand Redlich suggested in 1961 in his foreword of the 3rd Version, a "**Seventh final version**". (*It is not impossible that only a seventh final version, which will unite the achievements and characteristics of each its predecessors may become the universally accepted performing version of the future.*) Redlich's idea has now become a reality.

Critical Complete Editions cannot offer such scores. Their raison d'être is to publish impartial autographs and other authentic sources. Only a few exceptions are possible. But in musical practice often mixed opera versions are to be found. Some well known examples are: Moussorgsky's "Boris Godunov", (Pavel Lamm's Edition); Wagner's "Tannhäuser" (Adaption by Clemens Krauss) and Mozart's "Don Giovanni" (Prague and Vienna Version mixed). These versions are made by practical experiences and are useful, for many alterations done by the composers were forced by massive pressure and not made voluntarily. These scores show again the true nature and offer the pure idea.

For my work I used all published scores. Thomas Röder's 'Revisionsbericht' of all three versions (C.E. Editor's Note) fortunately appeared in 1997; but was not known to me when I wrote the first manuscripts of my performing version. The 'Notes' show clearly that Bruckner's own handwriting is not free from 'prompting'. For my work the 'Notes' were without great importance. I worked in a 'musical No Man's Land' between theory and practical music making. With pragmatic intentions I choose the 'Endfassung' (3rd Version) as basis for work.

My intention in detail were as follows:

1 Formal reconstruction.

Many of Schalk's cuts, partially suggested by Bruckner himself, are well done. But the Recapitulation without main Theme and 3rd Theme is lacking. Here I choose the complete 2nd Version arranged in some details according to the Last Version. Bruckner here tried to combine (meld together) the Development and Recapitulation not unlike the 7th Symphony for getting a clearly shorter Version. But this did not work well for the completely different music of the 3rd Symphony. (Ferdinand Löwe's similar shortening of the 4th Symphony's Finale is better done and Bruckner accepted it. Löwe did sensitive and good work, quite contrary to Schalk, who even composed rather unconcerned his own 'bridge', Bruckner of course rejected it.) Even Mahler's proposal for a shorter Version of the First Print's Finale is much better than the actual solution suggested by Franz Schalk. Beginning from rehearsal letter **Bb** a very special way had to be found seeming to me as the only possible way, for the First Print remained too long and the Last Version much too short.

2 Changes in orchestration.

Schalk's retouching cannot be overlooked. Along with retouches, demonstrating great craftsmanship (e.g. **Uu f.**, woodwind) you can find many alterations, beginning with softening dynamics (**mf**, **poco forte**, ect.) and ending with massive rescoring. Instead of rhythmically structured chords we hear 'plane sounds'. The influence, the pressure of the arrangers was, as well known, so strong that even the manuscript isn't free from 'prompting'. These 'thinnings' were given up and the articulation mark according to Bruckner's manner became restored; so we achieved a 'Bruckner-like' score.

Bruckner's early works (Symphony No. 0 and others) are full of endless syncopations. Good orchestras nowadays handle this rhythmic problems quite well, but the effect to the listener is very unsatisfactory, especially when the 'afterbeating Bass' is played. Played by a piano it sounds very effective, but played by an orchestra, it mostly sounds wrong. The syncopated trombones you can hear in the finale are a good example. Many listeners thought in the past that the trombones 'play false notes'.

In his mature works, beginning with the 4th Symphony, Bruckner avoided the syncopations and used with great effect the typical 'Bruckner-tremolo'. Inserts, written for the End-Version (1889/90) only show tremolo. After long reflections I decided to replace all syncopations by tremolos and re-

store the bars at the rehearsal numbers **K,L,M,Z**, after the 2nd Version (3rd Theme). The Brass instruments get back their ‘thematic nucleus’ and the strings now play the important **Unisono** tremolo. For the First Print (1878/79) Bruckner unfortunately omitted at the recapitulation the nucleus. I restored ‘per analogiam’.

3 Compilations between 2nd and 3rd Version.

The second print (1890) (v. C.E. III/3.) shows clearly that the editors overtook some parts from the first print – something astonishing. (First Bruckner became forced to change the score although the ‘old score’ was a good one.) Seen from a musical view the restoring was good, the bars have a better effect in the original manner. Therefore in the now existing ‘performing score’ both versions became mixed whenever it seemed to be useful. Often Bruckner ‘bended’ (Oeser), along with very good alterations, the straight voice leading of the original 2nd Version. This has been corrected.

Haas’ intention was to restore scores by earlier versions, written without strange influence, and to keep the ‘true sense and sound’. But after WW II Haas, who was the real pioneer in editing Bruckner’s original scores, came under attack. His carefully prepared editions suddenly were no longer regarded as ‘scientific’. But many conductors still prefer Haas’ scores for their musical quality and coherent texture.

A ‘final performing version’ only was possible, for Bruckner, under great pains, finally found in this 3rd Symphony his musical language. The thematic power is so strong, it allowed for a third arrangement undertaken from 1888 until 1890. Many alterations, cuts and emendations are well done, except in the Scherzo and the Finale. All versions together with the orchestral parts now are easily available, but only a good version remains popular. For some revisions aren’t successful: the ‘Linz Version’ of the 1st Symphony did put away for a long time the very popular ‘Vienna Version’.

The first three movements of the ‘Performing Version’ have the same formal structure as the 3rd Version (Endfassung). The Scherzo gets back the clear powerful orchestration of the first print, typical of Bruckner. But for the Finale a different way had to be found. The massive cuts - about 150 bars (!) being omitted – needed restoration and the orchestration restored in the manner of Bruckner’s orchestration we know well from his other symphonies.

This score is dedicated to the memory of Robert Haas, the meritorious pioneer of the Bruckner Complete Edition. Because of the very unhappy circumstances of his time, he couldn’t edit, as he wanted, the Third Symphony in all versions. The first version, already engraved, was lost during the war and only a few proof prints survive. Haas’ work remained a torso and after WW II he was prevented from finishing the Complete Edition in a rather ugly manner. To him, who had the fine feeling for Bruckner’s ‘true sense and sound’, I posthumously dedicate this new score. I am sure that Haas, besides the careful editing of all authentic sources, might also have published a ‘performing version’ for musical practice.

Personally I have to thank two men:

To my worshipped teacher Wolfgang Edward Rebner, who taught me to recognise mistakes of beloved persons (and musical works), without giving up the love for them. And Peter Jona Korn, who always was convinced of the fact “...*playing Bruckner in that version that is the best one.*”

This score would not have been possible without the hard work of Fritz Oeser and Leopold Nowak in publishing all the scores and the voluminous ‘Revisionbericht’ (Editor’s Notes) that Nowak couldn’t finish. Thomas Roeder concluded the book in 1997 – a real Sisyphus-work. I have the greatest admiration for his compendium, containing all the dispersed documents, drafts etc., in

'legible' form. Oeser's publications were very important for me, containing fundamental information about Bruckner's music.

Last, but not least Hans Ferdinand Redlich encouraged me with his idea of a "7th Final Version". Redlich has done much for Bruckner's music in English speaking countries and all his books, publications and edited scores are worth being read.

Joseph K a n z .

Wiesbaden, January 2005.

I thank John F. Berky for his help in improving my English version.

Postscript 2008: Prof. Dr. Vogg (Vienna) wrote me several times that there was absolutely no animosity between Haas and Nowak. They had sometimes quite different scientific opinions, but they respected and understood each other. Vogg never heard any bad words about Haas from Nowak, not even commentaries about his political opinion. These facts should become more known.

Haas had to give up his position as Director of the Austrian National Library **only for political reasons**, and Nowak had to begin at point ZERO. Both editors did a good job.

The unusual situation after 1945 gave Haas no chance, and even in the 90's in Austria he seemed to be a 'persona non grata'. The New Edition of the F Minor Mass is the first, accepting the fundamental work of Haas.

Without Robert Haas' work, there would not be a Complete Edition.

Joseph K a n z .

The Study Score (published 2005) offers an earlier, slightly different Version. The Conductor's Score has no Foreword, only the Introduction.

Editor's Notes

This score is a practical performing version, thus brackets or different letter type does not indicate most emendations and alterations. Details of editorial work can be seen in my 'Vorlagenbericht' [Editor's Notes] and are indicated by an (*). Some alternative or optional parts, mostly taken from the second print (1890) are indicated in special case. Important differences became indicated in following manner:

Round bracket; Emendations taken from the first print (1878) and other authentic sources. (Ur-Version (1873), credible copies etc.): (*lang gezogen*).

Fraktur (Old German Black Letter Type); Marks in Bruckner's own conductor's score (Handexemplar) and other remarks, hitherto not found in prints: **Auf das leiseste ohne alle Anschwellung.**

Round bracket and bold Type; Emendations, taken from the second print (1890): (**breit**),

and finally:

Handwriting type; Editor's proposals: *deutlich*.

Further proposals and remarks of the editor were printed in bold *italics*, as a footnote, or in pointed brackets < a2 >.

The setting of accidentals (flats and sharps, accents and other graphic details) sometimes a little bit differs between score and parts. For performing musicians clear legible notes are more important than observation of all sophisticated engraver's rules.

The TREBLE-clef, sounding *8va bassa*, used by Bruckner for high notes of Cello's (and sometimes even Double Basses), generally became replaced in the parts by the common TENOR-Clef. The score but shows the original, in Bruckner's days already becoming more and more obsolete notation.

The parts even of the 3rd & 4th Horn are written in F, the Trombones got the Bass clef, but the 1st (Alto) Trombone is also printed in the Alto clef. The Trumpet parts are in Bb as well in the original F-Notation.

Joseph K a n z .