The Musical Quarterly 80 (1996)

Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich and After: An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception

Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt

I do not believe that we as yet know how to think what Nazism is.
Jacques Derrida, The Ear of the Other

It is no secret that Anton Bruckner figured importantly in the cultural pantheon of National Socialism.[1] Like many other German-speaking artists of the past, Bruckner was exploited by the Nazi cultural program. Both the image of Bruckner and his music were imagined to exemplify the essence of Aryan art and were thus enlisted in the campaign to legitimate Nazism. The outlines of this dark chapter in the history of Bruckner reception are well documented.[2] Bruckner's music was featured at overtly political events; each of Hitler's cultural speeches at the Nuremberg rallies, for example, was preceded by the performance of a movement from a Bruckner symphony.[3] Radio broadcasts were announced with the trumpet theme that opens Bruckner's Third Symphony.[4] The Nazi government sponsored numerous Bruckner festivals.[5] Hitler even hoped to hold an annual Bruckner festival in St. Florian that would rival the prestigious Bayreuth Festival. Although these plans were never fulfilled, in 1943 the Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester of Linz was formed for this purpose.[6] Such crass political exploitation of "German" culture was characteristic of National Socialism; yet the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner was extreme even by the standards of its time and place. As Mathias Hansen put it, Bruckner, even more than Wagner or Strauss, was "occupied by fascist ideology."[7]

A number of coincidental circumstances fueled the National Socialist appropriation of Bruckner. Bruckner's music fit Nazi aesthetic desiderata: with its monumental sweep, its outwardly clear and balanced formal outlines, its chorale-like passages, and its prominent use

of brass instruments, it was easily heard as profoundly "German" music untainted by decadent cosmopolitanism. Adolf Hitler publicly declared his fondness for Bruckner's music, and seems to have identified personally with the composer: not only were both he and Bruckner born in Upper Austria, but Hitler imagined that his own unsuccessful attempts to establish himself as an artist in Vienna paralleled Bruckner's ambivalent reception by the Viennese music community. With characteristic paranoia, Hitler ascribed both his and Bruckner's difficulties in Vienna largely to the hostility of the Jewish Viennese establishment.[8] In addition, the tenor of Bruckner criticism in the 1920s and 1930s facilitated the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner. Bruckner had been an icon for conservative and reactionary elements in Austrian society since the 1890s.[9] By the early part of this century the image of Bruckner and his music had become identified with militaristic, feudalistic, and nationalistic tendencies.[10] This pattern of reception only intensified after the First World War; the Bruckner literature of the 1920s is shot through with antimodern mythologizing and partisan rhetoric.[11] The consistent rightward slant of much, if not most, Bruckner reception in the early decades of the twentieth century effectively prepared the ground for developments in the Third Reich.

These conditions—consideration of musical style, Hitler's personal predilections, and trends in Bruckner criticism—certainly did facilitate the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner. Taken by themselves, however, they are insufficient to explain the trajectory of Bruckner reception in the Third Reich; something else was at work. We can only make sense of these developments if we account for the dark political ideology that informed them. Consider the enshrinement of Bruckner in Walhalla, an ersatz nineteenth-century Parthenon built by Ludwig I of Bavaria, during the Regensburg Bruckner Festival of June 1937.[12] At the culmination of the ceremony, Hitler personally consecrated the new bust of Bruckner by laying a laurel wreath at the foot of its pedestal.[13] One observer characterized Hitler's gesture as "an elevated symbol of the unlimited solidarity of the Führer and the German people."[14] In reciprocation for the honor granted to Bruckner, Max Auer, the president of the Internationale Bruckner Gesellschaft, presented Hitler with the society's first *Ehrenmedaille*, describing it as "a small token of our deep gratitude for the admission of the bust of Bruckner to Walhalla."[15]

The symbolism of these events was glossed in no uncertain terms by the other speakers at the festival. In his address at the unveiling ceremony, Joseph Goebbels claimed Bruckner as a mystical symbol of German destiny.[16] "As a son of the Austrian soil," Goebbels said,

"Anton Bruckner is a particularly apt symbol of the spiritual and emotional community of destiny, insoluble even to this day, that unites the entire German people." His installation in Walhalla was "a symbolic event of more than simply artistic significance for us."[17] The comments of Peter Raabe, the head of the Reichsmusikkammer, painted a less overtly political, yet still tendentious, picture of Bruckner's personality and his historical position.[18] He depicted Bruckner as an artist out of step with the negative tendencies of his epoch: a simple man in an era of pretentious and cultured artists, a mystically religious man in an age of secularism—in short, a healthy man in a decadent world. As a result of its lack of artifice and its ideal genuineness, Bruckner's music was able to express something essentially German: "Therefore, for those who are receptive to them, listening to these works is something more than simply enjoying art: it is a return to the 'mother lodes,' to the sources of feeling, to which no thinking can lead, nor knowledge and research, rather only the Will, small before the infiniteness of creation but great in its striving after good."[19]

The speeches by Goebbels and Raabe, like the agenda of the Regensburg festival as a whole, are so transparently political that the temptation is strong to dismiss the entire event as nothing more than politically expedient propaganda. While it is true that Nazism exploited Bruckner—among others—for political purposes, it is not sufficient to leave the analysis at that. The enshrinement of Bruckner in Walhalla *was* politically expedient, and it was a perverse misappropriation of the composer. But it was more than that: far from being an eccentric or isolated event, the Walhalla ceremony was a public performance of the ideology that subtended German Bruckner reception between 1933 and 1945.[20] It is in the nature of performances to focus ideological energy and to represent it in a desired form. As Richard Poirier wrote, a performance is an "exercise of power" that produces "a form that presumes to compete with reality itself for control of the mind exposed to it."[21] The goal of this essay is to uncover something of this ideological underpinning in the hope of understanding an important phase of the genealogy of modern Bruckner reception. Since current views of Bruckner are still shadowed by traditions of reception that crystallized under National Socialism, this history has immediate pertinence. Ultimately this project means to clear the way for more critical and sensitive approaches to the composer. We may not, *pace* Derrida, "know how to think what Nazism is"; but by patiently unraveling how National Socialism appropriated Bruckner and his music, we might grasp the conceptual dynamics that governed Bruckner reception in the Third Reich.

National Socialism and the Ideology of Bruckner Criticism

Although the Nazi state was governed with previously unimagined brutality, its political authority was founded on the exploitation of the cultural power of aesthetic values as well as authoritarian terrorism. Since even this most brutal of totalitarian regimes was unable to exert actual physical control over all phases of life, the stability of the Nazi government depended not only on state terror and mass murder but also on the compliance of the populace. As Wolfgang Benz has argued, a populace willing to comply with National Socialism was engendered by what he termed the "ecstasy of the ruled." This "ecstasy" was fostered largely by aesthetic means: the self-representation of the regime in flattering terms, state rituals that substituted for religion, and the stylization of the people as a "cultic fraternity."[22] As Peter Adam wrote, these "rituals and public activities with quasi-religious overtones . . . had one purpose in common, to enfold Party members and, by extension, all Germans in a seamless web of propaganda."[23] The aestheticization of politics and power was a necessary constituent of the National Socialist project; it allowed totalitarian terror and appeals to the greatness of German art not only to coexist but to reinforce each other.

It was necessary for this aestheticization of politics to remain largely beneath the threshold of conscious public awareness; had it been consciously recognized, it would have lost much of its efficacy. As Goebbels put it, "This is the secret of propaganda: whomever propaganda seeks to capture is thoroughly imbued with the idea of the propaganda without realizing at all that he is thus imbued."[24] Yet at the same time, the National Socialist government loudly and frequently proclaimed that art was a fundamental part of the totalizing "geistige Kampf" it was waging. Not only did the ideology of National Socialism systematically exploit the propagandistic value of culture and artistic representation as sources of both power and legitimization, but it saw art as a way of formulating and promulgating ideologically desired consciousness. The ultimate goal of Nazi aesthetics was to affirm ruling ideological paradigms; above all, art was called upon to promote and valorize the myths of race, *Volk,* and German essence, and to offer idealized metaphors of the fascist order. These tropes are evident in Goebbels's screed on the role of the art in the new state:

> The mission of art and artists is not only to unite, their mission is, far more, to form, to give shape, to get rid of the sick, to clear the way for the healthy. As a German politician I am therefore not able simply to recognize the distinction . . . between good and bad art. Art should

> not only be good, but it must also appear to be conditioned by the *Volk* or, better said, only an art arising out of the total *Volkstum* itself can, in the end, be good.[25]

This conceptual desire to regulate art—to separate the "good and bad"—was supported by extensive, and brutal, practical means. All artistic, literary, and musical activities were subjected to a highly regimented campaign to take control of the apparatus of artistic production. As part of this *Gleichschaltung* of German culture the Nazi government organized the Reichskulturkammer, headed by Joseph Goebbels, in the fall of 1933.[26] The official charge of the Reichskulturkammer was to "promote German culture on behalf of the German Volk and Reich" and to "regulate the economic and social affairs of the cultural professions."[27]

Equally important were the ways in which Nazism drew upon well-entrenched traditions of cultural reaction, and by selectively exploiting them generating, in Allan Steinweis's words, "key areas of consensus between official policy and prevailing sentiment in the art world."[28] We can see this dynamic at work in the large body of Bruckner criticism that appeared in the 1930s and 1940s.[29] Reading Bruckner criticism from these years is an often jarring experience; much of this literature often seems absurdly beholden to reactionary political agendas. Bruckner and his music are often glossed in terms of the *völkische* narrative of cultural decline and imminent rebirth. The two paradigmatic manifestations of this tendency were the prevalent representations of Bruckner as an Aryan hero and the identification of Bruckner's music with a mythical lost spirituality. Here is a remarkable example, written in 1936 by Max Auer:

> For four years destruction was visited upon Europe [i.e., the First World War]. . . . Out of deepest need the people called out for guidance. False leaders brought nations and peoples to the edge of the precipice in the following decades. . . . Without spiritual renewal, recuperation was not possible. A yearning for elevation out of the misery caused by the crass materialism of the preceding century grew ever greater. . . . Artistic bolshevism was carried to extremes. Against all this there was but one remedy: a return to the pure sources! What art was purer than that born of the deep religiosity of Bach, Beethoven and Bruckner! Especially Bruckner's God-consecrated art now found a fertile soil, at last it was rightly understood. For many thousands it was the guide to a beautiful, spiritual world and thereby the foundations were laid for a healthy and strong Bruckner movement, which is only now, after the World War, succeeding with elemental power.[30]

The bizarrely apocalyptic rhetoric of this example may be unusual, but its themes are not. Besides evoking a number of leitmotifs that echo the authoritarian Führer cult, its diagnosis of the ills of modern society was in keeping with the party line, as was its call for "a return to the pure sources" and a concomitant spiritual renewal and salvation from decadence and modernism.

An even more sharply political view can be seen in Fritz Skorzeny's article "Anton Bruckner in Light of the German Resurrection" which allied the increased popularity of Bruckner's music with the imagined "resurrection" of the German spirit effected by National Socialism.[31] Skorzeny claimed that these two moments were two sides of one coin: the source of the new "understanding" and "love" of Bruckner's music was nothing other than the rebirth of the German *Volksgeist*. "It was reserved for our age," Skorzeny wrote, "to experience for the first time, with the deepest emotion, the break of dawn light, the great 'Awake, the day draws nigh.' In this light the miracle of Anton Bruckner is fulfilled."[32] Although these passages by Auer and Skorzeny are extreme, their tendentiousness is symptomatic. Both exploited the political resonance of portraying Bruckner as an innocent soul persecuted by nefarious (often ostensibly "Jewish") modern critics, representing Bruckner's music as spiritual, pure, free from the contamination of modernity, and sacralizing it as an embodiment of the German Volksgeist.[33]

One recurrent subtext of real topical import was the belief that Bruckner symbolized the rightful status of Germany and Austria as one nation. After listening to a recording of the Seventh Symphony given to him by Goebbels, Hitler is reported to have said: "How can anyone say that Austria is not German! Is there anything more German than our old pure Austrianness?!"[34] Skorzeny's article, which appeared only weeks before the *Anschluss*, related Bruckner reception to German expansionism in no uncertain terms.

> The earth of this land [Austria] is perhaps the most precious and sacred in all Germany. In the remote past, profoundly stirred up by the plow of Barbarian invasions, having drunk the blood of all the German races over the course of centuries such soil became profound, powerful and fateful, like the people that sprang from it. Thus long ago it transpired that Austria was selected as the spiritual seedbed for the plant garden of the entire German people. Her gardeners were certainly not always the best, however, and often permitted weeds and poisonous plants to long hinder the noblest seeds. When these were transplanted in the wide German mother-earth they became mighty trees and bore ripe fruit. Herein lies the crux of Austrian destiny.[35]

Skorzeny further claimed that "just as Bruckner's personality embodied the essential image of the Austrians, the destiny of his works is, in its deepest essence, characteristically Austrian."[36] His works, like Austria itself, could come to full fruition only when they were replanted in Germany. The metaphorical unity between Austria and Germany, publicly endorsed at the Regensburg Bruckner Festival by the enshrinement of Bruckner in Walhalla and in Goebbels's speech, was made concretely manifest less than a year later with the Anschluss in March 1938.[37]

Racism was never far from the surface of völkisch Bruckner criticism. Certainly, Bruckner's status as an Aryan was essential to his canonization, and discussions of the essentially German profundity of Bruckner's music presupposed that he was an Aryan. (In fact, Ernst Schwanzara actually "demonstrated" the "purity" of Bruckner's bloodlines by tracing his lineage back to the fourteenth century.[38]) While issues of race remained relatively discrete, anti-Semitism was often explicit. Thus, the slow public acceptance of Bruckner music in Vienna in the 1880s and 1890s was often interpreted in racial terms; in Skorzeny's brazenly anti-Semitic view: "As Bruckner set out on his artistic life journey, world Jewry, in the guise of European liberalism, had already taken up the battles against the German *Geist* which had begun to stir in art."[39] Or consider Karl Grunsky's complaint that Herman Kretzschmar's *Führer durch den Konzertsaal* devoted excessive space (eleven pages) to Felix Mendelssohn's five symphonies, in contrast to the short shrift—"barely more than one page"—given to Bruckner's symphonies. It was, he wrote, a "gross instance of imbalance between Jewish and Aryan in a German book!"[40]

The critical remodeling of Bruckner also flowed along ideological channels that are perhaps less immediately apparent. On the one hand, National Socialism set out quite deliberately to appropriate the tradition of "German music." The canon of Austro-German classical music was identified with the Aryan race and was seen to symbolize its greatness; in 1939, for example, Peter Raabe went so far as to identify Germany as "das Volk Bachs, Beethovens und Bruckners" and to ally the fate of the Third Reich with the fate of German music.[41] Indeed, the legacy of great German composers not only was seen as a sign of German intellectual and spiritual power but was actually imagined to have prefigured the "awakening of the German people" and the rise of Nazism.[42] On the other hand, this nationalistic agenda also had other, less obvious dimensions. Perhaps the most important function of the exploitation of this repertory was its symbolism of power.[43] As Bernd Sponheuer wrote, "High art as such appeared—like the *Führer*,

the *Volk*, and the state—as the representation of 'eternal laws,' which demanded subordination and unquestioning obedience."[44] The desired stagings of power through music depended on a complex interpretative edifice that included not only ritualized performance contexts but also verbal and critical explanations of the meaning and significance of the music. Due to the nonrepresentational (and thus radically polysemous) character of music, this ideological appropriation had to circumscribe the potential meaning of German music.[45] Thus the project of musical propaganda in the Third Reich needs to be seen, in large measure, as a systematic remodeling of musical hermeneutics in terms of the hegemonic narrative of Nazism.

This reinterpretative process had several facets. The most basic included purposeful exploitation of music in the context of Nazi rituals and the coupling of exemplary classical music with popular or explicitly Nazi music in broadcasts.[46] The use of music in such definitely politicized contexts attempted to impose a rigidly disciplined musical hermeneutics: by seeking to ensure that music served the unified, totalizing telos of National Socialist mythology, and thereby narrowing the possible meanings of the musical compositions it employed, it pressed them into the service of contemporary ideological needs. All refractory tendencies that might have been latent in either an artwork or its *Wirkungsgeschichte* were erased or masked beneath a ritualized, prefigured interpretation.

The hermeneutical remodeling of Bruckner also encompassed biographical revision. It embraced the völkische tradition of portraying Bruckner as parochial and oddly anachronistic. This biographical tradition emphasized Bruckner's piety, naiveté, simplicity, provinciality (as opposed to urbanity), mystical profundity (as opposed to intellectual calculation), and essential Germanness; at its most extreme, it saw Bruckner as a "prophet of the *völkische* and racial rebirth of greater Germany and the victory of 'earthy,' stable life-will over decadent civilization."[47] Bruckner, like the völkische movement itself, was believed to be ahead of his time. As critical attacks against Bruckner in the liberal press in the 1880s and 1890s supposedly demonstrated, during his life the German culture was not yet ready to recognize the genius of Bruckner's works; such hostility was taken as a sign that "his time was yet to come."[48]

These biographical constructions were then read back into Bruckner's music. Since Bruckner supposedly stood outside of the cultural and historical currents of his time and place, his works were imagined to be free from the influence of practical contingencies and the corruptions of the marketplace.[49] Indeed, Bruckner's music was

often considered to represent a primordial mystical experience, an *Urmusik* that expressed archetypical Germanic truths.[50] These musical qualities were often openly linked with völkisch appeals to Bruckner's "peasant" origins, his rural nature, and his "rootedness." Consider, for example, Werner Danckert's comments from 1938: "After decades of unusually stubborn misunderstanding, an audience, prepared by experience, has presently developed for the master of St. Florian. There is no lack of smart and informative explanation for this. However, it seems to me, an essential prevailing tendency in Bruckner's work and life has eluded virtually every comprehensive interpretation: Bruckner's unique position in his historical environment."[51] According to Danckert, Bruckner's music contained a " 'subterranean' transmission of the South German–Austrian baroque."[52] The composer was, in the strict sense, *unzeitgemäss*: he was the "continuer, indeed the consummator, of an age-old world of expression, that flourished in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but was later swamped by other artistic currents[. It is] filled with powerful sensuality, love of brilliance, and a mighty richness of form drawn from a 'preclassical,' appealingly 'objective' sense of form."[53] This strange historiography played with the covertly political mythology of art as timeless verity; such mythic interpretations of Bruckner tied into the continual appeals to "eternal values" by the German Right during the upheavals following the First World War and the Weimar Republic.[54] Hitler, for example, claimed that "true art is and remains eternal. It does not follow the laws of fashion: its effect is that of a revelation arising from the depths of the essential character of a people."[55] This jargon of timelessness was deeply complicit with Nazism. As Berthold Hinz wrote: "The notion of 'eternal German art' was often invoked as a proof to support the idea of a Thousand-Year Reich, which was itself a metaphor for permanence and immutability. At the same time, the National Socialist concept of history, based as it was on the aesthetic category of 'greatness,' precluded any possibility of progress or change."[56]

The Musicological Appropriation of Bruckner

Most of the critical writing about Bruckner that emanated from Germany in 1930s and 1940s is so clearly a function of the corrupt cultural climate of Nazi Germany that it demands a highly suspicious reading. Today very little of this output retains any degree of legitimacy; instead, the enduring contributions to Bruckner studies date—

with few exceptions—from either the 1920s or from after the war. Nevertheless, one product of this musicological appropriation of Bruckner has remained largely unchallenged: the central issue in modern Bruckner scholarship—establishing "authentic" editions of the composer's works—is still largely governed by arguments and interpretations that originated in connection with the first critical edition of Bruckner's works, the *Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, edited by Robert Haas, which was prepared and published between 1930 and 1944.

Haas began the *Gesamtausgabe*, unexceptionably, by publishing works that Bruckner had left unpublished, including two early masses, the first version of the First Symphony, and the Ninth and Sixth symphonies. But in the mid-1930s, when Haas turned to works that Bruckner had published—a group that included seven of the nine numbered symphonies—he took a revolutionary position, namely that the published texts of these works had been corrupted by intrusive, unauthorized editing and thus needed to be supplanted by modern editions based exclusively on the "pure" texts of Bruckner's autograph manuscripts. Following this approach, Haas produced new editions of all of Bruckner's numbered symphonies, except the Third.

Haas's edition refigured the canon of Bruckner's works. It made available a substantial number of important texts, including previously unpublished versions of the First, Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth symphonies. The text-critical program of the *Gesamtausgabe* did, however, have a more radical dimension; Haas's dogmatic insistence that works not preserved in extant autograph manuscripts could not be accepted as authentic, entailed abandoning the versions of a number of compositions—notably the Second, Fourth, Fifth and Eighth symphonies—published during Bruckner's lifetime and supplanting—not supplementing—them with modern editions based solely on the earlier versions preserved in Bruckner's holographs. Indeed at times Haas's zeal to produce new, "authentic" editions prompted him to employ highly questionable editorial methods: for example, his editions of the Second and Eighth symphonies do not correspond to any known versions Bruckner himself wrote; rather Haas conflated discrete texts to produce what he imagined Bruckner would or should have written in the best of all possible circumstances.

Whatever their philological status, Haas's editions differ musically from those published in the 1880s and 1890s. While they are basically similar in their fundamental thematic, harmonic, and rhythmic substance, the versions of the symphonies Haas favored often contain passages—typically short ones—not found in the original

published scores. In addition, the orchestration of the *Gesamtausgabe* scores tends to be more rugged and, especially in the brass, more imposing, if occasionally less transparent and finely judged. Moreover, as a rule, Haas's scores are considerably sparer in their notation of nuances of tempo and dynamics than are the texts Bruckner published, and thereby convey a more massive and thus less dynamic image of the music, a factor that bears crucially on performance practice.

The historical justification of the categorical judgment against the authority of the editions printed during Bruckner's lifetime is, as I have argued in detail elsewhere, beset by a number of unresolved historiographic and evidential problems that render it highly doubtful.[57] For example, Bruckner never attempted to suppress the editions published in his lifetime nor did he ever publicly renounce or even criticize their authenticity; moreover, substantial textual evidence exists that testifies to the authority of these editions. These concerns were countered (and still often are) by assertions that Bruckner may, whether as a result of expedience, naiveté, or coercion, have allowed his scores to be altered, and even partially rewritten, prior to publication, and that he always believed his unpublished manuscripts contained the "real," essential versions of his works. Thus, by publishing these texts, the *Gesamtausgabe* claimed to carry out Bruckner's ultimate will. Many critics saw the *Gesamtausgabe* as the disclosure, after decades of obscurity, of the "true Bruckner." As Franz Moissl wrote, the *Gesamtausgabe* was "a liberation of the true symphonic will of the master."[58]

Although many of the arguments and rationales that were used to justify the outright dismissal of the first printed editions of Bruckner's symphonies and, by extension, to promote the exclusive preserve of the *Gesamtausgabe* may seem tenuous to a skeptical observer, their claim to truth came to seem all but self-evident in the Third Reich (and indeed beyond). This acceptance was, in part, an overtly political affair. The new edition was not only consistently heralded and praised in state-sanctioned journals, but it received financial and moral endorsement from the Nazi government. In his speech at the 1937 Regensburg Bruckner Festival, Goebbels declared that since Bruckner's symphonies were a precious national legacy, the Bruckner Gesellschaft would henceforth receive an annual contribution to fund the editing of the "original versions." Goebbels not only offered financial support to the *Gesamtausgabe*, he also granted it Hitler's imprimatur:

> The Führer and his government consider it their honorable duty to do all that is within their power to permit the whole German people to

> receive this [i.e., Bruckner's] fortunate legacy and, by means of a large-scale promotion of Bruckner cultivation, assist its effects to penetrate not only deeply, but broadly. On these grounds they have decided to make a substantial annual contribution to the Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft for the editing of the original versions of his symphonies until the complete works of the master are produced in the form he envisioned.[59]

The politicization of the new Bruckner edition directly affected the course of its reception and legitimation. When the initial volumes of the *Gesamtausgabe* began to appear in the early 1930s their merits were debated vigorously in the German musical press. This debate, the so-called Bruckner-Streit, occupied pages of the leading journals and was joined by both staunch opponents of Haas's methodology as well as those in favor of Haas's text-critical position. Yet by 1937 the Bruckner-Streit had fallen silent and the *Gesamtausgabe* was clearly established as *the* authoritative source of Bruckner's works. *Gesamtausgabe* editions largely replaced others in performance, and, more importantly, the arguments in their favor were generally accepted by the German-speaking scholarly community.

The tenor of the whole discussion about the textual problems of Bruckner's works clearly changed in the wake of the Regensburg festival as historical and philological questions gave way to ideologically overdetermined aesthetic and stylistic issues as the main concern of Bruckner scholars. The support given to the *Gesamtausgabe* by Goebbels and, by proxy, Hitler at the Regensburg festival had a pivotal effect. In the ideological climate of the Third Reich, where scholarship and historical truth were both theorized as political functions, Goebbels's public opinion weighed heavily in favor of the *Gesamtausgabe*, and soon it became de facto official policy to uphold, if not simply assume as a proven fact, the absolute authority of the *Gesamtausgabe*.

In addition to the effect of Goebbels's sanction there were other ways—perhaps more important ones—in which the cultural climate shaped the discourse that legitimated the *Gesamtausgabe*. This discourse depended, in large part, on then current text-critical beliefs, including the view that artworks transcend the material facts of their production, a notion of authorship as the free play of genius, and a belief that the goal of editing should be to produce a hypothetical urtext. But this discourse also drew heavily on a complex set of ideological and aesthetic presumptions that gained credence and weight from their resonance with the culture of the Third Reich. In a culture increasingly committed to völkisch theories of *Wissenschaft*, the mission of uncovering the "real" Bruckner carried a real emotional and

ideological charge. Advocates of the *neue Bruckner-Bewegung* exploited völkisch sentiments by adopting exaggerated tones of fatefulness. As early as 1936 Auer referred to the "spiritual battle for the possession of the 'real' Bruckner."[60] In the next year, Hans Weisbach wrote that the issues facing Bruckner scholars were "weighty . . . because our generation, which was presented with this decision by fate, bears the responsibility for the form in which Bruckner's symphonies will live in the spiritual life of humanity."[61] Horst Büttner assumed a similarly portentous tone when he claimed that opinion had decided in favor of the new edition of the Ninth Symphony and that "due to the heightened sense of responsibility at present for great national cultural treasures, the time cannot be distant when the *Originalfassungen* of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Symphonies will also have won out."[62]

This völkische attitude also placed great import in "public opinion" as a determinant not only of value but also of truth. The German art historian Hans Weigert argued in 1935 that the "consensus omnium" was a decisive determinant of aesthetic quality since it reflected the "given and native" (*gegeben und eingeboren*) evaluative standards of the "people."[63] Although, as Bettina Preiss noted, this position is "theoretically virtually meaningless,"[64] such thinking played an important role in the legitimation of the *Gesamtausgabe*. Many who advocated the *Gesamtausgabe* asserted that the new edition allowed the German people to experience for the first time the greatness of Bruckner's music in its pure form. Consider Auer's statement that "in view of the victory march of the *Originalfassungen* through the concert halls, . . . in view of the not-to-be-explained-away 'authenticity' of the scores written down by the master's own fingers, the old compromise versions have lost their right to exist."[65] The importance of the *Gesamtausgabe* to the "public" was reflected in Oskar Lang's comment in 1936 that, unlike most collected editions, which are generally purely academic enterprises, the Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe* was different: "it is attempting a great feat—and this must be emphatically pointed out to the public—which concerns the whole music world, for it removed the spell that until now lay over Bruckner's works."[66] As the public became aware of these new editions, they did seem to be persuaded that they contained the "truth" of Bruckner's music. Or at least so the critics claimed: in 1938, after the tide had clearly turned, Fritz Oeser declared that performances of the new critical editions of Bruckner's symphonies "aroused unconditional approval among completely unbiased listeners, who set aside their prejudice against the original versions out of respect for the inviolable work of genius."[67]

Another set of ideological premises also weighed heavily in the debates about the *Gesamtausgabe:* the pursuit of imagined textual

purity resonated with the National Socialist obsession with race. Viewed critically, it is hard to avoid the suspicion that the editors of the *Gesamtausgabe* aimed in part to free Bruckner's works from the specter of an imagined history of Jewish influence, especially since some of those who were accused of corrupting Bruckner's scores were of Jewish descent, notably the conductor Ferdinand Löwe and the publisher Albert Gutman. Auer, for instance, said that older editions of Bruckner's music transmitted texts that reflected the deleterious influence of "overly refined city folk" (*überkultivierte Städter*), a coded term for Jews.[68] An undercurrent of racism swirled in the suggestion that the psychological difficulties Bruckner supposedly suffered late in life—which were believed by some to have affected the authorship of the first edition of a number of his works—were largely induced by the trauma of Hermann Levi's rejection of the first version of the Eighth Symphony in 1887.[69] Similarly, part of the covert mission of the *Gesamtausgabe* seems to have been to remove Bruckner's scores from the purview of the Viennese publishing house Universal Edition.[70] Universal Edition, which had established its reputation by publishing such composers as Mahler, Zemlinsky, Schoenberg, and Berg, had long been a target for reactionary critics, who identified it with such supposedly deleterious forces as modernism, atonality, bolshevism, and Judaism; it is not surprising that the Nazis would have been eager to dissociate Bruckner from the firm.[71]

In a less overt way, too, the desire to remove all "foreign" traces from the texts of Bruckner's compositions and to present pure, "authentic" versions resonated with the mythos of racial purity. In a discussion of the textual differences between nineteenth-century editions of Bruckner's works and those published in the *Gesamtausgabe,* Rolf Pergler transposed the metaphor of purity from a sociological to a textual plane. He claimed that Bruckner's works were governed by the truth of the "Brucknerian formal principle" (*Brucknersche Gestaltungsprinzip*); accordingly, textual contaminations, or, as he called them, "foreign bodies" (*Fremdkörper*) found in the older scores could be easily identified by their lack of harmony with the overall form and eliminated.[72] Pergler's stated wish to "eliminate" such "foreign bodies" made manifest a desire that had been latent since the start of the project. In April 1932 Alexander Berrsche compared the new critical edition of the Ninth Symphony with the earlier edition edited in 1903 by Ferdinand Löwe. Berrsche wrote:

> It is hardly to be believed what Löwe alone made out of the Scherzo—in Bruckner's version it inhabits an entirely different sphere of sound and expression. Löwe cleverly and ingeniously gussied up the piece; his

> work alone induced the view that the Scherzo of the Ninth has an elfin, "Midsummer Night's Dream" atmosphere and, on the whole, seems a synthesis of Mendelssohn, Berlioz, and Bruckner. Now it is gone forever, and we may confidently pack away the old comparisons. The actual Bruckner Scherzo may be without any sparkling bubbliness, but it stands on firm, sturdy legs, on the native soil of the Upper Austria land.[73]

The nationalistic, anti-Semitic, and gendered subtext of this review is clear: the polemical implications of the references to Mendelssohn and the use of the terms "elfin" and "sparkling bubbliness" are obvious. So too is its appeal to the politically loaded metaphor of purification; the "original version" was imagined to have rescued Bruckner's music by cleansing it of alien elements.

During the period 1936–38, the claim that the first editions were inauthentic and that the *Gesamtausgabe* alone contained the "real" texts of Bruckner's works gradually metamorphosed from a text-critical hypothesis into dogma. Direct public criticism of the *Gesamtausgabe* was increasingly suppressed. For example, the official journal of the Bruckner Gesellschaft, the *Bruckner-Blätter*, became increasingly unwilling to publish views that were unsympathetic to the *Gesamtausgabe*. During the mid-1930s as the official Bruckner establishment closed ranks, its intolerance grew so strong that it prompted at least two writers who were ambivalent about the *Gesamtausgabe*—Friedrich Klose and Friedrich Herzfeld—to use the terminology of religious apostasy in describing their positions. In 1936 Herzfeld wondered aloud if it was considered "blasphemy" (*Gotteslästerung*) even to raise reasonable arguments against the text-critical claims of the *Gesamtausgabe*.[74] Klose wrote that even "at the danger of excommunication" (*auf die Gefahr hin exkommuniziert zu werden*) he preferred the first printed edition of the Ninth Symphony to the new critical edition.[75] Thus by the time of Goebbels's speech at Regensburg in June 1937, the debate was ready to be peremptorily ended.

And After

It remains to evaluate how present-day understanding of Bruckner betrays an indebtedness to Nazi-era reception, to determine if and how our engagements with Bruckner and his music are still shadowed by ghosts from this past. In the immediate postwar period, Bruckner scholars generally shied away from explicitly wrestling with the legacy

of the 1930s and 1940s, yet the field did strive to reform itself. Although these efforts at renovation were something less than thoroughgoing, it would be a mistake wholly to discount them. In the late 1940s several East German scholars and musicians did attempt forthrightly to confront the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner, most importantly Emil Armbruster.[76] Also, in 1946 in Leipzig the conductor Heinz Bongartz performed the old edition of the Fifth Symphony, which had been damned by Haas.[77] Bongartz's gesture was intended in part as a repudiation of Haas's Bruckner project, but it was not understood as such by critics. In the same year, the progressive West German critic Heinrich Strobel addressed the politics of Bruckner reception, if only in passing. His lead essay in the inaugural postwar issue of *Melos*, which was resuscitated in 1946 following its dissolution by the Nazis in 1934, was built around the contention that "one certainly cannot simply blot out the last twelve years and pick up again where one left off in 1933."[78] Significantly, Strobel singled out Bruckner reception for comment; he saw the celebration of "Bruckner as the incarnation of the German urge for endless depths or heights" as particularly hard to disentangle from residue of the Nazi era.[79]

Western Bruckner scholars generally, however, took a more indirect approach to this painful issue; typically they have tried to move Bruckner reception onto new ground and to distance it from its immediate past, without explicitly mentioning National Socialism or the Third Reich. For example, in 1947 Leopold Nowak published an oddly allusive monograph on Bruckner's *Te Deum* in which he aggressively reclaimed Bruckner for Catholicism (and hence away from the *Gottgläubigkeit* imposed on him by Goebbels) and modeled Bruckner as a beacon that could help to guide Austria out of the spiritual confusion sown by the war.[80] A similar tendency to move away from the attitudes of the Nazi era is evident in some of the articles published in the issue of the *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* in 1946 devoted to Bruckner on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his death.[81] A new critical direction can be sensed in Wilhelm Waldstein's essay "Anton Bruckner: Versuch einer kritischen Skizze," which compares Bruckner with Goethe, an artist who was not popular with the National Socialists.[82] Franz Gräflinger's contribution, "Anton Bruckner und Hermann Levi, sein 'Edelster Gönner' und 'Höchstberühmster Vater,' " also evinces the changed political climate. Its topic, Bruckner's close association with Hermann Levi, was pointedly ignored by the Nazis. Although it stems from Bruckner himself, the notion of the Jewish Levi as Bruckner's "noblest patron" and "most famous father"

would have been anathema in the Third Reich. Analytic studies of Bruckner's music have also broken with the past. Since the 1960s progressive German musicologists have focused their attention on exactly those aspects of Bruckner's music—its constructivist tendencies, its motivic intensity, its dissonance—that were minimized if not ignored by völkische interpretations of Bruckner.[83]

All of these scholars, intent on not reopening old wounds unnecessarily, addressed the problem of Nazi reception gingerly. This approach, which has typified much postwar German culture, has been sufficient to expunge the most politically complicit tendencies emanating from Nazi-era Bruckner reception; no one now sees Bruckner either as a victim of Jewish critics or as the muse of a new Aryan world order. Yet as a result of the failure to tackle the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner head-on, some of the subtler and more conceptually slippery dimensions of the traditions of reception fostered by National Socialism still haunt our engagements with Bruckner and his music. As a result, present-day understanding of Bruckner betrays a subtle—even subterranean—indebtedness to Nazi-era reception in two areas: the image of the composer as a naive genius and the editorial status of Bruckner's music.

The prevailing image of Bruckner is that of an exceptionally naive character, a notion derived in large measure from the *völkisch Brucknerbild* that was canonized in the 1930s. As Bruckner scholars have become more sophisticated about the nature and value of anecdotal evidence—thanks largely to the work of Manfred Wagner and Erich Wolfgang Partsch—the scholarly credibility of old stereotypes about Bruckner's psyche has faded.[84] Yet while most Bruckner scholars recognize the composer's sophistication and his ambition as well as his simplicity, the popular image of Bruckner has not been similarly corrected. One can still read descriptions of Bruckner that paint the composer as a virtual cipher. As recently as 1992 Robert Simpson wrote that it "almost defeats the imagination" to reconcile Bruckner's "legendary personal naivety, his provincial background, his total lack of general culture, [and] . . . his willingness to alter his scores at the behest of self-appointed mentors" with his undeniable compositional achievements.[85] Simpson's work is not simplistic, but is, rather, generally thoughtful and often perceptive. Yet his credulous acceptance of the image of Bruckner as a Parsifal-like *reiner Tor* demonstrates the extent to which such notions continue to infuse modern consciousness of Bruckner: Simpson's misprision is symptomatic of the widespread failure to appraise critically the ideological commitments of the received wisdom about Bruckner. No scholar subscribes any longer to

the völkisch ideology of Bruckner reception, but through inattention there is a real and present danger of reinscribing piecemeal fragments of this very tradition.

Similarly, despite the critical suspicion now rightly accorded to most German Bruckner reception of the 1930s and 1940s, very little such skepticism exists about the Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe* of 1930–44. The textual criticism of the first Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe* has, of course, been subject to major revision, most importantly by Leopold Nowak, Haas's postwar successor as the general editor of the *Gesamtausgabe*. Nowak did not merely pick up where Haas had left off. Indeed, although Nowak did share Haas's exclusive preference for manuscript sources, he revised all of Haas's editions and rectified Haas's most questionable text-critical leaps of faith, notably those found in Haas's editions of the Second and Eighth Symphonies.[86] Haas's editions themselves may no longer universally be accepted, but Bruckner scholars do continue to accept the flawed central premise of the *Gesamtausgabe* as a proven historical fact: autograph manuscripts are still considered the only representations of the "real Bruckner," and the early printed editions are dismissed as corruptions of Bruckner intentions. As Deryck Cooke wrote in his article on Bruckner in *The New Grove Dictionary*, "the first editions . . . have been utterly discredited."[87] As the rejection of the first editions has become an inherited article of faith, it has assumed an undeserved mantle of truth, and its connection to the ideological environment of National Socialism has largely escaped our consciousness.

The confluence of these two vestiges of the dark past of Bruckner reception—namely, the image of the composer as an unwitting genius and a dogmatic belief in the rightness of modern editorial conclusions about Bruckner—substantially governs our approach to his music. We can see this dynamic at work in contemporary Bruckner performance practice. The dominant modern approach to Bruckner interpretation emphasizes monumental sonorities, sets steady, generally slow tempi, and presents Bruckner's forms with architectural severity rather than with dynamic sweep. This style, made famous by Herbert von Karajan, Günter Wand, and Carlo Maria Giulini, among others, is a postwar phenomenon. Performances of Bruckner's symphonies by musicians of an earlier generation exemplify a quite different approach to the music, one much more concerned with shaping Bruckner's music gesturally and dynamically, and with conveying not the massive coherence of Bruckner's music but its mercurial drama.[88]

The evolution of modern Bruckner performance is, of course, part of a broader postwar trend toward "objective" performance styles;

but it also derives—crucially—from the peculiar course of Bruckner reception in this century. On one hand, with their emphasis on grandeur, weight, and depth of tone, modern interpretive approaches to Bruckner appear as musical analogues of the biographical construction of Bruckner as a mystical genius, singing great hymns of piety and reverence. On the other, modern performances of Bruckner's symphonies concretize the biases of modern Bruckner editing. Performances of the old school reflect the texts of the editions printed in the 1880s and 1890s; these older scores contain abundant indications for subtleties of tempo and dynamics that are absent from Bruckner's earlier unpublished manuscript texts. Haas's and Nowak's scores more or less faithfully reproduce these manuscript sources; as a result, they are spartan in their tempo, expression, and dynamic markings. Modern conductors, innocent of the genealogy of modern Bruckner editing and abjuring the old, supposedly corrupt scores, take the texts of modern critical editions as gospel and then read these texts all too literally.[89] In so doing they perpetuate an interpretative style that is alien to earlier traditions.

We would be mistaken to posit any direct influence of politics on the changes in Bruckner performance practice. Indeed, many conductors active in the Third Reich—like most Bruckner conductors who cut their teeth before Haas's editions were published—retained elements of the first printed editions, even when they used Haas's scores.[90] Rather, the current state of affairs reflects the odd mixture of continuity and rupture that has characterized modernist Bruckner reception. The postwar ideology of scholarly objectivity has succeeded in overthrowing the conscious tendentiousness promulgated in the Third Reich. At the same time this creed has sown its own confusion: while modernist paradigms of scholarship, which do not actively account for ideology, have relegated the most egregious historical and critical misapprehension borne in the 1930s and 1940s to obscurity, with their stubborn empiricism they have, paradoxically, shielded us from seeing how Bruckner reception continues to be shaded by this ideology. For example, since the pursuit of "authentic" urtexts is central to the practice of modern musicology, the essentials of the text-critical project inaugurated by Haas were easily taken over largely intact in the postwar era. Indeed, the belief that the editions published in the nineteenth century are "inauthentic" has deepened its hold in the past fifty years; certainly the replacement of these editions by new critical editions is now complete. Yet as a result of the narrow focus of this editorial program, we have lost sight of the compromising origins of the dismissal of these older editions. And, at least partially

as a result of understandable hesitance to grapple with old demons, we have failed to weigh the historical and evidential merits of this received text-critical position. The longer we persist in failing to account for the aftereffects of the purgatory through which Bruckner reception passed in the 1930s and 1940s, the more pernicious this legacy. The past will not go away, even if we stare at it long and hard. All we can do is to address it squarely and try bravely to grasp how it shapes the present.

Notes

I owe thanks to William Carragan and Bryan Gilliam for their helpful comments on this essay.

1. This issue has not received the attention it merits. The earliest discussions are short and relatively insubstantial: Peter Gülke, "Der schwerige Jubilar: Zu Anton Bruckners 150. Geburtstag," *Musik und Gesellschaft* 24 (1974): 547–50; Mathias Hansen, "Die faschistische Bruckner-Rezeption und ihre Quellen," *Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft* 28 (1986): 53–61; and Hansen, *Anton Bruckner* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1987), especially the chapter entitled "Wirkungsgeschichte I (1896–1945)," 19–41. (Note that both Gülke and Hansen wrote their studies in the old DDR.) In the past few years scholars have begun to explore in a more substantial way the historical and political dimensions of Bruckner reception in the Third Reich; see Christa Brüstle, "Bruckner's 'Original' Fifth Symphony: Aspects of its Reception and Use (1933–1945)," paper read at "Perspectives on Anton Bruckner," Connecticut College, 23 Feb. 1994, and Bryan Gilliam, "The Annexation of Anton Bruckner: Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation," *Musical Quarterly* 78 (1994): 584–604. I address this topic at length in "The First Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995) and " 'Return to the Pure Sources': The Ideology and Text-Critical Legacy of the First Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe*," in *Bruckner Studies*, ed. Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

2. They are laid out lucidly, for instance, in Gilliam.

3. Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich*, trans. Clara and Robert Winston (New York: Macmillan, 1970), 156. The finale of Bruckner's Fifth Symphony was a particular favorite for such events. It was performed, for example, "at the personal wish of the Führer" at the "Parteitag der Arbeit" in Oct. 1937 (see Erwin Bauer, "Musik auf dem Parteitag der Arbeit," *Die Musik-Woche*, 9 Oct. 1937, 6, excerpted in Joseph Wulf, *Musik im Dritten Reich: Eine Dokumentation* [Gütersloh: Mohn, 1963], 248–49); at the presentation of "deutsche Nationalpreise" at the Reichsparteitage in Nuremberg on 7 Sept. 1937 (see Fred Prieberg, *Kraftprobe: Wilhelm Furtwängler im Dritten Reich* [Wiesbaden: Brockhaus, 1986], 279); and at the "Programm für die weltanschauliche Feierstunde 'Stirb und Werde' " in Weimar on 4 Nov. 1942 (see Klaus Vondung, *Magie und Manipulation: Ideologischer Kult und politische Religion des Nationalsozialismus* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971], 91). See also Brüstle.

4. Dieter Schnebel reported, for example, that "during the first years of the Second World War" the broadcast entitled "Unsterbliche Musik der Deutschen Meister" used

this theme as a motto; see Schnebel, "Der Dreinige Klang oder die Konzeption einer Leib-Seele-Geist-Musik (Zu Bruckners Dritter)," in *Musik Konzepte 23/24: Anton Bruckner*, ed. Heinz-Klaus Metzger and Rainer Riehns (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1982), 15. I am grateful to Maribeth Clark for her bibliographic assistance with this item.

5. In 1936 alone three Bruckner festivals were held in Germany: "Brucknerfest in Leipzig," "Bruckner-Feier der Stadt Leipzig," and "Deutsches Bruckner-Fest in Berlin." See Fred Prieberg, *Musik im NS-Staat* (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1982), 282–83.

6. Hanns Kreczi, *Das Bruckner-Stift St. Florian und Das Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester (1942–45)*, Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 5 (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1986) details the history of this short-lived organization. The plans to make St. Florian "das 'Bayreuth Bruckners' " are discussed on pages 29–36.

7. "Kein anderer Musiker, nicht einmal Wagner oder Richard Strauss, ja kein anderer grosser Künstler der Vergangenheit überhaupt ist so vorbehaltlos und vollständig von der faschistischen Ideologie okkupiert worden wie Bruckner"; "Die faschistische Bruckner-Rezeption und ihre Quellen," 53. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine.

8. Gilliam discusses Hitler's attitude toward Bruckner in "The Annexation of Anton Bruckner," 587–88; also see Albrecht Dümling, "Missbrauch als eigentliche Entartung. Das Beispiel: Bruckner," in *Entartete Musik: Zur Düsseldorfer Ausstellung von 1938; Eine kommentierte Rekonstruktion*, ed. Albrecht Dümling and Peter Girth (Düsseldorf: Landeshauptstadt Dusseldorf, 1988), xxviii. The pathological nature of this identification is suggested by Hitler's plan to build a bell tower in Linz to serve as the tomb for his parents and himself. The bell tower was to feature a carillon that played passages from Bruckner's Fourth Symphony. See Evan Burr Bukey, *Hitler's Hometown: Linz, Austria, 1908–1945* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 199–200.

9. Manfred Wagner, "Von den Wurzeln unseres Brucknerbildes: Die Nekrologe von 1896," in *Anton Bruckner: Monographie* (Mainz: Schott, 1983), 307–43.

10. Hansen, *Anton Bruckner*, 10.

11. See Hansen, *Anton Bruckner*, 19–41.

12. This event was discussed most recently by Gilliam. For first-hand reportage see Paul Ehlers, "Das Regensburger Bruckner-Erlebnis," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 104 (1937): 745–48 and the unsigned article "Anton Bruckner zog in die Wallhalla," *Hakenkreuzbanner*, 6 June 1937, no page given; excerpted in Wulf, 156–57. For additional modern critical analysis of the event see Dümling and Girth, 9–18, xxviii, and Hansen, *Anton Bruckner*, 37–38.

13. The ceremonies on 6 June 1937 also included a performance of Bruckner's Third Symphony and his Overture in G Minor and a pontifical mass featuring Bruckner's Mass in E minor. See Ehlers, 746–47.

14. "Eine erhebendes Symbol der durch keine Schranken eingeengten Verbundenheit des Führers mit dem deutschen Volke"; Ehlers, 747.

15. "Ein kleines Zeichen unserer tiefen Dankbarkeit für die Aufnahme der Brucknerbüste in die Wallhalla"; quoted in "Anton Bruckner zog in die Wallhalla," 157.

16. An English translation of this address by John Michael Cooper can be found in *Musical Quarterly* 78 (1994): 605–9.

17. "Anton Bruckner als der Sohn der österreichischen Erde ist ganz besonders dazu berufen, auch in unserer Gegenwart die unlösliche geistige und seelische Schicksalsgemeinschaft zu versinnbildlichen, die das gesamte deutsche Volk verbindet. Es ist daher für uns ein symbolisches Ereignis von mehr als nur künstlerischer Bedeutung, wenn Sie, mein Führer, sich entschlossen haben, in diesem deutschen Nationalheiligtum als erstes Denkmal unseres Reich eine Büste Anton Bruckners aufstellen zu lassen"; quoted in Ehlers, 747–48.

18. This speech was printed as "Anton Bruckner: Rede, gehalten am 7. Juni 1937 auf dem VIII. Bruckner-Fest zu Regensburg, anlässlich des feierlichen Einzuges Anton Bruckners in die Wallhalla," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 104 (1937): 741–44.

19. "Darum ist das Anhören dieser Werke für den, dem sie sich erschliessen, etwas anderes als nur ein Kunstgenuss: es ist ein Gang zu den 'Müttern,' zu den Quellen der Empfindung, zu denen kein Denken führt, kein Wissen und Forschen, sondern nur der Wille, klein zu sein vor der Unendlichkeit der Schöpfung, aber gross in dem Streben nach dem Guten"; "Anton Bruckner: Rede," 744.

20. For a meditation on the relationship of ideology to music, and on the resistance of Anglo-American musicology to recognizing it, see Rose Rosengard Subotnick, "The Role of Ideology in the Study of Western Music," in *Developing Variations: Style and Ideology in Western Music* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), 3–14.

21. *The Performing Self: Compositions and Decompositions in the Languages of Contemporary Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971); quoted in Edward Said, *Musical Elaborations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 1.

22. On the aesthetics and ideology of mass rallies, see Peter Adam, *Art of the Third Reich* (New York: Abrams, 1992), 82–90; Wolfgang Benz, "The Ritual and Stage Management of National Socialism: Techniques of Domination and the Public Sphere," in *The Attractions of Fascism: Social Psychology and Aesthetics of the "Triumph of the Right,"* ed. John Milfull (New York: Berg, 1990), 273–88; and Vondung.

23. Adam, 77.

24. "Das ist das Geheimnis der Propaganda: Den, den die Propaganda erfassen will, ganz mit den Ideen der Propaganda zu durchtränken, ohne dass er überhaupt merkt, dass er durchtränkt ist"; speech of 25 Mar. 1933, quoted in Bernd Sponheuer, "Musik, Faschismus, Ideologie: Heuristische Überleugungen," *Musikforschung* 46 (1993): 250 37n.

25. "Es ist nicht nur die Aufgabe der Kunst und des Künstlers, zu verbinden; es ist auch weit darüber hinaus ihre Aufgabe, zu formen, Gestalt zu geben, Krankes zu beseitigen und Gesundem freie Bahn zu schaffen. Ich vermag deshalb als deutscher Politiker nicht lediglich den einen Trennungsstrich anzuerkennen . . . den zwischen guter und schlechter Kunst. Die Kunst soll nicht nur gut sein, sie muss auch volkmässig bedingt erscheinen oder, besser gesagt, lediglich eine Kunst, die aus dem vollen Volkstum selbst schöpft, kann am Ende gut sein. . . ." Open letter to Wilhelm Furtwängler, *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger*, 11 Apr. 1933; reprinted in Wulf, 88.

26. See Berthold Hinz, *Art in the Third Reich*, trans. Robert and Rita Kimber (New York: Pantheon Books, 1979), 31–35, Michael Meyer, *The Politics of Music in the*

Third Reich (New York: Lang, 1991), esp. chap. two, "Music Organization (1933–1945)," 89–252; and, above all, Alan E. Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany: The Reichs Chambers of Music, Theater and the Visual Arts* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).

27. Steinweis, 1.

28. Steinweis, 2.

29. The increased importance of Bruckner to musical scholarship in the Third Reich is evident in the remarkable inflation in the number of articles on Bruckner and related topics that were published in the *Zeitschrift für Musik*. In the decade of the 1920s the *Zeitschrift für Musik* published fewer than a dozen articles on Bruckner, but after 1932 the volume rose sharply, peaking in 1936 with twenty-one contributions on Bruckner in that year alone.

30. "Vier Jahre der Vernichtung waren über Europa hingezogen. . . . Aus tiefer geistiger und seelischer Not rief das Volk nach einer Führung. Falsche Führer brachten in den weiteren Jahrzehnten Völker und Nationen an den Abgrund. . . . Ohne geistige Erneuerung kann es eine Gesundung nicht geben. Immer mehr wuchs die Sehnsucht nach innerer Erhebung aus dem Elend, das der krasse Materialismus des vergangenen Jahrhunderts hervorgerufen hatte. . . . Der Bolschewismus in der Kunst wurde auf die Spitze getrieben. Gegen all dies gab es nur ein Mittel: Rückkehr zu den reinen Quellen! Welche Kunst aber wäre reiner als die aus tiefer Religiosität geborene eines Bach, Beethoven und Bruckner! Besonders Bruckners gottgeweihte Kunst fand nun einen günstigen Nährboden, nun erst das richtige Verständnis, er wurde vielen Tausenden zum Führer in eine schöne geistige Welt, und damit war die Grundlage für eine gesunde und starke Bruckner-Bewegung gegeben, die nun, nach dem Weltkrieg mit elementarer Gewalt sich durchsetzte"; August Göllerich and Max Auer, *Anton Bruckner: Ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1936), IV/4:61–62. *Anton Bruckner: Ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild* has a complex history. Bruckner himself selected Göllerich to write his biography, but Göllerich died in 1923 without having come close to finishing the work. Auer subsequently took over Göllerich's notes and sketches and finished the biography. The quotation above is from the final volume (published in 1936) and is undoubtedly the work of Auer.

31. "Anton Bruckner im Lichte deutscher Auferstehung," *Die Musik* 30 (1938): 310–13.

32. "Denn erst unserer Zeit war es vorbehalten, in tiefster Erschütterung den Anbruch der Morgenröte, das grosse 'Wach auf, es nahet der Tag' zu erleben. In diesem Lichte vollzieht sich das Wunder um Anton Bruckner"; Skorzeny, 311.

33. For example, consider Oskar Lang's monograph *Anton Bruckner: Wesen und Bedeutung* (Munich: Becksche Verlagshandlung, 1924), whose introduction argues that not only was Bruckner free from the flaws and banalities of the nineteenth century, but that (in 1924) his music offered "das Vorbild echter unwandelbarer, menschlicher Grösse und Hoheit" ["an example of authentic, constant human greatness and sovereignty"] to a world threatened by chaos and both human and musical anarchy, 10. Also see Fritz Grüninger, "Der deutsche Geist in den Werken Anton Bruckners," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 101 (1934): 427–29.

34. "Ja, da soll einer sagen, Österreich wäre nicht deutsch! Gibt es etwas Deutscheres als unser altes reines Österreichtum?!" Quoted in Friedrich Heer, *Der Kampf um die österreichische Identität* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1981), 420.

35. "Die Erde dieses Landes is vielleicht die kostbarste und die heiligste in ganz Deutschland. In grauer Vorzeit schon vom Pflug der Völkerwanderung zutiefst aufgewühlt, im Laufe der Jahrhunderte mit dem Blute aller deutschen Stämme getränkt —ein solcher Boden wird tiefgründig und schwer und schicksalhaft wie die Menschen, die ihm entwachsen. So ist es gekommen, dass Österreich seit alters her zum geistigen Saatbeet, zum Pflanzengarten des ganzen deutschen Volkes auserkoren war. Seine Gärtner waren freilich nicht immer die besten, und oft durften Unkraut und Giftpflanzen die edelsten Keime lang, lang eindämmen, bis diese, in die weite deutsche Muttererde verpflanzt, zu mächtigen Bäumen wurden und reiche Frucht trugen. Darin liegt der Kernpunkt des österreichischen Schicksals"; Skorzeny, 311.

36. "Es muss gesagt werden, dass, so wie die Persönlichkeit des Meisters das Urbild des Österreichers verkörperte, auch das Schicksal seines Werkes seinem tiefsten Wesen nach ein kennzeichnend österreichisches ist"; Skorzeny, 311.

37. Pamela Potter has commented on this tendency to "coordinate musicological writings with foreign policy"; see "The Deutsche Musikgesellschaft, 1918–38." *Journal of Musicological Research* 11 (1991): 168. Studies of the "Germanness" of Austrian music were common in the year leading up to the Anschluss; see, for example, Wilhelm Zentner, "Was danken wir der österreichischen Musik," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 104 (1937): 9–13. Also consider the publication of various articles about "German" music in recently annexed or conquered regions, such as Gustav Beding, "Die Lage der sudetendeutschen Musik," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 105 (1938): 574–76; Edwin Janetschek, "Die Stellung der Sudetendeutschen im deutschen Sängerleben," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 105 (1938): 594; and Fritz Feldman, "Deutsche Musikkultur im ostoberschlesischen Industriegebiet," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 106 (1939): 1085–88.

38. See Schwanzara, "Anton Bruckners Stamm und Urheimat," in Göllerich and Auer, 4:135–222.

39. "Als Bruckner seine künstlerische Laufbahn antrat, hatte das Weltjudentum in Gestalt des europäischen Liberalismus bereits den Kampf aufgenommen gegen den deutschen Geist, der sich in der Kunst zu regen begann"; Skorzeny, 311.

40. "ein krasser Fall des Missverhältnisses zwischen Jüdischem und Arischem in einem deutschen Buch!" "Gedanken über Mendelssohn," *Westdeutscher Beobachter*, 10 Mar. 1935; reprinted in Wulf, 447–48.

41. "Über den Musikbetrieb während dem Krieges," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 107 (1939): 1029–30.

42. Hanns-Werner Heister and Jochem Wolff, "Macht und Schicksal: Klassik, Fanfaren, höhere Durchhaltemusik," in *Musik und Musikpolitik im faschistischen Deutschland*, ed. Hanns-Werner Heister and Hans-Gunter Klein (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1984), especially 116–17.

43. In this connection see Fred Prieberg's discussion of the role played by music in the Nazi "Aussenpolitik" in occupied countries, *Musik im NS-Staat*, 376–409. As one musician wrote: "Music paves the way for the political understanding of the Germanic peoples" ["Die Musik ist ein Wegebereiter der politischen Verständigung der germanischen Völker"], *Thorwald Lammers Tagebuch*, quoted in Prieberg, *Musik im NS-Staat*, 380.

44. "Die hohe Kunst als solche—wie Führer, Volk und Staat—als Repräsentation 'ewiger Gesetze,' die Unterordnung und fraglosen Gehorsam verlangen"; Sponheuer, 251.

45. Erik Levi made a similar point: "Nazi cultural aesthetes found great difficulty in determining the meaning and value of a particular piece of music unless it was allied to an unequivocal political slogan"; "Music and National Socialism: The Politicisation of Criticism, Composition and Performance," in *The Nazification of Art: Art, Design, Music, Architecture and Film in the Third Reich*, ed. Brandon Taylor and Wilfried van der Will (Winchester: Winchester School of Art, 1990), 159.

46. Heister and Wolff, 116.

47. "als Prophet völkisch-rassischer Wiedergeburt Gross-Deutschlands, des Sieges 'schollenhaft'-beständigen Lebenswillen über dekadente Zivilisation"; Hansen, *Anton Bruckner*, 21.

48. It is tempting to relate this to Nietzsche's *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen* (1873–76) and particularly to Nietzsche's notion that German culture had reached such a state that it considered truth itself as "unzeitgemäss." On the influence of this aspect of Nietzsche's thought on German culture, see Stephen Aschheim, *The Nietzsche Legacy in Germany, 1890–1900* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 22–25, 69.

49. Jeffery Herf wrote that "reactionary modernist" ideology embraced the "legend of the free creative spirit at war with the Bourgeoisie who refuses to accept any limits"; *Reactionary Modernism: Technology, Culture and Politics in Weimar and the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 12.

50. Norbert Nagler comments on the many terms in Bruckner research that begin with the prefix *Ur-*; "Bruckners gründerzeitliche Monumentalsymphonie: Relexionen zur Heteronomie kompositorischer Praxis" in Metzger and Riehn, 89.

51. "Nach Jahrzehnten ungewöhnlichen hartnäckigen Missverstehens hat sich in der Gegenwart das Werk des Meisters von St. Florian einer zusehends erlebnisbereiten Hörergemeinde erschlossen. Auch an kenntnis- und verständnisreichen Auslegungen fehlt es nicht. Dennoch—so will es mir scheinen—entzog sich ein vorwaltender Wesenzug im Werk und Leben Bruckners noch jeder zusammenschauenden Deutung: Bruckners Sonderstellung in seiner geschichtlichen Umwelt"; Danckert, "Bruckner und das Natursymbol," *Die Musik* 30 (1938), 306.

52. " 'unterirdisch' fortwirkende Überlieferung des süddeutschen-österreichischen Barock"; Danckert, 306. The notion that Bruckner's music fused baroque and romantic elements was not original to Skorzeny. Gotthold Frotscher had made a similar claim in "Anton Bruckners dynamische Prinzip," *Die Musik* 16 (1924): 886–87.

53. ". . . Fortsetzer, ja Vollender einer älteren, im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert lebendigen, späterhin aber von anderen künstlerischen Strömungen überfluteten Ausdruckswelt, erfüllt von kräftiger Sinnlichkeit, Freude an Glanz und wuchernder Gestaltenfülle, getragen von einem 'vorklassisch' anmutenden 'objektiven' Formensinn"; Danckert, 306.

54. Hansen, *Anton Bruckner*, 11–12, 24.

55. Speech of 18 July 1937, quoted in the *Völkische Beobachter*, 19 July 1937; quoted and trans. in Adam, 24.

56. Hinz, 2.

57. See Korstvedt, "The First Printed Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony," esp. 332–68 and Korstvedt, "Return to the Pure Sources," passim, for a more substantial discussion of the issues raised in this paragraph.

58. "Eine Befreiung des wahren symphonischen Willens des Meisters"; quoted in Alfred Orel, "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner," *Deutsche Musikkultur* 1 (1936–37): 223.

59. "Der Führer und seine Regierung betrachten es als ihre kulturelle Ehrenpflicht, alles in ihren Kräften Stehende zu tun, um das ganz deutsche Volk dieses beglückenden Erbes teilhaftig werden zu lassen und durch eine grosszügige Förderung der Bruckner-Pflege daran mitzuhelfen, dass diese in ihren Auswirkung nicht nur in die Tiefe, sondern auch in die Breite dringt. Aus diesen Gründen hat sie sich entschlossen, der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft so lange jährlich zur Herausgabe der Originalfassung seiner Symphonien einen namhaften Beitrag zur Verfügung zu stellen, bis das Gesamtwerk des Meisters in der von ihm geschauten Form vorliegt"; quoted in Ehlers, 747. See also Cooper's translation of this speech, 608.

60. "dem geistige Kampf um den Besitz des 'echten' Bruckner"; Max Auer, "Der Streit um den 'echten' Bruckner im Licht biographischer Tatsachen," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103 (1936), 1195.

61. "Schwerwiegend auch deshalb, weil unsere Generation, die vom Schicksal vor diese Entscheidung gestellt wurde, die Veranwortung dafür trägt, in welcher Form die Symphonien Bruckners im Geistesleben der Menschheit lebendig sein werden"; Weisbach, "Erfahrungen und Erkenntnisse" in *Anton Bruckner: Wissenschaftliche und Künsterlische Betrachtungen*, ed. International Bruckner-Gesellschaft (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1937), 31–32.

62. "bei geschärften Verantwortungsbewusstein der Gegenwart grossen nationalen Kulturgütern gegenüber dürfte die Zeit nicht fern sein, da sich auch die 4., 5. und 6. Sinfonie[n] in der Originalfassung durchgesetz haben werden"; Horst Büttner, "Der Linzer Fassung von Bruckners Erster Sinfonie," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103 (1936): 471.

63. See Bettina Preiss, "Eine Wissenschaft wird zur Dienstleistung: Kunstgeschichte im Nationalsozialismus," in *Kunst auf Befehl, Dreiunddreissig bis Fünfundvierzig*, ed. Bazon Brock and Achim Preiss (Munich: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1990), 49.

64. Preiss, 50.

65. "Angesichts des Siegeszug der Originalfassungen durch die Konzertsäle, . . . angesichts der nicht hinwegzuleugnen 'Echtheit' dieser von den eigenen Fingern des Meisters niedergeschrieben Partituren, haben die bisherigen Kompromissfassungen ihre Daseinsberechtigung verloren"; Auer, "Der Streit um den 'echten' Bruckner," 1195.

66. "hier aber handelt es sich—und darauf muss die Öffentlichkeit mit allem Nachdruck hingewiesen werden—um eine Grosstat, die die ganze Musikwelt angeht; denn sie löst den Bann, der bislang noch auf Bruckners Werk gelegen war"; Lang, "Der Ur-Bruckner: Betrachtungen zur kritischen Gesamtausgabe," *Die Musik* 28 (1936): 257.

67. "wächst gerade bei den völlig unvoreingenommen Hörern und bei solchen, die aus Respekt vor der unantastbaren Arbeit des Genius ihre Vorurteile gegen die originalen Fassungen ablegten, die uneingeschränkte Zustimmung"; Fritz Oeser, "Zur Frage der Originalfassungen bei Bruckner," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 105 (1938): 773.

68. Auer, "Die biographischen Tatsachen," in *Anton Bruckner: Wissenschaftliche und Künstlerische Betrachtungen*, 10.

69. This story was widely repeated. For an influential formulation of it see Robert Haas, "Vorlagenbericht," in *Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke, Band 4, Teil 1: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur (Fassung von 1878 mit dem Finale von 1878), Partituren und Entwürfe mit Bericht*, ed. Haas (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1936), ii.

70. In the first decade of this century Universal acquired the copyrights to all of Bruckner's symphonies and most of his concerted choral works. See Herbert Vogg, *1876–1976: 100 Jahre Musikverlag Doblinger* (Vienna: Doblinger, 1976), 25, and Alexander Weinmann, "Anton Bruckner und seine Verleger" in *Bruckner-Studien: Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz Grasberger (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1964), 126.

71. On the right-wing animosity to Universal Edition see Douglas Jarman, "Vienna after the Empire" in *Modern Times: From World War I to the Present*, ed. Robert Morgan (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1994), 70–71, 77, and Joel Sachs, "Some Aspects of Musical Politics in Pre-Nazi Germany," *Perspectives on New Music* 9 (1970): 78–79. Brüstle also discussed this issue.

72. Rolf Pergler, "Der Durchbruch des stilbildenden Prinzips in den Originalfassungen der Symphonien von Anton Bruckners," in *Anton Bruckner: Wissenschaftliche und künstlerische Betrachtungen*, 18–30.

73. "Es ist kaum zu glauben, was Löwe allein aus dem Scherzo gemacht hat, das in der Brucknerschen Fassung einer ganz anderen Sphäre des Klanges und des Ausdrucks angehört. Löwe hat das Stück in einer sehr aparten und geistreichen Art aufs Gefällige hingerichtet und seine Arbeit allein hat den Anstoss zu jener Betrachtungsweise gegeben, die aus dem Scherzo der Neunten Elfen- und Sommernachtstraumstimmungen und überhaupt so was wie eine Synthese von Mendelssohn, Berlioz und Bruckner heraushört. Damit ist es nun für immer vorbei, und wir können die alten Vergleiche getrost einpacken. Das wirkliche Scherzo Bruckners hat nichts von moussierender Spritzigkeit, es steht mit festen, markigen Knochen auf dem heimatlichen Boden des oberösterreichischen Landes"; review in *Münchener Zeitung*, 4 Apr. 1932, quoted in Auer, "Anton Bruckners IX. Sinfonie in der Originalfassung," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 99 (1932): 863.

74. Friedrich Herzfeld, reply to Oskar Lang, "Noch einmal 'Der Ur-Bruckner,' " *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 63 (1936): 481.

75. Friedrich Klose, response to Alfred Orel, "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner," *Deutsche Musikkultur* 1 (1936–37): 223. Klose's preference for the first edition of the Ninth Symphony must have been based on personal taste alone. This edition was edited by Ferdinand Löwe from Bruckner's unfinished manuscript and published in 1903, seven years after Bruckner's death. Thus this edition cannot be claimed to represent Bruckner's own text in all details.

76. Emil Armbruster, *Erstdruckfassung oder "Originalfassung"?: Ein Beitrag zur Brucknerfrage am fünfzigsten Todestag des Meister* (Leipzig: Jost, 1946).

77. See Armbruster, 2.

78. "Man kann doch nicht einfach die letzten zwölf Jahre auslöschen and wieder da anfangen, wo man 1933 aufgehört hat"; Strobel, "Melos 1946," *Melos* 14 (1946): 1.

79. "Bruckner als die Inkarnation des Deutschen Dranges in unendliche Tiefen oder Höhen"; Strobel, 2.

80. *Te Deum Laudamus: Gedanken zur Musik Anton Bruckners* (Vienna: Herder, 1947).

81. This was the Sept. 1946 issue of the *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift.*

82. Franz Gräflinger, "Anton Bruckner und Hermann Levi, sein 'Edelster Gönner' und 'Höchstberühmster Vater,' " *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 1 (1946): 292–95.

83. For examples of this tendency see Hansen, *Anton Bruckner,* passim; Michael Kopfermann, "Über den Anfang des Ersten Satzes von Bruckners VIII. Symphonie," in Metzger and Riehn, 23–70; and Manfred Wagner, "Musik von Gestern—Provokation für Heute: Zum Einfluss Anton Bruckners auf die musikalische Gegenwart," in Metzger and Riehn, 71–84.

84. Erich Wolfgang Partsch, "Kritische Gedanken über Bruckner-Rezeption" and "Der Musikant Gottes—Zur Analyse eines Stereotyps," in Renate Grasberger and Erich Wolfgang Partsch, *Bruckner-skizziert: Ein Porträt in ausgewählten Erinnerungen und Anekdoten,* Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien, vol. 8 (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1991), 201–34 and 235–57 respectively; Partsch, "Über Wert und Unwert von Bruckner-Anekdoten," *Musica* 46 (1992): 166–70; Manfred Wagner, "Gefahr der Anekdote," in *Bruckner Symposion 1977,* ed. Franz Grasberger (Linz: Linzer Veranstaltungsgesellschaft 1978), 27–33; and Wagner, *Anton Bruckner,* especially "Von den Wurzeln unseres Brucknerbildes: Die Nekrologe von 1896, Dokumente zur Rezeption," 307–34.

85. Robert Simpson, *The Essence of Bruckner: An Essay Towards the Understanding of his Music,* rev. ed. (London: Victor Gollancz, 1992), 13.

86. See Leopold Nowak, "Die Anton Bruckner Gesamtausgabe: Ihre Geschichte und Schicksale," in *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1983/84,* ed. Othmar Wessely (Linz: Linzer Veranstaltungsgesellschaft, 1985), 40.

87. Deryck Cooke, "Anton Bruckner" in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians,* ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Grove's Dictionaries of Music, 1980), vol. 3, 360; reprinted in *The New Grove Late Romantic Masters,* ed. Stanley Sadie (New York: Norton, 1985), 32. See also Cooke's "The Bruckner Problem Simplified" in Cooke, *Vindication: Essays about Romantic Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 43–71.

88. Numerous examples of this performance tradition are preserved in recordings from the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s by Eugen Jochum, Wilhelm Furtwängler, Hans Knappertsbusch, Carl Schuricht, and Jascha Horenstein.

89. Nikolas Harnoncourt's comments in the notes to his recent recording of Bruckner's Third Symphony offer a recent example of these phenomena (Teldec 4509-98405-2): "I think Bruckner knew perfectly well how he imagined his works would sound and that he set this down quite clearly. He said: 'My work is in the score.' . . . The versions that various friends and conductors forced out of him were concessions to these friends and to audiences, prompted by the wish to be performed at all" (7). Harnoncourt also decried the unwritten decelerandos often taken in the slow movement of the Third Symphony: "There isn't the slightest indication in the score that this is how these passages should be taken. And yet orchestras are used to

playing them like this. But when a composer like Bruckner writes even the tiniest change of tempo into the score and when he prescribes even the least expressive nuance by means of footnotes and explanations, I'm tempted to agree with him and [am] inclined to clear away all this ballast" (8). I am grateful to William Carragan for bringing Harnoncourt's remarks to my attention.

90. Tempo schemes derived from these older texts can be heard quite clearly in, for example, Karl Böhm's 1936 recording of the Fourth Symphony with the Sächsische Staatskapelle (reissued on Da Capo 1C 053.28 924M LP) and Eugen Jochum's 1939 recording of the Fourth Symphony with the Hamburg Philharmonic (reissued on Lys 007/8 CD). Similarly, Siegmund von Hausegger, who was one of Haas's consultants and premiered the *Gesamtausgabe* edition of the Ninth Symphony in 1932, adopted some of the tempo and dynamic indications found only in Löwe's 1903 edition when he recorded the new critical edition of the symphony in 1938 with the Munich Philharmonic (reissued on Preiser 90148 CD). On the continued prevalence of many of the performance indications of Löwe's edition of this symphony, see Mark Kluge, "Furtwängler and the Art of Bruckner Interpretation: Conclusion," *The Newsletter of the Wilhelm Furtwängler Society of America*, vol. 4, no. 4 (1993): 6–13. Furthermore, when performing Haas's edition of the Fifth Symphony several conductors adhered to a practice derived from the text of the first edition: adding supplementary brass players in the peroration of the Finale (mm. 583–635 in Haas's edition; compare the passage beginning at rehearsal U in the 1896 edition). Hausegger probably did this in the first performance in Munich in October 1935; Kabasta definitely did so in the Viennese premiere in March 1936, as did Eugen Jochum at a concert in Berlin in 1938; see Brüstle.