5 "Return to the pure sources": the ideology and text-critical legacy of the first Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe*

Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt

The first modern critical edition of the works of Anton Bruckner was published between 1930 and 1944 under the direction of Robert Haas.[1] Although it was never completed, the *Gesamtausgabe* revolutionized the text-critical reception of Bruckner's works.[2] The new edition included revised texts of eight of Bruckner's nine numbered symphonies; these were intended to replace – not supplement – all previous editions.[3] Seven of Bruckner's symphonies had appeared in print during his lifetime; these editions had been accepted as authoritative by his contemporaries as well as by performers and scholars in the decades following his death.[4] Their successful replacement required a body of criticism that denied their historical and text-critical validity. In its most influential formulation, the line of argument held that the first editions had been tainted by external influences and did not accurately reflect Bruckner's intentions, and thus new scores based on the composer's autograph manuscripts were needed.

During the 1930s this position was propounded, discussed, and ultimately legitimized in the German-language musical press. Although many of the arguments in favor of the *Gesamtausgabe* are tenuous, their validity was widely accepted at the time. Many critics and scholars saw

[1] The original *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* was published by the Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna, which was founded for this purpose. After 1938 the publishing apparatus was moved to Leipzig and then Wiesbaden. For a survey of the history of the *Gesamtausgabe* see Leopold Nowak, "Die Anton Bruckner Gesamtausgabe. Ihre Geschichte und Schicksal," in *Bruckner Jahrbuch* 1983/84, pp. 33–67.

[2] The *Gesamtausgabe* also made available a number of unpublished early works, including the Requiem in D minor, the *Missa Solemnis* in B♭ minor, the *Vier Orchesterstücke* and the "Linz" version of the First Symphony.

[3] The only numbered symphony not included in the first *Gesamtausgabe* was the Third. By 1945 Robert Haas had nearly completed an edition of the 1873 version.

[4] By the time of Bruckner's death in 1896 all of Bruckner's numbered symphonies had been published except the Sixth and the Ninth. The String Quintet, the three Linz masses, the Te Deum, Psalm 150 and many smaller choral pieces had also been published. Alexander Weinmann, "Anton Bruckner und seine Verleger," in *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz Grasberger (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1964), pp. 121–38.

the new edition as the disclosure, after decades of obscurity, of the "real Bruckner." As Franz Moissl wrote in 1936, the *Gesamtausgabe* was "a liberation of the true symphonic will of the master."[5] By the end of the 1930s the Haas edition was widely accepted as definitive and had effectively ousted all earlier publications of the works it included.

This dismissal of the first printed editions has proven to be very durable; in large measure, it continues to shape – and, I contend, constrain unacceptably – current understanding of Bruckner's music. Despite its lasting influence, Haas's *Gesamtausgabe* has been subject to critical scrutiny. The most important stemmed from Leopold Nowak, who succeeded Haas as both director of the Music Collection of the Austrian National Library and general editor of the Bruckner edition.[6] Nowak not only picked up where Haas had left off, producing many new critical scores, he also revised and republished all the volumes Haas had done, rectifying some of the more dubious editorial decisions.[7] One facet of Haas's *Gesamtausgabe* escaped Nowak's reevaluation. During the last half century, the belief that the early printed editions of the composer's works are "inauthentic" has become a virtual article of faith of Bruckner reception.[8] Indeed, there is a consensus that the so-called "Bruckner Case" is closed: as Deryck Cooke wrote in the 1970s, "the first editions . . . have been utterly discredited."[9] At least to this extent, the basic canonical lines drawn by the first Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe* still define the textual province of Bruckner reception.

The assertion that the first editions do not reflect the composer's wishes is problematic on historical grounds. Bruckner never attempted

[5] *Brucknerblätter* 1 (1936), quoted in Alfred Orel, "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner," *Deutsche Musikkultur* 1 (1936/37), 201.

[6] Nowak became general editor of the *Gesamtausgabe* in 1946. Before his death in 1991 he produced editions of most of the versions of Bruckner's works. (The project is ongoing.)

[7] Nowak, "Bruckner Gesamtausgabe," 40–45. Nowak's was a distinct enterprise; he was careful to distinguish between the "alte" and "neue" *Gesamtausgabe*. His editions are based on his own recension; for practical reasons, he reused, with the necessary corrections, plates from the Haas editions of the First, Second, Fourth (1878/80), Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth (1890), and Ninth Symphonies. In the Second, Seventh, and Eighth Symphonies Haas conflated sources to create texts that he imagined Bruckner would or should have written under the best of all possible circumstances. Nowak pointed out that these editions do not merit their label "Originalfassungen" but are better seen as hypothetical "Idealfassungen." Nowak, "Bruckner Gesamtausgabe," 40. Today Nowak's scores have replaced Haas's as the accepted, authoritative editions.

[8] One of the few articles to consider the historical importance of the early editions is Constantin Floros, "Historische Phasen der Bruckner-Interpretation," in *Bruckner-Symposion Bericht 1982. Bruckner-Interpretation*, ed. Othmar Wessely (Linz: Linzer Veranstaltungsgesellschaft, 1983), pp. 93–102. Floros explored the value of these editions as reflections of changes in Bruckner performance practice.

[9] Deryck Cooke, "Anton Bruckner," in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Macmillan, 1980), III, p. 360; "The Bruckner Problem Simplified," in *Vindication: Essays about Romantic Music* (Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 43–71.

to suppress, criticize, or renounce them. He attended performances based on most of these scores and, on several occasions, expressed his satisfaction with the concerts.[10] Furthermore, there is clear textual evidence testifying to the authority of several of the early prints. The *Stichvorlagen* for the first editions of the Second, Third, Fourth, and Seventh Symphonies, as well as the String Quintet, survive with extensive entries in Bruckner's hand.[11]

During the 1930s and 40s several scholars were aware of these facts. Perhaps the most important was Alfred Orel, who had been an original member of the editorial staff of the *Gesamtausgabe.*[12] In 1936 he criticized the new edition for what he saw as its unjustified rejection of previous editions, particularly those that had been published with Bruckner's apparent consent and approval.[13] Orel was joined by two European expatriates writing for English-language publications, Egon Wellesz and Werner Wolff.[14] Wellesz, in particular, questioned the credibility of the notion that the printed editions did not represent Bruckner's intentions. He suggested (quite rightly, I believe) that, far from being falsifications, the early editions embody a different, later phase of the creative process,

[10] Examples can be found in Bruckner's letter to Hermann Levi dated 27 February 1888 (Franz Gräflinger, *Anton Bruckner. Leben und Schaffen* [Berlin: Hesse, 1927], pp. 340–41); his letter to Felix Weingartner dated 27 January 1891 and his letter to Siegfried Ochs dated 3 February 1892 (Auer, *Bruckner gesammelte Briefe*, pp. 237–38 and 255–56).

[11] The first edition of the Seventh Symphony (Vienna: Gutmann, 1885) was apparently engraved directly from Bruckner's autograph. The *Stichvorlage* of the second edition of the Third Symphony (Vienna: Rättig, 1890) consisted of a mixture of pages from the first printed edition (which had been published by Rättig in 1878) and pages newly copied by Franz Schalk. The entire document, now Wn Mus. Hs. 6081, was thoroughly revised by the composer. The *Stichvorlagen* of the first editions of the Fourth Symphony (Vienna: Gutmann, 1889) and Quintet (Vienna: Gutmann, 1884) are copy scores with extensive additions and annotations in Bruckner's hand. The former is now in private possession; a complete set of photographs is in Wst M.H. 9098/c. Benjamin Korstvedt, "The First Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995); and "The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity," *19th Century Music* 20 (1996), 3–26. On the Quintet see Nowak, *Sämtliche Werke B*, XIII/2, "Vorwort."

[12] Orel prepared the edition of the Ninth Symphony that was published in the *Gesamtausgabe* in 1934, and his name was listed along with Robert Haas's on the title pages of the four other volumes that appeared before 1936.

[13] Orel agreed with the position of the *Gesamtausgabe* that "for the posthumously published editions [i.e. the first editions of the Sixth and Ninth Symphonies] Bruckner's manuscripts are doubtless the only correct textual basis." "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner," 221. Contrary to Haas, Orel did not admit any such blanket conclusion about the editions published during the composer's lifetime: such decisions, he wrote, "can only be addressed case-by-case, rather than on a general basis." Ibid., 222.

[14] Egon Wellesz, "Anton Bruckner and the Process of Musical Creativity," *The Musical Quarterly* 24 (1938), 265–90 and Werner Wolff, *Anton Bruckner: Rustic Genius* (New York: Dutton, 1942), pp. 261–70. Another criticism, more political, of the editorial approach of the *Gesamtausgabe* can be found in Emil Armbruster, *Erstdruckfassung oder "Originalfassung"? Ein Beitrag zur Brucknerfrage am fünfzigsten Todestag des Meister* (Leipzig: Jost, 1946).

one that was more responsive to practical considerations. Both Wellesz and Orel struck upon the central issue: there is no conclusive evidence that Bruckner considered the early printed scores inauthentic.

The editors of the *Gesamtausgabe* also realized that the dismissal of the first editions was not defensible purely on the basis of textual evidence. To justify their position they combined biographical and psychological interpretation in support of an idealist theory of textuality.[15] All professions of objectivity notwithstanding, ideology as much as scholarship shaped the preparation, reception, and legitimization of the new edition. By the late 1930s the *Gesamtausgabe* had been overtly politicized by the Nazi Government and had come to hold an esteemed place in the official culture industry.[16] The process crystallized with Joseph Goebbels's speech at the 1937 Regensburg Bruckner Festival, when he declared that, since Bruckner's symphonies were a precious national legacy, the Bruckner Society would henceforth receive an annual contribution to support the editing of the "original versions." Goebbels not only offered financial support to the *Gesamtausgabe*, he granted it Hitler's *imprimatur*.

> The Führer and his government consider it a cultural debt of honor to do all that is within their power to permit the whole German people to share [Bruckner's] blessed heritage 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 International Bruckner Society for the editing of the original versions of his symphonies until the complete works of the master are produced in the form he envisioned.[17]

This chapter will demonstrate that this frank politicizing played a formative role in developing the crucial notion that all earlier editions of Bruckner's symphonies were "inauthentic" and needed to be replaced by "original" texts. The editorial policies of the new edition, often riddled with historiographic contradictions, cannot be understood without reference to the ideological context of Austro–German musicology and Bruckner reception of the 1930s and 1940s.

[15] The Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe* was not unique; many critical editions prepared in this century have had broadly similar text-critical agendas. On the conceptual premises of modern Urtext editing and the role of text-critical paradigms in shaping the *Gesamtausgabe*, see Korstvedt, "Bruckner's Fourth Symphony," pp. 186–208.

[16] Geoffrey Sharp recognized this as early as 1942; he wrote, "the present *régime* in Germany has made a political gambit of the Critical Edition." "Anton Bruckner: Simpleton or Mystic?" *Music Review* 3 (1942), 46–54.

[17] Quoted in Paul Ehlers, "Das Regensburger Bruckner-Erlebnis," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 104 (1937), 747. John Michael Cooper's English translation of this address is appended to Bryan Gilliam, "The Annexation of Anton Bruckner: Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation," *The Musical Quarterly* 78 (1994), 605–09.

The ideological context of the *Gesamtausgabe*

It is no secret that the 1930s witnessed the darkest chapter in the history of Bruckner reception. The persona of Anton Bruckner and his music figured importantly in the cultural pantheon of National Socialism.[18] Many of the facts are familiar. Bruckner's music was routinely featured at mass rallies and in radio broadcasts. The Nazi government supported Bruckner festivals, including the notorious 1937 Regensburg Festival at which Adolf Hitler received the medal of honor of the International Bruckner Society. Propagandizing about Bruckner was prevalent: Joseph Goebbels described Bruckner as a symbol of "the spiritual and psychic community of destiny, insoluble even to this day, that unites the entire German people."[19] The Nazi appropriation of Bruckner was thorough even by the standards of its time and place. As Mathias Hansen wrote:

> No other musician, not even Wagner or Richard Strauss, indeed no other great artist of the past became so unconditionally and totally occupied by fascist ideology as did Bruckner.[20]

The glorification of Bruckner was reflected in both musical and critical practice. His music was widely performed and scholarly activity devoted to the composer increased markedly, particularly in 1935 and 1936 with the outbreak of the "Bruckner-Streit," as the debate over the *Gesamtausgabe* became public.[21] Scores of articles on Bruckner and his music also appeared in the non-specialist press. During this era, critical writing about Bruckner resonated loudly with many of the cultural tendencies that underlay National Socialism. Two paradigmatic manifestations were the prevalence of blatantly ideological representations of

[18] 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 *Anton Bruckner* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1987), pp. 19–41; Christa Brüstle, "Bruckner's 'Original' Fifth Symphony: Aspects of its Reception and Use (1933–1945)," unpublished paper read at "Perspectives on Anton Bruckner," Connecticut College, 23 February 1994; as well as my "Bruckner's Fourth Symphony" and "Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich and After (An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception)," *The Musical Quarterly* 80 (1996), 132–60. Bryan Gilliam and Stephen McClatchie discuss aspects of this topic in their chapters in the present volume.

[19] Quoted in Ehlers, "Das Regensburger Bruckner-Erlebnis," 747.

[20] Hansen, "Faschistische Bruckner-Rezeption," 53.

[21] For example, after comprising a mere 10 percent of the repertory in the Vienna Philharmonic during the early and middle 1930s, Bruckner's music formed an average of 22 percent in 1941–45. The total fell to between 12 and 13 percent in the late 1940s and 1950s. His place in the repertory of the Vienna Symphony underwent a similar, if less extreme, upswing after the *Anschluss*. Desmond Mark, *Zur Bestandaufnahme des Wiener Orchesterrepertoires* (Vienna: Universal, 1979), pp. 32, 40, and 50. Also during the 1920s the *Zeitschrift für Musik*, for example, published fewer than a dozen articles on Bruckner. After 1932 the number rose sharply and peaked with a total of twenty-one contributions on Bruckner in 1936.

Bruckner as an Aryan hero and the identification of Bruckner's music with a mythical, lost spirituality. These critical themes were often allied with the highly charged metaphor of cultural rebirth. In 1936, for example, Max Auer argued that Bruckner's music offered a remedy to the modern corruptions that threatened German culture. He suggested that, as "the guide to a beautiful, spiritual world" and a "return to the pure sources," Bruckner's music offered potential salvation from the pressing dangers of "crass materialism" and "artistic Bolshevism."[22] An even more overtly political view can be seen in Fritz Skorzeny's article "Anton Bruckner im Lichte deutscher Auferstehung."[23] Skorzeny allied the increased popularity of Bruckner's music with the imagined "resurrection" of the German spirit effected by National Socialism. He claimed these phenomena were two sides of one coin: the source of the new "understanding" and "love" of Bruckner's music was the rebirth of the German *Volksgeist*:

> It was reserved for our age, to experience for the first time, with the deepest emotion, the break of dawn light, the great "Awake, the day is nigh." In this light the miracle of Anton Bruckner is fulfilled.[24]

Völkisch critical strategies were not confined to the margins of the critical discourse about Bruckner. A broad spectrum of the musicological discussion of Bruckner was infused with rhetoric of this sort. Consider, for example, the "Einleitung" of Robert Haas's influential biography:

> Anton Bruckner's artistic appearance presents a tightly bound essential unity of life and work of such keenly marked and extraordinary mental attitude, that its significance reaches far beyond purely musical concerns. In the age of machines and materialism it contains the full primordial power of German mysticism and allows its soulful fervor and ardor [*ihre seelentiefe Inbrunst and Glut*] to shine forth . . .[25]

[22] Auer's striking rhetoric merits lengthy quotation:

> 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. It became apparent that 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 [*Führer*] to a beautiful, spiritual world and thereby the foundations of a healthy and strong Bruckner movement were laid which is only now, after the World War, succeeding with elemental power. (Göllerich–Auer, IV/4, pp. 61–62.)

[23] *Die Musik* 30 (1938), 310–13.

[24] Ibid., 311.

[25] Robert Haas, *Anton Bruckner* (Potsdam: Athenaion, 1934), p. 1.

Following comments on Bruckner's profoundly German nature and comparisons with such icons of the German anti-modernist right as Meister Eckhardt, Jacob Böhm, and Rainer Maria Rilke, Haas closed his essay:

> This [Bruckner's] *Weltanschauung* is fully and thoroughly grounded in the German essence, its musical setting allows the German soul to stream forth unclouded; every cosmopolitan refinement and every admixture of foreign blood [*jeder weltbürgerliche Schliff und jede fremde Blutmischung*] is absent, as by a law of nature. Even the formative experience of Catholicism left no traces. Hence the Germans' impetuous, drunken love for this master is as understandable as is the reserve of other nations.[26]

In hindsight, the ideological biases of such critical positions are so clearly bound up with the culture of Nazism that today no responsible person would lend them any real credence.[27]

The origins of the Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe*

The roots of the controversy over the authenticity of the early printed editions extend back to the 1920s, when scholars began to suspect that the available editions might be unreliable. The issue was raised for the first time in 1919 in an article entitled "Wichtige Aufgaben der Musikwissenschaft gegenüber Anton Bruckner" by Georg Göhler, a German conductor and scholar.[28] He argued that the published scores of Bruckner's symphonies were so poorly prepared that they made performance unnecessarily difficult; a new critical edition was needed.[29] His perspective was that of a performer, rather than a scholar or philologist; his call for an edition that reflected "what Bruckner himself had originally written" was not based on evidence drawn from Bruckner's manuscripts. Rather, Göhler argued that inconsistencies in certain published editions (such as prevalent errors in the orchestral parts of the Sixth Symphony and discrepancies between the published orchestral score and piano score of the same symphony) were indicative of sloppy work by Bruckner's publishers (*Verlagsschlamperei*). He felt that an edition based on Bruckner's manuscript texts would allow conductors discretion about what to alter in performance.[30]

[26] Ibid., 6.

[27] Facets of the legacy of German Bruckner reception in the 1930s and 1940s, including most of Haas's study, have proven to be of more lasting value. Several books of continuing importance were published including the third and fourth volumes (Linz and Vienna years) of the Göllerich–Auer biography, as well as Robert Haas's study of the composer.

[28] Georg Göhler, "Wichtige Aufgaben der Musikwissenschaft gegenüber Anton Bruckner," *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 1 (1919), 293–95.

[29] Göhler proposed 1927 for the publication of this new edition since Bruckner's works were under copyright until that date.

[30] Ibid., 294.

Alfred Orel published a reply that emphasized scholarly rather than practical concerns.[31] He rejected Göhler's permissive attitude towards textual license in performance and was at pains to distinguish between practical and "scholarly-critical" (*wissenschaftlich-kritisch*) editions. A critical edition of Bruckner's work, Orel argued, must be based on Bruckner's manuscripts. He invoked the authority of Guido Adler, who had studied under Bruckner at the Vienna Conservatory, to support his claim that there were significant discrepancies between the printed versions and autograph manuscripts of Bruckner's symphonies.[32]

Despite the articles by Orel and Göhler, editorial problems were not widely discussed in the abundant scholarly writing about Bruckner that appeared during the first half of the 1920s.[33] It was not until 1927 with the founding of the International Bruckner Society that these issues began to dominate. The original by-laws of the organization reflect the positions of both Göhler and Orel: they state that the central goals of the organization included "the preparation of a complete critical edition of Anton Bruckner's musical works" and "the publication of error-free practical editions [*fehlerfreier praktischer Ausgaben*]."[34]

The text-critical argument of the *Gesamtausgabe*

In practice, the *Gesamtausgabe* project assumed a dimension which could not have been foreseen in 1927, let alone 1919 when Göhler first called for a new edition. Total rejection of the early prints required an extensive campaign to establish the superiority of manuscript sources. One of the most important strategies was to invoke the authority of Bruckner's will. Bruckner bequeathed many of his autograph manuscripts to the Court Library in Vienna (now the Austrian National Library).[35] These were the

[31] Alfred Orel, "Bruckner-Ausgaben (Eine Erwiderung)," *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 1 (1919), 422–24.

[32] Orel wrote that Adler had given a proseminar, "Erklären und Bestimmen von Kunstwerke" at the Musikhistorisches Institut der Wiener Universität. As part of this seminar, Orel gave a presentation on the textual problems of Bruckner's symphonies, enumerating "every single discrepancy" ("jede einzelne Diskrepanz") between Bruckner manuscripts and the printed editions. Ibid., 422.

[33] One of the few scholars to address the issue was Karl Grunsky, "Bruckner-Not: Eine Beitrag zur Neuherausgabe der Bruckner-Partituren," *Neue Musik-Zeitung* 46 (1925), 213–14. In his *Bruckner* (Berlin: Hesse, 1925), Ernst Kurth addressed editorial problems only once, p. 603.

[34] The 1927 charter of the International Bruckner Society is quoted in Cornelius van Zwol, "Wie original ist eine Originalfassung?" *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1980*, p. 61.

[35] The text of this document has been widely reproduced. Two recent sources are Manfred Wagner, *Bruckner. Eine Monographie* (Mainz: Schott, 1983), pp. 300–01; and Rolf Keller, "Die letzwilligen Verfügungen Anton Bruckners," *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1982–83*, pp. 98–99. See also Elisabeth Maier's chapter in the present volume.

primary sources for the *Gesamtausgabe*. The first promotional pamphlet (1933) observed that Bruckner's will bound the National Library not only physically to preserve the manuscripts, but also to "ensure the accuracy of these texts by promoting worthy publications."[36] Claims that editors were "duty-bound" by the will to publish *only* manuscript versions of his works became a frequent refrain in the "Bruckner-Streit" of the 1930s.[37] In point of fact, the text of Bruckner's will does not state, or even suggest, that the bequeathed manuscripts are the only valid sources of his works.

Often the claim that the *Gesamtausgabe* fulfilled the dictates of Bruckner's will was allied with the notion that the composer believed his "original versions" (i.e. his manuscript versions) to be valid only for "later times" ("spätere Zeiten"). The will contains no such reference to posterity. Bruckner once used the phrase "spätere Zeiten" himself in quite a different connection. Writing to Felix Weingartner in 1891, he requested that the conductor cut the Finale of the Eighth Symphony, since "it would be much too long and is valid only for *spätere Zeiten* and indeed [only] for a circle of friends and cognoscenti."[38] Although this statement indicates that Bruckner harbored a belief that his works were destined for the future, its value as an argument against the first edition of the Eighth Symphony is uncertain. It is possible, in fact, that the manuscript Weingartner had in his possession was actually the *Stichvorlage* of the first edition.[39] If this were true, Bruckner, perhaps ironically in light of later interpretations of this letter, must have believed that the allegedly bowdlerized text of 1892 – and not the "Originalfassung" – was meant for later generations. The theme that Bruckner's music was intended for a later age was a mainstay of *völkisch* Bruckner criticism and resonated with aspects of Nazi cosmology.[40]

[36] The pamphlet is reproduced in Nowak, "Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe," 53.

[37] Robert Haas, "Die neue Brucknerbewegung," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103 (1936), 1185 and *Sämtliche Werke A*, II, "Einführung"; and Oskar Lang, "Noch einmal 'Der Ur-Bruckner,'" *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 63 (1936), 279. This notion continued to be repeated after the war: Franz Grasberger, "Anton Bruckners Arbeitsweise," *Bruckner-Studien*, 33–34; Erwin Doernberg, *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner* (London: Barrie & Rockcliff, 1960), pp. 118–19 and Deryck Cooke, "Anton Bruckner," *The New Grove*, III, p. 30.

[38] "Bitte sehr, das Finale so wie es angezeigt ist, fest zu kürzen; denn es wäre viel zu lange und gilt nur für spätere Zeiten und zwar für einen Kreis von Freunden und Kennern," letter dated 27 January 1891. Auer, *Bruckner gesammelte Briefe*, p. 237. Weingartner's performance was canceled when he was engaged in Berlin later in 1891.

[39] Bruckner did not normally send out autograph manuscripts for use in performance. In a subsequent letter to Weingartner (17 March 1891, ibid., p. 241) he requested that the conductor not physically alter the score or parts, since it was his "innermost wish" ("innigsten Bitten") that they be published unaltered, suggesting that the manuscript in question was intended as the *Stichvorlage*. After publishing the Seventh Symphony in 1885, Bruckner did not use autograph manuscripts as *Stichvorlagen*.

[40] Hans Weisbach explicitly allied the publication of the symphonies in their "ursprüngliche Gestalt" with Bruckner's

As a historical justification of the *Gesamtausgabe* it bears little weight.[41]

Despite appeals to the authority of Bruckner's will, the fact that most of these editions appeared in Bruckner's lifetime, and that he attended several performances of them, posed a difficult problem for supporters of the new edition. It was downplayed by situating it in largely fictitious biographical narrative. The story is familiar: Bruckner was a naive and simple soul, ill-suited to worldly affairs and, as such, was manipulated, duped, and even coerced by his young associates, especially Franz and Joseph Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe. They adapted and arranged Bruckner's symphonies to suit both contemporary fashion and practical expedience and then, so the story goes, imposed these revisions on the composer.[42]

Often the plot was given a psychological twist: Bruckner's self-confidence was so deeply shaken by his lack of public success, and particularly by Hermann Levi's rejection of the Eighth Symphony in October 1887, that he was rendered even more vulnerable to manipulation by opportunistic schemers. Editions of six of Bruckner's symphonies appeared between the crisis of October 1887 and the composer's death in 1896.[43] These publications were particularly suspect, since they were prepared at a time when Bruckner was supposedly unusually susceptible to untoward influence.[44]

The motivations of Bruckner's young associates were variously interpreted. Often they were considered well-meaning, if misguided, attempts to promote Bruckner's music by making it more palatable to popular taste. Other interpretations were less charitable: in a lecture, Robert Haas went so far as to claim, without demonstrable evidence, that Bruckner was under the sway of "sanctions" threatened by the Schalks and Löwe.[45] And, although he later claimed to have been misunderstood, several who attended the lecture heard Haas suggest that the shock Bruckner experi-

"prophetically foreseen 'later times.'" "Erfahrungen und Erkenntnisse," Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft, *Anton Bruckner. Wissenschaftliche und künstlerische Betrachtungen zu den Originalfassungen* (Vienna: n.p., 1937), p. 42.

[41] The phrase "für spätere Zeiten" has been invoked for this purpose more recently. See Nowak, ed., *Bruckner Sämtliche Werke B*, IV/2, "Vorwort" and Friedrich Blume, "Anton Bruckner," in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1952), II, cols. 358 and 378.

[42] The *locus classicus* of this narrative is Max Auer, "Der Streit um den 'echten' Bruckner im Licht biographischer Tatsachen," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103 (1936), 538–45 and 1191–96.

[43] The First (1893), Second (1892), Fourth (1889), Fifth (1896), and Eighth (1892) Symphonies and the second edition of the Third (1890).

[44] Haas, ed., *Bruckner Sämtliche Werke A*, IV/1, Vorlagenbericht, II–III.

[45] Haas made this claim in a private lecture that preceded the Viennese premiere of his edition of the Fifth Symphony on 15 March 1936. Paul Stefan reported that Haas claimed that "in the last years of his life, Bruckner was under the threat of sanctions [*Sanktionsdrohnungen*] to alter his early works or to allow them to be altered." "Um Bruckner," *Die Stunde*, 15 March 1936, 4.

enced upon seeing the first printed edition of his Fifth Symphony in 1895 contributed to his death in the following year.[46]

Whatever their specific details, such psycho-biographical explanations served two purposes. They distanced the first editions from Bruckner's "real intentions" and provided the new editors with a moral imperative. The first prints were not the product of "inner, artistic reasoning," but the result of the influence of men who were unsympathetic to Bruckner's "robust, austere and organ-like instrumentation."[47] Publication of the "original" versions of Bruckner's symphonies was thus seen as more than the rectification of textual mistakes or sloppy editing: it was the correction of an injustice that had been visited upon one of the greatest and noblest of all "German" artists.

Ideology and the legitimation of the *Gesamtausgabe*

Historical and biographical arguments were only part of the discourse that legitimized the *Gesamtausgabe*. A large body of secondary criticism grew up in support of its editorial claims. This literature depended on a complex set of ideological and aesthetic assumptions. Some of the notions are, although questionable by present critical standards, morally unobjectionable: an idealist 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 basic goal of editing should be to produce a hypothetical Urtext. One set of premises was not so innocent: the pursuit of imagined textual purity was often couched in terms of one of the main cultural psychoses of National Socialism, the obsession with racial purity.

The Nazi preoccupation with race affected the editing of Bruckner's music in two ways. On one level, by representing (literally re-presenting) the untainted "German" texts, the *Gesamtausgabe* manifested a desire to free Bruckner's works from the specter of an imagined history of Jewish influence.[48] In his postwar critique of the *Gesamtausgabe*, Emil

[46] Max Morold, "Die wahre Bruckner?" *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103 (1936), 536–57 and Victor Junk, "Zur Urfassung von Bruckners fünfter Symphonie. Eine Erklärung," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103 (1936), 546. Haas responded that he did not actually make this statement but had "related the experience with the Eighth and the events around the publication of the Fourth to the nervous crisis [*Nervenkrise*] of 1890." "Die neue Bruckner-Bewegung," 1184.

[47] Auer, "Die biographischen Tatsachen," 10.

[48] Even the debates about the *Gesamtausgabe* were see by some in racial terms. In declaring victory by the "neue Bruckner-Bewegung" (i.e. the supporters of the new *Gesamtausgabe*) in the battle over the Bruckner symphonies, Auer referred to "the veritable witchhunt against the 'real' Bruckner, that the Jewish Viennese press, above all, could not do enough to support." "Furtwängler setzt den Schlußpunkt zum Streit um die Fassungen bei Bruckner," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 106 (1939), 81.

Armbruster pointed out that anti-Semitism was a formative premise of the edition.

> The defamation of Löwe and Schalk as "Jews and allies of Jews" [*Juden und Judengenossen*] had a determining influence on the position of the government of the Reich: Bruckner in Jewish hands, sultry eroticism dragged into nordic, *Übermensch* heroism [*nordisch-übermenschlichen Heroismus*] – this musical miscegenation must be put to an end once and for all![49]

The involvement of Löwe and the Schalk brothers was, at times, discussed – and dismissed – in racial terms.[50] Max Auer, for instance, cast aspersions on the first prints as reflecting the unacceptable influence of "overly refined city-dwellers [*überkultivierte Städter*]," a coded term for Jews. Between the lines of Auer's argument lay the claim that such individuals were incapable of understanding the essence of Bruckner, who was "deeply rooted in the healthy earth of his Upper Austrian home."[51]

One function of the *Gesamtausgabe* was to remove Bruckner's scores from the purview of the Viennese publishing house Universal-Edition. In the decade after its founding in 1900, this firm had acquired the copyrights to all of Bruckner's symphonies and most of his large choral works.[52] Since Universal-Edition had long been a target for reactionary critics who identified it with such taboos as modernism, atonality, Bolshevism, and Judaism, it is not surprising that the Nazis would have been eager to dissociate Bruckner from the firm.[53] Nor should it be forgotten that, with the *Anschluss* and subsequent relocation of the Musikwissenchaftlicher Verlag from Vienna to Leipzig in 1938, the Third

[49] *Erstdruckfassung oder "Originalfassung?"* p. 2.

[50] Although Löwe was of Jewish descent, he was not always identified as such. He is listed as a "Halbjude" in *Lexikon der Juden in der Musik*, ed. Theophil Stengel and Herbert Gerigk (Berlin: Hahnefeld, 1941), p. 164. In some Nazi-era books on Bruckner in which the names of Jews were marked with asterisks, Löwe's name was *not* so marked. See, for example, Fritz Oeser, *Die Klangstruktur der Bruckner-Symphonie. Eine Studie zur Frage der Originalfassungen* (Leipzig: Musikwissenschaftliche Verlag, 1939), p. 33, and Peter Raabe, *Wege zu Bruckner* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1944), p. 239. (I am indebted to Brian Robison of Cornell University for his help with the information in the *Lexikon*.) Although the Schalks were Gentiles, they were often mistaken for Jews, both during their lives and posthumously. Göllerich–Auer, IV/1, p. 570, and Ernst Decsey, *Hugo Wolf* (Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1906), pp. 3, 4, pointedly identified the Schalk family as "Christian." As Thomas Leibnitz pointed out, the Schalks' physical appearance, which was easily caricatured with anti-Semitic stereotypes, may have helped perpetuate the supposition that they were Jewish. *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1988), pp. 30–31.

[51] Auer, "Die biographischen Tatsachen," 10.

[52] See Herbert Vogg, *1876–1976. 100 Jahre Musikverlag Doblinger* (Vienna: Doblinger, 1976), p. 25, and Alexander Weinmann, "Bruckner und seine Verleger," p. 126.

[53] Douglas Jarman, "Vienna after the Empire," in *Modern Times: From World War I to the Present*, ed. Robert Morgan (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1994), pp. 70–71 and 77; Joel Sachs, "Some Aspects of Musical Politics in Pre-Nazi Germany," *Perspectives on New Music* 9 (1970), 78–79; Christa Brüstle, "Bruckner's 'Original' Fifth Symphony."

Reich was able to claim the royalties that accrued from the performance of Bruckner's music.

At a deeper ideological level – one that is perhaps part of the cultural unconscious, but no less important – the desire to remove all "foreign" traces from the texts of Bruckner's compositions and to present pure, metaphysically authentic versions resonated with the myth of racial purity. This notion echoes disturbingly in an essay from 1937 by Rolf Pergler on the relative merits of the early printed editions and the *Gesamtausgabe*.[54] Here the metaphor of purity is transposed from a sociological to a textual plane. Pergler claimed that Bruckner's works were governed by the truth of the "Brucknerian formal principle [*das Brucknersche Gestaltungsprinzip*]"; accordingly, textual contaminations or, as he called them, "foreign bodies [*Fremdkörper*]," could be identified by their lack of harmony with the overall form and eliminated.[55] In Pergler's formulation textual accretions were analogous to the threat to the German people by the presence of non-Aryan blood.[56] Today, Pergler's desire to "eliminate" "foreign bodies" cannot fail to invoke chilling images.

Another tactic was to explain the intrinsic "authenticity" of the newly available "original versions" on the basis of stylistic criteria.[57] Although such studies were not overtly politicized, they were not free of ideological bias. The ideals of objective research were anathema to the principles of National Socialism.[58] Like much of the scholarship produced in the Third Reich, they were marred by circular logic: premises were based on conclusions and vice versa. Such scholarship was often couched in what Adorno later called "the jargon of authenticity."[59] This rhetorical approach, which was allied with reactionary anti-modernism, appealed to the mythology of the sacredness of the genuine, the rooted or, in Heidegger's words, "the splendor of the simple."[60] "Its language," Adorno wrote, "is a trademark of societalized chosenness, noble and homey at once."[61] Rhetoric replaced

[54] Rolf Pergler, "Der Durchbruch des stilbildenden Prinzips in den Originalfassungen der Symphonien von Anton Bruckners," in *Anton Bruckner. Wissenschaftliche und künstlerische Betrachtungen zu den Originalfassungen*, pp. 18–30.

[55] Ibid., 19.

[56] It is worth recalling Haas's comment that Bruckner's music was inherently free from "every admixture of foreign blood," *Anton Bruckner*, p. 6.

[57] A number of studies of this sort appeared in the 1930s. The longest and best-known of them is Oeser, *Die Klangstruktur der Bruckner-Symphonie*. See also Lang, "Noch einmal 'der Ur-Bruckner'"; Alfred Lorenz, "Zur Instrumentation von Anton Bruckners Symphonien," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103 (1936), 1318–25; Pergler, "Der Durchbruch des stilbildenden Prinzips"; and Frank Wohlfahrt, "Der Ur-Bruckner," *Deutsche Musikkultur* 2 (1937/38), 144–51.

[58] See George Mosse, "Science and National Socialism," *Nazi Culture: Intellectual, Cultural and Social Life in the Third Reich* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1966), pp. 197–234.

[59] Theodor W. Adorno, *The Jargon of Authenticity*, trans. Knut Tarnowski and Frederic Will (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1973).

[60] Ibid., 50.

[61] Ibid., 5.

critical argument. Dense tangles of prose substituted for intellectual depth.

Fritz Oeser, for example, opens his book, *Die Klangstruktur der Bruckner Symphonie*, with two opaque sections, "On the Situation of Bruckner Interpretation" and "On the Concept of Structure." He argued that the investigation of the originality and authenticity of Bruckner's works needed to be reframed by moving away from objective empiricism and historiography toward a sort of existential phenomenology.

> All questions concerning the human nature of [the works'] creator, his fate in time and surroundings and his historical position must remain "bracketed" for the purposes of analysis and the *Werkgestalt* must be regarded as a (provisionally) unique case offering information about Bruckner's personal style.[62]

Oeser's odd alliance between phenomenological and historical comprehension betrays a vicious hermeneutic circularity. He argued that the "simply 'given' of the musical work" is "perceptible to the senses," but, "it receives its fullness of sense and meaning from the spiritual 'background,' which is, in turn, secreted in the manifest sounding object [*im klingenden Realgebilde*] and is accessible only through this manifest object."[63] Since Oeser's concept of structure encompassed not only formal criteria but also the "spiritual basis" of the artwork, he was able to posit that engagement with the phenomenal reality of a composition could lead to understanding of its historical dimensions. "Art observation" alone (without recourse to the compositional history of the piece or its *Wirkungsgeschichte*) could ascertain the "content" of an artwork.[64]

[62] Oeser, *Die Klangstruktur*, pp. 11–12. This work struck a responsive chord with the editors of the *Gesamtausgabe*. It was Oeser's Ph.D. dissertation, "Die Klangstruktur und ihre Aufgabe in Bruckners Symphonik" (University of Leipzig, 1939), before it was published by the Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag. During this period Oeser also assisted Robert Haas with the preparation of his editions of the Eighth Symphony (published in 1939) and the Mass in E minor (published in 1940). In 1941 the Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag published Oeser's edition of Dvorak's Eighth Symphony. After the war, Oeser prepared the first modern edition of the 1878 Version of the Third Symphony, *Anton Bruckner 3. Symphonie in D-Moll, 2. Fassung von 1878. Mit Einführung und den Hauptvarianten der Endfassung* (Wiesbaden: Brucknerverlag, 1950). More recently, Oeser has prepared controversial editions of Bizet's *Carmen* (Kassel: Alkor, 1964) and Offenbach's *Tales of Hoffmann* (Kassel: Alkor, 1977). For a sustained critique of the former, see Winton Dean, "The True *Carmen*?", *Musical Times* 106 (1965), 846–55; revised in Dean, *Essays on Opera* (Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 281–300.

[63] Oeser, *Die Klangstruktur*, p. 13.

[64] Ibid., 12. Oeser's vocabulary echoed official Nazi positions. In 1936 Joseph Goebbels banned "Kunstkritik" as a nefarious product of "the age of Jewish infiltration of art" and incompatible with National Socialism. "Kunstkritik gesetzlich verankert," *Völkischer Beobachter*, 27 November 1936; reprinted in Joseph Wulf, *Die bildenden Künste im dritten Reich* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1963), pp. 119–20. In the place of "criticism" Goebbels called for "art reporting" and "art observation." He was heeded by writers on music. See, for example, Wilhelm Zentner, "Musikbetrachtung statt Musikkritik," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 104 (1937), 260–61; and Wilhelm Matthes, "Aufgabenkreis

From this anti-historicist position, Oeser was able to claim that the "questionable authenticity" of the first editions could better be ascertained by means of "an examination against the criteria" of Bruckner's earlier manuscript versions than through historical research or textual criticism.[65] Of course, such an approach could lead only to the reinscription of *a priori* aesthetic and historical premises. Oeser's analyses do, in fact, reaffirm his assumption that the process of "concealing and painting-over the Brucknerian original and its recent discovery by later generations" is "a necessary and meaningful working of a historical and transhistorical justice."[66]

Oeser's discussion of the significance of Bruckner's manner of writing for brass instruments provides a good example of his confused mixture of aesthetic observation, essentialist hermeneutics, and appeals to existential authenticity. Bruckner's characteristic use of brass instruments, Oeser suggested, derived from the techniques of choral music and therefore embodied the essence of choral music-making, specifically "communal being" rather than "subjective experience." The authenticity of the *Gesamtausgabe* editions, Oeser believed, was evident in such passages: in the modern editions, the writing for the brass was more faithful to the inherent "choral soul" of the music than it was in earlier editions.[67] For Oeser, authenticity was more a metaphysical quality than a philological determination. It was, to borrow Adorno's phrase, "a mythically-imposed fate" to be divined through aesthetic experience.[68]

The *Gesamtausgabe* triumphant

The claim that the first editions were inauthentic became a shibboleth of official German Bruckner reception. As Emil Armbruster pointed out, after Goebbels's speech in 1937, the "debate was suddenly silenced when the Nazi government dictatorially called it off with the public declaration" of support for the Bruckner Society and the *Gesamtausgabe*. From this point on "the 'Kritische Gesamtausgabe' was sacrosanct and the 'neue Bruckner-Bewegung' was the winner of the feud."[69] It is instructive to

der Kritik und Kunstbetrachtung," *Zeitschrift für Musik* 104 (1937), 273–80. Oeser followed both the letter and the spirit of Goebbels's ban. As Rolf Geissler argued, critical writing about art threatened totalitarian fascism by exposing the social and historical contingencies of all assertions of truth. Oeser's critical strategy constructed the "authenticity" (read: truth) of Bruckner's music as free from social and historical condition. Rolf Geissler, *Dekadenz und Heroismus. Zeitroman und völkisch-nationalsozialistische Literaturkritik*, Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrsheft für Zeitgeschichte 9 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1964), pp. 22–24.

[65] Oeser, *Die Klangstruktur der Bruckner-Symphonie*, p. 11.

[66] Ibid., 10.

[67] Ibid., 53.

[68] Adorno, *Jargon of Authenticity*, p. 127.

[69] Armbruster, *Erstdruckfassung oder "Originalfassung"?*, pp. 1–2.

consider the more skeptical reception accorded the *Gesamtausgabe* outside of Nazi Germany. In Vienna, performances of the new editions of several symphonies (the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Ninth, and the Adagio of the Seventh) at the Seventh International Bruckner Festival in October 1936 prompted considerable unfavorable response. One outside observer commented on "the rather strange attitude of the Vienna critics. Though otherwise accessible [sic] to new ideas, these writers could not control their anger at the success of the original editions."[70] Many of the most trenchant critiques of Haas's editorial policy (i.e. those of Wellesz and Armbruster) issued from outside of the Third Reich.[71] One interesting dissenting view came from Donald Francis Tovey. In an essay written before the new critical edition had been published he singled out for particular praise musical elements found only in the first edition of the Fourth Symphony.[72] Tovey did not change his opinion after he became acquainted with the *Gesamtausgabe*. In 1939 he wrote:

> Today the pious restoration of Bruckner's original form and scoring is acclaimed as the restoration of things that were beyond the spiritual grasp of the age . . . If these changes had been made after Bruckner's death or against his will, there would be a strong case for returning to his original versions; but, apart from their intrinsic merits, they were all accepted and published by him as expressing his final intentions. And it is to these that piety is due.[73]

Some German and Austrian scholars did directly criticize aspects of the *Gesamtausgabe*; such public opposition was not well received. The journal of the International Bruckner Society, the *Bruckner-Blätter*, was not willing to publish views that were unsympathetic to the *Gesamtausgabe*. Max Morold (a Viennese musicologist who had been privately labeled an "enemy of the Bruckner-mission" by Max Auer) criticized the journal for declining to print critical discussion about the new edition. To Morold this refusal was an abdication of scholarly responsibility, particularly since the scholarly community, and even the membership of the Bruckner Society itself, was of a divided opinion.[74] At least two writers who were ambivalent about the *Gesamtausgabe* – Friedrich Klose and Friedrich Herzfeld – felt compelled to employ the

[70] G. E. Arnold, "The Bruckner Festival at Vienna," *Musical Times* (December 1936), 1136.

[71] After the war, several German and Austrian scholars were critical of both the ideology and the textual criticism of the *Gesamtausgabe*, most notably, Emil Armbruster, *Erstdruckfassung oder "Originalfassung"?* and Wilhelm Oerley, "Von Bruckners eigener Hand. Revision der Revision," *Der Turm* 2 (1946), 138–42.

[72] "Bruckner: Romantic Symphony in E Flat Major, No. 4," *Essays in Musical Analysis*, 6 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1935–39), II: *Symphonies (II), Variations and Orchestral Polyphony*, pp. 69–79.

[73] "Retrospect and Corrigenda," *Essays in Musical Analysis*, VI: *Miscellaneous Notes, Glossary and Index*, p. 144.

[74] Unpublished letter in the Austrian National Library (Wn F18 Schalk 358/3/7).

terminology of religious apostasy. Herzfeld wondered if it was already considered "blasphemy" to raise reasonable arguments against the text-critical claims of the *Gesamtausgabe.*[75] Klose wrote that, even "at the danger of excommunication," he preferred the first edition of the Ninth Symphony to the new one.[76]

Perhaps the most important victim of this doctrinaire climate was Alfred Orel. At just the time he must have been formulating the dissent he articulated in "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner," his name ceased to appear in publications associated with the *Gesamtausgabe*, and his direct involvement with the project ended. As Franz Grasberger has suggested, Orel may well have been removed from his editorial position precisely because of his refusal to take a position against the first editions.[77] By stifling the *sine qua non* of rigorous scholarship – open debate about evidence and its interpretation – orthodoxy compromised the entire project.[78]

Conclusion

Despite many advances in text criticism of Bruckner's music in the postwar era – including, above all, those of Leopold Nowak – one shadow from the 1930s remains. As a rule, scholars and performers continue to accept as fact the central premise of the *Gesamtausgabe* that autograph manuscripts alone represent the "real" Bruckner and that these are the only texts that matter. As we have seen, the historical justification for this position is tenuous. In the case of some works, the notion that Bruckner was not involved in the publication process is incorrect.[79] For example, although the *Stichvorlage* of the Fourth Symphony was not an autograph manuscript, the composer played a major role in its preparation.[80]

[75] Friedrich Herzfeld, response to Oskar Lang's "Noch einmal 'der Ur-Bruckner,'" *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 63 (1936), 481.

[76] Friedrich Klose, response to Alfred Orel, "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner," *Deutsche Musikkultur* 1 (1936/37), 223. Although Klose's statement reflects the climate of Bruckner reception, a certain irony in his preference for the first edition of the Ninth Symphony should be noted. It was edited by Ferdinand Löwe and published in 1903, seven years after Bruckner's death; it cannot be claimed to represent Bruckner's intentions.

[77] Franz Grasberger, "Einleitung," *Bruckner Symposion 1980. Die Fassungen*, ed. Franz Grasberger (Linz: Linzer Veranstaltungsgesellschaft, 1981), p. 12.

[78] As Edward Said wrote, "The one thing intellectuals *cannot* do without is the full intellectual process itself. Into it goes historically informed research as well as the presentation of a coherent and carefully argued line that has taken account of alternatives." "The Politics of Knowledge," *Raritan* 11 (1991), 20.

[79] See note 9 above. In addition to the aforementioned *Stichvorlagen* for the Third, Fourth, and Seventh Symphonies and the Quintet, Bruckner's correspondence documents his involvement in the publication of his symphonies.

[80] See note 11 above.

Almost every page contains his handwriting. Bruckner's personal calendar refers to his work on this score and, in at least two letters, he accepted responsibility for the new version.[81] On 15 May 1888, he signed a contract with Gutmann authorizing its publication.[82]

In the past decade the theoretical basis for editing texts has been subject to considerable reexamination.[83] In particular, idealist models of authorship and textuality and the pursuit of a metaphysically pure and authentic Urtext have been criticized as conceptually naive and historically inappropriate. More recent – and, I believe, more theoretically cogent – critical models of textuality compel us to regard the authorship and production of texts in their historical and cultural complexity. From this perspective, Urtext editing is unacceptably compromised by its premises: its final textual product hides as much as it reveals. As Jerome McGann observed:

> The chief difficulties emerge when textual criticism has the effect of desocializing our historical view of the literary work. When we make decisions about the condition and significance of various texts on the simple criterion of the author's (final) intention we foster serious misconceptions about the nature of literary production. Too many relevant aspects of the literary work are de-emphasized, or even abstracted from the critical view altogether, when we operate on such a principle.[84]

Accepting the creation and production of published musical texts as social phenomena renders untenable any categorical assertion that Bruckner's intentions can be represented only by private, manuscript sources. Bruckner did collaborate with other people (copyists, engravers,

[81] Benjamin Korstvedt, "Bruckner's Fourth Symphony," pp. 297–310 and 318–28; and "First published Edition," 7–16.

[82] See Alexander Weinmann, "Anton Bruckner und seine Verleger," pp. 128–29.

[83] This process crystallized with Jerome McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (University of Chicago Press, 1983), who further advanced his argument in *The Textual Condition* (Princeton University Press, 1991). Many other scholars have taken up the challenges offered by McGann's *Critique*. Philip Cohen and David H. Jackson, "Notes on Emerging Paradigms in Editorial Theory," *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory*, ed. Philip Cohen (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991), pp. 103–23; Paul Eggert, "Textual Product or Textual Process: Procedures and Assumptions of Critical Editing," *Devils and Angels*, ed. Cohen, pp. 57–77; Peter Shillingsburg, "An Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism," *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989), 55–79; Jack Stillinger, "Multiple Authorship and the Question of Authority," *Text* 5 (1991), 285–86; and John Sutherland, "Publishing History: A Hole at the Centre of Literary Sociology," *Critical Inquiry* 14 (1988), 574–89. This discussion of the theory and methodology of textual criticism has not yet entered the mainstream of musicological thought. Among the musicologists to have addressed it are Philip Brett, "Text, Context and the Early Music Editor," in *Authenticity and Early Music*, ed. Nicholas Kenyon (Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 84–114; James Grier, *The Critical Editing of Music: History, Method, and Practice* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 16–19; and James Hepokoski, "Overriding the Autograph Score: The Problem of Textual Authority in Verdi's *Falstaff*," *Studi Verdiani* (1992), 14–51.

[84] McGann, *Critique*, p. 121.

editors, proof-readers, friends, advisors) when he published his scores, but simply to reject these texts in search of a "pure, original" text is to go too far, too quickly. That scholars have, for more than half a century, been willing to do so reflects the continued influence of the text-critical ideology of the first Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe*. The dismissal of the first editions has, in effect, become an inherited dogma; in the process, it has assumed an undeserved mantle of truth and thus escaped critical skepticism.

It is not the objective of this study to advocate a wholesale abandonment of modern critical editions of Bruckner's music. Rather it is to remind scholars and performers that the composer's autograph manuscripts are *not* the *only* valid or historically important sources.[85] The early printed editions deserve to be studied. Their merits as authentic Bruckner must be re-assessed, and their potential as evidence about areas that are only imperfectly understood, including Bruckner's role in the publication of his symphonies and his evolving approach to revision and contemporary performance practice needs to be considered. We cannot hope to understand Bruckner's music in all of its historical and aesthetic complexity until we have studied these texts.

[85] This perception is starting to change. William Carragan, who is preparing a new critical edition of the Second Symphony, considers the first edition of this symphony (published by Doblinger in 1892) to be, in many ways, the soundest score yet published.