

# BRUCKNER'S NINTH REVISITED

TOWARDS THE RE-EVALUATION OF A  
FOUR-MOVEMENT SYMPHONY

T H E S I S

Submitted for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

in

Adelaide University

Elder Conservatorium — School of Performing Arts

by

JOHN ALAN PHILLIPS

— V O L U M E O N E —

© Copyright Adelaide 2002

Text pages prepared by the author in Times New Roman using Microsoft Word 2000™ on an IBM-compatible Pentium 3 PC; Musical examples, the Reconstruction of the Autograph, Documentation and Performing Version scores prepared by the author using Score™; printed on an Okipage 12i™ Laser printer.

Facsimile pages 1–339 reproduced from a pre-print publication by Maier and Co., 1220 Vienna; © by Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna, 1996. Used by permission (**included only in examination copies**).

Reconstruction of the Autograph Score © 1994, 1999 by Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna.  
Used by permission (**included only in examination copies**).

Documentation of the Fragment © 1999, 2002 by Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna.  
Used by permission (**included only in examination copies**).

Performing Version © 1992, 1996 by John A. Phillips, Adelaide.

Overall production © May 2002 by John A. Phillips, Adelaide.

Original printout 27 May 2002;

this printout 24 March 2003.

In memory of my father

**WILLIAM ALAN PHILLIPS**

1924–1989

who first introduced me to symphonic music

and my mother

**YVONNE RUTH PHILLIPS**

1928–2001

who lovingly saw it through



*Auch weit über die ganz eigenartige Formkunst hinaus erhebt sich Bruckners Neunte zu einem der überragendsten Ereignisse aller Kunst überhaupt, nur Werken vergleichbar, die alle Bereiche des Denkens und Fühlens, Leben und Tod, Welt und Weltgeheimnisse in ihrer Ideengröße vereinheitlichen, wie Dantes 'Göttliche Komödie' oder Goethes 'Faust'. Wie diese in gedanklicher Dichtung, so umfaßt Bruckners metaphysische Tongewalt alle Weltkreise und grenzenlose Weiten des Lebensgefühls in ihrer übergedanklichen Fülle und Stimmungsschwere.*

—Ernst Kurth



# Contents

## VOLUME I

Abstract . . . . .	xii
Declaration . . . . .	xiii
List of Tables . . . . .	xiv
List of Musical Examples . . . . .	xv
List of Facsimiles . . . . .	xvi

### 0.1 Foreword

0.1.1 Mistaken assumptions concerning the Ninth and its Finale . . . . .	xix
0.1.2 The new research . . . . .	xx
0.1.3 Justification for this study . . . . .	xxiv
0.1.4 Approach and outline . . . . .	xxvi

### 0.2 Guide to Terminology

0.2.1 Glossary of German terms . . . . .	xxxii
0.2.2 General abbreviations . . . . .	xxxiii
0.2.3 Library sigla . . . . .	xxxv
0.2.4 Bibliographic sigla . . . . .	xxxv
0.2.5 The citation of works by Bruckner . . . . .	xxxvi
0.2.6 Internal cross-references . . . . .	xxxvi

### 0.3 Concerning Bifolio Classifications

0.3.1 The use of prepared paper in the score of the Finale . . . . .	xxxvii
0.3.2 The revision of Orel's bifolio classifications . . . . .	xxxvii

0.4 Acknowledgements . . . . .	xxxix
--------------------------------	-------

## PART ONE. THE GENESIS AND SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE NINTH

### 1.0 Prolegomena

1.0.1 Introduction to Part One . . . . .	3
1.0.2 Literature . . . . .	4
1.0.3 Beethoven, Bruckner, and the Ninth Symphony . . . . .	17
1.0.4 The problem of the primary sources and their modern-day reading . . . . .	27

### 1.1 Bruckner's Last Years

1.1.1 The beginning of work on the Ninth; the last revision phase . . . . .	37
1.1.2 The composition of the first three movements . . . . .	44
1.1.3 Growing fame, declining health . . . . .	52
1.1.4 Bruckner's will; relations with his 'disciples' . . . . .	69
1.1.5 The move to the Belvedere . . . . .	76
1.1.6 The beginning of work on the Finale . . . . .	80
1.1.7 The projected opera . . . . .	81
1.1.8 Heller's recollections concerning the Finale . . . . .	84
1.1.9 Bruckner's devotional life and state of health . . . . .	86
1.1.10 The composition of the Finale . . . . .	94
1.1.11 The Te Deum as Ersatz . . . . .	98
1.1.12 The final months . . . . .	102

## 1.2 The Transmission of the Sources

1.2.1	Bruckner's death . . . . .	109
1.2.2	The dispersal of Bruckner's musical estate . . . . .	112
1.2.3	The transmission of the autograph score of the Ninth . . . . .	115
1.2.4	The transmission of the remaining MSS of the Ninth . . . . .	117
1.2.5	The transmission of the particello sketches for the Finale . . . . .	127
1.2.6	The transmission of the orchestral bifolios of the Finale . . . . .	129
1.2.7	Corroborative cases . . . . .	140
1.2.8	More recent developments . . . . .	142
1.2.9	Conclusions . . . . .	145

## 1.3 Reception of the Ninth Symphony and its Finale

1.3.1	Early Brucker reception: a perspective . . . . .	149
1.3.2	Ferdinand Löwe's version of the Ninth . . . . .	151
1.3.3	The reception of the Löwe version . . . . .	159
1.3.4	Early opinion concerning the Finale and the Te Deum . . . . .	168
1.3.5	The "Streit um den 'echten' Bruckner" and the Gesamtausgabe, then and now . . . . .	175
1.3.6	Alfred Orel and the <i>Entwürfe und Skizzen</i> . . . . .	196
1.3.7	Reception in the 1930s and early 1940s . . . . .	202
1.3.8	Max Auer and the Finale . . . . .	206
1.3.9	Reception from the late 1940s to the early 1970s . . . . .	210
1.3.10	Contrasting views: Paul-Gilbert Langevin and Harry Halbreich . . . . .	218
1.3.11	More recent stances . . . . .	225
1.3.12	Towards a 'Wirkungsgeschichte' of the Ninth Symphony . . . . .	233
1.3.13	Conclusions . . . . .	247

## 1.4 Performing Versions of the Finale, 1934–1990

1.4.0	Apologia . . . . .	252
1.4.1	Terminological clarification . . . . .	253
1.4.2	The term 'reconstruction' and the Finale . . . . .	257
1.4.3	The methodology required by a performing version of the Finale . . . . .	258
1.4.4	Early piano presentations . . . . .	261
1.4.5	Fritz Oeser . . . . .	263
1.4.6	Edward Neill and Giuseppe Gastaldi . . . . .	265
1.4.7	Arthur D. Walker . . . . .	267
1.4.8	Hein 's Gravesande . . . . .	268
1.4.9	Ernst Märzendorfer . . . . .	270
1.4.10	The radio productions of Hans-Hubert Schönzeler and Peter Ruzicka . . . . .	272
1.4.11	Marshall Fine . . . . .	275
1.4.12	William Carragan . . . . .	276
1.4.13	Nors S. Josephson . . . . .	281
1.4.14	Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca . . . . .	283
1.4.15	The Rome Symposium . . . . .	294
1.4.16	Nicola Samale and Gunnar Cohrs . . . . .	297
1.4.17	Conclusions . . . . .	302

## PART TWO. BRUCKNER AS THEORETICIAN AND COMPOSER

### 2.0 Prolegomena

2.0.1	Introduction to Part Two . . . . .	307
2.0.2	Outline . . . . .	310
2.0.3	Literature . . . . .	313



## 2.1 Bruckner's "musikalische Architektur"

2.1.1	The relationship between theory and composition. . . . .	321
2.1.2	Harmonic theory in Bruckner's teaching and compositional practice . . . . .	331
2.1.3	"Terzschichtung" and the ninth chord . . . . .	340
2.1.4	Bruckner's formal concepts . . . . .	346
2.1.5	Period structure and metrical numbers. . . . .	352
2.1.6	The numerology hypothesis. . . . .	363
2.1.7	Conclusions . . . . .	368

## 2.2 Motivic-Thematic Process

2.2.1	The Mutationsverfahren. . . . .	370
2.2.2	Motivic-thematic process in the Ninth. . . . .	375
2.2.3	Quotation, allusion, and the Mutationsverfahren. . . . .	382
2.2.4	On Bruckner's conception of the Ninth. . . . .	390

## PART THREE. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE FINALE

### 3.0 Prolegomena

3.0.1	Introduction to Part Three . . . . .	399
3.0.2	Literature . . . . .	402

### 3.1 The Sources Re-Assessed

3.1.1	The sources for the Finale . . . . .	408
3.1.2	The Orel edition and its revision; Nowak's corrections. . . . .	413
3.1.3	Working method and compositional process . . . . .	420
3.1.4	The condition and legibility of the MSS . . . . .	431
3.1.5	The paper types . . . . .	434
3.1.6	The particello sketches. . . . .	437
3.1.7	The paper rulings . . . . .	441
3.1.8	The composition of the Finale . . . . .	451
3.1.9	The editorial principles of the Autograph-Partitur. . . . .	474
3.1.10	Critical commentary on the reconstruction of the Autograph-Partitur . . . . .	480
3.1.11	The 'vi-de' markings and the Te Deum transition . . . . .	507

### 3.2 The Dokumentation des Fragments

3.2.0	Introduction . . . . .	512
3.2.1	Concerning the Dokumentation des Fragments . . . . .	513
3.2.2	Editorial principles. . . . .	516
3.2.3	General critical remarks. . . . .	517
3.2.4	The question of tempi. . . . .	518
3.2.5	Further supplementations. . . . .	519
3.2.6	Critical commentary . . . . .	520
3.2.7	Concerning the coda. . . . .	544

### 3.3 The Aufführungsfassung

3.3.0	Introduction . . . . .	546
3.3.1	Concerning the Aufführungsfassung . . . . .	549
3.3.2	Editorial principles. . . . .	550
3.3.3	General critical remarks. . . . .	552
3.3.4	The question of tempi . . . . .	554
3.3.5	Further supplementations. . . . .	557
3.3.6	Critical commentary . . . . .	558
3.3.7	Concerning the coda . . . . .	592
3.3.8	The conjectural Te Deum transition. . . . .	609

### 3.4 History and Reception of the Finale since 1990

3.4.1	Research developments since 1990 . . . . .	611
3.4.2	The Linz premiere and ensuing reception . . . . .	614
3.4.3	Lectures and publications. . . . .	618
3.4.4	Subsequent performance plans. . . . .	619
3.4.5	The Eichhorn recording. . . . .	623
3.4.6	The German and Italian premieres. . . . .	626
3.4.7	Publication of the Aufführungsfassung . . . . .	629
3.4.8	Publication of the Autograph-Partitur . . . . .	633
3.4.9	Publication of the Faksimile-Ausgabe . . . . .	634
3.4.10	The 1996 Bruckner Symposium . . . . .	635
3.4.11	Reception of the Aufführungsfassung since 1996 . . . . .	638
3.4.12	The Dokumentation des Fragments . . . . .	653
3.4.13	The Ninth Symphony in the Gesamtausgabe . . . . .	659
3.4.14	Conclusions . . . . .	661
	<b>Epilogue</b> . . . . .	668

### APPENDICES

I.	Notes for the first CD release of the Aufführungsfassung by Camerata Tokyo (J. A. Phillips) . . . .	673
II.	Notes for the second CD release of the Aufführungsfassung by Sonarte (B. G. Cohrs) . . . . .	684
III.	Text spoken at the premiere of the Dokumentation, November 1999 (Nikolaus Harnoncourt) . . . .	696
IV.	Notes for the Bremen performances of the Aufführungsfassung, March 2000 (Eva Pintér). . . . .	700
V.	“Das Finale der Neunten Symphonie: Herausforderung an den musikalischen und musikwissenschaftlichen Kanon” (J. A. Phillips) . . . . .	704
VI.	“Für die IX. ist gesorgt.’ Einige Erläuterungen zum Editionsprojekt Neunte Symphonie in der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe—und wie es dazu kam” (J. A. Phillips). . . . .	711

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

I.	Musical Scores and Critical Reports . . . . .	727
II.	Biography, Documentation, Reception . . . . .	730
III.	Further Perspectives . . . . .	742
IV.	The Ninth Symphony and Finale . . . . .	747
V.	Bibliographic Studies; Work Listings . . . . .	753

## VOLUME II

Volume Two is paginated in seven sections:

- |  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| A. Tables [Tabs.] . . . . .  | A/i–ii, 1–47        |
| B. Musical Examples [Mus. Ex.] . . . . .   | B/i–ii, 1–25        |
| C. Facsimiles [Facs.] . . . . .  | C/i–iv, 1–361       |
| D. <i>Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie</i> , edited by Alfred Orel (Leipzig 1934), pages relevant to the Finale [Orel] . . . . .   | D/i–ii, 1–6, 63–143 |
| E. Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur (Reconstruction of the Autograph Score), edited by John A. Phillips (Vienna 1994, 1999) [AP] . . . . .                                  | E/i–vi, 1–145       |
| F. Dokumentation des Fragments (Documentation of the Fragment), edited by John A. Phillips (Vienna 1999, 2002) [DdF]. . . . .  | F/i–xvi, 1–84       |
| G. Aufführungsfassung der Rekonstruktion (Performing Version of the Reconstruction), edited by John A. Phillips (Adelaide 1992; 2nd revised impression July 1996) [AF] . . . . . | G/i–iv, 1–103       |

Detailed listings of the Tables, Musical Examples and Facsimiles are given on pp. xiv ff. below.

**For copyright reasons, the facsimiles C/1–339, as well as sections E (E/1–145) and F (F/i–xvi, 1–84) were included only in the three official copies of this thesis. The reader is referred to the identically numbered pages of the following MWV publications:**

- **Section C (as far as C/339; facsimiles C/340–361 are included here):** *Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke: Zu Band 9: Finale (unvollendet): Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten*, John A. Phillips, ed., Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1996 (pp. 1–339 correspond with C/1–339)
- **Section E:** *Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke: Zu Band 9: Finale (unvollendet): Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen: Studienpartitur.*, John A. Phillips, ed., Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1994, 1999 (pp. 1–142 correspond with E/1–142)
- **Section F:** *Anton Bruckner: IX. Symphonie D-Moll: Finale (unvollendet): Dokumentation des Fragments: Partitur*, John A. Phillips, ed., Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1999, 2002 (pp. 1–84 correspond with F/1–84).

## Abstract

EVER since its first performance in 1903, the Ninth Symphony of Anton Bruckner (1824–1896) has been generally thought of as a symphony in three movements. Despite the publication in 1934 of the surviving materials for the fourth movement together with the known sketches and drafts for the first three, the existence of a highly advanced orchestral score for the Finale of this symphony was until recently largely ignored or dismissed as irrelevant. The author's research established the following:

- i. That the surviving fragments of the orchestral score of the Finale constitute no mere draft but an *emergent autograph score*;
- ii. that Bruckner, by the time of his death, may have reached the end of the movement in its initial score phase; and
- iii. that material for the Finale has not survived the work's capricious transmission.

Endorsed by an examination of Bruckner's compositional techniques, these findings, firstly, made a Performing Version of the movement a far more justifiable proposition, resulting in publication and performance of the version edited by Samale, Phillips, Cohrs and Mazzuca (Adelaide–Bremen 1992, 1996). Secondly, it brought about a decision by the Bruckner Complete Edition (Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna) to publish a reconstruction of the movement from the extant sources (1994, 1999), facsimile edition of relevant manuscripts (1996), and monograph (forthcoming). In 1999 and 2002, Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag published a second performing version of the Finale, the *Dokumentation des Fragments*, based solely on the surviving fragments of the movement. The original project was expanded to encompass a new edition and critical report on the first three movements (2000, 2002), separate monographs on the sources for each movement and a text volume on the symphony's genesis and reception.

This thesis combines a detailed history of the Finale and its reception with an account of the author's philological research and commentaries on the resulting scores and publications—research which in time may assist musical opinion in re-evaluating this work more closely along the lines of its composer's original conception. It is divided into three sections:

Part One, *The Genesis and Subsequent History of the Ninth*, examines the biographical background surrounding the composition of the symphony, the transmission of its manuscripts and critical reception of both the torso of the first three movements and, in varying realisations, the Finale.

Part Two, *Bruckner as Theoretician and Composer*, examines the theoretical underpinnings of Bruckner's compositional technique, the insights into his compositional procedures to be gained from an understanding of his harmonic and structural thinking, and presents a model for better understanding the motivic processes of his music.

Part Three, *The Reconstruction of the Finale*, examines Bruckner's compositional method, the surviving manuscripts of the Finale, its compositional chronology and reconstruction. Included are critical reports on the reconstruction of Bruckner's autograph score, the *Documentation and Performing Version of the Finale*, and an account of the critical reception of the Finale to 2002.

Volume One concludes with six appendices of relevant texts and articles and a comprehensive bibliography. Volume Two comprises the tables, musical examples and manuscript facsimiles, a reproduction of relevant portions of Alfred Orel's 1934 publication, and the scores of the reconstructed autograph, *Documentation and Performing Version*.

## Declaration

**T**HIS work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any other university or tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been given in the text.

I consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Signed:

J. A. Phillips.

Adelaide, May 2002

## List of Tables

See volume II, section A

I. Relevant MS Sources. . . . .	A/1
II. Compositional Dates, mid-1887–1896. . . . .	A/6
III. Principal Biographical Dates, mid-1887–1896. . . . .	A/10
IV. Principal Dates, 1896–2002. . . . .	A/14
V. Significant Versions of the Finale, 1940–1988 . . . . .	A/18
VI. Currently Known Autograph Sources for the Ninth Symphony . . . . .	A/23
VII. The Finale MSS Ordered by Library Signature . . . . .	A/25
VIII. Concordance of the Finale MSS with the Orel Edition . . . . .	A/28
IX. Paper Types Used in the Composition of the Finale . . . . .	A/32
X. Paper Rulings Used in the Finale Score. . . . .	A/34
XI. Genesis of the Finale Score . . . . .	A/36
XII. Sources Used in the Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur. . . . .	A/37
XIII. Repetition Signs and Instrumental Directives Written Out in the Autograph-Partitur. . . . .	A/39
XIV. Sources Used in the Dokumentation des Fragments . . . . .	A/42
XV. Sources Used in the Aufführungsfassung. . . . .	A/44
XVI. Formal Overview of the Aufführungsfassung . . . . .	A/47

## List of Musical Examples

See volume II, section B

1. Analysis of the Ninth Symphony along Sechterian lines: a. First harmonic progression of the first movement; b. Opening of the Scherzo; c. Opening of the Adagio. . . . . B/1
2. Mutation procedures in the Ninth Symphony: a. Motivic derivation of the Hauptthema of the first movement; b. Evolution of the principal motive of the Adagio; c. Motivic derivation of the Hauptthema of the Finale; d. Motivic links between the Finale and foregoing movements . . . . . B/2
3. a. Reconstruction of a 24-measure bifol. [1]; b. Reconstruction of a later, 16-measure bifol. [1E] . . . . B/5
4. a. The beginning of the Gesangsperiode in the particello sketches; b. Reconstruction of the beginning of the Gesangsperiode, work phase 3; c. Reconstruction of the subsequent expansion of the Gesangsperiode. . . . . B/6
5. a. Herankomponierung in the Durchführung of the fugal subject and countersubject; b. Herankomponierung and subsequent mutation of the accompaniment figure. . . . . B/7
6. a. The sketch ÖNB 28.229 for the opening of the Durchführung; b. Derivation of the descending line with which the Durchführung begins; c. Reconstruction of a bifolio [12/“13”];  
d. Reconstruction of the subsequent expansion of the Durchführung. . . . . B/7
7. Reconstruction of a bifolio [14/“15”]. . . . . B/9
8. a. Reconstruction of a bifolio [19/“20”]; b. Harmonic reduction with Sechterian analysis of root movement . . . . . B/10
9. a–d. The horn theme and its precursors. . . . . B/11
10. Reconstruction of a bifolio [24/“25”]. . . . . B/11
11. a. Reconstruction of a bifolio [27/“28”]; b. Possible links between the chorale “Christ ist erstanden” and themes of the First, Third and Ninth Symphonies of Bruckner . . . . . B/12
12. a. Reconstruction of a bifolio [30/“31”]; b. Harmonic reduction showing derivation from the chorale. . . . . B/14
13. a. Expansion of the last measures of bifol. 31E/“32” and reconstruction of a bifol. [32/“33”];  
b. Motivic reduction showing Herankomponierung of the first-movement Hauptthema . . . . . B/15
14. Beginning of the coda. . . . . B/15

---

15. The added four measures preceding the Themenüberlagerung . . . . .	B/15
16. The Themenüberlagerung . . . . .	B/16
17. Entry of the chorale in D major . . . . .	B/16
18. Supplementation of the ascending sequence ÖNB 6085/45 . . . . .	B/16
19. Final cadence: elaboration of the progression ÖNB 6085/43 . . . . .	B/17
20. Entry of the "Allelujah" . . . . .	B/18
21. a–k. Anabasic phrases, possibly variants of an "Allelujah" topos . . . . .	B/18
22. Concluding tutti . . . . .	B/19
23. a–l. The 'Nebenton complex' in Bruckner's works . . . . .	B/20
24. a–v. The catabasis topos in Bruckner's works . . . . .	B/21
25. a–t. The thematic material of the Finale . . . . .	B/23



## List of Facsimiles

See volume II, section C.

**The facsimiles C/i–iv, 1–361 correspond with the same-numbered pages of the 1996 facsimile edition and have not been reproduced in this copy of volume II for copyright reasons.**

A complete index of the autograph sources (sections I and II) is given on pages C/iii ff.

I. The Particello Sketches .....	C/3
II. The Score Bifolios and SVE (Continuity Drafts) .....	C/53
III. Appendix:	
Photocopy of a sketch possibly connected with the chorale in the Finale of the Ninth Symphony.	
From the estate of Leopold Nowak (provenance unknown) .....	C/323
“Dies Blatt ist eine Berechnung des Verhältnisses der Takte im letzten Satze der IX. Symphonie [...] / A. Stradal.”. ÖNB 38.846 <sup>f</sup> .....	C/324
“Meißner behauptet, es sei die Instrumentation des 4ten Satzes der 9ten [...] Stradal.”. ÖNB 28.240/1-2 <sup>f</sup> .	C/325
1st p. of a cover bifolio of the composer with the autograph inscription “v[om] 1. bis inclusive 12.”. ÖNB 6085/37 <sup>r</sup> .....	C/328
1st p. of the 1st unfoliated cover bifolio of ÖNB 6085 (handwriting of Franz Schalk, Leopold Nowak) ..	C/329
1st p. of the 2nd unfoliated cover bifolio of ÖNB 6085 (handwriting of Franz Schalk) .....	C/330
1st p. of the unfoliated cover bifolio of ÖNB 6087 (handwriting of Robert Haas, Leopold Nowak) .....	C/331
Max Auer’s transcription of the score bifolios StB 3791. ÖNB 19.677/1–2 .....	C/332
Title page of the Orel edition (Vienna 1934) .....	C/336
Pages 64, 83 and 101 of the Orel edition (Leopold Nowak’s copy, with his corrections) .....	C/337
Calendar entries for May 1895 (handwriting of Bruckner and Meißner) .....	C/340
Anonymous report concerning Bruckner’s last months (provenance Hueber family) .....	C/341
<i>Vexilla regis</i> (WAB 51; first edition, 1892) .....	C/343
<i>Psalm 150</i> (WAB 38; Universal Edition, n.d.), final page .....	C/344

---

<i>Das deutsche Lied / Der deutsche Gesang</i> (WAB 63; first edition, 1911) . . . . .	C/345
<i>Helgoland</i> , symphonischer Chor (WAB 71; first edition, 1899), final pages . . . . .	C/351
Ninth Symphony (edition of F. Löwe, 1903), title page . . . . .	C/353
Ninth Symphony, Löwe edition, pp. 4, 46, 63, 65, 136, 139 . . . . .	C/354
Sketch for the inversion of eleventh and thirteenth chords. ÖNB 6072 . . . . .	C/360
Leopold Nowak's transcription of Cracow, IX, fol. 1 <sup>r</sup> . . . . .	C/361

## 0.1

### Foreword

Rarely has the posthumous work of a great composer been treated by posterity with such persistent unfairness as Bruckner's Ninth Symphony.

—Hans Ferdinand Redlich<sup>1</sup>

#### 0.1.1 Mistaken assumptions concerning the Ninth and its Finale.

WHILE the three-movement torso of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony, “unvollendet und dennoch keiner Ergänzung bedürftend”,<sup>2</sup> long ago became one of the most significant works of the concert repertoire, the tenacity with which the very existence, let alone the extent, of an unfinished fourth movement has been suppressed, disguised, falsified, denied or explained away in the literature of four generations of scholars must rank as an indictment of historical musicology. Lack of accurate biographical data, misapprehensions, hasty and ill-informed conclusions, unqualified generalisations, and a counterfeit, taboo-like awe before the ‘Last Bequest’ have, down to the present day, continued to obscure the issue of the unfinished Ninth like the suffocating incense clouds of an earlier generation of Bruckner exegetes. From numerous writers it would appear that the surviving material for the fourth movement of the Ninth represents no more than “scant sketches”,<sup>3</sup> “pathetic relics”,<sup>4</sup> or a mere “sphinx-like fragment”,<sup>5</sup> justifying such sweeping inferences as, for instance, that it was impossible for Bruckner to proceed beyond the daring harmonic experiments of the Adagio, leaving only “Berge von Skizzen”;<sup>6</sup> that he undertook six different attempts to draft its musical course;<sup>7</sup> that he was so old and senile as to have put nothing rational on paper, apparently unsure

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony”, *MMR* 79 (July–Aug. 1949), p. 143 (concerning bibliographic sigla see §0.2.4, general abbreviations §0.2.2).

<sup>2</sup> According to Max Morold, *Anton Bruckner*, Leipzig 1912, p. 12. See ch. 1.3 concerning this and the following views.

<sup>3</sup> Erwin Doernberg, *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner* (Foreword by Robert Simpson), London 1960, pp. 109, 207.

<sup>4</sup> R. Simpson, in an unpublished revision to chapter 11 (formerly 10) of *The Essence of Bruckner*, New York 1967. Photocopy, unpublished (written 1986–87), courtesy of the author.

<sup>5</sup> Gabriel Engel, *The Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, Iowa City 1955, p. 89.

<sup>6</sup> Hans Apel, “Ein musikalisches Geheimnis wurde am Dienstag gelüftet. Uraufführung eines Bruckner-Fragments”, *Die Wahrheit* (Berlin), 20 Feb. 1986.

<sup>7</sup> This represents a frequently encountered misinterpretation which began with the Orel edition. More recently promulgated by Peter Ruzicka, “Annäherung an einen Torso”, *Hi-Fi Stereophonie* 18 (Feb. 1979), p. 141. Susan M. Filler notes an identical criticism of the MSS for the Mahler Tenth: “Some musicologists considered the multiplicity of material an indication of Mahler's confusion of mind regarding eventual solution of problems with form, melody and texture [...] Confusion of mind is in no way more apparent than when Mahler followed the same processes in the composition of the previous works” (“The case for a performing version of Mahler's Tenth Symphony”, *JMusRes* 3, nos. 3–4 [1981], pp. 290f.).

whether he was writing the Ninth or revising an earlier work;<sup>8</sup> that whether the Ninth was intended to have a Finale or not is unimportant given the beautiful ending of the Adagio;<sup>9</sup> or even that each of the three completed movements of the Ninth could stand satisfactorily as an individual entity.<sup>10</sup>

### 0.1.2 The new research.

Such views, in many cases based on the persistence of glaring factual errors which in over fifty years have not been challenged, are overdue for a complete and thoroughgoing revision. Recent research on the matter, underway in part since 1983,<sup>11</sup> suggests the following:

- i. Bruckner was in no doubt in his own mind of the artistic necessity of a Finale to the work, going so far as make the aesthetically surprising but apparently completely serious and highly significant nomination of the *Te Deum* as a substitute should he not live to complete the composition of an orchestral Finale.<sup>12</sup>
- ii. He laboured unceasingly on the composition of the Finale, probably amassing more material for this one movement than for any other work.
- iii. The composer's mental acuity is perfectly evident from the surviving material, which reveals less unsurety of intention than the most exhaustive and self-critical perfectionism.<sup>13</sup>
- iv. The Finale manuscripts as Bruckner left them constituted no disconnected pile of sketches but (a) a series of sketches and drafts in *particello*, whose notation preceded (b) a coherent, continuously written orchestral score on sequentially numbered 'Bogen'<sup>14</sup> or bifolios,<sup>15</sup> of which several are no longer extant.<sup>16</sup>
- v. The score has a clear musical structure and must originally have constituted a continuous entity well in excess of 600 measures in length. 172 measures of the surviving material are fully scored down to the entry of all whole-measure rests in

---

<sup>8</sup> Harry Halbreich, "Un Essai de Synthèse", in: P.-G. Langevin, ed., *Bruckner: Apogée de la Symphonie*, Lausanne 1977, p. 269.

<sup>9</sup> This view originated with Robert Hirschfeld, who wrote the programme for the performance of Löwe's arrangement of the first three movements in 1903; see discussion in §1.3.3.

<sup>10</sup> See Ruzicka, citing the views of Bernhard Hansen, p. 141. A detailed examination of these and other views will be made in chs. 1.3, 1.4 and 3.4.

<sup>11</sup> A fresh examination of some of the MSS in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB) was first made by Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca in 1983; the research begun in early 1990 by the present writer toward this thesis was the first since Alfred Orel to attempt to establish a definitive philology for the whole material as opposed to that research required merely for the preparation of a performing score.

<sup>12</sup> See discussion of this point in chs. 1.1, 1.3 and 3.1.

<sup>13</sup> See ch. 3.1.

<sup>14</sup> For this and other German terms see Glossary, §0.2.1.

<sup>15</sup> See discussion in ch. 3.1.

<sup>16</sup> The problems of the loss and scattering of Bruckner's musical estate following his death are now well recognised. See discussion in ch. 1.2 and elsewhere.

every part, the remainder in complete and apparently originally continuous string score, with numerous indications of wind scoring, from isolated notes and written directives to apparently complete texture.<sup>17</sup>

- vi. This material shows that Bruckner was clear about the design of the movement almost from the earliest sketches, gradually enlarging and balancing formal sections precisely as was his normal compositional practice, which appears to have remained consistent with that of his late compositions. Entire bifolios were discarded and replaced each time a change of any magnitude was made. In the case of the Finale, in particular, Bruckner used score paper prepared in part by his last ‘secretary’ and companion Anton Meißner,<sup>18</sup> with the corollary that Bruckner’s somewhat liberal use thereof caused the total amount of score material to proliferate.
- vii. It is possible, even likely, given his working methods, that Bruckner may have continued the first phase of scoring as far as the very end of the movement and hence finished its essential compositional conception some months before his death, the systematic completion of the scoring being hampered by increasing physical disability and ultimately the onset of senility.<sup>19</sup>

It seems remarkable that, since the 1934 publication by Alfred Orel<sup>20</sup> of the then-known material of all four movements of the Ninth, *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie*,<sup>21</sup> no further detailed examination of the extant original manuscripts of the Finale has ever been made.<sup>22</sup> Orel was unquestionably one of the greatest Bruckner scholars and most distinguished Austrian musicologists of this century. His work together with Robert Haas<sup>23</sup> as founding editor of the Bruckner Gesamtausgabe (GA) represented a signal achievement in

---

<sup>17</sup> See ch. 3.1.

<sup>18</sup> See Erich Wolfgang Partsch, “Anton Meißner, der letzte ‘Sekretär’ Bruckners”, *BrJb* 1984–86, pp. 57–62; details see chs. 1.1 and 3.1.

<sup>19</sup> See chs. 1.1 and 3.1.

<sup>20</sup> 1889–1967, born in Vienna, studied law, musicology under Guido Adler, from 1929 professor at Vienna University, where he taught until 1945. 1918–1938 director of the music collection of the Wiener Stadtbibliothek; 1940–45 director of the “Sonderreferat für Wiener Musikforschung”; numerous publications and state honours.

<sup>21</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie, Vorgelegt und erläutert von Alfred Orel. Sonderdruck aus Anton Bruckner: Sämtliche Werke, 9. Band: IX. Symphonie D-Moll (Originalfassung)*, Leipzig 1934. Hereinafter referred to as ‘Orel’; reproduction of the Finale-relevant pages in vol. II, D.

<sup>22</sup> The first study of this nature in connection with the Ninth was the 1987 doctoral thesis of Mariana Sonntag, *The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner: A study of the sketches and drafts for the first movement of the IX. Symphony* (University of Chicago, Illinois; unpubl.). Prior to this the only major published study dealing with any Bruckner MSS was that of C. C. Röthig, *Studien zur Systematik des Schaffens von Anton Bruckner* (= *Göttinger Musikwissenschaftliche Arbeit* 9), Kassel 1978. See discussion in Part Three.

<sup>23</sup> 1886–1960, born in Prague, studied musicology in Berlin, Vienna and Prague. Doctorate 1908; later assistant to Guido Adler; 1920–45 director of music collection of the ÖNB; prolific publications and editions. Haas’ Nazi-party affiliations and aggressive promotion, by political means, of the autograph over the first-edition versions has for many modern-day scholars come to dominate their assessment of his legacy.

music scholarship; this is not surprising, given the great difficulty, and in many cases impossibility, of resolving the complex problems of compositional order, the issue of versions and the involvement of Bruckner's assistants and editors, as well as the often inextricably entangled notational layers, particularly in Bruckner's *particello* sketches, in which version after version can be found written over each other.

But while Haas' critical reports on several of the symphonies still pass muster today,<sup>24</sup> Orel's presentation and elucidation of the then-known sources for the Ninth constitutes a highly problematic text, by no means the authoritative philological undertaking that it was until recently assumed to represent. Not only were the transcriptions apparently rushed and poorly proof-read, but Orel's entire philological methodology, particularly in the case of the Finale, was often misleading. Leopold Nowak<sup>25</sup> undertook a detailed correction of the Orel edition shortly after its publication in 1934–35<sup>26</sup> but this fact was not revealed until many years later<sup>27</sup> as a re-publication, with such manifold emendations, might well have damaged the credibility of the GA, which had been set up only against the embittered opposition of those seeking to maintain the rights and status of the earlier editions, in particular by Franz Schalk, Ferdinand Löwe and their adherents.

Secondly, as was only realised following publication of the volume in 1934, Orel had overlooked a major source of sketches and drafts that had been sold by Ferdinand Löwe's widow to the Preußische Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, material that, following the Second World War, had again been given up as lost or destroyed, becoming accessible again when they were rediscovered in Cracow in the 1970s.<sup>28</sup> While Nowak retained the intention of republishing all of the material in a wholly new edition, he was never to realise his aim, burdened as he was from 1946 onwards with the task of re-establishing the credibility of the GA and re-issuing the symphonies. The useful critical discussion of Bruckner's compositional technique that a new, more complete and reliable publication of this huge body of materials should have provoked never eventuated.

It is perhaps possible to see in this sad story one of the historical reasons why musicology had until recently achieved so little in the way of coming to terms with Bruckner's unique symphonic style, and why discussion of this composer so frequently remained stranded in the shallows of anecdote, speculation and aesthetic dispute.

---

<sup>24</sup> Cf. their republication and augmentation in Nowak's *Kritische Berichte* in the second GA (Bibliography, §I).

<sup>25</sup> Viennese musicologist, 1904–1991; Haas' assistant from 1937, subsequently Director of the Musiksammlung of the ÖNB from 1946 to 1969; founding editor of the second Bruckner GA; numerous publications, editions and honours.

<sup>26</sup> Nowak's copy of the Orel edition with his corrections was made available to the present writer shortly before his death in May 1991 by courtesy of Prof. Dr. Herbert Vogg of Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag (MWV), Vienna. See discussion in chs. 1.3, 3.1 and 3.4; facsimiles thereof see vol. II, C/337ff.

<sup>27</sup> See Nowak, "Die Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe: Ihre Geschichte und Schicksale", *BrJb* 1982–83, p. 37.

<sup>28</sup> See §1.2.4.

The problems Orel encountered in the publication of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* point up a further important problem in Bruckner scholarship: in undertaking ‘the’ critical, exhaustive study of them, the then foremost authority on the Ninth had no knowledge of almost a third of the surviving sources. While Bruckner himself destroyed most of his older sketches and drafts before moving into his last residence in the Belvedere, the dislocation and dispersal of the surviving materials for the Finale, in particular, and the fact that no proper inventory of his estate was ever carried out make it impossible for the Bruckner researcher to determine whether all the surviving sources have really been exhausted<sup>29</sup> and frustrate attempts to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of Bruckner’s complex compositional processes.

The issues surrounding the reception of the Finale and the problems that have continually thwarted attempts to come to a better understanding of this movement are far less surprising when one considers that all attempts (but one<sup>30</sup>) to arrive at a performing version of the final movement had been based on the landmark, but flawed, musicological venture of Orel.<sup>31</sup> All published literature has apparently been confined to it, and often (manifestly) to a very limited acquaintance with it. Where it has not been studiously ignored, a cursory glance at the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* was thought to constitute adequate basis for far-reaching pronouncements on Bruckner’s final artistic legacy, pronouncements with implicit or explicit ramifications for his entire compositional output.<sup>32</sup>

Why has no one in over half a century bothered to properly review Orel’s edition of the sketches and drafts for the Ninth, or indeed appeared to have been aware of its more obvious shortcomings? Why does so much apparent misinformation exist and continue to be promulgated concerning the Finale? Why is it so painfully obvious from most of the last fifty years of literature concerning the Ninth and its Finale that the primary sources—the MSS as well as early biographies and memoirs—never seem to have been considered worthy of attention? We would be foolish indeed to imagine that all the manifold problems associated with the genesis and transmission of this work were somehow ‘solved’ back in 1934, even if many may have made up their minds on the matter since. Even today, the Finale appears for many serious Bruckner scholars to be either an issue not worthy of attention or one which has become ‘too hot to handle’ except in the most peremptory fashion. Either way it appears to remain a kind of blind spot, as much critical response since the initial publication of this author’s research reveals.<sup>33</sup> Yet no matter what the present-day views of distinguished scholars and authorities may be, critical or aesthetic evaluations based on historical

---

<sup>29</sup> See the discussion in chs. 1.2 and 3.1.

<sup>30</sup> Namely, that of Nicola Samale and his colleagues.

<sup>31</sup> See ch. 1.4.

<sup>32</sup> Part Four will deal with these issues in greater detail.

<sup>33</sup> See the discussion in ch. 3.4.

circumstance or superficial appearance become indefensible in the face of more adequate and updated evidence. They demand a complete re-evaluation.

### 0.1.3 Justification for this study.

As the comprehension and interpretation of any composer's output rests to such an extent on an understanding of the whole, it is in the fervent hope of beginning what may at long last lead to an accurate and unbiased reassessment of the entire Ninth Symphony—and not merely the repatriation of its 'lost' Finale—that this research is presented here. Almost all writers so far—with few exceptions<sup>34</sup>—have looked either at the first three movements of the Ninth Symphony or at the Finale; few have attempted to see the work as Bruckner himself unquestionably saw it, as a symphony in four movements. It may now justifiably be claimed that perspectives revealed by new research on the surviving manuscripts as well as primary biographical sources make it possible to employ strict musicological techniques—as opposed to anything resembling what Peter Gülke aptly described as “Drauflosbrucknern”<sup>35</sup>—to either ‘reconstruct’ the movement largely as Bruckner would appear to have left it,<sup>36</sup> or to expand that conception into a continuous, performable score sufficient to permit a stylistically adequate image of Bruckner's original conception, if possible without the necessity of introducing either significant amounts of independent material or an indefensible degree of editorial speculation.<sup>37</sup> The reasons for doing so are important for an adequate understanding of this symphony. As a writer pointed out in 1906—and, one would have thought, scarcely need to say: “Das Brucknersche Finale ist ein Teil des Ganzen, ohne das Vorhergehende nicht verständlich und zum Verständnis des Übrigen selber unentbehrlich.”<sup>38</sup>

Major revisions of thought in musicology, where they occur at all, take time. Moreover, for these to filter out to the ‘popular’ level of audiences and critics the stimulus of repeated confrontation with the auditory experience is imperative. While the fact that Bruckner never completed the composition of this movement cannot be overlooked, nor the loss of significant parts of the autograph score be repaired, it will be argued that audiences stand to gain a far more accurate idea of Bruckner's intended conception of his Ninth Symphony by means of a conjectural performing version of its Finale than by interpreting the symphony as if a fourth movement never existed.

The *Aufführungsfassung* of the Finale—presented here as one of two practical outcomes of this research—arose from the realisation that the surviving material, together with a great

---

<sup>34</sup> See for instance Hans Ferdinand Redlich's commendable discussion of all four movements in his Preface to the Eulenburg score of 1963.

<sup>35</sup> Peter Gülke, “Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987. Bruckner-Symposion”, *Mf* 41, no. 3 (1988), p. 243.

<sup>36</sup> Presented here as the Autograph-Partitur (AP) and its performing-score counterpart, the Dokumentation des Fragments (DdF); see vol. II, E and F; discussion in chs. 3.1 and 3.2; history and reception see ch. 3.4.

<sup>37</sup> Presented here as the *Aufführungsfassung* (AF); see vol. II, section G and the discussion in ch. 3.3; history and reception see ch. 3.4.

<sup>38</sup> Max Morold, “Das Brucknersche Finale”, *Die Musik* 6 (1906–07), p. 33.



deal of insight into Bruckner's compositional approach, was sufficient to support the juxtaposition of the original scores of the first three movements with an in-part 'synthetic' *Ergänzung*<sup>39</sup> of the reconstructed Finale. This concept is, in turn, predicated on the postulate that just such a 'synthetic' approach (as opposed to a predominantly 'analytical'—the manner in which instruction in all the arts was carried on until quite recently in the West) still has valuable contributions to make towards musicology, and to a more accurate and detailed assessment of the historical and musical "Erscheinung Anton Bruckner".<sup>40</sup> One can learn much about the nature of a particular style in the attempt to duplicate it. Although by no means delimited thereby, many of the conclusions and findings of the present study originated in just that approach. With the publication in the Bruckner GA of the surviving fragments of Bruckner's autograph score of the Finale in 1994 a gradual change of opinion made itself felt, and by the end of the 1990s sufficient progress in terms of 'public education' had been made to justify Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag's decision to present, in a regular subscription concert of the Wiener Symphoniker, the *Dokumentation des Fragments* of the Finale: the extant portions of the score, with an absolute minimum of added orchestration, a version best suited to performance within a workshop concert or a broadcast. It was in this form that the Finale was at last to receive its first performance in the city in which it was written, 103 years after the death of its composer.

Meanwhile, however, the aesthetic question as to whether Bruckner here wrote a qualitatively good, bad or indifferent movement—an issue frequently invoked as an alibi for dismissing the issue of the Finale out of hand—should not enter consideration until we are familiar with what the composer actually wrote, the circumstances by which the compositional artefact has come down to us, and the factors that have determined its reception (or contributed to its dismissal) for the last hundred years. Happily, the last decade has seen a gradual movement towards change on this front. Reference to the words of Swiss musicologist Ernst Kurth (1886–1946)<sup>41</sup> as the motto of this thesis is intended not as an endorsement of his musicological approach than as an ironic reminder of the gaping discrepancy which obtains between the historical status accorded the first three movements of the Ninth and that accorded its fourth. As will be suggested on the basis of the evidence presented here, a rapprochement is well overdue.

---

<sup>39</sup> The *Performing Version* of the reconstruction was first performed in Linz in 1991 under the title *Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung nach den erhaltenen Autographen*; see ch. 3.4.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Anton Neumayr, "Anton Bruckner", in: *idem, Musik und Medizin* vol. 2, Vienna 1989, p. 261; cf. also Theophil Antonicek, "Ein neues Bruckner-Bild?", in: *Bruckner-Vorträge: Budapest 1983–84: Bericht*, Linz 1985), pp. 21–24.

<sup>41</sup> Taken from *Anton Bruckner* (2 vols.), Berlin 1925, p. 737.

### 0.1.4 Approach and outline.

The present study takes then as its object the Ninth Symphony, but in attempting a reassessment of the whole work focusses on its 'unknown' final movement and the ramifications of its inclusion in the overall conception of the work, both for a better understanding of the symphony itself and of the development of Bruckner's music as a whole. What began in 1989 as a modest analysis of the first three movements and deliberation over attempts to complete the Finale snowballed into a much larger undertaking involving cataloguing, correlating and evaluating not only the MSS of the Finale but those of the other three movements and other late Bruckner works as well; rewriting with Samale much of the earlier Samale/Mazzuca/Cohrs performing version; preparing scores, parts and facsimile publications for the Bruckner Complete Edition; evaluating Bruckner's late compositional technique; and (subsequent to the the conclusion of the present study) preparing an exhaustive re-transcription and analysis of all relevant MSS for the Finale, together with those of the first and third movements, and a comprehensive monograph on the genesis and reception of the whole symphony.

During the period over which this study was written the discipline of musicology itself underwent profound and apparently accelerating changes in its approach and rationale. The old pre-eminent status that the tradition of absolute music gave to the 'great' composers and works of the symphonic repertoire—a status that justified and legitimised positivistic, in-depth analyses of compositions and compositional method without the need to investigate their ramifications within the wider domain of cultural or political history—was increasingly called into question. Pamela M. Potter wrote:

The field of musicology has recently experienced a number of methodological crises. Musicologists are acknowledging the extent to which music has been isolated as an object, and many perceive that the field has fallen far behind other disciplines by failing to contextualise its subject matter. In an attempt to bring music out of isolation and understand its broader ramifications beyond 'the text itself', musicologists have turned to other disciplines for theoretical models and methodologies. The benefits of this process have been to open up and establish a wide variety of new approaches and to enable scholars to seek out entirely new directions. It has also alerted the field to the political nature of both music and music scholarship after a long period of indulging in the self-perception of immunity from politics.<sup>42</sup>

The revival of the issue of textual authenticity in Bruckner's music has emerged as one corollary of this paradigm shift. During the 1990s an almost global revolution in Anglo-American Bruckner scholarship took place. Dormant, some would say suppressed, since the late 1930s, the issue of the authenticity of the first-edition texts and to what extent Bruckner was complicit in and to what extent sanctioned their redaction was re-opened and re-evaluated. Disturbing connections were detected between Nazi ideology and state cultural

---

<sup>42</sup> *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's Reich*, New Haven and London 1998, pp. 264f.

policy on the one hand, and the agendas and editorial policy of the Internationale (subsequently Deutsche) Bruckner Gesellschaft and the first Bruckner GA on the other—issues around which Bruckner scholarship after 1945 had by and large erected a wall of silence. For some scholars, these links appeared to justify a wholesale rejection of the Robert Haas versions as unhistorical as well as ‘tainted’ by their connection with the “radical evil” (Botstein) of the Third Reich, and a call for a return to the texts presented by the first editions—to a “pre-Nazi Bruckner”. As a result, the validity of the text-critical principles of Leopold Nowak’s post-war GA were also called into question, and with them, perhaps, the *raison d’être* of any study such as this one, which attempts to establish an ‘authentic’ Bruckner text ‘merely’ by recourse to the composer’s MSS.

While recognising the importance of political and ideological contexts, this shift in Anglo-American approaches to Bruckner (which, it must be mentioned, has only very recently begun to elicit significant responses within Austro-German circles) has also considerably widened the purview appropriate to any text-critical study of a Bruckner text. We now realise that textual critique of the editions published during Bruckner’s lifetime, cannot be divorced from the issues surrounding the comprehensive politicisation which Bruckner’s music suffered prior to and during the Nazi era. Equally, these issues can be seen as relatively tangential to an evaluation of the autograph score of the Ninth according to the original premises of this study, nor are they even as immediately crucial, as we will see, for the reception of the posthumous first edition of the Ninth, the Finale’s reconstruction, or even (though to a lesser degree) the symphony’s overall reception history with regard to the integrity of the work in its customary three-movement form. While the writer has reviewed and critiqued this scholarly sea-change (arguing in the interests of maintaining specificity and objectivity against an attitude of global reactionism—however politically correct), it could not be his task here to exhaustively address issues properly appropriate to a much broader field of cultural inquiry, no matter how important they may recently have become.<sup>43</sup>

Two German-language monographs from the early 1990s did provide significant precedents for the structure and approach of the present study, however: Christoph Wolff’s *Mozarts Requiem: Geschichte—Musik—Dokumente—Partitur des Fragments*<sup>44</sup> and Peter Schleuning’s study of the issues involved in the composition and subsequent reception of that other archetypal unfinished work of the Western canon, *Johann Sebastian Bachs ‘Kunst der*

---

<sup>43</sup> These issues have been dealt with in much more detail in the author’s conference papers: “Bruckner, the ‘Musikant Gottes’ and the New Musicology” (5th Conference of the International Society for the Study of European Ideas, Utrecht, August 1996); “Ferdinand Löwe’s Version of Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony (1903), or: How to Earn a Place in the Canon” (23rd National Conference of the Musicological Society of Australia, University of Sydney, April 2000); “Ideology and Authenticity: Ferdinand Löwe’s Version of Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony (1903)” (19th-Century Music Conference, Royal Holloway, University of London, June 2000); as well as: Review of Benjamin M. Korstvedt, *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony* (Cambridge University Press), *M&L* 82, no. 2 (May 2001), pp. 323–328.

<sup>44</sup> Munich–Kassel 1991.

*Fuge*: *Ideologien—Entstehung—Analyse*.<sup>45</sup> Both studies constitute powerful arguments for the integration of 'forensic' musical philology with the scrutiny of documentary evidence supplied by both contemporary accounts and subsequent reception history as a means to approach the challenging issues surrounding such key, and myth-susceptible, works of the Western canon.

Inevitably, other aspects presented within this dissertation remain, due to their scope, in a provisional state. In particular, the question of the relationship between Bruckner's theoretical and compositional approaches (Part Two) and the question of the interrelation of a conceptually 'restored' Ninth with Bruckner's complete compositional *œuvre* (Part Four) has been limited to brief essays which perhaps raise more questions than they resolve. As a complete transcription and analysis of all Finale MSS has been reserved for publication in the planned GA monograph, the focus of Part Three has been placed on the reconstruction of the Finale as it stood at the time of Bruckner's death; a less detailed exegesis of the initial sketches and the many bifolios discarded from the emergent orchestral score has been made.

Moreover, far from attempting to supply the 'last word', this study acknowledges the paucity of informed literature on the subject of the Finale and hence is intended to provide a comprehensive resource as a basis for further discussion, and, given the extent of the source material, closer analysis of the manuscripts than is possible within this study. Moreover, with crucial pieces of the puzzle still missing, any publication on the Finale remains a 'work in progress'. The wide dissemination of the sources and the fact that the attempt is being made here, for the first time in seventy years, to collate, analyse and interpret them, militates against definitive conclusions.

The citation of primary and subsequent literature also attempts to be relatively comprehensive, particularly with respect to reception and critical opinion. Writers have been quoted throughout in their original languages, original orthography and punctuation preserved where possible. A number of German terms have been used commonly throughout (see §0.2.1). Italics are reserved for book and work titles and for special emphasis; shorter quotations use double quotation marks; longer passages are indented; single quotation marks are reserved for quotes-within-quotes and for emphasis. Footnote citations of literature have been abbreviated in many cases; full details are given in the Bibliography.<sup>46</sup>

The dissertation is presented in two volumes: Volume I comprises the main text; volume II, bound separately for easier reference, the scores and other materials to which it refers. Volume I is divided into three parts, each constituting to some extent an independent module; each is preceded by introductory 'Prolegomena' (1.0 etc.) establishing context and outlining the aims and bibliographic sources. Part One examines the role of the genesis of the Ninth and particularly the Finale within a biographical context (chapter 1.1, essentially concordant with

---

<sup>45</sup> Munich–Kassel 1993.

<sup>46</sup> See also 0.2, Guide to Terminology.

the German historiographic category of ‘Entstehungsgeschichte’), the transmission of its manuscripts (chapter 1.2—‘Überlieferung’) and its reception history (chapter 1.3, ‘Rezeption’, touching briefly upon ‘Wirkung’) and concludes with an examination of the Orel-edition-based performing versions of the Finale and their reception to 1989 (chapter 1.4). Part Two comprises two essays which evaluate aspects of Bruckner’s compositional technique from the standpoint of his harmonic, formal and structural training and teaching (2.1), and presents a model for the analysis of motivic process in his music and for his conception of this work (2.2). This provides important perspective for the following section. Part Three focusses on the compositional artefact of the Finale itself, the reconstruction of the Autograph Score (3.1) and critical reports on the Documentation of the Fragments (3.2) and Performing Version (3.3) based upon it. The final chapter recounts the history and reception of the Finale from 1990 to 2001 (3.4), followed by a brief Epilogue. Six appendices reprint a number of programme and CD texts significant for the reception of the Finale and articles by the author on the Finale and Ninth Symphony publication project. The volume concludes with a substantial bibliography.

Volume II, which is paginated in seven separate sections, contains the larger tables (section A) and longer musical examples (B), facsimiles of all relevant manuscripts (C), a reproduction of the relevant pages of the 1934 edition by Alfred Orel (D), the reconstruction of Bruckner’s autograph score of the Finale (E), and the scores of the Documentation (F) and Performing Version (G) based on it. The extant autographs of the Finale were published in facsimile by Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag (MWV) in 1996 in a companion volume to the autograph score, *Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten*; early proofs of this edition have been reproduced here in section C [Facs.] C/i–iv, 1–361.<sup>47</sup> The *Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen* was published as a supplementary volume to Volume IX of the Bruckner GA in 1994 (2nd edition 1999; reproduced here as [AP] E/i–vi, 1–145). The *Dokumentation des Fragments* (vol. II, [DdF] F/i–xvi, 1–84) was first published as loan material in 1999; a second, purchasable edition (2002) was in press at the time of writing, this being the version reproduced here. The *Aufführungsfassung* based on the reconstruction of the autograph score ([AF] G/i–iv, 1–98) was first published by its four authors with the assistance of a subvention from numerous musicologists and other sponsors in 1992, and reissued in July 1996 in a second impression; this is the score presented here.

While a number of excerpts from historical editions of Bruckner’s late works have been included in the facsimiles, copyright considerations militated against the reproduction of material from other versions of the Finale, inclusion of which would have expanded the

---

<sup>47</sup> The poor quality of the reproduction was the result of technical problems experienced during preparation of the facsimile edition by MWV—problems subsequently overcome in the published version, see §3.4.9. Although considerably expanding the dimensions of the second volume, inclusion of all the sources was considered indispensable, given that the present research attempts to come to a complete and exhaustive understanding of such a large body of material, some of it not previously transcribed and much of it unsuited to transcription.

second volume beyond reasonable limits. As many useful corroborative comparisons with other Bruckner scores also had to be excluded for reasons of space, the reader is referred to the scores of the second, 'Nowak' edition of the GA. Reproduction of the relevant sections of the 1934 edition of the sketches and drafts for the Ninth Symphony by Alfred Orel, long out of print, available in few libraries and superseded by recent research, was indispensable to the present study, and remains so until republication of all extant materials for the Ninth Symphony has been completed.

Since 1996, considerable progress on this task has been made. MWV's original intention to publish a *Studienband* on the Finale of the Ninth was in 1996 extended to include similar volumes for each movement as well as a new edition of the first three movements, under the editorship of Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs and the present writer. The *Studienband* for the Scherzo and Trio of the Ninth Symphony (ed. Cohrs) appeared in 1998; the revised performing score, parts and *Kritischer Bericht* of the first three movements (ed. Cohrs) were in press at the time of writing, and those for the first, third and fourth movements (ed. Phillips) in preparation. These remaining *Studienbände* will incorporate transcriptions of all surviving sketch and score materials for each movement, and hence finally unburden the Orel edition of its role as principal intermediary for these sources; a comprehensive *Textband* will present detailed study of the genesis and reception of the whole symphony. Special acknowledgement is due here to Prof. Dr. Herbert Vogg of MWV for his vision, magnanimous support and sponsorship of this project, as well as for his permission to reproduce the relevant pages of the Orel edition,<sup>48</sup> facsimiles of the manuscripts, the reconstruction of the autograph score of the Finale and the documentation of the Finale fragments.

Adelaide, May 2002

JOHN A. PHILLIPS

---

<sup>48</sup> Permission to reproduce sections of the Orel edition was granted in a letter from MWV dated 18 Jan. 1990.

## 0.2

### Guide to Terminology

#### 0.2.1 Glossary of German terms.

THE presentation in English of such a quintessentially German field of musicological research as Bruckner scholarship is fraught with linguistic dilemmas. Virtually all major studies concerned with Bruckner and the overwhelming majority of the literature are written in German; furthermore, many terms exist only in German, or have counterparts in English which are more misleading than precise. Due respect should also be given to Bruckner's own technical terminology (see chs. 2.1 and 2.2), often ignored by those wishing to apply accepted models of sonata form to movements which follow quite different thematic procedures. At the risk of a certain linguistic eclecticism the attempt has been made to steer a middle course by citing non-English language quotations and titles (including those of Finale publications) in the original and by using German terms (unitalicised) where no better English substitutes exist. The following glossary explains the principal terms most widely used:

Abbau	literally 'dismantling', the diminuendo passage following a musical climax (opposite of 'Steigerung', <i>q. v.</i> )
Abbruch	literally 'break off', an abrupt truncation of a phrase or passage
Abschrift (AS)	copy
Aufbereitung	A motivic anticipation of a later theme or texture (cf. ch. 2.2; see also 'Herankomponierung')
Aufführungsfassung (AF)	Performing version of the reconstructed Finale (ed. Samale–Phillips–Cohrs–Mazzuca, 1992, 1996)
Autograph-Partitur (AP)	Autograph score; standing alone it implies Anton Bruckner: Ninth Symphony: Finale: Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen (= Reconstruction of the autograph score from the surviving sources; Vienna 1994, 1999)
Dokumentation (DdF)	Anton Bruckner: Ninth Symphony: Finale: Dokumentation des Fragments (= Documentation of the Fragment; Vienna 1999, 2002)
Durchführung (Durchf.)	development section
Ergänzung	supplementation, compositional or instrumental
Erster/Zweiter Teil	Bruckner's own terminology for (respectively) the exposition and development/recapitulation/coda of symphonic movements
Exposition (Exp.)	Sonata-form exposition, corresponding to Bruckner's "Erster Teil"
Gesamtausgabe (GA)	complete edition, specifically the Bruckner GA
Gesangsperiode (Gesangsp.)	Bruckner's term for his second theme groups
Hauptthema (Hauptth.)	Principal theme, in Bruckner's usage implying the entire first group

Herankomponierung	Motivic preparation of a significant theme or texture, like 'Aufbereitung', but forming a gradual transition toward the new idea; see ch. 2.2
Reprise (Repr.)	Recapitulation
Schlußperiode (Schlußp.)	Bruckner's term for the third group, often termed by him "unisono"
Spiegelbild	Simultaneous use of both recto and inversus of a fugal subject
Steigerung	Literally 'climbing'; a dynamic crescendo usually accompanied by ascent in pitch of the melodic line, but involving many musical parameters in the build-up of tension toward a climax
Stichvorlage	Printer's proof
Themenüberlagerung	The contrapuntal overlay of themes with which Bruckner concluded the Finale of his Eighth Symphony and which perhaps constituted an element in the Finale coda of the Ninth

### 0.2.2 General abbreviations.

The following list contains the abbreviations and library sigla (adopted in part from those of Orel) used throughout the text, tables and footnotes, as well as the German instrumental designations and other abbreviations used throughout the scores and musical examples, which, for the sake of consistency, mostly conform to the house style of the Bruckner Gesamtausgabe. A guide to the terminology used in the classification of the Finale MSS is given in §§0.3.1 and 0.3.2 *infra*. Abbreviated references to books and articles, where other than the first words of the titles, are listed under the appropriate entry in the Bibliography.

ABIL	Anton Bruckner Institut Linz
Akk.	Akkolade(n)
Anm.	Anmerkung(en)
AF	Aufführungsfassung: <i>Anton Bruckner: IX. Symphonie D-Moll: Finale. Rekonstruktion nach den erhaltenen Quellen: Aufführungsfassung.</i> Von Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Giuseppe Mazzuca und Gunnar Cohrs. Studienpartitur. Vorgelegt von John A. Phillips. Adelaide 1992, 1996.
AP	Autograph-Partitur (autograph score) generally; specifically it refers to <i>Anton Bruckner: IX. Symphonie D-Moll: Finale (unvollendet). Rekonstruktion nach den erhaltenen Quellen. Studienpartitur.</i> Vorgelegt von John A. Phillips. Vienna 1994, 1999.
A.-Pos.	Alt-Posaune
AS, ASS	Abschrift(en)
Bg.	Bogen
bifol(s).	bifolio(s)
Bl.	Blatt, Blätter
Blechbl.	Blechbläser
Blst.	Bleistift
B.-Pos.	Baß-Posaune
br(s).	bracket(s)
Br.	Bruckner



Brs.	Bruckners
bsn(s).	bassoon(s)
B.-Tb.	Baß-Tuba, -Tuben
c.	circa
cb.	contrabass
ch(s).	chapter(s)
clar(s).	clarinet(s)
DdF	Dokumentation des Fragments: Anton Bruckner: <i>IX. Symphonie D-Moll: Finale (unvollendet)</i> . <i>Dokumentation des Fragments</i> Vorgelegt von John A. Phillips. Vienna 1999, 2002. (Documentation of the Fragment)
Durchf.	Durchführung
ed., eds.	editor/s
edn., edns.	edition/s
e.g.	for example
Entw.	Entwurf, Entwürfe
etc.	et cetera
Ex., Exx.	Musical Example(s)
Exp.	Exposition
f., ff.	following page(s)
FA, F.-A.	Faksimile-Ausgabe: Anton Bruckner: <i>IX. Symphonie: Finale</i> . <i>Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten</i> . Vorgelegt und erläutert von John A. Phillips. Vienna 1996
Facs., Facss.	Facsimile(s)
Fag.	Fagott(e)
fl(s).	flute(s)
fn., fns.	footnote(s)
fol., fols.	folio(s)
fr.	freie
GA	Gesamtausgabe
Göll.-A.	August Göllerich and Max Auer: <i>Anton Bruckner, ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild</i> , Regensburg 1922–1937 (4 vols.)
Hauptth.	Hauptthema (principal theme)
Holzbl.	Holzbläser (woodwind)
Hrn., Hrner., hrn(s).	Horn, Hörner, horn(s)
IBG	Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft
<i>idem</i>	same (author)
i.e.	that is
I. N.	Inventar Nummer
Kb.	Kontrabaß (double bass)
K-Btb.	Kontra-Baßtuba (contrabass tuba)
Klar.	Klarinette(n)
l.	links

---

M.	Mitte
m., mm.	measure(s)
M. H.	Musik-Handschrift(en); StB MS signatures; see §0.2.3
MS, MSS	manuscript(s)
Mus. Hs., Mus. Hss.	Musik-Handschrift(en); ÖNB MS signatures; see §0.2.3
MWV	Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna
n. d.	no date
no., nos.	number(s)
o.	oben, obige
Ob., ob(s).	Oboe(n), oboe(s)
obl.	oblong format
Orel	Alfred Orel (ed.), Anton Bruckner: <i>Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie</i> . Vorgelegt und erläutert von Alfred Orel. Sonderdruck aus: Anton Bruckner: <i>Sämtliche Werke</i> 9. Band: IX. Symphonie D-Moll (Originalfassung). Leipzig 1934
P.	Partitur
p., pp.	page(s)
pc.	particello
Pk.	Pauken
Pos.	Posaune(n)
publ.	published
q.v.	which see
r.	rechts, rechte
r	recto
rej.	rejected
Repr.	Reprise
rev.	revised
s.	siehe
S.	Seite(n)
Schlußp.	Schlußperiode
Sk., sk, sks.	Skizze(n), sketch(es)
Str.	Streicher
SVE	Satzverlaufentwurf, -entwürfe
Syst.	System(e)
T.	Takt(e)
Tb., tba(s).	Tuba, Tuben, tuba(s)
Ten., ten.	Tenor, tenor
Ti.	Tinte
timp.	timpani
T.-Pos.	Tenor-Posaune (tenor trombone)
transl.	translation
tromb(s).	trombone(s)

Tromp., Tr., trp(s).	Trompete(n), trumpet(s)
u.	unten (below, lower)
unfol.	unfoliated
unpubl.	unpublished
usw.	und so weiter
v	verso
Vc., vlc.	Violoncell, violoncello
vgl.	vergleiche
Viol., vln(s).	Violine(n), violin(s)
Vla.	Viola
vol., vols.	volume(s)
z. g. T.	zum größten Teil (largely)
z. T.	zum Teil (partly)

### 0.2.3 Library sigla.

Cracow	Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Cracow
HMdSW	Historisches Museum der Stadt Wien (listed by Orel as “Schubertbund”); this siglum has been maintained, although the source in question, owned by the Schubertbund but held by the museum, has since passed into unknown hands
Hochschule	Bibliothek der Hochschule (now Universität) für Musik und Darstellende Kunst in Wien (listed by Orel as “Akademie”); preceding a signature it implies ‘I. N.’
ÖNB	Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, generally implying the Musiksammlung; preceding a MS signature it implies ‘Mus. Hs.’
StB	Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek (Musiksammlung); preceding a MS signature it also ‘M. H.’
Washington	Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

### 0.2.4 Bibliographic sigla.<sup>49</sup>

<i>AcMus</i>	<i>Acta Musicologica</i>
<i>AfMw</i>	<i>Archiv für Musikwissenschaft</i>
<i>BrBlätter</i>	<i>Bruckner Blätter</i>
<i>BrJb</i>	<i>Bruckner Jahrbuch</i>
<i>BrSympBer</i>	<i>Bruckner Symposion Bericht</i>
<i>Ch&amp;D</i>	<i>Chord and Discord</i>
<i>DMK</i>	<i>Deutsche Musikkultur</i>
<i>JMusRes</i>	<i>Journal of Music Research</i>
<i>KmJb</i>	<i>Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch</i>
<i>M&amp;L</i>	<i>Music and Letters</i>
<i>ME</i>	<i>Musik-Erziehung</i>
<i>Mens&amp;Mel</i>	<i>Mens und Melodie</i>

<sup>49</sup> Abbreviations have been in part adopted from *The Music Index*, Warren, Michigan: Harmonie Park Press (yearly and monthly publications).

<i>Mf</i>	<i>Die Musikforschung</i>
<i>IBG-Mitt</i>	<i>Mitteilungsblatt der Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft</i> (= <i>Studien und Berichte</i> )
<i>MGG</i>	<i>Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> (Basel–Kassel, 1954)
<i>MMR</i>	<i>Monthly Musical Record</i>
<i>MQ</i>	<i>The Musical Quarterly</i>
<i>MR</i>	<i>Music Review</i>
<i>MT</i>	<i>The Musical Times</i>
<i>MuG</i>	<i>Musik und Gesellschaft</i>
<i>MuK</i>	<i>Musik und Kirche</i>
<i>NeueMZ</i>	<i>Neue Musikzeitung</i> (Stuttgart)
<i>NG</i>	<i>The New Grove</i> (London 1980)
<i>NZfM</i>	<i>Neue Zeitschrift für Musik</i> (Mainz)
<i>ÖGM-Mitt</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft</i>
<i>ÖMz</i>	<i>Österreichische Musikzeitschrift</i>
<i>ZfM</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Musik</i> (Regensburg)

### 0.2.5 The citation of works by Bruckner.

The following examples indicate the method used for abbreviated citations of the symphonies:

IX/1, m. 63	Ninth Symphony, first movement, measure 63
VIII(1887)/Trio, m. 25	Eighth Symphony, 1887 version, Trio, measure 25
VIII(1890)/4, mm. 480–490	Eighth Symphony, 1890 version, Finale, measures 480–490

WAB numbers (Renate Grasberger, *Werkverzeichnis Anton Bruckner (WAB)*, Tutzing 1977) have been used only where necessary to identify lesser-known works. Unless otherwise indicated, all citations of Bruckner scores refer to the ‘second’ GA (ed. Nowak, 1951–).

### 0.2.6 Internal cross-references.

Cross-references are by section, the numerals indicating the subdivisions within volume I as follows: §[Part].[Chapter].[section]. The Foreword, Prolegomena and any preliminary sections of chapters are indexed as ‘0’. Volume II is paginated in seven sections. References use the following system or abbreviations thereof:

Table ..., A/...	Table ..., section A, page ...
Mus. Ex. ..., B/...	Musical Example ..., section B, page...
Facs. C/...	Facsimiles, section C, page ...
Orel D/...	Orel edition (cf. §0.2.2 <i>supra</i> ), section D, page ...
AP E/...	Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur, section E, page ...
DdF F/...	Dokumentation des Fragments, section F, page ...
AF G/...	Aufführungsfassung der Rekonstruktion, section G, page ...

## 0.3

### Concerning Bifolio Classifications

#### 0.3.1 The use of prepared paper in the score of the Finale.

As will be subsequently explained in greater detail, Bruckner used for the score of the Finale almost exclusively a music paper printed by his publisher Josef Eberle, namely “JE & Co./No. 8./24 linig.”, in slightly variant sizes and types (see ch. 3.1 and Table IX, Paper Types Used in the Composition of the Finale, vol. II, A/31). According to the manner in which the paper was prepared for use, a task carried out largely by Bruckner’s secretary Anton Meißner, at least five separate rulings can be identified, the principal differences between which are given in the following table. Further details and subdivisions are to be found in the discussion of the sources in ch. 3.1 and in Table X, Paper Rulings Used in the Finale Score (vol. II, A/33).

Ruling A	autograph	violins and viola indicated by “I / II / III”
Ruling B	not autograph (Meißner)	violins and viola indicated by “I / II / III”
Ruling C	not autograph (anonymous)	violins and viola indicated by “I. / II. / III.”
Ruling D	not autograph (Meißner)	violins and viola indicated by “I / II / III”
Ruling E	not autograph (Meißner)	violins and viola indicated by “Vl. 1. / 2. / Br.”

A comparison of the course of composition with these rulings indicates that they were used principally in this order. The further “version” designated by Orel as F is merely another paper type, “JE & Co./No. 8./24 *lienig*”, which appears between the bifolios of Rulings D and E. Rulings E and F have not been renamed, in order to avoid confusion.

#### 0.3.2 The revision of Orel’s bifolio classifications.

As far as possible the classifications introduced by Alfred Orel have been retained; however, in numerous cases corrections and additions were necessary. Further details are to be found in Table VIII, Concordance of the Autograph Finale MSS with the Orel edition (vol. II, A/28ff.).

Most importantly, the equation ‘paper ruling = compositional version’ regarded as axiomatic by Orel can no longer be maintained today. A more meaningful subdivision of the composition of the movement, taking into account paper ruling, renumeration and the later, in part dated revisions, is given in Table XI, Genesis of the Finale Score (vol. II, A/36) and discussed in ch. 3.1.

The following points provide a key to the classifications used in the new edition of the score:

- i. Multiple drafts for any one bifolio belonging to the same paper ruling are indicated by lower case letters in superscript following the bifolio number. For example, 1<sup>a</sup>C, 1<sup>b</sup>C, 1<sup>c</sup>C.
- ii. Lower case, normally placed letters following the bifolio number specify bifolios inserted in the course of expansions, e. g. "13a"E, = "13b"E.
- iii. " " encloses the numbering of bifolios written following the renumeration of the score, e. g. "2"E, "3"E.
- iv. /" " indicates existing numeration, or numeration altered by Bruckner, e. g. 4C/"5", 7C/"8".
- v. [ ] indicates the classification of non-extant bifolios whose existence can be predicated on the basis of the surviving material, e. g. [1E], [2A].
- vi. = indicates the classification of bifolios not numbered by Bruckner but introduced by the editor, e. g. = "13b"E.

## Acknowledgements

THE author wishes to cordially thank the following persons for their invaluable assistance in research and in supplying information or further contacts (in alphabetical order): David Aldeborgh (New York), Lady Evelyn Barbirolli (London), Prof. Dr. Rupert Feuchtmüller (Vienna), Marshall Fine (Memphis), Prof. Dr. Peter Gülke (Wuppertal), Prof. Paul Hawkshaw (New Haven, Connecticut), Erwin Horn (Würzburg), DDr. Volker Kalisch (Berlin), Assoc. Prof. Timothy L. Jackson (Austin), Michael Kennedy (Manchester), Prof. Dr. Hartmut Krones (Vienna), Prof. Dr. Christoph-Hellmut Mahling (Mainz), Dr. Sandra McColl (Melbourne), Hofrat Univ.-Prof. Dr. Leopold Nowak† (Vienna), Erich Nowotny (Kronstorf), Univ.-Prof. Walter Pass (Vienna), Prof. Eva Rieger (Bremen), Dr. Thomas Röder (Nürnberg), Dr. Wolfgang Ruf (Halle), Maestro Nicola Samale (Rome), Dr. Robert Simpson (Eire), Dr. Morten Solvik (Vienna), Dr. Mariana Sonntag (Philadelphia), Asst.-Prof. Dr. Werner Schultze (Vienna), Ritter Cornelis van Zwol (The Netherlands), Arthur D. Walker (Manchester), Univ.-Prof. Dr. Othmar Wessely† (Vienna) and Dr. Franz Zamazal (Linz).

Special thanks is also due to my publishers Prof. Dr. Herbert Vogg, Frau Mag. Tilly Eder and Dr. Angela Pachovsky of Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag (Vienna), and Drs. Elisabeth Maier, Andrea Harrant, Renate Grasberger, Uwe Harten and Erich W. Partsch of the Anton Bruckner Institut Linz (Linz–Vienna), through whose foundational work as a central bibliographic and coordinating agency for Bruckner research, comprehensive studies of this kind first become possible.

Grateful acknowledgement is further due for the invaluable assistance of the several libraries involved and for their kind permission to access original sources held by them, in particular Hofrat Dr. Günter Brosche and staff of the Musiksammlung of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna, Dr. Ernst Hilmar and Johann Ziegler of the Musikabteilung of the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Hofrat Dr. Helga Scholz of the Bibliothek of the Universität (previously Hochschule) für Musik und Darstellende Kunst in Vienna, Dr. Robert Münster and the staff of the Musikabteilung of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, staff at the Library of Congress, Washington D. C., and Gordon Abbott and his staff of the Performing Arts Collection of the Barr Smith Library, Adelaide University.

Concerning the reproduction of the autograph manuscripts, the Reconstruction of the Autograph Score of the Finale, Documentation and of the relevant pages of Alfred Orel's 1934 edition of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie* the author wishes to acknowledge the kind permission of Hofrat Dr. Günter Brosche, Director of the Musiksammlung of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek and Prof. Dr. Herbert Vogg, of

Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna, as well as the reproduction team of Mayer and Co. (Vienna) for their reproduction of the autographs in vol. II, C/1–339.

Special thanks is also due to my ‘partners in crime’, Nicola Samale, Giuseppe Mazzuca and Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs, without whose years of trial and error, painstaking research and invaluable insights the Performing Version of the Finale could never have been brought to a satisfactory conclusion, let alone the Reconstruction published in the Complete Edition, and Documentation performed in Vienna. It is to them, ultimately, that we owe many of the concepts and approaches which brought about the present state of knowledge on the Finale.

Finally, heartfelt personal thanks is owed to the following persons: my esteemed friend and German tutor, the late Dipl.-Ing. Vladimir von Niedermueller (whose father-in-law once met Bruckner personally, so creating a living link between present writer and composer) for many hours of guidance in translation and assistance in deciphering both Bruckner’s and Nowak’s *Kurrentschrift*; Edward Kriek, for his assistance with translation and with the two-piano performance and ABC recording of the Finale in 1990; Greg Kimber for many helpful services, my friend and colleague Benjamin Cohrs (Bremen), for his assistance and his own inestimable input through twelve years of research and writing; my late mother, Yvonne Phillips, for her proofreading and assistance with translation and with the production of the 360 pages of facsimiles in volume II—but far beyond that for her years of patient financial support—and last but not least my doctoral supervisors Prof. Emeritus Andrew D. McCredie (Munich/Melbourne) for providing the initial stimulus for this project and advice in the early stages, and in the final stages, Associate Prof. Kimi Coaldrake (Adelaide), for her patient and supportive supervision, Prof. John Rink (London) for his guidance, encouragement and helpful reading, and Dr. Paul Attinello (Los Angeles/Newcastle-upon-Tyne) for his generously given advice, support and detailed proofreading of the final pre-submission copy. Further proofreading was undertaken post-submission by my friend and colleague Jim Cyphers (Boston), many of whose valuable observations have been incorporated here.



PART ONE

THE GENESIS AND SUBSEQUENT

HISTORY OF THE NINTH



## 1.0

### Prolegomena

Die Bruckner-Rezeption [seit 1945] unterscheidet sich wesentlich von der anderer Großmeister des 19. Jahrhunderts, indem sie sich gleichsam zwischen zwei Polen vollzog: Die einen Rezipienten haben es sich mit dem Menschen und Komponisten Bruckner lange Zeit offensichtlich zu leicht gemacht, die anderen tun sich bis zur Stunde sehr schwer mit ihm. Das ist zweifellos begründet in der exzeptionellen Stellung dieses Komponisten im 19. Jahrhundert, die zwar immer wieder konstatiert, aber bisher nur selten wirklich analytisch angegangen wurde. Das Kernproblem, wenn es überhaupt ein solches ist, welches sich wie ein roter Faden nahezu durch die gesamte Bruckner-Literatur zieht, die angebliche Unvereinbarkeit von Persönlichkeit und Werk, harrt somit nach wie vor auf eine Lösung. Insgesamt scheint die noch am Ende der vierziger und in den fünfziger Jahren zu konstatierende Zelebration des Musikanten Gottes vor allem seit den siebziger Jahren einer abgeklärten, unvoreingenommenen Sicht Bruckners gewichen zu sein. Eine ganze Reihe von kritischer Stimmen gegen das alte Bruckner-Bild läßt sich vernehmen. Aber wir befinden uns im Augenblick noch inmitten oder gar am Anfang dieses Klärungsprozesses. Die bisherige Bruckner-Rezeption hatte eindeutig ihren Schwerpunkt in dem Persönlichkeitsbild des Komponisten. Nur hin und wieder wird eine Stimme laut, die für eine stärkere auf das Werk Bruckners bezogene Forschungsintensität plädiert. Was vor allem für die Zukunft notwendig erscheint, sind breitangelegte vergleichende analytische Arbeiten, die das Werk Bruckners einmal in seinen musik- und kulturhistorischen Zusammenhang stellen und dann ästhetisch zur Person Bruckners in Beziehung setzen. Es ist zu vermuten, daß sich dann der sogenannte Zwiespalt zwischen Werk und Person von selbst auflösen wird.

Es ist verwunderlich, daß trotz der relativ umfangreichen biographischen Bruckner-Literatur bisher so wenig authentisches Quellenmaterial vorgelegt wurde.

—Winfried Kirsch<sup>1</sup>

#### 1.0.1 Introduction to Part One.

**W**HILE it is now twenty years since Winfried Kirsch wrote the above words in his admirable guided tour of post-World War II Bruckner literature, it is disheartening to think how little, up until quite recently, had been achieved in the way of remedying the lack of authenticated source material of which he so rightly complained. The problematic transmission of the score of the Ninth and the dispersal of its unfinished Finale, the first performance of the reorchestrated first three movements, the eulogistic and no less carefully orchestrated reception, the later reinstatement of the autograph as a valid and performable score and its appearance in the vanguard of the first Gesamtausgabe all stand as emblematic of the issues inherent in the biography of this composer and the chequered fate of his works.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Die Bruckner Forschung seit 1945 (I)”, *AcMus* 53, no. 2 (1981), pp. 157f.

They are also indicative of the extent to which early biographers, critics and subsequent editors established subsequent patterns of reception, and reveal the difficulty of 'breaking the mould' in thinking about a composer and his works once they are established to the degree exemplified by the vast majority of Bruckner literature.

The composition of the Ninth Symphony dominated the last five years of Bruckner's life, years characterised both by Bruckner's late but triumphant 'arrival' as a widely accepted although controversial composer as well as by a sequence of episodes of increasing debility and final decline. Despite the vast amount of material written about this work and its key role in the reassessment of Bruckner's musical language ushered in by the critical edition of the 1930s, a detailed and comprehensive account of Bruckner's last years, particularly one attempting to interrelate compositional and biographical data and taking into account all known compositional dates for the period, is being attempted here for the first time. So far, little effort has been expended on elucidating the convoluted transmission history of the currently extant sources for the Ninth Symphony and other works of the late period or on analysing the evolution of perceptions about the Ninth Symphony and its Finale. Accordingly, Part One, the largest part of this dissertation, revisits the principal historical stations of the 'Entstehung', 'Überlieferung' and 'Rezeptionsgeschichte' of the symphony, with special emphasis on the much neglected issue of genesis, transmission and reception history of the Finale itself. While the compositional chronology of the Finale is dealt with in more detail in chapter 3.1, chapter 1.1 gives a broad outline of the essential compositional phases of all four movements.

The reader is referred here in advance to the first six Tables (vol. II, A/3ff.), which give an overview of the relevant MS sources (Table I; see also Table VI), compositional and biographical dates (II and III), reception history (IV) and the performing versions of the Finale (V). A number of facsimiles (vol. II, section C) as well as the Finale-relevant portions of the Orel edition of *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie* of 1934 (section D) will be referred to in the course of the text.

The ensuing three sections present introductory essays outlining the biographical literature and recent developments in scholarship (§1.0.2), Bruckner's debt to Beethoven and his conception of the Ninth Symphony (§1.0.3.), and the problem of our approach to the modern day sources (§1.0.4).

### **1.0.2 Literature.**

The body of literature surrounding Anton Bruckner, both bane and blessing to all who attempt to deal critically with his life and works, is vast, and its often journalistic tone, its preponderance of anecdote and personal reminiscence and its intermingling of fact with fiction, mysticism and various degrees and varieties of political ideology make in-depth studies of biography and reception laborious in the extreme.

Of the early memoirists, Friedrich Eckstein,<sup>2</sup> Joseph Gruber,<sup>3</sup> Anton Meißner (as related by Viktor Keldorfer),<sup>4</sup> Otto Kitzler<sup>5</sup> and August Stradal<sup>6</sup> prove the most informative in regard to Bruckner's last years. Max von Oberleithner<sup>7</sup> and Ferdinand Klose<sup>8</sup> provide lesser insights. The journalist Ernst Decsey, a student of Bruckner's at the Conservatorium, claims the dubious honour of having written the first fully-fledged biography of the composer.<sup>9</sup> Bruckner's subsequent 'official' biographers, the problematic alliance of August Göllerich and his successor Max Auer,<sup>10</sup> saw their task as limited to the wholesale and uncritical collection and collation of material provided by documents and the literature that had already appeared, embedding them in the matrix of their own 'Bruckner ideology'—an unsavoury mixture of mystical hero worship and increasingly nationalist *völkisch* ideology.<sup>11</sup> In regard to their general reliability the early editions of the letters, published by Gräflinger and Auer,<sup>12</sup> fared no better.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*, Vienna 1923. See concerning Eckstein, Max Schönherr, "Wer war Friedrich Eckstein?", *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 163–172.

<sup>3</sup> *Meine Erinnerungen an Dr. Anton Bruckner: Ernste und heitere Episoden aus seinem Leben*, Einsiedeln 1928.

<sup>4</sup> Viktor Keldorfer, "Erinnerungen an Bruckner", *Die Furche*, supplement *Die Warte* 2, no. 2 (1946), pp. 1–9, and *idem*, "Anton Meisners [sic] Bruckner-Erinnerungen: Aus den Aufzeichnungen Anton Meisners", *Die Furche Jahrbuch 1947*, pp. 78–87. See Erich W. Partsch, "Anton Meißner, der letzte 'Sekretär' Bruckners", *BrJb* 1984–86, pp. 57–62 and Heinrich Salzer, "Erinnerungen an Anton Meißner: Nach den Erzählungen meines Vaters Josef Anton Salzer", *BrJb* 1984–86, pp. 63–64.

<sup>5</sup> *Musikalische Erinnerungen, mit Briefen von Wagner, Brahms, Bruckner und Richard Pohl*, Brünn 1906.

<sup>6</sup> "Eine Erinnerung an Anton Bruckner", *ZfM* 93, no. 9 (Sept. 1926), pp. 505–506, and *idem*, "Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit", *ZfM* 99, no. 10 (Oct. 1932), pp. 853–860, continued in no. 11 (Nov. 1932), pp. 971–978 and no. 12 (Dec. 1932), pp. 1071–1075.

<sup>7</sup> *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*, Regensburg 1933.

<sup>8</sup> *Meine Lehrjahre bei Anton Bruckner: Erinnerungen und Betrachtungen*, Regensburg 1927.

<sup>9</sup> *Bruckner: Versuch eines Lebens*, Berlin 1919, not including two slighter attempts (essentially work commentaries) by Rudolf Louis (*Bruckner*, Munich 1905) and Max Morold (*Anton Bruckner*, Leipzig 1912).

<sup>10</sup> Max Auer's single-volume biography was originally entitled *Anton Bruckner: Sein Leben und Werk*, Zurich–Leipzig–Vienna 1923, subsequent editions appearing in Vienna in 1934, 1941 and 1947 (hereafter Auer, *Bruckner* (1923), (1934), etc.). The later editions proved difficult to obtain, but appear to present the 1934 text—itsself a substantial expansion of the 1923 edition—in amplified form. The four-volume *Anton Bruckner: Ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild* (subdivided into nine separately-bound sub-volumes), Regensburg 1922–37 (repr. 1974), was begun by August Göllerich and completed by Max Auer following the former's death in 1922 (hereafter referred to as 'Göll.-A'); for further discussion see §1.0.4.

<sup>11</sup> By virtue of simple chronology, the early biographies of the 1920s and 1930s were by and large not dependent upon the Göllerich-Auer biography as Kirsch states ("Die Bruckner-Forschung... (II)", *AcMus* 54, 1982, p. 209), publication of which was only concluded in the late 1930s, but *vice versa*, Auer drawing on accounts already published in the earlier 'Memoirenliteratur'.

<sup>12</sup> Anton Bruckner, *Gesammelte Briefe*, ed. Franz Gräflinger, Regensburg 1924, hereafter referred to as '*Ges. Briefe* (Gräflinger)'; and Anton Bruckner, *Gesammelte Briefe, Neue Folge*, ed. Max Auer, Regensburg 1924, hereafter '*Ges. Briefe* (Auer)'. New editions of the letters are nearing completion as part of the Gesamtausgabe.

One of the examples of the *Erinnerungsliteratur* most valuable for the present study was the 1924 centenary Festschrift *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner*,<sup>13</sup> in particular the article by Max Auer, “Anton Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”,<sup>14</sup> in which Auer appears to have reproduced the recollections of the composer’s last doctor, Richard Heller, without significant editorial intervention.

Richard Heller was to prove important for another reason. In sharp contrast to the questionable reliability of many such specialist biographies, the substantial *Musik und Medizin* of the Viennese medical internist Anton Neumayr<sup>15</sup> included a balanced, comprehensive and practical chapter on Bruckner’s life, psychology and medical history, incorporating and evaluating many aspects of a newer Bruckner image. While Neumayr’s study is regrettably not referenced, his approach nonetheless embodied significant advantages over most biographical studies written up to that point in being able to draw upon an unpublished account of Bruckner’s medical history written by Richard Heller and preserved in the Institut für Geschichte der Medizin of the University of Vienna.<sup>16</sup> The account is of special significance as it would seem not to have been available to Auer, and because apart from numerous medical details concerning Bruckner’s last months, Neumayr was able to cite a number of incidents which do not appear in any of the earlier biographies or memoirs. Some of these could be incorporated into the account of the composer’s life in ch. 1.1.

It is significant to note that, as long as biography was limited to the essentially anecdotal, theoretical studies of Bruckner’s music were almost wholly *synchronic* in nature—at least until the problem of the “Originalfassungen” raised its head in the 1920s. Authors such as August Halm<sup>17</sup> and first and foremost the theorist Ernst Kurth<sup>18</sup> wrote analyses almost wholly devoid of any reference to such ephemera as biographical detail or compositional genesis. Based only on the first-edition scores, these early studies tended to circle in a speculative limbo far removed from any study of the composer’s manuscripts or his working methods. Parallel with this analytical tradition runs that of the metaphysical and anthropo-

---

<sup>13</sup> Ed. Karl Kobald, Zurich–Leipzig–Vienna 1924. See also the article by Max Eckstein, “Die erste und die letzte Begegnung zwischen Hugo Wolf und Anton Bruckner”, *ibid.*, pp. 44–59.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21–35.

<sup>15</sup> “Anton Bruckner”, in: *idem, Musik und Medizin*, vol. 2, Vienna 1989, pp. 261–361 (hereafter ‘Neumayr’). Neumayr’s study forms a sharp contrast with the earlier journalistic *Krankheiten großer Musiker* of Dieter Kerner, Stuttgart 1963–67. Reference should be made here to the questionable Erwin Ringel, “Psychogramm für Anton Bruckner”, in: *BrSympBer 1977*, pp. 19–26, echoes of which are found in Neumayr views, and the interesting discussion of personality and composer from psychological and musical viewpoints by Karl Amadeus Hartmann and Waldemar Wahren, “Briefe über Bruckner”, *NZfM* 126 (1965), pp. 272–276; 334–338; 380–387.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Neumayr, p. 314.

<sup>17</sup> *Die Symphonien Anton Bruckners*, Munich 1914.

<sup>18</sup> *Anton Bruckner*, 2 vols., Berlin 1925.

sophical hermeneutists of Bruckner's music, foremost among them Erich Schwebsch<sup>19</sup> and Fritz Grüninger.<sup>20</sup>

Indeed, almost the whole of the literature up to the 1930s stood in contrast to the publications of the first editors of the Bruckner GA, although sharing with them much the same ideological and philosophical bent. Alfred Orel first attempted to bridge the scholarly gap between work analysis and compositional process with the publication of his *Anton Bruckner: Das Werk—Der Künstler—Die Zeit* (Vienna—Leipzig, 1925)—and most of all with the 1934 publication of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie*. While inevitably stained by the times in which it was written and the Nazi sympathies of its author, Robert Haas' *Bruckner*<sup>21</sup> remains the most significant and serious addition to the biographies of the period. Orel's later *Bruckner-Brevier: Briefe, Dokumente, Berichte*<sup>22</sup> was also a significant attempt to provide scholars with a more adequate foundation—though by no means on the scale required—than that provided by the memoir and anecdotal literature, the flawed editions of the letters and the dilettante biography of Göllerich and Auer. The anecdotal tradition of Bruckner reception was particularly damaging for early attempts at promoting Bruckner's music in English-speaking countries: one need only read between the lines of articles such as Geoffrey Sharp's "Anton Bruckner: Simpleton or Mystic?" of 1942<sup>23</sup> to gauge some impression of the pejorative effect the typical Bruckner anecdotes had in leading a culturally distant audience, in effect, away from a better understanding of Bruckner's music. The reception of the 1930s and 1940s, dominated by its confluence with Nazi ideology, is of course a subject in itself; some issues arising from them will be aired in ch. 1.3.

Bruckner research in the years following the Second World War was dominated by what might well be termed a 'neue Sachlichkeit'. Of special significance for the present study, a remarkable volume appeared in 1950: a stenographic account of the last years of Bruckner's harmony teaching at the University of Vienna, undertaken by Ernst Schwanzara (1873–1954).<sup>24</sup> This is unquestionably the most detailed and accurate impression we have of Bruckner's University teaching; it also provides invaluable and reliable indications as to his state of health, his thinking and compositional developments throughout the years 1891/92–

---

<sup>19</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnis von Entwicklungen in der Musik*, Stuttgart 1921.

<sup>20</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Der metaphysische Kern seiner Persönlichkeit und seiner Werke*, Stuttgart 1921; subsequently republished Augsburg 1930, 1949.

<sup>21</sup> Potsdam 1934.

<sup>22</sup> Vienna 1953.

<sup>23</sup> *MR* 3, pp. 46–54.

<sup>24</sup> Anton Bruckner, ed. E. Schwanzara, *Vorlesungen über Harmonielehre und Kontrapunkt an der Universität Wien*, Vienna 1950 (hereafter 'Schwanzara'). Ernst Schwanzara, Ingenieur and Ministerialrat, assisted Auer in the latter's biography, vol. IV/4 of which, published in 1936, included Schwanzara's research confirming the composer's Aryan ancestry (Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 9f., pp. 135ff.). The significance of Schwanzara's account is attested to, for instance, by William Waldstein, "Bruckner als Lehrer", in: *Bruckner-Studien: Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, Franz Grasberger, ed., Vienna 1964, pp. 116 and 118.

1893/94, the period during which much of the Ninth was composed. While some authors have belittled Bruckner's commitment to his students, as well as his teaching abilities and even his supposed 'blind' adherence to antiquated Sechterian theory,<sup>25</sup> observations made by Neumayr find strong backing in Schwanzara's account: "Als er [...] 1876 seine Antrittsvorlesung hielt, wurde er von der akademischen Jugend stürmisch begrüßt, die sein unkonventionelles Benehmen und sein gesellschaftliches Außenseitertum als Ausdruck eine hinter einer biedereren Maske verborgenen Genies richtig deuteten." According to Neumayr, Bruckner's students were among the first "die seine Menschlichkeit, die Größe seiner Persönlichkeit und sein Genie voll begriffen haben".<sup>26</sup> We realise today more keenly the political divide that existed between Bruckner adherents and detractors, which would have been reflected in the manner in which the young progressive musicians and music-lovers of Bruckner's day flocked to a composer reviled by the Viennese establishment.<sup>27</sup> As Korstvedt has explained,<sup>28</sup> support for Bruckner tended to polarise along lines of both age and social division; the often astonishingly vitriolic criticism he encountered stemmed largely from the old-guard Liberal establishment, which in the 1880s saw its belief in rationalism and the social order increasingly under siege from radical new political factions such as the Pan-Germanists and Christian Socials, while aesthetic challenges came from the new ideals of emotional abandon, populism, monumentalism, the epic and the sublime, all of which were musically embodied in unbridled formal, dynamic and harmonic expansionism.

The 1950s also saw the publication of Friedrich Blume's *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, the principal event in music lexicography of the post-war period, and which heralded the beginning of a significant *Wende* in approaches to Bruckner. Blume's article on Bruckner<sup>29</sup> anticipated more modern perspectives, as Kirsch<sup>30</sup> pointed out, "die Bruckner als mystischen universalistischen Dombaumeister eines ewigen Domes ablehnt und die Geschichtsbezogenheit auch dieses Komponisten in den Vordergrund gerückt sehen will". In

---

<sup>25</sup> See further discussion in chs. 2.0 and 2.1. Schwanzara (p. 65) writes: "Alles zusammengenommen, war Bruckner durch die Art, seine Lehrsätze klar und einprägsam vorzutragen, und an vortrefflich ausgewählten Beispielen zu erläutern, für jeden ernsten Studenten ein sehr geschätzten Lehrer." This view is in marked contrast to the stance of William Waldstein, "Bruckner als Lehrer", pp. 113–120 *passim*, who claimed Bruckner "unfähig" to teach more than elementary theory (p. 118).

<sup>26</sup> Neumayr, p. 291. Concerning the reliability of Schwanzara's account of Bruckner's teaching Kirsch notes: "Da Bruckner selbst keine musiktheoretischen Schriften hinterlassen hat, kommt der von Schwanzara als Student in den Jahren 1891–94 angefertigten vollständigen Niederschrift von Bruckners Harmonielehre ein hoher dokumentarischer Stellungwert zu" ("Die Bruckner-Forschung... (II)", *AcMus* 54, 1982, p. 233).

<sup>27</sup> See for instance Margaret Notley, "Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style, and Politics in Late 19th-Century Vienna", *19th-Century Music* 17 (1993), pp. 107–123 *passim*.

<sup>28</sup> *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony*, Cambridge 2000, pp. 3ff.

<sup>29</sup> *MGG* (1954) vol. 2, cols. 342–382.

<sup>30</sup> (II), p. 218.



contrast, the much later *New Grove* entry of Deryck Cooke<sup>31</sup> appears both less informed and more dependent upon traditional tropes of reception.

Indeed, despite the best efforts of writers such as Hans F. Redlich,<sup>32</sup> Deryck Cooke<sup>33</sup> and Robert Simpson<sup>34</sup> at popularising the symphonies, Anglo-American Bruckner reception and scholarship, until quite recently, lagged significantly behind the best efforts of their German-speaking counterparts, the more populist biographies<sup>35</sup> presenting an image of the composer even further removed from that of the original sources.<sup>36</sup> *Chord and Discord*,<sup>37</sup> the organ of the American Bruckner Society, was particularly active throughout the 1950s and 1960s, and provided an important English-language forum for the discussion of the music of both Bruckner and Mahler.<sup>38</sup>

A particularly useful bibliographic overview of post-World War II literature is represented by Winfried Kirsch's comprehensive review article of 1981–84,<sup>39</sup> quoted at the outset of this section. Kirsch's article provides in effect a reference point for the major critical re-assessment of man and music that began around the middle of the preceding decade with the sesquicentenary of the composer's birth in 1974<sup>40</sup> and which has since achieved so much in the way of historically recontextualising a composer formerly all too often viewed as a "geheimnisvoller und bedeutungsschwerer Anachronismus, eine Erscheinung ohne Vorbe-

<sup>31</sup> "Bruckner, (Josef) Anton", Bibliography by Leopold Nowak, in: *NG* (1980) vol. 3, pp. 352–371.

<sup>32</sup> *Bruckner and Mahler* (The Master Musicians Series, London 1955, 1970).

<sup>33</sup> "Anton Bruckner (1824–1896)", in: *The Symphony: Vol. 1: Haydn to Dvořák*, ed. Robert Simpson, Harmondsworth, Middlesex 1966–75, pp. 283–306; *idem*, "The Bruckner Problem Simplified", in: *idem*, *Vindications: Essays on Romantic Music*, London 1982, pp. 43–71.

<sup>34</sup> *The Essence of Bruckner*, New York 1967. See also his article "Bruckner and the Symphony", *MR* 7 (1946), pp. 35–40 and the several articles which appeared in *Chord and Discord* (*infra*).

<sup>35</sup> Werner Wolff, *Anton Bruckner, Rustic Genius*, New York 1942; Gabriel Engel, *The Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, Iowa City 1955; Erwin Doernberg, *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, London 1960; Hans-Hubert Schönzeler, *Bruckner*, London 1970; Derek Watson, *Bruckner* (The Master Musician Series), London 1975.

<sup>36</sup> Indeed, as Winfried Kirsch pointed out, Bruckner research has remained until recently largely an "österreichische Angelegenheit" ("Die Bruckner-Forschung... (I)", , p. 158).

<sup>37</sup> New York 1947, etc.

<sup>38</sup> See for instance the articles by Robert Simpson, "The Eighth Symphony of Bruckner: An Analysis", *Ch&D* 2, no. 6 (1950), pp. 42–55; "The Seventh Symphony of Bruckner: An Analysis", *ibid.* 2, no. 10 (1963), pp. 57–67, and "The Ninth Symphony of Anton Bruckner", *ibid.* 2, no. 6 (1950), pp. 115–117; and those by Warren Storey Smith, "The Cyclic Principle in Musical Design, and the Use of it by Bruckner and Mahler", *ibid.* 2, no. 9 (1960), pp. 3–32, and "Bruckner's Three Styles", *ibid.* 2, no. 10 (1963), pp. 28–39.

<sup>39</sup> "Die Bruckner Forschung seit 1945 (I)", *AcMus* 53, no. 2 (1981), pp. 157–170; (II) *AcMus* 54, nos. 1–2 (1982), pp. 208–261; (III) *AcMus* 55, no. 1 (1983), pp. 201–244; (IV) *AcMus* 56, no. 1 (1984), pp. 1–29.

<sup>40</sup> See from that year Walter Gerstenberg, "Bruckners Symphonie—damals und heute", *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 175–180; Manfred Wagner, "Zum Formalzwang im Leben Anton Bruckners", *ibid.*, pp. 418–425 (see also Manfred Wagner's earlier "Vorwort zu einer Bibliographie; dargestellt an jener über Anton Bruckner", *Mf* 26 (1973), pp. 225–235); Franz Grasberger, "Neue Aspekte des Bruckner-Bildes", *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 426–429; Günter Brosche, "Anton Bruckners Traditionsbewußtsein", *ibid.*, pp. 430–436; Peter Gülke, "Der Schwierige Jubilar", *MuG* 24 (1974), pp. 547–550.

reitung und ohne Folgen" (Grebe).<sup>41</sup> Chief among the forces in that enlightenment has, of course, been the Vienna circle centred around the Anton Bruckner Institut Linz (hereafter ABIL), which was founded in 1978 by Franz Grasberger, then Director of the Musiksammlung of the ÖNB.<sup>42</sup>

Grasberger had in the previous year organised a Bruckner Symposium in Linz in conjunction with an exhibition entitled "Anton Bruckner zwischen Wagnis und Sicherheit"; the perspectives aired stressed the importance of arriving at a re-evaluation of the composer's personality.<sup>43</sup> With Grasberger and following his death Othmar Wessely as chief editors, the members of the Bruckner Institute, including Elisabeth Maier, Renate Grasberger, Andrea Harrandt, Uwe Harten and Erich W. Partsch,<sup>44</sup> together with Manfred Wagner<sup>45</sup> and others, have contributed to a dramatic and long-overdue change in our conceptualisation of the composer via their publication of the *Bruckner-Jahrbuch*,<sup>46</sup> annual symposium reports<sup>47</sup> and a further series entitled *Anton Bruckner: Dokumente und Studien*.<sup>48</sup> Valuable reference works such as Renate Grasberger's *Bruckner-Bibliographie (bis 1974)*<sup>49</sup> and her *Bruckner-Ikono-*

<sup>41</sup> Karl Grebe, *Anton Bruckner in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*, Reinbeck bei Hamburg 1972, p. 127. Similar views to those of Grebe are echoed by Walter Abendroth, "Der große Anachronismus: Anton Bruckner", in: *Vier Meister der Musik: Bruckner, Mahler, Reger, Pfitzner*, Munich 1952, pp. 11–37; the confessional mode found latter-day representatives in the writings of Leopold Nowak; among other adherents could be cited Hans Pflugbeil ("Omnia ad maiorem Dei gloriam. Anton Bruckner 1824–1896", *MuK* 44 (Nov.–Dec. 1974), pp. 261–267), or even more recently Roland Mörchen ("Mystiker der Monumentalität", *Lutherische Monatsheft* July 1993, pp. 36f.).

<sup>42</sup> See Winfried Kirsch's account of the early stages of the Bruckner 'Wende', "Die Bruckner Forschung... (I)", p. 168.

<sup>43</sup> See the overview provided by Herbert Seifert's article "Die Entwicklung der Bruckner-Forschung", in: *Bruckner-Vorträge: Budapest 1983–84: Bericht*, Linz–Vienna 1985, pp. 17–20, *passim*.

<sup>44</sup> See Bibliography, §II.

<sup>45</sup> See, among other contributions to the literature, his *Bruckner: Leben—Werke—Dokumente*, Mainz—Munich 1983, hereafter *BrLWD*. Particularly significant also for the reception history of the Ninth is the relevant chapter of his *Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik in Beispielen*, Tutzing 1979, pp. 235–277.

<sup>46</sup> Linz–Vienna, since 1980; edited 1980–1981 by Franz Grasberger, from 1982 by Othmar Wessely.

<sup>47</sup> *Bruckner Symposium Berichte*, Linz–Vienna, from 1980, edited 1980–1981 by F. Grasberger, from 1982 by Othmar Wessely.

<sup>48</sup> Graz, subsequently Vienna, from 1979, vols. 1–3 edited by Franz Grasberger, thereafter by Othmar Wessely. See in particular the volumes *Anton Bruckner in Wien: Eine kritische Studie zu seiner Persönlichkeit (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 2*, ed. Franz Grasberger), Graz 1980, with the contributions of Manfred Wagner ("Bruckner in Wien: Ein Beitrag zur Apperzeption und Rezeption des oberösterreichischen Komponisten in der Hauptstadt der k. k. Monarchie", pp. 9–74), Johannes-Leopold Mayer ("Musik als gesellschaftliches Ärgernis—oder: Anton Bruckner, der Anti-Bürger: Das Phänomen Bruckner als historisches Problem", pp. 75–160) and Elisabeth Maier ("Anton Bruckners Arbeitswelt", pp. 161–228); Renate Grasberger and Erich Wolfgang Partsch, *Bruckner—skizziert: Ein Porträt in ausgewählten Erinnerungen und Anekdoten (Anton Bruckner: Dokumente und Studien 8*, ed. Othmar Wessely), Vienna 1991, with Partsch's outstanding essays analysing the popular image of the composer, its roots, transmission and variant aspects, "Kritische Gedanken zur Bruckner-Rezeption", pp. 201–234, and "Der 'Musikant Gottes—Zur Analyse eines Sterotyps", pp. 235–255.

<sup>49</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Dokumente und Studien 4*, ed. Othmar Wessely, Graz 1985.

*graphie: Teil 1: Um 1854 bis 1924*<sup>50</sup> have also appeared in this series.<sup>51</sup> The *Bruckner-Handbuch*,<sup>52</sup> published in 1996 for the centenary of the composer's death, embodied in ready-reference form many aspects of the new documentary research, providing a useful compilation of knowledge concerning Bruckner and his milieu up to the revival of the Haas and first-edition controversy that emerged in the mid 1990s.

Concerning other figures prominent in Bruckner's last years and in the ensuing reception of his music, recent studies have also begun to reassess the relationship between the composer and his pupils and editors, chief among them the Schalk brothers and Ferdinand Löwe—complex relationships previously visible only through the distorted glasses of the revisionists who followed them.<sup>53</sup> In the forefront of these studies were Thomas Leibnitz's *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*;<sup>54</sup> more recently the first volume of Reinhard Rauner's *Ferdinand Löwe: Leben und Wirken*, has appeared.<sup>55</sup> Bruckner's relationship with each of these three men, while significant for the reception of the Ninth Symphony and, particularly in regard to other works, for the vexed issue of textual validity, represents a chapter in itself, and cannot be dealt with more than cursorily here. As Erich Wolfgang Partsch suggested with masterly understatement in a report on the 1994 Bruckner Symposium, "Bruckner-Freunde—Bruckner-Kenner",<sup>56</sup> Bruckner's reception was complicated far more by his friends than by his enemies.

In addition to this attempt at reassessing Bruckner as a historical figure and his relationship to the personalities surrounding him a fresh focus came in the 1990s upon the cultural and political mechanisms of reception that led to the stereotypical older reduction of the composer to ingenuous *savant* and the political exploitation of that image as *völkisch* icon. Over the last decade considerable efforts have been made, largely within Anglo-American scholarship, to place the German symphonic tradition in greater cultural and ideological context and to re-think axiomatic concepts such as absolute music, the symphonic canon and the cult of 'great' German composers—Bach, Beethoven, Wagner, Brahms (and Bruckner)—as cultural phenomena rather than given truths. The older, ostensibly positivistic, but in fact ideologically and even politically motivated paradigm inherited from musicology's nineteenth

---

<sup>50</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Dokumente und Studien* 7, ed. Othmar Wessely, Graz 1990.

<sup>51</sup> Mention should also be made here of R. Grasberger's earlier *Werkverzeichnis Anton Bruckner (WAB)* (*Publikationen des Instituts für Österreichische Musikdokumentation* 7, ed. Franz Grasberger), Tutzing 1977.

<sup>52</sup> Ed. Uwe Harten, Residenz Verlag: Munich. See the advance notice in *IBG-Mitt* no. 34 (June 1995), p. 32.

<sup>53</sup> See for instance the *Briefe und Betrachtungen* of Franz Schalk, ed. Lili Schalk, Vienna–Leipzig 1935.

<sup>54</sup> *Publikationen des Institutes für Österreichische Musikdokumentation* 14, Tutzing 1988. See also his earlier article, "Josef Schalk. Ein Wagnerianer zwischen Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf", *BrJb* 1980, pp. 119–128.

<sup>55</sup> *I. Teil 1863–1900: Ein Wiener Musiker zwischen Anton Bruckner und Gustav Mahler (Musikleben: Studien zur Musikgeschichte Österreichs: Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Musikgeschichte an der Hochschule für Musik und darstellende Kunst in Wien* 3, ed. Friedrich Heller), Frankfurt am Main–Bern 1995.

<sup>56</sup> "Von Bruckner-Freunden, Feinden, Kennern und Verehrern", *IBG-Mitt* 43 (December 1994), pp. 28ff.

century roots continued to dominate musicological discourse for most of the twentieth century, remaining largely unquestioned in mainstream musicological debate until the 1980s. From the late 80s onwards, however, writers such as Susan McClary,<sup>57</sup> Leo Treitler,<sup>58</sup> John Shepherd,<sup>59</sup> James Hepokoski,<sup>60</sup> Lawrence Kramer,<sup>61</sup> Gary Tomlinson,<sup>62</sup> Lydia Goehr,<sup>63</sup> Sanna Pederson,<sup>64</sup> Margaret Notley<sup>65</sup> and Celia Applegate<sup>66</sup> among many others published research opening new and much-needed perspectives in the interpretation and re-contextualisation of many aspects of what was a largely German-oriented discourse—witness to a new and long-overdue willingness within musicology as a whole to engage with its methodological postulates.

The older positivist paradigm also began to reveal troubling links with German nationalist thinking, including its hypostasis during the Nazi era in the political-cultural ideology of national socialism, as Erik Levi<sup>67</sup> or Pamela Potter,<sup>68</sup> among others, have argued. This was a logical corollary of the awareness that music history and issues such as text criticism or analysis cannot be viewed within a conveniently and comfortably apolitical vacuum. Potter writes:

[T]he Nazi phenomenon reveals the inherently political nature of musicology. [...] [O]ne may argue that musicology was a political discipline from its very beginnings, particularly with regard to its Germanocentric emphasis, and has never ceased to be a political

---

<sup>57</sup> See Richard Leppert and Susan McClary, eds., *Music and Society*, Cambridge 1987. Concerning McClary's readings of the symphonic canon, see her "Narrative Agendas in 'Absolute' Music": Identity and Difference in Brahms's Third Symphony", in: Ruth Solie, ed., *Music and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1993, pp. 326–344, and "Constructions of Subjectivity in Schubert's Music", in: Philip Brett, Elizabeth Wood, Gary C. Thomas, eds., *Queering the Pitch: The New Gay and Lesbian Musicology*, New York 1994, pp. 205–233.

<sup>58</sup> *Music and the Historical Imagination*, Cambridge 1989.

<sup>59</sup> *Music as Social Text*, Cambridge 1991.

<sup>60</sup> "The Dahlhaus Project and Its Extra-musicological Sources", *19th-Century Music* 16, no. 3 (Spring 1991), pp. 221–246.

<sup>61</sup> "Haydn's Chaos, Schenker's Order; or, Hermeneutics and Musical Analysis: Can They Mix?", *19th-Century Music* 16/1 (Summer 1992), pp. 3–17

<sup>62</sup> "Musical Pasts and Postmodern Musicologies", *Current Musicology* no. 50, 1992, pp. 18–24.

<sup>63</sup> Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*, Oxford 1992.

<sup>64</sup> "A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity", *19th-Century Music* 18, no. 2 (Fall 1994), pp. 87–107.

<sup>65</sup> "Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style and Politics in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna", *19th-Century Music* 17, no. 2 (Fall 1993), pp. 107ff.; "Volksconcerte in Vienna and late Nineteenth-Century Ideology of the Symphony", *JAMS* 50, nos. 2–3 (Summer—Fall 1997), pp. 421–453.

<sup>66</sup> "How German Is It? Nationalism and the Idea of Serious Music in the Early Nineteenth Century", *19th-Century Music* 21, no. 3, Spring 1998, pp. 274–296.

<sup>67</sup> *Music in the Third Reich*, Houndsmills, Basingstoke and London 1994.

<sup>68</sup> "Musicology under Hitler: New Sources in Context", *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 49, no. 1 (Spring 1996), pp. 70–113; *idem*, *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's Reich*, New Haven and London 1998.

discipline. The pioneer works of the nineteenth century arose in a political climate intent on formulating a German identity, and the field continued to grow under circumstances that repeatedly demanded a positive reinforcement of that identity: the campaign for unification in 1871, the demoralization following World War I, the promotion of German racial superiority and the elimination of inferiors under Hitler, and the mission to spread German culture throughout Europe during the war.

After 1945, shifts in methodology gravitated toward objective, positivist approaches, such as chronologies and the careful analysis of source materials. These shifts might have been regarded as a departure from Nazi musicology, in that they abandoned the irrational in favour of the rational. Nevertheless, the German emphasis remained intact. Methods may have become less subjective as therefore less politically suspect, but the favoured objects of these methods were still the composers designated as pillars of German greatness, such as Bach, Beethoven, Mozart, and Wagner.<sup>69</sup>

Accordingly, to simply reject the work of all scholars—such as Robert Haas—who worked during the years 1933–45 often in acknowledged collusion with Hitler’s regime cannot be the aim of modern research. Rather we must seek to understand this period and its impact upon modern scholarship as part of an ongoing historical process with which we ourselves, and our own musicological discourse, are still occupied. Potter:

[A] concept of Nazi musicology is problematic because it hinders an honest assessment of the scholars that flourished and the research that was produced under Nazi patronage. Contemporary music scholarship still relies heavily on the work of those who were active in the Third Reich and frequently utilizes landmark studies produced in those years. [...] Postwar readers of Third Reich literature have had to choose between ignoring [...] references or [...] renouncing the entire twelve-year period as an isolated moment of temporary insanity and delegitimizing such ‘politically tainted’ products as unscholarly and unworthy of attention. [...]

Attractive as it may be to isolate and dismiss the Nazi era, such treatment underestimates the deep roots of intellectual trends that found correspondence with aspects of Nazi ideology. [...] [S]cholarship could not be denazified because German musicology was never really nazified per se but was following a course set long before 1933. This course could continue in the Third Reich and benefit from state support owing to its potential service to Nazi goals. It did not start spontaneously during Hitler’s rise nor could it be drastically rerouted after his fall but continued in some form after 1945.<sup>70</sup>

By the mid-1990s the new awareness of musicology’s ideological dimensions had inevitably begun the painful and long-overdue confrontation with the ramifications of Bruckner’s appropriation by Nazi cultural ideology during the Third Reich. While, as Manfred Wagner irritably pointed out,<sup>71</sup> musicologists had previously looked at the issue of Nazi appropriation (most notably—and significantly—in the writing of then East German scholar

---

<sup>69</sup> *Most German of the Arts*, p. 263.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 262.

<sup>71</sup> In his “Response to Bryan Gilliam Regarding Bruckner and National Socialism”, *MQ* 80, no. 1 (1996), pp. 118–123.

Mathias Hansen<sup>72</sup>), they had never before looked at the question as boldly, nor gone as far in considering the implications presented by Bruckner scholarship's eager collusion in the Third Reich's cultural agendas.

Studies begun around 1990, like those of Thomas Röder and Benjamin Korstvedt, paved the way for this reassessment largely on documentary-biographical grounds, Röder and Korstvedt urging re-assessments of Bruckner's collaborative interactions with Franz Schalk on the 1890 Finale of the Third<sup>73</sup> and with Ferdinand Löwe on the 1889 first edition of the Fourth Symphony respectively.<sup>74</sup> But it was a new confrontation with "the dark chapter of Bruckner reception during the Third Reich" (Gilliam<sup>75</sup>) which seemed to throw open the long-dormant issue of the authenticity of the first editions and the collusion of personal motives and political strategies by which the GA's proponents overturned the established performance practice of the time, wrest control of Bruckner's performing texts from Universal Edition, and achieve political backing for the GA at the highest political level.<sup>76</sup> Austro-German Bruckner scholarship in the early 1990s remained characterised by efforts such as those of Manfred Wagner<sup>77</sup> or Franz Scheder<sup>78</sup> to work against what are apparently still all-too generally accepted clichés concerning the composer—in part perhaps a legacy of Bruckner's political appropriation—by ever more exhaustive and accurate presentation of 'facts'. This analysis should not overlook the work of two German scholars who approached the issue via historical-documentary, rather than text-critical avenues, namely Albrecht Dümling and Christa Brüstle.<sup>79</sup> German-Austrian vs. Anglo-American differences in approach to this still

---

<sup>72</sup> *Anton Bruckner* (Leipzig 1987), in particular "Wirkungsgeschichte I (1896–1945)", pp. 19ff.

<sup>73</sup> See in particular his *Revisionsbericht* to the Bruckner Third Symphony, Vienna: MWV, 1997.

<sup>74</sup> *The First Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1995); "The First Published Edition of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity", *19th-Century Music* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1997), pp. 3–26

<sup>75</sup> "The Annexation of Anton Bruckner", p. 601.

<sup>76</sup> See in particular, Bryan Gilliam, "The Annexation of Anton Bruckner: Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation", *MQ* 78, no. 3 (Fall 1994), pp. 584–609; Benjamin M. Korstvedt, "Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich and After: An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception", *MQ* 80, no. 1 (1996), pp. 132–160; Leon Botstein, "Music and Ideology: Thoughts on Bruckner", *MQ* 80 (1996), pp. 1–10; Morten Solvik, "The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P.: A Case Study of Robert Haas and the Critical Edition", *MQ* 82 (1998), pp. 362–382; Christa Brüstle, "Politisch-ideologische Implikationen der ersten Bruckner Gesamtausgabe", in: *Bruckner-Probleme. Internationales Kolloquium 7.–9. Oktober 1996 in Berlin*, Stuttgart 1999. See also the articles by Gilliam, Korstvedt and Stephen McClatchie in *Bruckner Studies*, ed. Timothy Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, Cambridge 1997.

<sup>77</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Werk und Leben (Musikportraits 1)*, Vienna 1995; see "Neue Publikationen", *IBG-Mitt* no. 46 (June 1996), p. 37.

<sup>78</sup> *Anton Bruckner Chronologie*, 2 vols., Tutzing 1996; see *ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>79</sup> See for instance 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 1988, pp. 9–18; Brüstle, Christa. "Musik für Verehrer. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der frühen Bruckner-Rezeption", *ÖMz* 51 (1996); *idem*, *Anton Bruckner und die Nachwelt. Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte des Komponisten in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Dissertation, Berlin 1996,

delicate (and in Austria largely taboo) subject can readily be gauged by reading between the lines of Manfred Wagner's "Response to Bryan Gilliam Regarding Bruckner and National Socialism"<sup>80</sup> and Gilliam's rejoinder, "Bruckner's Annexation Revisited: A Response to Manfred Wagner".<sup>81</sup> The almost complete silence on the part of ABIL concerning Bruckner reception during the Third Reich speaks volumes in itself, although it remains striking that ABIL published, as early as 1986, Hanns Kreczi's *Das Bruckner-Stift St. Florian und das Linzer Reichs-Bruckner-Orchester (1942–45)*,<sup>82</sup> an eye-opening documentary study which nonetheless leaves untouched matters such as the relationship of Nazi ideology to 1930s Bruckner scholarship, residues of which, so Korstvedt and others would claim, persist within present-day text-critical philosophies.<sup>83</sup> More recently, Thomas Leibnitz drew attention to the manner in which Josef Schalk led the reception of Bruckner's music in nationalist directions, with full awareness of the links between this and its latter appropriation during the Third Reich.<sup>84</sup>

It was hardly surprising that Leon Botstein's and Benjamin Korstvedt's attempts to rehabilitate the first-edition texts and reinstate a 'lost' and in their view improperly discredited performance practice emerged within Anglo-American, rather than Austro-German scholarship; few advocates of the first-edition scores were to be found within the far more strongly entrenched German musical tradition. As recently as 1998 a book such as *Die Symphonien Bruckners: Entstehung, Deutung, Wirkung*<sup>85</sup> could include a brief chapter dealing with the fascist appropriation of Bruckner, but not a single bibliographic reference to the first-edition controversy. On the other hand, the political issues, and the claim that first editions represented 'authorised' or 'sanctioned' collaborations which Bruckner had welcomed and which deserved rehabilitation as constituting valuable links with the performance practice of Bruckner's own time had become a dominant theme for Bruckner scholarship by the turn of the millennium, and in America even led to a performance revival by conductor-scholar Botstein of the 1896 edition of the Fifth Symphony, a text hitherto regarded by Bruckner

---

publication Stuttgart 1998; *idem*, "Politisch-ideologische Implikationen der ersten Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe" and Albrecht Dümling, "Der deutsche Michel erwacht. Zur Bruckner-Rezeption im NS Staat", both in: *Bruckner-Probleme. Internationales Kolloquium 7.–9. Oktober 1996 in Berlin*, ed. Albrecht Riethmüller (*AFMW Beihefte* 45), Stuttgart 1999.

<sup>80</sup> *MQ* 80, no. 1 (1996), pp. 118–123.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 124–131.

<sup>82</sup> *Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien* 5, Graz.

<sup>83</sup> See for instance "Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich and After: An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception".

<sup>84</sup> "Anton Bruckner and 'German Music': Josef Schalk and the establishment of Bruckner as a national composer", in: Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson, eds., *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, Aldershot 2001, pp. 328–340.

<sup>85</sup> Ed. Renate Ulm, "Im Auftrag des Bayerischen Rundfunks", Kassel 1998.

scholarship as wholly inauthentic.<sup>86</sup> More recently, Benjamin M. Korstvedt's *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony* (Cambridge 2000) also included a spirited argumentation in favour of the revival of the first-edition text of the symphony—yet presenting no convincing documentary evidence that Bruckner played any real role in its redaction.<sup>87</sup> The suspicion grows that current scholars' attempts to disqualify the Haas GA and its successor on text-critical grounds may unwittingly have been swayed by a new awareness of Haas' enthusiastic collusion in the political and cultural agendas of the Nazi regime.

Problematic as was this sudden intrusion by the muddy jackboots of political history into the pristine halls of text-critical scholarship, its relation to the paradigmatic shift towards a more contextualising and politically aware musicological discourse was in itself a positive sign, and not simply to be dismissed. However, musicologists were still grappling with the conflicting demands made by the new concern with music-as-history vs. the older view of music-as-autonomous-artwork. Hepokoski wrote of this parting of the ways:

In some ways [...] such a divisive issue as 'aesthetic autonomy' vs. 'art-as-politics' is beyond objective resolution. Asserting that, say, the Austro-Germanic canon is *either* the one *or* the other is characteristically no more than reciting an *article de foi* within an accepted faith system. The argument is rarely advanced by supporting only one of the two sides. This repertory is both aesthetic and political—both in full measure, depending on the nature of the inquiry one wishes to pursue.<sup>88</sup>

That such profound paradigmatic differences might really underlie the two sides of the case, and that politic revisionism need not automatically take the upper hand over aesthetic considerations was a crucial one for the first-edition debate, yet with the exception of Paul Hawkshaw's 1997 article "The Bruckner Problem Revisited", little in the way of rebuttal for the arguments of first-edition proponents emerged until 2001.<sup>89</sup>

In February of that year Wolfgang Doebel's comprehensive doctoral dissertation (Hamburg 2000) appeared in print as *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen: Die Konzepte der Bruckner-Schüler und ihre Rezeption bis zu Robert Haas*.<sup>90</sup> Doebel's comparative exam-

---

<sup>86</sup> See Botstein's "Music and Ideology", pp. 2f.

<sup>87</sup> See the review by the present writer, *Music and Letters* 82, no. 2 (May 2001), pp. 323–328.

<sup>88</sup> "The Dahlhaus Project and Its Extra-Musical Sources", p. 227. For an additional slant on the problem of the Dahlhaus model and its defence of the work as central category of music history, see Leo Treitler, "What Kind of Story is History?" *19th-Century Music* 7, no. 3 (1984), pp. 363–373, in particular p. 371.

<sup>89</sup> It could well be said that the majority of the objections raised by Paul Hawkshaw to the first-edition line of argumentation have never been fully rebutted by Korstvedt or any other proponent of the first editions; see Hawkshaw, "The Bruckner Problem Revisited", *19th-Century Music* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1997), pp. 96–107.

<sup>90</sup> (*Publikationen des Institutes für Österreichische Musikdokumentation* 24, ed. Günter Brosche), Tutzing 2001. Dissertation title: *Zum Problem der Fremdbearbeitungen in den Symphonien Anton Bruckners: Untersuchungen zu den Bearbeitungskonzepten der Brüder Schalk, Ferdinand Löwes und Max von Oberleithners, dem Wandel der Bruckner Rezeption zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts und der Gesamtausgabe von Robert Haas*, Hamburg 2000. See announcement in *IBG-Mitt.* no. 54 (June 2000), pp. 49f.



ination and analysis of the first-edition vs. autograph texts of the Fifth to Ninth symphonies ranks as the most thorough and exhaustive ever undertaken and a milestone for Bruckner scholarship. It conclusively rebuts the arguments in favour of the first editions of these symphonies, revealing the extent to which the personal traits of the editors influenced and obscured Bruckner's musical language. Doebel's conclusions for the current controversy are far-reaching; to sum them up briefly and doubtless inadequately: close study of the changes made by Bruckner's editors reveal that essential components of his musical language were obviously not understood by his contemporaries, and that of any surviving texts, Bruckner's intentions are still best represented by the autographs of these works.

Contemporary musicology's struggle to view Anton Bruckner and his music wholly as 'historische Erscheinung', neatly contextualised and integrated into his own time and culture, runs aground precisely on that rock which post-1945 positivist approaches have always most deplored: the perceived uncontemporary nature of the composer and his music as an 'erratic block' in the musical landscape, his apparent unwillingness to fit neatly into the meta-narrative of nineteenth-century music history. Time only will tell whether Anglo-American scholarship will mount a counter-challenge to Doebel's conclusions, whether Bruckner scholarship will remain divided on this central issue, or whether some form of consensus will eventually be reached.<sup>91</sup>

### 1.0.3 Beethoven, Bruckner, and the Ninth Symphony.

The manner in which Bruckner can be contextualised within the historical fabric of nineteenth-century music becomes more apparent when we look at his relationship to Beethoven and in particular what was perhaps his most significant compositional model, Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, a work which, as noted by Doebel,<sup>92</sup> had represented a landmark for the compositional development of both Brahms and Wagner before him. Although Bruckner must have been familiar with the work long before, he, heard it for the first time on 22 March 1866 under Herbeck in Vienna,<sup>93</sup> the rest, it could justifiably be said, is history.

By coincidence first performed in the year in which Bruckner was born, Beethoven's Ninth was for Bruckner, Gülke observed, nothing less than "das maßgebende Stück Musik, das als unübertreffbares Muster immer neu bestätigt wird", its significance "dem auf unbezweifelte Autoritäten und Hierarchien eingeschworenen Bruckner zu danken".<sup>94</sup> While the full impact of Beethoven on Bruckner's music can scarcely be summarised in a few

---

<sup>91</sup> Further discussion in §1.3.5.

<sup>92</sup> p. 42.

<sup>93</sup> Nowak, *Ges. Aufs.* pp. 156.

<sup>94</sup> "Über die Zeitgenossenschaft Bruckners", p. 17.

paragraphs, it remains true that the manner in which Bruckner and his time perceived the music of Beethoven was fundamental to the former's compositional development as well as to the conception of all Bruckner's symphonies, most of all his Ninth.<sup>95</sup> The question of why Bruckner turned to symphonic composition at all becomes more comprehensible once we reconstruct the status of Beethoven's music for Bruckner's time; such insights also contribute to our understanding of the reception of Bruckner's music and how it subsequently came to be appropriated for political purposes.

At the heart of the 'objective' positivist musicology of the modern tradition lies the nineteenth-century assumption of the primacy and integrity of 'absolute music'. This has been well demonstrated by Pederson, who showed the extent to which nationalistic tendencies were implicated in the emergence of the Austro-German canon and especially the symphony.<sup>96</sup> Bruckner's symphonies were written at the apogee of belief in that paradigm: his music was not only retrospectively interpreted within this tradition by subsequent musicologists, but is among the prime examples of music composed as a direct response to the nineteenth century's Beethoven cult. The elevation of Beethoven's music to this status can be traced in the writings of critics such as A. B. Marx,<sup>97</sup> whose treatise on composition was among the texts Bruckner studied with Otto Kitzler in Linz in 1861–63.<sup>98</sup> Margaret Notley writes:

The musical life of the culturally dominant *Bildungsbürgertum* (the educated middle and upper middle classes) centred upon private and public performances of chamber music, but critics of all persuasions acknowledged the symphony's privileged position in the hierarchy of genres. Hanslick thus expressed accepted wisdom when he called the symphony 'the most inexorable touchstone and the supreme consecration of the instrumental composer'.<sup>99</sup>

The idea that instrumental music conveyed transcendent meaning was an intrinsic component of what Lydia Goehr and others have termed the "romantic aesthetics" of instrumental music, views which emerged around 1800 in the writings of E. T. A. Hoffman, Tieck, Herder, Wackenroder and others, and on which the doctrine of music as an autonomous

---

<sup>95</sup> An early article by Harold Truscott ("The Ninth in Perspective", *MMR* 88, no. 990, Nov.–Dec. 1958, pp. 223–228, particularly p. 225) is significant in attempting to relativise the significance of Beethoven's last symphony for Bruckner, the author's agenda presumably being to stress Bruckner's originality for English-speaking readership at greater remove from the German symphonic tradition.

<sup>96</sup> According to Pederson, the concept of a nationalistic German musical culture (centred upon the symphonies of Beethoven) came ultimately to dominate the paradigm of absolute music, acting to exclude non-German musics from the canon—an agenda explicit in the writings of A. B. Marx and other music critics in Berlin in the early part of the century ("A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life and German National Identity", p. 89).

<sup>97</sup> See also Scott Burnham, "Criticism, Faith and the *Idee*: A. B. Marx's Early Reception of Beethoven", *19th-Century Music* 13, no. 3 (Spring 1990), pp. 188f.

<sup>98</sup> See further discussion in ch. 2.1.

<sup>99</sup> Notley, p. 425.

fine art was laid.<sup>100</sup> These philosophers solved the problem of the apparent meaninglessness of instrumental music by recourse to a new quasi-religious vocabulary, so that, according to Herder, for instance, the appropriate response to music was one of awe. Even modes of behaviour appropriate to church worship were adopted in the contemplation, practice and appreciation of instrumental music as a new, autonomous fine art. In what is perhaps the lynchpin of Goehr's thesis,<sup>101</sup> music soon came to be construed no longer as a mere conveyor of transcendent meaning, but as 'the thing itself':

It was the shift from imitation of particulars to immediate expression and embodiment of the transcendent that ultimately gave to instrumental music its new meaning. Indeterminate on a concrete level, it was deemed utterly meaningful on a transcendent one. Precisely in its indeterminacy was it able to capture the very essence of emotion, soul, humanity, and nature in their most general forms.<sup>102</sup>

Taking Goehr's thesis one step further, Willem Erauw went as far as to suggest that it was, therefore,

a secularised form of religious experience that gave birth to the phenomenon of classical music, to the musical monuments of the canon, and to conceptual imperialism. With Beethoven's symphonies as the new Holy Scripture, the audience would never become bored of listening to the same music, in the same way people in a church would never tire of listening to the same words at Holy Mass every Sunday. If instrumental music had not changed its status and remained as it was experienced before 1800 [...] there would probably be no such thing as musicology today.<sup>103</sup>

The reception of Beethoven's music came to play a decisive role in German nineteenth-century music literature in establishing not only normative formal procedures but taste and aesthetic ideals, so that by the later part of the century Romantic symphonists such as Mendelssohn, Schumann and even Brahms could be criticised as inadequate successors to Beethoven's monumentalism.<sup>104</sup> Their music was accused of lacking in the dramatic-epic vision, popular appeal and universal gestures that came to be seen as quintessential to the symphony, and which differentiated it from the intimacy, subjectivity and introversion of more 'elite' chamber music.<sup>105</sup> The kinds of polarisation employed in reception models of the time

---

<sup>100</sup> See Goehr's chapter on musical meaning and romantic transcendence, pp. 148–175. Mark Evan Bonds' more detailed and subtle delineation of the individual philosophies of these authors ("Idealism and Aesthetics...", *passim*) stresses (p. 389) that the changes c. 1800 were occasioned more by the resurgence of idealism as an aesthetic principle than by any alteration in the musical repertory.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 157.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 155.

<sup>103</sup> "Canon formation: some more reflections on Lydia Goehr's *Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*", *AcMus* 60, no. 2, July–December 1998, p. 115.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Doebel's remarks on Bruckner's problematic relationship to the first two, p. 42.

saw the symphonic style depicted, in the Berlin critic Paul Marsop's words, as "decisive, German, Beethovenian, in a word, *manly*".<sup>106</sup> A moral or ethical component, regarded as strong and masculine as opposed to weak and feminine (and presumably, therefore, less than truly German), was an accepted part of the ideology of the genre, reflecting notions of cultural power that would later feed into National Socialist doctrine.

From this it can be seen that Bruckner's music, which began to receive increasingly frequent performances from the early 1870s onwards, arrived on the German concert stage perfectly suited to fulfil such dictates; in this respect it was far from being the anachronistic 'erratic block' it is usually thought to be.<sup>107</sup> There are also important correlations, often overlooked, between the monumentalism of Bruckner's music and the culture of his own time. Norbert Nagler pointed out that the *Gründerzeit*, the period up to 1873 (during which the earlier symphonies were written), while one of increasing secularisation and social upheaval, was also a period of massive industrial expansion and great feats of architecture and engineering—consider for instance the vast building project of the Vienna Ringstrasse. Gülke speaks of Bruckner erecting his own Ringstrasse in his symphonies: "Ein allgemeiner, um die Mitte der sechziger Jahre einsetzender gründerzeitlicher Zug zur Monumentalität begegnet in ihm einem ungebrochenen Verhältnis zum Pathos der großen, kolossalischen Form".<sup>108</sup> As in the other arts and the music of other composers, notably Wagner, Bruckner's symphonic style, with its massive formal structures, its epigonic integration of older styles and overriding concern with representative grandeur, monumentality and formal expansion, has striking affinities with dominant cultural characteristics of the period.<sup>109</sup>

The music critics of Bruckner's time clearly saw the late Romantic conception of the symphony as imbued with religious connotations. Notley writes:

The suprapersonal quality Speidel attributes to Beethoven's symphonic art has clear religious overtones. Bekker would later go so far as to declare that in its 'power to mould a community', the symphony was 'in accord with the goals of religion', suggesting that the genre had assumed the role earlier assigned to masses, Passions, and oratorios.<sup>110</sup>

Given this, it is hardly surprising that Bruckner, despite having written up to his fortieth year little more than liturgical *Gebrauchsmusik*, including what are regarded nowadays as concert, (non-liturgical) mass settings, and despite the tremendous impact made upon him by the music

---

<sup>106</sup> Quoted in Notley, pp. 428f.; italics of the original.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. for instance Franz Schalk, *Briefe und Betrachtungen*, pp. 78f.

<sup>108</sup> *Brahms—Bruckner*, p. 105.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 109ff.

<sup>110</sup> Notley, p. 435.

of Liszt, Wagner and the Neudeutsche school,<sup>111</sup> unhesitatingly committed his compositional career to what was regarded as the ‘highest’, most serious and most ‘sublime’ musical genre of the time.<sup>112</sup> Apart from a number of choral works, both sacred and secular, and a single string quintet he remained unwaveringly faithful to it for the rest of his life. It is also no surprise that, of all the Beethoven symphonies, Bruckner was to owe the greatest debt to that composer’s Ninth, the most monumental, and at the same time most heavily indebted to topoi of religious transcendence of any work in Beethoven’s symphonic output.<sup>113</sup> Bruckner’s symphonies, especially his Ninth, can thus be seen as eloquent mirrors of Bruckner’s personal response, and to an extent, that of his time to Beethoven’s last symphony.

According to Carl Hruby, Beethoven was for Bruckner “die Incarnation alles Großen und Erhabenen in der Tonkunst”;<sup>114</sup> According to Stradal, “Haydn, Mozart und Beethoven verehrte er”;<sup>115</sup> Beethoven’s Ninth, last quartets and sonatas “waren sein teuerstes Gut, und ich traf Bruckner oft an, wie er sich mit diesen Werken beschäftigte”.<sup>116</sup> Bruckner’s symphonies were his at times self-conscious answer to the challenge and models presented by those of Beethoven, uniting an intentionally epic, sublime mode of self-expression with transcendent, spiritual values. In Bruckner’s hands the symphony became considerably more religious, however. “Weil die gegenwärtige Weltlage, geistig gesehen, Schwäche ist, flüchte ich zur Stärke und schreibe kraftvolle Musik”, Bruckner is recorded as having said in

---

<sup>111</sup> An extensive literature exists on this question; cf. Doebel, pp. 41ff. Stradal’s “Erinnerungen” cites Bach, Beethoven, Handel, Schubert, Berlioz and Wagner (pp. 854ff., pp. 971ff.) as the strongest influences on Bruckner; specific instances of apparent allusion to two scores of Bach, the D-minor Toccata BWV 545 and F-major Toccata BWV 540 are referred to in §§3.3.6 and 3.3.7. There are also important references to Bruckner’s preferred composers in Meißner’s memoirs; see Viktor Keldorfer, “Erinnerungen an Bruckner”, *Die Furche*, supplement *Die Warte* 2, no. 2 (1946), pp. 1–9 and *idem*, “Anton Meisners Bruckner-Erinnerungen: Aus den Aufzeichnungen Anton Meisners”, *Die Furche, Jahrbuch 1947*, pp. 78–87. See also Günter Brosche, “Anton Bruckners Traditionsbewußtsein”, *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 430–436. Of Liszt, Stradal mentions the “Faust” Symphony, which Bruckner apparently knew well; Liszt’s fugues and bigger piano works found less favour, while only some of Liszt’s religious music met with Bruckner’s approbation; the “Graner Messe und Krönungsmesse liebte er sehr”, however (p. 974). See further the discussion of quotation in §2.2.3.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. concerning the aesthetic category of the sublime, Benjamin M. Korstvedt’s chapter “The Adagio and the sublime” in *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony*, Cambridge 2000, pp. 54ff., in which he reads the analysis and reception of that movement against the Romantic concept of the sublime as defined by Burke and Kant, and the political and cultural meaning which this category, central to the aesthetics of Bruckner’s music, held in Vienna at the time.

<sup>113</sup> See for instance Constantin Floros, *Brahms und Bruckner, Studien zur musikalischen Exegetik*, pp. 55–63, Walter Wiora and Egon Voss (*infra*); further discussion in §2.2.3.

<sup>114</sup> *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*, Vienna 1901, pp. 19–22. Cf. Auer (Göll.-A. II/1, pp. 340f.), cites ASS by Bruckner of Beethoven’s Opp. 95 and 130 quartets and the Mozart C-minor quintet in Bruckner’s estate, along with a number of works from the Austrian church music repertoire. Bruckner also undertook metrical analyses of Beethoven’s Third and Ninth Symphonies and the *Gloria* of the *Missa Solemnis* (see §2.1.5); significant also for the composition of the Ninth is a report from 1892 by Wilhem Zinne, which noted the score of Beethoven’s *Missa Solemnis* lying open on Bruckner’s harmonium (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 248).

<sup>115</sup> “Erinnerungen...”, p. 976.

<sup>116</sup> Pp. 975f.

1874<sup>117</sup>—a reference, presumably, to the spiritual strength of his music rather than its dynamic volume.<sup>118</sup> Given that the symphony could be seen as a ‘transcendent’ musical genre, it becomes unnecessary to suggest that Bruckner, devout Catholic and equally ‘devout’ musician, in any way compromised his ethical and religious beliefs by turning from liturgical music to the composition of symphonies.<sup>119</sup> Gülke noted that few scholars have so far attempted to explain why Bruckner—who by virtue of his musical training and socialisation might have been expected to remain an organist and composer Caecilian-sounding liturgical and organ music for the rest of his life—suddenly began composing symphonies, without even the usual classical preparation of works in other ‘preparatory’ genres.<sup>120</sup> Mathias Hansen, however, recognised that the music of Bruckner’s mature compositional period was in many respects a fulfilment rather than a contradiction of his earlier training:

Erst mit dem ‘Freispruch’ von 1863, die als Schlußstrich unter die Unterrichtsphasen [...] verstanden werden darf [...] wurde der Boden bereitet für eine künstlerische Darstellungsweise, die bald als Erfüllung des Ideals einer transzendentalen, zu den ‘letzten Dingen’ strebenden Musik galt.<sup>121</sup>

Although it is certainly an overstatement to speak of his symphonies as “masses without text” (Redlich<sup>122</sup>), the problem, much discussed in the literature,<sup>123</sup> of what Bruckner’s music signifies, its ‘content’ or ‘message’, can readily be understood less as an attempt to consecrate a secular genre than to infuse with at times religious and others extra-musical content, a form which was already seen as imbued with transcendent meaning. That Bruckner’s deeply held religious convictions found their way into his symphonies, that they are substantially, although by no means exclusively, ‘religious’ in content is beyond question. As Wiora recognised:

Über die Musik als reine Sonderwelt gehen schließlich Komponisten hinaus, welche die religiös-metaphysische Sinngebung der Instrumentalmusik [...] als leitende Idee zur Entfaltung bringen, ohne andererseits der Darstellung bestimmter Programme zu dienen.

---

<sup>117</sup> Quoted and discussed in Norbert Nagler, “Bruckners gründerzeitliche Monumentalsymphonie: Reflexionen zur Heteronomie kompositorischer Praxis”, *Musik-Konzepte*, nos. 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 108f.; cf. also Gülke, “Über die Zeitgenossenschaft Bruckners”, p. 17.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. Doebel’s discussion of the characteristics of Bruckner’s musical language, pp. 30ff.

<sup>119</sup> Needless to say, while most of us would no longer identify an ostensibly ‘religious’ dimension in Beethoven’s symphonies today, many modern listeners still recognise a secularised transcendent quality adherent to classical music as a whole.

<sup>120</sup> “Über die Zeitgenossenschaft Bruckners”, p. 17.

<sup>121</sup> “Über Nutzen und Nachteil von Metaphern: Anton Bruckner und das ‘Architektonische’”, *MuG* 36, Oct. 1986, p. 524.

<sup>122</sup> See Hans Ferdinand Redlich, “Das programmatische Element bei Bruckner”, in: *Bruckner-Studien: Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, Franz Grasberger, ed., Vienna 1964, pp. 87–97.

<sup>123</sup> See for instance Constantin Floros overview of this issue, “Thesen über Bruckner”, *Musik-Konzepte* nos. 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 5–14. Floros’ views of the Bruckner symphonies as programme music are put forward in his *Brahms und Bruckner: Studien zur musikalischen Exegetik*, Wiesbaden 1980.

Indem sie Ur-Phänomene betonend herausstellen oder durch Klangsymbole auf Gott, Gebet und Erlösung hinweisen, wie Bruckner in Anfängen und Schlüssen seiner Symphonien, in Ewigkeitsrhythmen und Chorälen, gehen sie über alle Musik hinaus, die auf den ewigen Dingen nur unreflexiv als auf einem Grunde beruht und dem besinnlich Lauschenden nur einen Augenblick gewährt.<sup>124</sup>

Wiora here addressed a dimension within Bruckner's music that cannot readily be harmonised with the literary programmes supplied by him to the Fourth or the Eighth Symphonies, nor need it be: there is an element even in Bruckner's earlier works which seems to exceed the confines of such narrow programmatic categorisations,<sup>125</sup> insightful as they are as to Bruckner's thoughts about his music. The conception of 'absolute music' created this situation by imposing upon instrumental music a hermeneutic structure within which not only such ostensibly 'religious' topoi as fugue and chorale, but even the basic materials of music, came to be seen as imbued with transcendent meaning. We should thus be wary of treating the Ninth, of all of Bruckner's symphonies, as if it were 'absolute music,' its content subjective and incidental to its compositional structure.

In Bruckner's Ninth, any such discrepancy between latent and explicit content, between the implications of its dedication "an den lieben Gott", the "Abschied vom Leben" of its Adagio and the sublimity of the musical language itself, is eliminated: content merges with formal medium. While constituting an internally complete and self-justifying musical design, and as such beyond the description of 'programme music',<sup>126</sup> the Ninth can be considered 'programmatic' at a more profound, 'ontological' level by virtue of its intrinsic musical structure no less than the numerous concrete instances of quotations from Bruckner's foregoing symphonic and sacred works, as we shall subsequently consider (§§2.2.3–4).

In an article published in 1978,<sup>127</sup> Wiora explained component aspects of Bruckner's style using terminology borrowed from the theologian Rudolf Otto's seminal examination of the phenomenology of religious experience.<sup>128</sup> Otto sought to define the 'numinous'—that quality of the 'wholly other' and the feeling of awe—weird, uncanny, mysterious or terrifying—that man experiences on confrontation with superhuman, divine or transcendent forces.

---

<sup>124</sup> "Zwischen absoluter und Programmusik", in: A. A. Abert, ed., *Festschrift Friedrich Blume*, Kassel–Basel 1963, p. 74.

<sup>125</sup> Redlich wrote, "Bruckners literarisches Program zur Achten Symphonie zerbricht machtlos an der majestätischen Gewalt seiner musikalischen Struktur" ("Das programmatische Element bei Bruckner", in: *Bruckner-Studien*, ed. F. Grasberger, Vienna 1964, p. 93).

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Floros, *Brahms und Bruckner. Studien zur musikalischen Exegetik*, Wiesbaden 1980; "Von Mahlers Affinität zu Bruckner", *BrJb* 1982/83, pp. 109–118. Floros' claims of the dominance of implicit or explicit programmaticism in Bruckner's works has met with considerable opposition; see further discussion in §2.2.3.

<sup>127</sup> "Über den religiösen Gehalt in Bruckners Symphonien", in: Walter Wiora, ed., *Religiöse Musik in nicht-liturgischen Werken von Beethoven bis Reger (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 51)*, Regensburg 1978, pp. 157–184.

<sup>128</sup> *Das Heilige: Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*, Gotha 1926.

What Otto called 'das Heilige' is hence the quality of the 'numinous', abstracted from the ethical and moral components of divinity. As useful descriptions of individual aspects Wiora suggested the application to Bruckner's music of the following terms from Otto:<sup>129</sup>

*Mysterium tremendum*—the mystery of the numinous, found in the *pianissimi tremolandi* with which Bruckner's symphonies so often begin, the *locus classicus* for which is surely the opening of Bruckner's Ninth;

*Majestas*—most clearly exemplified in the dotted rhythm topos, also in the intervals of octave, fifth and fourth which characterise Bruckner's principal themes;

*Augustum*—the 'aweful', an element found in the exalted chorales as well as in the imperturbable harmonic progressions;

*Energicum*—energy, urgency, force, dynamic power: qualities most often found in the Scherzi;

*Mirum*—the quality of wonder and awe, which appears particularly in the transcendent, bass-less passages of woodwind writing; and

*Fascinans*—irresistible attraction, ecstasy, rapture or beatitude, most frequently encountered in Bruckner's aptly entitled *Gesangsperioden*.

In no work of Bruckner's is the correspondence between these theological and musical concepts more conspicuous and far-reaching as it is in the Ninth; in regard to all such aspects it represents a *ne plus ultra*. The key of the Ninth corresponds to its metaphysical theme, recalling not only Beethoven's final symphony but also Bach's *Kunst der Fuge* and Mozart's Requiem—both final compositions, both unfinished. Long one of Bruckner's favourite works, Mozart's Requiem provided a model for Bruckner's own Requiem of 1849, which was revised as late as 1892; as Günter Brosche has pointed out, a calendar entry from 1885 confirms that for at least fifteen years (from 1870) Bruckner had attended the annual performance of the Mozart Requiem in the Hofburgkapelle on Allerseelen.<sup>130</sup> D minor is represented by no less than four major works of Bruckner's maturity: the first of the three great masses (1864), the 'Nullte,' Third and Ninth Symphonies. The use of D minor for Bruckner's final setting of the text *Christus factus est* (1884) may well be a pointer as to the spiritual significance of this key, which stands in connection with the expressive directives 'feierlich' and 'misterioso' for which the opening of the Ninth is paradigmatic.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Wiora, "Über den religiösen Gehalt...", especially pp. 176–179. Also Manfred Wagner, "Der Quint-Oktav Schritt als 'Majestas'-Symbol bei Anton Bruckner", *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch* 59 (1972), pp. 97–103, and *idem*, *BrLWD*, pp. 382f.

<sup>130</sup> "Anton Bruckners Traditionsbewußtsein." *Österreichische Musikzeitung* 29 (1974), pp. 432f.

<sup>131</sup> Bruckner's exclusive use of terms such as 'feierlich' or 'misterioso' as indications of expression is noted by Wiora in "Über den religiösen Gehalt in Bruckners Symphonien", in: Walter Wiora, ed., *Religiöse Musik in nicht-liturgischen Werken von Beethoven bis Reger (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 51)*, Regensburg 1978, p. 162; reprinted in: C.-H. Mahling, ed., *Anton Bruckner: Studien zur Werk und Wirkung:*



Bruckner appears to have regarded it as virtually inevitable that his Ninth should be in the same tonality as Beethoven's. "Was kann i' dafür," as recorded in Göllicherich-Auer, "daß mir 's Hauptthema in d-Moll eing'fall'n is': sie is halt a mal mei' Lieblingstonart."<sup>132</sup> "D-moll g'fällt mir so guat", he similarly quipped to Göllicherich, "daß i' die letzte Sinfonie in der Tonart schreib."<sup>133</sup> Max von Oberleithner reported: "D-moll war seine Lieblingstonart, sie erschien ihm feierlich, mysteriös. Bei dieser Gelegenheit sagte Bruckner: 'Ich schreib' meine letzte Symphonie in d-moll, wenn auch die IX-te von Beethoven in derselben Tonart steht. Beethoven wird nichts dagegen haben'."<sup>134</sup> Ernst Kurth wrote of Bruckner's use of D minor in the first movement:

Merkwürdig leer ist namentlich die Haupttonart d-Moll gehalten, die auch durch lange Strecken hindurch nur wenig aus dem Grundakkord heraustritt; auch sie ist die mittelalterliche Tonart als die harmonische Urmitte der Kirchentöne, von der kalten Weihe der Dome erfüllt, und sie blieb bis in die neueste Zeit die eigentliche Mysterientonart.<sup>135</sup>

Comparison of Gothic cathedrals with Bruckner's music has long been a cliché of Bruckner reception, but the analogy cannot be entirely discounted. Noting the report that Bruckner in 1892 had been seen frequently in and around St. Stephan's in Vienna, apparently seeking inspiration for the Ninth,<sup>136</sup> Kurth recognised the common attributes which the Ninth, of all of Bruckner's symphonies, shares with the architecture of the Gothic age:

Die gotische Architektur betonte die Vertikale nicht nur von ihrem gewaltigen Auftriebe her, von der Höhe warf sie auch den Blick wieder in die furchtbare Steile zurück [...]. Festigkeit und Unerfaßliches schwanken im gesamten Ausdruck dieser Kunst. Auch das ist Musik der Gotik. Das Sturzhaftes spiegeln schon die Themen der IX. Symphonie nicht minder gewaltig als die hinantragende Ekstase [...].<sup>137</sup>

The opening tremolo, the use of 'elemental' intervals such as octave and fifth, the dotted rhythms, the extended *Steigerungen* built out of brief motivic fragments and coalescing into an overwhelming, *ff* statement of the theme in unison, the character and structural design of the Scherzo, the rondo-like form of the Adagio, the lofty, tragic language and monumental

Walter Wiora zum 30. Dezember 1986, Tutzing 1988. Like Wiora, Egon Voss, in "Bruckners Sinfonien in ihrer Beziehung zur Messe", *Schallplatte und Kirche: Beihefte zu Musik und Kirche* 5 (1969), used Bruckner's tempo markings, particularly "feierlich", as indices of the "statisch-zeremoniell" character of his music; "misterioso" is used in the Ninth and Third, but combined with "feierlich" only in the first movement of the Ninth (p. 106).

<sup>132</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 458.

<sup>133</sup> Göll.-A., IV/2, p. 691.

<sup>134</sup> *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner (Von Deutscher Musik 38)*, Regensburg 1933, p. 25. Cf. Göll.-A. IV/2, p. 691.

<sup>135</sup> *Bruckner*, Berlin 1925, p. 679. Similarly Schwanzara, p. 273: "Ich habe gern die alten Tonarten; sie haben etwas Mystisches an sich."

<sup>136</sup> Cf. quotation and further discussion in §2.1.6.

<sup>137</sup> Kurth, p. 676. Cf. also Doebel, p. 33.

expansion of form—these are all quite unmistakable borrowings from Beethoven model.<sup>138</sup> Bruckner would have seen these less as self-conscious imitations of Beethoven than as inevitable, as virtual givens of the symphonic style, sanctioned and ‘approved’ by his model—by way of contemporary comparison one need only consider the extent to which Brahms borrowed from Beethoven, particularly in his First Symphony. “Schon die Wahl der Tonart mag als Hinweis gelten,” wrote Gülke, “daß Bruckner die Fügung akzeptierte, bezugnehmend ebensowohl auf Beethovens Neunte Sinfonie, die als Vorbild für ihn allerwichtigste, als auch auf seine eigene Dritte—dasjenige Werk, in dem er sich erstmals voll ausgewiesen empfand.”<sup>139</sup> That Bruckner wrote nine symphonies and wrote the last, his second symphony in D minor, in the same key as Beethoven’s, was thus an obeisance to the ‘divine image’, an intentional act of homage; there would have been no Tenth, even had lived long enough to write one. In 1892, already plagued by chronic illness, Bruckner observed to his publisher’s agent Josef Stritzko: “Die Neunte wird mein Meisterwerk. Den lieben Gott bitt’ i’ nur so viel, daß er mi’ so long leben läßt, bis s’ fertig is’.”<sup>140</sup> Again, Gülke notes:

Die innere Logik seines Komponierens und zunehmende Intransigenz seines Altwerdens erklären vieles, jedoch nicht alles. In der Neunten schreibt er eine Sinfonie, die in jeder Hinsicht Steigerungen und Verschärfungen des Vorausgegangenen bringt und, wäre sie fertiggestellt worden, auch in den äußeren Dimensionen die bisher umfangreichsten Sinfonien, die Fünfte und Achte, übertroffen hatte.<sup>141</sup>

Subsequent to the composition of the Ninth, Bruckner intended to turn to the composition of operas—in diametrical opposition to the intended late career of that other great influence upon his music, Richard Wagner, who in his later years spoke of turning to the composition of single-movement symphonies.<sup>142</sup>

Equally, Bruckner was aware of the limitations in pursuing his own chosen model too far: the Ninth was conceived initially as a purely instrumental work. He remarked to Göllerich: “Mit’n Beethoven werd’ ich mi’ do’ nöt messen! In d-Moll is’ schon, weil’s so viel a schöne

---

<sup>138</sup> Floros (“Thesen über Bruckner”, p. 9) mentions Bruckner’s indebtedness to the Scherzo of Beethoven’s Ninth, the rondo-like form of the Adagio, the construction of certain themes and Steigerungen, unisons, etc. See concerning a number of Beethoven allusions in the Finale, perhaps not entirely ‘intentional’, perhaps partly the result of common-language topoi; see §3.1.8; cf. Ex 2d, iv and v. A passage in fugue of the Finale is also strongly reminiscent of the Beethoven Ninth, coda of the first movement mm. 428ff.; there are also the links with Beethoven’s passacaglia-like chromatic descent phrase (cf. Ex. 6b i, also discussed in 3.1.8, The Durchführung).

<sup>139</sup> *Brahms–Bruckner*, p. 75.

<sup>140</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 258. See further concerning Bruckner’s conception of “Meisterwerk”, §2.2.2, 2.2.4.

<sup>141</sup> *Brahms–Bruckner*, p. 124.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. Egon Voss, *Richard Wagner und die Instrumentalmusik: Wagners symphonischer Ehrgeiz (Taschenbücher zur Musikwissenschaft 12*, ed. Richard Schaal), Wilhelmshaven 1977, p. 117. Significantly, in terms of the problem of symphonic closure, Wagner is noted as having said: “Die letzten Sätze sind die Klippe, ich werde mich hüten; ich schreibe nur einsätzig Symphonien” (*ibid.*; the passage is also cited by Doebel, p. 74).

Tonart is', aber mit an Chor wie Beethoven—na, so dumm is' der Bruckner nöt".<sup>143</sup> In the event, however, Bruckner was to specify the use of his *Te Deum* as a substitute Finale should he not live to complete the fourth movement, a procedure only occasionally followed today—its significance was purposely downplayed in the early reception of the work, as was the significance of a Finale at all,<sup>144</sup> in order to establish an ostensibly incomplete work in the repertoire as aesthetically 'vollendet'. Thus, ironically, despite his intention to remain true to the ideal form of the four-movement, purely instrumental symphony, Bruckner's failing health, coupled with his determination to see his symphonic output conclude with a "Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott",<sup>145</sup> effectively meant that he followed Beethoven's model to the very end.

#### 1.0.4 The problem of the primary sources and their modern-day reading.

While the reception of Bruckner's music in the 1930s and its ramifications for text-critical scholarship mushroomed into a central 'problem' for Bruckner scholarship in the 1990s, the very fact that Bruckner's music could be ideologically appropriated to such an extent in the first place, together with the composer's ambiguous relationship to the assistance given to him by his editors or collaborators, remain areas for further research and deliberation. The roots of all these issues are to be found, firstly, in the composer's complex psychological make-up which, seen from the perspective of over a century of reception history, has proven inscrutably elusive—a cipher upon which both contemporaries and subsequent generations all wrote their own glosses—and secondly the problem of Bruckner's perceived distance from his own milieu, as viewed from either a socio-cultural or music-stylistic standpoint. These two factors—*natura abhorret vacuum*—contributed significantly to the endless line of interpretations, appropriations and annexations to which Bruckner and his music fell prey: from the friends, pupils and editors of his own time through anthroposophists, national socialists and Catholic revivalists, even, dare it be said, to the well-meaning but often iconoclastic objectivism of modern scholarship. Where does the 'real' Bruckner lie, if there ever was one?

One of the central issues for the researcher in attempting to unravel any sort of 'truth' about this composer lies in the credibility accorded to the richly anecdotal primary sources and their varied treatment by the authors of the great mass of secondary literature, largely consisting of amateur biographies and personal memoirs, that appeared in the first half of the twentieth century. Among these, the chief source—and chief problem—remains the huge, rambling biography begun by Bruckner's 'authorised' biographer August Göllerich<sup>146</sup> and

<sup>143</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 457; the passage is quoted more extensively in §1.1.1.

<sup>144</sup> Further discussion in §§1.1.11 and 1.3.4.

<sup>145</sup> See discussion in §1.1.8 and elsewhere.

<sup>146</sup> 1859–1923; Upper Austrian music teacher, conductor and writer. Cf. letter by Bruckner to Göllerich, dated 11 May 1891: "Daß Du mein berufener, autorisirter Biograf bist, versteht sich ja von selbst" (Göll.-A. I, p. 33).

completed, following Göllicher's death in 1923, by Max Auer.<sup>147</sup> No large-scale study of Bruckner can avoid it, yet it remains one of the most problematic and unreliable biographies of any major musician of the nineteenth century.

It is difficult not to immediately call into question the reliability of a publication that opens with the motto "Biographie soll keine Recension sein—darum muß die Liebe sie schreiben!"<sup>148</sup> "Ist sein Werk auch", wrote Manfred Wagner, "vom Standpunkt des begeisterten Anhängers gesehen, oft zu sehr in Einzelheiten zergliedert und hinsichtlich der 'Bruckneraussagen' kritiklos und unreflektiert, so mag es als die bis heute einflußreichste Grundlage Brucknerscher Persönlichkeitsforschung gelten".<sup>149</sup> Evident throughout the voluminous, poorly organised and scantily indexed text is what must, consciously or unconsciously, have been seen as the overwhelming duty of the Bruckner apostles of the first generation: namely, the attempt to establish Bruckner as one of the 'greats' in the pantheon of German music. That meant, if necessary, polemically justifying and defending the composer's actions and music, condemning the allegedly hostile or disinterested environment in which he lived, and presenting an image of the composer largely pre-determined by the *völkisch* sentiments of the time—both simple, rustic innocent, or even martyr, in life, and heroic master in the cult of music, high priest at the altar of his art—with the predication of all attendant 'German' virtues—piety, fortitude, humility, chastity. While the majority of the biography, written in the late 1920s and early 1930s by Auer and permeated by that writer's commitment to German nationalist, and subsequently national-socialistic ideals and aspirations,<sup>150</sup> August Göllicher's own often unreadably overzealous, sanctimonious style established the tone of the work in passages such as the following:

So gerüstet schritt der nie Rastende—immer einwärts, immer aufwärts—neuen Taten zu, weiterer Vervollkommnung entgegen.

Aus der Pilgerfahrt zum geheimsten Heiligtum der Seele blieb er fest in Gott verankert und sein Gewissen mahnte ihn stets:

---

<sup>147</sup> 1880–1962; Upper Austrian (born Vöcklabruck); writer on music (primarily Anton Bruckner) and teacher; later President of the Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft. For details of the involvement of each see Göll.-A. II/1, pp. 5ff. See concerning Bruckner's early biographers Franz Zamazal, "Göllicher—Auer—Gräflinger: Konturen zu ihrem Leben und Wirken: Ihre Bedeutung für Bruckner", in: *BrSympBer 1994: Bruckner-Freunde, Bruckner-Kenner*, Linz 1997, pp. 113–131.

<sup>148</sup> Göll.-A. I, p. 9.

<sup>149</sup> "Vorwort zu einer Bibliographie; dargestellt an jener über Anton Bruckner", *Mf* 26 (1973), p. 226.

<sup>150</sup> See for instance pp. 61f. of the final volume (IV/4, published 1937; quoted by Korstvedt, "Bruckner in the Third Reich", p. 136). In the first 134 pp. of the volume Auer recounts the victorious rise of the 'Bruckner Bewegung', the triumph of the autograph over the first-edition texts, and allots a further over 100 pp. to genealogical research (by Ernst Schwanzara) demonstrating Bruckner's Aryan ancestry and links with the German soil ("Anton Bruckners Stamm und Urheimat", pp. 135ff.). The first section of the book also closes with reference to the planned unveiling of Bruckner's bust in the Regensburg Walhalla by Hitler in Spring 1937 (p. 129)—for Auer and others caught up in the political fervour of the time, a long-awaited indication that the music of their idol had finally 'arrived'.

Suche dich selbst!"<sup>151</sup>

Consider also the same writer's dedication of the first volume: "Möge sie dienen zur Würdigung eines hehrsten Wahrhaftigen, der—ein Held des Willens—in der Welt lebte, um sie zu überwinden."<sup>152</sup>

Auer subsequently undertook publication of the already prepared second volume and the vast mass of material for the remaining volumes which had been collected by Göllerich. Auer, who had edited material for Göllerich in the 1900s, had already published a more accessible, 'popular' biography in 1923, a hugely popular work that was subsequently to run into four revised editions, printed in some 26,000 copies.<sup>153</sup> The earliest edition of Bruckner's letters were published in 1924 by Ferdinand Gräßlinger,<sup>154</sup> a second volume following in the same year under Auer's editorship (with no greater reliability as regards the accuracy of the texts). As Othmar Wessely points out:

Bedauerlicherweise sind aber die bisher vorliegenden Editionen von Bruckners Briefen für wissenschaftliche Zwecke eigentlich unbrauchbar. Denn beide Herausgeber waren auffallenderweise nicht mehr in der Lage, eine Schrift aus der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts korrekt zu lesen und die wenigen in diesem Zeitraum noch üblichen Abkürzungen richtig aufzulösen; und sie haben, was am schwersten wiegt, willkürliche Eingriffe in die Brieftexte vorgenommen, meist Auslassungen, Unterdrückungen von Namen, u. ä., ohne dies ausdrücklich zu kennzeichnen.<sup>155</sup>

Franz Grasberger wrote of Göllerich, Auer and Gräßlinger that:

Die Verdienste dieser drei Bruckner-Apostel sind unbestritten, besonders Göllerich wäre der prädestinierte Mann gewesen, Bruckner darzustellen. Aber man darf nicht vergessen, daß sein Nachfolger vieles unkritisch gesichtet und unsystematisch behandelt hat. Göllerich-Auer bleibt die wichtigste und verdienstvolle biographische und werkgeschichtliche Zusammenfassung, das darf aber nicht heißen, daß eine große Bruckner-Biographie nach modernen wissenschaftlichen Gesichtspunkten nicht notwendig wäre.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.* I, p. 319.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

<sup>153</sup> 2nd edn. Vienna 1934, subsequent edns. 1941 and 1947; concerning the meteoric rise in the popularity of Bruckner's music in Germany in the 1930s see §1.3.5.

<sup>154</sup> 1876–1962; Upper Austrian (born Linz); student and later teacher at the Linz Musikvereinsschule; among the most important of the earliest Bruckner scholars; author of numerous biographical books and articles, chief among them *Anton Bruckner: Bausteine zu seiner Lebensgeschichte*, Munich 1911, *Anton Bruckner: Sein Leben und seine Werke*, Regensburg 1921, and *Anton Bruckner: Leben und Schaffen*, Berlin 1927.

<sup>155</sup> "Bruckner als Briefschreiber", in: *BrSympBer 1983: Johannes Brahms und Anton Bruckner*, Vienna 1985, p. 90.

<sup>156</sup> Franz Grasberger, "Neue Aspekte des Bruckner-Bildes", *ÖMz* 29 (1974), p. 427.

Erwin Doernberg, author of one of the better and earlier English-language biographies, viewed the Göllicherich-Auer biography in more scathing terms:<sup>157</sup>

Göllicherich's biography never got very far. To judge from the four chapters which were eventually published, the writer became overwhelmed by his ever-increasing collection of materials and was unable to discard what was clearly irrelevant or, at least, unimportant. Max Auer ultimately added to the collection of Göllicherich's papers and had the entire miscellany published. The result is a biography of nine rambling volumes with next to no organisation or order of any kind. The work retains some value as a unique, uncritical collection of 'Bruckneriana', most of which would not otherwise have survived. [...]

The large work testifies to the devoted intentions of compiler and editor, but the hero of this biography is Bruckner as seen through the eyes of the contemporary young Wagnerians: the Bruckner of the anecdotes, a friendly, embarrassing, half-witted simpleton.

Today, after a century of radical social and political change and upheaval in Europe, the loss of much original documentation and growing distance from the historical object itself, the possibility of bringing any real clarity into the inextricable confusion of factual reportage, hearsay and biased retouchings that the Göllicherich-Auer account presents must be regarded as chimerical: a comprehensive, definitive 'modern' biography, despite significant attempts in this direction by Manfred Wagner<sup>158</sup> and ABIL's exhaustive documentary work, will probably never be written. Yet there is still much to be done in the way of accurate and reliable reassessments based on the improved availability of documentary material in many areas. The definitive edition of the letters has finally begun to appear in the GA,<sup>159</sup> also forthcoming are the *Dokumente zum Leben Anton Bruckners* and a number of related publications, for instance that of Bruckner's desk calendars, which he used for day-to-day notes and personal memoranda.<sup>160</sup> Mention has already been made of Franz Scheder's comprehensive *Anton Bruckner Chronologie*. The other crucial area in the issue of the systematic investigation and

---

<sup>157</sup> *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, London 1960, footnote to p. 100.

<sup>158</sup> See for instance his *Bruckner: Leben—Werke—Dokumente*, Mainz—Munich 1989, among several other publications.

<sup>159</sup> *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke* 24/1 (1999); vol. 2 in preparation. See E. Maier, "Aus den Arbeiten des Anton Bruckners Institutes Linz (ABIL)", *ÖGM-Mitt* no. 27 (Dec. 1994), p. 45 (also in an issue of the *IBG-Mitt* from the same year), where mention is made of the forthcoming edition of the letters.

<sup>160</sup> See E. Maier, and Renate Grasberger, eds., *Anton Bruckner: Verborgene Persönlichkeit: Anton Bruckner in seinen privaten Aufzeichnungen*, Linz 2001. See *idem*, "Verborgene Persönlichkeit", notice in *IBGMitt* no. 43 (Dec. 1994), p. 42. Concerning the Gebetsaufzeichnungen see Franz Kosch, "'Der Beter Anton Bruckner' nach seinen persönlichen Aufzeichnungen", in: *Bruckner-Studien: Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz Grasberger (Vienna 1964), pp. 67–73, subsequently an important basis for Kantner's study of "Die Frömmigkeit Anton Bruckners" in: *Anton Bruckner in Wien*, Graz 1980, pp. 229–278.

publication of the Bruckner sources concerns the cataloguing and documentation of all surviving MSS,<sup>161</sup> a matter that will be touched upon again in chapter 1.2.

The issue remains: how can the modern Bruckner researcher best overcome the limitations and often wholesale ideological biases of both primary and subsequent literature? Firstly, it is clear that an attempt to reach the truth by excluding everything not independently verifiable is far too exclusive, and likely to lead to a greater impoverishment than enrichment of our knowledge concerning this composer. Auer did not, most of the time, intentionally set out to deceive or misrepresent, at least not in areas where no particular ideological advantage was to be obtained. His mistakes are mostly ones of bias and (all too often) sheer incompetence rather than of outright falsification.<sup>162</sup>

One of the most useful approaches is also an obvious one: wherever possible, to work back to the original reports on which Göllicherich and Auer based their narrative, and fortunately our knowledge of the late period of Bruckner's life is greatly enhanced by the existence of a number of surviving, wholly independent eye-witness accounts, among them that of Bruckner's doctor Richard Heller.<sup>163</sup> Dangers lie not merely in the catholic inclusivity of the Göllicherich-Auer account and its absence of source citations, but in the unacknowledged 'processing' of what first-hand accounts, reliable or otherwise, existed.<sup>164</sup> Kantner notes:

[...] die Eigenart dieses Autorenpaars, auf den Nachweis einer Quellenangabe weitgehend zu verzichten, führt allerdings zwangsläufig dazu, daß jeder Bezug auf ihr Werk in seiner Verlässlichkeit mit der Verlässlichkeit des dort verarbeiteten Materials steht und fällt, einer Verlässlichkeit, die keine Probleme bietet, wo Briefe oder Zeitgenossenberichte zitiert werden, die jedoch schon weniger gesichert erscheint, wo der bzw. die Autoren eigenes Erfahrungsmaterial verarbeiten.<sup>165</sup>

Modern textual criticism suggests further options in working backwards towards the factual material. In many cases it is possible to identify specific 'topoi' or agendas, while word usage and stylistic features may also be called upon to provide pointers to the reliability

---

<sup>161</sup> See Andrea V. Harrandt and Erich W. Partsch, "Quellen—neu erfaßt, neu gedeutet", *ÖMz* 46 (1991), pp. 698f.; *idem*, "Bruckner auf 'einen Blick'", *ÖMz* 47 (1992), p. 627; *idem*, "Dokumentationsprojekt zu Anton Bruckner", *ÖGM-Mitt* 25 (Dec. 1992), pp. 32–37 and Reinhold Tauber, "Welt-Zentrale für Bruckner", *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* (Linz), 2nd Sept. 1992.

<sup>162</sup> In Auer's defence it should be pointed out that, according to Doebel (p. 9), he suffered from a severe visual disability.

<sup>163</sup> See Max Auer, "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt" in: *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner*, ed. Karl Kobald, 1924, pp. 21–35, where Auer reproduces Heller's original text apparently verbatim; until now the article has all too often been overlooked by commentators preferring the pre-packaged convenience of the Göllicherich-Auer version.

<sup>164</sup> Kantner, p. 230. Kantner, for instance, notes that it is by and large only Klose's and Schwanzara's material that cannot be traced to any significant degree in the pages of Göllicherich-Auer.

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.*

of a given passage—instances of this do indeed arise in the course of chapter 1.1. The first-hand accounts themselves leave much to be desired:

Gerade die Erinnerungsliteratur dürfte an gewissen Umwegen sehr beteiligt gewesen sein. Sie ist verhältnismäßig umfangreich, kommt aus der Nähe zu Bruckner, vermittelt aber kaum einen Einblick in das Wesen. Als Ergebnis stellte sich dann das Anekdotenhafte ein.<sup>166</sup>

As a result, Bruckner reception largely remained prey to a perpetual round of justification and apologetics.<sup>167</sup> It is now said to have been Hans von Bülow who first characterised Bruckner as “halb Genie, halb Trottel”;<sup>168</sup> the notion of Bruckner’s social as well as musical inadequacy, as Partsch has shown, contributed to reception models in which the composer and his music were extolled over a range of epithets, from simple and *völkisch* to devout and other-worldly—reception patterns which were to lay the foundations for the composer’s subsequent appropriation by the propagandists of the Third Reich. Matthias Hansen goes so far to claim that:

Die komplizierte Wirkungsgeschichte von Anton Bruckners Werk ist ein beispielloses Ergebnis der Anhäufung und Verknotung von irrationalistischen Deutungen, die ihre konkreten Zwecksetzungen seit den zwanziger Jahren immer unverstellter hervortreten lassen und vollends im deutschen Faschismus enthüllen.<sup>169</sup>

Today, disengagement from the old *Musikant Gottes* or *Deutscher Michel* images of Bruckner is well advanced but still by no means universal.<sup>170</sup> Revising treasured and inaccurate notions of Bruckner’s character has brought with it the attempt not only to ‘demythologise’ them, but to emancipate them from past perspectives, both those of the first

<sup>166</sup> F. Grasberger, “Neue Aspekte”, p. 429.

<sup>167</sup> As Leopold Kantner writes: “so wie Göllerich-Auer für fast jedes Werk eine fromme Erklärung parat haben, blieb dies nicht ohne Einfluß auf einen großen Teil der Brucknerliteratur” (“Die Frömmigkeit Anton Bruckners”, in: *Anton Bruckner in Wien*, Graz 1980, p. 231). Concerning earlier Bruckner writers, Franz Zamazal also notes that: “Bruckner leidet—aus der Sicht der Gegenwart—nicht nur unter seinen “Freunden”, welche die Partituren verunstaltet oder gar vieles verschlampt haben wie bei der “Neunten”. Sie haben auch als Propagandisten, wie Göllerich und Auer, ein gerütteltes Maß an Schuld auf sich geladen. Sie ließen es zu, daß er auch nach seinem Tod von einer vermeintlich religiösen und von einer nationalen Seite vereinnahmt wurde” (letter to the present writer, dated Linz 18/4/1995).

<sup>168</sup> See Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen, “Halb Genie, halb Trottel”; Hans von Bülow’s Urteil über Anton Bruckner”, *IBG-Mitt* 55, December 2000, pp. 21–24. “Das infame Diktum” (Hinrichsen, p. 21) was long attributed to Gustav Mahler (quoted for instance by Ferdinand Pfohl, *Gustav Mahler: Eindrücke und Erinnerungen aus den Hamburger Jahren*, ed. Knud Martner, Hamburg 1973, p. 15; similarly Elisabeth Maier, “Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk: Einleitende Worte zum Symposium”, in: *BrSympBer 1992*, Vienna 1995, p. 8).

<sup>169</sup> p. 19.

<sup>170</sup> See Erich W. Partsch, “Der Musikant Gottes—Zur Analyse eines Stereotyps”, in: *Bruckner—skizziert*, pp. 235–256, and Elizabeth Th. Hilscher, “Zwischen ‘Musikant Gottes’ und ‘Deutschem Michel’”, *Bruckner-Symposium Linz* (18.–22. 9. 1991), *IBG-Mitt* no. 37 (Dec. 1991), pp. 34f. See also John A. Phillips, “Bruckner, the ‘Musikant Gottes’ and the New Musicology”, paper delivered at the 5th Conference of the International Society for the Study of European Ideas, Utrecht, August 1996.



and second generations of Bruckner devotees as well as those deriving from the political appropriation in the 1930s—a point to which I will later return. All too often the iconoclasm of Bruckner’s revisionists has come at the expense of a better understanding of the music, which demands to be understood not only in the terms in which Bruckner may have written it, but also in the perspectives of the time and those by which subsequent generations have approached it. Modern writers have at times gone too far in the other direction in the attempt to ‘free’ his music from what has been perceived as the encumbrances of its historical modes of reception. Leopold Kantner,<sup>171</sup> for instance, confuses Wiora’s investigation of religious content in Bruckner’s symphonies<sup>172</sup> with the corollary supposition of a personal “Frömmigkeit” on part of the composer, decrying the fact that Wiora purportedly places a ‘low priority’ on the ‘purely musical’ element in Bruckner’s music, mentioned in Wiora’s article only after twenty-three pages of text concerning religious content): “es scheint nicht gerade ein Kompliment für eine Musik zu sein, wenn das ‘rein Musikalische’ keinen besseren Stellenwert findet”.<sup>173</sup> Kantner’s standpoint suggests that the previous tendency to reflect imputed ‘musical’ qualities—transcendence, purity, strength, integrity, sublimity, etc.—back onto the personal biography of the composer negates the idea that such qualities should ever have been thought of as immanent within the music. This is going too far. Manfred Wagner plots the course of Bruckner’s “steile Karriere” as “sozialer Aufsteiger”,<sup>174</sup> welcoming the new objectivity of more recent interpretations of Bruckner’s works,<sup>175</sup> but at times reduced Bruckner’s biography to nothing more than an obsessive craving for ever greater heights of social prestige,<sup>176</sup> his compositional practices to nothing more than an obsessive-compulsive neurosis. Was Bruckner merely a provincial church composer suffering from symphonic delusions of grandeur? Wagner writes elsewhere, in attempting to explain the phenomenon of Bruckner’s *Fassungen*:<sup>177</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> “Die Frömmigkeit Anton Bruckners”, in: *Anton Bruckner in Wien*, pp. 229–278.

<sup>172</sup> “Über den religiösen Gehalt in Bruckners Symphonien”, in: Walter Wiora, ed., *Religiöse Musik in nicht-liturgischen Werken von Beethoven bis Reger*, Regensburg 1978, pp. 157–184; See the present writer’s summary of Wiora’s approach in §1.0.3 *infra*.

<sup>173</sup> Kantner, p. 229. See also pp. 267ff. and conclusion, p. 269: “Die Beurteilung von Bruckners Werken sowie das religiöse Erlebnis, welches sie vermitteln können: das steht in keinem Zusammenhang mit der Frömmigkeit Anton Bruckners.”

<sup>174</sup> Manfred Wagner, “Bruckner in Wien”, p. 16.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*, in particular pp. 16ff. The controversy between Constantin Floros and Rudolf Stephan (see the present writer’s “Neue Erkenntnisse...”, pp. 121, and §2.2.3) over the question as to whether Bruckner’s music is programmatic or absolute in nature is a related issue that tends to polarise along similar axes.

<sup>177</sup> “Bruckners Sinfonie-Fassungen—grundsätzlich referiert”, in: *BrSympBer 1980*, p. 22. Later (ch. 1.4) we will see the manner in which Wagner extended his reservations to question the compositional integrity of the multi-version symphonies *per se*.

Wichtig ist aber klarzustellen, daß der Komponist, mit einem skrupulösen ästhetischen Gewissen ausgestattet und, wie sein gesamter Lebensweg zeigt, versessen auf öffentliche Anerkennung, von der Persönlichkeitsstruktur her dazu neigte, immer wieder Anläufe in Richtung einer zu erzielenden Position, sei es gesellschaftlich oder kompositorisch, zu machen. Diese Anläufe, die im Persönlichen eine Beharrungstendenz erfuhren, wie sie kaum andere Komponisten kannten, prägen auch die Geschichte seines Werkes.

This 'tabula rasa' ideal thus implies qualitative evaluations of Bruckner's music. Given the overwhelming nature of the previous inaccuracies, biases, popularisations and appropriations to which the composer has fallen prey, iconoclasm of this kind can be well understood—Bruckner has, after all, been viewed for the better part of a century almost exclusively, in Manfred Wagner's words, "aus dem Blickwinkel seiner Anhänger, sprich: einer deutschnationalen, Wagner verpflichteten und religiös-motivierten Geisteshaltung, die Bruckner zum 'Genie an sich', herausgelöst aus der ästhetischen Entwicklung einerseits und der historischen andererseits, machte".<sup>178</sup> But the acknowledged complexity of the 'Erscheinung Anton Bruckners' in all its contradictions and peculiarities is not better grasped by simply replacing the previous religious, ideological and metaphysical clichés with mundane, materialistic ones. "Der Topos vom christlichsten der großen Musiker inmitten einer zunehmend unchristlichen Zeit", wrote Kirsch, "ist gleichsam ein Tabu."<sup>179</sup>

We are products of the age in which we live, and this is as fundamentally determinant a factor for present-day attempts to arrive at an allegedly greater objectivity and rationality as it was for the reception models of the past. While we can perhaps justifiably claim to have come closer to understanding the nature of the reception process involved, we have to bear in mind that a purely rationalistic, materialistic view of Bruckner's life and works does not necessarily offer a 'better'—i.e., more fruitful, comprehensive or 'objective'—explanation than that of any previous author. We are ourselves limited by our own preconceptions. Partsch supplies an important caveat:

Wenn man heute an Bruckner möglichst nüchtern herantreten will, muß man sich dennoch bewußt sein, daß stets *subjektiv getönte zeitgebundene Sichtweisen das Ergebnis sind*. (Was für das hier Gesagte selbstredend ebenso gilt.) Niemand sollte sich dadurch irritieren lassen. Die Vielfalt an Dokumenten, wissenschaftliche Darstellungen, Erinnerungsberichten, Anekdoten, mündlichen Überlieferungen und populären Schriften ergibt ein reichhaltiges Bild, das erst eine umfassende Zusammenschau—und damit Erweiterungen unserer Erkenntnis über den Komponisten—möglich macht. Ein Blick auf die nahezu hundertjährige Rezeptionsgeschichte Bruckner beweist dies.<sup>180</sup>

<sup>178</sup> In his review of Claudia Catharina Röthig's dissertation, *Studien zur Systematik des Schaffens von Anton Bruckner auf der Grundlage zeitgenössischer Berichte und autographischer Entwürfe* (published as *Göttinger Musikwissenschaftliche Arbeiten* 9, Kassel 1978), *Mf* 34, no. 1 (1981), pp. 111.

<sup>179</sup> *AcMus* 56, no. 1 (1982), p. 222; quoted in Hansen, *Anton Bruckner*, p. 319.

<sup>180</sup> *Bruckner—skizziert*, p. 255; italics added.

The attempt has been made, in the ensuing discussion of Bruckner's later years, to use aspects of both older and newer approaches, attempting to combine greater accuracy in respect to biographical detail with an awareness of the unalterable fact that the Ninth Symphony, in relation to both its compositional genesis as well as its 'content', is inextricably bound up not only with the biographical facts but also with the spiritual aspirations and agendas of the composer. The Ninth remains, as we have seen, a profoundly religious work, Bruckner's most overtly religious symphony, and the significance of its spiritual perspectives, both for Bruckner and in the responses it has evoked throughout its reception history, should not be discounted. It is not possible to simply dismiss the implications of spiritual and metaphysical significance as if they were spurious encrustations of an underlying rational 'truth' that awaits discovery. Instead, we must attempt to find a methodology that does justice to the rationality of modern musicological discourse as well as to the claims such work-immanent aspects as religious content, clearly visible in the genesis and reception of this work, make upon our understanding of it. We also have to attempt to do so without falling into the trap of positivism or uncritically elevating work or composer into a no-man's land of pure aesthetic contemplation.<sup>181</sup> Given the consequences of viewing music primarily as autonomous artwork or as historical artefact, as revealed in the revival of the first-edition controversy—the problem for modern Bruckner scholarship is to find a middle ground, or, as Treitler puts it, “to obey the dictates of both ‘aesthetic autonomy and the concept of continuity’”.<sup>182</sup> In the following, Elisabeth Maier, scarcely in the rear guard of 'new' Bruckner scholars, attempts to steer just such a course:

Ist Bruckners weltanschauliche Ausrichtung nicht nur für den Entstehungsprozeß eines Werkes relevant, sondern auch inhaltlich in seine Symphonik eingeflossen? Die Erörterung dieser Frage hat bezeichnenderweise in der Bruckner-Forschung auch in jüngerer Zeit zu heftiger Kontroversen geführt, berührt sie doch offenbar mehr als andere Themen ein Tabu der Gegenwart. Hier soll keineswegs jener etwas platten Definition der Brucknerschen Symphonien als 'Messen ohne Text' das Wort geredet werden, doch ist Bruckners Lebenswerk ganz eindeutig in ständiger Auseinandersetzung mit und Verantwortung vor einer transzendenten Wirklichkeit, und das heißt im konkreten Fall: dem persönlichen Gott des Christentums, zu sehen. Gerade diese Tatsache wurde in den ersten Jahren der Bruckner-Literatur ebenso überstrapaziert (und dadurch banalisiert), wie sie in unseren Tagen (vielfach peinlich berührt), umgangen wird.<sup>183</sup>

---

<sup>181</sup> Leo Treitler has written: “[T]he problem is more acute for the historian of art because his attitude toward his object must be both aesthetic and scientific. Though artworks may be of the past they are directly given in the present and they require to be treated fully as apprehended in the present. They tend to disappear from view as artworks the more the historian concerns himself, not with their uniqueness, but with the generalized and abstracted dimensions and categories of art that can readily be presented in continuous narratives” (“History, Criticism and Beethoven's Ninth Symphony”, *19th-Century Music* 4 (1980), p. 205).

<sup>182</sup> Treitler (quoting Dahlhaus), “What Kind of Story is History,” p. 371.

<sup>183</sup> E. Maier, p. 9. Cf. Nowak, “Zum Verständnis von Bruckners Musik gehört neben der wohl fundierten Einsicht in das Gefüge seiner Werke das religiöse Ethos, der Glaube an einen lebendigen Gott. Wo immer

“Omne quod recipitur, ad modum recipientis recipitur”, Maier admonishes.<sup>184</sup> Difficult as it is today, given the modern rationalistic world-view and our profound suspicion of the religious and irrational, to unapologetically lay claim to the religious component within Bruckner’s music, no ‘factual’ reduction of personal creativity to the lowest common denominator of personal advancement can alter the testimony of the Ninth, in particular, to the religious convictions of its composer, and it is precisely these qualities which led to the establishment of this work in its current location within the Western musical canon. The reception of Bruckner’s music, the tradition of myth-making that grew up about him and his elevation to Nazi cultural icon were not merely cultural and political phenomena, but were intimately bound up with the impact works such as the Ninth made on his contemporaries and their successors. The until recently standard and still widespread dismissal of the Finale and view of the Ninth Symphony as a work aesthetically complete in three movements remains, as we will see, a legacy of this history.

Hence, while we need to carefully sift through the original sources once more, a heightened awareness of cultural context and its implications is thus crucial for the manner in which we read the primary Bruckner literature. The cultural politics of late-nineteenth-century Vienna, the notoriety that Bruckner enjoyed, the manner in which he psychologically ‘recreated’ himself to suit certain situations and revised his works under pressure from friends or enemies, the way those around him reacted to him, became impassioned champions or entrenched critics, and finally the nature and function of music journalism of the time, are all essential keys to better understanding the nature and success of Bruckner’s music and this work, as well as the cultural milieu in which it was written. One cannot dismiss as obstructive or prejudicial the memoirs and biographies of a generation who dealt directly with Bruckner by attempting to dig through their distortions to find some prized gem of historical truth. The voices of the past should speak for themselves.

---

Bruckners Musik ertönt, dort will sie nicht rein irdischen sondern gehobenen Sinnes erfaßt werden. Dies ist schließlich ein Merkmal jeder großen meisterlichen Musik, nur ist bei Bruckner der Zug ins Überirdische besonders stark ausgeprägt und für seine Werke bestimmend” (*Anton Bruckner Musik und Leben*, pp. 93f.).

<sup>184</sup> Literally, “Whatever is received is received according to the manner of the recipient”, *ibid.*, p. 8; the quotation is taken by her from Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* I, 75, art. 5.

## 1.1

### Bruckner's Last Years

Ich will mit der IX. (Symphonie) gar nicht beginnen, ich getraue mich nicht, sie anzufangen, denn [...] auch Beethoven machte mit seiner IX. den Abschluß seines Lebens.

—Anton Bruckner<sup>1</sup>

#### 1.1.1 The beginning of work on the Ninth; the last revision phase.<sup>2</sup>

**B**RUCKNER began work on the Ninth Symphony shortly following completion of what was to become the first version of the Eighth, the score of which was officially concluded on 1 July 1887, although the datings of later revisions include 4 and 10 August 1887.<sup>3</sup> The earliest surviving particello sketches (hereafter ‘pc. sks.’<sup>4</sup>) for the first group of the first movement of the Ninth (= ‘IX/1, Hauptth.’) bear the dates 12, 13, 14, 15 and 18 August 1887; further dates of early drafts for the closing group (= ‘Schlußp.’) include 4, 7, 9 and 16 September;<sup>5</sup> and the earliest known, subsequently discarded score bifolio (= ‘bifol.’) of the Exposition (= ‘Exp.’) is dated 21 September 1887.<sup>6</sup> This suggests that Bruckner’s ideas for the Ninth probably began their crystallisation before the Eighth was fully completed.

In commencing the composition of the Ninth Symphony, Bruckner did not proceed to first substantially sketch the entire movement before beginning its scoring, as he may have

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Josef Gruber, in *Meine Erinnerungen an Dr. Anton Bruckner: Ernste und heitere Episoden aus seinem Leben* (Einsiedeln 1928), p. 37; cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 457 (quoted *infra*).

<sup>2</sup> A concise chronology of the whole period in question, including the most important biographical and compositional dates, is given in Table II (vol. II, A/5ff.); Table III (A/9ff.), provides a discrete list of compositional dates. Table I (A/1ff.) provides references for all cited MSS sources; a full listing of all extant autograph sources for the Ninth is given in Table VI (A/23f.). Regarding autograph datings of late-period MSS cf. Orel, *Entwürfe und Skizzen...*, reproduced in vol. II, D/3. A tabularisation by Orel of Bruckner’s three main revision periods, to which this rubric refers, is to be found in his “Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner”, *Deutsche Musik* 1 (1936–37), pp. 203ff. More detailed treatment of Bruckner’s working methods will be found in ch. 3.1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Orel, D/3, where Orel seems to take the date of Karl Aigner’s completion of the AS (‘Abschrift’) on 9 August 1887 as the conclusion of the composition of the Eighth; cf. also Göll.-A. IV/2, pp. 531 and 534; and Manfred Wagner, *BrLWD*, p. 182.

<sup>4</sup> Concerning abbreviations and references see Guide to Terminology, §§0.2.1–6.

<sup>5</sup> In the Cracow and Washington MSS (fols. 1–9 and fol. 2 respectively), which were unknown to Orel; cf. also Sonntag, *The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago 1987, pp. 412ff. Concerning the dates of 9 and 16 September, see Franz Scheder, “Zur Datierung zweier Autographen Anton Bruckners: I. Skizzenblätter zur Neunten Symphonie; II. Bruckners Brief vom 31. Oktober 1894”, *BrJb* 1987–88, pp. 63f.

<sup>6</sup> StB 4189/1–2.

done with VIII/1.<sup>7</sup> Instead, he seems to have plunged into the composition of the Exp. in score, even before having definitively formulated all its thematic material. Perhaps this was psychologically significant, as Peter Gülke wrote:

Ist der rote Faden—nicht des einzelnen Werkes, sondern des Komponierens—verloren, so fällt es schwer, ihn wiederzufinden, denn die gesamte Organisation seines Lebens gerät durcheinander. So stürzt er sich nach Beendigung einer Sinfonie rasch in die nächste und läßt sich—wenige umfangreiche Revisionen ausgenommen—auf Nebenarbeiten erst ein, wenn die Fortführung des Hauptweges gesichert ist.<sup>8</sup>

Perhaps it was just such a feeling of urgency, coupled with the elation of having finally completed the Eighth, that made Bruckner so impatient to continue with the Ninth. Anton Neumayr ventured another explanation:

Aus der Tatsache, daß Bruckner—mit Ausnahme der 2. Symphonie—stets die nächste Symphonie in Angriff nahm, noch bevor er die vorhergehende hören konnte, erkennt man deutlich den unerschütterlichen Glauben an seine Sendung als Symphoniker, an dem ihn auch die oft mehr als unqualifizierten Kritiken nicht irremachen konnten. Das beweist einmal mehr, daß er von seinem eigenem Wert als Künstler zutiefst überzeugt war [...].

On 4 September Bruckner, then in St. Florian, exuberantly announced to Hermann Levi:<sup>9</sup> “Hallelujah! Endlich ist die Achte fertig und mein künstlerischer Vater muß der Erste sein, dem diese Kunde wird”,<sup>10</sup> and in a further letter dated 19 September, following his return to Vienna, and apparently accompanying a copy of the score, wrote: “Ich bin so frei, mit Ihrer Erlaubniss die Partitur der 8. Sinfonie zu übersenden. [...] Die Freude über die zu hoffende Aufführung durch Hochdesselben Meisterhand ist allgemein eine unbeschreibliche.”<sup>11</sup>

But the elation of the moment was brief, for it was the rejection of this work at the hands of Bruckner's esteemed and trusted champion—Levi felt himself wholly incapable of understanding it—that plunged Bruckner into a deep spiritual crisis and brought about the final great revision phase of Bruckner's career and the near cessation of work on the Ninth until early 1891.<sup>12</sup> Over the interim period of three-and-a-half years, Bruckner was to

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Göll.-A. IV/2, pp. 531f.; Manfred Wagner, *BrLWD*, p. 182. See discussion of ÖNB 6040 in §3.1.3.

<sup>8</sup> Gülke, *Brahms—Bruckner: Zwei Studien*, Kassel 1989, p. 102.

<sup>9</sup> 1839–1900, German conductor, champion of Wagner (he conducted the first performance of *Parsifal* in Bayreuth in 1882) and of Bruckner; cf. the account of his first performance of Seventh, Leipzig, 30 December 1884, Göll.-A. IV/2, pp. 201ff., which was Bruckner's first and most decisive critical success.

<sup>10</sup> Göll.-A. IV/2, p. 558.

<sup>11</sup> The wording of the letter is taken from an auction catalogue of the firm of Leo Liepmannssohn (Berlin 1931, p. 6), in which it is noted that the letter, along with three others to Levi from 29 April, 4 June and 16 November 1886, had probably never been published before.

<sup>12</sup> See concerning further details and the involvement of Josef Schalk, to whom Levi initially wrote seeking assistance, Thomas Leibnitz, “Josef Schalk: Ein Wagnerianer zwischen Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf”, *BrJb* 1980, pp. 121f. Most recently, Benjamin Korstvedt discovered the original text of Levi's letter to Bruckner, dated 7 October; see his *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony*, Cambridge 2000, pp. 17f.

substantially revise the Third (5 March 1888 to 4 March 1889<sup>13</sup>) and First (12 March 1890 to 18 April 1891<sup>14</sup>) along with the newly completed Eighth (first-cited reference to revision being mid-October 1887, although the symphony was revised largely within the period 4 March 1889 to 10 March 1890<sup>15</sup>). Further autograph dates from this period are to be found in the *Stichvorlage* of Ferdinand Löwe's<sup>16</sup> arrangement of the Fourth Symphony,<sup>17</sup> published by Gutmann in September 1889, the last of which is "18 Fb. 888", and in the autograph score (hereafter 'AP'—Autograph-Partitur) of the brief *Träumen und Wachen*<sup>18</sup> (WAB 87), for unaccompanied male choir (dated 15 December 1890). Aside from these works, the F-minor Mass and a number of earlier compositions such as the five *Tantum Ergo* (WAB 41 and 42) and later (in 1892) the Requiem (WAB 39), were also subjected to revisions and "Verbesserungen".<sup>19</sup> The principal pc. sk. for the Scherzo of the Ninth,<sup>20</sup> dated 4 January 1889, and a further date, "26.10.90" in a pc. sk. for the Hauptth. of IX/1,<sup>21</sup> are the main indications of further progress on the symphony before the resumption of further 'serious' work on the first movement in February 1891, work which even then could only proceed full time following the completion of revisions to the First Symphony in late April of that year.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>13</sup> AP see ÖNB 6081.

<sup>14</sup> AP see ÖNB 19.473.

<sup>15</sup> AP of movements 1, 2 and 4: ÖNB 19.480; that of the Adagio ÖNB 40.999. See also Korstvedt's detailed account of the revision of the Eighth, *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony*, pp. 19ff., 68ff.

<sup>16</sup> 1863–1925; choral and orchestral conductor; pupil of Bruckner at the Conservatorium, editor and champion of his music. Löwe produced the first edition of the Fourth (1890) and Ninth (1903) Symphonies (see both here and §1.1.4 *infra*). According to Reinhard Rauner (*Ferdinand Löwe: Leben und Wirken, I. Teil 1863–1900: Ein Wiener Musiker zwischen Anton Bruckner und Gustav Mahler*, Frankfurt am Main–Bern 1995, discussed in "Neue Publikationen", *IBG-Mitt* 45 (Dec. 1995), p. 36), the birth date 1865 hitherto given in lexicis is incorrect.

<sup>17</sup> This first reappeared in 1949; see Alfred Orel, "Ein Bruckner-Fund (Die Endfassung der IV. Symphonie)", *Schweizerische Musikzeitung* 89 (1949), pp. 319–324. A photocopy of the *Stichvorlage* can be found under StB 9098/c; as Nowak points out in the Vorwort to the 1878 version of the Fourth, Bruckner made emendations to this score (used as the proof for the first edition, 1890) but (allegedly significantly) did not sign them. The issues of the authenticity and validity of this score were investigated by Benjamin M. Korstvedt in his doctoral dissertation *The First Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception*, University of Pennsylvania 1995; see also his article "The First Published Edition of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity", *19th-Century Music* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1997), pp. 3–26.

A number of further revision dates from this period can be found, according to Korstvedt, in previously undeciphered calendar entries.

<sup>18</sup> AP held by the Universitätssängerschaft Barden, Vienna; pc. sk. ÖNB 3175.

<sup>19</sup> Concerning these and other dates not included in Table III, see Renate Grasberger, *Werkverzeichnis Anton Bruckner*, p. 274.

<sup>20</sup> ÖNB 3196; according to Cohrs (see §1.1.2 *infra*) the pc. sks. for the first discarded Trio in F major (ÖNB 28.225 and 3165) were also made at this time.

<sup>21</sup> Again in the Cracow material, fol. 6.

<sup>22</sup> See Tables II and III; cf. Orel, D/3, where not all the dates are correctly given. Gunnar Cohrs has pointed out that ÖNB 28.224 contains sks. for both the beginning of IX/Scherzo and the trumpet part (in D) of the 1889 revision of III/2; hence it probably dates from early 1889 and documents the transition from the composition of the Ninth to the revision of earlier works.

There are further indications as to the composition of the Ninth which date from this period. Auer recounts that in early 1889 Bruckner played the theme of IX/1 in variant rhythmic forms to Göllicher, asking which he preferred:

Als es in der heute gültigen Weise erklang, erweckte es Göllicher's besondere Bewunderung, und da meinte der Meister: 'Also, Herrn Göllicher zu Ehren soll's so bleiben!'

In der Musikalienhandlung Gutmann hatte Bülow einmal in seiner höhnischen Weise geäußert, daß, wenn Bruckner eine neunte Symphonie schreiben werde, er sie gewiß à la Beethoven in d-Moll komponieren und mit einem 'Hymnus an die Schaden-Freude' versehen werde. Diesen Ausspruch des Feindes hatte jemand dem Meister hinterbracht.

Göllicher gegenüber kam er nun darauf zurück und erklärte: 'Mit'n Beethoven werd' ich mi' do' nôt messen! In d-Moll is' schon, weil's so viel a schöne Tonart is', aber mit an Chor wie Beethoven—na, so dumm is' der Bruckner nôt. Was kann i' dafür, daß mir 's Hauptthema in d-Moll eing'fall'n is'; sie is' halt mei' Lieblingstonart; wenn mir dös Thema nôt so an's Herz g'wachsen wär, möcht i's iazt am liebsten weg-schmeißen!'<sup>23</sup>

Significant for Auer's use of his sources is the following, earlier and more detailed version of the story, related in a *Feuilleton* written by Karl Josef Fromm on the occasion of the first performance of the Ninth in 1903,<sup>24</sup> an anecdote which also substantiates the date of the episode as March 1889 and confirms the Scherzo's date of composition:

Entgegen der wiederholt aufgetauchten Behauptung, daß Bruckner die ganze Symphonie überhaupt nur in drei Sätzen und seinem Tedeum als viertem Satz gedacht habe, muß festgestellt werden, daß dies ebenso wenig in der Absicht des Meisters lag, als mit seiner 'Neunten' ein Gegen- oder Seitenstück zu[r] 'Neunten' Beethovens zu schaffen. Ja, er war sehr entrüstet, als er hörte, daß Hans v. Bülow einem Kunstfreund gegenüber ironisch bemerkt habe: 'Wenn Bruckner eine 'Neunte' schreibt, wird sie wohl in D-moll stehen und einen Chorschluß haben', und entgegnete darauf: 'Ich kann nichts dafür, daß mir das Hauptthema in D-moll eingefallen ist; jetzt möcht' ich's aber am liebsten 'weg-schmeißen', wenn es mir nicht doch so ans Herz g'wachsen und D-moll nicht meine Lieblingstonart wäre.' Im Frühjahr 1889 komponierte er noch an dem Scherzo. Damals, es war an einem Märztag, besuchte ihn Musikdirektor August Göllicher einmal an einem Vormittag in seiner Wohnung. Wie uns Göllicher selbst erzählt, spielte Bruckner mit ihm vierhändig den ersten Satz der 'Neunten', und zwar Bruckner den Diskant und Göllicher den Baß. Der Meister legte Göllicher noch ein zweites Thema vor und fragte ihn, ob ihm dieses oder das ursprüngliche, in Oktave herabstürzende Hauptthema mit der Triole im vierten Takt, besser gefälle. Göllicher entschied sich sofort für das ursprüngliche wichtige Thema mit der Triole, worauf Bruckner erwiderte: 'Na, 'n Herrn Göllicher zulieb' soll's so bleiben!'<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 457; cf. Auer, *Bruckner* 1923, p. 311. See discussion in §1.0.3.

<sup>24</sup> *Deutsches Volksblatt*, 11 February, p. 1; quoted in M. Wagner, *Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik in Beispielen* (Tutzing 1979), pp. 266.

<sup>25</sup> In *ibid.*, p. 267.



A further date from the following year—20 May 1890—has come down to us in a copy (hereafter ‘AS’—Abschrift), perhaps by Göllicher, of a sk. in B major, apparently of or for an organ improvisation.<sup>26</sup> Bruckner was later to expand this sk., probably late in 1890, under the title “Adagio 9. Sinf.”.<sup>27</sup> It therefore represents, though distantly removed from the final result, the earliest known notation for the Adagio, and while its first measures are radically different from the ultimate opening of the movement, it is surely significant that m. 3 already features the hallmark “Dresden Amen” (after Mendelssohn’s *Reformation* Symphony) or “Grail motive” (after Wagner’s use of the same motive in *Parsifal*) which concludes the first phrase of the Adagio in its final form (mm. 7–8). The connection of this early sk. with a later Adagio sk. in the Cracow material—both having only recently come to light—and with its subsequent reworking was commented on by Max von Oberleithner back in 1933:<sup>28</sup>

Das Interessante aber war, daß ich die 9. Symphonie in Skizzen entstehen sah. — Bruckner spielte gern etwas aus seiner jeweiligen Arbeit vor, ohne daß man darum bitten mußte. Dabei mußte man mehr lesen, als zu hören war, denn seine Finger zitterten und in seiner Nervosität schlug er meist betonte Einsätze zweimal an, die Konzeption aber konnte man deutlich erkennen.

Als Bruckner mir einmal das Thema des Adagios mehrmals vorspielte, weil er es nicht richtig sehen konnte (so sehr war es durch viele Korrekturen verwischt) brachte ich es ihm sauber notiert in die nächste Stunde mit. Es war in H-dur und hatte an einer Stelle im 7. Takte viel Aehnlichkeit mit dem Gralsmotiv im Parsifal. Er hat es dann vollständig verändert und viel bedeutender gestaltet, nur der Rhythmus des ersten Taktes und der an das Grals-Motiv erinnernde Aufstieg war geblieben. Aus dem Schritte der Oberstimme des ersten Taktes in der alten Fassung dis-gis wurde der große Seufzer h-c (Non).

While Levi’s incomprehension of the Eighth was doubtless one of the most severe disappointments Bruckner was to suffer, it is also true that the revision process it engendered constituted not merely a regrettable delay—due to which the Ninth remained incomplete—but a significant and perhaps even psychologically necessary retrospective, part of an inner process by which the essential unity underlying Bruckner’s output was clarified and strengthened, as Franz Grasberger observed:

Meist von einem Gipfel aus (V. bzw. VIII. Symphonie) wendet er seine Erfahrungen für die Umarbeitung früherer Werke an und unternimmt so den musikgeschichtlich einma-

<sup>26</sup> A transcription of the original sk., the current location of which is unknown, can be found in Georg Kinsky, ed., *Manuskripte—Briefe—Dokumente von Scarlatti bis Stravinsky: Katalog der Musikautographen-Sammlung Louis Koch*, Stuttgart 1953, p. 277. Göllicher’s AS (according to Kinsky, but see below), apparently not entirely by Bruckner, as several apparent mistakes can be found, is entitled “am 20. Mai 1890” (information courtesy of Erwin Horn, Würzburg). See §1.2.8 *infra*, concerning a further perhaps earlier copy of this AS.

<sup>27</sup> See the Cracow sks. for the Ninth Symphony, fols. 32<sup>r</sup>–33<sup>v</sup>; further discussion *infra*; cf. also §§2.1.2 and 2.2.3.

<sup>28</sup> P. 28. At least one of the ASS in question (*supra*) may have been that described by him. Von Oberleithner, 1868–1935, the son of a wealthy industrialist, studied at Vienna University and subsequently (1890–1895) became a private student of Bruckner, whom he assisted by organising a consortium to support him financially (see *infra*) and by copying and editing his works. He became an opera composer, Kapellmeister and writer.

ligen Versuch, Entwicklungsstufen auszumerzen und das Gesamtwerk als geschlossenes Ganzes im Vollendungsstil zu hinterlassen.<sup>29</sup>

The composer Karl Amadeus Hartmann, in his Bruckner correspondence with the psychiatrist Waldemar Wahren of 1965,<sup>30</sup> brought the revision process into the perspective of Bruckner's adherence to the monumental model that the nine symphonies of Beethoven constituted for him, concluding colourfully but in essence similarly to Grasberger:

Die jahrelang anhaltende Revisionswelle, die ihn nach der Achten überkam, verstehe ich außerdem als ein Atemholen. Er wurde nicht nur in seinen Anhängerkreisen als der zweite Beethoven bezeichnet, er selbst sah in Beethoven seinen Kunstpatron, der ihm in der neunten Symphonie einen besonderen Höhepunkt, wenn nicht gar einen neuerlichen Abschluß der Symphonie schlechthin auferlegte. Vor der Größe dieser Aufgabe stockte Bruckner zunächst und erhöhte die Stufen, welche ihn auf den Thronszitz seiner Neunten führen sollten.<sup>31</sup>

Manfred Wagner, on the other hand, saw Bruckner's inner insecurity as primarily responsible: according to him the cessation of work on the Ninth was a combination of "äußere Umstände und innere Geneigtheit, resultierend aus einer großen Unsicherheit".<sup>32</sup> Anton Neumayr brings the revisions of 1887–1891 into direct connection with the subsequent formulation by Bruckner of his Will. "Bruckner fiel in eine depressive Phase," he notes,

denn selbst seine engsten Freunde konnten offensichtlich seine musikalische Ausdrucksweise letztlich nur zu einem kleinen Bruchteil wirklich verstehen. Dies war wohl auch der Grund, warum er seine Werke, die 'für spätere Zeiten' gelten sollen, in ihren Autographen testamentarisch der Wiener Hofbibliothek vermachte.<sup>33</sup>

Max von Oberleithner—who was subsequently to observe an episode of Bruckner's compulsive obsession with numbers in Dresden on the return journey from the triumphant performance of the *Te Deum* in Berlin in May 1891<sup>34</sup>—notes what he regarded as nervous compulsion involved in the revision of the First Symphony in 1890:

Er arbeitete damals an einer Korrektur der 1. Symphonie. Ferdinand Löwe hatte die Symphonie dem Hofkapellmeister Hans Richter vorgespielt und dieser nahm die Partitur unter den Arm, um sie möglichst bald aufzuführen; aber Bruckner bestand darauf, die Partitur noch einmal durchzugehen, bevor das Werk in die Oeffentlichkeit käme. Aus

<sup>29</sup> "Anton Bruckners Arbeitsweise", in: *Bruckner-Studien: L. Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. F. Grasberger (Vienna 1964), pp. 34f. The statement can also be found in *idem*, "Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe", *ÖMz* 21 (1966), p. 532.

<sup>30</sup> "Briefe über Bruckner", *NZfM* 126 (1965), pp. 272–276; 334–338; 380–387.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 385f.

<sup>32</sup> *BrLWD*, p. 186.

<sup>33</sup> p. 295.

<sup>34</sup> p. 64ff.

diesem Entschluß wurde die Arbeit eines Jahres. Er erfreute sich zwar manchmal an der Konzeption dieses Werkes, und mit der Absicht, es als einen kecken Besen zu bezeichnen, nannte er es 'Das Beserl'; auch erwähnte er, daß viele Stellen darin schwierig seien und er selbst sie habe studieren müssen, dabei verfiel er aber der Manie, sogenannte nachschlagende Quinten und Oktaven zu suchen, kurz: die Arbeit machte ihn mehr nervös, als später die an der IX. Symphonie.<sup>35</sup>

Suggesting other reasons for the interruption of work on the Ninth, Auer conjectures that Bruckner may well have entertained the same superstitious fears about the significance of a Ninth Symphony that are known to have plagued Mahler,<sup>36</sup> citing in notably more 'rusticated' form the conversation with Josef Gruber<sup>37</sup> quoted at the outset of this chapter: "'I mag dö Neunte gar nôt anfangen, i' trau mi nôt, denn,' sagte er feierlich[,] in Schriftdeutsch fortfahrend, 'auch Beethoven machte mit der Neunten den Abschluß seines Lebens.'" <sup>38</sup>

There is every reason to believe that Bruckner, faced with the huge psychological hurdle that his Ninth Symphony represented, felt inwardly obliged to pause and take stock at this point. Three main issues seem to be involved. Firstly, the idea of concluding his symphonic life's work brought with it the awareness that he must, creatively speaking, 'set his house in order', attempting, as Grasberger suggested, to bring earlier works up to the same stylistic level and degree of compositional 'finish' exhibited by later ones, but also involving, as can be seen from his revisions to the First and Fourth Symphonies in particular, a reconception of many aspects of orchestration and, to a lesser extent, form. Secondly, there may also have been a lack of assurance or even an element of procrastination involved, as if, affected by Levi's reaction to the Eighth, he suddenly felt unsure of his preparedness for the task in hand. Moreover, the idea of completing what was for Bruckner the 'life's work' of his symphonies must inevitably have raised the question, What do I compose when it is finished?

As we will subsequently see, numerous details of his life and thinking testify to the likelihood that Bruckner, despite his faith, and in line with the high degree of insecurity and (at least, in certain areas<sup>39</sup>) lack of self-confidence that plagued him throughout his life,<sup>40</sup> profoundly feared death. It seems more than likely that that fear would have been closely implicated in the compositional agenda of the Ninth. The psychological assurance that

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32. See further §2.1.1.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. an observation made by C. Floros, "Mahlers Affinität zu Bruckner", *BrJb* 1982–83, p. 113; see further discussion in §1.3.12.

<sup>37</sup> 1855–1933, Upper Austrian organist and composer of church music; he was a choir boy in St. Florian, student of the organist Johann Evangelist Habert and Bruckner, and from 1878 successor to the monastery organist of St. Florian Josef Seiberl.

<sup>38</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 457. The style given to the quotation by Auer is characteristic of the writer's reworkings of Bruckner's statements.

<sup>39</sup> Neumayr: "Demgegenüber muß doch aufmerksam gemacht werden, daß nachweislich bei Bruckner das Bewußtsein seines eigenen Wertes auffallend gut ausgeprägt war" (p. 287; see also p. 291).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Neumayr's analysis of the origin and symptoms of these psychological traits, pp. 266 and 274.

permitted, as it were, a resolution of the issue of 'Life after a Ninth'—the assurance of an ongoing life-task—was to come later, in the form of the offer of an opera libretto made by a Berlin writer.<sup>41</sup>

### 1.1.2 The composition of the first three movements.

Ultimately, it is undeniable that there were positive aspects to the delay in the composition of the symphony, for during the years of revisions Bruckner's conception of the work can only have matured and deepened. The first references we have in 1891 to work on the symphony suggest that composition was well underway. On 10 February Bruckner wrote to Hermann Levi that: "Vom Beserl (1. Sinfonie) habe ich nur noch 3 Bogen Vortragszeichen zu machen, dann geht's an die neunte (D-Moll), wozu ich bereits die meisten Themen notiert habe",<sup>42</sup> while a week later, on 18 February, Bruckner similarly confessed to Theodor Helm<sup>43</sup> as "3tes Geheimnis" that "Die neunte Sinf[onie] (D-moll) ist begonnen".<sup>44</sup> Up to early February 1891, the extant dated material for the Ninth would probably have included only the initial pc. sks. and subsequently discarded score pages for the Exp. of IX/1 and pc. sks. for the Scherzo and Trio, plus the early sk. for the Adagio referred to above (cf. Table II, A/7). In a letter of 11 Nov. 1891 to his brother Franz, Josef Schalk reported that: "Bruckner arbeitet fleißig an der IX. Der erste Satz ist so gut wie fertig auch das Scherzo größtenteils komponiert."<sup>45</sup>

The subsequent extant drafts do indeed reveal that Bruckner had now begun in earnest on the orchestral score of the first movement, subsequently rejecting the second and third bifols. of a score, which probably went back as far as the date of 21 September 1887 found on the earliest surviving version of bifol. 1. These two bifols.<sup>46</sup> bear the dates 18 and 19 February, which presumably denote the last revisions or additions before being discarded.

Auer records that at around this time (early 1891) Bruckner played the sks. to the Viennese conductor Hermann Haböck, who visited him frequently, asking his advice: "'Manst es is' so schöner, oder a so,' frug er und tappte ängstlich, ohne jede technische Fertigkeit am Klavier herum."<sup>47</sup> Here follows the first reference to what becomes one of the principal leitmotives in Auer's account of Bruckner's last years: "Schon damals erklärte er: 'Wann i's nimmer dalöb, kummt 's Te Deum zum Schluß daran'."<sup>48</sup>

<sup>41</sup> See §1.1.7 *infra*.

<sup>42</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 137; also p. 456. Revisions to and inspections of the first movement of the First Symphony nonetheless continued into April of that year.

<sup>43</sup> Viennese critic, 1843–1920.

<sup>44</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 137; also in *Ges. Briefe* (Gräflinger), pp. 38f., and *Ges. Briefe* (Auer), p. 239.

<sup>45</sup> Quoted in the new edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2, in press (draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>46</sup> StB 4189/3–6.

<sup>47</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 138.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

The suggestion of compositional progress on more than just the first two movements is confirmed by the report of visiting Dresden conductor and composer Jean Louis Nicodé (1853–1919) to whom Bruckner, at the beginning of March 1891, played passages “aus allen Sätzen”,<sup>49</sup> though at this stage, judging by the earliest sks., neither Adagio nor Finale could have been very close to the form in which we recognise them today. Again, Auer records Nicodé as adding: “Nicht beschwören möchte ich’s, aber ich glaube sogar, daß er mir gegenüber damals schon die Äußerung tat: falls er die Vollendung eines selbständigen 4. Satzes nicht mehr erleben sollte, möge sein ‘Tedeum’ als Schluß-Satz gelten.”<sup>50</sup> If Auer’s reporting of both Haböck’s and Nicodé’s words is accurate, and does not merely contain, or indeed consist of editorial appendages by the biographer, both testimonies are significant in revealing that the idea of replacing the final movement with the Te Deum<sup>51</sup> appears to have constituted an integral part of Bruckner’s conception of the Symphony from the outset. It also suggests that Bruckner was already reckoning with the possibility he might not live to complete the symphony and perhaps clutching at the psychological assurance a pre-composed, ersatz Finale may have provided.

Spring 1891 brought the commencement of notation of the autograph score of the Ninth as we now know it, the definitive version of bifol. 1, the first page of the AP, being dated “Ende April 1891”.<sup>52</sup> During the summer of that year, spent, as was his custom, in Steyr, Bruckner continued composition of the movement as far as the end of the Exp., a (subsequently discarded) bifol. 10 being dated “Steyr. 891. Ende Juli”,<sup>53</sup> another, bifol. 8, “3.8.”, apparently also 1891.<sup>54</sup> August also saw the composition of a number of pc. sks. for IX/1<sup>55</sup> which charted its further course from the beginning of the “2. Abtheilung”<sup>56</sup> (cf. IX/1, mm. 227ff.; the sk. is dated 3 August) to virtually the end of the movement (cf. mm. 421ff., dated 21 August). A further date of 26 August can be found on a subsequently discarded bifol. 17 of the score.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 146; Nicodé was in Vienna for a performance of his choral ode *Das Meer* by the Wiener Männergesangsverein. According to Max von Oberleithner, *Erinnerungen...* p. 28, Bruckner frequently played works to students or friends during their composition. See also the report of Hamburg Brucknerphile Wilhelm Zinne from 1892, to whom Bruckner played passages from IX/1, Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 246ff.

<sup>50</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 146.

<sup>51</sup> See further discussion in chs. 1.3 and 3.3.

<sup>52</sup> Perhaps significantly, considering this was the beginning of composition of his last work, Bruckner dated a ‘restoration’ of his earliest composition, a *Pange lingua* (WAB 31; AP ÖNB 3184, composed probably in 1835 or 1836), with “19. April 891 restaurirt”.

<sup>53</sup> StB 4189/17–18.

<sup>54</sup> StB 4189/13–14.

<sup>55</sup> Cracow, fols. 19–23.

<sup>56</sup> Concerning the origin and application of Bruckner’s formal terminology, see §2.1.4.

<sup>57</sup> StB 4189/25.

While there is no MS evidence extant to indicate that Bruckner had at this stage committed anything more than the initial ideas of the first three movements to paper, this is not to say that he had not, as the reports of Haböck and Nicodé suggest, at least conceived the general thematic character of the Finale, which until now has normally been excluded from any discussion of the symphony's genesis. There exists, for instance, a reference to an organ concert which Bruckner gave in Steyr on 17 September 1891: “[Bruckner] begann mit Themen aus seiner VII. Symphonie in zarter Registrierung, ging dann im Pleno zum Gralsthema aus Parsifal über und beschloß das grandiose Spiel mit einem Choral aus seiner eben erst in Konzeption begriffenen IX. Symphonie.”<sup>58</sup>

The reference to the Grail theme is perhaps an allusion to Bruckner's initial conception of the Adagio. While it is tempting to imagine that Bruckner may have played an early version of the chorale theme of the Finale here (or, perhaps less likely, given the *pleno* registration, the “Abschied vom Leben” theme in which the same stepwise descending fourth topoi appears in the Adagio<sup>59</sup>), it may be significant that drafts for the chorale already appear in largely definitive form in the earliest sks. for the Finale, while the instrumentation of the passage in the orchestral score appears also to have been completed at an early stage.<sup>60</sup> This element doubtless constituted part of Bruckner's conception of the Finale from early on. Harmonic and melodic elements of Bruckner's last choral motet *Vexilla regis* (WAB 51), composed in February 1892, also appear to corroborate this early conception of the Finale chorale.<sup>61</sup> Further evidence can be inferred from the existence of a sk. dated “<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> 9 Uhr Ab[e]nds. / 27.12.93.” (Facs. C/323), known only from a photocopy found in Nowak's estate, containing several drafts for a descending phrase and the remarks “H[au]pt[t]h[ema]” and (twice) “Choral”. The dating of this sk. may well be of significance as it was apparently written only four days after conclusion of the AP of IX/1—see *infra*.

Of greater significance in respect to the early genesis of the Finale's thematic material is the brief but characteristic *Das Deutsche Lied* (WAB 63) for male choir and brass band, written in April 1892 for the Akademischer Gesangsverein on a trenchantly nationalistic text by Graz school teacher Aurelius Polzer, known as a writer under the pseudonym of Erich Fels. The score was completed in Vienna on 29 April 1892 and first performed, according to Schwanzara, by the Sommerliedertafel of the Wiener Akademischer Gesangsverein in the

<sup>58</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 177, where the date, as is obvious from the context, is incorrectly given as 17 December.

<sup>59</sup> See IX/3, mm. 29ff.; cf. Mus. Ex. 24k (vol. II, B/24). The essential identity of these thematic elements is discussed in ch. 2.2.

<sup>60</sup> See Facs. C/10, 11, 15 and 193ff.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Facs. C/343, which reproduces the first edition, *Album der Wiener Meister* (Vienna) of the same year. The connections with the Finale are discussed in more detail later. Perhaps significant in this case is that Bruckner writes, in a letter of 7 March 1892 to Bernhard Deubler, to whom he sent a copy of the score, that he had composed it “nach reinem Herzensdrange” (quoted in new edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2, in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

Volksgarten on 2 July 1892.<sup>62</sup> As it is so significant for the composition of the Ninth and Finale yet almost completely unknown, and has not yet appeared in the GA, this striking work has been reproduced in its entirety from the original edition in vol. II (Fac. C/345–350).<sup>63</sup> It is in the same key as the Ninth, uses similar harmonic language<sup>64</sup> and explicitly anticipates several thematic and harmonic elements of the Finale in an astonishing manner. Among these are the rhythmic and melodic contour of the Hauptth. of IX/4<sup>65</sup> and the stepwise falling fourth of the chorale theme,<sup>66</sup> intentionally quoting the eponymous chorus, *Das Deutsche Lied*, by Prague composer Johann Wenzeslaus Kalliwoda (1801–1866), which remained a standard of the German male-choir repertoire until well into the twentieth century.<sup>67</sup> Bruckner's *Das Deutsche Lied* stands in a similar relationship to the Finale of his Ninth as does Beethoven's choral *Fantasie*, Op. 80, for piano, orchestra and chorus, to the much later Finale of his Ninth Symphony. The almost complete neglect in the Bruckner literature of this composition underscores the disregard to which many of the smaller compositions of Bruckner's later years—which in musical calibre are actually anything but 'minor'—have been summarily relegated.<sup>68</sup> The comprehensive integrity of Bruckner's style means that these often forgotten works reveal connections with and insights into the principal symphonic compositions.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>62</sup> P. 76, where Schwanzara rebuts Auer's claim that the first performance took place under Raoul Mader in Salzburg on 5 June of the same year on the occasion of the first "Deutsch-Akademisches Sängerkongress der vereinigten Gauverbände Deutschlands und Österreichs" (Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 235f.; p. 674).

<sup>63</sup> *Das Deutsche Lied* was published by Universal in 1911 in a series of "Chorwerke aus dem Nachlasse Anton Bruckners", edited by the Austrian choral conductor Viktor Keldorfer (1873–1959); a new publication is planned for vol. 23 of the Bruckner GA. The only late twentieth-century performance known to the present writer was together with other lesser known Bruckner works in a concert given by the Wiener Männergesangsverein under Xaver Meyer, in the Brucknerhaus, Linz, on 19 September 1982. See Margareta Wöss, "Brucknerpflege im Brucknerhaus", *BrJb* 1982–83, p. 180.

<sup>64</sup> See particularly the "Kernspaltung" (Gülke) of IX/1, m. 19, 1 m. after figure 1 of *Das Deutsche Lied* (C/346).

<sup>65</sup> See Facs. C/345, mm. 5ff.; cf. Mus. Ex. 25b (B/23).

<sup>66</sup> See Facs. C/349, mm. 63ff.; further discussion in §2.2.3.

<sup>67</sup> A similar quotation appears in Bruckner's *Sängerbund* (WAB 82), dated 3 February 1882, written for the Salzburg-Upper Austria Sängerkongress of that year; (cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 236). According to Alena Némcová's article on the composer (in: *NG*, vol. 9, p. 779), Kalliwoda's *Das Deutsche Lied* was also entitled "Wenn sich der Geist auf Andachtsschwingen"—presumably the opening words. It seems possible, however, that these words refer to a later retexting of the song, as according to the earlier biographical article of Walter Kramolisch in *MGG* (vol. 7, cols. 454–8), in which a facsimile of the AP of the chorus is reproduced (cols. 457–8), the original opening words were the patently nationalistic "Willst du ein Mann, ein Deutscher sein?". Both Kramolisch and Némcová point out that the song remained popular at German male choir festivals well into the 1930s. Kramolisch: "Dem Tetschener Gesangsverein einst zu einem Jubiläum geschrieben, wurde es um 1900 zu einer Art Nationalhymne und Kampflied der Deutschen in Böhmen" (*ibid.*, col. 458).

<sup>68</sup> The only known discussion is that in Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 235f., where Auer writes: "Es hat auch etwas von dem gewaltigen Geist des ersten Satzes der 'Neunten' abbekommen, in dessen Entstehungszeit es fällt" (p. 236); surprisingly, no mention is made by Auer of the choral work's readily apparent links with the Finale.

<sup>69</sup> One notes, for instance, concerning *Helgoland* (WAB 71), that the only articles to have appeared so far are those by Johannes-Leopold Mayer, "Die Zwielfichtigkeit des Erfolges: A. Bruckners *Helgoland* im historischen Umfeld des Wiener Männerchorwesens", *BrJb* 1980, pp. 21ff., and Wolfgang Grandjean, "Anton Bruckners 'Helgoland' und das Symphonische", *Mf* 48 (1995), pp. 349ff., the latter article being heavily indebted to the

Bruckner continued to work relatively slowly on the Ninth throughout the remainder of 1892 and 1893. Aside from the brief composition of *Vexilla regis* (AP dated 9 February 1892<sup>70</sup>) and *Das Deutsche Lied* (completed on 29 April 1892<sup>71</sup>), lengthy interruptions were occasioned by the composition of Psalm 150 (WAB 38; begun late March 1892, AP concluded on 29 June<sup>72</sup>) and, in the following year, Bruckner's last completed work, the "symphonischer Chor" *Helgoland* (WAB 71; AP completed in late August 1893<sup>73</sup>).

The remaining stages of the genesis of the first three movements of the Ninth can be summarised in the following terms.<sup>74</sup> The sks. for *Das Deutsche Lied* use bifols. numbered "24." and "25." from the end of IX/1,<sup>75</sup> so it is reasonable to assume that Bruckner had finished laying out the movement in score by early April 1892. The last date to be found among any of the discarded materials from the score of the movement is 1 October 1892, on bifol. 17; the orchestration of the movement was preliminarily concluded shortly after that on the 14th of the same month, although apparently, according to the final date on its last page, not fully completed until over a year later, on 23 December 1893.<sup>76</sup> Work on the second movement, initial pc. sks. for which date from early January 1889, was probably resumed later in October 1892, although the movement was not concluded until 15 February 1894. Two quite distinctly different versions of the Trio were undertaken before Bruckner settled upon the third and final one in 1894.<sup>77</sup>

---

present writer's research; see for instance J. A. Phillips, "Die Arbeitsweise Anton Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren", *BrSympBer* 1992, pp. 153ff.

<sup>70</sup> The AP can be found today under the signature ÖNB 24.262, the pc. sk. ÖNB 28.228. See Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 218f.

<sup>71</sup> Sources (both ASS) ÖNB 3187, 19.748; pc. sk. Archiv der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde A 177. The ÖNB's card catalogue designates 3187 as an "AP", but this is not the case; the current location of the AP is not clear. See also discussion in Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 235f.

<sup>72</sup> AP ÖNB 19.484; no extant sks. known. See Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 232ff., concerning reception of the first performance pp. 275ff.; cf. Auer, *Bruckner* 1923, pp. 290ff.; 1934, pp. 320f. P. 46 of the Philharmonia score, ed. Joseph V. Wöss (Vienna n. d.) is reproduced in Facs., C/344.

<sup>73</sup> AP ÖNB 19.485; pc. sks. ÖNB 6038, 29.304, 24.261; pc. sks. and rej. score bifols. StB 3792. See Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 330ff., 354ff. Pp. 65–66 of the original edition (Vienna 1899) are reproduced in Facs. C/351–2.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. here again Table II, A/5ff.

<sup>75</sup> See the further explanation of the origin of these bifols. in §3.1.3.

<sup>76</sup> Both dates ÖNB 19.481/49.

<sup>77</sup> These were transcribed in the Orel edition, pp. 42–51. See Oskar Lang, "Zwei frühere Fassungen des Trios der IX. Symphonie von Anton Bruckner", *ZfM* 105, no. 12 (Dec. 1938), pp. 1328–1330. Both William Carragan and Gunnar (subsequently Benjamin Gunnar) Cohrs produced performing versions of the Trio drafts, the latter appearing with Doblinger, Vienna in 1997. Cohrs' work establishing the compositional genesis of the Scherzo and its three Trios may be found in *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke: Zu Band 9: Entwürfe zum zweiten Satz und Trio mit Viola-Solo/ Studienband*, ed. Gunnar Cohrs, Vienna 1998. His elucidation of the compositional chronology of IX/2 is that given in abbreviated form in the following paragraphs here; grateful acknowledgement is due for many further points concerning compositional chronology.



The first of these, known from two pc. sks.,<sup>78</sup> the second a kind of ‘clean copy’ of the first, is an ingenuous, lyrical piece in F major, reminiscent of the Trio of the Eighth but apparently featuring a viola solo. It must have been drafted in pc. sk. at much the same time as the Scherzo movement itself<sup>79</sup> (January 1889) but doubtless before August of the same year, as elements of this movement were salvaged as the second version of the Trio of the Eighth Symphony, composed in the Autumn of 1889; Bruckner must have resolved to discard it by then. No pc. sks. for the second Trio are extant, although its score<sup>80</sup> advanced as far as an almost complete instrumentation. It is again in  $\frac{2}{4}$  time, featuring a solo viola, but stands in the new key of F# major, and is both shorter and harmonically more complex than the first. Most significantly, it introduces at m. 29 what was subsequently to become the second theme of the final Trio (cf. mm. 53ff. of that score), while at m. 11 Bruckner notated on an spare stave, in  $\frac{3}{8}$  time, a phrase eventually found at mm. 86ff. of the final Trio.<sup>81</sup>

While the second Trio score is itself undated, its composition would probably have had to have taken place during or just prior to February 1893. The initial date found at the end of the AP of the Scherzo, 27 February 1893, suggests that the score of that movement was preliminarily concluded on that date, at which stage it would probably still have incorporated the score of the second Trio.<sup>82</sup> The third and definitive Trio—its thematic material derived in part from that of the second, its repeated-note accompaniment and  $\frac{3}{8}$  metre a spin-off from the original conception of the Adagio Gesangsp.—must have been written some time between the early months of 1893 and February of the following year.

The first extant indication of work on the Adagio is, as already mentioned, the early sk. for an organ improvisation of 20 May 1890, subsequently expanded under the title “Adagio 9. Sinf.”. A circuitous but unbroken evolutionary path can be traced from the first c. 47 mm. of this sk. (the lyrical material expanded from the organ improvisation, in B major, **C**) to the daringly chromatic opening of the final score. The subsequent course of the “Adagio 9. Sinf.” sk., a passage beginning in G major and  $\frac{2}{4}$  time, can be readily identified with the G $\flat$ -major “Etwas bewegter” passage of the Gesangsp., mm. 57ff. of the Adagio.

The next reference that we appear to have to the composition of the Adagio is a reference in Schwanzara’s account of Bruckner’s University lecture of 19 December 1892: “Dann erzählte er vom Fortgang seiner IX. Symphonie. Tiefgerührt, mit Tränen in den Augen, teilte er mit, daß ihm gestern das Todesthema eingefallen sei.”<sup>83</sup> As this date falls between

<sup>78</sup> ÖNB 28.225 and 3165.

<sup>79</sup> Pc. sk. ÖNB 3196, as already noted.

<sup>80</sup> StB 4189/34–39.

<sup>81</sup> See the transcription of this score in Cohrs, *Entwürfe zum zweiten Satz und Trio.../ Studienband*, pp. 113ff.

<sup>82</sup> Schwanzara (pp. 185f.) notes Bruckner’s serious illness during Fasching 1893, during which the Scherzo was completed on 27 February 1893.

<sup>83</sup> p. 161.

preliminary completion of IX/1 (14 October) and the first dated pc. sk. for IX/3 (2 Jan. 1893), and Bruckner had almost completed the Scherzo by this time, it can be assumed that Bruckner was referring to a theme in the Adagio, possibly the “Abschied vom Leben” theme. However, no further sources for the Adagio survive from the December 1892 period; the next surviving advance over the initial material derived from the organ sk. can be found in the pc. sks. ÖNB 28.237/3<sup>r</sup>, 4<sup>r</sup> and 8<sup>r</sup>, the last of which bears the date “2. Jänner / 893”.<sup>84</sup> Another sk. dated 28 February of the same year,<sup>85</sup> the day after the initial conclusion date for the Scherzo, would appear to be for the Gesangsp. of the Adagio; it reveals important similarities to a further pc. sk. of some 40 mm., ÖNB 39.193, which came to light only in 1988. This was first thought to be a sk. for the third version of the Trio,<sup>86</sup> but is entitled “Fis d[ur]/Ges d[ur]/Gesangs:/per[iode]”; it is hence also an early sk. (again, probably c. February 1893), for the second group of the Adagio. Schwanzara’s account of a lecture held in March 1893 reveals that by this time a number of ideas had evolved for the Adagio. Having completed the Scherzo precisely three weeks earlier, Bruckner referred to the Adagio,

das der dritte Satz seines letzten Werkes werden sollte, unternehmungslustig: ‘Die sechs Hauptthemen des Adagio werden wir aussausen lassen. Bedenken Sie, es soll schön sein und originell.’ Ernster und nachdenklich: ‘Das heißt was, heutzutage originell!’<sup>87</sup>

That Bruckner had not yet definitively determined upon his material and its structure at this stage is probably evidenced by the fact that the final score of the Adagio contains only five thematic elements that appear to qualify as themes, namely the opening Hauptth., the Undezim structure (letter A), the “Abschied vom Leben” (B), and the two themes of the Gesangsp. (C and D). But not long after this, work on the Adagio must have been interrupted by the composition of *Helgoland*, initially sketched in pc. in late March or April 1893. The carefully dated score and discarded bifols. include the dates 27 and 28 April (completion of the sks.<sup>88</sup>), 24 May (completion of the choral parts), 18 June (completion of the strings), 7 and 23 July (completion of the winds and brass respectively), to 7 August (presumably the overall completion of the score, including articulation and performance markings); 28 August is the last date found in the score for any revision.<sup>89</sup> Bruckner returned to the Ninth later in 1893, concluding final emendations to the AP of the first movement, as already mentioned, on 23

<sup>84</sup> ÖNB 28.237/8 (according to original foliation of 3176, fol. 32).

<sup>85</sup> Cracow, fol. 34.

<sup>86</sup> See the further discussion of this sk. in §1.2.7 *infra*.

<sup>87</sup> Schwanzara, pp. 202f.

<sup>88</sup> Schwanzara (p. 248) records Bruckner having finished the sk. of *Helgoland* on 29 April 1893—this must refer to the dating on a discarded bifol. 13 of “Scitze 28. April 893 / A. B.” (StB 3792/unfol.)—and that “[e]r sei jetzt fleißig daran, die Partitur [...] auszuarbeiten” (*ibid.*).

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Auer, *Bruckner* 1923, p. 301. The precise dates are instructive as to the sequence in which Bruckner worked upon a score—cf. §3.1.3.

December 1893. Conceivably therefore, the above-mentioned 'Nowak sketch' of 27 December 1893, headed "Hauptthema" and "Choral", and suggestive of the subsequent "Abschied vom Leben" theme, was a further attempt at defining the still uncertain thematic material for the Adagio, the crystallisation of which had apparently not extended much further than the still tentative explorations of the pc. sks. made early the same year. The musical ideas originally intended for the second group of the Adagio were probably eliminated from that movement and incorporated into the third and definitive Trio (F# major,  $\frac{3}{8}$  time) drafted later in the winter of 1893–94,<sup>90</sup> as the final date found on the last page of the AP of the Scherzo, which must by then have included the score of the new Trio, is "Fine 15.2.94".

The excision and reuse of this material suggests that Bruckner probably had conclusively established the thematic material of the Adagio by this time. In fact, a complete pc. sk. of mm. 1–44 of the movement, largely as they now stand, is dated 2 March 1894.<sup>91</sup> The subsequent datings of material for the Adagio reveal that its composition extended throughout most of 1894 (see Table III) and, while Bruckner was still working in pc. sks. as late as July,<sup>92</sup> he had already begun notation of the orchestral score by then. A discarded bifol. 10 was ceremoniously signed, dated and given to an admirer as a memento on July 13.<sup>93</sup> Moreover, the date of 11 May 1894 can be found on the first page of the last bifol. of the Adagio;<sup>94</sup> this suggests that Bruckner had 'laid out' the entire score of the Adagio by that time, over six-and-a-half months before its eventual completion. According to a further MS dating, the AP of the Adagio was preliminarily concluded on 10 October, and on 5 November Bruckner relayed to his "Gaudeamus" at the University: "Drei Sätze meiner IX. Symphonie sind schon fertig, die beiden ersten schon vollständig, nur im 3. Satze muß ich noch etwas nuancieren."<sup>95</sup> The score of the movement was finally completed on 30 November<sup>96</sup>—a date which marks the apparent cessation of all compositional activity on Bruckner's part until May of the following year, when Bruckner finally began drafting the Finale.

---

<sup>90</sup> Particello draft (string score) ÖNB 28.226.

<sup>91</sup> Cracow, fol. 39.

<sup>92</sup> StB 4189/42–48.

<sup>93</sup> ÖNB 6079; the bifol. is transcribed in Orel, *Entwürfe und Skizzen*, p. 63, where the date is omitted, however.

<sup>94</sup> This date was only recently discovered by Cohrs during his preparation of the Kritischer Bericht of the first three movements in September 2000; written in faint pencil at the very edge of the page, it went unnoticed by either Orel or Nowak.

<sup>95</sup> See Schwanzara, p. 97. Auer (*Bruckner* 1923, p. 311, and Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 445) erroneously gives the date of Bruckner's last lecture as 12 November.

<sup>96</sup> In his *Bruckner* 1923, p. 311, Auer cites only "31. Oktober"; apparently the movement was played to Göllicher at this time. The dates of the score are also listed in *ibid.*, p. 312. Orel (D/3) gives "31. 11. 1894" (!) for the conclusion of the Adagio. The dates of the AP are given correctly in Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 455ff.

### 1.1.3 Growing fame, declining health.

The listing of compositional dates given here in intentionally 'abstract' form should not blind us to the profound influence that Bruckner's worsening health had on the composition of the entire Ninth, not merely the Finale, as is sometimes claimed. Having examined, at least in general outline, the compositional evolution of the Ninth up to this point, it is useful to attempt to put this into a broader biographical perspective.

Far from being indicative of the sort of neglect or incomprehension often implied by biographers, Bruckner's fortunes at this stage of his life had begun a decisive turn upward. The Order of Franz Josef had been bestowed upon him by the Emperor on 9 July 1886,<sup>97</sup> and the title of honorary doctorate granted him by the University of Vienna on 7 November 1891<sup>98</sup>— of enormous psychological importance for Bruckner, as Neumayr notes, "weil damit in seinen Augen endlich seine soziale Benachteiligung offiziell beendet wurde".<sup>99</sup> While Hermann Levi had already made a crucial breakthrough with the critical success of the Seventh in Leipzig in December 1884, highly successful performances of his works brought the ageing composer increasingly enthusiastic recognition, among them that of the *Te Deum* under Siegfried Ochs<sup>100</sup> in Berlin on 31 May 1891,<sup>101</sup> the first performance of the Eighth in Vienna under Hans Richter<sup>102</sup> on 18 December 1892<sup>103</sup> and performances in January 1894, again in Berlin, of the *Te Deum*, the String Quintet and the Seventh Symphony, which Bruckner attended in the company of Hugo Wolf.<sup>104</sup>

<sup>97</sup> Göll.-A. IV/2, pp. 491; cf. here and concerning the following dates the aforementioned Table II, Principal Biographical Dates, mid-1887 to 1896 (A/5ff.); cf. also the "Zeittafel", Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 650ff. The official decree, ÖNB 33.796, is dated 8 July 1886.

<sup>98</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 178ff.; cf. also Auer, *Bruckner* 1923, p. 287, where Auer also notes Bruckner's petitions concerning a doctorate to Cambridge, Cincinnati and Philadelphia; cf. Rolf Keller, "Das 'amerikanische Ehrendoktorat' für Anton Bruckner", in: *BrSympBer* 1992, pp. 73–92; cf. also Neumayr, p. 295.

<sup>99</sup> P. 297.

<sup>100</sup> 1858–1929; German conductor and composer; protégé of Hans von Bülow; in 1882 founded the Chor der Musikhochschule of Berlin, which in 1887 became the Philharmonischer Chor, Berlin.

<sup>101</sup> See Bruckner's letter from Vienna of 26 June 1891 to Siegfried Ochs (*Ges. Briefe* (Auer), p. 249); see also his letter from Steyr of 8 August 1891 to Felix Weingartner: "In Berlin waren so schöne Tage für mich, wie—nie" (*Ges. Briefe* (Auer), pp. 132f.). Neumayr (p. 296) cites the Berlin performance of the *Te Deum* as the greatest single success of Bruckner's career.

<sup>102</sup> 1843–1916; renowned Austro-Hungarian conductor studied in Vienna, sang in the Hofkapelle; was later a student of Simon Sechter. Richter's contacts with Wagner led him into conducting; he was appointed to the Hofoper in 1875 and conducted the first performance of the Ring in Bayreuth the following year. From 1880 to 1890 he was conductor of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde concerts, later conducting extensively in England.

<sup>103</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 282ff.

<sup>104</sup> See Bruckner's letters to Bernhard Deubler (*Ges. Briefe* (Auer), p. 279) and Franz Bayer (*ibid.*, pp. 289f.). Günter Brosche ("Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf", in: *Bruckner Studien*, ed. Othmar Wessely, Vienna 1975, p. 183) notes that the joint trip, undertaken on account of performances of both their works, marked a break in relations between the two composers; Bruckner returned from Berlin alone, and for some time after there was little further contact between them (p. 184).

Bruckner's delight over the performances of the *Te Deum* is apparent in his letter of 3 February 1892 to Siegfried Ochs (Berlin) concerning the Vienna performance of the work (*Ges. Briefe* [Auer], p. 255), that of 26

By the early 1890s Bruckner was no longer a well man, complaining increasingly of pain in the feet, stomach, heart and throat,<sup>105</sup> and his constant battle with failing health during the final six years of his life forms a poignant backdrop to the patient but laboured compositional genesis of the Ninth. As Neumayr writes:<sup>106</sup>

Machten sich schon 1885 die ersten Anzeichen einer Krankheit bemerkbar, die durch Wasseransammlung in den Beinen auffiel und ihn im Gehen und beim Orgelspiel behinderte, so häuften sich vor allem seit 1890 Mitteilungen über Krankheiten, sodaß er schließlich die Befürchtung hegte, seine neunte Symphonie nicht mehr vollenden zu können.

Granted sick leave by the Konservatorium in July 1890 on account of his medical condition—diagnosed in March 1890 by his doctors Chiari and Riedl as “chronische Katarrhe des Rachens und Kehlkopfes und hochgradige Nervosität”<sup>107</sup>—the institution granted him full retirement on 15 January 1891,<sup>108</sup> freeing his time considerably for composition, although the precious time gained would be increasingly lost to ill-health. Not until late April 1891, following completion of the revision of the First Symphony, was Bruckner to begin uninterrupted work on the score of IX/1 and even then, as we have seen, the composition of the movement seems to have been concentrated largely in the month of August during the composer's customary summer sojourn in Steyr and following the triumphant performance of the *Te Deum* under Siegfried Ochs, attended by Bruckner in Berlin in May of that year. Despite the official success it is striking that the ‘nervousness’ diagnosed a year earlier was to translate into the curious bout of numeromania, observed by von Oberleithner in Dresden during Bruckner's return from Berlin the following month.<sup>109</sup>

Curiously, no further compositional dates survive for the period of autumn and winter 1891–92, although it can be assumed that work on IX/1 continued with relatively few

April of the same year to Oddo Loidol (Kremsmünster) concerning the performances in Hamburg and St. Louis (*ibid.*, p. 258), and that of 22 April of the following year to Theodor Helm concerning the Hamburg performance under Mahler of the *Te Deum* and D-minor Mass (*ibid.*, p. 271). The popularity and success of the *Te Deum* is also amply confirmed by the letters of several parties to Bruckner praising the work, among them Otto Kitzler, Gustav Mahler (who first performed the *Te Deum* in Hamburg in April 1892), Rudolf Weinwurm and Wilhelm Zinne (*ibid.*, see pp. 310, 329f, 376 and 391 respectively).

<sup>105</sup> Cf. M. Wagner, *BrLWD*, pp. 206f., 297. Auer (*Bruckner* 1934) notes increasing indispositions (p. 277) and the onset of more serious ill-health (p. 301).

<sup>106</sup> P. 298. Elsewhere, however (p. 314), Neumayr suggests that the earliest mention by Bruckner of swelling of the feet was four years earlier, in 1881.

<sup>107</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 53 and calendar note p. 120; cf. also Auer, *Bruckner* 1934, p. 277; and Neumayr, p. 314.

<sup>108</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 126; see also Bruckner's letter to Felix Weingartner of 27 January 1891 (*Ges. Briefe* [Gräflinger], pp. 129ff.), in which Bruckner reports: “Ich bin leider nicht gesund, leide am Magen; muß eben wieder zum Doktor” (p. 131). In a subsequent letter of 17 March to Weingartner from St. Florian, Bruckner reports he has been instructed by his doctor to spend some time in the country, “Da ich seit langem Hals[-] u. Magen-leidend bin” (*ibid.*; both letters are also to be found in Wagner, *BrLWD*, pp. 294f.).

<sup>109</sup> Von Oberleithner, pp. 64ff. See the further discussion in §2.1.5.

interruptions during this time, which saw the long-desired honorary doctorate bestowed upon Bruckner by the University of Vienna on 7 November, and a reception in his honour on 11 December, organised by the Wiener Akademischen Gesangsverein, held in the Sophiensaal and attended by some 3,000 people.<sup>110</sup> Bruckner's spirits can only have been uplifted by this overwhelming indication of official and public esteem. In gratitude he dedicated to the University the newly revised score of the First Symphony, which received its premiere under Hans Richter in the third concert of Vienna Philharmonic on 13 December 1891.<sup>111</sup> Following a further performance of the *Te Deum* under Wilhelm Gericke on 20 December, Bruckner spent Christmas and the New Year in St. Florian, returning to Vienna on 2 January 1892.<sup>112</sup>

February–June 1892 witnessed the composition of the three commissioned works *Vexilla regis*, *Psalm 150* and *Das Deutsche Lied*;<sup>113</sup> Bruckner remained in Vienna throughout this time, largely keeping to his apartment due to his ongoing complaint of swollen feet and legs. He had to forego his customary Easter sojourn in St Florian, was unable to attend the triumphal performance of the *Te Deum* in Hamburg under Mahler on Good Friday, 15 April,<sup>114</sup> and even declined the invitation of Oddo Loidol to spend Whitsun (which would have fallen in May) in Kremsmünster.<sup>115</sup> In a letter of 21 May to Wilhelm Gericke<sup>116</sup> Bruckner complains of not having yet finished the Psalm due to his continuing foot ailment.<sup>117</sup> In August, however, Bruckner was well enough to make a final pilgrimage to Bayreuth, where he saw *Parsifal* and *Tannhäuser* for the last time, but where one of the first serious, although unspecified, health crises was to arise.<sup>118</sup> In a letter written on his return to Steyr in August 1892 to Pater Oddo Loidol<sup>119</sup> in Kremsmünster Bruckner complained of being a patient again, and of liver, stomach and foot ailments.<sup>120</sup> After spending most of the

---

<sup>110</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 178–202. A program is preserved under the signature ÖNB Mus. Hs. 27.893 which also includes a draft by Bruckner for his acceptance speech. See also Schwanzara's account, *Vorlesungen...*, pp. 76ff.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 203ff. The success of Bruckner's music was sufficient by this stage that the firm of Josef Eberle offered the composer a contract in July of the following year for the publication of all future works (pp. 256ff.).

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 216f.

<sup>113</sup> See *ibid.*, pp. 218f., 232ff., 235f. respectively.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 222ff.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 231f.

<sup>116</sup> (1845–1925), conductor and composer, from 1874 Kapellmeister of the Wiener Hofoper, 1880–1884 and 1890–1895 conductor of the Gesellschaftskonzerte of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde.

<sup>117</sup> New edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2 (in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>118</sup> Neumayr, p. 298f.; see also p. 314. During this trip Bruckner was also to lose—albeit briefly—his luggage, containing the MSS of the Ninth (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 263, Auer, *Bruckner* 1923, p. 292; *idem*, *Bruckner* 1934, p. 321). The shock may have been a contributing factor in the medical crisis.

<sup>119</sup> 1858–1893; composer and organist, took up monastic life in Stift Kremsmünster in 1880; one of Bruckner's favourite university students.

<sup>120</sup> Quoted by Neumayr, p. 299. The letter, dated 2 August 1892 is given in full in the new edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2 (in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

autumn recovering in Steyr, where he preliminarily completed the AP of IX/1 on 14 October, he returned to Vienna, recommencing his lectures on the 17th.<sup>121</sup>

On the basis of his increasing incapacitation Bruckner was also officially relieved of his duties as organist at the Hofkapelle on 28 October 1892, a position which, as “wirkliches Mitglied”, he had held since 1878.<sup>122</sup> According to a medical certificate dated 11 July 1892 and prepared for the imperial Obersthofmeisteramt by Drs. Torök, Kraus and Kahler, the diagnosis included arterial sclerosis, hepatitis and diabetes.<sup>123</sup> Bruckner's University lectures, on the other hand, although increasingly intermittent, were not to terminate until 5 November 1894, shortly before the first period of really serious illness began.<sup>124</sup> Schwanzara<sup>125</sup> vividly recounts a particularly moving incident from Bruckner's lecture of 5 December 1892, which reveals Bruckner's intense fear of death and an emotional, human side of the man profoundly at odds with traditional images of obsequious congeniality and child-like faith:

Unvermittelt erzählte Bruckner: “Vorigen Montag wär' ich so gern g'kommen, aber Schrötter hat gesagt: “Wenn Sie eine Lungenentzündung haben wollen und in acht Tagen nicht mehr unter den Lebendigen sein wollen, so können S'ja geh'n.’ Das hat geholfen!” Der aufrecht stehende Bruckner reckte sich, aus seinen sonst so milden Augen blitzte ein wilder Kampfgeist, eine kühne Entschlossenheit, und er rief mit bebender Stimme, aber entschieden: “Ja, ich will noch unter den Lebenden sein, so lange als möglich noch!” Seine Lippen waren farblos geworden, sein Gesicht verzerrte sich; in den Zügen wechselten zäher Lebenswille und bange Todesangst. Es war eine beklemmende Pause eingetreten, in der Bruckners stechend gewordene Blicke wie hilfesuchend, angsterfüllt und verzweifelt im Saale herumirrten. Es war eine Pause, die uns den Atem raubte; eine Pause des Entsetzens, entsprungen dem niederschmetternden Bewußtsein, daß Bruckners Tage bereits gezählt seien, auch wenn es seinem zähen Willen gelingen sollte, dem harten Schicksal noch eine Gnadenfrist abzutrotzen. Während unsere Herzen noch bange schlugen, kämpfte der noch immer in achtungsgebietender, aufrechter Haltung dastehende Bruckner seine Erregung nieder. Dann setzte er, beruhigt, in gewohnter Art die Vorlesung fort.

Following the triumphantly successful performance of the Eighth under Richter on 18 December 1892 which, as Schwanzara notes<sup>126</sup> must have taken considerable toll of Bruckner's already weakened condition, the composer spent Christmas and New Year in

<sup>121</sup> Schwanzara, pp. 90f. See Epilogue.

<sup>122</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 272ff.; cf. Neumayr, p. 289; quite apart from Conservatorium and private teaching, the Hofkapelle alone had, since 1878, brought Bruckner a comfortable annual income of 800 Gulden (Alfred Orel, “Anton Bruckners Nachlaß”, *Oberösterreichische Heimatblätter* 3, no. 2 [1949], p. 118).

<sup>123</sup> Wagner, *BrLWD*, pp. 206f., which Wagner cites from T. Antonicek, *Bruckner und die Wiener Hofmusikapelle*, Graz 1979, p. 118; cf. also Bruckner's petition, *BrLWD*, p. 296.

<sup>124</sup> There is some confusion in the literature concerning this date; cf. Schwanzara, pp. 89ff.; further discussion *infra*.

<sup>125</sup> Pp. 90f.

<sup>126</sup> Pp. 91ff.; the following also derives from this source.

Steyr, but from 10 January 1893 onwards the fluid retention from which he increasingly suffered began to press upon the heart and lungs, causing severe shortness of breath.<sup>127</sup>

This is referred to by Bruckner, for instance in his letter of 14 March 1893 to his friend and teacher Otto Kitzler,<sup>128</sup> as “Wassersucht”.<sup>129</sup> Neumayr, however, explains that all of Bruckner's various symptoms were in fact linked to coronary heart disease, a diagnosis apparent from the hand-written account of Bruckner's medical history left by his last attending doctor Richard Heller, preserved in the Institut für Geschichte der Medizin of the University of Vienna:<sup>130</sup>

Bruckner litt an einer schweren, chronischen Herzmuskelerkrankung mit allen konsekutiven Erscheinungen, also eine sich stets steigernde Atemnot bei Bewegung, Wasseransammlungen in der Pleura, Ödeme der Beine, Stauungsleber, verringerte Harnausscheidung, Herzerweiterung.

Neumayr confirms:

Aus heutiger Sicht ist diese Diagnose völlig korrekt. Die Herzmuskelerkrankung Bruckners entsprach einer sogenannten koronaren Herzkrankheit, deren Ursache letztlich in arteriosklerotischen Ablagerungen mit Verengungen im Bereiche der Herzkranzarterien gelegen ist. Wahrscheinlich war das deftige Essen, das Rauchen und mangelnde körperliche Bewegung fördernd für die Entwicklung der arteriosklerotischen Prozesses. [...] Im Verlaufe dieser koronaren Herzerkrankung, von der die linke Hälfte des Herzens bevorzugt betroffen wird, kam es zu Stauungen in den Lungen, in der Leber und an den Beinen und schließlich bildeten sich Flüssigkeitsansammlungen in der Brust- und in der Bauchhöhle aus.<sup>131</sup>

Just after his return to his lectures following the Christmas break on 16 January 1893, Bruckner's new doctor Prof. Dr. Leopold Schrötter, Ritter von Kristelli, a noted specialist in

<sup>127</sup> Neumayr, p. 299.

<sup>128</sup> 1834–1915, Kapellmeister in Linz, Bruckner's teacher in form and orchestration, with whom he studied from 1861 to 1863.

<sup>129</sup> *Ges. Briefe* (Gräflinger), pp. 55f. August Stradal (“Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit”, *ZfM* 99, no. 12, Dec. 1932, p. 1073) also notes that the “Wassersucht” from which Bruckner suffered made its first appearance in 1892.

<sup>130</sup> Richard Heller (1862–1934), Vienna doctor and Sanitätsrat, who was later to treat Mathilde Wesendonck in Gmunden (cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 453) and who ended his career as director of sanitation in Salzburg, left both the extensive Krankengeschichte along with some c. 75 letters from Wilhelm Mager, Ernst Schwanzara and other Bruckner researchers (cf. Gerhard Renner, *Die Nachlässe in den Bibliotheken und Museen der Republik Österreich*, Vienna–Cologne–Weimar 1993). Grasberger and Partsch (*Bruckner-Skizziert*, p. 272) gives the dates 1837–1908, though it is not clear from the context whether these are intended to apply to Schrötter or Heller.

<sup>131</sup> Neumayr, pp. 315f. Leibnitz (*Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*, pp. 174f.) quotes a further report by Alexander von Weismayr: “Damals fanden wir Bruckner, der vorher scheinbar gesund war, in einem trostlosen Zustand. Infolge eines bis dahin ganz symptomlos verlaufenden Herzfehlers waren ganz plötzlich starke Wassergüsse in die Bauchhöhle und in die Haut der unteren Extremitäten eingetreten. Heftige Atemnot quälte den Kranken, der unbeweglich im Bett liegen mußte. [...] Bruckner folgte wie ein Kind, denn er sehnte sich nach Gesundheit. Es wurde ihm strengste Milchdiät angeordnet und Herzwickel dazu, es besserte sich sein Zustand rasch, sodaß Bruckner nach etwa 14 Tagen das Bett wieder verlassen konnte.”



diseases of the thoracic organs,<sup>132</sup> ordered complete bed rest, forbade him the consumption of alcohol and reduced his diet to milk.<sup>133</sup> Shortly after this time (the date cannot be determined more accurately), Bruckner apparently underwent an operation to relieve the pressure of built-up fluid in the thoracic cavity. Although no date is given we have information from the medical history of Heller, which mentions, as quoted by Neumayr, that “zur Erleichterung der Atemnot eine Punktion des Rippenfellergusses vorgenommen [wurde]”.<sup>134</sup>

Neumayr placed this in direct connection with Bruckner's letter of 10 March 1893 to Göllicherich in which the composer expresses his despair and feelings of desolation at the time:<sup>135</sup> “Mein Wasser ist von der Brust abgegangen, die Füße schwellen noch an! Ich fühle mich total verlassen!”<sup>136</sup> but such an operation may have taken place some weeks earlier, as similar wording is found in a letter of 8 February to Hermann Levi:

Ich muß schon mehrere Wochen das Bett hüten, indem ich das Unglück hatte, die Wassersucht zu bekommen. Ich bekam eine große Atemnot. Das Wasser stieg von den Füßen ganz herauf und ich war sehr verzagt. Das Wasser ist jetzt, Gott sei gedankt—abgegangen.<sup>137</sup>

In fact, as August Stradal suggested,<sup>138</sup> Bruckner may have undergone the operation several times over. We read in his memoirs that: “Schrötter mußte oftmals vom Körper des Meisters das Wasser entfernen, eine Prozedur, die Bruckner sehr angriff.”<sup>139</sup> Neumayr was nonetheless correct in maintaining “daß es sich gleichzeitig mit der schon 1892 vorhandenen, von ihm als Leberleiden bezeichneten Leberstauung um einen Stauungsaszites, also eine Wasseransammlung in der freien Bauchhöhle, gehandelt haben mußte”.<sup>140</sup>

Confined to bed, Bruckner was nonetheless able to begin composition of the Adagio and preliminarily conclude composition of the Scherzo of the Ninth during this time. He was sufficiently recovered to permit him to recommence lectures on 27 February<sup>141</sup> and to attend a concert of the Akademischen Gesangsverein under Raoul Mader on 11 March at which his

<sup>132</sup> Neumayr, p. 299.

<sup>133</sup> The “Milchtage” regime was introduced by Philipp Jakob Karell (Neumayr, p. 299). As noted by Schwanzara (p. 91), Auer incorrectly dates Bruckner's recourse to Schrötter to the end of January (Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 303f.).

<sup>134</sup> Neumayr, p. 314.

<sup>135</sup> This is further complicated by the fact that Neumayr gives ‘1894’ here, a lapsus apparent from the context.

<sup>136</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 313; *Ges. Briefe* (Auer), p. 55; see Neumayr, pp. 299 and 314.

<sup>137</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 312.

<sup>138</sup> 1860–1930; initially studied law, subsequently music at the Vienna Conservatorium, from 1880 a pupil with Bruckner there, later taking private lessons from him. Stradal also studied with Liszt and was a noted pianist. He prepared piano transcriptions of the First, Second, Fifth, Sixth and Eighth symphonies.

<sup>139</sup> “Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit”, p. 1073.

<sup>140</sup> Neumayr, p. 314.

<sup>141</sup> Schwanzara, p. 91.

early *Tafellied* (WAB 86; 1843) was performed,<sup>142</sup> but this would appear to have been too much too soon, as on the 13th Bruckner suffered another partial relapse. Confirmation of Bruckner's condition is found in a letter to Otto Kitzler dated 14 March 1893:<sup>143</sup>

Ich bin seit Mitte Jänner an der Wassersucht erkrankt; die Füße schrecklich geschwollen; das Wasser drang bis an die Brust, daher bittere Athemnot!

Professor Schrötter commandirte mich ins Bett, und durfte ich durch Wochen nichts als Milch (ohne Brot) genießen! [...]

Bruckner was nonetheless able to attend the first concert performance of the F-minor Mass under Josef Schalk<sup>144</sup> on the 23rd and spend Easter in St. Florian and Steyr. On Good Friday he heard his *Vexilla regis* for the first time at St. Florian and on Easter Sunday his D-minor Mass in Steyr, conducted by his friend Franz Bayer.<sup>145</sup> He was forced to remain at home for the duration of the semester holidays;<sup>146</sup> however, lectures could again be resumed on 24 April 1893 and apparently continued regularly up until the end of semester in July,<sup>147</sup> during which time most of the score of *Helgoland* was completed, both pc. sks. and AP revealing the intense struggle with ill health and tremulous handwriting.<sup>148</sup> Neumayr notes Bruckner's letter of May to his pupil Viktor Christ in which he complained that he was "immer unwohl" and had been bedridden for three weeks, while a further letter of 1 July to Vincenz Fink in Linz makes it clear that he had again received strict orders to rest: "Infolge meiner gefährlichen Krankheit darf ich nach Vollendung meines Werkes [i.e., the Ninth] nichts komponieren".<sup>149</sup> On 16 August Bruckner left Vienna for Steyr, where in September he was yet again forced to take to his bed,<sup>150</sup> returning to Vienna in early October.<sup>151</sup> The worst danger was now over for a time, but some indication of the severity of Bruckner's condition in the earlier part of the year can be gleaned from a very interesting letter dated 9 October 1893 written by his brother Ignaz from St Florian, in which Ignaz informed him that his last illness

<sup>142</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 314.

<sup>143</sup> *Ges. Briefe* (Auer), pp. 55f.

<sup>144</sup> 1857–1900; Josef (also 'Joseph') studied piano with Eckstein, music theory with Bruckner in the Conservatorium. Together with his brother, the conductor Franz Schalk, Joseph was later, as pianist and editor, an enthusiastic and influential champion and editor of Bruckner's music.

<sup>145</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 320ff. Gustav Mahler also performed the D-minor Mass with the Te Deum in Hamburg on Good Friday. Franz Xaver Bayer (1862–1921) was Regens chori and music director in Steyr.

<sup>146</sup> Schwanzara, pp. 91f.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 92.

<sup>148</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 338.

<sup>149</sup> Both letters are quoted by Neumayr, pp. 299f.; full text in the new edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2 (in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL) Assuming that Schwanzara is correct concerning Bruckner's return to lectures on the 24 April, the letter to Christ must refer to the period of three weeks between Easter and that date.

<sup>150</sup> See the letter to C. Hynais of 28 September, quoted in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 342.

<sup>151</sup> "Meines Wissens am 5. oder 6." (Schwanzara, p. 92, fn. 63); Neumayr, cites the end of September for Bruckner's return; however, on 2 October Bruckner wrote to Kremser from Steyr (see *infra*).

had indeed been life-threatening and that the doctors had withheld the information from Bruckner on the grounds that it could further endanger his health.<sup>152</sup> The letter mainly recounts a meeting by Ignaz with the prelate of St Florian to whom Ignaz had gone to obtain assurance that his brother's testamentary wishes concerning interment would be respected. Significantly—in view of subsequent events—the prelate Ferdinand Moser appears to have passed on an admonition—to set his musical affairs in order—which Bruckner apparently heeded only after more serious illness in June 1895:

H. Pra[e]lat hatte auch gesagt, Deine Musikalischen sachen, sollst Du auch genau in Ordnung bringen, wegen den brauchst Du noch nicht zu Sterben, Du bist ganz under fremde Leite, *diese würden sich um vieles annehmen*, wie Er auf alles denkt.<sup>153</sup>

Bruckner appears to have returned to Vienna in early October to attend the final rehearsals of *Helgoland*, which received its successful first performance at a concert of the Wiener Männergesangsverein under Eduard Kremser on 8 October.<sup>154</sup> It is perhaps significant that, following the last dated inspection of the *Helgoland* score on 28 August, no further compositional dates can be cited for the remainder of the year until late December; the autumn would seem to have passed with little apparent compositional activity.

However, reference should be made to the following passage from Göllicher-Auer, placed by Auer at the conclusion of volume IV/3, following discussion of the Te Deum transition, and just prior to his listing of the themes of the Finale—in other words, with no obvious indications as to a likely date:

Trotzdem der Meister das Finale ursprünglich als reinen Instrumentalsatz geplant hatte, wurde in seinem Freundeskreis die Frage eines Chor-Finale erörtert und Rudolf Weinwurm hatte ihm den Vorschlag gemacht, für den Chorsatz das alte Kirchenlied 'Christ ist erstanden' zu wählen, was ihm sehr einnahm.<sup>155</sup>

Auer appended to this the following footnote:

Darüber berichtet auch der ehemalige Vorstand des Wiener Männergesangsvereins, Franz Schneiderhan: Anton Bruckner war im Musikvereinssaal bei einer Probe eines seiner Werke, das der Männergesangsverein aufführte. Nach deren Beendigung begleitete ich den Meister, der den Wunsch aussprach eine Tasse Kaffee zu trinken. Wir

<sup>152</sup> Quoted by Neumayr, p. 300. The full text of the letter is to be found in the new edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2 (in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>153</sup> New edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2, in press (draft copy courtesy of ABIL; orthography of the original; italics added). The most likely interpretation of Ignaz' rather tortuous sentence is probably: Herr Prelate also said you should carefully put your musical matters in order as well; don't die before you do, for you're completely surrounded by strangers, *and they would appropriate things*—he [the prelate] thinks of everything.

<sup>154</sup> The composer and conductor Eduard Kremser (1838–1914) conducted the Wiener Männergesangsverein from 1868 and from 1877 to 1880 was director of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde.

<sup>155</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 615.

nahmen an einem der auf der Ringstrasse vor dem Café Kremser stehenden runden Tische Platz. Im Laufe des Gespräches fragte ich auch nach den weiteren Schaffensplänen. Er antwortete, daß er an dem Finale der IX. Symphonie arbeite, nahm einen Bleistift zur Hand, zog Notenlinien auf die Marmorplatte des kleinen runden Tisches und sagte: 'Das ist das Thema, welches ich für das Finale verwenden will!' und schrieb hin die alte Kirchenweise, die früher in Wien und anderwärts vom Priester angestimmt wurde, nachdem er am Karsamstag bei der Auferstehungsfeier das Allerheiligste enthüllt hatte: *Der Heiland ist erstanden*.<sup>156</sup>

The references to reports by two external parties, Weinwurm and Schneiderhan, add weight to what is an intriguing and possibly very significant anecdote. Concerning the performance to which this most likely refers, the premiere of *Helgoland* by the Wiener Männergesangsverein under Eduard Kremser on 8 October 1893, took place in the Hofburg Winterreitschule,<sup>157</sup> yet rehearsals may well have been held in the Musikverein.<sup>158</sup> Schneiderhan's report appears to suggest that Bruckner was readily ambulant at the time and in sufficiently good health to have sat outdoors in a café in autumn, which militates against a date subsequent to May 1895, at which time Bruckner was 'officially' at work on the Finale but in poorer health. However, no Café Kremser exists today, or is known to have existed at the time;<sup>159</sup> conceivably, Auer's correspondent may simply have confused the name of the Café with that of the conductor of the performance (which, ironically, would confirm the date of the anecdote). As we have seen, there are no further MSS datings indicating work on the Adagio during the October 1893 period; yet perhaps Bruckner was 'at work on the Finale' at the time as Schneiderhan suggested and—whether at the suggestion of Rudolf Weinwurm or not—considered the possibility of concluding the symphony with just such a chorale fantasy on *Der Heiland ist erstanden*. Concerning this hymn, which was apparently one of Bruckner's favourites, Meißner notes the following incident, apparently at Easter 1896:

Als ich am Ostersonntag zwölf Uhr nachts noch bei ihm war, dachte er an die große Orgel in St. Florian und meinte: Jetzt erklingt dort gerade das herrliche Osterlied 'Der Heiland ist erstanden'!<sup>160</sup>

The possible motivic allusion to this hymn in the Finale will be discussed in §3.3.6.

---

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>157</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 354.

<sup>158</sup> A letter from Bruckner to Eduard Kremser dated Steyr, 2 October 1893 asks when and where the final rehearsal for *Helgoland* is to take place (new edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2; in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>159</sup> As kindly ascertained by Elisabeth Maier (email correspondence with the author, February 2001).

<sup>160</sup> Anton Meißner, ed. Viktor Keldorfer, "Aus den Aufzeichnungen Anton Meißners", *Die Furche: Jahrbuch* 1947, p. 84. Neumayr (p. 303) also notes the increasing importance of the Passion idea to Bruckner in his last years.

A new health crisis at the beginning of November involving extreme shortness of breath was severe enough to cause Bruckner to fear for his life,<sup>161</sup> and on the 10th of that month he signed his Last Will and Testament, citing Ferdinand Löwe, Cyrill Hynais<sup>162</sup> and Dr. Theodor Reisch (Bruckner's subsequent executor) as witnesses (see §1.1.4 *infra*).<sup>163</sup>

Despite a further brief flare-up in late November 1893 that had passed by 8 December,<sup>164</sup> Bruckner was sufficiently recovered to put the finishing touches to the AP of IX/1 on the 23rd of that month and—astonishingly—play the organ at Klosterneuburg on Christmas day:<sup>165</sup> “Mir geht es seit 8. Dezember (Beichttag) unendlich besser”, confessed Bruckner in a letter of 30 December to Bernhard Deubler in St Florian.<sup>166</sup> In early January 1894 Schrötter even permitted him to travel to Berlin, a journey undertaken, as already mentioned, in the company of Hugo Wolf, in order to attend the performances of his Seventh Symphony, Te Deum and String Quintet there.<sup>167</sup> In Berlin Bruckner was to announce his engagement to Ida Buhz, a hotel maid whom he had first met and fallen in love with on his previous visit to Berlin in May 1891, and—despite his age—to whose parents he made yet another, ultimately unsuccessful, proposal of marriage.<sup>168</sup> Although they remained in contact with one another, the prospect of marriage appears finally to have come to an end in September 1894 on grounds other than difference in age, the devoutly Lutheran Ida steadfastly refusing to convert to Catholicism.<sup>169</sup> Even before his return journey to Vienna Bruckner had already found another paramour, a Margarethe Boucher of Charlottenburg.<sup>170</sup> As Neumayr notes: “Man wundert sich, wie sehr Bruckner selbst in vorgerücktem Alter immer wieder von der ‘holden Weiblichkeit’ angezogen wurde, wobei es ihm vor allem besonders junge

---

<sup>161</sup> Neumayr, p. 300.

<sup>162</sup> 1867–1914; preparatory school teacher in Vienna, composer and writer on music. Hynais studied counterpoint with Bruckner at the Conservatorium 1884–1886, subsequently preparing piano transcriptions and vocal scores for a number of his works and copying *Helgoland* and the Sixth Symphony.

<sup>163</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 359ff.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 362.

<sup>165</sup> Schwanzara, p. 92.

<sup>166</sup> Quoted by Neumayr, p. 302; see *Ges. Briefe* [Auer], p. 279. Bernhard Deubler (1884–1906) was Regens chori in St Florian.

<sup>167</sup> The details of the dates are listed by Bruckner in the letter of 30 December 1893 to Bernhard Deubler, cited above.

<sup>168</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 372ff.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 160f., 251, 367, 415f. Ida Buhz (who later became a Lutheran archdeaconess) was the object of probably the most serious, but not the last of Bruckner's many attempts at finding a wife: Neumayr (p. 296) mentions a Minna Reischl in Upper Austria in summer 1891. A serious study of Bruckner's innumerable liaisons, real or desired, with the opposite sex has yet to be written.

<sup>170</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 374, Schwanzara, p. 93.

Mädchen angetan hatten.”<sup>171</sup> Heller notes that Bruckner continued to cherish thoughts of marriage during his final years in the Belvedere.<sup>172</sup>

Again following the Berlin visit, the stresses of travel and emotional strain proved too great and, shortly after completion of the Scherzo with its definitive Trio on 15 February, a further relapse appears to have taken place,<sup>173</sup> Bruckner being so ill this time as to have called for and been given the last rites on 24 March 1894 (what was to be the first of three such instances).<sup>174</sup> Strikingly, significant composition appears to have continued intermittently through this period of crisis, the definitive continuity of the opening of the Adagio and later passages of that movement being sketched during the months March–July, excerpts of which, as Auer reports, were played to Friedrich Klose<sup>175</sup> and Rudolf Louis,<sup>176</sup> who visited him during this time.<sup>177</sup> In a letter of 10 March to the Berlin conductor Siegfried Ochs Bruckner was also to complain of continuing ill health and of neglect by his Vienna circle: “Hier bin ich ganz vereinsamt! Niemand besucht mich! Hugo Wolf habe ich auch nie gesehen.—Hans Richter sah ich nie [...]”<sup>178</sup> Unable to attend the first performance of the Fifth Symphony under Franz Schalk<sup>179</sup> in Graz on 9 April,<sup>180</sup> Bruckner was well enough to spend Holy Week and Easter in St. Florian, playing the organ there on Easter Sunday (25 April<sup>181</sup>) during what was to be his final sojourn in his spiritual home. Hitherto unobserved by either Orel or Nowak, a light pencil dating on the last bifol. of the score of IX/3, “11.5.94”<sup>182</sup>, appears to

<sup>171</sup> P. 296; see also *ibid.*, p. 281: “Es ist überraschend, daß Bruckner in seinen Werbungen immer wieder nach einem gleichen Schema voring, ungeachtet der Tatsache, daß es nie zum Erfolg führte. Dieses unbewußt festgelegte, rührende Muster Frauen gegenüber, das er in der gleichen Form immer wiederholte, entspricht medizinisch einem Verhaltensmuster, wie wir es typisch für eine Neurose kennen.”

<sup>172</sup> Max Auer, “Anton Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, in: *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner*, ed. Karl Kobald, Zurich—Leipzig—Vienna 1924, p. 29.

<sup>173</sup> Noted in Schwanzara, p. 93; cf. Neumayr, p. 302.

<sup>174</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 387, Neumayr, *ibid.*

<sup>175</sup> 1886–1942. A private student of Bruckner’s, Klose later taught composition in Basel (1906) and in Munich (1907–1919), living the rest of his life in Switzerland.

<sup>176</sup> 1870–1914. Louis began his career as a conductor; from 1900 he was active in Munich as a critic and writer.

<sup>177</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 381.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 381f.

<sup>179</sup> 1863–1931, conductor, one of the principal early proponents of Bruckner’s music; like his brother Josef, pupil of Bruckner at the Conservatorium. In 1900 Franz Schalk was appointed Erster Kapellmeister at the Wiener Hofoper under Gustav Mahler; in 1918 he became joint director there with Richard Strauss, and later (1924–29) director in his own right.

<sup>180</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 381f. Further details in §1.1.4 *infra*.

<sup>181</sup> By a lapsus of Auer, as is clear from the context, the date appears in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 384 as 25 March; the contradiction is noted by Schwanzara, p. 93. Schwanzara further notes (*ibid.*) that Auer confused the fact that Bruckner played at only one service, not two, namely on Easter Sunday (25 April), which happened that year to coincide with the feast of Maria Verkündigung.

<sup>182</sup> This discovery was made in late 2000 by Benjamin Cohrs during the preparation of the *Kritischer Bericht* on the first three movements (forthcoming, 2002).

suggest that Bruckner had laid the entire movement out in initial draft stage by early May—almost seven months prior to the eventual completion date of the score.

Perhaps fatigued by what would appear to have been considerable compositional labours during this period, Bruckner's condition again worsened on his return to Vienna. This time an improvement first became apparent around mid-June, at which time (as Anton Meißner reports<sup>183</sup>) Bruckner was again well enough to be carried down in a portable chair from his fourth-floor Heßgasse apartment to attend mass on the Monday after Whitsunday in the Michaelerkirche.<sup>184</sup> Auer gives the date of Bruckner's recovery as mid-May; as Whitsunday occurs seven weeks after Easter, however, Auer's date for Bruckner's recovery was out by a month: with Easter falling on 25 April, Whit Monday 1893 would have fallen on 14 June.<sup>185</sup>

Shortly before leaving on 26 July for what was to be his last summer vacation in Steyr, Bruckner received news that the city of Linz had granted him honorary citizenship.<sup>186</sup> His doctor, Weißmayr, who also took summer holidays in Steyr, fortunately followed him, and indeed was to be called upon on a number of occasions.<sup>187</sup> Composition on the score of the Adagio continued slowly during the ensuing months. On 4 September Bruckner was to celebrate his seventieth birthday in Steyr and, although any stressful official celebrations had to be cancelled by Weißmayr,<sup>188</sup> the more than 70 telegrams and 200 letters which poured in, among them honorary memberships of the Wiener Schubertbund and Steyrer Liedertafel, provide an indication of the high esteem in which Bruckner was held.<sup>189</sup> For Manfred Wagner, the event represented an important station in the slow process of Bruckner's decline: "Wie sehr das gesamte Wien vom Zustand des Komponisten [...] wußte, geht unter anderem daraus hervor, daß sich viele Glückwunschadressen bereits als Nachrufe verstehen lassen."<sup>190</sup> Numerous press articles appeared on the occasion, characteristic of them the report of Ludwig Speidel in the *Fremdenblatt* of 4 September, in which the extent to which Bruckner had become an acknowledged "Wiener Figur" is apparent. Here, as Manfred Wagner writes,<sup>191</sup>

<sup>183</sup> In Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 411. Unfortunately, Schwanzara gives little information at this point, his notes for the period in question having been stolen (Schwanzara, pp. 6, 93). See concerning Anton Meißner, §1.1.5 *infra*.

<sup>184</sup> Bruckner's "sedia gestatoria", as Meißner called it ("Aus den Aufzeichnungen Anton Meißners", ed. Viktor Keldorfer, *Die Furche: Jahrbuch* 1947, p. 84), figures again later in the story; according to ABIL it is still in existence.

<sup>185</sup> This is probably a result of Auer's previous slip concerning the date of Easter—see fn. 181 *supra*.

<sup>186</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 412f.; the official decree is dated 15 July. Neumayr (p. 302) cites the honour as first bestowed on the occasion of Bruckner's seventieth birthday in September (presumably an oversight).

<sup>187</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 415.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 416ff.; cf. Auer, *Bruckner* 1923, pp. 308ff.

<sup>189</sup> These are today preserved in the ÖNB, Mus. Hs. 28.251.

<sup>190</sup> *BrLWD*, p. 212.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 213f., quoting Speidel's article on the ensuing pages.

vermengen sich, symbolisch für den Geist der Rezeption, sachliche Einschätzung und geliebtes Erscheinungsbild, nüchterne realistische Beschreibung und farbelartiges Konstrukt in einer Publikation derart treffend, daß keine noch so exakte Beschreibung der Zustände das geteilte Rezeptionsbild besser dokumentieren könnte.

Bruckner's financial situation, now that he was, in effect, fully retired from all official duties, was itself indicative of his greater social prestige. While sixteen years previously Bruckner had applied unsuccessfully for the financial assistance of a "Landesdotation", "zum Zwecke freieren Schaffens", from the Upper Austrian Landtag,<sup>192</sup> he was by now the beneficiary of a consortium of friends and patrons that had been initiated in Bruckner's Upper-Austrian circles by Max von Oberleithner in mid-1890 and by the end of that year had extended to include a number of his Vienna circle, chief among these benefactors being Prince Fürstenberg.<sup>193</sup> Indeed, this financial assistance had made it possible for Bruckner to seek his retirement from the Conservatorium der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in December 1890, where his annual salary there had been the not inconsiderable sum of 800 Gulden.<sup>194</sup> In 1894 the Faculty of the University was to vote Bruckner an increased honorary remuneration of 1200 Gulden (in place of the 800 he had received annually since 1881 from that source); in November of the same year the Minister for Culture and Education awarded him, "in Anerkennung seiner Leistungen auf dem Gebiete der musikalischen Komposition", an honorary annuity of 600 Gulden for the year 1895 and a subvention of 150 for the remainder of 1894.<sup>195</sup> In addition to these sums came an annual "Personalzulage" accompanying the award of the Order of Franz-Josef which Bruckner received from the Emperor in 1886, thereby raising Bruckner's annual payments from the Hofkapelle (800 Gulden annually since 1878) to an annual total of 1,000 Gulden.<sup>196</sup> There was also an annual honorarium of 400 Gulden paid to him since 1890 by the province of Upper Austria,<sup>197</sup> the Conservatorium's

---

<sup>192</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 73.

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 54ff, 70, 127 and 148.

<sup>194</sup> Alfred Orel, "Anton Bruckners Nachlaß", p. 118.

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 447.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.* According to Auer (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 69), at the (second) imperial audience in late 1890 (precise date unknown), which Bruckner attended in the company of Richter, Bruckner initially declined the offer of financial support directly from the Franz Josef's purse, requesting only assistance to attend performances of his works in other countries. See also Renate Grasberger and Erich W. Partsch, *Bruckner—Skizziert*, p. 273, where the sum of 300 Gulden is cited as "Personalzulage". Auer mentions elsewhere (*ibid.*, p. 57): "Nach Mitteilung der Wirtschafterin des Meisters, Frau Kathi, hat auch der Kaiser in der letzten Zeit 400 Gulden jährlich bewilligt"; this sum, according to Neumayr (p. 297) had been paid to him since 1890, presumably replacing the annual 1,000 Gulden he would have received from the Obersthofmeisteramt during the years 1886–1890 during which he was still active at the Hofkapelle.

<sup>197</sup> See the *Linzer Volksblatt's* report on the sitting and the official decree of 30 October 1890, Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 75ff.; cf. also, as an indication of Bruckner's financial status, the reaction of Swiss organist Johann E. Habert to Bruckner's earnings, *ibid.*, p. 79.



annual pension of 440 Gulden,<sup>198</sup> and finally royalties earned from the increasing numbers of performances and publications of his works. It can hence be seen that in his last years Bruckner was more than secure financially—indeed, his situation could be called comfortably wealthy. Following his death his estate would be valued at over 20,000 Gulden, the majority of this substantial sum being in cash or bonds in various bank accounts.<sup>199</sup>

Despite worldly success, with the composition of the Adagio nearing completion, thoughts of death appear to have been uppermost in his mind. Bruckner again gave expression to his lifelong craving for security, even in death, by appending a codicil to his Will dated Steyr, 25 September 1895,<sup>200</sup> which makes several macabre specifications concerning the location of his resting place, the embalming of his body, specifications of sarcophagus and burial, and makes ample financial provision for requiem masses to be read for his soul.<sup>201</sup> Bruckner was still unsure whether St. Florian would allow him to be buried in the situation he most desired—under the organ of the Stiftskirche—and being unable to obtain written confirmation from the Prelate, decreed in the codicil that, should St. Florian not wish to have him, his sarcophagus should be interred in the cemetery in Steyr “in eine neu zu erbauende, für immerwährende Zeit auf meinen Namen zu schreibende Gruft im Arkadengang der Ostseite des Friedhofes”.<sup>202</sup> Neumayr writes:<sup>203</sup>

Mag sein, daß Bruckners intensive Befassung mit dem Tode mit seinem lebenslange an den Tag gelegten übergroßen Interesse ‘an allem, was mit Medizin, Krankheit und Tod zu tun hatte’, zusammenhing oder auch durch die damals noch sehr verbreitete Angst vor dem Scheintod bedingt war, womit sein Wunsch nach einer Glasscheibe im Sarg und dessen Aufstellung in einem freistehenden, nicht mit Erde zugeschütteten Grab eher nachvollziehbar wäre. Auf jeden Fall wird die Nachwelt in einigem Erstaunen versetzt, daß ein so stark im Glauben verwurzelter Mann sich im Angesicht des nahenden Todes ‘in geradezu naiver Weise ängstigte’.

By the end of September Bruckner was sufficiently recovered to be able to undertake the return journey to Vienna, which he made on 30 September in the company of Karl Reder.<sup>204</sup> News of his ill health had travelled far: in a Berlin paper of 17 October cited by Auer<sup>205</sup> we

<sup>198</sup> See the official letter of 15 January 1891 from the Pensionsverein of the Conservatorium, Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 127f.

<sup>199</sup> Alfred Orel, “Anton Bruckners Nachlaß”, pp. 121ff.; cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 606; see also Neumayr, p. 302.

<sup>200</sup> Wording see Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 427ff. See also Neumayr, pp. 301f.

<sup>201</sup> As Dahlhaus has pointed out (“Bruckner und der Barock”, *NZfM* 124 (1963), p. 336), such specifications, like Bruckner’s lifelong fascination with medicine, death and the hereafter, would not have appeared out of place in an earlier age. Cf. Neumayr, p. 268; concerning Bruckner’s interest in medicine, sickness and death, p. 293.

<sup>202</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 429.

<sup>203</sup> Pp. 301f.

<sup>204</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3. p. 431; Schwanzara, p. 93

<sup>205</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, *ibid.*

read of great concern for his health being expressed by his supporters there, with the pious commentary that “Dr. Anton Bruckner ist sich seines Zustandes wohl bewußt, doch erfüllt von Gottvertrauen”. Bruckner is further reported to have confessed to a visitor:<sup>206</sup>

Ich habe auf Erden meine Schuldigkeit getan, [...] ich tat, was ich konnte, und nur eins würde ich mir noch wünschen. Wäre mir doch vergönnt, meine neunte Symphonie zu vollenden! Drei Sätze sind nahezu fertig, das Adagio ist fast zu Ende komponiert, bleibt nur mehr der vierte Satz übrig. Der Tod wird mir hoffentlich die Feder nicht früher aus der Hand nehmen.

Again Bruckner rallied, putting paid to fears of his impending demise with the announcement that he would recommence his University lectures on the 29th.<sup>207</sup> It was his penultimate lecture, however; on 5 November<sup>208</sup> he stood before his beloved students for the last time. As Ernst Schwanzara's account<sup>209</sup> dramatically reveals, he was greeted with storms of applause, the brilliantly successful concert premiere of the F-minor Mass under Wilhelm Gericke having taken place the previous evening at the first season's concert of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde. It was on this occasion that Bruckner made the observation<sup>210</sup> that the first to third movements of the Ninth were already complete, “die ersten schon vollständig, nur im dritten Satz muß ich noch etwas nuancieren”, adding:

Mit der Symphonie hab' ich mir noch eine starke Arbeit auferlegt. Ich hätt' es nicht tun sollen bei meinem hohen Alter und meiner Kranklichkeit. Zu spielen wird die Symphonie nicht leicht werden. Das Adagio, das drinnen vorkommt, soll das schönste sein, das ich geschrieben habe. Mich ergreift es immer, wenn ich es spiele. Sollte ich vor der Vollendung der Symphonie sterben, so soll statt dem vierten Satz mein Tedeum gespielt werden. Ich habe es schon so bestimmt.<sup>211</sup>

The following week, 11 November,<sup>212</sup> saw the successful performance of the Second Symphony under Hans Richter at the Vienna Philharmonic's second concert of the season, the

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*; partially quoted by Neumayr, p. 298.

<sup>207</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 432. Schwanzara (pp. 93f.) obtained no notification of the 29 October lecture; he accordingly inserts into his account a report by Theodor Altwirt published in the *Linzer Montagspost*, 5 November 1894, of Bruckner's second-to-last lecture; it is reproduced in Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 432f. A further extract, apparently from Altwirt, although not apparently published, is reproduced *ibid.*, pp. 444f., and also by Schwanzara, pp. 96ff.

<sup>208</sup> Schwanzara, pp. 96ff. According to Auer (*Bruckner* [1923], p. 311; Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 445), the date of the last lecture was 12 November, causing Auer to speculate (p. 446) about what Bruckner may have said at one of his 'three' last lectures and perhaps also causing him confusion over the date of the Philharmonic concert of (correctly 11 November). Concerning the correction of the Göll.-A. date, see Schwanzara, p. 98.

<sup>209</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>210</sup> As already noted, §1.1.2.

<sup>211</sup> Schwanzara, pp. 97f.

<sup>212</sup> In Göll.-A. (IV/3, p. 447, and again, p. 499) this date is given incorrectly as 25 November. As Schwanzara (p. 98) dryly notes, “In der großen Bruckner-Biographie stimmen allerdings auch nicht alle Daten”.

excitement associated with which would seem to have constituted the proverbial ‘last straw’ for Bruckner’s nerves and brought about what was apparently the most severe decline in his state of health so far. Bruckner’s lectures were cancelled and he spent the remainder of November in his apartment where, on 30 November, he was to write the final date in the score of the Adagio. By 8 December his health had deteriorated to the extent that the doctors gave up hope for him; on the 9th he again called for and received the Last Sacrament.<sup>213</sup> Bruckner soon rallied, however, and was sufficiently recovered to spend Christmas at Klosterneuburg, even playing the organ at the high mass on the Feast of St. Stephen (December 26). But it was to be the last time he ever played the instrument. As reported by Dr. Josef Kluger,<sup>214</sup> Bruckner concluded the improvisation with a wrong note in the pedal, “den der Meister gar nicht merkte und deshalb starr festhielt”.<sup>215</sup> On his return to Vienna Bruckner suddenly developed severe pleurisy,<sup>216</sup> remaining bedridden for much of the winter.

This was Bruckner’s most extended and serious illness so far, although again his convalescence alternated several times between sudden, marked improvement and partial relapse. Bruckner’s brother Ignaz was immediately telegraphed and came to Vienna from St. Florian; he remained with Bruckner for some six weeks assisting Bruckner’s housekeeper Kathi Kachelmayer.<sup>217</sup> The worst crisis passed quickly. A recently discovered postcard from Ignaz to his brother-in-law Johann Hueber dated Vienna, 1 January 1895<sup>218</sup> reports:

Herr Bruder hat sich schnell gebessert, jetzt haben wir Hoffnung. Die Doktoren staunen über die schnelle Besserung. Er ist schon mehrere Stunden auf, u[nd] darf schon Fleischspeisen essen. Einen Gruß von mir u.[nd] H:[errn] Bruder an Euch u[nd] alles Gute zum Neuen Jahr.

The following day Josef Schalk wrote to his brother: “In Bruckner’s Befinden ist leichte Besserung eingetreten, er ist unter strenger Überwachung einer Wärterin, welche Prof.

<sup>213</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 451.

<sup>214</sup> 1865–1937; priest, attended Bruckner’s university lectures. From 1890 doctor of theology at Vienna University; later abbot of Klosterneuburg.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 452; see also Neumayr, p. 303.

<sup>216</sup> “Rippenfellentzündung”, after Auer, following Heller (“Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, p. 23): “Ich lernte Bruckner kennen, als er im Jahre 1894 im Winter eine schwere Rippenfellentzündung überstanden hatte”; Neumayr, however (p. 315), merely speaks of a “Rippenfellerguß”.

<sup>217</sup> Göll.-A. p. 452. Kathi Kachelmayer (1846–1911; also ‘Kachelmayer’ or ‘Kachelmaier’) was Bruckner’s housekeeper from the time of his sister Maria Anna’s death until Bruckner’s death in 1896, remaining faithful to him throughout the difficult period of his final mental decline. Somewhat meanly, considering her years of devotion, Bruckner in his Will provided her with only the single payment of 400 and, providing she remained with him until his death, 700 Gulden. Sadly, she was to end her days in the mental asylum of Steinhof, but there continued to receive the generous financial support of Bruckner’s brother Ignaz until her death in 1911, two years before that of Ignaz. See Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 611.

<sup>218</sup> Copy courtesy of Dr. Maier of the Bruckner Institute. Reference to the correspondence was intended to be made in *IBG-Mitt* no. 36 (June 1991), presumably in the article “Neue Bruckneriana aus Privatbesitz”, pp. 6–13; however, the document is not mentioned there.

Schrödter [sic] ihm bestellt hat.”<sup>219</sup> A clue to Bruckner's initially rapid recovery can be found in Auer's remark to the effect that Schrötter permitted his assistant and colleague Dr. Richard Heller<sup>220</sup> to replace him on daily visits to Bruckner once the immediate danger was over.<sup>221</sup>

Bruckner's condition at this juncture obviously remained unstable for a protracted period of time; the long periods of bed rest can scarcely have been expected to have impacted favourably on his already weakened constitution. Early in the new year he contracted pneumonia<sup>222</sup> from which he again quickly recovered, though according to Kathi Kachelmayr the overall deterioration in his health was so serious this time that it would have been better had he not recovered at all.<sup>223</sup> Ill as he was, it is hardly surprising that Bruckner should have betrayed a lack of interest in the reports of further performances of his works during this time, as observed by both Dr. Josef Kluger and Anton Meißner.<sup>224</sup> Josef Schalk reports in a letter to his brother of 18 February<sup>225</sup> that: “Bruckners Siechtum zieht sich endlos dahin. An Abhilfe ist nicht zu denken. Er sitzt täglich von 4 bis 6 und  $\frac{1}{2}$  9 abends bis  $\frac{1}{2}$  12 Uhr im Lehnstuhl und darf jetzt wegen eingetretener Schwellung nur Milchkost geniessen.”

At about this time Schrötter passed Bruckner's monitoring and treatment over to his assistant Dr. Eisenmenger,<sup>226</sup> who reduced Bruckner's diet to milk foods and cocoa (for a time Bruckner lived solely on cocoa).<sup>227</sup> Around Easter, as his condition improved, Eisenmenger recommended to Bruckner that he have himself carried downstairs and back in order to spend time in the fresh air. To Bruckner's great regret he was forced to forego his customary Easter sojourn in St. Florian and the festivities planned there for the 50-year

<sup>219</sup> Quoted in Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*, p. 181.

<sup>220</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 453; this is Auer's first mention of Heller's name in the biography. Heller himself (“Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, p. 23) cites the beginning of his involvement with Bruckner from Winter 1894.

<sup>221</sup> Concerning the length and details of the illness, Auer maintains at one point that Bruckner did not leave his apartment after attending the performance of his Second Symphony on 25 November 1894 (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 499); not only is the date (correctly, 11 November) wrong, but as Auer had already recounted Bruckner playing the organ at Klosterneuburg at Christmas 1894 this is an obvious oversight, perhaps arising from a letter by Bruckner to Franz Bayer of 26 June 1895, in which the composer, himself forgetful, wrote that he did not leave his apartment between 11 November 1894 and Whitsunday 1895, i.e., 2 June (*ibid.*, p. 510). There are references on the foregoing pages to Dr. Eisenmenger (along with Richard Heller Dr. Schrötter's assistant during this period, later followed by Dr. Weißmayr) giving permission for the patient to be brought out into the fresh air.

<sup>222</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 503; further dates are not given. Ignaz was again contacted by telegram at this time, so obviously this must have been in February, if Auer's previous information concerning Ignaz's initial stay of six weeks from the collapse just after Christmas 1894 is accurate.

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>224</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 503ff. Bruckner's concern with performance would later revive: for instance in the letter of 14 April 1895 to Siegfried Ochs (Berlin), requesting performance of the F-minor Mass (*ibid.*, p. 510).

<sup>225</sup> F. Schalk, *Briefe und Betrachtungen*, p. 64.

<sup>226</sup> Later Hofrat, and as Auer notes (p. 508) personal physician to Franz Ferdinand, successor to the Austrian throne.

<sup>227</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 508.

anniversary of the Liedertafel 'Frohsinn', who had placed a plaque on the house in Ansfelden in which he was born. According to Auer, Bruckner was first able to leave his bed on 18 April 1895; however accurate this date may be, we can presume that the general period of Bruckner's incapacitation was indeed over by this time.<sup>228</sup>

#### 1.1.4 Bruckner's Will; relations with his 'disciples'.

Probably aware of the uncertainty in which his life stood, and apparently also concerned with the editorial activities of his disciples, especially Franz and Josef Schalk, who had begun to go far beyond the jurisdiction of nineteenth-century editorial practice in arranging and 'improving' his works, Bruckner had in his "Testament" of 10 November 1893 bequeathed the autograph MSS of his symphonies—"bisher acht an der Zahl, die Neunte wird, so Gott will, bald vollendet werden"—the three masses, the Quintet, the Te Deum, Psalm 150 and *Helgoland* to the Hofbibliothek, with the request that they be preserved and made available to publishers when necessary.<sup>229</sup> The musical significance of these specifications is noted by Franz Grasberger: "Die im Testament genannten Kompositionen bilden eine Werkgruppe, die Bruckner bei der Sichtung seines Gesamtschaffens in den letzten Lebensjahren voll anerkannt hat."<sup>230</sup> Neumayr has pointed out the psychological significance of these stipulations:

Wahrscheinlich trug zu diesem Entschluß aber auch eine "lebensnotwendige Egozentrik und Isoliertheit des sich seines künstlerischen Wertes voll bewußten Genies" bei. Seine Erfolge und Ehrungen der letzten Jahre stärkten sein Selbstbewußtsein und Eigenwertgefühl als Künstler sehr, wenngleich er im Umgang mit seiner Umwelt bescheiden blieb. Seine sichere Erkenntnis, "daß ich 'Wer' bin und meine Sachen von Bedeutung sind" zwang ihn deshalb zu Maßnahmen, seine Autographen angesichts der mangelnden Kompetenz seiner Geschwister in sicherer Obhut zu wissen.<sup>231</sup>

Furthermore,

All die Enttäuschungen und Niederlagen als Künstler ließen eigentlich nie Zweifel an sich selbst aufkommen, hatten aber insofern einen tiefen und weitgehenden Einfluß auf sein künstlerisches Schaffen, als sie Anlaß für seine so viel Zeit und Mühe in Anspruch nehmenden endlosen Revisionen waren.<sup>232</sup>

Ready (all too ready, some would say) to revise his own works on the advice of others, it is also understandable that Bruckner was less than delighted when his compositional authority

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 510.

<sup>229</sup> Cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 358ff., in particular pp. 360f.; also *Ges. Briefe* (Gräflinger), pp. 148ff. A detailed discussion of the legal dimensions of Bruckner's Testament has been made by Rolf Keller, "Die letztwilligen Verfügungen Anton Bruckners", *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 95–116. Cf. also Franz Grasberger, "Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe", pp. 531–534.

<sup>230</sup> "Anton Bruckners Arbeitsweise", p. 33.

<sup>231</sup> P. 300; no sources for the quotations are given.

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 291.

was blatantly abrogated by others. That Bruckner harboured misgivings against the Schalks and Ferdinand Löwe for their reinstrumentations of his scores appears likely: all three of them not only pressured Bruckner to alter his orchestral conception to better match the reigning tastes of the day but also, ultimately, went far beyond mere orchestral re-touchings to alter the conception and character of the music entirely at their own discretion.<sup>233</sup> Franz Schalk had apparently already exceeded Bruckner's tolerance in 1891 over the question of the published version of the Eighth Symphony,<sup>234</sup> a letter to Max von Oberleithner of 5 August 1891 confirming just how close to the wind both of them were sailing: "Wenn Bruckner bei einer Probe aus der geschriebenen Partitur mitlesen müsste, wären alle unsere guten Absichten vereitelt und wir würden uns statt seines Dankes vielleicht gar seinen Fluch verdienen."<sup>235</sup> In March 1893, presumably sometime after the operation to relieve the water retention, Bruckner gave vent to his depression and isolation from his friends in the letter to Göllicherich already quoted above, which continues in the words:

Ich fühle mich total verlassen! Niemand will kommen, oder höchst selten. Der Wagner-Verein ist ihnen alles! Selbst Oberleithner ist nur dort! H.[err] Schalk scheint ihn ins Garn gezogen zu haben. Schon vor Monaten hörte ich von Bekannten, daß Schalk meine 3. Messe aufführen will. Mir sagte ers erst vor Tagen.<sup>236</sup>

Leibnitz notes the "getrübtes Verhältnis"<sup>237</sup> that developed between Bruckner and Josef Schalk due to alterations made in the orchestration of the F-minor Mass, performed on 23 March 1893, at the final rehearsals for which Bruckner expressed his displeasure over Josef's re-orchestration in no uncertain terms, all participants being united in their indignation over what appeared to them to be the composer's unreasonable behaviour.<sup>238</sup> In the case of Franz Schalk's first performance of the Fifth in Graz in April 1894, Leibnitz claims pointedly that:

Josef und Franz Schalk täuschten Bruckner ganz bewußt, offenbar aber in subjektiv bester Absicht und mit gutem Gewissen. Sie ließen ihn in dem Glauben, seine eigene

---

<sup>233</sup> Leibnitz, *ibid.*, p. 126; see also Reinhard Rauner: "[Es] handelt [...] sich nicht nur um bloß geringfügige Eingriffe, sondern auch um teilweise nicht autorisierte Abänderungen der Autographen, die in Kürzungen und Änderungen der thematisch-harmonischen Substanz als auch in Uminstrumentierungen bestehen" (*Ferdinand Löwe: Leben und Wirken, I. Teil 1863–1900: Ein Wiener Musiker zwischen Anton Bruckner und Gustav Mahler*, Frankfurt am Main–Bern 1995, p. 79; quoted in "Neue Publikationen", *IBG-Mitt* 45 (Dec. 1995), p. 36.

Since this chapter was written, the doctoral thesis of Wolfgang Doebel, *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen: Die Konzepte der Bruckner-Schüler und ihre Rezeption bis zu Robert Haas* (Publikationen des Institutes für Österreichische Musikdokumentation 24, ed. Günter Brosche), Tutzing 2001, has appeared, which deals with far more detail with the complex of questions surrounding the first editions of the later symphonies.

<sup>234</sup> Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner* (Tutzing 1988), p. 191.

<sup>235</sup> Quoted by Leibnitz, "Josef Schalk: Ein Wagnerianer zwischen Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf", *BrJb* 1980, p. 126.

<sup>236</sup> Quoted in Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*, p. 175.

<sup>237</sup> "Joseph Schalk: Ein Wagnerianer zwischen Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf", *BrJb* 1980, p. 124.

<sup>238</sup> *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*, p. 177.

Fassung solle in Graz aufgeführt werden und teilten ihm die Tatsache der Bearbeitung nicht mit. Andererseits wünschten sie seine Anwesenheit bei der Aufführung. [...] Bruckner sollte vor vollendete Tatsachen gestellt werden und sich durch den Höreindruck und den Publikumserfolg von der Sinnhaftigkeit der 'verbessernden' Eingriffe überzeugen.<sup>239</sup>

Bruckner, of course, was not present at the performance, and replied to the good reports of its success with a particularly congratulatory letter to Franz the following day (12 April 1894).<sup>240</sup> Shortly after, however, Bruckner became suspicious that something may have been altered in the printed version of the F-minor Mass, which he had entrusted to Oberleithner, and upon whom Josef now enforced his own alterations, having a heated argument with both Josef and Oberleithner, reported by Josef to his brother in a letter of 24 May.<sup>241</sup>

Mit größtem Ungestüm forderte er seine Partitur zurück, die Oberleithner in Verwahrung hatte. Glücklicherweise ist die gedruckte Partitur noch nicht erschienen und bleibt nur zu hoffen, daß Bruckner inzwischen die Sache wieder vergißt, sonst giebt's [sic] einen Höllenskandal.

Fortunately for Josef, Bruckner appears never to have seen the printed score or, if he did, he never responded. Leibnitz summarises the attitude of the brothers in the following terms:

Bezüglich Bruckner vertraten die Brüder den gleichen Standpunkt: sie hielten die Bearbeitungen—ob mit oder ohne Wissen Bruckners—für notwendig; Bruckners Reaktion was auch für Franz die eines schwierigen alten Mannes, die nicht zu ernst genommen werden dürfe.<sup>242</sup>

Auer made the claim that Bruckner at some stage presented the autograph MSS of the completed first three movements to the visiting conductor Karl Muck,<sup>243</sup> at that time resident in Berlin, allegedly with the (presumably typically Brucknerian) remark, "daß nix g'schiacht dran!",<sup>244</sup> observing portentously that "Es müssen schwerwiegende Gründe gewesen sein, die

---

<sup>239</sup> P. 179.

<sup>240</sup> P. 190.

<sup>241</sup> Pp. 191f.

<sup>242</sup> P. 193. Elsewhere Leibnitz notes that Josef Schalk's "Weltanschauung [...] führte wohl dazu, daß Schalk Bruckner gegenüber als der Intellektuelle auftrat, der sich berufen fühlte, an das Werk eines (aus seiner Sicht) naiven Genies helfend Hand anzulegen"; indeed there existed in his personality a complex: "Nebeneinander von bedingungsloser und aufopferungsbereiter Gefolgschaft und eigenmächtigem Besserwissen. Unzweifelhaft aber sind die 'guten Absichten', die er sowohl mit seiner Propaganda wie mit seinen Eingriffen verfolgte" ("Josef Schalk: Ein Wagnerianer...", p. 125). See also Leibnitz, "'Francisce' und der 'Generalissimus': Die Brüder Schalk als Interpreten und Bearbeiter der Werke Bruckners", in: *BrSympBer 1994: Bruckner-Freunde, Bruckner-Kenner*, Linz 1997, pp. 88–94 *passim*.

<sup>243</sup> 1859–1940; known particularly for his performances of Wagner, Muck had been appointed principal Kapellmeister of the Berlin Opera in 1892.

<sup>244</sup> "Der Streit um den 'echten' Bruckner im Licht biographischer Tatsachen", *ZfM* 103 (1936), p. 539. The claim that Bruckner gave the score of the Ninth to Muck cannot be substantiated from other sources, however, and may have been confabulated by Auer and Muck; the question is discussed further in §1.2.3.

den Meister veranlaßten, die Handschrift aus Wien wegbringen zu lassen!”<sup>245</sup>—although, as we shall see (§1.2.3), this may have been confabulation on his part—while in the Göllicher-Auer biography he reports on the above-mentioned argument between Josef Schalk and Bruckner, proceeding to make explicit the implied connection between the matter of the score of the Ninth and Bruckner’s estrangement from the Schalks:

Von seinen musikalischen Freunden mochte er, wie Frau Kathi erzählt, nichts mehr hören. Er hatte sich einmal noch in der Heßgasse [Wohnung], bei einem Besuch Joseph Schalks und Dlahuys furchtbar aufgeregt. Sie kamen tags darauf nachfragen, ob es ihm doch nicht schlechter gehe. Kathi durfte nun nur mehr Meißner hereinlassen. Schalk und Löwe überhaupt nicht. Auch Hugo Wolf ließ er stets abweisen.

Wie mißtrauisch er jetzt gegen seine besten Freunde war, beweist auch der Umstand, daß er die Partitur der fertigen drei Sätze der Neunten später seinem treuen Freund Dr. Karl Muck zur Aufbewahrung übergab [...].<sup>246</sup>

The belief debated in the 1930s,<sup>247</sup> emphasised by Auer but qualified by Orel,<sup>248</sup> that Bruckner came to harbour grave misgivings against the Schalks and Löwe for their treatment of his scores, remains an issue upon which further research is required.<sup>249</sup> Auer’s notion that a serious and to all intents and purposes permanent break in relations occurred around May 1894 is not defensible.<sup>250</sup> That there were tensions and arguments in Bruckner’s relations with his erstwhile pupils, particularly in his later years, was understandable and generally symptomatic of the composer’s increasing mistrust of, and withdrawal from, his Vienna circle—against which outsiders such as the choral conductor Franz Xaver Bayer (Steyr), the pianist August Stradal, the conductor Karl Muck (then in Berlin) and first and foremost the devoted (and deeply religious) Anton Meißner, appear to have been given warmer welcomes.<sup>251</sup> Max von Oberleithner<sup>252</sup> testifies to Bruckner’s annoyance with Schalk and

---

<sup>245</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>246</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 527. Auer adds in a footnote that Joseph Schalk nonetheless reported several visits to Bruckner in letters to his brother Franz. Cf. also Franz Schalk, *Briefe und Betrachtungen*, ed. Lili Schalk, Vienna–Leipzig 1935, pp. 64ff. See also Göll.-A. IV/4, p. 38. Again, questions concerning the transmission history of the AP of the Ninth will be taken up in more detail in §1.2.3.

<sup>247</sup> Cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 526; Max Auer, “Der Streit um den ‘echten’ Bruckner”, p. 538.

<sup>248</sup> *DMK* 1 (1936–37), pp. 193–222 *passim*; see also his *Bruckner-Brevier...*, pp. 184f., particularly p. 185.

<sup>249</sup> See however, Doebel’s outstanding contributions to the debate in his *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen*, pp. 113ff.

<sup>250</sup> E.g. “Der Streit... (I)”, p. 543.

<sup>251</sup> The question is discussed at length by Thomas Leibnitz, *Anton Bruckner und die Brüder Schalk*, pp. 191ff. Eckstein explains Bruckner’s increasing social isolation in the words: “[...] ganz und gar verloren in das innere Weben zusammenklingender Stimmen, war er immer mehr und mehr allem abgestorben[,] was ihn von jener Welt hätte entfernen können” (“Die erste und letzte Begegnung zwischen Hugo Wolf und Anton Bruckner”, in: *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner*, p. 58).

<sup>252</sup> *Erinnerungen...*, p. 33.



Hugo Wolf; Stradal<sup>253</sup> notes that Löwe and the Schalks visited Bruckner less often in his last year; Meißner also reports that:

Gegen die Gebrüder Schalk und auch in gewissen Sinne gegen Löwe ist er mit zunehmenden Alter etwas mißtrauisch geworden. Besonders der nachmalige Operndirektor Franz Schalk, dem Bruckner übrigens für sein eifriges Eintreten zeitlebens dankbar blieb, erfreute sich im Grunde nicht seiner persönlichen Sympathie. [...] Vielleicht mögen dabei auch die unausgesetzten, sicher gutgemeinten Bemühungen des erfahrenen Dirigenten, ihm weitgehende Umänderungen und Striche in seinen Symphonien abzunötigen, eine Rolle gespielt haben.<sup>254</sup>

This is especially significant, as it was written independently of Auer by a non-professional musician who more than likely remained unaffected by the pro/contra polemics surrounding the first editions. But while the argument of May 1894 certainly represented a serious incident in Bruckner's relations with his pupils, the break was by no means as profound or permanent as Auer, writing in the early 1930s as one of the foremost proponents of the original autograph scores over the first editions, wanted to suggest. From Bruckner's letter to Josef letter of 6 October 1894 it is apparent that relations were again civil if not necessarily as cordial as they once were. In a letter to his brother dated 12 July 1895 Franz could report having made his first visit to Bruckner's new apartment.<sup>255</sup>

Hence, the anecdotal attestations by others such as Friedrich Klose or Orel as to the generally good relations between the composer and his erstwhile pupils are essentially plausible, even if in his last years Bruckner may have had grounds to feel abused by the extent of their editorial activities. Klose, called upon to offer an opinion about the original versions, stated categorically "daß ich in 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> Jahren meines Wiener Studienaufenthaltes, während dessen ich unzählige Abende im Kreise Bruckner–Löwe–Schalk verbrachte, niemals zwischen dem Meister und einem seiner einstigen Schüler wegen unerlaubter Eingriffe in die Partituren eine Mißstimmung erlebt habe".<sup>256</sup> It should not be overlooked, however, that Klose himself had little direct communication with Bruckner in his last years, nor was he a supporter of the 'Originalfassungen' in any case. Orel, similarly, in his "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner", concluded a recital of anecdotal attestations as to the strength of the Schalks' and

<sup>253</sup> "Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit", p. 1074. Stradal (*ibid.*, p. 1072) recounts a 'köstliche' anecdote regarding Löwe's sisters and Bruckner: as Bruckner became increasingly annoyed over delays in Löwe's preparation of a piano reduction, Löwe sent his sisters to explain his situation to Bruckner, who were greeted by Bruckner with the words: "Vor den Damen meine Hochachtung, vor den Schwestern des Löwe meine Mißachtung."

<sup>254</sup> "Aus den Aufzeichnungen Anton Meißners", ed. Viktor Keldorfer, *Die Furche: Jahrbuch 1947*, pp. 82f.

<sup>255</sup> Leibnitz, pp. 194f., 199; cf. Schalk, *Briefe und Betrachtungen*, p. 64 (quoted in §1.1.5 *infra*).

<sup>256</sup> "Zum Thema 'Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner'", *DMK 1* (1936–37), pp. 223; quoted also by Orel, *Bruckner-Brevier...*, p. 184.

Bruckner's relationship with the magnanimous but more probably simply politically astute pronouncement that: "Das Andenken dieser großen Bruckner-Apostel ist makellos".<sup>257</sup>

As substantiated (a) by Leibnitz' study of the relationship between the Schalks and Bruckner (already discussed), (b) by Korstvedt's study of the first edition of the Fourth,<sup>258</sup> and (c) by the fact that as late as October 1895 Bruckner intentionally had an AS of the first movement made by Meißner and permitted it to be given to Josef Schalk "zum Arrangement",<sup>259</sup> Bruckner, however diffident he may have been about details, seems to have continued to see his pupils' interest in the performance and publication of his works and their willingness to undertake the task of 'improving' his orchestration as necessary compromises subsidiary to the overriding issue of achieving a broader dissemination and greater acceptability for his music, services for which he was rightly grateful. That Bruckner accepted, even solicited, changes made in his works by others, and indeed built on them, as Röder has shown in the case of the Finale of the Third Symphony and Korstvedt with the first edition of the Fourth, can be shown with reasonable certainty: Bruckner accepted such interventions in the awareness that his music would not be performed or published otherwise; equally, he saw to it, in his correction and amendment of these reworkings, that the changes were as thoroughly musically 'correct' for him as was possible. Performance and publication of his works in whatever form that could be brought about was simply a higher priority than making such concessions, as contrary as they may seem to our own exclusive concepts of textual authenticity. He appears to have remained grateful for their efforts to the end. In July 1892, as Bruckner signed with the firm of Eberle, the firm's director Josef Stritzko reported Bruckner as having stated: "Wenn 'was nach meinem Tod herauskommen soll, so soll es durch die Hand von Löwe und Schalk gehen, oder sie sollen doch nichts dagegen haben."<sup>260</sup> That statement was, officially at least, never revoked.

The attempt has been made here to attempt to place in the perspective of contemporary reports the facts of Bruckner's relationship with his younger colleagues; the issue of

---

<sup>257</sup> *Bruckner-Brevier...*, p. 185. Mention must be made here of the logical difficulties encountered by Auer, Orel and Nowak in having to endorse the intentions of Schalks and Löwe while negating their actions. Auer attempts to impose the simplistic explanation that the original scores were simply too difficult for the orchestras of the time, an explanation which, however placatory, is completely inadequate to explain the nature and extent of the reworkings ("Der Streit... I", p. 1195 and again 1196): "Was die Schüler für ihren Meister [...] getan haben, war mehr Verdienst als Schuld." Nowak (*Anton Bruckner: Musik und Leben*, p. 89) expends considerable effort in explaining and justifying Löwe's retouchings. In *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 19 he again supports Löwe and Schalk.

<sup>258</sup> *The First Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception*, doctoral dissertation. See the dissertation abstract, in "Neue Publikationen", *IBG-Mitt* no. 46 (June 1996), pp. 37f. See also his article, "The First Published Edition of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity", *19th-Century Music* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1997), pp. 3–26.

<sup>259</sup> Cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 546: "4. Oktober 95: Die ersten 10 Bogen des ersten Satzes zum Arrangement erhalten. Joseph [i.e., Josef] Schalk", an entry in Bruckner's calendar, ÖNB Mus. Hs. 3179b, fol. 18<sup>r</sup>. This is cited by Orel in defence of the pupils' actions and Bruckner's apparent acquiescence in them (*Bruckner-Brevier...*, p. 185).

<sup>260</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 258.

Bruckner's authorisation of the first-edition scores, which in the 1990s returned to dominate particularly English-language Bruckner scholarship, will be touched upon again in §1.3.5. Pertinent here are comments made by Ingrid Fuchs in regard to the roles played in the late nineteenth century by composer and interpreter in relation to the work, an issue which adds a further layer of complexity to our understanding of Bruckner's often contradictory behaviour towards his 'disciples' and their editorial efforts. It should be borne in mind, she maintains:

daß sich in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts der Typus des modernen, mit großen Selbstbewußtsein ausgestatteten Dirigenten herausgebildet hat. Diese Dirigentengeneration sah sich meist nicht als Diener am Werk, sondern trat dem Komponisten sozusagen auf gleicher Ebene entgegen und glaubte, auch zu Eingriffen in das Werk nach persönlichem künstlerischen Empfinden berechtigt zu sein. Man sollte daher Bruckners zunehmende Konzessionsbereitschaft bei Aufführungen sowie sein devotes Verhalten gegenüber den Dirigenten auch in Zusammenhang mit der zeitbedingten Entwicklung des Verhältnisses zwischen Komponist und Dirigent sehen, dem Bruckner aufgrund seiner Persönlichkeitsstruktur nicht ganz gewachsen war.<sup>261</sup>

It should also be borne in mind that, from a modern perspective, the editorial interventions of Bruckner's assistants substantially compromised intrinsic elements of his musical style—precisely such elements—sharpness of contour in respect to dynamics and orchestration, uncompromising motivic and harmonic logic, etc.—which would subsequently be recognised as the true hallmarks of his compositional achievement, aspects stressed most recently by Wolfgang Doebel in his thesis *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen* (Tutzing 2001). As Dermot Gault pointed out,<sup>262</sup> Bruckner's largely young supporters—including those who edited his scores for their initial publication, Franz and Josef Schalk, Ferdinand Löwe, Max von Oberleithner, Cyrill Hynais and Gustav Mahler—were all enthusiastic proponents of the *Neudeutsche Schule* who tended to see Bruckner, rather than as the stylistically unique composer we now recognise, within the polarized musico-political spectrum of the time, as the Wagner cult's symphonic answer to Brahms' classicism. As a result, Bruckner's original scores tended to be regarded by the initial generation of his admirers as badly orchestrated Wagner rather than *sui generis* Bruckner.<sup>263</sup> Nor did Bruckner, in the 1890s, move closer toward the 'Wagnerised' style represented by the first-edition versions, whether expressly 'sanctioned', 'authorised' or otherwise, in his own personal, stylistic evolution; if anything the opposite is true. That speaks against the idea that Bruckner saw these collaborative publications as representing anything but a means to an end. Accordingly, whatever validity

---

<sup>261</sup> Ingrid Fuchs, "'Künstlerische Väter' und 'Vormünder'. Bruckner und die zeitgenössischen Dirigenten seiner Symphonien," in: *BrSympBer 1994. Bruckner-Freunde-Bruckner-Kenner*, Linz 1997, p. 77.

<sup>262</sup> "For Later Times", *MT*, June 1996, p. 14.

<sup>263</sup> Particular exception has to be taken to Korstvedt's claim (*Bruckner: Eighth Symphony*, p. 97) that Bruckner himself was a Wagnerian in the same way as the conductors he cites, and wrote his scores with the expectation that they would sound in performance like Wagner.

they may now possess as historical documents they still represent a qualitatively different form of musical text to that represented by the autographs. It remains understandable that Bruckner saw fit to concern himself with the preservation of his original MSS and that those MSS, as specified in his will, were to be made available to his publishers as required at future points in time. That single statement, as noted by Paul Hawkshaw,<sup>264</sup> probably remains the most significant indication of the longer-term role Bruckner intended his autographs to play.

### 1.1.5 The move to the Belvedere.

On 4 July 1895 Bruckner moved into what was to be his final residence, the *Kustodenstöckl* or lodge of Schloß Belvedere, a more convenient dwelling than Bruckner's fourth-floor apartment in the Heßgasse, and placed at his disposal as a 'grace and favour' apartment by the Emperor Franz Josef himself (no small honour)<sup>265</sup> at the instigation of Bruckner's mentor the Archduchess Marie Valerie and others with court connections.<sup>266</sup> Schrötter had already voiced concern in early 1895 over the difficult location of Bruckner's Heßgasse apartment, which made unassisted access for the invalid impossible.<sup>267</sup> At his suggestion Bruckner wrote in late January to Prince Liechtenstein concerning the possibility of obtaining an apartment from him on ground or mezzanine level.<sup>268</sup> This initial request proved unsuccessful.

From the late 1880s onwards, Anton Meißner (1862–1945) began to play a significant role as the composer's secretary and constant companion. Meißner studied theory with Bruckner in 1878/9 as a fellow student with Franz Schalk; he later attended Bruckner's University lectures.<sup>269</sup> We read further in Göllerich-Auer:

Anton Meißner, der das Musikstudium nur aus Liebhaberei neben seinem Hauptberuf der Handelswirtschaft betrieb, war ein streng gläubiger, katholischer Jüngling, den der Meister, der in der Großstadt sich von lauter Unglauben und Liberalismus umgeben sah, wegen seiner gleichen Lebenanschauung besonders ans Herz schloß. In den letzten Lebensjahren war ihm Meißner ein treuer Famulus und der Vertraute in religiösen Dingen. Über seine Studienzeit erzählte Meißner: [...] 'Gleich in den ersten Stunden befreundete er sich mit mir in herzlichster Weise und es wurde sofort das Verhältnis des

---

<sup>264</sup> "The Bruckner Problem Revisited," *19th-Century Music* 21, no. 1 (Summer 1997), pp. 96ff.

<sup>265</sup> The wording of the official decree can be found in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 512.

<sup>266</sup> Bruckner had played the organ in Ischl at the wedding of Marie Valerie on 31 July 1890 (Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 58f).

<sup>267</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 499.

<sup>268</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 499ff. Schrötter also attended Prince Liechtenstein, who owned numerous properties in Vienna. The letter itself was probably written by Meißner, as was the later petition addressed to Marie Valerie (see below).

<sup>269</sup> Göll.-A. IV/1, pp. 578f

Lehrers zum Schüler auf den Kopf gestellt, wie schon aus der Titulatur "Du, Antonius" hervorgeht.<sup>270</sup>

It was Meißner who first made the suggestion of the Belvedere apartment to Bruckner and who was ultimately instrumental in obtaining it for him, assisting him in writing a petition to Bruckner's mentor the Archduchess Marie Valerie which was passed on to the Emperor's daughter via the mediation of Bruckner's father confessor, the noted preacher and Jesuit father Heinrich Abel. The petition, in Meißner's best and most calligraphic hand, was dated 19 February 1895.<sup>271</sup>

Auer does not inform us, however, of the court's reaction to the letter to the Archduchess.<sup>272</sup> Partsch quotes from Meißner's memoirs an internal letter of Marie Valerie's lady-in-waiting the Baroness Maria Vecsey to Prince Hohenlohe in which, somewhat cynically, the point is made that the composer "hoffnungslos krank ist, u. eigentlich kaum mehr die Uebersiedlung erlebt". Partsch concludes: "Der Wortlaut des internen Schreibens zeigt deutlich die Einschätzung von Bruckners Gesundheitszustand in dieser Zeit. Die höfische Protektion wurde als reiner Formalakt angesehen."<sup>273</sup>

In assisting Bruckner with the move Meißner was also entrusted with the destruction of large amounts of MS material, probably including significant compositions and certainly substantial amounts of sk. material, which Bruckner had kept in his Heßgasse apartment, and now sifted through.<sup>274</sup> August Stradal reports that the second, room of this apartment was

ganz und gar leer und unbewohnt. Nur in einer Ecke häufte sich ein Stoß von Manuskripten, Zeitungen und Briefen zu mächtiger Höhe an. Hier lagen die Manuskripte seiner Symphonien und Messen, vermischt mit Briefen Levis, Nikischs, Richters etc. und Zeitungskritiken. [...] Leider ließ Bruckner im letzten Lebensjahre alles, was ihm nicht

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid.* Auer also notes that Meißner was most recently (presumably in the 1930s) employed as a office clerk with the Vienna metalwork firm of Salcher u. Söhne. See concerning Anton Meißner: Viktor Keldorfer, ed., "Erinnerungen an Bruckner", *Die Furche*, supplement *Die Warte* 2, no. 2 (1946), pp. 1–9; *idem*, "Anton Meisners [sic] Bruckner-Erinnerungen: Aus den Aufzeichnungen Anton Meisners", *Die Furche: Jahrbuch* 1947, pp. 78–87; Erich W. Partsch, "Anton Meißner, der letzte 'Sekretär' Bruckners", *BrJb* 1984–85–86, pp. 57–62; and Heinrich Salzer, "Erinnerungen an Anton Meißner: Nach den Erzählungen meines Vaters Josef Anton Salzer", *BrJb* 1984–85–86, pp. 63f. Schwanzara (e. g. p. 94) spells the name "Meihsner".

<sup>271</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 502. Meißner knew Abel; his name is raised previously in connection with a series of sermons given by Abel at the Augustinerkirche in March 1891 at which Bruckner, at the request of Anton Meißner, was asked to improvise (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 148). See also "Aus den Aufzeichnungen Anton Meisners", ed. Viktor Keldorfer, *Die Furche: Jahrbuch* 1947, pp. 84f.

<sup>272</sup> A facsimile of the letter is reproduced by E. W. Partsch, "Anton Meißner, der letzte 'Sekretär' Bruckners", *BrJb* 1984–85–86, pp. 60.

<sup>273</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59. Bruckner was initially (in an internal memo of the Belvedere administration of 15 May) granted the apartment for the duration of the summer only. Not until 9 August was this extended, decreeing "daß dem Profeßor [sic] Dr. Anton Bruckner die bisherige Wohnung im Belvedere in so lange zu belassen sein wird, als er selbe [sic] zu benützen gedenkt" (quoted in *ibid.*, p. 60).

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 512. Friedrich Eckstein (*Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*, Vienna 1924, pp. 8f.) also writes of the immense piles of MSS heaped in the bedroom of Bruckner's Heßgasse apartment; a similar observation by Wilhelm Zinne is found in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 250.

wichtig erschien, verbrennen. So gingen viele Jugendkompositionen, Entwürfe der Symphonien, wichtige Briefe von Dirigenten, Zeitungsausschnitte verloren.<sup>275</sup>

Bruckner's scores were carefully ordered and packed prior to the move,<sup>276</sup> and it is significant in connection with this that Meißner recorded for Bruckner pertinent details concerning the location of the MSS on a page of Bruckner's calendar (see Facs. C/340), noting: "Mir fehlt: I die Originalpartitur der F. Messe/ II Die Partitur der F-Messe[,] die zum Druck verwendet worden ist/ III Die Partitur der V. Symphonie, die jetzt zum Druck verwendet wird./ IV die Partitur des 'Helgoland'."<sup>277</sup> Meißner subsequently made memoranda of such details as that the score of the F-minor mass had been given away immediately after the performance, "wahrscheinlich vom Verleger abgeholt",<sup>278</sup> information obtained "L[au]t. Meldung vom Prof. Schenner 9. Mai 1895", but there are further notes in Bruckner's hand stretching back to November 1894 concerning scores and items on loan,<sup>279</sup> so it can be seen that the arrangements for the proper preservation of his MSS had occupied Bruckner's mind for some time. Auer observed: "Mehrere Aufzeichnungen beweisen, daß Bruckner in klarer Voraussicht der Gefahr, in der er schwebte, seine Manuskripte in Ordnung brachte, seine Wertsachen in die Hände Meißners, seines Vertrauten, legte und viel mit seinem Rechtsfreund und Testamentsvollstrecker, Dr. Theodor Reisch [...] verkehrte."<sup>280</sup> An entry from November 1894 also records the binding of the scores of several symphonies.<sup>281</sup>

By July 1895 Meißner could finally record that a number of autographs—among them, however, the complete scores of only the First (both versions) and Fifth Symphonies and the Quintet—had been placed in a "gesiegelten Paquet". The other contents specified are a movement of the "annullierte" second symphony in D minor (WAB 99), the Finale and Adagio (minus several bifols.) of the 'old' version of the Third, both old and new versions of the Scherzo of the Eighth, and the Scherzo and Finale of the Sixth.<sup>282</sup> Significantly, no mention is made of the first three movements of the Ninth.<sup>283</sup> It may be assumed that these

---

<sup>275</sup> "Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit", *ZfM* no. 10 (Oct. 1932), pp. 854f. Cf. Nowak: "Für den Umzug mußte Meißner im Beisein Bruckners auch die zahlreichen Manuskripte durchsehen und jene, die Bruckner der Mitnahme nicht wert hielt, verbrennen. Bei dieser 'Säuberung' sind viele Niederschriften Bruckners zugrunde gegangen, die uns wertvollen Einblicke in des Meisters Entwicklung und die Entstehung einzelner Werke gegeben hätten" (*Anton Bruckner: Musik und Leben*, p. 270). Cf. also W. Partsch, "Anton Meißner...", p. 59.

<sup>276</sup> "Der Streit...", p. 541.

<sup>277</sup> Also in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 544.

<sup>278</sup> *Ibid.* See the account of the eventual recovery of this MS in §1.2.8.

<sup>279</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 543.

<sup>280</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 542

<sup>281</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 543.

<sup>282</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 545.

<sup>283</sup> See concerning the transmission of the first three movements of the Ninth, §1.2.3.

works would have remained among the “diverse Originalmanuskripte, Kopiatoren und Drucke von Bruckners Kompositionen” cited but not detailed, in the official *Nachlaßaufnahme*.<sup>284</sup>

Shortly before the move to the Belvedere Bruckner wrote to his sister Rosalie Hueber in Vöcklabruck: “Ich werde besser, aber werde nicht mehr so gesund, wie früher.—Bald ziehe ich ins k. k. Belvedere. Wird mir alles nachgeschickt.”<sup>285</sup> Bruckner entrusted his most precious possessions to Meißner during the move, which Meißner organised. The new apartment consisted of four larger and five smaller rooms of which the large, well-lit main room, with its impressive view over the Belvedere park and city of Vienna, served Bruckner as bedroom, study and living room, accommodating his bed, the ancient Bösendorfer grand piano that had accompanied him throughout his career, his writing desk, armchair and other furniture.<sup>286</sup> The entry room served Bruckner as both wardrobe and bathroom and was also the day room of his housekeeper Kathi Kachelmayr.<sup>287</sup> From here, Bruckner had access to the main park of the Belvedere where he took daily walks accompanied by ‘Frau Kathi’, and was given the key to the private botanic garden on the other side of the lodge. From his front door he had only a few steps to the chapel of the Belvedere, where he could attend daily mass.<sup>288</sup> Although a brief period of ill-health is noted later in July,<sup>289</sup> Bruckner was in good spirits and tolerably good health, his new, comfortable situation, as Auer wrote, “übte anfangs sehr wohltätig auf sein Befinden ein. Bruckner lebte förmlich auf [...]”.<sup>290</sup> Josef Schalk, one of the first to visit Bruckner in his new apartment, could write to his brother on 12 July with the words: “Bruckner, den ich gestern in seinem neuen Heim in Belvedere besuchte, ist ziemlich wohl, wenn auch recht schwach.”<sup>291</sup>

---

<sup>284</sup> Alfred Orel, “Anton Bruckners Nachlaß”, p. 123. Further discussion see again ch. 1.2.

<sup>285</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 513ff.

<sup>286</sup> Bruckner’s pedal harmonium, offered initially to Heller, was later given to Dr. Schrötter; cf. “Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, pp. 28f., as well as a touching letter written by Bruckner to Schrötter dated only May 1895, in which Bruckner requests Schrötter accept the gift of the instrument. This concludes: “Die eine Bitte erlauben mir Hochderselbe mich vor dem Schmerze einer Ablehnung bewahren zu wollen, da eine Verweigerung zur Gesundheit gewiß nicht dienlich sein könnte” (new edition of Bruckner’s letters, GA vol. 24/2; in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>287</sup> A plan of the apartment, to which Auer refers (p. 511) was omitted from the biography, presumably an oversight. According to information supplied by Dr. Elisabeth Maier the apartment is still rented out as a domicile by the City of Vienna; a ‘Gedenktafel’ marks it as Bruckner’s last apartment, but efforts to have it made into a Bruckner museum have so far proven unsuccessful.

<sup>288</sup> Subsequently chided by the priest for his loud and ostentatious manner of praying in the small chapel, however, Bruckner took umbrage and from then on had himself driven into the city every Sunday to attend mass at the Michaelerkirche (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 524).

<sup>289</sup> See Bruckner’s letters to Franz Bayer of 9 (quoted in §1.1.9 *infra*) and 22 July, Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 517f.

<sup>290</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 514.

<sup>291</sup> F. Schalk, p. 64.

Not only was Bruckner's financial situation now secure, but a comfortable and even prestigious accommodation reassured him. Citing the Kustodenstöckl apartment as "den Gipfel des Wohnkomforts", Manfred Wagner writes cynically, though not without truth, that:

Diese Adresse, bis heute zum Nonplusultra des Wiener Wohnungskomforts zählend, beweist, daß Bruckner auch in dieser immer als unwichtig abgetanen Frage sein Ziel der Etablierung in den obersten Luxusebenen durchgesetzt hatte.<sup>292</sup>

### 1.1.6 The beginning of work on the Finale.

The first reference to any work on the Finale appears in Bruckner's hand in the calendar notice: "24. Mai 895. 1.<sup>mal</sup> Finale neue Scitze [sic]"<sup>293</sup> (see Facs. C/340), and that serious work on the Finale began in May 1895 and not before is corroborated by a letter of 13 May 1895 from Josef Schalk to his brother Franz: "N. B. Bruckner hat sich auffallend erholt u. gedenkt in diesen Tagen das Finale der IX. in Angriff zu nehmen."<sup>294</sup> The first date to be found in the *sks.* themselves is "8. Juni" as will be discussed below (§1.1.10); that, as claimed by Heller and Auer,<sup>295</sup> composition of the movement only began following the move into the Belvedere, is not strictly true as the June dating, almost a month before the eventual move, already appears on fol 5. of the *sks.* Bruckner therefore appears to have begun in earnest on the *pc. sks.* in late May, and may already have commenced work on the orchestral score immediately following the move. Moreover, as already mentioned, it should be borne in mind that the conceptualisation of the movement had already begun years before: Bruckner probably had a clear idea of the overall character of the movement, its principal thematic material, the Hauptthema, chorale and use of the Te Deum motive long before May 1895. A newspaper report from Steyr, dated 14 July 1895,<sup>296</sup> makes the following apparently informed statement:

Dr. Anton Bruckner hat nun die Wohnung, die ihm von Hofe im Belvedere zu Wien eingeräumt wurde, bezogen. Der greise Componist befindet sich ziemlich wohl und arbeitet an der Fertigstellung seiner 'Neunten.' Drei Sätze sind bereits vollendet und auch

---

<sup>292</sup> "Bruckner in Wien...", p. 21.

<sup>293</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 512; twice confirmed, pp. 544 and 612; the location of the original is the ÖNB, Mus. Hs. 3179b, fol. 13<sup>r</sup>. The date is incorrectly quoted by Manfred Wagner, *BrLWD*, p. 209, as "24. Mai '894", which would appear to have been used as a source by Gülke (*Brahms—Bruckner*, p. 139). In the copy of the original page of the calendar, reproduced courtesy of Dr. Elisabeth Maier, the figures '895' are unmistakable. According to Gülke (*ibid.*) "neue Scitze" implies that "da muß also eine 'alte Scitze' schon vorausgegangen sein", but there is no evidence to suggest this, and the clarity of the wording "1.<sup>mal</sup> Finale" overrides any questionable interpretation of "neue".

The incorrect date of 1894 is also cited in Jürgen Sachs, "Entstehungs- und Aufführungsdaten der Messen, des Te Deum und der Symphonien Anton Bruckners", *BrJb* 1989–90, p. 274.

<sup>294</sup> Franz Schalk, *Briefe und Betrachtungen*, p. 64. Cf. Thomas Leibnitz, p. 199.

<sup>295</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 526, based on Heller's observation: cf. Auer, "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt," p. 25.

<sup>296</sup> *Der Alpenbote* 41 no. 56 (14 July 1895), p. 4.



zu dem vierten, der eines der bedeutendsten Tonwerke Bruckners zu werden verspricht, liegen schon die Entwürfe vor.

### 1.1.7 The projected opera.

From May 1895 dates also the last round of correspondence with the Berlin writer Gertrude Bollé, an exchange significant for the light it throws upon Bruckner's health, his progress on the Ninth and future plans at that time.

Surprising as the idea of an opera by Bruckner may seem, Friedrich Eckstein,<sup>297</sup> recording an (alleged) first meeting between Bruckner and Hugo Wolf on Fronleichnamstag (Corpus Christi) of 1885,<sup>298</sup> notes that:

Bruckner war nämlich damals gerade aufs eifrigste bemüht, für eine Oper ein geeignetes Buch zu finden, und ich erinnere mich noch ganz genau, wie ich alle die vielen Bücher und Texte, die er zugeschickt bekam, für ihn lesen mußte. Das meiste war durchaus unbrauchbar, nur zwei Bücher kamen meiner Erinnerung nach überhaupt in Betracht: das eine hieß, wenn ich mich nicht irre, 'Ingo', ich habe vergessen, wer der Verfasser gewesen ist, das andere war eine 'Libussa' von Christian v. Ehrenfels; aber auch diese beiden Dichtungen erwiesen sich später bei näherem Studium als ungeeignet für die Komposition.

Five years later, we read in a report by Michael Maria Rabenlechner<sup>299</sup> of a University lecture in December 1890,<sup>300</sup> the following passage:

'Meine Herren Akademiker'—begann er plötzlich, indem er in seine musiktheoretischen Prinzipien Erinnerungen an sein eigenes Schaffen einflocht, 'ich habe auch die Absicht, in naher Zeit mich an eine Oper zu machen, vielleicht könnte mir dann einer der Herren Akademiker einen recht schönen Text verfassen!'<sup>301</sup>

In a passage which curiously does not appear to have been carried over into the major Göllerich-Auer biography, Auer observes in the one-volume biography:<sup>302</sup>

<sup>297</sup> 1861–1939; publicist, philosopher and industrialist, studied with Bruckner from 1880 at the Conservatorium and from 1884 privately, assisting Bruckner financially in the publication of the *Te Deum*. Several books and articles recounting memoirs of the composer. See Max Schönherr, "Wer war Friedrich Eckstein?", *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 163–172.

<sup>298</sup> "Die erste und letzte Begegnung zwischen Hugo Wolf und Anton Bruckner", in: *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner*, ed. Karl Kobald, pp. 44–59; ensuing quote p. 54. See also Günter Brosche, "Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf", p. 175, according to whom it is not clear as to whether or not Wolf had previously been a student of Bruckner's at the Conservatorium.

<sup>299</sup> According to Auer, actually a student of philosophy, who merely happened to be present at the lecture.

<sup>300</sup> The date is given (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 106) only as shortly before the performance of the Third Symphony (in a philharmonic concert in the Musikverein, under Hans Richter) on 21 December.

<sup>301</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 109.

<sup>302</sup> *Bruckner* (1934), pp. 331f.; emphasis original.

Auch früher schon tauchten Opernpläne auf; so trug sich Bruckner kurze Zeit mit der Absicht, eine Oper "*Ekkehard*" nach Scheffels gleichnamiger Dichtung zu schreiben. Dieser Stoff enthielt eben jede Bedingungen, ohne welche er sich zur Komposition einer Oper überhaupt nicht hätte entschließen können: eine *Jagdszene* und eine *Kirchenszene* mit Orgelspiel.

Mit Rücksicht auf diese Wünsche hat für ihn auch ein begeisterter Verehrer und Freund, Dr. Franz Schaumann, ein Libretto mit dem Titel: "*Die Bürgerreuth*" verfaßt. Diese enthielt jedoch eine Szene, welche Bruckner aus religiösen Gründen nicht gelten lassen wollte.

As so often the case, no source nor even any indication of approximate date is given for the episode; it is merely apparent from the context that it occurred prior to 1893. A further indication of Bruckner's interest in following in the footsteps of his idol Wagner can be found in the following passage, from a conversation with Bruckner reported during a visit to Admont in mid-September 1891:<sup>303</sup>

Dann sprach er von der 'Neunten', daß sie die letzte Symphonie sein soll—auch wie Beethoven in D-moll und er dann zum dramatischen Schaffen übergehen wolle. Einen ihm zusagenden Text hatte er noch nicht gefunden. Grundzug des Werkes sollte der des Mystischen sein, eine nach Erlösung sich sehrende Menge, welcher endlich der Erlöser und Befreier erscheint, etwa der geheimnisvolle Geist von Wagners 'Lohengrin' oder 'Parsifal'.

Gertrude Bollé had met Bruckner in Vienna 1887 and, on the basis of several conversations with him, had learned of his interest in writing an opera once the Ninth was completed, but she also bore the brunt of his amusement when she made the offer of writing him a libretto herself.<sup>304</sup> Using the *nom-de-plume* G. Bollé-Hellmund, so as to keep her female identity secret from the chauvinist Bruckner,<sup>305</sup> she subsequently wrote to the composer in early September 1893 with the offer of a libretto for his composition; in Bruckner's reply of 5 September from his summer retreat in Steyr we read the following:

---

<sup>303</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 176. Similarly in vol. IV/2, pp. 30, the M. D. and later Professor Alexander Fränkel reported: "Daß die Neunzahl seiner Symphonien eine beabsichtigte Analogie mit Beethoven war, kann ich gleichfalls bezeugen, —er hat mirs ausdrücklich gesagt, daß er dießbezüglich Beethoven gleich tun wolle. Eine Oper zu komponieren lag durchaus nicht außerhalb seiner Absichten für die Zukunft; nur um den Stoff war er besorgt, ein Textbuch mit einem 'mystischen Helden wie Lohengrin' hätte er sich gewünscht."

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 350. Not unlike the Pan-Germanist Josef Schalk, Bollé appears to have been another individual of pointedly anti-Semitic tendencies with whom Bruckner associated and who—as we read in a letter of Bollé's dated 15 January 1894 to Franz Bayer concerning critiques of Bruckner's works in Berlin (Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 378ff.)—saw the advancement of his music within a real or imagined political dimension: "Wir müssen gegen das Judentum, das demoralisierende Gesippe der Deutscheinde, rücksichtslos vorgehen, sonst ersticken wir in Unkraut!" (p. 379); "Wir haben die Absicht, diesen Winter noch ein Bruckner-Konzert zu schaffen, womöglich—es wird Kampf kosten 'gegen die Anti-Germanen'—aber desto besser" (pp. 380f.).

<sup>305</sup> See *ibid.*, p. 345f. Bollé also knew about Bruckner's patronising attitude to women from the experience of a female Viennese friend, who had requested of Bruckner an opinion on her songs.

Auf Befehl der Ärzte muß ich jetzt ganz ausruhen. Dann gedenke ich meine neunte Symphonie ganz fertig auszucomponieren, wozu ich fürchte 2 Jahre zu brauchen. Lebe ich dann noch und fühle die nöthige Kraft, dann will ich herzlich gerne an ein dramatisches Werk gehen.

Wünschte mir dann eins à la Lohengrin, rom.[antisch,] religiös-misteriös und besonders frei von allem Unreinen!<sup>306</sup>

Following a further letter from Bollé, Franz Bayer wrote on the 21st of the same month from Steyr with apologies that Bruckner was too ill to proceed with further negotiations at that stage.<sup>307</sup> Bollé, who had meanwhile proceeded with the composition of a libretto entitled *Astra* based on the popular novel *Die Toteninse*<sup>308</sup> by Richard Voss, again instigated correspondence in May of 1895, receiving via Meißner the following reply:

Leider ist der Meister noch immer nicht im Vollbesitze seiner Gesundheit und ist vor allem noch der letzte Satz der 9. Symphonie zu vollenden; Dr. Bruckner hat seit Dezember vorigen Jahres nichts gearbeitet und war diesen Winter sehr übel daran. Gott sei Dank, daß es jetzt besser geht, und vielleicht die frische Luft wohltätig auf den ganzen Organismus einwirkt. Meinem Ermessen nach könnten Sie das Libretto [...] einsenden, doch, wie gesagt, ist an die Komposition vorläufig nicht zu denken.<sup>309</sup>

The last sentence is possibly significant, as it perhaps suggests Meißner saw some hope of improvement in Bruckner's condition. A final letter of 6 July in Meißner's hand, following the receipt of Bollé's libretto, notes that Bruckner "[...] arbeitet, jedoch sehr wenig, an der Vollendung seiner neunten Symphonie, welches Werk noch geraume Zeit in Anspruch nehmen wird [...]"<sup>310</sup> noting furthermore that the libretto was unlikely to have been suitable, were Bruckner to live to even consider its composition. It is apparently therewith that any discussion of an opera by Bruckner appears to have concluded.

### 1.1.8 Heller's recollections concerning the Finale.

From early 1895 to the time of the composer's death, Dr. Richard Heller, among Weismayr, Schrötter and later Sorgo, was the most personally significant of the doctors to have attended Bruckner in the last years of his life. While Heller's account of Bruckner's medical treatment was extensively used by Neumayr, his recollections of Bruckner's last months, published by Auer in 1924, must be regarded as the most important and detailed source not merely of

<sup>306</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 344f.; also in *Ges. Briefe* (Auer), p. 276.

<sup>307</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 352f.; full text in *Ges. Briefe* (Gräflinger), p. 13. A subsequent letter by Bollé to Franz Bayer is quoted in fn. 304 *supra*.

<sup>308</sup> The Isle of the Dead was a popular German romantic topos—one need only recall Böcklin's painting which inspired numerous compositions, among them the eponymous tone poems Op. 128 of Max Reger and Op. 29 of Sergei Rachmaninov.

<sup>309</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 531; also in *Ges. Briefe* (Gräflinger), p. 13.

<sup>310</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 531f.

biographical but also of musical information, his knowledge of music rendering him a reliable recipient for statements which Bruckner may not have had opportunity to communicate to his music-professional contacts. The following passage from Heller's account of Bruckner's last months is highly significant and quoted here in its entirety:

‘Sehen Sie, nun habe ich bereits zwei irdischen Majestäten Symphonien gewidmet, dem armen König Ludwig und unserem erlauchten Kaiser, als die höchste irdische Majestät, die ich erkenne, und nun widme ich der Majestät aller Majestäten, dem lieben Gott, mein letztes Werk und hoffe, daß er mir noch so viel Zeit gönnen wird, es zu vollenden, und meine Gabe gnädig aufnimmt. Ich habe auch deshalb vor, das Allelujah (wollte wahrscheinlich Tedeum sagen) des zweiten Satzes\* mit aller Macht wieder im Finale zu bringen, damit die Symphonie mit einem Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott endet.’

Und dann setzte er sich an das Klavier und spielte mir mit zitternden Händen, aber richtig und mit voller Kraft, Partien daraus vor.

Oftmals habe ich bedauert, musikalisch nicht so weit gebildet zu sein, um einmal Gehörtes wiederspielen oder niederschreiben zu können, denn dann wäre es mir möglich gewesen, vielleicht den Schluß der Neunten Symphonie zu skizzieren.

Da er damals recht schwach war, bat ich ihn öfters, die Symphonie in den Hauptgedanken niederzuschreiben, er war aber nicht dazu zu bewegen.

Seite für Seite komponierte er die ganze instrumentale Durchführung und ich glaube, einige seiner Äußerungen dahin deuten zu müssen, daß er in seinen Ideen gewissermaßen mit dem lieben Gott einen Kontrakt abgeschlossen habe. Wenn der liebe Gott will, daß er die Symphonie, die ja ein Preislied Gottes sein sollte, fertigmache, so müsse er ihm ebensolange das Leben schenken, stürbe er früher, so hat sich das der liebe Gott selber zuzuschreiben, wenn er ein unvollendetes Werk bekommt.<sup>311</sup>

It should be stressed that, rather than paraphrasing the passage to some extent as was his usual procedure, Auer reproduces Heller's memoirs here *ipsissima verba*<sup>312</sup> including Heller's attempted clarification in brackets of the word ‘Allelujah’, itself significant, and footnotes the reference to an ‘Allelujah of the second movement’ by specifying “Trio der Achten Symphonie mit Anklängen an das Te Deum”. Presumably Auer implies by this the phrase appearing at m. 25 of that movement, as will be discussed later.<sup>313</sup> On the other hand, the citation of this passage in the Göllerich-Auer biography<sup>314</sup> represents Auer's rewording of Heller's text, and significantly—probably more out of a sense of piety than for reasons of space—he omits the paragraphs beginning “Oftmals habe ich bedauert [...]” and “Da er damals recht schwach war [...]” and recasts the foregoing paragraph in the perhaps misleading words: “Oftmals setzte er sich ans Klavier und spielte mir mit schwachen zitternden Händen

<sup>311</sup> Quoted from “Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, p. 26. Quoted also in AP, E/142.

<sup>312</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 23: “Im Folgenden seien die mir freundlich zur Verfügung gestellten Erinnerungen Dr. Hellers mit seinen eigenen Worten erstmalig mitgeteilt.”

<sup>313</sup> See §3.3.7.

<sup>314</sup> Vol. IV/3, p. 526, where the elision is indicated by three dashes.

Partien aus derselben und speziell aus Teilen, die er noch nicht zu Papier gebracht, vor.”<sup>315</sup> Nevertheless the corrupted version contained in the biography is that usually recurring in quotations<sup>316</sup> and, not surprisingly, the full significance of Heller’s account has until now been overlooked.

Remembering that this is an eyewitness account from one trained as a careful observer, who furthermore appears to have been quite musical, and attempting to recapture some of his train of thought, the following conclusions may be drawn, the significance of aspects of which will become apparent later in discussion of the Aufführungsfassung in §3.3.7.

- i. Bruckner appears to have had a clear idea in his mind of the end of the work, which apparently was to use an “Allelujah des zweiten Satzes”, significantly a theme or phrase extrinsic to the thematic material of the Finale itself. While no date is given by Heller, it may be significant that this is placed early in Heller’s account, just after mention is made of the move to the Belvedere. Accordingly, the incident Heller describes is perhaps more likely to have occurred early in the composition of the movement; *ergo* the conclusion of the movement was clear to Bruckner at that stage, sufficiently so for Heller to have believed it possible to have sketched the conclusion of the symphony from what Bruckner played to him.
- ii. Heller appears in this report to have preserved Bruckner’s words quite accurately, placing his own attempted clarification in parentheses. Heller’s reference to the Te Deum (“wollte wahrscheinlich Tedeum sagen”) probably implies that the end of the Finale as Bruckner played it to him was similar enough in sound to suggest the Te Deum as an explanation of what the composer meant by the cryptic expression “Allelujah des zweiten Satzes”, which Heller appears to have passed on faithfully, although without really understanding himself. Auer’s attempted elucidation in the footnote—that the reference was to the second movement of the Eighth rather than the Ninth, presumably implying the phrase occurring at letter C (m. 25) of the Trio of the Eighth Symphony—is probably a reasonable supposition, given that little or nothing resembling any “Allelujah”-like motive appears in the Scherzo of the Ninth.<sup>317</sup> Significantly, the phrase is different enough to militate against the possibility that Heller heard the end of the Finale simply as a reference to the Te Deum; it is possible that an accompaniment texture incorporating the string figuration of the Te Deum motive prompted Heller’s parenthesis.
- iii. Bruckner seems to have been unwilling to sketch the main themes, at least at the early stage of composition that the related encounter took place, even, apparently,

---

<sup>315</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>316</sup> Cf. Ruzicka, p. 140; or L. Nowak, *Anton Bruckner. Musik und Leben*, Vienna–Munich 1964, p. 86.

<sup>317</sup> See in reference to this the more extended discussion of the Allelujah motive in §3.3.7.

the theme of the end of the coda; the remainder appears on paper in any case, obviating Heller's request. This would appear to provide oblique evidence that Bruckner composed in order of musical form rather in the order in which inspiration came to him.<sup>318</sup>

- iv. Heller writes of Bruckner as composing directly to score—as the words “die ganze instrumentale Durchführung” probably mean, inevitably involving numerous page turns (“Seite für Seite...”). He continues as if implying that this had some connection with Bruckner's concern about finishing the work. The Ninth was for Bruckner his great remaining life task. He prayed to live as long as required to finish it—yet the conclusion of the task would also have meant the end of his life.

### 1.1.9 Bruckner's devotional life and state of health.

Much has been made of the fact that Bruckner's religious devotions in the last two years of his life seem to have taken on an increasingly obsessional character.<sup>319</sup> Neumayr, who makes an extensive discussion of this aspect of Bruckner's life in his last months,<sup>320</sup> notes:

War er in Erfüllung seiner religiösen Pflichten schon immer äußerst genau [...] so ging er nun über den bloßen Pflichtgedanken hinaus. Immer ließ er sich zur Kirche tragen oder fahren. Eine besondere Stellung nahmen der Rosenkranz und seine Gebetsaufzeichnung ein, wobei hier allerdings eine für die zweite Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts typische allgemeine Frömmigkeit mit in die Betrachtungen einbezogen werden muß.<sup>321</sup>

And further:

Es besteht kein Zweifel, daß Bruckner in religiösen Belangen zwangsneurotische Züge aufwies, die man in der Medizin mit dem Ausdruck Skrupulose umschreibt, und in der Tat sind es ja vor allem die katholischen Seelsorger, die im Umgang mit Skrupulanten auf eine jahrhundertlange Erfahrung zurückblicken können. Bestimmender Faktor war für Bruckner seine enorme Unsicherheit, die in diesem Falle die Religion betraf und die er als tiefgläubiger Christ besonders ernst nahm.<sup>322</sup>

As Leopold Kantner has pointed out,<sup>323</sup> one cannot arrive at an accurate picture of this aspect of Bruckner's character by eliminating the influence of the times in which he lived, as such (for us) extreme religious observances were in the late nineteenth century considered

<sup>318</sup> See concerning Bruckner's compositional technique, ch. 3.1.

<sup>319</sup> Cf. the references concerning Bruckner's 'numeromania' in §2.1.5.

<sup>320</sup> Pp. 303f.

<sup>321</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 303.

<sup>322</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 304. Manfred Wagner makes reference to Bruckner's *Zählzwang* and “conscientia skrupulosa” in “Bruckners Sinfonie-Fassungen...”, p. 21.

<sup>323</sup> Leopold M. Kantner, “Die Frömmigkeit Anton Bruckners”, in: *Anton Bruckner in Wien: Eine kritische Studie zu seiner Persönlichkeit (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 2*, ed. Franz Grasberger), Graz 1980, pp. 229–278 *passim*; also in: *ME* 40 (1986), pp. 61–73 *passim*.

quite 'normal', and were indeed expressly encouraged by the religious authorities of the time. Erwin Horn<sup>324</sup> notes that:

Bruckners 'Zählzwang' auch und besonders in religiösen Dingen, wird gerne als die bedenklichste Eigenheit dieses insgesamt denkwürdigen Menschen gehandelt. Was da so extraordinär erscheint, relativiert sich fast zum Gewöhnlichen, wenn es nach Regeln gemessen wird, wie sie vor hundert Jahren üblich waren. Eine systematisierte Frömmigkeit verlangte vom christkatholischen Menschen wohlsortierte und abgezählte Gebetsleistungen, wollte er sich seiner ewigen Glückseligkeit sicher sein. [...] Bruckners numerische Sorgfalt verdient keinen Spott; suspekt ist nur die kirchliche Akribie, mit der eine derartige Kasuistik durchdacht und durchgesetzt wurde.

Heller also notes the diligence with which Bruckner prayed as well as the often unusual form of his prayers, observing:

Er betete eine Anzahl 'Vaterunser' und 'Gegrüßet seist Du' und schloß oft mit einem ganz freien Gebet, wie: 'Lieber Gott, laß mich bald gesund werden, schau, ich brauche ja meine Gesundheit, damit ich die Neunte fertigmachen kann' usw. Diesen letzten Passus brachte er in ziemlich ungeduldiger Weise vor und schloß mit einem dreimaligen Amen, wobei er sich einigemal beim dritten Amen mit beiden Händen auf die Schenkel schlug, so daß man sich des Eindruckes nicht erwehren konnte, er denke sich: 'Wenn das jetzt der liebe Gott nicht erhört, so ist das nicht meine Schuld.'<sup>325</sup>

Kantner supposed a profound influence on the composer having been exerted by the famous Jesuit evangelist Pater Heinrich Abel through Anton Meißner, with whom he was friendly. According to Stradal,

Meißner war eng befreundet mit dem berühmten Prediger Jesuitenpater Abel, der in flammenden Worten wie ein Savonarola die Abkehr des Menschen von jeder irdischen Freude verlangte. Es schien mir nun, daß Meisner vom Pater Abel zu Bruckner gesandt wäre, um des Meisters Seele für den Himmel vorzubereiten [...].

Der fanatisch religiöse Meißner hielt nun mit Bruckner täglich stundenlange Betübungen ab, so daß der Meister der Welt immer mehr abzusterben schien und sein Geist fast nur noch im Gebete weilte. Vielleicht wäre der letzte Satz der neunten Symphonie doch noch vollendet worden, wenn der Meister sich nicht fast von seinen Werken abgewandt hätte.<sup>326</sup>

<sup>324</sup> "Eros und Marienlob: Gedanken zu Anton Bruckners Marienmotetten." *BrJb* 1989–90, p. 229.

<sup>325</sup> "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt", p. 27. Similarly, Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 524f.; also quoted by Neumayr, p. 305.

<sup>326</sup> "Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit", *ZfM* 99, no. 12 (Dec. 1932), p. 1074. Kantner was not correct in maintaining on the basis of this that Stradal claimed that Abel sent the "religiös fanatischen Meisner [sic]" to rescue Bruckner's soul: that is by no means clear from Stradal's use of the subjunctive ("Es schien mir nun"). Perhaps Kanter was correct in agreeing with Stradal that Meißner was "in seinem religiösen Überschwang nicht gerade der geeignete Ausgleich zu Bruckners Seelenverfassung" (p. 253).

Bruckner's religious devotions were recorded at length in his calendars, which continue up to the very day before his death, and provide, as Elisabeth Maier noted, significant pointers as to the wide fluctuations of his mental clarity during the final ten months.<sup>327</sup> Franz Kosch,<sup>328</sup> who has given a complete list of all the calendar dates with prayer lists from their inception in 1881 to the end of Bruckner's life,<sup>329</sup> proposed a possible connection between the beginning of the prayer records and the catastrophic destruction of the Ringtheater by fire on 8 December 1881—an event that apparently affected Bruckner profoundly.<sup>330</sup> Neumayr wrote:

Die in den Kalendern Bruckners so auffallenden und eigentümlichen Gebesteintragungen sind wahrscheinlich noch zusätzlich angeregt worden durch das damals ungemein verbreitete Büchlein "Der Himmlische Hof", das vom Minoritenpater Ludwig Musäus herausgegeben wurde [...]. In diesem Büchlein [...] wurde nur jenen Gläubigen eine Garantie für ewiges Heil verheißen, welche insgesamt 34.000 "Vater unser", "Ave Maria" und "Ehre sei dem Vater" beten. Die in diesem Büchlein enthaltenen mathematischen Tabellen ähneln in auffallender Weise der Gebetsbuchhaltung Bruckners während seines letzten Lebensjahrzehntes [...].<sup>331</sup>

Bruckner's last desk calendar in which he recorded day-to-day information and personal memoranda was *Fromme's Österreichischer Professoren- und Lehr-Kalender für das Schuljahr 1894/95*.<sup>332</sup> Among other notices, stretching back as far as October 1894 (fols. 7<sup>v</sup>–8<sup>f</sup>) we find carefully dated memoranda of Bruckner's prayers in his last months, often with the further specification of morning or evening. Those from the months June–October 1896 are summarised here in chronological order:

---

<sup>327</sup> In a letter to the present writer, dated 23 March 1990. Cf. also Heller's entries in letters to his wife, for July and August 1896, in: Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 564 and 571 and Auer, "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt", pp. 31ff., which also testify to wide fluctuations in Bruckner's physical and mental condition.

<sup>328</sup> "Der Beter Anton Bruckner" nach seinen persönlichen Aufzeichnungen", in: *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz Grasberger, Vienna 1964, pp. 67–73.

<sup>329</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68.

<sup>330</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 69.

<sup>331</sup> p. 304.

<sup>332</sup> *Siebenundzwanzigster Jahrgang [...] Wien, Druck und Verlag von Carl Fromme [...]*; ÖNB Mus. Hs. 3179. The ensuing information, including bracketed annotations (here translated) were kindly supplied by Elisabeth Maier in a letter to the present writer of 23 March 1990. Bruckner's calendar notices were published by ABIL shortly before completion of this study in early 2002, ed. by Elisabeth Maier with the assistance of Renate Grasberger, *Anton Bruckner: Verborgene Persönlichkeit. Anton Bruckner in seinen privaten Aufzeichnungen*. Andrea Harrandt ("Erstes Bruckner Symposium in den USA", *ÖMz* 49 no. 6 [June 1994], p. 385) mentions a paper given at the Bruckner symposium held at Connecticut College, New London, 21–24 February 1994 by Maier on the calendar notices. Wagner (*BrLWD*, p. 211) reproduces a page of the Gebetseintragungen from 25 July to 5 August. The paper appears in *Bruckner Studies* (Cambridge 1997, pp. 30–53), as "A hidden personality: access to an 'inner biography' of Anton Bruckner".



Prayer records	Calendar folios
June 4–11	136 <sup>v</sup> –137 <sup>f</sup>
June 8 (a.m.)–13 (very unclear!), 18–20	137 <sup>v</sup> –138 <sup>f</sup>
June 19 (a.m.)–22 (a.m.) (very unclear)	138 <sup>v</sup> –139 <sup>f</sup>
June 22 (p.m.)–28 (p.m.) (somewhat clearer)	139 <sup>v</sup> –140 <sup>f</sup>
June 28 (p.m.) (?) – July 2 (p.m.) (very unclear)	140 <sup>v</sup> –141 <sup>f</sup>
July 3 (a.m.)–18 (a.m.) (?)	141 <sup>v</sup> –142 <sup>f</sup>
July 6 (a.m.)–19 (p.m.) (?) (very unclear)	142 <sup>v</sup> –143 <sup>f</sup>
July 9 (a.m.), 12 (a.m.)–19th	145 <sup>v</sup> –146 <sup>f</sup>
July 20–24 (p.m.) (suddenly better)	147 <sup>v</sup> –148 <sup>f</sup>
July 25 (a.m.)–5 (a.m.)	148 <sup>v</sup> –149 <sup>f</sup>
August 5 (p.m.)–13 (p.m.)	149 <sup>v</sup> –150 <sup>f</sup>
August 14 (a.m.) (?)–19 (p.m.)	150 <sup>v</sup> –151 <sup>f</sup>
August 20 (a.m.) (?), 23 (a.m.), “13.” (?), September 6–9, 18 (?)	151 <sup>v</sup> –152 <sup>f</sup>
September 5–8 (very unclear)	146 <sup>v</sup> –147 <sup>f</sup>
September 19–23 (?), October 9–10	152 <sup>v</sup> –153 <sup>f</sup>
October 1–2, 6–8, 10	153 <sup>v</sup> –154 <sup>f</sup>

Further confused attempts, apparently to ascertain the date, appear to derive from 2–26 August (fols. 143<sup>v</sup>–146<sup>f</sup>), while prayer records without dates can also be found (fols. 154<sup>v</sup>–155<sup>f</sup>). The increasingly intermittent and often confused entries, particularly those of June to mid-July, illustrate the changeability of Bruckner's mental condition, with its alternating periods of greater and lesser mental clarity, the rapid recovery in late July noted by Heller, and final, steady decline during the last months. Auer wrote of these entries at the conclusion of his chapter on 1895: “Aus den zerstörten Schriftzügen grinst schon das Furchtbare, was im Jahre darauf eintrat.”<sup>333</sup>

A discarded bifol. from the fugue of the Finale also contains entries recording Bruckner's prayers: ÖNB Mus. Hs. 6087/45<sup>v</sup>, bifol. 17F (Facs. C/266)<sup>334</sup>, comprising the abbreviations *R*[osenkranz], *V*[ater Unser], *A*[ve Maria] and *S*[alve Regina] (twice). The vertical line crossed by three horizontal strokes appears, according to Franz Kosch,<sup>335</sup> to have replaced an earlier abbreviation “*Gl*”, signifying either the Credo (“*Gl*aube an Gott”) or Doxology (“*Gl*oria patri”);<sup>336</sup> the underlinings of this sign and other letters indicate repetitions. Unfortunately, no dating is apparent, although paper type, ruling and the dating of a subsequent draft for the beginning of the fugue, bifol. 17<sup>a</sup>D, “16. 12.” (1895), indicates that its composition was prior to that date.<sup>337</sup>

<sup>333</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 546. The entries do indeed refer to 1896; Auer simply mentions them at this point as they are written in an 1895 calendar.

<sup>334</sup> Transcription in Orel D/106, where these annotations were omitted.

<sup>335</sup> p. 70.

<sup>336</sup> Kantner (pp. 257 and 275) opts for the latter throughout.

<sup>337</sup> That Bruckner wrote these on a score bifol.—probably already discarded by the time the prayers were noted—is by no means evidence of mental deterioration. Similar entries can be found on a discarded score page

The pious tone of Bruckner's letter to Bayer from 9 July 1895, apologising for the impossibility of taking his customary summer vacation in his beloved Steyr, in contrast to the greater reticence of most of his correspondence, also suggests an intensification of his devotional life, perhaps heightened by his illness as well as Meißner's influence:

Fortreisen werde ich wohl nicht dürfen, wenigstens für heuer nicht, so gern ich auch wollte.—Gebe mir Gott Athem und größere Kraft.—Schwer hat mich Gott heimgesucht; und danke ich doch dem Herrn, daß ich so weit gebessert bin.<sup>338</sup>

But as we have already observed, Bruckner appears to have felt surprisingly well in his new apartment. Auer writes that: "Der Sommer verlief, ohne daß sich ein Unwohlsein einstellte. Er ging öfter wieder allein aus und verließ sogar den engeren Bezirk des Belvedere."<sup>339</sup> Meißner also records that: "Sobald sich Bruckner besser fühlte, arbeitete er eifrig an der IX. Symphonie. Sein ehemaliger Lehrer, der Theaterkapellmeister Otto Kitzler, fand sich öfter zum Besuch ein; ebenso erfreute ihn auch Hans Richter durch einen Krankenbesuch."<sup>340</sup>

Obviously regaining strength, the composer must have worked consistently on the Finale throughout the autumn of 1895, in September even considering a return to his University lectures from which, understandably, his doctors had to dissuade him.<sup>341</sup> An anonymous newspaper report of mid-October 1895<sup>342</sup> is also instructive both in regard to Bruckner's health and activities and, again, his self-reassurance—probably by now an indispensable psychological necessity for him—that the *Te Deum* be used in place of the fourth movement should it be required:

Ueber das Befinden Anton Bruckner's kommen unerfreuliche Nachrichten aus dem Belvedere [...] Anton Bruckner kann sich nur mehr von Chokolade nähren und verläßt er auf wenige Momente sein Zimmer, um im Park frische Luft zu schöpfen, so wird er von Frösteln befasst und muß schleunigst den Rückzug antreten. Und trotzdem ist der Meister unermüdlich beim Komponieren; er hat seine neunte Symphonie bis zum Finale vollendet und trägt sich mit dem Gedanken, der Dichtung als vollständigen Schluß sein früher geschaffenes *Te Deum* anzuhängen. "Ich habe die achte Symphonie meinem guten Kaiser und die neunte Symphonie dem lieben Gott in tiefer Ehrfurcht gewidmet, deshalb soll sie mit einem *Te Deum* ausklingen und dann will ich die Feder für immer hinlegen," sagte der geniale Mann vor einigen Tagen einem Freunde, der zu Besuch gekommen [war]. Bruckner steht in der Behandlung des Professors v. Schrötter, der mit aufopfernder Liebe den Kranken betreut. Anlässlich der Konzerte der böhmischen Kammermusik-Vereinigung wird des Meisters Streichquintett zur Aufführung gelangen; um Bruckner

---

from the Finale of the Eighth, begun 4 September 1886: "12. Aug. Ab[en]ds. R V A S " and "13. Aug. M[o]rg[ens]. R V A S " Göll.-A. IV/2, p. 533.

<sup>338</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 517.

<sup>339</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 533.

<sup>340</sup> P. 84 (the anecdote is undated).

<sup>341</sup> Bruckner went as far as to have the forthcoming lectures announced; see Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 533f.

<sup>342</sup> Under the rubric "Theater, Kunst, Musik und Literatur", *Neuigkeitsweltblatt* (Vienna) 13 Oct. 1895, p. 3.

eine Freude zu bereiten, finden die Proben zu dem Werke in seiner Wohnung im Belvedere statt.

Nonetheless, Bruckner continued persistently to work on the Finale. In passably good health, he could at least now compose uninterruptedly and, as the few surviving datings in the Finale MSS suggest,<sup>343</sup> he worked steadily and meticulously on the score of the Finale throughout the autumn and winter, advancing as far as the fugue, compositionally speaking the midpoint of the movement, by mid-December 1895. Early in the New Year he was well enough to attend a concert of the Vienna Philharmonic including his own Fourth Symphony under Hans Richter on 5 January as well as a performance of the *Te Deum* under Richard Perger on 12 January.<sup>344</sup> Yet the success of these performances vouchsafed Bruckner little personal pleasure. According to Stradal:

Nach dem großen Erfolg seiner vierten Symphonie [...] besuchte ich den Meister. Ich hoffte, daß die stürmischen Ovationen, welche das Publikum ihm bereitete, auf sein Gemüt günstig wirken würden. Ich sah mich aber enttäuscht, da er sagte: 'Zu spät, ich bin ja so sehr krank; ja, früher hätte der Erfolg mich schon sehr gefreut, nun kommt alles zu spät.' Tränen standen ihm in den Augen, und auch ich mußte weinen, ahnte er doch schon seinen Tod.<sup>345</sup>

Of January to May 1896 we have less information, and it would appear that the steady decline in Bruckner's condition, both physical and mental, very gradually and yet with many fluctuations, diminished the pace of his creative work. A letter to Jean Louis Nicodé dated 24 February 1896, written on Bruckner's behalf by Anton Meißner, begins: "Da ich mich noch immer nicht ganz wo[h]l befinden u. mir das Schreiben etwa schwer fällt [...]."<sup>346</sup> Heller writes that Bruckner's "geistige Frische war in stetem Abnehmen, wenn auch nur unbedeutend, sodaß nur wir, die wir ständig mit ihm verkehrten, es merkten. Er wurde langsam kindisch".<sup>347</sup> As Neumayr has noted: "Das Nachlassen der Herzkraft ließ auch Symptome einer Arteriosklerose der Gehirnfäße erkennen, was sich in einer Veränderung seines Wesens bzw. in einer Verstärkung schon vorher bestandener Eigentümlichkeiten äußerte."<sup>348</sup>

Comparison of Heller's account with the Göllerich-Auer biography for this period is instructive as to the extent to which Auer elaborated and padded his source material. Auer

<sup>343</sup> Further details see §1.1.9 *infra*.

<sup>344</sup> "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt", p. 29; similarly Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 548 and 550; Auer, *Bruckner* (1934), p. 331.

<sup>345</sup> P. 1073. It is significant that Stradal's report makes no reference to mental deterioration on Bruckner's part at this stage.

<sup>346</sup> New edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2 (in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>347</sup> "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt", p. 29.

<sup>348</sup> P. 316.

writes, for instance: “In diesen Wintertagen saß er meist im Lehnstuhl vor dem Tischchen am mittleren Fenster, sah sinnend hinaus und beschrieb von Zeit zu Zeit das stets vor ihm liegende Notenblatt mit zitternden Händen. Ab und zu ging er ans Klavier, um einzelne Akkorde anzuschlagen.”<sup>349</sup> This is probably simple journalistic embellishment on Auer's part. The ensuing remarks are likely more accurate and can be verified against the MSS themselves, as well as quoting Heller's report:

Die ganze Zeit arbeitete er langsam an seiner IX. Symphonie, die schon deshalb langsamer fortschritt, als seine Hände sehr zitterten und beim Schreiben oft Klexe [sic] und Fehler entstanden, die dann wieder sorgsam ausradiert oder überklebt werden mußten. Seine geistige Frische war in stetem Abnehmen, jedoch so allmählich, daß es nur die, die immer um ihn waren, merkten.<sup>350</sup>

Among those to visit Bruckner in March 1896 was Czech composer Antonin Dvořák. Josef Suk, who accompanied Dvořák on the visit to the Habsburg capital, records:<sup>351</sup>

Wir trafen ihn am Schreibtisch sitzend, ohne Rock und bekamen den Eindruck, daß hier ein Mensch haust, der ganz in seinem Geiste und seiner Arbeit aufgeht [...]. Als wir uns von ihm verabschiedeten, war er plötzlich sehr gerührt. In seinen merkwürdigen Augen standen Tränen. In seiner wattierten Weste begleitete er uns hinaus und solange unser Wagen zu sehen war, warf er uns Kußhände zu [...].

We also read in Göllerich-Auer of a visit by Edvard Grieg in the same month.<sup>352</sup> In a letter of 27 March to Otto Kitzler, who on the 25 had performed the Second Symphony in Brünn, Bruckner was to write: “Bin noch immer krank. Leider wirst Du nicht wissen, daß ich noch immer krank bin. Gott wolle mir helfen!”<sup>353</sup> although there is no indication of a further specific illness at this stage in Heller's report. On Palm Sunday, 29 March, he was well enough to attend a final performance of the Vienna Philharmonic under Hans Richter, being carried in his portable chair to the concert, the programme of which included Richard Strauß' *Till Eulenspiegel* and Wagner's *Liebesmahl der Apostel*.<sup>354</sup> During Holy Week Bruckner

---

<sup>349</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 550.

<sup>350</sup> *Ibid.*, the source of the words, according to Auer, ‘reported by Dr. Heller’, being of course “Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, p. 29, quoted above.

<sup>351</sup> “Aus meiner Jugend”, in: *Anton Dvořák in Briefen und Erinnerungen, Deutsch von Bedrich Eben* (Prague 1954), p. 207; quoted in: Kurt Honolka, *Dvořák*, Hamburg 1974, p. 110. Paul Stefan, in his biography *Dvořák* (transl. Y. W. Vance, New York 1941, p. 250), recounts that Bruckner was supposedly working on the *Adagio* (i.e., the last movement) of the Ninth at the time of Dvořák's visit, an error symptomatic of the general ignorance concerning the Finale to be found in popular literature. A letter from Cyrill Hynais to the Förster and Fibich student Emanuel Chvala, dated Vienna 2 October 1896 incidentally confirms Dvořák's personal acquaintance with Bruckner (new edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2, in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>352</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 555.

<sup>353</sup> *Ges. Briefe* (Gräflinger), p. 56; cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 556.

<sup>354</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 557, erroneously cites Whitsunday (24 May) as the concert date, Auer noting effusively: “Es war das letzte Konzert, das der Meister besuchen konnte und Richard Wagners Klänge die letzten, die an

could not be prevented from attending ceremonies in the Michaelerkirche with Frau Kathi, who on one of these days had to spend no less than seven hours there with him. “So oft sie Miene machte fortzugehen, setzte er sich ganz wild von ihr weg. Es war kein Wunder, daß bald darauf wieder Verschlechterung in seinem Befinden eintrat. Auch zuhause betete er stundenlang bei verschlossener Türe ‘Vater unser’ und ‘Glaube an Gott’.”<sup>355</sup>

In several letters of April 1896, in part written for Bruckner by Meißner or dictated to him, we again receive the impression that Bruckner's condition has improved, though he is still not fully recovered.<sup>356</sup> Max von Oberleithner records his last visit to Bruckner at Easter (around 5 April).<sup>357</sup> Shortly after, Bruckner was requested by his cousin Eduard Zachhuber to act as godfather to the latter's offspring in Wolfern near Steyr, whereupon Bruckner requested Franz Bayer to act as his proxy. In a letter to him of 17 April dictated to Meißner, Bruckner complains that he was again mostly confined to his bed.<sup>358</sup> A month later he appears to have undertaken the surviving pc. sks. for the coda (see §1.1.10 *infra*).

One of the more significant clues to compositional progress on the Finale by this time is a report in the *Steyrer Zeitung* of 10 May 1896, where mention is made of a three-day visit by Bayer to Bruckner “auf dessen [Bruckner's] speziellen Wunsch.”<sup>359</sup> According to this it appears that Bruckner's health was not of the best and, although mainly out of bed, he spent most of the day sleeping in his armchair.<sup>360</sup> The report, probably recounting a personal discussion with Bruckner, continues: “den Schlußsatz seiner 9. Symphonie hat er wohl vollständig skizziert, doch, wie er zu Herrn Bayer selbst äußerte, hofft er selber nicht mehr, diesen ganz fertig ausarbeiten zu können.” Auer also places the following passage in the context of spring or early summer 1896:

Trotzdem er schon ganz gebrochen war, schrieb er noch am letzten Satz seiner ‘Neunten’, von der er den Besuchern sagte, er müsse sie noch fertig bringen. Die Arbeit ging sehr mühselig vonstatten und strengte ihn sehr an. Der Gedanke, das Werk un-

---

sein Ohr drangen”. Scheder (*Anton Bruckner Chronologie*, Tutzing 1996, p. 784) establishes the earlier date from a surviving concert programme; the concert season would have also ended well before 24 May (information courtesy of a personal communication from Jim Cyphers, 14 March 2003).

<sup>355</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 556f.

<sup>356</sup> This is apparent in several letters dated April 1896 (cf. new edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2; in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>357</sup> *Erinnerungen...*, pp. 71f.

<sup>358</sup> *Ges. Briefe* (Gräflinger), pp. 10f.; cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 557, where the date of the letter is given, presumably incorrectly, as 23 May.

<sup>359</sup> No. 38, p. 3, under the rubric “Lokalnachrichten.” Also published in the *Linzer Volksblatt*, 12 June 1896. See concerning the relationship of the Styrian press to Bruckner, Erich W. Partsch, “‘Unser berühmter Landsmann’: Zur Bruckner-Berichterstattung in der Steyrer Presse bis 1896,” *BrJb* 1994/95/96, pp. 289–294.

<sup>360</sup> Cf. Heller, who notes following his return to Bruckner's bedside on 15 September 1896 that “Die meiste Zeit des Tages verbrachte er im Lehnssessel” (“Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, p. 35).

vollendet hinterlassen zu müssen, quälte ihn, und doch hoffte er immer wieder mit Gottes Hilfe den Satz vollenden zu können.<sup>361</sup>

Auer continues with a passage concerning Hans Richter suggesting to Bruckner the use of the Te Deum (as if for the first time), with Bruckner subsequently taking up the idea of using the Finale torso as a transition to the Te Deum.<sup>362</sup> Apparently, even during walks in the Belvedere garden—according to Auer—Bruckner informed his visitors: “‘Wann i’ nimmer kann, müssen S’ halt das Te Deum machen’. Er hatte schon das bestimmte Gefühl, daß es zu Ende gehe.”<sup>363</sup> Auer then cites Josef Kluger, with whom Bruckner spoke concerning his funeral and resting place and who appears to have left one of the clearest and most significant clues to the character and ‘program’ of both the symphony and its Finale that we possess. Auer writes:

Auch Dr. Kluger gegenüber äußerte sich der Meister seine Absichten betreffend die neunte Symphonie, worüber dieser berichtet: ‘Diese bezeichnete mir Bruckner als *“Die Huldigung vor der göttlichen Majestät”*. Auch hier hätte der Schlußsatz den leitenden Gedanken in vollster Klarheit entwickeln sollen. Doch anders, als es sich Bruckner gedacht, sollte diese Absicht des frommen Meisters zur Ausführung gelangen. Infolge schwerer Krankheit unfähig, diesen vierten Satz zu schreiben, legte ihm die Idee des Ganzen den Gedanken nahe, sein bereits 1884 vollendetes Tedeum als den klarsten Ausdruck seiner Huldigung vor der göttlichen Majestät den drei Sätzen der IX. anzuschließen.’<sup>364</sup>

### 1.1.10 The composition of the Finale.

Though largely ignored by Orel, the dating of the MS of the Finale is significant and instructive for an attempt to reconstruct the compositional chronology of the movement. While a more detailed examination of the compositional chronology on the basis of the surviving MSS will be made in ch. 3.1, something of the nature and disposition of the surviving material will be explained in general terms here in order to correlate the principal dates found in the material with other documentary references to compositional progress and Bruckner’s fluctuating state of health.

While important elements of the Finale, principally the chorale and Hauptthema, appear to have been clear in the composer’s mind from at least 1892 and Bruckner also presumably wove the tritone progressions into the coda of Adagio as a compositional “Aufbereitung”<sup>365</sup> for the Finale, there is no apparent evidence for the actual notation of the movement prior to

<sup>361</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 558f.; the passage does not appear in Heller’s report.

<sup>362</sup> See concerning the apparent evolution of Auer’s thinking §1.3.8, and subsequent discussion of the Te Deum transition in §3.1.11 and ch. 3.3.

<sup>363</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 559.

<sup>364</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 560; italics added.

<sup>365</sup> Korte; see ch. 2.2.

May 1895. The pleurisy Bruckner contracted shortly before the completion of the Adagio (30 November 1894) cost him several months of bed rest, during which time Bruckner was apparently not well enough to work. Hence the note in his calendar (ÖNB 3179, fol. 14<sup>r</sup>, Facs. C/340) “24. Mai 895. 1.<sup>mal</sup>, Finale neue Scitze” most likely indicates the beginning of the notation of the movement on ÖNB 3194.1<sup>r</sup> (C/3: “I. Anf[ang]”) although many aspects of it must already have been thought out in his mind.

As in his previous works, Bruckner began composition of the Finale by sketching its musical continuity in *particello* (pc.) or short-score sk. before proceeding to elaborate it in full score. Initial, unstructured and invariably untidy, explorations of the material in pencil, such as we find in ÖNB 3194/1–12 (Facs. C/3–20) were followed by more definitive notations in ink (ÖNB 6086, C/31). In composing the first movement, as we have seen, Bruckner appears only to have outlined the most essential elements of the Exp. before beginning the orchestral score. Here Bruckner outlined the continuity of at least the Exp. and part of the “2. Theil” of the movement at an early stage, and a significant extent of the continuity of the movement as given in these initial drafts remained unaltered in the course of subsequent reworkings. The first date to be found in the preliminary materials, “8. Juni” (Facs. C/9, top right), refers to an early draft of the *Steigerung* preceding the chorale in the Exp.; comparing this date, two weeks after the first indication of the beginning of work and almost a month before the move, with the extent of the surviving material the assumption is probably correct that all the initial 12 fols. of the 3194 material and some if not all of the ink sk. 6086 were already written by the time Bruckner established himself in the Belvedere.

Bruckner's relatively good health and the opportunity to devote himself to his last and most important work unhampered by other duties appears to have ensured rapid compositional progress. The end of the movement, intended as a “song of praise to the dear Lord”, would appear to have taken shape in Bruckner's mind at a relatively early stage and was played by him to Heller, as reported in Heller's memoirs.<sup>366</sup>

The full score was written on bifols. of 24-stave paper, the first page of each numbered in the top right hand corner, and the bifols. were written one after another rather than interlaid in signatures, as was Bruckner's custom. While the first few bifols. of the orchestral score reveal that the composer himself ruled the pages into measures and listed the instruments along the left margin, the later bifols. were apparently prepared by another hand, the composer delegating this laborious task to Meißner.

Considering the intractability of his deteriorating handwriting, Bruckner's compositional progress on the score would appear to have been relatively good. Given his working methods—which involved composing to a great extent directly in score, and hence having to discard whole 16-m. sections and rewrite often fully scored material every time a change of

---

<sup>366</sup> “Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, pp. 21–35, as well as the AP, E/142.

any magnitude was made—it is not surprising that Bruckner left more sks. for the Finale than for any other movement of the Ninth—over 200 out of almost 500 fols. The amount of material was increased by Bruckner's rather profligate use of prepared score bifols. as *Satzverlaufsentwürfe* (continuity drafts; hereafter SVE), with single lines (usually the 1st violin) establishing the content of a particular bifol. Bruckner wished to revise or perhaps merely reconsider. In fact, approximately half the surviving material can be regarded as *Satzverlaufsentwürfe*, the majority of which were placed into ÖNB 6085, separate from the more substantially orchestrated score bifols., ÖNB 6087.<sup>367</sup> Aside from the exceptional extent of these discarded SVE in the material for the Finale, Bruckner's *Bogen-Verfahren*, his use of prepared score paper as a kind of armature on which he moulded the clay of his musical inspiration, probably remained consistent throughout his compositional career.

While, as noted, parts of the score such as the chorale remained consistent with their initial outline in the pc. sks., others were reshaped by Bruckner, as was the Exp. of IX/1, several times over. That Bruckner at some stage probably regarded the Exp. as complete and set it aside is revealed by a surviving cover bifol. ÖNB 6085/37–38 with the autograph title “v[om] 1. bis inclusive 12. [Bogen]” (C/328). Bruckner had embarked upon the composition of the fugue, compositionally speaking the mid-point of the movement, by mid-December, as demonstrated by the date “16.12.” on bifol. 17<sup>a</sup>D (C/269, extreme top right<sup>368</sup>). Over half the movement, with the exception of later revisions of the beginning of the movement, *Gesangsp.* and *Durchf.*, had probably reached definitive form and even partial completion in score by the end of 1895; the fugal Exp. (bifol. 17) was also extensively reworked. The latter part of the score, on the other hand, underwent far fewer revisions.

The next date cited in Table II is that of “14. Jänner” on the SVE “14”<sup>a</sup>E, ÖNB 6085/77<sup>r</sup> (C/229), but it is far from certain as to whether this annotation is actually a date.<sup>369</sup> Moreover, the SVE “14”<sup>a</sup>E, like several other similar, scarcely construable drafts for bifols. 13–15, is notated on a bifol. of the last paper ruling used by Bruckner; the implication that these bifols. were written in January 1896 is scarcely likely.<sup>370</sup>

The remaining dates all derive from the later part of 1896; aside from the amount of surviving material—the entire second half of the movement—which Bruckner appears to have

<sup>367</sup> See further §1.2.6. A factor explaining Bruckner's apparent over-reliance on this prepared score material for single-line drafts is that he may only have had the one pile of prepared paper ready at hand and so took a prepared bifol. each time he reached for a new page; see ch. 3.1.

<sup>368</sup> This is scarcely visible in the reproduction in section C; that provided by the *Faksimile-Ausgabe* (p. 229) is considerably clearer.

<sup>369</sup> The date is cited by Orel (D/122, no. 42, “14<sup>d</sup>. Bogen E”); the smeared pencil annotation is significantly more legible in the *Faksimile-Ausgabe* (p. 229). The “14.” is written twice, occupies a separate line to what appears to be “Jänner”, most of which is partially erased. It is also unclear why the bifol. numbering “14.” was crossed out and replaced with “13.”

<sup>370</sup> Another interpretation is ventured in §1.1.11 *infra*.



composed during that period, we have few indices as to compositional progress between late 1895 and May 1896. By the time of Bayer's visit in May 1896 Bruckner would have had ample time to have progressed as far as the coda of the movement, and the absence of more substantial sks. for any later part of the work up to the coda probably suggests that composition of the later bifols. of the score proceeded smoothly. However, Bruckner probably did require preliminary clarification of his ideas prior to the composition of the final *Steigerung* and cadence of the movement. If Bruckner had arrived at the composition of the coda by early May, it confirms the wording "wohl vollständig skizziert" found in Bayer's report of 10 May (*supra*) and suggests that the movement was probably complete up to that point in a minimum of continuous string score—a phase which, in the case of *Helgoland*, occupied about two-thirds of the total period taken for the composition of the work.<sup>371</sup> By May, as Bayer's report suggests, Bruckner may also have been becoming increasingly pessimistic about his chances of completing the huge task of the movement's instrumentation.

Confirmation of this timeline can be found in all the verifiable aspects of the late surviving bifols. of the score—logical harmony, often intricate counterpoint, consistent metrical numbering, etc.—as well as in Bruckner's handwriting which, as would first be pointed out by Paul-Gilbert Langevin (§1.3.10), remained firm and consistent up to and including the last extant bifol. of the score. If Bruckner had indeed advanced as far as the coda by late May 1896 it is perfectly conceivable that he would have proceeded to finish laying out the remaining few bifols. (probably no more than 4 or 5) in late May and early June, including the final D-major peroration of the "Allelujah des zweiten Satzes", conceived in any case, as Heller's memoirs indicate, many months before.

The resultant score would probably have extended as far as a bifol. 39 or 40. Bruckner thereafter appears to have begun revising and completing the orchestration. He obviously still had time and strength before the onslaught of what was to be his next serious illness (§1.1.12)<sup>372</sup> to begin the systematic revision and instrumentation of earlier sections of the score; the renumbering of all valid bifols. of the score which occurred at this time was occasioned by the splitting up of bifol. 2F, and is confirmed by the date "14.6.96" on the recopied 13E/"14" (C/225ff.; cf. §3.1.8). Perhaps recognising the impossibility of completing the task, he may have considered using the movement in an abbreviated form as a transition to the *Te Deum*, possibly giving rise to the 'vi-de' markings, which will be discussed in §3.1.11.

---

<sup>371</sup> Cf. the dates given in Table II, A/7.

<sup>372</sup> Wagner (*BrLWD*, p. 221) reproduces a signed receipt for royalties from 4 June 1896 confirming the deterioration in Bruckner's hand during this period.

### 1.1.11 The Te Deum as Ersatz.

Bruckner's earnestly intended injunction that his Te Deum was to be used in performance to replace the fourth movement of the Ninth should he not live to complete an instrumental Finale, however problematic its implementation, cannot be overlooked for the clear corroboration it provides as to Bruckner's intentions in this work. All too often dismissed by scholars and critics merely on the basis of aesthetic preconception as something which Bruckner 'could not have intended', the weight given to this issue by the early memoirists—where it accompanies an overwhelming number of references to the Ninth Symphony—reveals that it must be seen as irreproachably authentic. Bruckner must have mentioned the issue to innumerable friends and acquaintances who recall his words independently in several forms, so that, despite the general unreliability of much of the Erinnerungsliteratur as regards precise quotations, it is grasping at straws to believe that all were engaged in a conspiracy to perpetrate a notion which had no foundation in fact. The Adagio does, of course, evoke many aspects of 'finality'; however, that it represented in any sort of respect the end of the symphony *for the composer* is not endorsed by any examination of his compositional intentions or comprehensive interpretation of all four intended movements. The retrospective nature of the Adagio and thematic "Auflösungsvorgang" (Kurth) of its coda is more to be ascribed to the conception of that movement—its 'programme,' if one will.<sup>373</sup>

We have already noted (§1.1.2) the testimony of Nicodé to this effect. Bruckner's friend Dr. Kluger reported the composer describing his Ninth as: "Die Huldigung vor der göttlichen Majestät," continuing, as we have seen (§1.1.9):

Auch hier hätte der letzte Satz den leitenden Gedanken in vollster Klarheit entwickeln sollen. Doch anders, als es sich Bruckner gedacht, sollte diese Absicht des frommen Meisters zur Ausführung gelangen. Infolge schwerer Krankheit unfähig diesen vierten Satz zu schreiben, legte ihm die Idee des Ganzen den Gedanken nahe, sein bereits 1884 vollendetes Tedeum als den klarsten Ausdruck seiner Huldigung vor der göttlichen Majestät den drei Sätzen der IX. anzuschließen.<sup>374</sup>

---

<sup>373</sup> Many commentators have remained prisoners of the early interpretation and reception of the work: echoes continue down to the present day. Gülke claimed: "So sehr man sich hüten muß, das factum brutum des fragmentarisch gebliebenen Finales a posteriori zur Intention umzufälschen—daß der Adagioschluß mehr ist als ein Schluß nur dieses Satzes, Ausklang von mehr als dem hier abgehandelten, läßt sich so wenig überhören wie simpel strukturell begründen" (*Brahms—Bruckner*, p. 114). Surely, however, if the Adagio was "mehr [...] als ein Schluß nur dieses Satzes" it may also be because it was intended to be the last slow movement Bruckner would ever write. As Auer noted: "Vielleicht hat Löwe in die ganze Neunte zu sehr die Idee der Parsifal-Entsagung hineingetragen und den Adagioschluß zu subjektiv gefaßt, während Bruckner ohne Selbstbespiegelung festen Schrittes dem sicheren Jenseits entgegenging. Nicht Ergebung ist der Sinn des Werkes sondern Erhebung" ("Die Neunte Symphonie in der Originalfassung", *Bruckner-Blätter* 1934, no. 3, p. 42). The relation of the Adagio to the overall conception of the Ninth is discussed in ch. 2.2; see also the author's "Neue Erkenntnisse...", p. 124.

<sup>374</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 560.

The symbolic appropriateness of the *Te Deum* as a fourth movement of the Ninth is underlined by the dedication of both works to God. The dedication of the *Te Deum* was confirmed by Bruckner in a letter to Hermann Levi of 10 May 1885: “Das [...] *Te Deum*, welches ich Gott widmete, zur Danksagung für so viel überstandenes Leiden in Wien [...]”<sup>375</sup>—The title page of the first edition is even inscribed “O.A.M.D.G.” (*Omnia ad maiorem Dei gloriam*). The cleric Josef Gruber wrote:

Er druckte noch vor seinem Ableben den Wunsch aus, man möge bei der Aufführung statt des Schlußsatzes, welchen er nicht mehr komponieren konnte, seine ‘*Te Deum*’ nehmen. Von diesem gewaltigen ‘*Te Deum*’ sprach er einmal folgende Worte: ‘Wenn ich einst mein lieber Gott vor seinen Richterstuhl ruft, so zeige ich auf mein ‘*Te Deum*’, welches ich ihm gewidmet habe, und ich hoffe, er wird mir barmherziger Richter sein!’<sup>376</sup>

The clearest and most uncompromising indication of Bruckner’s intentions to use the *Te Deum* in case the fourth movement was not completed appears to have been made by Bruckner at his last University lecture on 12 November 1894: “Sollte ich vor der Vollendung der Symphonie sterben, so muß mein *Te Deum* als 4. Satz dieser Symphonie verwendet werden. Ich habe es schon so bestimmt und eingerichtet.”<sup>377</sup> Comparison with the earlier quotation of this passus from Altwirth’s report (§1.1.3, *supra*) reveals that the words “und eingerichtet” were added by Auer, perhaps in order to give weight to his contention—not incorrect in itself—that Bruckner had composed a *transition* to the *Te Deum*. Auer’s later implication that it was Richter who first suggested this idea to Bruckner in autumn 1896 is hence misleading.<sup>378</sup>

Although overemphasised by Auer and Löwe, and as vigorously denied by Orel,<sup>379</sup> Redlich<sup>380</sup> and Nowak,<sup>381</sup> there is also no question that Bruckner, confronted by the possibility that he might die before completing of the movement, deliberated over the idea of using the instrumental torso of the Finale as a transition to the choral work. The likely manner in which Bruckner may have undertaken this remarkable apotheosis of symphonic movement

<sup>375</sup> Quoted in: Alfred Orel, *Bruckner Brevier. Briefe, Dokumente, Berichte*, Vienna 1953, p. 248.

<sup>376</sup> Joseph Gruber, *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner: Ernste und heitere Episoden aus seinem Leben*, Einsiedeln 1928, p. 37.

<sup>377</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 446; cf. E. Schwanzara, ed., *Anton Bruckner: Vorlesungen Über Harmonielehre u. Kontrapunkt an der Universität Wien*, Vienna 1950, p. 98.

<sup>378</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 557. This was probably a residue in text taken from Auer’s earlier biography, *Bruckner* (1934), p. 348. In the 1941 edition (cf. p. 426) the reference to the proposal being made by Richter does not appear. See further §1.3.8.

<sup>379</sup> See Orel’s concluding remarks on the Finale, D/139.

<sup>380</sup> *Bruckner and Mahler*, London 1955, pp. 104 and again 105.

<sup>381</sup> For example in *Anton Bruckner. Musik und Leben*, p. 86: “An des Meisters Äußerung, das *Te-Deum* als Abschluß zu nehmen, knüpft sich die irrige Meinung, er habe eine Überleitungsmusik geplant.”

with liturgical setting—the notion itself suggests a Catholic apotheosis of the choral Finale of Bruckner's 'musical god' Beethoven—will be examined in more detail in Part Three. The presence of the so-called Te-Deum motive in the earliest sks. for the movement (ÖNB 3194/6<sup>r</sup>, Facs. C/11) reveal it to have been an intentional 'programmatic' link to the concept of a "Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott" from the outset; the motive was surely intended to feature significantly in the final peroration. That Bruckner at some stage conceived the idea of using the unfinished Finale as an 'Überleitungsmusik' is beyond question, however, and should not prove so surprising, given what we know of Bruckner's intentions in writing the Finale. Meißner reported:

Die Überleitung zum [vom?] vierten Satz seiner Neunten dachte er sich mit Motiven aus seinem Tedeum, das ja den Schlußsatz der Symphonie bilden sollte. Und während dieser Überleitung sollte der Sängchor in feierlichem Schritte auf das Podium schreiten.<sup>382</sup>

It is striking that Meißner apparently refers to the Te Deum here as if it was a matter of course that it was to constitute the 'fourth movement' of the Ninth. Concerning the dating of the passage, the remarks appear within the context of Easter 1895, but Meißner may simply have been putting down ideas more or less as they occurred to him, or there may have been editorial interference from the editor Viktor Keldorfer. The version of Meißner's text published in Göllicherich-Auer appears to have been taken from a common source but includes details not found in the 1947 publication (perhaps edited out by Keldorfer); comparison suggests the occurrence described more likely took place a year later, in April or May 1896. In Göllicherich-Auer we read, again apparently in Meißner's words, that Bruckner promised:

von dem weit einherschreitenden Hauptthema, vom Bläserchor hinausgeschmettert, und den darauf fern anklingenden bekannten und originellen Einleitungstakten des Te Deum, sowie den auftretenden Sängern eine ungeheure Wirkung. Er wollte ... gleichsam an den Pforten der Ewigkeit rütteln.<sup>383</sup>

The pencil inscription "Te Deum" on Bogen 11A/"12" (AP, E/50), 12 mm. before the actual appearance of the motive in E minor in the flute, was noted by both Auer and Orel,<sup>384</sup> but its significance was not understood. It follows a 12-m. pencil sk. (cf. E/47ff.), not reproduced by Orel, in the 1st ob. and 1st bsn., of the second statement of the chorale, transposing it from C to E major. Bruckner may have considered introducing the Te Deum at this point, following what would have been musically speaking a feasible, if stop-gap, transposition of the preceding 12 mm. of the chorale to C major.

---

<sup>382</sup> "Aus den Auszeichnungen Anton Meißners", ed. V. Keldorfer, *Die Furche: Jahrbuch 1947*, p. 84.

<sup>383</sup> Quoted in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 559.

<sup>384</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, IV/3, p. 614; Cf. also Orel D/98 and text D/101.

Further consideration of a transition would appear to have been made during later revisions of the Durchf., probably much later in the movement's genesis. Perhaps ÖNB 6085/77–8 (SVE “14”<sup>a</sup>E; C/229ff.), which modulates toward a statement of the Te Deum motive in minims in C—the only time that key occurs in the drafts of this section—was intended to link up with the choral work; speculatively, the anomalous apparent dating of “14. Jänner” (if it is that) on that bifol. could be thought of as a reference to the performance of the Te Deum under Perger which Bruckner heard on 12 January 1896.<sup>385</sup>

A final possibility appears to have occurred to Bruckner in the chorale Repr., where the combination of the chorale and Te Deum motive apparently persuaded both Auer and Orel that Bruckner had progressed no further with the movement's composition. Auer wrote that according to Stradal and Altwirth<sup>386</sup> Bruckner played a transition to the Te Deum from this point to them at the piano, which Stradal transcribed from memory, although no such sk. is extant:

Aus der Mitteilung der erwähnten Gewährsmänner [...] scheint der Meister nicht eine selbständige Überleitungsmusik vom Adagio bis zum Te Deum, sondern eine solche von dem Punkt der Reprise an, geplant zu haben, wo die Koda einsetzen sollte. Als er erkennen mußte, daß die Vollendung eines rein instrumentalen Finales unmöglich war, versuchte er eben zu dem ihm als Schluß vorgeschlagenen Te Deum eine organische Verbindung herzustellen.<sup>387</sup>

Auer even concluded his discussion of the Finale with an analysis of the movement as a transition to the Te Deum.<sup>388</sup> However, Bruckner's own final word on the question seems not to have been known to either Auer or Stradal. As Meißner reported in his “Erinnerungen”:<sup>389</sup> “[...] keiner seiner musikalischen Entwürfe befriedigte ihn. Da schlug er vor mir unwillig den Klavierdeckel zu und sagte: ‘Sie sollen halt das Tedeum einfach so an die Symphonie anhängen.’”<sup>390</sup>

While apparently garbled—and one must recall not only that Meißner's memory may have been dimmed by the passage of time, but also that the text published in 1947 was edited by Keldorfer—it is possible that Meißner, like Stradal and Altwirth, was referring to a transition passage from the reprise of the chorale (“dem weit einerschreitenden Hauptthema”), with figuration reminiscent of the Te Deum (“den darauf fern anklingenden bekannten und originellen Einleitungstakten des Te Deum”) leading into the entry of the

<sup>385</sup> See discussion of the dating in §1.1.10 *supra*. Further discussion in §3.1.11.

<sup>386</sup> *Ibid.*, IV/3, p. 613. See further quotation from this passage in §3.1.11.

<sup>387</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 614f.

<sup>388</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 620.

<sup>389</sup> *Die Furche. Jahrbuch 1947*, p. 84.

<sup>390</sup> Quoted by Wolfgang Partsch, “Anton Meißner...,” p. 59.

singers at the beginning of the choral work itself. If one agrees that this is more likely to have occurred subsequent to Easter 1896 rather than Easter 1895, and if Bruckner soon revoked the idea of using the Finale as a transition, this readily accords what we know about Bruckner's progress on the composition of the Finale which, by the time of Franz Bayer's visit in early May 1896, was "wohl vollständig skizziert"—i.e., almost completely sketched (§1.1.9 *supra*).

It is impossible to know how serious Bruckner was about the last and most likely alternative outlined above. The possibility that three "vi-de" markings found in the score may have been related to the use of the already composed torso of the movement as a transition is raised in §3.1.11; a hypothetical realisation of how a transition from this point could have been conceived musically is discussed in ch. 3.3.<sup>391</sup>

### 1.1.12 The final months.

The pneumonia which Bruckner suddenly contracted in early July marked an abrupt end to the composer's last intensive creative period. It appears to have constituted his first serious illness since the pleurisy and pneumonia Bruckner contracted in December 1894,<sup>392</sup> and like it, probably followed, or was even triggered by, an intensive period of work—in this case, very likely the completion of the first phase of the Finale score. Neumayr explains the medical details of this final crisis:

Anfang Juli trat plötzlich schwerste Atemnot mit Erstickungsgefühl auf, gefolgt von einer komplizierenden Lungenentzündung. Aus heutiger Sicht erlitt Bruckner ein akutes Linksversagen des Herzens mit Ausbildung eines Lungenödems, also einer Flüssigkeitsstauung in den Lungen, dem häufig eine Lungenentzündung nachfolgt. In dieser lebensgefährlichen Phase lag Bruckner zeitweilig wie bewußtlos, wohl wegen des begleitenden Fiebers, und die Ärzte glaubten damals nicht mehr daran, daß er diese Krise noch einmal überstehen würde.<sup>393</sup>

Stradal also observed: "Meißner erzählte mir, daß Bruckner in den letzten Tagen seines Daseins entsetzlich litt und insbesondere Erstickungsanfälle hatte."<sup>394</sup> According to Heller's notes, the period from 9 to 16 of July appears to have been most critical, and on 17 July, at the instigation of his brother Ignaz who had hurried to his side, Bruckner received the Last Sacrament for the third and last time.<sup>395</sup> Yet he again rallied and, as an indication of the

<sup>391</sup> See vol. II, section G: Appendix, G/99ff.

<sup>392</sup> "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt," p. 30; Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 561.

<sup>393</sup> p. 315.

<sup>394</sup> "Eine Erinnerung aus Bruckners letzter Zeit", p. 1075.

<sup>395</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 561. On the same day, at Heller's suggestion, Fritz Ehrbar, the photographer and piano builder, was to secretly make what were the two final photographs of Bruckner, one of him sleeping in bed, the other a group portrait standing at the door of the Belvedere lodge; cf. "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt", p. 31. The latter exists in two versions, one with Heller, the other without, as Schrötter gave a copy of the photograph to Ignaz Bruckner with Heller's image brushed out. This was due to the fact that Heller and another doctor had become involved in a legal case, accusing Schrötter's son of plagiarism in publishing, under his own

composer's astonishingly tenacious hold on life, Heller could note that by Sunday 19 July Bruckner was again "vollkommen wiederhergestellt".<sup>396</sup> He continues: "Leider war seit der letzten Erkrankung der Geist Bruckners nicht unversehrt geblieben—er wurde von Tag zu Tag kindischer und verworrener."<sup>397</sup> Nevertheless, "Trotz der geistigen Abnahme [...] komponierte er weiter und war oft so heiter, daß er uns 'Ländler' vorspielte."<sup>398</sup>

Forbidden by Heller to leave the house on the 19th to attend mass, Bruckner asked Heller to fill out an attestation to the effect that "Nachdem Herr Professor Dr. Anton Bruckner sich bis in hohes Alter um die Kunst stets hochverdient gemacht hat, soll er immer seine volle Freiheit (sobald er genesen ist) haben und überhaupt sein ganzes Leben voll und voll genießen", of which "voll und voll genießen" were apparently dictated to Heller by Bruckner himself. This "Ärztliches Zeugnis" is dated Vienna, 20 July 1896.<sup>399</sup> In gratitude Bruckner promised his doctor to compose a chorale for him, began the following day with its composition, "und schrieb ein Thema auf ein neues Notenpapier, das auf dem Flügel lag".<sup>400</sup> Heller notes further: "Leider gelang es mir nicht, nach seinem Tode dieses für mich so wertvolle Manuskript zu erhalten, obgleich sein Bruder und Kathi bestätigten, daß es mir gehörte".<sup>401</sup> Like so many fragments of the Finale, the manuscript has never been found.

A further sudden downturn was recorded by Heller on 2 August: "Bruckner ist heute wieder plötzlich sehr schlecht beisammen—das heißt nicht so schwer körperlich als geistig. Er spricht ganz verworrenes Zeug und will ununterbrochen Stuhl haben."<sup>402</sup> Over the ensuing days Bruckner became steadily more confused and moody, to the extent that Heller could only with difficulty persuade a nursing assistant to remain with him.<sup>403</sup> But yet again, as Heller left

---

name, a medical work on which all three had been involved; cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 562f. The photographs are reproduced in Göll.-A. IV/3, facing pp. 512 and 560; see also the reproductions in Renate Grasberger, ed., *Bruckner-Ikonographie, Teil I*, pp. 65f. A further half-portrait of Bruckner (*ibid.*, p. 64; Göll.-A. IV/3, facing p. 561) may be either an excerpt from the group picture at the door of the Belvedere or a separate portrait made with Bruckner seated in the apartment. See explanation in Grasberger, pp. 168f. A good reproduction of the photograph of Bruckner sleeping is that given in Hans Conrad Fischer, *Anton Bruckner: Sein Leben: Eine Dokumentation*, Salzburg 1974, p. 197, where the date of the photograph is given incorrectly as "vermutlich Oktober 1896".

<sup>396</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 564; cf. "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt", p. 32. Strikingly, on the same day Kathi Kachelmaier wrote to the composer's friend Karl Lorenz: "Das Befinden von Hr[n] Doktor steht es nicht am besten. Er ist zeitweiße [sich] ganz verloren [...]" (courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>397</sup> "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt", p. 33.

<sup>398</sup> *Ibid.*; Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 569.

<sup>399</sup> Cf. "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt", p. 34. Here the actual wording of the *Zeugnis* (signature ÖNB Mus. Hs. 28.241), which was found in Bruckner's estate and appended by Auer in a footnote, is cited; Heller gave a slightly different wording in the text of his memoirs, presumably written from memory.

<sup>400</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>401</sup> *Ibid.* See further §1.2.2.

<sup>402</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>403</sup> *Ibid.* The nursing assistant ("Wärterin") would at this stage presumably have been Kachelmayr's daughter Ludovika. A further two, Anna Ortner (for the period 17 Sept. to 11 Oct.) and Katharina Prechal (26 Sept. to 11

for his summer holidays on 15 August, being represented in his absence by Dr. Sorgo, he observed that Bruckner was “körperlich ziemlich erholt”.<sup>404</sup>

What Bruckner can have composed after his illness of July 1896 is questionable. The medical crisis probably marked a significant juncture in Bruckner's mental as well as physical, decline and the real evidence of mental confusion, as opposed to the exigency of his failing handwriting, probably dates from this last tragic period of incipient senile dementia. Auer was surely thinking of these final months when he wrote:

Trotzdem er schon 6 Monate vor seinem Tod ganz verloren war, schrieb er bis zum letzten Augenblick Noten. Wenn er nur halbwegs konnte, wankte er ans Klavier, um einige Akkorde anzuschlagen. Er wußte aber meist nicht mehr was er schrieb, löschte es immer wieder aus oder verschmierte es ganz mit Blei.<sup>405</sup>

The passage perhaps represents a certain embellishment—note the similar wording to the quotation cited earlier concerning Bruckner going to the piano—as neither Heller's report nor any of the other eyewitness accounts suggests such extreme mental disarray as early as six months before Bruckner's death. It is probably more significant that Heller, on returning from vacation on 15 September, “fand ihn geistig noch mehr herabgekommen und die vielen Korrekturen in der Partitur im letzten Jahr zeigten auch, daß er musikalisch nicht so leicht mehr arbeitete. Die meiste Zeit des Tages verbrachte er im Lehnstuhl.”<sup>406</sup> The bizarre, almost frenzied attempts to further renumber already composed score bifolds, probably date from these last tragic months—cf. Facs. C/293, 297, 301, 305, 309, 313 and 317, the obvious confusion of which is patently at odds with the firm handwriting, clear musical design and at times intricate counterpoint of the musical text of these pages.

Nonetheless, Bruckner continued to have moments of lucidity and seems even to have been capable of attempting further revisions to the score, demonstrated by the many late SVE for the beginning of the movement (C/71ff.) and drafted expansions to the beginning of the Durchf. (C/41, 49, 209ff., including bifol. “14”<sup>28</sup>E). Not all these later SVE can be rationally construed: many probably represent the wanderings of the composer's mind through varying states of mental clarity.

However, the date of “11. Aug.,” which recurs three times (C/217, 245, 257<sup>407</sup>) may well have represented a particularly ‘good’ day for the composer. Auer<sup>408</sup> notes that on 11 August Bruckner wrote to Joseph Gruber concerning lack of word from the composer's

Oct.) are cited by Orel as assisting Kathi Kachelmayr in the last months (“Anton Bruckners Nachlaß”, *Oberösterreichische Heimatblätter* 3, no. 2 (1949), p. 123).

<sup>404</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>405</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 566.

<sup>406</sup> “Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, p. 35.

<sup>407</sup> That on C/257 (bifol. 16C/“17”) doubtless refers to a later inspection or revision.

<sup>408</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 573.



brother Ignaz (who had returned to St Florian some weeks previously); the letter is lucidly written and is perhaps an index as to the clarity of Bruckner's mind on the day. The revisions of 11 August included (a) a credible and logical expansion of bifol. 13 of the Durchf., namely the SVE "13a" E and "13b" E (Facs. C/217ff., AP E/53<sup>409</sup>—the latter bifol. is unnumbered, the connection between the two bifols. substantiated by handwriting and paper ruling), and (b) an alteration of 13E/"14" on SVE "15" E (Facs. C/245ff.).<sup>410</sup> A further citation of this date on 16C/"17" (Facs. C/257; transcription AP E/73) probably refers to a revision or addition to the scoring made the same day; it appears (in pencil) in a handwriting that is difficult to connect with most of the musical contents which, as the paper ruling and renumbering indicates, must have been written at an earlier point in time.

An undated, anonymous report reproduced in Facs. C/341–42,<sup>411</sup> presumably made by a family member or friend of the family visiting Vienna from Upper Austria, probably derives from summer 1896 and is instructive in its reference to ongoing work on the Finale, by this time already "skizziert", to Bruckner's domestic situation, his introversion, and the state of his mental and physical health:

Nachmittag 5 Uhr. Eben kommen wir von Bruckner. Nachdem wir eine Ewigkeit geläutet [hatten] und schon fortgehen wollten sah ich bei einer anderen Thüre einen Herrn mit einer einfachen Frau herausgehen, denn ich in ganz Wien ausser an seiner Thüre als einen ganz Fremden hätte vorübergehen lassen. Und doch war es Bruckners Ruine mit Frau Kathi. Er ist schon so abgemagert, so alt daß nur mehr der Knochenbau sichtbar ist. Eigentlich ist er besser. Er kann mehr gehen, hat die drei ersten Sätze seine 9. Sinfonie fertig, der letzte Satz ist skizziert und arbeitet er viel daran. [S]eine Nahrung besteht hauptsächlich aus Milch, 4 Litres im Tag. Schrötter war schon ein paar Monate nicht bei ihm, nur sein Assistent kom[m]t. Frau Kathi sagt, mit Beiden thut er nichts als disputiren. Er erkundigte sich nach seinen Leuten und sagte[,] die kümmern sich gar nicht, ausser wenn sie etwas brauchen, worauf sogleich Frau Kathi sagte und wenn sie schreiben, giebt der Herr Doctor keine Antwort und regt sich auf. Da können sie wo[h] nicht schreiben! Das war ganz vernünftig. Frau Kathi machte mir überhaupt einen ganz guten Eindruck. 23 Jahre sagte sie, bin ich beim Herrn Doct[or]. ich habe aber auch schon viel mit ihm ausgestanden. Sie versprach mir eine Karte zu schreiben, wenn es ihm wi[e]der schlechter gehen sollte. Er hatte sichtlich große Freude, dass ich kam. Die Wohnung habe ich leider nicht gesehen. Jedenfalls hat er's hell, braucht nicht zu steigen, hat alle Gärten zur Disposition und ist wie am Land. Kurz er hat seine Pflege[,] sein Auskom[m]en und es sind ihm seine letzten Lebensjahre so behaglich gemacht, als es sein Zustand erlaubt.<sup>412</sup>

<sup>409</sup> Transcribed by Orel (D/122) as 13.<sup>c</sup> Bog. E and 13.<sup>b</sup> Bog. E.

<sup>410</sup> Transcription in Orel, D/122, 14.<sup>f</sup>E, where again Orel appears to have overlooked the significance of the dates, following the SVE bifol. with what he terms the "jüngste erhaltene Fassung", namely the largely scored-out 14.<sup>e</sup> Bog. E (now bifol. 13E/"14"), dated, as noted above, with "14.6.96".

<sup>411</sup> Copy and transcription (original orthography) courtesy of Elisabeth Maier; provenance of the Hueber family (Vöcklabruck).

<sup>412</sup> A similar-sounding report can be found in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 558, where we read that, just prior to Summer 1896, Herr und Frau von Mayfeld visited Bruckner for the last time: "Als sie an der Wohnungstür läuteten,

August must have seen an improvement of some significance in the composer's health following the crisis of July, as a letter from Bruckner's nephew Gustav Hueber refers to news reports speaking of Bruckner as recovered and again taking walks.<sup>413</sup> But in early September Hugo Wolf, hearing of the deterioration of Bruckner's health, paid a visit to the Belvedere, returning "tief erschüttert" according to Eckstein.<sup>414</sup> His account continues with an apparent and perhaps not unintentional allusion to the famous scene of Mozart dictating the timpani part of the Requiem on his deathbed:<sup>415</sup>

Als er nämlich die Wohnung im Belvedere betreten [sic], teilte ihm Bruckners Wirtschafterin mit, man könne den Meister nicht mehr sprechen, da er keineswegs bei klarem Bewußtsein sei. Wolf aber ließ sich nicht abweisen und, auf den Zehenspitzen leise sich heranschleichend, gelang es ihm schließlich, einen Blick durch die halbgeöffnete Tür in das Krankenzimmer zu werfen. Was er dort sah, war ganz eigenartig und tief ergreifend: In einem einfachen Metallbett, in Kissen ganz vergraben, lag Anton Bruckner, mit schmal gewordenem blassen Antlitz, den Blick starr und unbeweglich zur Decke gerichtet, auf den Lippen ein verklärtes Lächeln und diese, wie zu seligem Gesang leise bewegend, schlug er, die ganz abgezehrte Rechte auf der Bettdecke, mit dem ausgestreckten Zeigefinger den Takt zu einer Musik, die nur er allein zu hören vermochte und die der allem Irdischen schon völlig entrückte Meister mit in die Ewigkeit hinübergenommen hat.

Despite lucid moments, Bruckner's mental decline must by this stage have become quite obvious; to those who knew him the symptoms can only have been profoundly disturbing. Josef Schalk wrote to his brother on 24 September following a visit:

Von Bruckner kann ich dir nur sehr Trauriges melden. Sein Geist ist zerfallen und zerstört und immer mehr nimmt ihn das Gespenst des religiösen Wahnsinnes gefangen. Es macht einen grauenhaften Eindruck und wäre ein baldiges Ende wohl das beste, da jede Besserung ausgeschlossen [ist]. Dennoch hält er sich körperlich erstaunlich zähe. Bei meinem letzten Besuch (vor den Ferien) ließ er mich nach einigen Worten unbeachtet stehen und rezitierte krampfhaft, mit Wiederholung der einzelnen Sätze, immer wieder laut das Vater Unser. Ich hatte Mühe, meine Erschütterung zu verbergen und schlich mich weg. Jetzt wage ich nicht mehr, zu ihm ins Zimmer zu treten; ich kann das nicht

---

machte ihnen niemand auf. Da sahen sie in der Ferne eine alten, verfallenen Herrn, der wie ein Franziskaner aussah und ihnen mit einem Schnupftuch winkte: es war Bruckner." The remainder of the passage, however, does not correspond with the above.

<sup>413</sup> Dated Vöcklabruck, 1 September 1896; new edition of Bruckner's letters, GA vol. 24/2 (in press; draft copy courtesy of ABIL).

<sup>414</sup> "Die erste und letzte Begegnung zwischen Hugo Wolf und Anton Bruckner", p. 59; cf. Brosche, "Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf", p. 184.

<sup>415</sup> In the memoir of Sophie Haibel (the sister of Constanze), quoted in Christoph Wolff, *Mozarts Requiem*, Kassel 1991, p. 126.

ansehen, es ist zu schrecklich. Es sollen allerdings auch wieder freundlichere Tage vorkommen, aber das ist ganz unberechenbar [...].<sup>416</sup>

Auer again cites Bruckner as remarking to Karl Almeroth and Adalbert von Goldschmidt, who visited Bruckner around the end of September, that he regretted the impossibility of completing the Finale and—making reference to the dedication of the work—again specified the *Te Deum* as the best conclusion.<sup>417</sup> Franz Brunner, a pupil of Bruckner's visiting him at much the same time, found him at work, and is recorded by Auer as noting the numerous pages of manuscript lying about the room and Bruckner's comment: "‘Segn S’, das wird der Schlußsatz meiner Neunten. Gestern war der [Hans] Richter da, hat ihm sehr g’fall’n.’ Dann fügte er ergeben bei: ‘Na, wann i’ nimmer ferti’ wir, müssen s’ halt ’s *Te Deum* nehma’.”<sup>418</sup>

Even in October Bruckner was apparently still ambulant and took daily quarter-hour walks on warmer days.<sup>419</sup> According to Auer, Bruckner worked on the Finale even on the morning of his death. Yet, as unverifiable as this statement may now be,<sup>420</sup> it must be accepted that the composition of the Ninth Symphony had to all intents and purposes ceased long before, trailing off into an incoherent jumble of numbers scribbled over previously notated bifolds.—perhaps a pathetic, involuntary emulation of the revisions so characteristic of Bruckner's compositional labours.

As noted, Bruckner's prayer records continue in some form until 10 October. On the 7th, four days before his death, Bruckner wrote what was to be his last letter, addressed to his brother Ignaz and Karl Aigner in St. Florian.<sup>421</sup> Although the initial message still makes grammatical sense, the signature and postscript wander off into incoherent repetitions, a poignant indication of Bruckner's awareness of impending death and the degree of disorientation that had by this time set in:

---

<sup>416</sup> Schalk, pp. 65f.; cf. Leibnitz, p. 203. The Schalk correspondence later cites a further two references to Bruckner: p. 67, where, in a letter of 7 October 1896 from Prague, Franz was to ask his brother about the composer's condition, and p. 68, where, in a letter of 8 Nov., Joseph mentions ordering a wreath for Franz (and also, incidentally that one had been sent by Cosima Wagner).

<sup>417</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 572.

<sup>418</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 572f.

<sup>419</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 574

<sup>420</sup> See the discussion of the symbolism of this statement at the opening of the following chapter.

<sup>421</sup> *Ibid.*; a transcription is given in Göll.-A. II/I, p. 327; facsimile p. 328 of the same volume.

Liebster Bruder und Herr Aigner!

Ich bitte Dich nichts mehr an mich zu senden; Ignaz wolle an mich jetzt nichts senden, da ich ebenfalls nichts retournieren kann, mündl. einst mehr.

Dein

Bruder Anton.

Wien, 1896 Okt.

Leb' wohl, wohl wolh  
Belveverd.

7. Okt. 1896     A. B.

Sr Wohlgb. Hr. Ig. Bruck.  
im löbl. Stifte zu  
St. Flor. bei Linz.

Dein Bruder

Anton

1896

Dein

Bruckner.

TT [?] A. Br

Ignaz leb lebe wohl!

Leb webel woll wohl.

hochl leb wohlf!

## 1.2

### The Transmission of the Sources

[...] und daß man von Euch auch nichts Übles denkt,  
behaltet das Blatt, es sei Euch geschenkt.

—Richard Wagner<sup>1</sup>

#### 1.2.1 Bruckner's death.

**B**RUCKNER died at 3.30 pm on the afternoon of Sunday, 11 October 1896. In the Göllerich-Auer biography the paragraph quoted at the end of the previous chapter continues with the following report:

Am folgenden Sonntag früh fühlte sich Bruckner besonders wohl, verließ das Bett und frühstückte mit großem Behagen, dann setzte er sich an das Klavier, um am Finale der Neunten zu arbeiten.

Um 1/21 Uhr kam in Stellvertretung der anderen Ärzte, die auf dem Lande waren, Dr. Sorgo. Er fand nichts Auffallendes im Zustand der Patienten, doch riet er ihm von dem geplanten Spaziergang ab, da es trotz des hellen Sonnenscheins sehr windig war. Der Meister gab sich zufrieden. Er schaffte sich eine schwäbische Brotsuppe mit Würstel an, die er dann aber nicht mochte. Gegen 3 Uhr nachmittags klagte er, daß ihm kalt sei und bat, ihm einen Tee zu bringen. 'Geh'n S' liaber ins Bett', sagte Frau Kathi und ging, den Tee zu bereiten. Außer Frau Kathis Tochter war gerade die Wärterin anwesend. Die beiden brachten den Meister zu Bett. Die Wärterin rief plötzlich der mit dem Tee eintretenden Frau Kathi zu: 'schnell, schnell!'. Bruckner nippte dreimal an der Schale, dann sank er in die Kissen zurück. Mit Hilfe der Wärterin legte er sich auf die linke Seite, tat zwei tiefe Atemzüge und—verschied.

Seine 'via dolorosa' war beendet. — — —<sup>2</sup>

As is unfortunately so often the case with Auer's text, no source is given for the anecdotal report. It must be recalled that Auer, long after the publication of many shorter biographies, was writing less what we would nowadays regard as an accurate documentation than a compendium of transmitted details, some accurate, others embellishment or downright inventions. The statement that Bruckner worked on the Finale on the morning of his last day is consistent with a longstanding topos in music biography, in which the last work of a composer must inevitably bear traces of the final confrontation with death—perhaps an echo of C. P. E. Bach's famous attestation on the last page of the unfinished fugue of *Die Kunst der Fuge*:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*, III. Aufzug.

<sup>2</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 574f. Cf. as an instance of similar details, *ibid.*, p. 572.

“NB Ueber dieser Fuge, [...] ist der Verfasser gestorben”.<sup>3</sup> Aside from the details of the visit of Dr. Sorgo (which Auer presumably took from the doctor himself and which are in any case confirmed by Heller’s report, *infra*) the information given concerning the remainder of the day, from the point of view of its content, suggest most credibly information handed on to Auer by Kathi Kachelmayr herself and, like similar passages in the text where similar material is dealt with, can probably be regarded as authentic.

A report by Anton Meißner apparently quoted *verbatim* is appended to this account by Auer in a footnote.<sup>4</sup> Meißner had called in towards 3 p.m. to inquire about Bruckner’s condition and was informed by Frau Kathi and a nurse “daß es mit ihm schlechter gehe, und er ins Bett gebracht werden müsse”. Shortly after, at a service in the nearby chapel of the Belvedere, Meißner received the news of the death from Frau Kathi’s daughter,<sup>5</sup> who ran in to request the Last Rites from the priest. The report continues:

“[...] Ich lief gleich zu Tode erschrocken ins Sterbezimmer, wo der Meister bereits bewußtlos den letzten Seufzer tat. Und der bald darauf folgende Pater Heribert Witsch fand ihn schon entseelt vor. Der Tod muß plötzlich und schmerzlos eingetreten sein. Pater Heribert und ich beteten hierauf das ‘De profundis’. Es war ein schöner Herbstnachmittag. Tausende und Tausende prominierten über die Ringstraße und ich lief in die seinem ‘Conservatoire’ gegenüberliegende Karlskirche, um die Sterbeglocke läuten zu lassen. Nach Verständigung von seinem Ableben an Dr. Reisch, seinen Rechtsanwalt, August Stradal, den ich ersuchte, er möge nötiges an der Universität und Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde veranlassen, Hans Richter und Dr. Speidel sah ich meine Mission für Bruckner als erledigt an.”<sup>6</sup>

Stradal was hence the first person to visit the apartment after Bruckner’s death. An indication of the extreme religious hyperbole to be encountered in writing of the time is provided by the closing words of Stradal’s “Erinnerungen”:<sup>7</sup>

[Bruckners] Körper war ganz abgemagert; ein feierlicher, beglückter Ausdruck lag über seinem Antlitz, als hätte er alle Erdenpein abgestreift und erschaut das Paradies. Ich sank auf meine Knie, küßte die Hand, die mir so viel liebes erwiesen, und schwur ihm treu zu bleiben bis zum Tode, wo ich hoffe, den Meister wiederzusehen und ihm nahen zu dürfen als ‘ein treuer Diener seines Herrn’.

According to Auer, the news of Bruckner’s death, “verbreitete sich wie ein Lauffeuer”,<sup>8</sup> and the extent to which, given the day and time on which it occurred as well as the readily

<sup>3</sup> See Peter Schleuning, *Johann Sebastian Bachs ‘Die Kunst der Fuge’*, Kassel–Munich 1993, pp. 165ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 575.

<sup>5</sup> According to Orel (“Anton Bruckners Nachlaß”, *Oberösterreichische Heimatblätter* 3, no. 2 (1949), p. 123), this was one of the two nurses, Anna Ortner or Katharina Prechal, who were taken on in the final months to assist with a patient in increasing need of care (see §1.1.11, fn. 403).

<sup>6</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 575.

<sup>7</sup> P. 1075.

accessible location of the Belvedere lodge, may well have led to the arrival of pupils, friends and acquaintances eager to pay their respects.

Meißner's rapid departure from the scene on the 11th may also have had fateful consequences. Although he later returned to receive condolences,<sup>9</sup> he appears to have been away from the apartment for a time, and Kathi Kachelmaier may not have possessed the necessary authority or presence of mind to protect the property of the deceased. Bifolios seriously defaced by Bruckner in his final mental disarray may even have been placed separately from the others and perhaps subsequently destroyed by Kachelmaier or even Meißner.<sup>10</sup> But the principal documentary evidence that we have as to the manner in which the MSS of Bruckner's last composition were torn apart and scattered is that of a squalid rush on Bruckner's property, and that as a result, but all too late, that the apartment was officially sealed. The final, tragically terse paragraphs of Heller's recollections in "Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt" read as follows:

Am 11. Oktober wurde nach mir an die Klinik telephoniert. Ich war momentan nicht anwesend, kam eine halbe Stunde später zu Bruckner und fand ihn tot. Ein Herzschlag hatte seinem Leben ein plötzliches Ende bereitet.

Der Arme hatte kaum die Augen geschlossen, als sich Befugte und Unbefugte wie die Geier auf seinen Nachlaß stürzten. Es wurde sofort alles geschlossen und versiegelt.<sup>11</sup>

Dr. Theodor Reisch, Bruckner's executor, although notified by Meißner, did not arrive until the following day. Although Auer writes that he ordered "die Sicherstellung der nachgelassenen Manuskripte in versiegelten Paketen an", this was either not carried out immediately, or was already too late. The account in Göllerich-Auer lists respects having been paid to the deceased by numerous official persons, among them Schaumann, president of the Wagner-Verein, while of the many musicians and pupils who must surely have come to pay their respects only August Stradal is mentioned by name.<sup>12</sup> A sketch was made of the dead composer by the artist Ferry Bératon<sup>13</sup> and death mask taken by the sculptors Haberl and Zinsler. The body remained until Tuesday on the deathbed, at which time the embalming

<sup>8</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 576.

<sup>9</sup> "Bis zum Eintreffen des Bruders Ignaz [on the 12th or 13th?] nahm Anton Meißner die Kondolenzten entgegen" (Göll.-A., *ibid.*).

<sup>10</sup> Cohrs recently noted, following discussion with Elisabeth Maier, (cf. her recent publication *Verborgene Persönlichkeit...*) that a posthumous entry in Bruckner's calendar of 26 November 1896 made by Meißner (!) suggests that Meißner had given away material following Bruckner's death; further details currently unknown.

<sup>11</sup> "Bruckners letzte behandelnder Arzt," p. 35; the phrase concerning a "Geiersturz" is quoted in Göll.-A., *ibid.* Cf. also Sonntag, *The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner* (Diss., Chicago 1987), p. 28.

<sup>12</sup> Göll.-A., *ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> Auer (*ibid.*) has "Peraton", equally incorrect the caption of the illustration on the following p., "Bésanton".

requested by Bruckner in the codicil to his Will was undertaken by Prof. Paltauf, and the body was laid out in state.

It appears that the implementation of Bruckner's Will occurred, as we read in Orel's account of Bruckner's estate (see §1.2.2 *infra*), first on Friday 16 October, and probably by this time the worst damage had been done. As Elisabeth Maier notes,

Leider geschah diese Versiegelung jedoch um einige—vier bis fünf—verhängnisvolle Tage zu spät, wie sich bald zeigen sollte: Freunde und Schüler erhielten—vielleicht von Bruckners Haushälterin Kathi Kachelmayr, die die Tragweite ihrer Handlung nicht absehen konnte—Manuskripte, Skizzen und Einzelblätter als Andenken zum Geschenk oder eigneten sich vielleicht solche Andenken auch selbst an.<sup>14</sup>

Beyond the loss of bifolds. from the score of the Finale itself—material, it must be remembered, which would seem to have been lying around in greatest disorder in Bruckner's room, ripe for the taking of souvenirs—the chorale which Bruckner had written for Heller, as well as six volumes of Bruckner's Sechter studies, which for instance Franz Schalk noted as having frequently seen, were no longer to be found.<sup>15</sup> A pertinent aside from modern literature is justified here:

When someone dies alone, it's open season on his possessions. People tramp in and out of the apartment—the Emergency Medical Service, the cops, the mortuary personnel, the ME. The cops search for a medical history, the name of the doctor, the names of the next of kin, and during the extensive rummaging, things of value—cash, jewellery, stamp collections—disappear. It's rare that the relatives even know that anything is missing or, knowing, can prove it.<sup>16</sup>

### 1.2.2 The dispersal of Bruckner's musical estate.

We are left with the distinct possibility that significant musical material may have been stolen from Bruckner's apartment immediately following his death on the 11th, but probably even after the arrival on the scene of Reisch the following day. The musical MSS appear to have first been fully secured on the 16th, but even then Reisch seems not to have concerned himself with keeping intact the remaining MSS which had survived the “Geiersturz” of the foregoing

<sup>14</sup> Elisabeth Maier, “Aus den Arbeiten des Anton Bruckner Institutes Linz (ABIL)”, *ÖGM-Mitt.*, no. 27 (December 1994), p. 47. See also Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs' comments and those of Elisabeth Maier concerning the likelihood that mere ‘passers-by’ may have appropriated material, “Round-table: Finale der Neunten Symphonie”, in: *Bruckner-Symposion 1996: Bericht* (Linz 1998), pp. 194, 201; Elisabeth Maier: “Es war aber nicht das Publikum von der Straße sondern Bruckner's Schüler- und Freundeskreis, der sich natürlich darum gerissen hat, irgendein Andenken zu bekommen” (p. 201).

<sup>15</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 610. These were possibly the “sieben dicke Studienbücher, von denen einige leider im zweiten Weltkrieg verlorengegangen sind, mit Tausenden schriftlich gelöster Aufgaben” mentioned by Nowak in “Anton Bruckners ‘Gradus ad Parnassum’”, *Ges. Aufs.* p. 256; the recovery of one of these in the ten years prior to 1966 is noted by Nowak in “Das Bruckner-Erbe der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek”, *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 90.

<sup>16</sup> Michael Baden and Judith Adler Hennessee, *Unnatural Death. Confessions of a Forensic Pathologist*, London 1989, p. 28.



days. In Orel's account of the disposal of the estate, quoting from the official *Nachlaßakten*, we read that:

Bei der Nachlaßaufnahme am 16. Okt. wurde von den Originalmanuskripten 'eine Partie der aus der letzten Zeit herrührenden Kompositionen dem Testamentsexekutor Dr. Reisch zur Sichtung übergeben, die übrigen wurden in [einem] Wandschrank verwahrt, der mit dem Siegel des Obersthofmarschallamtes gesichert wurde[?]. Am 20. Oktober erschien neuerlich eine Kommission in der verwaisten Wohnung im Custodentrakt des Belvederes. Anwesend waren außer dem Erbenvertreter der Direktor der Hofbibliothek Dr. Heinrich R. v. Zeißberg, der Kustos der Hofbibliothek Dr. Franz Wöber, die Konservatoriumsprofessoren Josef Schalk und Ferdinand Löwe und der Offizial des Obersthofmarschallamtes Viktor Czerny. Nach Abnahme der unverletzt befundenen Siegel wurden laut Protokoll 'alle Manuskripte, Kopiaturen und Drucke von der Kommission gesichtet', auch die Kiste 'einer Überprüfung unterzogen'. Die Originalmanuskripte wurden dem Testamentsexekutor 'behufs Veranlassung einer genauen Durchsicht und Prüfung mit Genehmigung der Direktion der k. u. k. Hofbibliothek übergeben'. Am 26. November übernahm der Direktor der Hofbibliothek, die dem Institute von Bruckner vermachten Manuskripte.<sup>17</sup>

Auer wrote with full justification (and righteous indignation): "Ein unverzeihliches Versehen war es, daß eine Inventur des Nachlasses nicht aufgenommen worden war und sich ein genaues Verzeichnis nicht ermitteln läßt."<sup>18</sup> As Maier writes of the dispersal of Bruckner's estate:

Freilich darf hier nicht alle Schuld den "Reliquiensammlern" allein aufgelastet werden: Mindestens ebensosehr betrifft sie die unglückliche Interpretation des Testamentes durch Dr. Reisch, der nur jeweils die Letztfassungen der Werke als der Hofbibliothek zu übergeben ansah [...]<sup>19</sup>

It is equally astonishing that Reisch subsequently, and apparently with the full agreement of Bruckner's heirs, presented autograph MSS to societies which had sponsored Bruckner or awarded him honorary memberships, as well as to friends and patrons such as Rudolf Weinwurm and Karl Aigner. For instance, the Linz Museum was presented with the score of the "Nullte" Symphonie, Josef Schalk received the early version of the Fourth, Karl Aigner the *Vexilla regis*, etc.; the list given by Auer is long and undoubtedly incomplete also.<sup>20</sup> Elisabeth Maier observed in 1996 that Reisch,

hat geglaubt, daß sich Bruckners Legat an die Hofbibliothek nur auf die " Fassungen letzter Hand" beziehe und er daher das andere Material verschenken könne. Er hat z. B.

<sup>17</sup> Alfred Orel, "Anton Bruckners Nachlaß", pp. 123f. Cf. Leopold Nowak, "Das Bruckner-Erbe...", p. 87f.

<sup>18</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 610. Cf. Redlich, "The Finale...", pp. 143f.

<sup>19</sup> Elisabeth Maier, "Aus den Arbeiten des Anton Bruckner Institutes...", *ÖGM-Mitt* no. 27 (Dec. 1994), p. 48. Maier proceeds to quote from the article by Ernst Friedmann quoted at length in §1.2.8 *infra*.

<sup>20</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 608f.

auch Motetten als Souvenir verschenkt. Darüber gibt es Briefe von Reisch an Aigner. Es wurden sogar aus Bruckners Taschen-Notizkalendern Seiten herausgerissen und mit einem Beglaubigungsvermerk versehen: "aus Bruckner's Nachlaß", vermutlich von Oberleithner.<sup>21</sup>

As lawyer Rolf Keller observed of Reisch's practice: "Diese Maßnahmen können rückblickend als wenig glücklich bezeichnet werden; sie bestätigen wie sinnvoll Bruckners Anordnung hinsichtlich seiner Hauptwerke war."<sup>22</sup> Some of Bruckner's scores were not accessible at the time, as noted in the calendar entries of 1895: among them the scores of the E-minor and F-minor Masses and the first three movements of the Third Symphony. This was noted in a report by the Hofbibliothek's director, Hofrat Dr. Heinrich von Zeißberg, who called upon Reisch to investigate the matter. But apparently nothing further eventuated.<sup>23</sup>

Although the will cites only the principal works, it would certainly have been the best and most logical move for *all* of the composer's MSS, both *sk.* and earlier and later versions of the completed works, to have been deposited with the Hofbibliothek—a view that would later be taken (although not with full legal justification, given the wording of Bruckner's will) by Robert Haas.<sup>24</sup> For instance, the score of the Linz version of the First Symphony was apparently among the scores included by Bruckner and Meißner in the "gesiegelten Pacquet" of June 1895 (see §1.1.5), yet it only arrived at the ÖNB in 1990.<sup>25</sup> The original score of the E-minor Mass—the final score of which (an AS with Bruckner's corrections and alterations) appears not to have been accessible in 1896—was not even kept in lieu of a 'final' score, but bequeathed to the Archive of the Neuer Dom in Linz.<sup>26</sup>

Given Bruckner's already widely acknowledged fame as a composer as well as the high standing in which he was held in official circles—as Ehrendoktor of the Vienna University as well as holder of the Order of Franz Josef—Reisch's actions appear by modern-day standards to betray an egregious lack of foresight. Considering the fact that no proper records for the 'formal' bequests appear to exist, Reisch may well have given away *sk.* to interested parties, perhaps even compositional material for the Finale that had had the good fortune to survive the "Geiersturz" on the deceased composer's apartment; although, as we will see, the surviving Finale material was cited in a Protokoll signed on 18 October 1896, and accorded

---

<sup>21</sup> Round-table: "Finale der Neunten Symphonie", in: *Bruckner-Symposium 1996: Bericht* (Linz 1998), p. 201.

<sup>22</sup> p. 103.

<sup>23</sup> "Das Bruckner-Erbe...", p. 87.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Nowak, "Die Anton Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe...", p. 36. Concerning the interpretation that Bruckner intended only 'letzte Fassungen', and the case of the F-minor Mass (§1.2.7 *infra*), see also "Kleine Mitteilungen", *IBG-Mitt* no. 37 (Dec. 1991), pp. 38f.

<sup>25</sup> "Kleine Mitteilungen", p. 39.

<sup>26</sup> Nowak, "Das Bruckner-Erbe...", p. 90.

special treatment—treatment that ensured it would remain safely removed from public scrutiny until well into the 1930s (see §1.2.6 *infra*).

### 1.2.3 The transmission of the autograph score of the Ninth.

It is to Max Auer that we owe the information that Bruckner reputedly gave the completed score of the first three movements of the Ninth into the hands of visiting Berlin conductor Karl Muck at some stage during his last years, and furthermore that Bruckner did so to ensure the preservation of the MS from the editorial interventions of his Vienna circle:

Als Biograph des Meisters gewährte mir Dr. Karl Muck vor vielen Jahren in Bayreuth eine längere Unterredung, bei welcher er mir anvertraute, daß ihm der Meister die Handschrift der Neunten nach Berlin mitgegeben habe, mit der Bemerkung, ‘daß nix g’schiacht dran’! Später sandte ich Dr. Muck jenen Teil des IV. Bandes der großen Biographie von Göllicherich-Auer, der die Erstaufführung der Siebten unter Muck in Graz behandelt, wobei ich als Beweis, wie sehr der Meister seinen jungen Freund schätze, die eben erwähnte Tatsache anführte. Ich bekam das Manuskript mit einzelnen Bemerkungen als beglaubigt zurück. 1934 hatte ich nochmals Gelegenheit, Dr. Muck in Stuttgart zu besuchen, wo er auf meine neuerliche Frage betreffend die Neunte seine seinerzeitige Aussage wiederholte. Es müssen schwerwiegende Gründe gewesen sein, die den Meister veranlaßten, die Handschrift aus Wien wegbringen zu lassen!<sup>27</sup>

In the Göllicherich-Auer biography we also read: “Wie mißtrauisch er jetzt gegen seine besten Freunde war, beweist auch der Umstand, daß er die Partitur der fertigen drei Sätze der Neunten später seinem treuen Freund Dr. Karl Muck zur Aufbewahrung übergab, der sie erst lange nach dem Tod des Meisters nach Wien zurückbrachte.”<sup>28</sup> If Auer’s claims are true, we may well thank Bruckner’s prescience for the fact that the completed three movements of the Ninth survived intact. However, the statement does surely deserves closer attention.

It must first be kept in mind that Auer’s 1930s publications were written against the backdrop of an embittered battle over the question of the validity of first editions vs. the autographs. Bruckner’s bequest to Muck was doubtless intended by Auer to serve as an indicator of the composer’s increasing distance from and distrust of his editors (as discussed §1.1.4), but it remains problematic. Firstly, there is a notable absence of any corroborative evidence. While no date can be established for Muck’s visit with Bruckner nor for that matter the return of the score to Vienna, the former can only have been at a relatively late stage, at the earliest in mid-October 1895.<sup>29</sup> As the score was then officially taken into the Hofbibliothek’s holdings with the rest of the MSS determined by Reisch as comprising Bruckner’s bequest to the library, cited in its inventory, the *Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum*, as “Legat des

<sup>27</sup> “Der Streit um den ‘echten’ Bruckner (I)”, p. 539; excerpts already cited in §1.1.4.

<sup>28</sup> Vol. IV/3, p. 527; likewise cited in §1.1.4.

<sup>29</sup> Doebel (p. 129) endorses the bequest to Muck, for which he cites the date of April 1895 not given in the Göllicherich-Auer biography (cf. Auer, *Bruckner* 1941, p. 418; Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 527, IV/2, p. 420).

Komponisten. 26. Nov. 1896", it must surely have been returned to Vienna immediately following Bruckner's death—not 'long after', as Auer claims.<sup>30</sup> Nowak,<sup>31</sup> however, uncritically endorsed the claim that Bruckner sent the first three movements to Muck, like Auer expressly citing it as evidence of Bruckner's distrust of the Schalks and Löwe.<sup>32</sup>

Secondly, whether or not the score was ever removed from Vienna, it becomes clear that the already cited calendar note of 4 October 1895, in Josef Schalk's handwriting, "Die ersten 10 Bogen des ersten Satzes zum Arrangement erhalten. Jose[f] Schalk",<sup>33</sup> refers to the AS of that movement, doubtless ÖNB 29.305, prepared by Anton Meißner and bearing annotations for instrumental alterations in the hand of Franz Schalk. The AS was obviously made with Bruckner's full assent, as its 56 fols. are enclosed in a cover bifol. bearing the autograph inscription in pencil "9. Sinf. 1. Satz, Dr. A Br[u]ckn[e]r."<sup>34</sup> Schalk's calendar note makes clear that even at this stage Bruckner was still prepared to have his work arranged by Schalk. It also demonstrates that Meißner must not have finished copying the movement by that time. We can therefore conclude that the AP must still have been in Bruckner's possession at least until mid October.<sup>35</sup> B. G. Cohrs also substantiated the existence of an additional layer of articulation in pencil in the AP of the first three movements not to be found in Meißner's AS;<sup>36</sup> this represents corroborative evidence for Bruckner's continued compositional engagement with the AP of the first three movements beyond October 1895.

Additional evidence of Bruckner's continuing possession of the AP in summer or autumn 1895 is apparent from the context of the following scene, recounted by August Stradal:<sup>37</sup>

Ich hatte im vorhergehenden Winter (1894/95) in England und in München das Adagio der achten Symphonie (von mir zweihändig für Klavier bearbeitet) in Konzerten gespielt. Nun drängte es mich dem Meister das Adagio vorzuspielen. Nachdem ich geendet hatte,

<sup>30</sup> This information courtesy of Thomas Leibnitz (then on the staff of the ÖNB), who in a letter to the present writer of 11 Jan. 1993 concluded: "Wenn die von Auer berichtete Übergabe an Karl Muck überhaupt stimmt, so kann es sich nur um eine kurze Episode gehandelt haben".

<sup>31</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Musik und Leben*, p. 87.

<sup>32</sup> Karl Grebe (*Anton Bruckner in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*, Reinbeck bei Hamburg 1972, p. 130) is one of the very few secondary biographers to mention Bruckner giving the score to Muck.

<sup>33</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 546. As already noted, Auer usually spelt Josef Schalk's name with '-ph'.

<sup>34</sup> According to information supplied by Gunnar Cohrs, the bifols. (1–27) were so numbered by Meißner; a further foliation in pencil (1–56) appears to have been made by Max Auer.

<sup>35</sup> Significantly, as has been observed by Cohrs, the alterations in this copy are to be found mainly on bifols. 1–10; only occasional retouchings appear on bifols. 11, 13 and 15.

<sup>36</sup> This is mentioned in the Foreword to the new GA publication of the Ninth, ed. Cohrs (2000), p. IX.

<sup>37</sup> "Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit", p. 1074.

zeigte mir Bruckner das Adagio der Neunten, von dem er selbst mühsam mit zitterigen Händen einen kleinen Teil spielte.<sup>38</sup>

Hence the score can only have been given to Muck after October 1895, and Muck must have returned it to the Hofbibliothek shortly after receiving news of Bruckner's death, not long after. We are hence left with the possibility that verbal statements made by Muck were perhaps incorrectly conveyed by Auer. A passage in an earlier article by Auer<sup>39</sup> suggests more directly that the claim may have had an agenda:

Bei der neunten Symphonie, deren Handschrift der Meister einem Freund außerhalb Wiens zur Aufbewahrung übergab und die erst mehrere Jahre nach des Meisters Tod nach Wien zurückkam, konnte die Revision nicht mehr unter den Augen des Meisters erfolgen.

Of course, prior to late October 1895 Joseph Schalk or Löwe would have had ample opportunity to discuss alterations with Bruckner in any case, thus obviating the point of Auer's assertion. Moreover, had such an important document as the score of the Ninth been given away, Bruckner would surely have made some sort of note of it.<sup>40</sup>

In the view of the notable absence of corroborative evidence it may be significant that Auer went to such pains in his "Streit um den 'Originalfassungen'" article to base the claim solely on verbal statements from Muck himself, who died in 1940, and would therefore surely have been capable of refuting reports of conversations between himself and Auer if had they been blatant falsehoods.

Another possibility presents itself. Considering that Muck was Ehrenpräsident of the IBG from 1932 onwards, it seems at least possible that the claim represents either an intentional conspiracy on the part of Muck and Auer designed to lend weight to the defence of the autographs, or a ploy for this purpose by Muck alone in which Auer willingly or unknowingly acquiesced.<sup>41</sup> Either way—and this by no means constitutes 'proof'—the statement may provide an instance of factual falsification by the proponents of the autograph versions in order to corroborate their claims.

#### 1.2.4 The transmission of the remaining MSS of the Ninth.

While there was never any question, in the case of the first three movements of the Ninth (whether or not they ever left Bruckner's possession), that they were an integral part of

<sup>38</sup> August Stradal would later go on to make a piano transcription of the Scherzo of the Ninth (ÖNB 33.308), the date of which, however, cannot be established with certainty.

<sup>39</sup> "Anton Bruckners IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung", *ZfM*, no. 10 (October 1932), p. 861.

<sup>40</sup> As noted by Cohrs following his perusal of Maier's publication of Bruckner's desk calendars (*Verborgene Persönlichkeit...*, Linz 2001).

<sup>41</sup> Auer's claim was most recently adopted uncritically by Ingrid Fuchs in her article on Karl Muck in *Anton Bruckner: Ein Handbuch*, ed. Uwe Harten, Vienna–Salzburg 1996, p. 294.

Bruckner's bequest to the Hofbibliothek, the wording of Bruckner's will left a loop-hole which, as we have seen, rendered Reisch less than careful about protecting other MSS that were, or might be, pertinent to the Ninth Symphony.<sup>42</sup>

The present location of the known extant material for the Ninth Symphony (see Table VI, A/23f.)—namely under several signatures of the ÖNB, the Wiener StB, what is now the library of the Universität für Darstellende Kunst, the Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Cracow, the Library of Congress, Washington, and in private possession—is eloquent testimony to the catastrophic diaspora of materials occasioned by the “Geiersturz” reported by Heller as well as the lack of care exhibited by Reisch and his advisers. Concerning the often tortuous paths by which the material later re-emerged in official hands, numerous questions remain, many of which will probably never be resolved.<sup>43</sup>

Apart from the AP of the first three movements, no further MSS for the Ninth entered the Hofbibliothek's holdings in 1896<sup>44</sup> but, like many other works by Bruckner, they were only gradually acquired via bequests, purchases and exchanges. Leopold Nowak maintained that sks. for the Ninth were taken by “Ferdinand Löwe sowie Josef und nach ihm Franz Schalk, der Rest ging an die Erben des Meisters in Vöcklabruck, soweit er eben nicht untertauchte und verlorenging”.<sup>45</sup> Auer wrote similarly that a number of smaller works (perhaps including sks. and drafts):

wurde von den zur Sichtung beauftragten Herren fortlaufend numeriert. Sie wurden teilweise dem Biographen August Göllerich als Material für die Biographie zur Verfügung gestellt. Eine Anzahl davon wurde von Göllerich auch an Rudolf Louis ausgeliehen. Es gelang, einen Teil davon durch die Erben der Nationalbibliothek zuzuführen.<sup>46</sup>

The family of Bruckner's sister Rosalie Hueber also appears to have been the recipients of a number of documents and even sketches, yet seems scarcely to have appreciated the significance of much of this material. Auer reported the proverbial situation: finding a pile of paper—albeit non-autograph materials—at the side of their fireplace, being used by the relatives in Vöcklabruck as packing paper for their gardening wares, and rescued these and other autograph material at the cost of almost an entire month's salary.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Redlich, “The Finale...”, pp. 143f.

<sup>43</sup> An overview of the ensuing discussion of the provenance of the MSS is provided by Table VI, A/23f. See also Table IV, Principal Dates, 1896–1996 (A/14f.), which includes the acquisition dates of the MSS in chronological order.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Nowak, “Das Bruckner-Erbe...”, *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 587f; also Sonntag, p. 26.

<sup>45</sup> “Das Bruckner-Erbe der Österreichische Nationalbibliothek”, in: *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 87.

<sup>46</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 609. It may not be far-fetched to interpret Auer's wording in the last sentence as an indication that the Hofbibliothek may have required persuasion to agree to accept further items from the estate.

<sup>47</sup> Göll.-A. II/1, p. 11.

One of the earliest, modest additions to the Bruckner holdings of the ÖNB was the acquisition of a number of items in 1914, among them an initial single-page sk. for the opening of the Scherzo of the Ninth, (now) ÖNB 28.224,<sup>48</sup> which includes a sk. for the revision of the Adagio of the Third Symphony (documenting the transition from Bruckner's interrupted composition of the Ninth to the revision of the Third in early 1889). In the same year (1914) the Wiener Stadtbibliothek (StB) acquired its first four bifols. to the Finale from the estate of Cyrill Hynais (M. H. 3791; see §1.2.6 *infra*)—which would later be described by the then Director of that institution, Alfred Orel, in the earliest article to describe any sources for the Finale, “Skizzen zum vierten Satz von Bruckners Neunter Symphonie”.<sup>49</sup>

In January 1927, Robert Haas succeeded in purchasing a significant number—36 items in all—of Bruckner autographs from the Hueber family, among them the (original) signatures 3165 and 3176 containing sks. for the Ninth.<sup>50</sup> A further number of sks. was acquired from the estate of Ferdinand Löwe (3175), while in the same year Löwe's widow Amalie sold a much larger body of material from her husband's estate to the Wiener StB (M. H. 4189), consisting in all of some 56 fols. of pc. sks. and score material from all four movements of the Ninth, including the score of the second rejected Trio and a single bifol. detached from the score of the Finale (see again, *infra*). The ÖNB purchases from the Hueber and Löwe estates were all miscellaneous collections of sks. which would later be subdivided by Leopold Nowak into separate signatures according to their compositional contents;<sup>51</sup> the M. H. 4189 group remained untouched. In the years 1930–31 Max Auer donated an even larger body of autograph material to the ÖNB, among them the Finale-relevant signatures 3194 and 6007 and the early sks. for the Scherzo of the Ninth, ÖNB 3196. Significantly, all the material for the Ninth Symphony and Finale that can be officially traced via the Huebers, Löwe and Göllicher (whose material passed to Auer) was distributed among its recipients without the least regard for its contextual integrity.

While the Bruckner MSS of Josef and Franz Schalk were to remain in Vienna and eventually enter official holdings there, a further important body of materials for the Eighth and Ninth Symphonies found its way to Berlin. Although it cannot now be ascertained more precisely, the Preußische Staatsbibliothek's acquisition of the so-called “Krakauer Skizzen”, a further group of materials (c. 64 fols.) sold by Amalie Löwe (b. 1871, d. May 1933<sup>52</sup>) from

<sup>48</sup> Originally S.m. (i.e., Mus. Hs.) 2105, fol. 6; the provenance of the signature is not clear.

<sup>49</sup> *Der Merker* 12 (1921–22), no. 19, pp. 411–19; further discussion see §1.2.6 *infra*.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Nowak, “Das Bruckner-Erbe...”, p. 88; see also the following fn. As Cohrs has noted, ÖNB 28.225, previously fols. 3–4 of the Hueber 3165 miscellany, bears the name “Löwe” at the top of the first page; perhaps this was among material initially ear-marked by Löwe for himself but which eventually went to Vöcklabruck; cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 609f. (quoted *supra*).

<sup>51</sup> See Tables I and VI as well as discussion in §1.2.5 *infra*.

<sup>52</sup> Reinhard Rauner, *Ferdinand Löwe: Leben und Wirken, I. Teil 1863–1900*, p. 137.

her husband's estate, presumably took place at the same time or shortly after the 1927 Vienna acquisitions, but prior to 1933;<sup>53</sup> a more precise confirmation is impossible, the catalogues of the Berlin Music Collection having been destroyed by fire in 1945.<sup>54</sup> The material was analysed and annotated in 1933–34 by the Bruckner scholar Fritz Oeser, who, unfortunately, did not carry out a proper foliation of the material and make a separate report but inserted written comments on small sheets of blank paper attached to the originals by paper clips. These subdivide the original MSS, mainly 4-p. bifols., into a number of groups, making reference to the measure numbers of the Universal Edition publication of the score (a reprint of the original edition of 1903).

The fact that Orel (cf. D/6) makes no reference whatsoever to anything from Löwe's estate is doubtless indicative of an uncooperative attitude on the part of Amalie in her last years—scarcely surprising, considering that Orel and the IBG were, after all, unmasking Löwe's 1903 publication of the Ninth as an undeclared and unauthorised arrangement.<sup>55</sup> In 1929, as Orel appears to have begun active research towards the *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie*,<sup>56</sup> one might have expected her to at least have made known to him the existence of the MSS either already sold to Berlin or still in her possession by that stage; alternatively, in view of her previous sales of MSS to the ÖNB and StB in 1927, Orel may well have assumed that this material comprised the sum total of Bruckner autographs from Löwe's estate and made no further enquiries.

It is also not impossible that Oeser and the Berlin authorities may have entered into some sort of agreement not to inform Orel about the material, although of course the truth eventually became known. Shortly before the Orel edition appeared, the then director of the music department of the Berlin library, Johannes Wolf, accorded Oeser full rights to a musicological publication of the Berlin materials. This was stated in a letter from Oeser to Hans-Hubert Schönzeler quoted in Schönzeler's book on the Cracow sketches,<sup>57</sup> according to

---

<sup>53</sup> As noted by Hans-Hubert Schönzeler, *Zu Bruckners IX. Symphonie: Die Krakauer Skizzen*, Vienna 1987, p. 8. Mariana Sonntag, whose doctoral thesis of the same year (*The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner: A study of the sketches and drafts for the first movement of the Ninth Symphony*, Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago) was the first study to make use of this material, was not able to ascertain more concerning the acquisition date of the material (cf. pp. 27f.). An abstract of the thesis can be found in: *Dissertation Abstracts* 48, no. 7 (Jan. 1988), pp. 1580A–1581A; further discussion §3.0.2.

<sup>54</sup> See Richard S. Hill, "The Former Prussian State Library." *Notes* Ser. 2, vol. 3, no. 4 (September 1946), p. 329 (further information *infra*)

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Löwe's "ablehnende Haltung" towards the first initiatives toward a critical edition, §1.3.5, and the further analysis of the problems surrounding the Orel publication, in §1.3.6.

<sup>56</sup> The volumes dealing with the Ninth were in fact ready for publication in 1932, their appearance postponed by the collapse of Filser Verlag in the same year (§1.3.5).

<sup>57</sup> P. 8.



which Wolf requested Oeser “die Manuskripte systematisch zu ordnen und zu beschriften, er würde mir (meiner Bitte gemäß) dafür die wissenschaftliche Auswertung reservieren [...]”.<sup>58</sup>

Did the Berlin library refuse to allow Haas or Nowak to include these MSS in a subsequent edition of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen*? Mariana Sonntag, whose 1987 dissertation<sup>59</sup> was the first to make use of this important source, and who remains the only musicologist to have so far examined these MSS *in situ*, relates Leopold Nowak’s contentions that Oeser may have purposely kept the materials from Orel’s attention for his own purposes:<sup>60</sup>

After Bruckner’s death materials for the Ninth Symphony were divided between Josef Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe. According to Leopold Nowak,<sup>61</sup> most of the sketches and the drafts for the Ninth became the property of Löwe, who wanted to complete the Finale. The autograph manuscript as well as a few pages of sketches, were given to Josef Schalk.<sup>62</sup> While the latter’s materials were eventually returned or donated to the Nationalbibliothek, the former’s were not. After his death Ferdinand Löwe’s widow divided up the sketches and drafts which had been left to her. The sketches and a few of the bifolios of the preliminary manuscript she sold to the Preußische Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, the remaining drafts she sold to the Stadtbibliothek in Vienna in 1927.

While those sketches and drafts in Vienna have always been available those materials which went to Berlin virtually disappeared. For some time after they were received, [they] were not always made accessible to scholars.

—at which point Sonntag adds the footnote:

Leopold Nowak suggested (in the same private conversation) that Fritz Oeser, then maintaining some connection with the Staatsbibliothek,<sup>63</sup> sought to limit accessibility to these materials so he could use them for his own purposes. They were certainly not made available to Alfred Orel when he published his edition.

This passage raises the fact that Nowak appears to have believed that Löwe wished to complete the Finale—a tangential issue here, but one with important ramifications for the transmission history of the Ninth.

In the first place, there is no evidence for any of the Schalk-estate material for the Finale—in essence the present ÖNB signatures 6085–87—passing through Löwe’s hands at any time. That, as claimed by Nowak, significant amounts of material for the Finale went to

---

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.* Schönzeler also mentions that the last frame of the microfilm placed at his disposal contained a statement from Oeser to the effect that “Herr Fritz Oeser [...] behält sich die wissenschaftliche Auswertung der Brucknerschen Skizzen vor.” The statement, dated 13 January 1934, is signed by Wolf.

<sup>59</sup> *The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner: A study of the sketches and drafts for the first movement of the Ninth Symphony*, Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1987.

<sup>60</sup> Sonntag, pp. 27f.

<sup>61</sup> Sonntag here adds the footnote: “This information was passed on to me during a private conversation at Dr. Nowak’s house on 4 December 1983.”

<sup>62</sup> Perhaps this referred only to the Finale, not the whole Ninth? (note of the present writer).

<sup>63</sup> This is confirmed by introduction to Schoenzeler’s, see *infra* (note of the present writer).

Ferdinand Löwe as well as to Josef Schalk, in contradiction to the wording of the Protokoll of 18 October 1896 (see §1.2.6 *infra*), is not mentioned by Auer (who would have known) nor by Orel, nor Leibnitz, and is surely incorrect.<sup>64</sup> There are two exceptions: first, the single orchestral bifol. for the Finale, 20F/“21” (Facs. C/285ff.), included in the material for the first, second and third movements sold in 1927 by Löwe's widow to the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek and now ordered as fols. 27–28 of that library's M. H. 4189;<sup>65</sup> second, the isolated pc. sk. for the Finale found in the Cracow materials for the Ninth Symphony (fols. 59–60 thereof, a single p. of which is notated, Facs. C/49). These confirm that this material was detached from the main body of Finale MSS prior to being taken into the possession of Joseph Schalk.

Had Löwe wished to complete the Finale, he, rather than Josef Schalk, would surely have taken the Finale materials on 18 October 1896, and (consummate practical musician that he was), perhaps even made something of them—a kind of Bruckner/Löwe counterpart to the Mozart/Süßmayr Requiem. The opposite occurred: Löwe's signature on the Protokoll of 18 October suggests that he knew full well the extent of the material and was intentionally obfuscatory in stating, as he did in the Doblinger edition of 1903,<sup>66</sup> that the material represented merely “Skizzen” for a “groß angelegte” transition to the Te Deum, that permitted “nur andeutungsweise die letzten Absichten des Meisters errathen”. Löwe's own views concerning the Finale were probably in line with those who preferred to see the Finale materials (already disfigured and rendered less apparently intelligible by losses) as an embarrassing artefact of Bruckner's mental decline that was best suppressed. A footnote in Auer's discussion probably reflected Löwe's views:

Auch Jos. Wöß berichtet [...] nach einer Mitteilung Ferdinand Löwe, daß man dem schwerkranken Meister—seinem Wunsche gemäß—‘die Skizzen zum letzten Satz der Neunten, späterhin die der Überleitungsmusik vorgelegt habe; daß er wohl daran arbeitete, aber nichts Rechtes mehr zuwege bringe’.<sup>67</sup>

That Orel, although occupied with the publication of all extant material related to the Ninth—an undertaking which would probably have been known to musicologists in Berlin—had no inkling of the material sold by Amalie Löwe to the Preußische Staatsbibliothek is made more enigmatic by a laconic addendum in Robert Haas' Bruckner biography published in 1934<sup>68</sup> that “Skizzen zur 8. und 9. Symphonie liegen auch in Berlin, Staatsbibl.[iothek]”.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Sonntag, p. 27; cf. also Franz Grasberger, “Anton Bruckners Arbeitsweise”, p. 33.

<sup>65</sup> Orel's ascription of this material to what he called Fassung E is unquestionably incorrect. See discussion in §§1.3.6 and 3.1.2.

<sup>66</sup> See citation and discussion in §1.3.3.

<sup>67</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 613f.

<sup>68</sup> p. 158.

The significance of Haas' footnote was overlooked; 'official' clarification first appeared fifty years later, in 1984, when Nowak explained that the editors learnt of the material sold to Berlin only *after* the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* appeared in print, but, aware that making known such an obvious oversight would have brought the IBG's whole undertaking into disrepute, postponed any re-publication of the edition.<sup>69</sup> The idea of republishing the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* so as to include the Berlin materials was also never realised by Nowak, not least because of their dramatic destiny.<sup>70</sup> Following a surprise British bombing raid in April 1941 the Preußische Staatsbibliothek made the decision to evacuate its collections to various safe depots throughout the Third Reich and, from mid-1941 onwards,<sup>71</sup> its music collection was evacuated from Berlin to various destinations. A large number of autograph MSS, among them several Bach cantatas, Beethoven symphonies and quartets, several operas by Mozart and four by Meyerbeer, ultimately found their way to the monastery of Grüßau<sup>72</sup> in Silesia. Among these, as the library's only Bruckner MSS, went the sks. for the Eighth and Ninth Symphonies sold to the library by Löwe's widow.

Following the liberation of the area by the Russians in late spring of 1945 during their advance toward Berlin, the collection effectively became spoils of war. German authorities lost track of it; there were rumours that the MSS were destroyed by the Poles or Russians and even that the monastery had been destroyed by fire in the last days of the war.<sup>73</sup> In fact, however, the MSS remained in Grüßau for at least two years after the cessation of hostilities; according to an eye-witness they were taken away by army lorries to an unspecified location in about May 1947.<sup>74</sup> Numerous approaches to Polish and Russian libraries to ascertain the collection's whereabouts proved unsuccessful until in April 1973 an American music journalist by the name of Carleton Smith reported having examined 28 boxes of material at an unspecified location near Cracow.<sup>75</sup> The MSS were finally officially 'discovered' and taken

---

<sup>69</sup> "Die Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe..." p. 37. That the young Nowak himself corrected the Orel edition in 1934–35 has already been mentioned (§0.1.2); further discussion in §§1.3.6 and 3.1.2.

<sup>70</sup> The war-time fate of the Preußische Staatsbibliothek has been outlined by Richard S. Hill, "The Former Prussian State Library." *Notes* series 2, vol. 3, no. 4 (September 1946), pp. 327–350 and 406–410; the subsequent search for the music autographs is detailed by P. J. Y. Whitehead, "The Lost Berlin Manuscripts." *Notes* 33 (September 1976), pp. 7–15.

<sup>71</sup> Whitehead, pp. 7f.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 8ff.; cf. Hill (p. 342), who gives a list of the Preußische Staatsbibliothek's depots and the subdivision of its music collections among them. As we have noted, according to Hill (p. 329) the catalogues of the Music Collection were destroyed by fire in the Potsdamerstraße during their evacuation in February 1945.

<sup>73</sup> Whitehead, p. 11. It would, however, have been readily ascertainable that the originally Cistercian, later Benedictine, monastery of Grüßau survived the war intact. See Günther Grundmann, *Dome, Kirchen und Klöster in Schlesien*, Frankfurt 1963, p. 111.

<sup>74</sup> Whitehead, *ibid.*

<sup>75</sup> See the newspaper articles mentioned by Whitehead, pp. 12f.

into the possession of the Biblioteka Jagiellońska, a department of the University of Cracow, in 1976.<sup>76</sup>

By this time Nowak was no longer in a position to undertake a republication of the Bruckner materials. In 1983 he nonetheless ordered a microfilm from the Cracow library (now MF 583 of the ÖNB Musiksammlung), which reveals an attempted foliation in black felt pen in his handwriting. A further copy, MF 555 (also foliated), was used by the present writer and appears to be more complete.<sup>77</sup> F60 BRGA 68 contains much material—including detailed transcriptions—from as late as February 1986 testifying to Nowak's ongoing interest in its eventual publication in a new edition of the material for the Ninth. Along with c. 50 fols. of (mainly) discarded orchestral bifols. for the Eighth Symphony, the Cracow material includes some 64 fols. of sks. and discarded orchestral bifols., comprising 29 each for the first and third movements of the Ninth,<sup>78</sup> a bifol. (1 p. of sks.) for the Finale and a further 2 bifols. (2 pp. of sks.) regarded by both Oeser and Schönzeler as “unbestimmt”. Cohrs and the present writer undertook a foliation of the material based on a comparison of the available microfilms with the groupings of the material by Fritz Oeser that were employed by Hans-Hubert Schönzeler.<sup>79</sup> By establishing a concordance of the available microfilms and copies it was possible to arrive at an accurate foliation of the material ‘in absentia’, so to speak, augmenting the brief study made by Schönzeler (MWV, 1987), who transcribed and annotated the analytical notes made by Oeser in 1933, and correcting previous errors in foliation made by both Nowak and Sonntag. A complete study of these materials as well as their proper contextualisation and correlation with the other extant sources for the first and third movements of the Ninth still awaits completion.

---

<sup>76</sup> Information courtesy of Dr. Elisabeth Maier.

<sup>77</sup> This copy, originally made by the Jagiellońska library administration at the request of Nicola Samale, was given in 1989 to the library by Gunnar Cohrs, as at that stage the copy requested by Nowak was still in the latter's hands. The present writer also used for his research paper photocopies made from an incomplete set of photographic reproductions, in turn made from N. Samale's microfilm. Sincere thanks is due here to Nicola Samale, Gunnar Cohrs and subsequently the ÖNB for their generous assistance with the problems of this material.

<sup>78</sup> Sonntag (cf. *The Compositional Process...*, pp. 408f.) strangely omitted a blank folio (fol. 10; according to Oeser, Gruppe V) from her listing of the sources for the first movement; as a result she identifies 28, not 29 fols. for the first movement of the Ninth. Her study of the evolution of the first movement appears in abridged form in her article, “A New Perspective on Anton Bruckner's Composition of the Ninth Symphony”, *BrJb* 1989–90, pp. 77–114; cf. concerning the Cracow MSS, pp. 99 thereof.

<sup>79</sup> See *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke: Zu Band 9: Entwürfe zum zweiten Satz und Trio mit Viola-Solo/ Studienband*, ed. Gunnar Cohrs (Vienna 1998), Anhang 4, “Der Mikrofilm der Krakauer Skizzen in der Musiksammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek”, pp. 130ff., including a concordance of the foliations of the Cracow MSS according to Oeser, Nowak, Schönzeler and Sonntag (p. 133).

Mention must also be made here of a further group of materials for the Ninth described and evaluated by Sonntag,<sup>80</sup> namely those in the Library of Congress in Washington, D. C. This source comprises five fols. of pc. sks., mainly for the Gesangsp. of IX/1, from the Finale of the Eighth, the remainder being unruled MS paper. These comprise five apparently loose, unfoliated leaves, 24-stave, bearing the trade mark “B. & H. Nr. 14. A.”, with the exception of one folio without trade mark,<sup>81</sup> and contain pc. sks. in pencil and ink, a few relating to VIII(1890)/4, most, however, to the Exp. of IX/1, and include one page prepared in full score for letter Zz of VIII/4,<sup>82</sup> as well as a likewise discarded score fol. for the original conception of the end of the Gesangsp. in the Exp. of IX/1 (which altered radically in conception after 1890). The pc. sks. are marked “Gesangsp.”, “Schluß der Gesangsp.” sowie “Schlußp”, the latter dated 7, 8 and 9. September 1887.

In addition, the source includes two fols. (probably originally 1 bifol.), apparently used as a cover bifol., on the first page of which is written in a hand other than Bruckner’s (presumably, as we shall see, that of his pupil and copyist Viktor Christ): “Autographe/ von Anton Bruckner/ Skizzen theils aus der 8. theils aus der 9. Symphonie/ am 31. Oktober von ihm zum Andenken erhalten”. The date “1890” has been added in pencil.<sup>83</sup> The paper type of these two folios, the 24-stave “J. E. & Co. / No. 8.” used for substantial parts of the Ninth from 1890 onwards, tends to corroborate this date for the bequest of the material to Christ—and also suggests that it was indeed a bequest, not an appropriation. That Bruckner apparently chose to give these materials away correlates with what we know of compositional progress on the first movement. A sk. for the Hauptth. of IX/1 in the Cracow material being dated 26 October 1890 (cf. Table II, A/7), it seems reasonable to assume that Bruckner by that time (i.e., immediately following the revision of I/2, concluded on 24 October 1890) had so radically altered his conception of the Exp. of IX/1 that the sketches in question were no longer of any significance to him and he was therefore in a position to give them away, perhaps in return for the copying of the Eighth Symphony and/or other MSS. As Auer notes, Christ appears to have written his address in Bruckner’s calendar under January 1890;<sup>84</sup> this,

---

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Sonntag, *The Compositional Process...*, p. 32; “A New Perspective...”, p. 101. The bifol. was apparently discarded according to Sonntag because Bruckner had neglected to create a system for the bassoons (*The Compositional Process...*, p. 32).

<sup>81</sup> Double-sided copies were kindly made available to the present writer by the Library of Congress.

<sup>82</sup> Originally part of a discarded orchestral bifol. “32.”.

<sup>83</sup> As Sonntag noted, *The Compositional Process...*, p. 32. At the top right of this first page, probably from the hand of a librarian or archivist, stands “424”, on the verso, bottom, in small handwriting, “ML 96/ .B82/ Case”, and on the following page “acc. 545805”, the last annotations obviously having been made by the Library of Congress.

<sup>84</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 119, cf. p. 124. ASS and piano transcriptions of Bruckner symphonic movements from the hand of Viktor Christ have only recently reappeared, along with a sketch for the Trio of the Eighth. See Elisabeth Maier, “Aus den Arbeiten des Anton Bruckner Institutes Linz (ABIL)”, *ÖGM-Mitt*, No. 27 (Dec. 1994), p. 49.

coupled with the day and month cited on the MSS themselves, appears to substantiate the date of Bruckner's bequest to him.<sup>85</sup>

While the remaining sources for the Finale itself will be discussed in more detail below, a further number of smaller autograph sources for IX/1 and IX/3 which found their way into official holdings remain to be mentioned. A 2-fol. pc. sk. for the Schlußp. of IX/1, now ÖNB 6063, was acquired in 1938 via the antiquarian Hinterberger; its ultimate provenance remains unknown. A discarded score bifol. "10" from the Adagio, now ÖNB 6079, acquired from the widow of Julius Hermann in 1947,<sup>86</sup> was described by Orel in 1934 (cf. D/6) as being in the possession of Universitäts-Professor Hofrat H. J. Hermann in Vienna; it is ceremoniously dated "13. Juli 1894 Dr. A. Bruckner" and was presumably given on that occasion to Herr or Frau Hermann, who must have been visiting Bruckner in Steyr at the time. The signature is reproduced (but without the date), in Orel (p. 63), where Orel indeed notes that the composer's signature "wurde vom Meister wohl angefügt, als er den Bogen seinem gegenwärtigen Besitzer schenkte".

A further source for the Adagio could justly be termed the 'Steyrer Blatt'. A single fol. (half-bifol.) from the score of the Adagio, 4 mm. in all, corresponding to mm. 181–183 (the second half of bifol. 12 of the AP of the movement), it appears to have been given to the Steyr Regens Chori Franz Xaver Bayer, probably during Bruckner's (final) sojourn in Steyr in the summer of 1894, at which stage Bruckner was in the final stages of the composition of the movement.<sup>87</sup> Both the Steyrer Männergesang-Verein "Kränzchen" and the Steyrer Liedertafel elected Bruckner an honorary member in 1889 and 1894 respectively; whether Bruckner's apparent gift to Bayer stands in any relation to the honours awarded to him by these choirs is unknown. Following the subsequent amalgamation of these choirs with the later "Sängerlust" into the present-day Steyrer "Männergesang-Verein Sängerlust", the 'Steyrer Blatt' remains in possession of that choir to this day.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> The brief reference to Christ in Göllerich-Auer (IV/3, p. 124) concludes: "Er war Hofmusiker und ging am Latemar freiwillig in den Tod, indem er sich in die Tiefe stürzte." However, a newspaper report (*Neue Freie Presse*, 2 August 1902) states merely that he fell to his death during a climb on the Rothwandspitze in South Tyrol, shortly after he had become engaged at the Karersee Hotel (information courtesy of ABIL). Accompanying the sks. and cover bifol. in the copies sent to the present writer by the Library of Congress was a copy of an attestation dated Vienna, 18 February 1921 and signed by Eusebius Mandyczewski, then archivist and librarian of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, confirming that the five fols. of sks. in possession of a Frau (Fräulein) Helene Christ were indeed in Bruckner's handwriting. Helene must therefore have been an unmarried daughter of Viktor Christ; presumably then, the sketches—for which it has not as yet proved possible to establish an acquisition date by the Library—found their way to the US with her some time after 1921.

<sup>86</sup> According to the card catalogue of the ÖNB.

<sup>87</sup> P. 1 was reproduced in an obituary on Bruckner by Theodor Helm, in the *Neue musikalische Presse* 5, no. 42 (18 Oct. 1896), p. 4.

<sup>88</sup> For a time the fol. was also on loan to the Heimat Museum Innerbergerstadl in Steyr; the ÖNB Photogrammarchiv apparently does not possess a copy. The Bruckner autograph is also proudly discussed in the text of a CD produced by the choir entitled *Festkonzert: 150 Jahre Steyrer Männergesang-Verein Sängerlust (1944–1994)*; this information courtesy of Dr. Zamazal, letter to the present writer of 5 Jan. 1996.

Two further sources for the first and third movements of the Ninth Symphony appear to remain in private hands;<sup>89</sup> their existence can be established from the Photogrammarchiv of the ÖNB.<sup>90</sup> PhA 2073 reproduces 1 fol./2 pp. of incomplete score for the opening *Steigerung* of the first movement, a MS which at the time the reproduction was made (1948) was still in possession of Hofrat Prof. Viktor Keldorfer, who died in 1959; the present whereabouts of the fol. is unknown. PhA 2307-P, again 1 fol./2 pp. of incomplete scoring is described as “Skizzen zum Adagio der Symphonie Nr. 9”, undated is or was in private possession in Leipzig, and being from the estate of Max Auer (hence only in circulation post-1962; no date for the photocopy is given).

The remaining sources for the Ninth Symphony all relate to the Finale and are discussed in the ensuing §§1.2.5–7.

### 1.2.5 The transmission of the *particello* sketches for the Finale.

As the acquisition date of ÖNB 3194 attests, Max Auer first bequeathed these sks., probably among the MSS entrusted originally to Göllicher and taken over by him on the latter’s death, to the ÖNB in June 1930. Representing the chief source of the preliminary sks. for the whole movement (Facs. C/3ff.), these were the “16 Blatt zum 4. Satz” cited by Orel (D/6, D/64) as already being in the possession of the ÖNB by the time he came to list his sources. Mus. Hs. 6007 (Facs. C/27ff.), ostensibly presented by Auer to the ÖNB in February of the following year (although its *numerus currens* signature reveals that its formal acquisition must have occurred some years later), contains four pp. of pc. sks. for the Finale reproduced in volume IV/3 of the Göllicher-Auer biography published in 1936,<sup>91</sup> and may be the earliest of all surviving notations for that movement. As to why these sks. were not made available to Orel one can only conjecture that the pages were either not yet in Auer’s hands or were simply overlooked as Auer was making the 3194 bequest.<sup>92</sup>

These items were, at least, bequests. As we have already mentioned, the Hueber family and Löwe’s widow had already sold several less significant MSS, among them several pages pertinent to the Finale, to the ÖNB in 1927: these, probably bound as collections of miscellanea before coming into the possession of the ÖNB, included the signatures 3165, 3175 and 3176, which Nowak in 1951 split up into a number of separate signatures, among

<sup>89</sup> The privately owned sources for the Finale are dealt with separately (*infra*).

<sup>90</sup> Sincere thanks is due here to Hofrat Brosche for his letter of 1 Dec. 1993 and ensuing information concerning the ÖNB’s Bruckner holdings in their Photogrammarchiv.

<sup>91</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, between pp. 592 and 593.

<sup>92</sup> Nowak notes Auer as giving sketch material for the Scherzo and Finale of the Ninth to the ÖNB in 1930: cf. “Das Bruckner-Erbe...,” p. 528. The bifol. of sketches to the Scherzo (ÖNB 3196) was reproduced in Göll.-A. between pp. 480 and 481 of the same volume.

them the Finale MSS 28.238 (Fac. C/26) and 28.229<sup>93</sup> (C/39). Most of the typesetting of the 1934 edition must already have been completed by the time these sks. were first drawn to Orel's attention,<sup>94</sup> and they were hence published (in part) as a Nachtrag.<sup>95</sup> Of these, Orel published as pertinent to the Finale ÖNB 3176/25<sup>r</sup> (now 28.238), a sk. belonging to the initial sk. phase for the Gesangsp. in the Repr. (D/143, "J"). Unpublished for whatever reason remained S. m. (i.e., Mus. Hs.) 3175, fol. 7 from Löwe's estate, now ÖNB 28.229, a pencil sk. for the Durchführung of the Te Deum motive, probably composed before a similar sk. on 6085/39<sup>r</sup> (also not in the Orel edition; see Facs. C/40). Conceivably, these sks. were either regarded as too unimportant or too fragmentary to merit transcription, or were simply overlooked in Orel's exegesis of the large number of MSS with which he was confronted. The isolated pc. sk. for the Finale found in the Cracow MSS (C/49) also remained unknown to him, of course.

Mention finally should be made of two non-autograph sources among these signatures, which are nonetheless significant for the composition and transmission of the Finale. ÖNB 28.240 fols. 1 and 35 originally formed a cover bifol. enclosing the MSS of S. m. 3176 from the Hueber estate (Fac. C/325ff.). Rather than having the "Streicher abgeschnitten" as claimed by August Stradal (C/325), the regular 20-stave oblong format bifol. was probably used as a template for the instrumental designations of the wind systems (see §3.1.6). Finally, ÖNB 19.786, 2 fols. of oblong format, 10-stave paper with pencil annotations on fol. 1<sup>r</sup>, probably in the handwriting of August Göllerich, appears to reproduce remarks found in two late MSS of Bruckner, both of which were subsequently acquired by the StB from the estate of Cyrill Hynais. The quotations concern bifol. 1<sup>b</sup>C of the Finale, StB 3791/1<sup>r</sup>, where quotation is made of several autograph figures from the top of the first page of the bifol. (see Facs. C/59<sup>96</sup>) and the remark "Auf d.[er] 3. Seite d.[es] 1. Bogens steht oben: 'Ohr'" (cf. C/61<sup>97</sup>). Further down the same page we find the remark "Auf den bei Hynais befindlichen Helgoland Bleistiftskizzen steht am Schluß 20/4 893" and a further two quotations of dates from the rejected versions of bifol. 13 of that score that can likewise be identified in the StB 3792 material.<sup>98</sup>

<sup>93</sup> The provenance of 28.229 is given in the AP of the Finale, Table I, as Hueber; 'Estate of F. Löwe' is correct.

<sup>94</sup> In fact the 1934 publication, already overdue in 1932, was further delayed by the collapse of Filser Verlag in that year. See §1.3.6.

<sup>95</sup> See explanation, Orel D/140.

<sup>96</sup> Here the figures in question are barely legible; cf. the better reproduction of the Faksimile-Ausgabe.

<sup>97</sup> Here the remark is not legible; it is however just discernible in the Faksimile-Ausgabe.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Auer's statement concerning the dating of the sk. of *Helgoland*, Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 331. See further concerning the sources, John A. Phillips, "Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren", *BrSympBer* 1992, p. 160f. and Wolfgang Grandjean, "Anton Bruckners 'Helgoland' und das Symphonische", *Mf* 48 (1995), pp. 349–368 *passim*.



While no date for Göllicherich's noting of these *disjecta membra* is given, Göllicherich's AS, if it has any point, leads one to speculate on whether Bruckner might not have given this material, both the Finale bifols. StB 3791 and the *Helgoland* sks. StB 3792, to Hynais intentionally, obviously at a stage when the material was of no further use—perhaps a similar situation to that which we have already observed in connection with Viktor Christ in 1890 or 1891. This implies, as will be discussed later, that the StB 3791 Finale bifols. probably all represented 'discarded' material by the time they were given to Hynais and hence by that stage no longer constituted part of the emergent Finale score.

### 1.2.6 The transmission of the orchestral bifolios of the Finale.<sup>99</sup>

Given the extent and complexity of the surviving material of the Finale found in Bruckner's apartment after his death, it is scarcely surprising that Bruckner's executor Dr. Theodor Reisch turned to the composer's mentors, Josef Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe, for advice.

We have already traced (§1.2.2) the unfortunate ramifications of their handling of the other sks. and smaller works found in Bruckner's estate. Concerning the subsequent destiny of the surviving fragments of Bruckner's score of the Finale their record is not much better. As Auer records:<sup>100</sup>

Der Testamentsvollstrecker verfügte auch die Überweisung der vom Meister testamentarisch der Hofbibliothek vermachten Originalmanuskripte—womit der Meister dem Kaiser seinen Dank für alle Forderung bezeugen wollte—und ließ den übrigen schriftlichen Nachlaß durch Jose[f] Schalk und Ferdinand Löwe sichten. Vor allem wurde das letzte künstlerische Vermächtnis Bruckners sichergestellt und darüber folgendes Protokoll verfaßt:

This "Protokoll", dated 18 October 1896 and signed by Reisch, Josef Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe, reads as follows:

Die Herren Professoren Ferdinand Löwe und Josef Schalk haben sich über Ersuchen des Testamentsexekutors zur Sichtung des musikalischen Nachlasses des Meisters Anton Bruckner bereit erklärt und haben dieselben am heutigen Tage die Skizzen für den 4. Satz der IX. Symphonie sorgfältig durchgesehen, wonach sich ergab, daß 75 Partiturbogen vorhanden sind, welche die Paginierung 1.) bis 36.) aufweisen. Darunter beispielweise P. 1–10 und P. 2–8 etc. und übernimmt Joseph Schalk diese 75 Bogen, um den Zusammenhang dieser Fragmente zu erforschen.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>99</sup> This section also discusses the provenance of the pc. sks. included within the larger signatures of the ÖNB.

<sup>100</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 607.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 608; cf. Leibnitz, p. 205. The Protokoll is presumably referred to by E. Decsey (*Bruckner: Versuch eines Lebens*, Berlin 1919, p. 110), who noted that "Ferdinand Löwe and Josef Schalk stellten in seinem Nachlaß 75 Partiturbogen fest, die die Skizzen zu jenem letzten Finale enthielten".

The oddly worded last sentence appears to refer to the several versions of some of the bifols., specifying 10 versions of bifol. 1, 8 of bifol. 2, etc. This is followed by a sentence which in the Göllicher-Auer biography is included within the quotation-marks of the Protokoll, but probably represents a later addendum: “Diese Skizzenbogen befinden sich jetzt in Verwahrung von Prof. Franz Schalk in Wien.”<sup>102</sup>

Joseph Schalk himself appears never to have carried out the planned research into the “Zusammenhang dieser Fragmente” with which he had been entrusted—a task he would probably have found difficult, given that the main pc. sks., particularly ÖNB 3194, so significant for the reconstruction of the score, had been unwittingly placed by him and Löwe into other hands. Perhaps the apparent chaotic appearance of the material, underlined by the losses from the original sequence of numbered bifols. and the all-too obvious evidence of Bruckner’s final mental decline, simply made it more convenient to permit the matter to lie dormant. The disappearance of the surviving fragments into private possession and the probably quite purposeful suppression of their nature and extent implied also, of course, that little if any information about the movement could be ascertained at a formative stage for the evolution of critical opinion.

It remains particularly unfortunate that it took so long for the sks. and surviving torso of the score entrusted to Josef Schalk to find its way into official holdings.<sup>103</sup> After Josef’s death in November 1900 the MSS were quietly taken into the keeping of his brother Franz. In 1911 they were made available to Max Auer for analysis in the Göllicher-Auer biography, following which they were returned to Schalk.<sup>104</sup> As Cohrs’ and the author’s examination of files from Nowak’s estate, now held in the ÖNB, has shown,<sup>105</sup> the initial version of the

---

<sup>102</sup> According to Hofrat Brosche, the original Protokoll is now in the Handschriftensammlung of the ÖNB. A typed, unsigned copy of the original Protokoll has recently been placed together with the signature Mus. Hs. 6087. This may well have been typed by Auer, as it begins with the passage quoted *supra* (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 607, last paragraph) that precedes quotation of the Protokoll in the biography, and is followed by the same sentence as appears in the biography within Auer’s quotation marks.

<sup>103</sup> It is scarcely surprising, given the casual nature of Reisch’s, Löwe’s and Josef Schalk’s highly irregular “Testamentsvollstreckung” and the general negligence and carelessness with which Bruckner’s MSS were dealt out to, or appropriated by, unknown individuals, that the GA’s editors themselves were not clear about the precise routes by which material found its way into official holdings. Writing in his 1934 biography, Robert Haas, for instance, explained vaguely that a number of sks. for the Ninth “kamen [...] durch Josef Schalk an dessen Bruder Franz, zum Teil irgendwie an Göllicher, dessen Witwe [i.e., Göllicher’s] sie dann der Wiener Stadtbibliothek verkaufte” (*Anton Bruckner*, p. 26). As we have seen, the widow can only have been Löwe’s.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 611 *et seq.* The date of the return of the material from Auer is not given, either in Göllicher-Auer (cf. IV/3, p. 612), in Schalk’s published letters, or in Leibnitz’ study; presumably Auer had the materials for only a brief period of time. Auer writes simply (*ibid.*) that they were returned by Auer to Schalk, “in dessen Verwahrung sie bis zu seinem Hinscheiden am 3. September 1931 verblieben”. This is not quite correct, as we shall see.

<sup>105</sup> Established during his Vienna research in September 2000; see also his foreword to the new GA edition of the first three movements of the Ninth, ed. Cohrs, Vienna 2000.

*Entwürfe und Skizzen* got as far as the proof stage without the inclusion of any reference to the Schalk materials for the Finale. We read on p. 64 of the 1934 publication (Orel, D/64) that:

Bis vor kurzem waren an Partiturentwürfen zum Finale nur 4 Bogen aus dem Besitze der Wiener Stadtbibliothek bekannt [...], über die der Gefertigte vor 8 Jahren berichtete [Orel here gives the reference to his *Merker* article, published 1921–22]. Inzwischen fanden sich an anderen Stellen verstreute Bogen[,] das Hauptmaterial, das eine Übersicht über den ganzen Satz erst ermöglichte, stellte aber Franz Schalk zur Verfügung [...].

The first draft of Orel's *Vorlagebericht* for the Ninth, subsequently retitled *Entwürfe und Skizzen* must have been almost ready for publication by late 1929; a letter of Orel's to Schalk dated 28 October 1929 confirms receipt by the GA editor of the Finale material; a corresponding receipt signed by Schalk confirms its return on 23 December 1930 (both in F60 BRGA 1/3).<sup>106</sup> Revision and typesetting of the publication was then delayed by the collapse of Filser Verlag early the following year (see §1.3.6).<sup>107</sup> The MSS only 'officially' entered the ÖNB's holdings many years after Franz Schalk's death along with several other Bruckner MSS as a bequest of his widow Lili; Orel in the preface to his edition (D/6) cites them still as "im Besitze von † Gen.-Mus.-Dir. Franz Schalk in Wien", and Schalks claimed legal rights. Personal animosities over the issue of the first editions vs. autographs played a role in this reversal. Morten Solvik, among the first to examine the archives of the Internationale Bruckner Gesellschaft (Fonds F60 BRGA of the ÖNB), pointed out that a rift between Lili Schalk and Robert Haas emerged in 1936 over Haas' critique of the first edition of the Fifth, and that as a result Lili Schalk (so Solvik) "obstinately refused to hand these scores over to Haas".<sup>108</sup> The Finale sketches, previously loaned in good faith to Orel for the 1934 publication, shared the same fate.

Until recently it appeared difficult even to establish the date of the eventual acquisition of the Schalk material by the ÖNB. It is given in the Musiksammlung's card catalogue as "G.[eschenk] Lili Schalk 1939" and Leibnitz, in his *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton*

---

<sup>106</sup> Like Auer before him (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 612), Doebel's assertion (*Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen*, pp. 253f.) that Schalk continually evaded the request, made to him in 1929 by the editors of the GA, to hand over all MSS for the Ninth in his possession and that Orel only obtained access to the material from his widow, must be refuted. As recently as 2000 Cohrs maintained that Orel came into possession of the material for the Ninth via negotiations with Lili Schalk only after the death of her husband (1931) following which the early version of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie*, which did not contain the Schalk material, was revised and expanded (cf. the new edition of the first three movements of the Ninth, ed. Cohrs, Vienna 2000, Vorwort, p. VIII).

<sup>107</sup> The situation is somewhat more complex than this, as in fact the financially desperate Filser had printed and issued, without approval of the GA editors, a version of the score and parts for the Ninth prior to final corrections being made, so that following liquidation of the firm the GA was forced to withdraw the edition (according to a letter, apparently from Haas or possibly another member of the IBG Vorstand, dated December 1933; F60 BRGA 10/3).

<sup>108</sup> Morten Solvik, "The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P.: A Case Study of Robert Haas and the Critical Edition", *MQ* 82 (1998), p. 378, fn. 30.

*Bruckner*,<sup>109</sup> maintains that the material of the Finale was bequeathed to the Musiksammlung of the ÖNB by Franz' widow in that year. However, Nowak, in his "Das Bruckner-Erbe der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek" of 1966, made no mention of any acquisition in 1939, noting instead the following:

Dieser seit 1914 nun beachtlich vergrößerte Bestand erhielt 1954 durch ein Legat von Frau Generalmusikdirektor Lili Schalk weiteren bedeutenden Zuwachs. Es gelangten die 3. Fassung der III. Symphonie, die I. Fassung der VIII. (nur 1. und 2. Satz), Skizzen zum Finale der IX. und das Intermezzo in die Musiksammlung [...]<sup>110</sup>

This later date is apparently confirmed in the inventory listings of the ÖNB as "c. 1955".<sup>111</sup> However, in a letter to the present writer of 11 Jan. 1993, Dr. Thomas Leibnitz of the ÖNB, cited yet a further date. He explained:

Die Sachlage bezüglich der Erwerbsdaten von Mus. Hs. 6085–87 ist etwas undurchsichtig. Im Inventar wurden diese Signaturen nachträglich von Nowak in eine von Haas freigehaltene Lücke eingetragen und mit dem Datum '1947?' versehen. Hingegen befindet sich im Erwerbungsakt des Nachlasses Schalk ein Gutachten des ehemaligen Generalmusikdirektors Josef Bick vom 3. Dezember 1947, in dem festgestellt wird, daß Lili Schalk 1939 einen namhaften Bestand an Brucknerhandschriften der Nationalbibliothek schenkte. Im Wortlaut: 'Bei der 1939 an die Nationalbibliothek erfolgten Schenkung handelt es sich um insgesamt über 300 Blätter Autographe von Anton Bruckner. Darunter befindet sich das vollständige Autograph der IV. Symphonie in der ursprünglichen Fassung, Skizzen zur VIII. und IX. Symphonie und das Intermezzo zum Streichquartett.' Bei all diesen Werken steht im Kartenkatalog von Leopold Nowaks Hand: 'G. Lili Schalk 1939'. Es spricht daher alles dafür, daß noch das Datum 1939 stimmt. Warum allerdings Nowak in dem erwähnten Artikel der ÖMz von 1961 die Schenkung übergeht, kann ich nicht erklären.

Nowak's references to 1954 and 1955 may relate to an 'official' posthumous bequest date, perhaps following Lili Schalk's decease, but it is clear from other sources that her coveted Bruckner materials arrived in the ÖNB some years earlier. In May–June 2001 new light was shed on the question by a number of documents located in the voluminous Fonds F60 BRGA,<sup>112</sup> which confirm *both* 1939 and 1947 as significant dates in the complex acquisition process.

As we have seen, the Bruckner materials were returned by Orel to Franz Schalk in 1930 and must have been reborrowed from Schalk's widow by Leopold Nowak for the proofreading

---

<sup>109</sup> p. 205.

<sup>110</sup> "Das Bruckner-Erbe...", *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 90. The article was first published in the *ÖMz* in 1961.

<sup>111</sup> According to information obtained for the present writer by Elisabeth Wagner of the ÖNB in 1992.

<sup>112</sup> Grateful acknowledgement is made here of the kind assistance of Dr. Angela Pachovsky of MWV who continued the author's researches into the Fonds archives in relation to this and other questions and arranged for photocopying of relevant files.

of the Orel edition in 1934–35. At this stage, Lili Schalk was still cooperative; a situation which appears to have changed radically the following year (see §1.3.5). Evidence appears to show that the GA editors and their associates used every possible means of persuasion to attempt to get Lili Schalk to relinquish the material, the inaccessibility of which was by 1938 seriously delaying progress on publication of the Eighth.<sup>113</sup> It in fact remained in her possession until late 1939, as shown by a letter from the IBG’s administrator Friedrich Werner to Justus Brandstetter of MWV Leipzig dated 12 November of that year.<sup>114</sup>

The second year to which Leibnitz refers, 1947, is, however, more accurate in terms of the ÖNB’s actual acquisition of it. Evidence of this came to light in the form of a typewritten “Protokoll über die Öffnung der Kiste mit der Bezeichnung Musiksammlung/ Dr. Werner/ Aufgenommen am 23. September 1947 von Dr. Leopold Nowak im Beisein von Dr. Kasimir Kuzcewsky und Frl. Maria Razumovsky”<sup>115</sup> signed by these four officials and listing the contents of this chest as a number of items of Bruckner memorabilia, materials related to the Bruckner GA, including the proofs of GA publications,<sup>116</sup> and a significant number of Bruckner MSS, including those from the possession of Franz Eckstein, Wilhelm Kux (then President of the IBG)—and Franz and Lili Schalk.

The sender of this consignment, as an enclosed letter to the Director of the Nationalbibliothek dated 25 October 1939 appears to suggest, was none other than Dr. Friedrich Werner of the Deutsche (Internationale) Bruckner-Gesellschaft (Sitz Wien), a lawyer and the IBG’s financial administrator. Although it is possible that the letter and its date may refer only to the contents of the envelope in which it was enclosed rather than to the entire consignment, it appears on the face of it that the material included in the consignment had remained, as it were, *poste restante* in the hands of the IBG since 1939, although already marked for ‘official’ bequest to the ÖNB at that time.<sup>117</sup>

A rather chilling light was shed on the matter by a further letter dated 4 March 1947 from Werner to Ministerialrat Dr. Kurt Thomasberger, of the Austrian Bundestheater-

---

<sup>113</sup> Orel and Lili Schalk went so far as to draw up a contract in October 1937 (F60 BRGA 10/2), in fact initially agreed to by Joseph Bick, director of the Musiksammlung, by which Lili Schalk would permit loan of the MSS in return for the assurance that Orel have sole rights over their musicological evaluation. However, as these included MSS required for the edition of both volumes of the Eighth, such a contract would clearly have been in breach of Haas’ role as senior editor, and for this reason was abandoned.

<sup>114</sup> “Ich erlaube mir Ihnen mitzuteilen, daß mir gestern Frau Lilli [sic] Schalk zu treuen Händen für den deutschen Staat das gesamte bei ihr befindlichen Brucknermaterial übergeben hat [...]” (F60 BRGA 10/3).

<sup>115</sup> Likewise in Fonds F60 BRGA 10/3.

<sup>116</sup> A separate 2-p. inventory of the GA material, most likely from Haas’ possession, which included 4 original letters by Bruckner, appears to have been prepared by Nowak, dated Vienna, 21 July 1947, signed by Haas and also marked as sighted by Joseph Bick, the then Director of the Musiksammlung.

<sup>117</sup> The author’s comments in the article “Für die IX. ist gesorgt” (cf. Appendix VI) represent an earlier interpretation of this document: “Anzunehmen ist, daß sie [i.e., the contents of the chest] inzwischen bei Brandstetter bzw. dem MWV Leipzig liegengeblieben sind”.

verwaltung<sup>118</sup>. The letter appears to have been written in rebuttal of some kind of accusation made against MWV by the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in regard to an alleged withholding of Bruckner MSS by the firm, which Werner explains was not the case. Werner explained:

Das Propagandaministerium hatte damals, wie mir erinnerlich ist, bereits den Auftrag erteilt, die für die Gesamtausgabe noch notwendigen fehlenden und in Privatbesitz befindlichen Manuskripte im Wege der Gestapo sicherzustellen und nach Berlin bringen zu lassen. Es ist einzig und allein meiner Initiative gelungen, einmal die Gestapo auszuschalten und andererseits diese Manuskripte in Österreich bzw. in Wien zu sammeln und wie wir damals schon einvernehmlich vereinbart hätten, bei der Nationalbibliothek zu sammeln.

Daß mir die Sammlung der in Privathänden befindlichen restlichen Manuskripte ohne Gestapo, also ohne irgendwelchen Erpressungen gelungen ist, darf ich für mich buchen und habe ich auch nach langwierigen Kämpfen in Berlin es durchgesetzt, daß die so zustande gebrachten restlichen Manuskripte in Wien verbleiben konnten.

After referring to failed attempts to obtain sections of the original MS of the Third Symphony from Alma Mahler in Paris before her departure for the US, Werner concludes:

Die Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde geht also fehl, wenn sie der Meinung ist, daß zur Zeit die IBG über die seinerzeit eingebrachten restlichen Manuskripte, also auch über die von Herrn Kux zur Verfügung gestellten Materialien verfügte, die gesamten Unterlagen befinden sich [...] bei der Nationalbibliothek, die als Erbin nach Anton Bruckner wohl in erster Linie auch sachlich berechtigt ist, den Nachlaß zu verwahren.

The letter makes clear (as confirmed by other documents within F60 BRGA 10/1–3), that the IBG or the GA must have resorted, or threatened to resort, to the assistance of the Gestapo to secure the remaining MSS held privately within Austria, and, if we are prepared to believe Werner's version of the story, that Werner alone ensured that the material was retained privately, and prevented from expatriation against the official ministrations of Haas' superiors (an interpretation resting on the interpretation of Werner's 'wir', as no further correspondence has yet been found clarifying whether Haas assisted in preventing the material from leaving Austria).<sup>119</sup>

All the more interesting is a report by Werner to Haas' superior Heinz Drewes of Abteilung 10 of the Reichspropagandaministerium in Berlin from March 1938<sup>120</sup> in which Werner testified to his repeated attempts to get Haas and Orel to cooperate, reported on the continuing possession of Bruckner MSS by Lili Schalk and others, and requested that official steps be undertaken to secure these MSS as "Kulturgut des Staates". If Werner's explanation

---

<sup>118</sup> In F60 BRGA 10/3.

<sup>119</sup> Werner, incidentally, appears anxious in the letter to Thomasberger to deflect any suspicion of ideological entanglement by explaining that he was 'involuntarily' appointed by the IBG as "kommisarischer Verwalter".

<sup>120</sup> Likewise in F60 BRGA 10/3.

that he prevented the Schalk material from leaving Austria is taken at face-value, it appears that he was equally convinced that they be reclaimed from Schalk's estate by official means. It is difficult today to be sure as to precisely 'whose side' Werner was on—an unbridgeable chasm often seems to lie between the apparent motivations pre- and post-1945 of those involved in the Third Reich. *Pace* his letter of 1947, however, Werner's report to Drewes makes it more than likely that Lili Schalk, given her obstinate refusal to hand over the MSS earlier, was 'won over' in 1939 by some sort of action—or threat thereof.

The material for the Finale of the Ninth Symphony included in the 1947 consignment was in any case that main body of material now held by the ÖNB under the signatures Mus. Hss. 6085 (comprising mainly the less-written-on SVE and later pc. sks., in all 82 fols. or 41 bifols.<sup>121</sup>), 6086 (the extensive pc. sk. made prior to work on the score, 4 fols. or 2 bifols.) and 6087 (the more substantially notated score bifols., 72 fols. or 36 bifols.<sup>122</sup>). Presumably Franz Schalk (or perhaps even Josef before him) divided the material into the two main categories represented today by the signatures 6085 (the more marginally notated bifols.) and 6086–87 (the more densely notated), respectively; this would explain the two cover bifols. in Schalk's hand, the first pages of which are reproduced as Facs. C/329 and 330, both of which are now included in the 6085 material. The distinction would also explain the apparent selectiveness of Nowak's 1934–35 corrections to the Orel edition, which appear to have been limited to material included in the signatures 6086 and 6087 and made no recourse to that of 6085 (see §3.1.2).

Like the pc. sks. 3176 and 3194, which are known to have passed through Max Auer's hands, many of the bifols. of both 6085 and 6087 carry pencil annotations apparently made by the biographer during his examination of them in 1911 (cf. for instance Facs. C/181 and C/189). Several further bifols. (e.g. C/151, 169, 171) carry annotations in the hand of Robert Haas, whose own cover bifol. or Umschlag (C/331) details the number and numbering of the bifols. of 6086 and 6087 and probably dates from the acquisition of the Schalk materials.<sup>123</sup> The foliation of the 6085 and 6087 material (lower l. h. corner of each recto p.) was eventually undertaken by Leopold Nowak, perhaps around 1951, at which stage Nowak, in the course of preparing the new edition of the first three movements of the Ninth, appears to have thoroughly organised and systematised the ÖNB's holdings for the Ninth, splitting up the larger bound miscellanies of sks. acquired from the Hueber family in 1927 and from Auer in 1931. Nowak's own handwritten annotations can also be found on the Schalk cover bifol. of 6085 (C/329) and the Haas cover bifol. of 6087 (C/331).

---

<sup>121</sup> Plus 6 non-autograph cover fols. (i.e., 3 bifols.), giving a total of 88 fols./44 bifols.

<sup>122</sup> Plus 2 non-autograph cover fols. (i.e., 1 bifol.), giving a total of 74 fols./37 bifols. Nowak noted in the signatures: "6 Bll. Umschläge" (cover folios) in 6085 (cf. Facs. C/329), 2 in 6086 and 2 in 6087 (cf. C/331), but according to Hofrat Brosche 6086 now has no cover folios.

<sup>123</sup> Information courtesy of Hofrat Brosche of the ÖNB. Further discussion of the acquisition date *infra*.

Taken together, the three signatures which today encompass the Schalk material give a total of 79 autograph bifols. In 1934 Orel (D/6, 64) cited only 72 bifols. (i.e., 144 fols.) for the Finale as held in the possession of Franz Schalk, while 75 were enumerated in the Protokoll as being given to Joseph Schalk.<sup>124</sup> It seems impossible now to explain the discrepancy fully: perhaps an error was made, further fragments tacitly added to the Schalk collection or conversely not made accessible to Orel. Nor do we know whether Orel or the Protokoll included in their count of the bifols. either of the cover bifols. with Schalk's annotations (C/329f.) or that from Bruckner himself (6085/37<sup>r</sup>, Facs. C/328)—the sources simply provide too little information.

One further point needs to be raised in connection with the Protokoll's statement concerning 75 bifols. numbered *from 1 to 36*. Even given the difficulty—in view of the repeated renumberings—to establish a numbering for some of the later bifols., it is difficult to suggest a suitable candidate among the surviving Schalk bifols. that could have been construed as that “Bogen 36” referred to in the left margin of the coda sk. 6085/45<sup>f</sup> (Facs. C/45<sup>125</sup>). Did any further bifols. become detached from this main source since 1896 or perhaps simply not made available to Orel—as in the case of the Cracow material? One should also consider that Auer's list of recipients of Bruckner MSS merely places question marks by three names, including those of the Akademischen Gesangsverein of Vienna, Franz Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe.<sup>126</sup> If one begins with the likelihood that the list given by Auer is doubtless incomplete, and that nothing could be ascertained by Auer even about the material given to Löwe and to Schalk, it seems all the more likely that material from the Finale may have gone astray even after the examination of the estate was carried out.

Setting aside what might well have been the fate of many smaller sks., it remains clear that a substantial number of surviving bifols. were obviously not among the 75 taken over by Schalk on 18 October 1896. Orel (D/6) lists no less than eight further sources, official and private, for the Finale material, constituting abundant evidence that material must have been appropriated by unknown as well as known parties either by the time Reisch secured Bruckner's estate or prior to Josef Schalk's taking possession of what was left.

Minor confusion is created by the fact that Orel's second, independent listing of the Finale materials (D/64) reveals a discrepancy with his general list. This discrepancy concerns ÖNB 19.645, bifol. 2F (Facs. C/131ff.), listed on p. 6 of the Orel edition as being “Aus dem Besitze von Baron Vietinghoff (Berlin)”. No reference to the item is to be found in Orel's

---

<sup>124</sup> According to Redlich (“The Finale...”, p. 144), the Protokoll was simply mistaken.

<sup>125</sup> Unfortunately, this is scarcely visible in the facsimile in vol. II; the *Faksimile-Ausgabe* reproduction is much clearer.

<sup>126</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 608f.



listing on p. 64, nor does the bifol. appear anywhere in transcription.<sup>127</sup> The question remains of course, where and how Baron Vietinghoff, whose name appears to be completely unknown to Bruckner scholarship, came into possession of this bifol.<sup>128</sup> Even more curious, while Orel seems to have overlooked its transcription, he presumably subsequently returned it to its owner, for the ÖNB's inventory only cites its acquisition as a purchase from the antiquarian firm of Hans Schneider in December 1956.<sup>129</sup>

Orel's 1<sup>c</sup>. Bogen C (i.e., bifol. 1<sup>c</sup>C, Facs. C/63; transcription Orel D/84<sup>130</sup>) was cited by him (D/6) as being in possession of the Wiener Schubertbund. Whether the bifol. in question was apparently presented to the Schubertbund, which in Göllerich-Auer is listed only as the recipient of the AP of *Laßt Jubeltöne laut erklingen* (WAB 76), or merely later emerged as being in its possession is unclear. While legally belonging to the Schubertbund it was held on permanent loan for many years by the Historisches Museum der Stadt Wien (= HMdSW); in the late 1990s it was sold by the Schubertbund to the Vienna antiquarian Hassfurther and put up for auction on 14 May 2001; as the buyer's name and the current location of the bifol. are unknown, the last known permanent location of the bifol., the Historisches Museum, has been retained here.<sup>131</sup> A photographic copy made in 1935 is to be found in the ÖNB under the signature PhA 2044. The card catalogue of the Photogrammarchiv gives the provenance of the bifol. as "Frau Dr. Thyll; jetzt Wien, Schubertbund"; however, as a Frau Dr. Robert Thyll is cited in the 1934 edition (D/6) as the possessor of a bifol. of early drafts for the *Gesangsp.* of

<sup>127</sup> Nowak noted the original provenance of this signature in the card catalogue, the one item of information enabling a match with Orel's listing to be made. Only the acquisition data from 1956 is noted in the inventory.

<sup>128</sup> The perusal of several German peerage guides by the present writer have not established any further information. According to the present writer's German tutor Vladimir von Niedermueller (born 1907 in St. Petersburg and educated in Berlin), the Vietinghoffs were a Baltic aristocratic family particularly well-represented in St. Petersburg; they were usually well travelled, often in the diplomatic service, and tended to be connoisseurs of art and music. A Countess Browne, née von Vietinghoff, was the dedicatee of Beethoven's Op. 10 Sonatas. Georg Kinsky (*Das Werk Beethovens: Thematisch-bibliographisches Verzeichnis seiner sämtlichen vollendeten Kompositionen*, Munich–Düsseldorf 1955, p. 344) also cites a source for the Op. 119 Bagatelles in the collection of a Karl von Vietinghoff in New York in 1922. The Berlin Baron Vietinghoff cited by Orel is probably more likely to have been an autograph collector rather than any sort of acquaintance of Bruckner's or of his circle.

<sup>129</sup> This is probably the "zwei Blätter Partiturskizzen" noted by Nowak as being acquired in the 1950s ("Das Bruckner-Erbe...", *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 90).

<sup>130</sup> Orel's index of sources on D/64 incorrectly gives 2<sup>a</sup>C.

<sup>131</sup> Coincidentally in Vienna at the time, although not on 14 May, the author viewed the bifol. briefly at the Haus der Musik on 11 May, where it was being exhibited temporarily on loan from Hassfurther, in an exhibition on the history of the Wiener Philharmoniker. According to Hassfurther, the Philharmoniker expressed interest in acquiring the bifol., but subsequently decided against it. The bifol. was listed in the auction catalogue as "Letzte eigenhändige Skizzen im Todesjahr des Komponisten zum Finale der 9. Symphonie in D-Moll. / Autograph 1896" (Katalog 31, Galerie Hassfurther, n. d., p. 63, reproduction of first page, p. 64); a reserve price of 350,000–450,000 ÖS was allotted to it. An accompanying text refers to the reproduction of the bifol. in the F.-A., pp. 63–66, reiterating the original provenance of the bifol. as Frau Dr Thyll, Vienna. Since the outcome of the auction of 14 May remains unknown at the time of writing it appeared logical to retain the last 'permanent' location of the bifol. as stands in both AP and F.-A. (cf. listings in the tables in volume II).

IX/1<sup>132</sup> while the Schubertbund is cited on the same page as the owner of the Finale bifol., the attribution cannot be regarded as certain.<sup>133</sup>

Two bifols., 1<sup>d</sup>. Bogen C (D/89) and 2<sup>b</sup>. Bogen E (D/118), the latter now classified as “2”E (Facs. C/135ff.), were cited in 1934 by Orel (cf. D/6, 64) as being held by the Akademie für Musik und Darstellende Kunst in Wien. However, the library of the subsequent Hochschule (later Universität), as this collection subsequently became, possesses only the latter bifol., the ascription error in the Orel edition being noted in their catalogue (signature I. N. 36 555).<sup>134</sup> In fact, bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C (ÖNB 13.150; Facs. C/67ff.) came into the ÖNB’s holdings only very recently. Whatever its provenance, 1<sup>d</sup>C was apparently not returned to its original owner nor presented to the ÖNB, but was retained by Orel himself. It was finally acquired by the library in 1971, four years after his death in April 1967, purchased by the ÖNB from the musicologist’s estate via the antiquarian firm of Valentin Stampach.

The provenance of bifol. 2<sup>b</sup>E, on the other hand, is well-documented. It was acquired by the Akademie in 1916 as a bequest from Bruckner pupil, writer and music critic Max Graf (1873–1958). As no mention is made of Graf’s name in the list of bequests made by Reisch, the question again arises as to how Graf—who, in a critique of the first performance of the Ninth in 1903 appears to reveal detailed knowledge of the music of the whole Finale including, apparently, its coda (see §1.3.3)—came into possession of this bifol.

Five bifols. were recorded by Orel as being held by the Stadtbibliothek, according to his classification 1<sup>b</sup>. Bogen C, 2<sup>b</sup>. Bogen C, 5. Bogen B, 17<sup>a</sup>. Bogen D and 20. Bogen D.<sup>135</sup> Of these, the first four, comprising the signature M. H. 3791, were described by Orel in his 1922 article as “vier Bogen (16 Seiten) des Partiturentwurfes zum Finale der Neunten”.<sup>136</sup> These MSS were acquired by the Stadtbibliothek in 1914<sup>137</sup> from the widow (Hermine) of Bruckner’s pupil and amanuensis Cyrill Hynais. An undated, four-page piano reduction of their contents exists, ÖNB Mus. Hs. 19.677 (Facs. C/332ff.), made by Auer, as the handwriting indicates, probably at a time when Hynais himself was still alive—perhaps in 1911, when Auer borrowed the Finale material from Franz Schalk—since Auer’s AS is

<sup>132</sup> Its transcription can be found on pp. 10f. of the Orel edition.

<sup>133</sup> The quite separate provenances appear not to have been contested in Nowak’s corrections to this page.

<sup>134</sup> A further instance of confusion, also noted, appears to have been that Orel subsequently returned the 2<sup>b</sup>E bifol. to the Wiener StB; hence the crossed-out stamp of that institution visible on C/137. The inventory error was confirmed in an appended statement from the StB dated 21 Jan. 1958. Here again the tables in vol. II follow the earlier citations of this bifol. as belonging to the Hochschule.

<sup>135</sup> Following the present writer’s classifications, bifols. 1<sup>b</sup>C (Facs. C/59), 2<sup>b</sup>C (C/111), 5B (C/163), 17<sup>a</sup>D (C/269) and 20F/“21” (C/285) respectively.

<sup>136</sup> “Skizzen zum vierten Satz von Bruckners Neunter Symphonie”, pp. 412f. The article attempted some initial conjectures as to the likely structure of the movement.

<sup>137</sup> According to Dr. Johann Ziegler of the Stadtbibliothek these were bought in 1914, but first entered into the Bestandsverzeichnis in 1915.

headed: “Nach den bei [Cyrill] Hynais befindlichen Skizzen” (C/332). A further annotation on the last page, apparently added later, reads: “Diese Skizzen jetzt in [der] Musiksammlung der Stadt Wien” (C/335).

The question as to how these four bifols. came into the hands of Hynais returns us directly to the central problem of the missing material. Hynais is not named by Auer as being among the recipients of any of the bequests made by Reisch, and while it is not impossible that Hynais, like Max Graf and perhaps the mysterious Baron Vietinghoff, may perhaps have been among those who appropriated material from Bruckner’s apartment after his death or received such material subsequently as a gift, it is more likely that Hynais was given this material by Bruckner himself as we have already suggested. Accordingly, like the *Helgoland* sks. (StB 3792), the four StB 3791 bifols. probably represent material discarded by Bruckner at some point in time—probably as early as late 1895, by which time they no longer formed part of the emergent score and were hence of no further value to Bruckner.

Of great significance would be an explanation as to how bifol. 20F/“21” (Orel’s 20D; Facs. C/285ff.) did not remain among the MSS retained by Schalk, but turned up among the materials for the first three movements of the Ninth held by the Stadtbibliothek under the signature M. H. 4189, and which were acquired, as we have seen, in 1927 from Amalie Löwe, the widow of Ferdinand, who also sold materials for both Eighth and Ninth to the Preußische Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, located today in Cracow. Unlike the Hynais bifols., bifol. 20F/“21” of the Finale represented no discarded draft that might have been given away by the composer but an indispensable part of the emergent autograph score of the Finale. To all intents and purposes this may well have been material appropriated by Löwe, who was either sufficiently dishonest, acquisitive, negligent or uninterested not to return the fragment to Josef Schalk.

Finally, it is significant that at least one bifol. of the Finale now in the ÖNB reappeared long after 1934. A photographic reproduction of an autograph source for the Finale, made in 1963, can be found in the ÖNB’s Photogrammarchiv under PhA 1502-P and reveals a fragment completely unknown to Orel in 1931. PhA 1502-P nonetheless establishes the provenance of what is now ÖNB 24.264 and has been classified by the present writer as bifol. 1A (Facs. C/53ff.).<sup>138</sup> The library acquired the item in 1966 via the antiquarian Hans Schneider from Frau Alice Strauss, daughter-in-law of the composer. An excerpt from a letter from Frau Gabriele Strauss to Dr. Franz Zamazal dated Munich, 26 February 1992, quite coincidentally, provided information on the provenance of the bifol.:

Meine Schwiegermutter, Frau Alice Strauss, erzählte mir einmal, dass R. Strauss eine Seite der 9. Sinfonie von Anton Bruckner als Geschenk erhalten hätte, vielleicht bei Anlass seines Besuches? Die Partiturseite (handschriftlich!) wurde dann von meiner Schwiegermutter an Graf Berger von der Bruckner-Gesellschaft übergeben.

---

<sup>138</sup> The catalogue of the ÖNB gives only the date (1966) and immediate source of the acquisition (Schneider).

(Frau Strauss was here referring to a visit by Richard Strauss to Linz, possibly in 1924, which constituted the reason for Dr. Zamazal's letter in the first place).

Searches for the identity of a Brucknerphile by the name of "Graf Berger" by both Drs. Zamazal and Maier and the present writer having come to nothing, it was assumed that the remark recounted by Gabriele Strauss was probably referring to the late Prof. Dr. Franz *Grasberger*, who would probably have been an appropriate person to have taken possession of the "Partiturseite" mentioned, although it is curious that the bifol. was ultimately acquired by the ÖNB via an antiquarian firm rather than through the direct ministrations of Grasberger.<sup>139</sup> Neither Dr. Zamazal or the present writer have so far succeeded in establishing a likely date for the gift or by what path it may have come to be given to Strauss in the first place. 1A is preliminary to Orel's 1<sup>a</sup>. Bogen C (D/80), and quite possibly represents Bruckner's earliest attempt at an orchestral scoring of the opening of the movement, c. June or July 1895. Its fragile, tattered paper shows evidence of having been folded into quarters.

### 1.2.7 Corroborative cases.

Further confirmation of the manner in which Bruckner's followers dealt with his estate may be gleaned from the provenance of several ÖNB signatures, among them Mus. Hs. 24.261, 2 fols. of pc. sks. for *Helgoland* which supplements (and probably completes) the other collections of sks. for this work held in the StB under 3792 and in the ÖNB under 6038.<sup>140</sup> This latter was acquired by the ÖNB from the widow of Cyrill Hynais in 1915.<sup>141</sup> Concerning ÖNB 24.261, a letter from Amalia Löwe dated Vienna, 30 December 1926, was (perhaps, not without significance) placed by Nowak with the Bruckner autograph, and may be taken as indicative of the manner in which Bruckner's 'disciples' and their associates treated the material of their master:

Herrn Direktor Max Ast, dem feinfühligem musikalischen Führer der Rawag[,] widmet diese Blätter v. d. Hand eines unsterblichen: "Anton Bruckner" mit herzlichen Neujahrsgrüßen- u. Wünschen

Amalie Löwe.

Perhaps at the time Amalie Löwe was trying to divest herself of her husband's store of Bruckner MSS and thought that this one (which had a burnt area) might prove unsaleable, but make an impressive gift. In this manner it can be assumed that numerous bifols. and sks. for the Finale may also have been passed privately via antiquarians and autograph dealers from

<sup>139</sup> Sincere thanks are again due to Dr. Zamazal for following up this correspondence with Frau Strauss and for his letters to the present writer of 7 March 1992, 12 Dec. 1993 and 1 July 1994 concerning the question.

<sup>140</sup> A further signature relevant to *Helgoland*, ÖNB 29.304 was doubtless written by Bruckner as an intentional 'autograph souvenir' rather than as a formative sk.

<sup>141</sup> Confirmed by Auer's remarks, Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 331: "Die Bleistiftskizze (leider nicht vollständig), die sich bei Cyrill Hynais fand, trägt am Schlusse das Datum: '20. 4. 893'."

one hand to another, their eventual landing in official holdings often a result of little more than good fortune.

Another significant case is provided by the transmission of the autograph score of the F-minor Mass which in 1921, by pure chance, found its way into the ÖNB through the ingenuousness of its current owner.

Regarding the score of the last mass, we have already noted (§1.1.5) calendar entries from c. 1895 showing Bruckner setting his affairs in order and collecting his widely scattered autographs. In April 1895 he noted the absence of the score of the “3. Messe, die zum Drucke verwendet wurde”; under May 1895 we find, in Meißner’s handwriting: “Mir fehlt: [...] II Die Originalpartitur der F-Messe./ III Die Partitur der F-Messe, die zum Druck verwendet worden ist” (Facs. C/340). Reference was presumably being made here to two separate scores, one the AP, the other presumably an AS given to Max von Oberleithner, who supervised publication (cf. §1.1.4). Bruckner probably never saw either AP or AS again. The ensuing description of the recovery of the AP by Ernst Friedmann is sufficiently significant as to deserve quotation at length. Following a citation from Bruckner’s will concerning the bequest of his MSS to the Hofbibliothek, Friedmann continues:

Nach dieser letztwilligen Verfügungen hatte also die damalige Leitung der Hofbibliothek nicht nur ein Recht auf die bezeichneten Originalmanuskripte, sie hatte auch dem Verstorbenen gegenüber die Pflichten der Aufbewahrung und Behütung zu übernehmen. Das wäre ganz schön gewesen, wenn man nur nach dem Tode des Komponisten rasch und energisch zugegriffen hatte. Der seither verstorbene Hof- und Gerichtsadvokat Dr Ferdinand<sup>142</sup> Reisch, der das Erbe sicherstellen sollte, ließ sich von irgend jemand überzeugen, daß Bruckner unter den Originalmanuskripten nur ‘letzte Fassungen’ gemeint habe. So wurde aus den Stößen von Notenhandschriften, die in der Wohnung des Tondichters aufgestapelt waren,<sup>143</sup> im Beisein des ebenfalls schon verstorbenen Kapellmeisters Ferdinand Löwe herausgesucht, was an ‘letzten Fassungen’ gerade zu finden war. Aber auch da fehlte noch einiges. Man vermißte die Manuskripte der F-Moll-Messe, der E-Moll-Messe sowie einer Symphonie<sup>144</sup> und begnügte sich mit dem Versprechen der verwaltenden Personen, man werde suchen und finden und die Bibliothek nicht zu kurz kommen lassen. Die Sache schief aber ein.

[...] Im Jahre 1921, [...] flatterte eine Affäre auf, die in Wien viel von sich reden machte. Ein eigenartiger Zufall ließ damals die Originalniederschrift letzter Fassung der F-Moll-Messe den Weg in die Musikaliensammlung der Nationalbibliothek finden. Eine Dame hatte das Manuskript, das sie nach Amerika verkaufen wollte, in die Bibliothek ge-

---

<sup>142</sup> Correctly: Theodor.

<sup>143</sup> As previously noted (§1.1.5 *supra*), the composer’s MSS were obviously already significantly culled prior to the move to the Belvedere in July 1895.

<sup>144</sup> Reference is made to the MSS of the first three movements of the Third, (version 1890) which had remained in the possession of Gustav Mahler and were acquired by the ÖNB from Alma Maria Werfel in 1948. Cf. Nowak, “Das Autograph von Anton Bruckners III. Symphonie”, *Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 16f., and “Das Bruckner-Erbe...,” pp. 527, 530. The former appears in reprint in Thomas Röder’s *Critical Report on the Third Symphony* (Vienna 1997).

bracht, um sich die Echtheit der Handschrift bestätigen zu lassen. Gleichzeitig wurde aber von dritter Seite eine polizeiliche Anzeige gegen diese Dame erstattet, das sie sich in unrechtmäßigem Besitz eines Bruckner-Manuskriptes befinde. Der Leiter der Sammlung [...], Universitäts-Professor Doktor Robert Haas, [...] erwirkte sofort eine polizeiliche Verfügung. Das Manuskript der F-Moll-Messe wurde daraufhin zur einstweiligen Verwahrung der Nationalbibliothek übergeben, da diese gleichzeitig ihr Erbrecht an der Handschrift vertreten hatte. Die Dame erklärte ihrerseits wieder, die rechtmässige Besitzerin des Manuskriptes zu sein, das sie von einem Industriellen als Geschenk erhalten haben wollte. Die Staatsanwaltschaft stellte damals schon nach kurzer Zeitrist die Untersuchung der Angelegenheit mit der Begründung ein, daß kein strafbarer Tatbestand vorliege.

So hätte das Originalmanuskript der F-Moll-Messe der Dame zurückerstattet werden müssen. Professor Dr. Haas weigerte sich aber namens der Nationalbibliothek auch weiterhin, die Handschrift an ihre Überbringerin auszufolgen, solange diese nicht einen Gerichtsbeschluß erwirkt hätte. [...] Ehe es aber zur ersten Verhandlung kam, wurde die Klage zurückgezogen und am 17. Mai 1922 die Handschrift als Eigentum der Nationalbibliothek im Vergleichswege anerkannt.

Von den Manuskripten letzter Fassung der E-Moll-Messe sowie der bereits erwähnten Symphonie konnte in den seither verflossenen vierzig Jahren keine Spur gefunden werden. Sie sind verschollen und befinden sich wahrscheinlich irgendwo in Privatbesitz.<sup>145</sup>

The question can only be asked: what significance did Bruckner's sks. have when the possession of complete autograph scores had to be fought for in this manner? Since Friedmann's article was written, the ÖNB was to acquire the AS of the E-minor Mass bearing Bruckner's final corrections to that score and constituting the final version of this work through a bequest of Max Auer. The MS of the first three movements of the 1890 version of the Third were acquired in 1948 from Alma Mahler and added to the signature ÖNB 6081. Nowak noted, unfortunately far from correctly: "damit [wurde] die letzte Lücke des Testaments geschlossen."<sup>146</sup>

### 1.2.8 More recent developments.

In 1985 the ÖNB acquired from the estate of G. Kurth (son of Ernst Kurth) Mus. Hs. 38.846 (Facs. C/324), a page with an arithmetic sum in Bruckner's hand and the curious observation, by August Stradal:

<sup>145</sup> "Ein verschollenes Bruckner-Manuskript," *Neues Wiener Journal*, 22 Sept. 1926. See also Robert Haas, "Die Originalpartitur von Bruckners Messe in f-moll," *Der Auftakt* 4 (1924), p. 106.

<sup>146</sup> "Das Bruckner-Erbe...", p. 90. See concerning the Third Symphony, fn. 143 *supra*.

“Dieses Blatt ist eine Berechnung des Verhältnisses der Takte im letzten Satze der IX. Symphonie von Bruckner, von ihm selbst geschrieben. Das Blatt wurde mir 1895 im Som[m]er geschenkt./ August Stradal.”<sup>147</sup>

Finally, the recovery as recently as 1988 of an early 40-m. pc. sk. for the Gesangsp. of the Adagio of the Ninth Symphony, ÖNB 39.193, permits hope that further significant material from the Finale may yet await rediscovery. This was originally believed to be a sk. for the Trio owing to the key (F# major) and metre ( $\frac{3}{8}$ ), as the original ÖNB catalogue listing maintained. However, comparison with the Cracow material, particularly with fols. 34–35,<sup>148</sup> a number of sks. for the third movement which use similar metres ( $\frac{6}{8}$ ,  $\frac{9}{8}$  or  $\frac{12}{8}$ ) and keys, reveals that Bruckner first conceived the Gesangsp. of the Adagio in this manner as evinced by the marginal note of 39.193/1<sup>r</sup>: “~~Fis-d~~ /Ges d[ur] /Gesangs: /Per.[iode]” (cf. §1.1.2).

There are ongoing indications that significant materials—perhaps including some for the Finale—still lie in private hands. Cohrs, for instance, corresponded in 1989 with Dr. Walburga Litschauer, “die den Antiquariatsmarkt beobachtet hat. Sie schreibt, ein Partiturbogen zur Neunten sei im Katalog XXI, Nr. 161, S. 23 des Wiener Antiquariats Hinterberger angeboten und verkauft worden. Da sich das Antiquariat nach Tod des Besitzers auflöst, ist nichts darüber in Erfahrung zu bringen”.<sup>149</sup>

Discoveries within the last decade suggest further discoveries may yet be made. A sk. for a voice-leading problem in the violas (Facs. C/50, cf. AP E/5), which arose as Bruckner transcribed Bogen 2F onto “2”E, was until recently in the possession of Univ.-Prof. Dr. Othmar Wessely† (Vienna). The fragment appears to have been cut from a larger page of 24-stave Eberle paper, probably the middle third thereof, as suggested by the horizontal crease. Its current location is not known. A further MS possibly pertinent to the Ninth is known to exist or have existed, presumably in private hands, from a copy found in the estate of Leopold Nowak, and made available to the present writer via Herbert Vogg of MWV.<sup>150</sup> Previously discussed in §1.1.2 the MS (Facs. C/323) is dated 27 December 1893 and may well represent an initial sk. for the chorale theme of the Adagio and Finale of the Ninth. Nowak himself was at a loss as to the whereabouts of the original, writing on the reverse of the photocopy, according to Prof. Vogg, “Original—wo?”. A handwritten copy by Nowak of another unknown pc. sk., suggesting material related thematically to either the Adagio or the Finale of

<sup>147</sup> The catalogue of the ÖNB deciphers the text as ending “im Hause geschenkt”, which appears on closer analysis to be incorrect. A more prosaic interpretation of the arithmetic sum here—which also appears to evince a mistake in the multiplication—is that it pertains to the amount of paper Bruckner may have needed to buy for the composition of the score.

<sup>148</sup> Group 2, according to Schönzeler’s classification; cf. Schönzeler, *Zu Bruckners IX. Symphonie...*, p. 11; facsimile of Cracow, IX. Symphony, fol. 34<sup>r</sup>, see *ibid.*, p. 25. In fact, one of Oeser’s “Zettel” was lost; the group in question, is III, not II.

<sup>149</sup> As noted in his *Bruckner-Arbeit 1982–1992*, p. 2.

<sup>150</sup> Thanks are again due to Prof. Vogg for its use and reproduction.

the Ninth, turned up among the notes made by Nowak in the 1980s for the re-edition of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* in F60 BRGA 68; again, the location of the original source is unknown.

In the early 1990s the Bruckner Institute embarked upon a project to systematically document and inventory all known Bruckner MS sources<sup>151</sup> (one which since, it must be mentioned, has had to be postponed for lack of funding). While this is an important initiative, the extent to which Bruckner's MSS are now dispersed and the often secretive, when not downright clandestine trade of manuscript dealers militates against any assurance that we will ever have catalogued, let alone traced, every surviving source. Elisabeth Maier erred on the side of optimism when she stated in 1994 that:<sup>152</sup> "Die komplizierte Quellenlage, seit jeher eine Crux der Brucknerforschung und -edition, kann, wie zu erhoffen ist, in absehbarer Zeit durch eine zentrale und allgemein zugängliche Dokumentation entschärft werden."

ABIL's data bank incorporates for each entry details of the WAB number, precise title, the form in which the document survives (AP, AS, sk., etc.), the dating, the no. of folios, folio size and format, location, signature and annotations. The project has also been making a study of the catalogues of the principal auction houses in an attempt to reconstruct the complex paths by which material threaded its way through private hands in the course of last over 100 years.<sup>153</sup> The project was 'preliminarily' concluded in 1992, "Vorläufig deshalb, weil manche der Handschriften nur für kurze Zeit ans Tageslicht kamen, um nach wenigen Jahren wieder als gut gehütete Kapitalanlage von der Bildfläche zu verschwinden".<sup>154</sup> Many questions remain, particularly concerning brief 'sightings' of material for the Ninth found from time to time in auction catalogues.

It remains very likely, however, that significant Bruckner MSS, including those taken from the dead composer's apartment or otherwise subsequently separated from Bruckner's estate and including fragments of the Finale, are still in existence; this appears to be the opinion of many in the trade.<sup>155</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> See concerning the project, Andrea V. Harrandt and Erich W. Partsch, "Quellen—neu erfaßt, neu gedeutet", *ÖMz* 46 (1991), pp. 698f., *idem*, "Bruckner auf 'einen Blick'", *ÖMz* 47 (1992), p. 627 and *idem*, "Dokumentationsprojekt zu Anton Bruckner", *ÖGM-Mitt* 25 (Dec. 1992), pp. 32–37, and Reinhold Tauber (ReTa), "Welt-Zentrale für Bruckner", *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* (Linz), 2 Sept. 1992. Regarding the question of the original MSS and their transmission, see also "Kleine Mitteilungen", *IBG-Mitt* no. 37 (Dec. 1991), pp. 38f.

<sup>152</sup> *ÖGM-Mitt* 27 (Dec. 1994), p. 46.

<sup>153</sup> Cf. Nowak, writing in 1966 "Wie weit verstreut Autographe Bruckners liegen, beweisen Skizzenblätter und Studien, die zwischen 1937 und 1941 bei verschiedenen Antiquaren, selbst aus London, erworben werden konnten" (*Das Bruckner-Erbe...*, p. 90).

<sup>154</sup> Andrea Harrandt und Erich W. Partsch, "Bruckner auf 'einen Blick'", *ÖMz* 47 (1992), p. 627. Sincere thanks are due here to Dr. Harrandt for an early copy of the entries of this database for the Ninth Symphony—22 pp. of computer printout—which included numerous hints, among them the references to the Photogrammarchiv reproductions, of great assistance in research work for the present chapter.

<sup>155</sup> Nikolaus Harnoncourt, in introducing the Dokumentation des Fragments of the Finale in the Vienna Musikvereinssaal, 13 November 1999, appealed to his audience as follows:



As a final example of precisely the kind of problems which prevent MSS from being made accessible a minor case deserves mention. This concerns an AS of the organ sk., in B major, to which we have already referred (§1.1.1), representing, as testified to by Max von Oberleithner, the first notation for the Adagio of the Ninth Symphony, preliminary to the extensive development of the idea found in the Cracow sks. for the Ninth, fols. 32–33. The autograph source, the current location of which is unknown, and an accompanying AS was described by Georg Kinsky in his 1953 publication *Manuskripte—Briefe—Dokumente von Scarlatti bis Stravinsky: Katalog der Musikautographen-Sammlung Louis Koch*.<sup>156</sup> The AS accompanying the original sk. (either by Göllicher, according to Kinsky, or by von Oberleithner in his *Erinnerungen* (p. 28), is headed “am 20. Mai 1890”.

A further copy of this AS—again, either by Göllicher or by von Oberleithner—was identified in 1992 by Elisabeth Maier and Andrea Harrandt of the Bruckner Institute in a private collection in St Veit/Glan. This AS bears the title “von Anton Bruckner am 20. Mai komponiert”. It is probably generally significant for the transmission of Bruckner’s MSS that the owners of even this non-autograph sk. were unwilling to make the AS available to ABIL free of charge. A photocopy of a handwritten copy of it made by Dr. Maier ‘in situ’ was enclosed with an explanatory letter to the present writer dated 25 Jan. 1993. The letter reads:

Zur Abschrift aus dem Adagio der Neunten: Frau Grasberger und ich waren im Sommer 1991 bei Dr. Wolfgang Liebich [ein Tierarzt] in St. Veit/Glan in Kärnten. Dr. Liebich hatte uns gesagt, er besitze einen ganzen Koffer voller Objekte aus dem Oberleithner-Nachlaß, wir sollten kommen und die Dinge ansehen, als Gegengabe könnten wir Kopien von allem haben, was uns wichtig schien. Der Bestand erwies sich als kaum relevant (es waren nur mehr ein dürftiger Rest des ausgesuchten Nachlasses, der in Wien an der ÖNB ist). Das einzige Interessante war das Notenblatt, eine große elegante, zügige Handschrift, “von Anton Bruckner am 20. Mai komponiert” (die Anschrift haben im Moment Kollegen). Dr. Liebich versprach uns eine Kopie, die wir bis heute nicht erhalten haben [...]. Wir haben da unsere Vermutungen. Er glaubt wohl, mit dem Papier ein Geschäft machen zu können. Ohne Identifizierung ist das Blatt jedoch wertlos, und Sie haben nun ohnehin die Krakauer Skizzen, was ich ganz toll finde!!!

### 1.2.9 Conclusions.

From all of this it is clear that the Orel edition cannot be regarded as representing any kind of final word on the question of the Finale MSS and indeed that many mysteries remain

---

“Es gibt von diesem Satz vier Fragmente. Zwischen diesen Fragmenten fehlen ein oder zwei Partiturseiten; das sind sogar zum Teil Seiten, die seinerzeit existiert haben. Weil Bruckner sie durchnummeriert hat, und weil er die Takte durchnummeriert hat, kann man ganz genau sehen, was fehlt. Die wurden damals von liebevollen Andenkenjägern an sich genommen, und ich würde Sie sehr einladen: Schauen Sie nach zu Haus! Bei Schubert weiß man, daß man Sauerkraut in seine Manuskripte eingewickelt hat, aber bei diesen Manuskripten würde ich sagen, wurde nichts damit eingewickelt. Die liegen noch in Ihren Biedermaier-Kommoden, und vielleicht weiß man sogar, daß es von Bruckner ist und macht jeden Abend eine kleine Andacht davor! Aber ich würde Sie bitten: Schauen Sie nach! Die Stücke sind vorhanden” (see Appendix III and §3.4.12).

<sup>156</sup> Stuttgart 1953, p. 277.

concerning the dismemberment and dispersal of the sources for the Ninth and its Finale. It is very likely, as testified to by Heller and Auer and more recently endorsed by statements by Maier and others, that material found its way out of Bruckner's apartment before his estate could be properly secured, a fact confirmed by the provenance of such bifols. as those of Cyrill Hynais, Max Graf, Baron Vietinghoff, Richard Strauss and others of unknown provenance that subsequently reappeared, and which exhibit a transmission history quite distinct from that of the main body of materials cited in the Protokoll of 18 October 1896. The question of which parts of the Finale score can, on the basis of internal compositional evidence, most probably be regarded as lost will be more closely examined in ch. 3.1. Meanwhile, the author's supposition that numerous bifols. from the Finale have not survived the dispersal of the MSS is strongly confirmed by the following facts:

- i. The statements of the primary sources referring to a "Geiersturz", as well as of the negligent attitude of the executor and heirs of the composer's estate as to the preservation of the surviving MSS;
- ii. The present diaspora of Bruckner sources, most particularly the present-day ordering of the entire extant autograph material of the Ninth under some 30 signatures, often of widely disparate provenance, in five different libraries and three different countries;
- iii. The often dubious, untraceable or unverifiable routes by which this material arrived in official holdings;
- iv. The fact that it would still seem to be re-emerging: and finally
- v. The existence of further material known even today to lie in private hands.

In view of this—even before the internal evidence for the predication of missing material is examined—it may justifiably be claimed that the burden of proof rests upon those wishing to claim that all the original material for the Finale could somehow have survived the events of October 1896 intact.

It should also be borne in mind that the sources of the Ninth, despite obvious losses, are still substantially more complete than those of any other symphony, with the possible exception of the Eighth. While the ÖNB contains some 42 autograph signatures pertinent to the two versions of the Eighth,<sup>157</sup> the absence of any substantial material for the earlier symphonies is conspicuous, and highly significant.<sup>158</sup> Eyewitness accounts spoke, as we have

---

<sup>157</sup> These have not been included in Table I for reasons of space. The case of the Eighth is, at the same time, not readily comparable with the material for the Ninth, as much of the extant material is in the form of ASS; the sources are further amplified by Bruckner's revision of the score in 1887–1890.

<sup>158</sup> According to Cohrs who in November 1995 carried out such a search at the author's request, the ÖNB contains a total of only 16 signatures for all works composed prior to the Eighth Symphony, and these are largely isolated sks. or discarded score bifols. rather than more substantial sets of sks. or drafts. The StB contains, aside from several theoretical sks., photocopies of a number of scores and the previously mentioned sources for

seen, of huge piles of MSS in Bruckner's Heßgasse apartment;<sup>159</sup> given Bruckner's working methods it is probably more likely that these were sks. and drafts for completed compositions rather than unfinished or rejected, finished scores which Bruckner did not see fit to publish: Bruckner's *œuvre* is characteristic for its single-minded preoccupation with the symphonic form as well as with large-scale settings of the central texts of the Catholic liturgy and, with the exception of several significant smaller choral motets, the composer devoted almost no attention to the chamber music, songs and piano compositions characteristic of the outputs of most nineteenth-century composers. This is confirmed firstly by the compositional chronology of Bruckner's major works, which leave little opportunity for postulating the existence of substantial unknown compositions, secondly by the very few surviving thematic sks. for works which did not advance beyond the stage of first conception.<sup>160</sup>

Whatever Bruckner may have destroyed in the *auto da fé* of mid-1895 prior to his move to the Belvedere, it is significant that he would not appear to have rescued anything of any significance that was hitherto unknown; the survival of the original Second Symphony in D minor, which Bruckner pronounced "ganz und gar ungültig" yet was unwilling to destroy, is the exception which confirms this rule. On the contrary, he mainly concerned himself at this time with the retrieval and preservation of his autograph scores, as the calendar entries for April–July 1895 attest.<sup>161</sup>

The survival of the substantial number of sks. for the later works, the Eighth and first three movements of the Ninth Symphonies, *Helgoland* and *Das Deutsche Lied*,<sup>162</sup> can be explained on two grounds. Either: Bruckner may not have thought fit to destroy material so recently composed (it may for instance, still have been included in Bruckner's 'current' materials for the Ninth), or some of the material, like some earlier sources, survived as gifts to friends and students, as in the case of the sks. for the first movement of the Ninth given to Viktor Christ, the Adagio bifol. given to Julius Hermann, and probably also the sks. and drafts for *Helgoland* and for the Finale acquired by the ÖNB and the StB from the estate of Cyrill Hynais. Whatever the provenance and transmission of these artefacts—and despite observable

*Helgoland* and the Ninth Symphony, only a single discarded bifol. from the Sixth (M. H. 4079). A small number of other sources survive in Kremsmünster, largely for the early works (see for instance Paul Hawkshaw, "Weiteres über die Arbeitsweise Bruckners während seiner Linzer Jahre", *BrSympBer* 1992, pp. 143–152) and elsewhere (see e.g. Franz Zamazal, "Ein verschollenes Werk Bruckners: Die Rose", *IBG-Mitt* no. 35 (Dec. 1990), p. 11).

<sup>159</sup> As for instance, noted by Eckstein, *Erinnerungen...*, pp. 8f.; cf. §1.1.5.

<sup>160</sup> Cf. R. Grasberger, the *Werkverzeichnis Anton Bruckners (WAB)*, pp. 157ff., particularly the initial drafts for a Symphony in B flat (WAB 142), made in late October 1869 (referred to in Göll.-A. IV/1, pp. 112–118; facs. *ibid.*). Among later works, only a further 18-m. sk. for a Requiem (WAB 141) is known, dated 18 Sept. 1875 (referred to in Göll.-A. IV/1, pp. 360ff.); this was published by Haas in the first GA, vol. 15.

<sup>161</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 544f.; see again §1.1.5.

<sup>162</sup> Four fols. of sks. for the last named are known held by the Archives of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna (cf. ÖNB PhA 2253). In the case of Psalm 150 only the carefully written autograph score itself (ÖNB 19.484) now appears to be extant.

and construable losses—the near one thousand pages of material which comprise the extant autograph sources for the Ninth remain the most complete of those for any Bruckner symphony and our most valuable source of insight into his compositional methods. Considering the nature of the dispersal of 1896, it can surely be regarded as fortunate that so much of the original MS material for the Ninth has survived.

Had the Finale MSS survived intact, and had Josef Schalk or Ferdinand Löwe been able to successfully disentangle a final version from that material, the Ninth would probably never have entered the concert repertoire in its three-movement form and we would never have become accustomed to its Adagio ending even if, as a result of its instrumentation or perhaps even a more substantial completion by Schalk or Löwe, the Finale may have fallen below the artistic level of the first three movements. It must be borne in mind that most of Bruckner's works were known only in unacknowledged arrangements until well into the 1930s, and the original version of the first three movements of the Ninth itself was not heard until 36 years after Bruckner's death. Under such circumstances it would have been a matter of little consequence for an existing, unfinished final movement of the Ninth to have been completed and reorchestrated by other hands—although one can only speculate as to what Löwe or Franz Schalk would have made of this radical score, with its massive contrasts, extended, almost obsessive use of ostinato technique and remarkably progressive use of dissonance. Even if such an arrangement of the Finale had entered the repertoire, although it might subsequently have been rejected by the editors of the GA, the Finale would have acquired the endorsement of tradition, a similar situation to that of the Mozart/Süßmayr Requiem,<sup>163</sup> and sooner or later been revised and improved by modern scholars, but without the entire movement itself, and therewith Bruckner's concept of the symphony as a whole, being lost to history. The cavernous silence and clouds of misinformation which has coloured our perceptions of the movement and skewed the reception of the Ninth Symphony down to the present day would never have arisen.

The facts of Bruckner's death, the catastrophic transmission of the sources and for that matter whatever else in this case has been regarded as fateful or symbolic, should be considered for what it is: historical incident, not some pronouncement on the part of God or Destiny.<sup>164</sup> After a century of neglect and suppression we should be prepared to take this movement more seriously.

---

<sup>163</sup> The Mozart/Süßmayr Requiem score was published along with the original Requiem fragment by Nowak himself in the *Neue Mozart-Gesamtausgabe*.

<sup>164</sup> The allusion is made here to the views of Schönzeler, who considers any attempt to complete the Finale a 'sacrilege.' Cf. *Bruckner*, London, 1970, p. 108 (quoted in §1.3.9); even more forceful words from Schönzeler are quoted by Cornelis van Zwol, "Der Finalsatz der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners. Ein Referat in Utrecht (15. November 1986); ein Symposium in Rom (11.–12. Mai 1987)." *Bruckner-Jahrbuch* 1987–88, p. 34.

## 1.3

### The Reception of the Ninth Symphony and its Finale

Für die IX. ist gesorgt.

—Anton Bruckner<sup>1</sup>

#### 1.3.1 Early Bruckner reception: a perspective.

**I**N order to understand the process by which Ferdinand Löwe's orchestral arrangement of the first three movements of the Ninth Symphony came to command such a central status in the reception of Bruckner's music, and the manner in which the question of the unfinished Finale and its specified substitute the Te Deum came to be suppressed or dismissed, we must first understand the nature of the historical reception of Bruckner's music.

Manfred Wagner's essay "Von den Wurzeln unseres Brucknerbildes: die Nekrologe von 1896"<sup>2</sup> provides important insights into the manner in which the Viennese journals of the time set the tone of much of what was subsequently written about Bruckner. Over 80 reports of Bruckner's death appeared in the Austrian press in the days immediately following it, the Upper Austrian press alone producing six reports.<sup>3</sup> Surprisingly, the most accurate and sober report from a modern-day point of view appeared, as Manfred Wagner notes,<sup>4</sup> in the provincial paper, the *Linzer Tagespost* from 13 October 1896, where we read concerning Bruckner's last hours and the composition of the Ninth:

Bruckner war bis zu seiner Todesstunde geistig frisch und regsam. Bis in die letzte Zeit arbeitete er in jenen Stunden, da ihm sein Leiden weniger Beschwerden verursachte, an der Vollendung des vierten Satzes der neunten Symphonie, der bereits weit gediehen war.<sup>5</sup>

The *Tagespost* article confines itself to recounting Bruckner's life and career, the compositional and first performance dates of his main works and Bruckner's last hours, as if

---

<sup>1</sup> Bruckner's words, quoted in Max Auer, *Bruckner* (1923), p. 328, noted during a visit of Josef Kluger to Bruckner during his last months in the Belvedere: "Hier sagte er seinem Liebling, dem jungen Chorherrn Josef Kluger aus Klosterneuburg, ganz unvermittelt: 'Für die IX. ist gesorgt', ohne näheres darüber auszuführen". Cf. also the 1934 edition, p. 350. The words were also taken as a motto for an article by the author summing up recent research and publications on the Ninth and its Finale; see Appendix VI.

<sup>2</sup> *BrLWD*, pp. 307ff.; cf. also pp. 220ff. An earlier form of the chapter can be found in the article "Die Nekrologe von 1896: rezeptionsstiftend?—oder Wie Klischees von Anton Bruckner entstanden", in: *Musik-Konzepte* 23/24 (1982), pp. 119–147.

<sup>3</sup> *BrLWD*, pp. 220f.

<sup>4</sup> "Die Nekrologe von 1896: rezeptionsstiftend?", p. 119.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 121f.

the facts themselves were sufficient indication of Bruckner's achievement. The Vienna papers, on the other hand,

zogen [...], gleichgültig ob Bruckner wohlgesonnen oder ihm kritisch gegenüberstehend, das 'Provinzielle' seiner Person oder seines Charakters in das Zentrum ihrer Betrachtungen. Von der Wiege bis zum Grab mußten die Klischees stimmen [...]<sup>6</sup>

Accordingly we read in the *Wiener Fremden-Blatt*, in the article "Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner" by Hedwig Abel:

Als die Beine nicht mehr die Pedale zu treten vermochten, begann auch der granitharte Römerschädel zu verfallen. Mehr und mehr entwich das Leben aus ihm. Eine Legende erzählt, daß Bruckner bis zu seinem Tode an der Vollendung einer neunten Symphonie arbeitete. Er mag die Absicht gehabt haben. Es ist wohl ein königliches Los, nach einer neunten Symphonie zu sterben, wie Beethoven. Bruckner ist an ihr gestorben. Wie er sie, ohne Schlußsatz, hinterlassen, mag sie schon lange in seinem Pult gelegen haben.<sup>7</sup>

With less sarcasm but no greater accuracy Theodor Vogl, in the *Illustrierte Wiener Extrablatt* of 12 October 1896, wrote:

Die neunte Symphonie zu vollenden war Bruckner nicht mehr beschieden. Es sind *blos drei Sätze* vorhanden—der letzte, vierte Satz sollte nach den Worten des Componisten 'dem lieben Gott gewidmet' sein.<sup>8</sup>

An article of the same date in the *Neue Freie Presse* (Eduard Hanslick's podium) responded, perhaps unexpectedly, with a sober account, which closes with the paragraph:

Das letzte Werk, an welchem Bruckner bis zu seinem Tode arbeitete, die *neunte Symphonie*, ist wie schon erwähnt, bis zum letzten Satz gediehen. Der Verblichene hat bestimmt, daß für den Fall, als der letzte Satz unvollendet bleiben sollte, sein Tedeum den Schluß des großen Werkes bilden möge.<sup>9</sup>

A direct line appears to connect even the wording of such reports with comments which, as will be shown, appear to this day in concert programmes and concert guides, popular biographies, and—regrettably—even 'serious' musicological studies, against which overwhelming tide not even the best intentions of the Bruckner GA were able to achieve any significant stay. For from the outset, Bruckner's music was approached almost solely from a journalistic or literary point of view; the then nascent discipline of musicology had little if anything to do with the impact his works were making in the concert hall, and had little to offer the average concert-goer in the way of facilitating access to his music. Dominated by

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 122.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 125.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 128. Emphasis original.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 131. Emphasis original.

journalistic cliché, ubiquitous anecdotes and an overriding need to endorse the composer as an isolated heroic figure neglected or rejected amongst his musical peers, the Bruckner literature remained at least up until the 1970s, as Manfred Wagner put it, “im Fahrwasser der Nekrologe”.<sup>10</sup> Indeed,

Wenn man eine Gruppierung der Autoren nach ihrer sozialen Zugehörigkeit, Parteinahme oder auch nach ihren Fachgebieten vornimmt, ist leicht einzusehen, warum. Hier spielen Freunde und Schüler, Kritiker und Interpreten, der katholische, nationalistische und nationalsozialistische Autor ebenso eine Rolle wie die historisch-biographische Richtung, die große Diskussionsgruppe um die philologische Texterschließung, die Formspezialisten, die Stilkritiker, die Inhaltsdeuter, die geistesgeschichtlichen Argumenten Verpflichteten oder der religionsphilosophischen Schau Angehörigen bzw. jene Forscher, die synthetisch versuchen, eine allgemein gültige Biographie zu verfassen, wobei allerdings die Parteinahme für eine der genannten Richtungen bislang bei keinem der Autoren übersehen werden kann.<sup>11</sup>

Elsewhere Wagner concluded that:

Bruckner selbst hatte sich vom zwar bekannten, aber nicht etablierten Orgelkünstler zum Heroen einer ihn vereinnahmenden Gesellschaft entwickelt, hatte Lob und Ehren, inzwischen wohl auch Geld und Verdienste, darüber hinaus Ruhm in der ganzen Welt und eine ausführliche Presseberichterstattung eingeheimst. Auf der Strecke blieb, ohne daß er dafür verantwortlich zu machen wäre, bis auf wenige Ausnahmen *die sachliche Auseinandersetzung mit seinem Werk*, das entweder nicht verstanden wurde oder von den gutmeinenden Verstehern einer breiten Öffentlichkeit mit Hilfe wortreicher Programme und Adaptationen im Hinblick auf Publikumsgeschmack erklärt werden sollte.<sup>12</sup>

It was precisely this absence of “sachliche Auseinandersetzung” in the early decades of Bruckner reception that was to prove so significant in ensuring that the myths instigated in connection with the Ninth following Bruckner’s death would become such entrenched reception tropes and, endlessly propagated, remain in many cases unquestioned down to the present day.

### 1.3.2 Ferdinand Löwe’s version of the Ninth.

Ignorance concerning the existence and extent of a Ninth Symphony and the question as to whether the score could or should be performed appears to have persisted for some time after Bruckner’s death. A report by Josef Schalk in the *Jahresbericht des Akademischen Richard Wagner-Vereins*<sup>13</sup> reminds us that the Ninth was still an unknown quantity in 1896, despite

<sup>10</sup> *BrLWD*, p. 333.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> “Bruckner in Wien”, p. 66, italics added. See also Norbert Tschulik, “Anton Bruckner in der Wiener Zeitung: Ein Beitrag über die zeitgenössische Bruckner-Berichterstattung”, *BrJb* 1981, pp. 171–179 *passim*.

<sup>13</sup> Vol. 24 (1896), pp. 14–19.

transcriptions having been made and Bruckner having played passages to friends and acquaintances. After referring to the contrast of ‘tragic’ (pagan) and ‘spiritual’ (Christian) elements in the Eighth, Schalk muses: “Vielleicht, dass die IX. Symphonie es zu einem lebendigen Ausgleich der beiden drängenden Gewalten gebracht hätte, vielleicht auch nicht. Wer will entscheiden? Was war größer in Bruckner: die schöpferische Kraft oder der Glaube?”<sup>14</sup> The obituary article “Anton Bruckner†” of 18 October 1896 in the *Neue musikalische Presse*<sup>15</sup> by music critic Theodor Helm, a close acquaintance of Bruckner’s, is more specific and to the point, and reveals what was most likely an accurate knowledge of Bruckner’s specifications concerning the Te Deum and the probable intentions underlying them.<sup>16</sup> Here we read that:

Von der geplanten neunten Symphonie des Meisters (wie die dritte aus D-moll gehend) liegen angeblich drei Sätze im Schreibtische Bruckner’s vollendet vor; da ihm seine geschwächte Gesundheit nicht mehr die Ausarbeitung eines Finales erlaubte, so würde als solches nach seinem eigenen Wunsche—das Tedeum zu gelten haben. Eine gewiss sehr merkwürdige Idee, deren praktische Ausführbarkeit sich aber nicht früher beurtheilen lässt, bevor man nicht die drei Symphoniesätze kennt.

Offenbar wollte hiemit auch der Symphoniker Bruckner als begeisterter Sänger des Herrn von der Kunst Abschied nehmen und liesse sich in diesem Sinne allerdings ein grossartigeres Chorfinale, als das Tedeum, kaum denken.

It was almost four years later that an announcement of a premiere performance of the Ninth Symphony was finally posted. A 1901 report in the “Mittheilungen und Notizen” of the *Österreichische Musik- und Theaterzeitung* reads as follows:<sup>17</sup>

Die Philharmoniker haben, wie wir vernehmen, zwei große Originalnovitäten auf ihr Programm gesetzt, und zwar die Neunte Symphonie von Bruckner und die vor einigen Monaten vollendete Vierte Symphonie von Gustav Mahler. Die Bruckner’sche Symphonie wurde bekanntlich von dem verstorbenen Meister dem ‘lieben Gott’ gewidmet. Es war Bruckner nicht vergönnt, das Werk zu Ende zu componiren, und es wurden in seinem Nachlasse nur drei Sätze vorgefunden. Diese wird Capellmeister Hellmesberger dem Wiener Publicum zum ersten Male vorführen [...]

Two more years were to pass before the work was finally premiered, conducted not by Joseph Hellmesberger<sup>18</sup> but by the younger Ferdinand Löwe (1865–1925), a pupil of

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>15</sup> Vol. 5, no. 42, p. 4. The article, as mentioned in §1.2.4 *supra*, included a facsimile of a discarded bifol. from the Adagio of the Ninth Symphony, that had been presented by Bruckner to the Steyr Regens Chori Josef Bayer.

<sup>16</sup> As we shall later see from the article of 11 February 1903 by Karl Fromm (§1.3.3), Helm would appear to have been the recipient of ‘inside’ information concerning the Ninth during Bruckner’s last years.

<sup>17</sup> Vol. 12, nos. 17–18, p. 13; author anonymous.

<sup>18</sup> Jnr. (known as “Pepi”), 1855–1907; leading Viennese conductor and violinist, from 1900 conductor of the Philharmonic concerts. A scandal forced his exit from the Viennese musical scene in 1903.



Bruckner's at the Conservatorium who had meanwhile established himself as one of the leading conductors of his day—co-founder of the Vienna Konzertverein and since 1900 conductor of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde concert series.<sup>19</sup>

Auer's report concerning the first performance of the Ninth places the circumstances surrounding this event in context:

Als Ferdinand Löwe 1900 als Dirigent der Gesellschafts-Konzerte nach Wien zurückgekehrt war, begann dort allmählich eine zielbewußte Bruckner Pflege, die durch die Gründung des 'Konzert-Vereins', an dessen Spitze Löwe trat, wesentlich gefördert wurde.

Ursprünglich bestand der Plan, die fertigen drei Sätze der Neunten durch die Philharmoniker herauszubringen, doch traute man dem damaligen Dirigenten derselben, dem jungen Joseph Hellmesberger, eine pietätvolle Lösung dieser Aufgabe nicht zu. Auch Dirigenten von auswärts bewarben sich um die Erstaufführung, so Karl Straube – Münster i. W. [–] und Chevalier Cor de Las war eigens aus Petersburg nach Wien gekommen, um sich das Aufführungsrecht der Neunten zu sichern.

Nun, da Löwe sein eigenes Orchester herangebildet hatte, ging er selbst daran, den letzten Liebesdienst an seinem Meister zu erfüllen. Zwar war in musikalischen Kreisen, ja selbst in dem engeren Freundeskreis des Verstorbenen die Meinung verbreitet, die nachgelassenen Sätze seien zu skizzenhaft, ja unaufführbar. Auch Löwe meinte ursprünglich, man tue dem Meister mit der Bekanntgabe keinen Dienst. Endlich, nach eifrigem Studium der drei fertigen Sätze, begann er aus den nach dem Original geschriebenen Stimmen Orchesterproben zu halten. In jeder der zahlreichen Proben wurde, wie der Cellist Laser berichtet, eifrig gefeilt und instrumental geändert, und da das wachende Auge des Meisters nun nicht mehr über dem Jünger ruhte, geschah in Abänderung des Originaltextes des Guten zuviel. Schließlich kam das Werk in einem neuen Orchesterkleid zur Aufführung und in Druck, ohne daß der Öffentlichkeit die Umarbeitung durch Löwe mitgeteilt wurde. So kam es, daß des Meisters Schwanengesang fast dreißig Jahre in der Löwischen Fassung durch die Konzertsäle ging. Nur wenigen Eingeweihten war diese Tatsache bekannt, bis endlich die Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft 1932 die Uraufführung der Originale durch Siegmund von Hausegger in München vor einem Kreis Geladener durchführte, wobei die beiden Fassungen gegenübergestellt wurden.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Renate Grasberger, Erich Wolfgang Partsch, *Bruckner—skizziert*, Vienna 1991, p. 275; see also concerning Löwe's early career, the recent publication by Reinhard Rauner, *Ferdinand Löwe. Leben und Wirken. I. Teil 1863–1900. Ein Wiener Musiker zwischen Anton Bruckner und Gustav Mahler (Musikleben. Studien zur Musikgeschichte Österreichs. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Musikgeschichte an der Hochschule für Musik und darstellende Kunst in Wien, vol. 3, ed. Friedrich Heller)*, Frankfurt am Main–Bern 1995.

<sup>20</sup> Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 40f. Cf. Alfred Orel, "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner", *Deutsche Musik* 1 (1936–37), p. 196. Auer, in his subsequent major article of 1936, "Der Streit um den echten Bruckner im Licht biographischer Tatsachen (II)", *ZfM* 103, no. 10 (Oct. 1936), p. 1194, points out that the cellist's name was not 'Laser' but 'Lasner', and that a set of parts existed in Vienna containing only a few corrections. These, he assumes, must have replaced an initial set which at some point in time would of course have become so heavily overwritten as to be wholly illegible. Auer (*ibid.*): "Wäre dies Annahme unrichtig, dann müßte Löwe die Original-Partitur kurzerhand, ohne sie auch nur einmal zum Erklingen zu bringen, neu bearbeitet haben." Despite recent researches by B. G. Cohrs in the archives of the Konzerthaus and Gesellschaft der Musik, neither parts nor conducting score have yet come to light.

Nicknamed by the composer “mein Berlioz”,<sup>21</sup> Ferdinand Löwe, together with the Schalk brothers, had been the most significant influence on Bruckner regarding technicalities of instrumentation and their most effective application in his scores. The extent to which Bruckner may have amicably acceded to instrumental changes in his scores as worthwhile additions or begrudgingly recognised them as regrettable, if necessary, interim contingencies has already been mentioned;<sup>22</sup> most recently the issue has become fundamental to the major controversy over the authenticity of the Bruckner first editions.

As already noted,<sup>23</sup> the date of the return of the AP of the first three movements of the Ninth Symphony to Vienna, if indeed it ever left Bruckner's possession, has not come down to us; officially, however, it entered the holdings of the Hofbibliothek on 26 November 1896. Auer's assertion that it only returned to Vienna years after his death, and his further claim<sup>24</sup> that this was the reason for the seven-year lapse between Bruckner's death and the premiere of the work, is hence false. That either Franz or Josef Schalk, or perhaps both, considered ‘arranging’ the Ninth Symphony for performance back in 1895, presumably with Bruckner's consent, has also already been alluded to.<sup>25</sup> Sometime between Bruckner's death in 1896 and his own in 1900, Josef prepared the four-hand piano transcription of the first movement, Adagio and part of the Scherzo (in that order) that survives in his hand;<sup>26</sup> as we have seen, his brother Franz proceeded with his ‘own’ version of the Ninth as far as noting proposed changes in Meißner's AS of the first movement, ÖNB 29.305, presumably given to the Schalks with Bruckner's full permission. While there is no dating to give any indication of when Schalk undertook these changes, it is not unreasonable to assume that they could have been made shortly after receipt of the copy by Josef, i.e., sometime after 4 October 1895. It is more difficult to say to what extent the changes were made with Bruckner's consent, or indeed what validity he might have accorded them.

Certainly there was no question in Orel's mind regarding Löwe's version of the Ninth: “es [handelt] sich in diesem Werk zweifellos um eine Bearbeitung F. Löwes [...], die mehrere Jahre nach Bruckners Tod vorgenommen wurde und sozusagen kaum einen Takt unangetastet ließ”,<sup>27</sup> and there would be little point today in attempting to reclaim any validity for this

---

<sup>21</sup> Max Auer, “Die IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung”, *BrBlätter* 1934, no. 3, p. 41; cf. Alfred Orel, “Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner”, p. 196; cf. *ibid.*, p. 220: “Man kann dies nur dahin deuten, daß Löwe als Orchestertechniker bezeichnet werden sollte.”

<sup>22</sup> See §1.1.4.

<sup>23</sup> See §1.2.3.

<sup>24</sup> “Die IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung”, p. 41.

<sup>25</sup> See §1.1.4.

<sup>26</sup> ÖNB 28.420; see Table I, A/3. The piano versions subsequently published by Doblinger were prepared by Ferdinand Löwe who acknowledged the use of Schalk's piano transcription as a basis.

<sup>27</sup> Orel, “Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner”, p. 216.

score, as has been argued for Löwe's 1889 edition of the Fourth Symphony.<sup>28</sup> The score of the Ninth was, after all, only written after Bruckner had concluded a series of extensive revisions on his earlier symphonies; it not unreasonable to suppose that the stylistic choices he made in revising the earlier works would have been embodied in the original score of the Ninth—a work which Bruckner surely realised he would never have the opportunity to revise; its scoring otherwise could only have represented an “atavistischen Rückfall in den Urzustand seiner Ersten und Fünften”, as Auer pointed out.<sup>29</sup>

Lowe's addition of piccolo and double bassoon to Bruckner's instrumentation—recalling that of the 1890 version of the Eighth, without the harps—belongs to the merest superficialities of his reworking. In comparison with, for instance, Franz Schalk's first edition of the Fifth (1895), in which extensive structural changes were made, it has often been assumed that Löwe merely reorchestrated the Ninth, bringing it more into line with the 'mixed' conception of orchestral colour characteristic of the day. Yet alongside well-intended attempts to force the score to conform to a more orthodox orchestration, decisions can be observed which are based purely on personal taste.<sup>30</sup> In the process, the most striking and characteristic aspects of the music, including Bruckner's most daring and brilliant harmonic gestures, were 'rounded-off' where they were not systematically eliminated—surely a reflection of the conservatism of Viennese audiences of the time, of whom Löwe, like the Schalks, was an astute judge. The sharp contours of Bruckner's music, its clarity of voice leading and orchestral colour, its uncompromising abruptness, directness and intentional discontinuity, its contrast of overbearing mass and febrile clarity of line—criteria which for posterity were to become the dominant topoi for the reception of Bruckner's music—were compromised or lost.<sup>31</sup>

Equally, Löwe's score, published by Doblinger in Vienna in August 1903 (title page, Facs. C/353), is a beautiful and effective text full of highly sophisticated retouchings, with no dearth of helpful performing indications, expressive markings and delicate nuances.<sup>32</sup> As Wolfgang Doebel has shown, it is important nowadays to recognise just how universally

<sup>28</sup> Reference is made here to the work of Benjamin M. Korvstedt. See §§1.1.4 *supra*, and 1.3.4 *infra*.

<sup>29</sup> Auer, “Der Streit... (II)”, p. 1194.

<sup>30</sup> Auer cites the case of a young Munich composer whose composition was being prepared for performance by Löwe: “Bei der letzten Probe aber fand er seine Komposition so geändert, daß er Löwe bat, sie nicht aufzuführen, da er das Stück nicht mehr als seine Schöpfung anerkennen konnte!” (“Der Streit... (II)”, p. 1191).

<sup>31</sup> See also Auer's discussion of many of these details in his “Anton Bruckners IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung”, *ZfM* 99, no. 10 (October 1932), pp. 862f., and more recently in Constantin Floros, “Historische Phasen der Bruckner-Interpretation”, *BrSympBer* 1982, pp. 93–102.

<sup>32</sup> Orel, “Original und Bearbeitung...”, p. 216: “Der Handschrift gegenüber wirkt der Druck wie eine ‘Dirigeneinrichtung’. [...] Bruckner differenziert seine Partituren verhältnismäßig sehr wenig.”

accepted and highly regarded Löwe's version was:<sup>33</sup> even after the viability of Bruckner's original had finally been demonstrated in the milestone performance of April 1932 Robert Haas could write of it as "eine virtuose Konzerteinrichtung der Originalpartitur, bei der aber doch hinter der persönlichen Auslegung die klare Willensäußerung des Meisters zurückstehen muß".<sup>34</sup> No matter how much one might wish to take exception to Haas' opinions elsewhere, the statement cannot be drawn into question today. This was the conclusion of Wolfgang Doebel, who made a detailed and comprehensive analysis of Löwe's arrangement, including a complete itemisation of every alteration within eight categories, and which unequivocally demonstrates the precise extent and nature of Löwe's interventions.<sup>35</sup>

Löwe made dozens of alterations of dynamics which alone recast the work in a far more Wagnerian but also a more conventional mode, smoothing out the abrupt contrasts and effects of juxtaposed sound-masses so characteristic of Bruckner's style and making it more conservative or, to use Constantin Floros' apt expression, "salonfähig".<sup>36</sup> Like the Schalks in their arrangements, Löwe often turned Bruckner's massive *Klangflächen* into dynamic processes, for instance at mm. 269–276 of the first movement or 145–150 of the Adagio.<sup>37</sup> Bruckner's primarily objective, 'neutral' tempo indications, such as "Moderato", "Langsamer" were replaced with more affective specifications, such as an overworked "Ruhig",<sup>38</sup> while numerous even less Brucknerian epithets such as "appassionato", "weich", "ausdrucksvoll" or "mit grösstem Ausdruck" pepper the score. Liberties were also taken with transitional tempo markings. The initial *Steigerung* of the first movement, from letter A, was marked "Sehr allmählich etwas belebend"; conversely, Bruckner's decisive "riten." 2 mm. before letter C was reduced to a "poco rit.", Bruckner's "ritard." 11 mm. after C omitted entirely, and his "Langsamer" at letter D ameliorated into "Etwas langsamer". A similar list could be made of Löwe's alterations to bowing and agogics: the same tendency toward a more conventional moderation, together with a greater fluency and refinement, a certain urbane, superficial emotionalism can be observed.

---

<sup>33</sup> See *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen*, Tutzing 2001, pp. 184ff.; further discussion of the reevaluation of the original score in the 1930s in §1.3.5 *infra*. The following discussion of the Löwe score was written before the appearance of Doebel's thesis.

<sup>34</sup> *Bruckner* (Potsdam 1934), p. 152; see also *ibid.*, following p.

<sup>35</sup> *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen*, comparative list pp. 458ff.; discussion pp. 186ff.

<sup>36</sup> "Meiner Ansicht nach klingen die Bearbeitungen nicht 'wagnerischer' sondern weniger 'brucknerisch', das heißt: konventioneller. Ganz offensichtlich verfolgten die Bearbeiter das Ziel, den Brucknerklang gefälliger, salonfähiger, 'domestizierter' zu machen" (Constantin Floros, "Historische Phasen der Bruckner-Interpretation", p. 96).

<sup>37</sup> Doebel, p. 190. "So blieben von den knapp 20 Brucknerschen Tutti-Klangflächen im zwei- oder dreifachen forte lediglich fünf von Änderungen unberührt" (*ibid.*).

<sup>38</sup> See Doebel's comparison of original and first edition tempo markings, pp. 189f.; cf. also Cohn's *Kritischer Bericht* on the Ninth (in press), Anhang III, Konkordanz der Tempi in Autograph und Druck-Ausgaben.

However, Löwe's most obvious and radical changes concerned the orchestration of the score, which was altered, as we have seen, in almost every measure.<sup>39</sup> Mention should be made of his most salient addition, that of a transitional phrase in oboe and clarinet at mm. 301–302, just prior to letter M of the first movement, the apparent intention of which was to procure a smooth transition from the previous section and to break the sequence of general pauses throughout the preceding pages:<sup>40</sup>

IX(1903)/1: mm. 301ff.

Ob., Klar. *etwas zögernd*  
*ausdrucksvoll*  
 Viol. 1 *Ruhig*  
*p*  
 etc.

The opposite effect—an attempt to achieve a greater sense of finality and closure—can be found in the final measures of the first movement, where Löwe replaced Bruckner's continuing *tremolo* in the strings with punctuative repeated chords.

Extensive changes altered many stylistic aspects of the second and third movements. The opening of the Scherzo was rescored entirely by Löwe, omitting the held woodwind chords that underlie the *pizzicato* second violins, presumably to lessen their dissonant effect—cf. in particular the  $c\sharp^2/d^2$  clash of mm. 13ff.—while the original *pizzicato* quavers of the strings were allotted to the woodwind. This change also permitted the movement to be taken at a much faster tempo than is possible if the quavers are to be played by the strings as originally intended.<sup>41</sup> The changes in instrumentation as well as the much faster overall tempo gave rise to such surprising characterisations of the Scherzo as those of Robert Hirschfeld,<sup>42</sup> (“Befreiender Humor löst uns aus der Stimmung des ersten Satzes”<sup>43</sup>) or Arthur Neißer (“im zweiten [Satz], [...] triumphiert ein titanenhaft über die Götter erhabener Humor”<sup>44</sup>). Auer points out that contemporary critics particularly admired

[n]eben der ungeheuren Gedankentiefe des Werkes [...] die im Scherzo geradezu von französischem Esprit erfüllte, an Berlioz erinnernde Feinheit der Instrumentation, die Vermeidung schroffer Übergänge der einzelnen Formteile, die aushauchenden Schlüsse

<sup>39</sup> Haas' biography (p. 153) also cites alterations of individual notes by Löwe: 1st mvt., m. 437f., 1st violin: c instead of  $c\sharp$ ; 3rd mvt., m. 166, flute: f instead of  $f\sharp$ . Cf. Doebel, pp. 191ff.

<sup>40</sup> In one further place—m. 458 (just prior to letter U of the original score of the first movement)—Löwe prolonged a sustained octave  $a\sharp/a\sharp^1$  through to the following measure. Cf. again Doebel, pp. 198f.

<sup>41</sup> See discussion of Facsimile C/357 *infra*.

<sup>42</sup> 1857–1914; Viennese music critic; student and subsequently lecturer in music aesthetics at the Vienna Conservatorium and critic for the prestigious *Wiener Zeitung* (*Abendpost*). Hirschfeld was a friend of Löwe, of the Schalks, and of theorist Heinrich Schenker.

<sup>43</sup> Hirschfeld's programme for the First performance of the Ninth, p. 10; discussed at greater length in §1.3.3 *infra*.

<sup>44</sup> Arthur Neißer, “Anton Bruckner's Neunte Symphonie (Uraufführung in Wien)”, *Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musik-Gesellschaft* 4 (1902–03), p. 314.

der Phrasen, kurz die wohlerzogene Form und Glätte, die sonst nicht zu Bruckners Eigenart gehört.<sup>45</sup>

Another early reviewer, Albert Kauders, even regarded the Scherzo as

ein geglücktes Experiment auf einem fremden Gebiete gelten lassen, gewiß aber nicht als eine neuartige Frucht des ursprünglichen Schaffensvermögens Bruckner's. [...] der blendende Koboldspuk in der neunten Symphonie dagegen konnte ebensogut von irgend einem unserer modernsten Orchestervirtuosen ersonnen und illustriert worden sein.<sup>46</sup>

Aside from the very significant changes to the opening of the movement Löwe deleted 4 mm. of the D-minor peroration at the end of the Scherzo prior to the Trio, reinstating them at the end of the whole movement, necessitating that the *da capo* of the Scherzo be written out in full. He also filled in Bruckner's 3 empty mm. before the beginning of the Trio with timpani beats, the 3 mm. at the end of the Trio being similarly treated. In each of these cases the obvious intention was to ameliorate any feeling of finality prior to the end of the entire movement.<sup>47</sup>

The majority of changes to the orchestration of the Adagio again concerned alterations to phrasing and instrumentation. In general a softer, less defined sound, with its theatrical connotations of a nebulous, mystical hereafter, was obtained by greater use of mixed instrumentation and longer bowings in the strings. The sustained chord in the tubas under the flute solo at mm. 73ff. was rescored for the safer, softer and intonationally more secure lower strings; however, the dissonant climax of the Adagio was completely reharmonised (*infra*).

Seven facsimile pages from the 1903 score serve to highlight the nature of Löwe's editorial procedures in general terms:

**Facs. C/354:** p. 4 of the Löwe version (cf. p. 5 of the GA score, Nowak 1951), 9 mm. after letter A, where in pursuing a greater degree of 'Mischklänge' Löwe added bassoons and a 3rd clarinet to Bruckner's string texture. The plaintive effect of the oboe entry 6 mm. later is thereby reduced.<sup>48</sup>

**Facs. C/355:** Löwe version, p. 46 (cf. GA score, p. 57), the beginning of the transition to the Gesangsp. in the Repr. of IX/1, where Löwe reduced Bruckner's unusual

<sup>45</sup> "Anton Bruckners IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung", p. 861; the allusion is probably to the critique of Gustav Schönauich in the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung* of 14 February 1903, p. 2, quoted in Manfred Wagner, ed., *Die Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik in Beispielen*, Tutzing 1979, p. 254.

<sup>46</sup> See Albert Kauders' critique of the first performance in the *Fremdenblatt (Morgenblatt)* of 17 February 1903, p. 10, quoted in M. Wagner, p. 252.

<sup>47</sup> See A. Neuberg, "Das Scherzo der Neunten: Ein Vergleich beider Fassungen", *Dredener Bruckner-Blätter* no. 3, pp. 9–14.

<sup>48</sup> As Cohrs observed: "Ganz genau an diesen Stellen befinden sich im Autograph (!) Radierungen. Wie übrigens auch an einigen Stellen im Autograph. Ich hatte bei meiner letzten Durchsicht im Oktober 96 den Eindruck, daß Löwe durchaus manchmal von Bruckner selbst erwogene Varianten realisiert hat" (letter to the present writer, 17 December 1996). Cf. also Max Graf's comments concerning the scoring of the Adagio, quoted in §1.3.3 *infra*.

‘suspended’ fifth of the F-minor  $\frac{6}{3}$ -chord in the timpani and the ensuing falling minor third—itsself a covert link to the opening motive of the movement—to the motivically alien and disruptive rising semitone  $A\flat-A\sharp$ .

**Facs. C/356:** Löwe version, p. 63 (cf. GA score, p. 80), the final peroration of the coda: note Löwe’s addition of a theatrical timpani stroke in the second m. (GA m. 550) and the avoidance of Bruckner’s grindingly dissonant  $d^1/e\flat^1$  clash between bass trombone and trumpets in the 5th and 9th mm. (GA mm. 553 and 557).

**Facs. C/357:** p. 65 of Löwe’s score (cf. GA score p. 82), the completely reorchestrated opening of the Scherzo, as already discussed.

**Facs. C/358:** Löwe version, p. 136, 3rd m. (cf. GA score, p. 180, m. 199) the adulteration of Bruckner’s initial dominant thirteenth chord (fifth and eleventh omitted) into a simple  $\frac{6}{3}$ -chord of E major.

**Facs. C/359:** Löwe version p. 139, 1st m. (cf. GA score, p. 183, m. 206), at which the famous complete dominant thirteenth chord (‘Siebenklang’) with which the passage breaks off was diluted into a ninth chord.<sup>49</sup> Note also Löwe’s *fp* inception of the coda and added *pizzicato* (following m.), probably introduced by Löwe in an attempt to ameliorate the harshness of one of Bruckner’s most uncompromising transitions.

### 1.3.3. The reception of the Löwe version.<sup>50</sup>

The inherent integrity and individuality of Bruckner’s music becomes all the more apparent when we consider that, despite this treatment, it rapidly found its way into the concert halls of the world as a uniquely original creation. At the same time, we must also remember that Löwe had prepared the score to match the taste of contemporary audiences, the uncompromising abrasiveness and newness of its most unique aspects diluted to safe levels; moreover, a good ‘marketing campaign’ ensured that its success was triumphant and immediate.<sup>51</sup>

Indeed, the impact of the Löwe version, in which form the Ninth became known and performances of which continued well into the post-World War II period—Knappertsbusch, for instance, never performed the original score—should not be underestimated today. As we will see (*infra*), until the actual first performance of the original score in 1932, Bruckner’s MS was widely regarded as no more than a rough draft, its publication viable only on

<sup>49</sup> Auer wrote of Bruckner’s original at this point: “In diesem letzten Ringen vor der Erlösung und Verklärung weist der Meister harmonisch weit in die Zukunft und gibt ein glänzendes Beispiel der Verwendung der Kakophonie zu außerordentlicher künstlerischer Wirkung” (“Anton Bruckners IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung”, p. 864).

<sup>50</sup> See concerning this and §1.3.6, “Exkurs: Zur Erstausgabe der *Neunten Symphonie*” in Appendix VI, “Für die IX. ist gesorgt”.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Auer’s account of its early reception, Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 41ff.

musicological grounds, not as a performance text. As Wolfgang Doebel<sup>52</sup> has shown, both conductor Siegmund von Hausegger (1872–1948) and Franz Schalk prepared statements on the question at Auer's request; in both, comparisons of the original score and first edition of the Ninth were made in which the virtues of Löwe's arrangement were extolled over the shortcomings of the autograph in no uncertain terms. Siegmund von Hausegger, who wrote at greater length than Schalk, concluded:

Alles in allem ergibt ein Vergleich der beiden Partituren, daß L.[öwe]'s instrumentale Änderungen fast durchwegs eine wesentliche Verbesserung und klarere Herausarbeitung der musikalischen Idee bedeuten. *Die Feinsinnigkeit, Sachkenntnis und Treue, mit der L.[öwe] voring, sind bewundernswert.*<sup>53</sup>

The first performance of Löwe's score, posted as an "Außerordentliche Musikaufführung", was jointly organised by the Wiener akademischen Wagner-Verein and Wiener Konzertverein and took place in the große Musikvereinssaal. Löwe's own orchestra, the Wiener Konzertverein (the orchestra of the Conservatorium), played, with the combined choirs of the Singverein, Akademische Wagner-Verein and members of the Akademische Gesangsverein participating in the *Te Deum*. The performance achieved a triumphant and lasting success with both audience and critics. Auer's purple prose, as much as the subsequent critiques, gives a clear indication of the sort of atmosphere in which the work was received.<sup>54</sup>

Eine erwartungsvolle ehrfürchtige Menge harrte im großen Musikvereinssaal dem großen Ereignis entgegen. Diese wahrhaft 'außerordentliche' Aufführung wurde allen, die sie miterleben durften, zu einem unvergeßlichen und einmaligen Erlebnis und manches Auge füllte sich mit Tränen, als aus dem 'mystischen Abgrund' des Orgelpunktes die Motive der Hörner geheimnisvoll emporstiegen und die geniale Ausweichung nach *Ces* sich wie ein Licht aus dem Jenseits ausbreitete.

Nach dem überirdischen Schluß des *Adagio* war die Ergriffenheit so groß, daß sich lange keine Hand zum Beifall erheben wollte.

Early writers such as Max Morold had nothing but praise for Ferdinand Löwe, whose "Anlage und Entwicklung befähigten ihn in besonderem Maße, die Schöpfungen Bruckners so darzustellen, daß alle Schroffheiten gemildert, alle Unebenheiten ausgeglichen erschienen".<sup>55</sup> However, it can be presumed that this referred merely to the conductor's interpretative faculties, as at the time this was written—1912—the extent to which Bruckner's original score had been altered was still not public knowledge. The most unwittingly ironic reference to Löwe's skills as conductor and interpreter—a reference that in fact openly implies and

---

<sup>52</sup> *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen*, pp. 234ff and 245ff.; both documents are reproduced by Doebel in facsimile (pp. 445ff.).

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 235; emphasis added.

<sup>54</sup> Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 41f.

<sup>55</sup> *Anton Bruckner*, Leipzig 1912, pp. 35f.



applauds his editorial interventions—can be found in the words of Robert Hirschfeld, who observed in his already cited critique of the performance of the Ninth in 1903 that:

Unser Ferdinand Löwe [...] verwaltet Bruckners künstlerisches Erbe treu im Geiste des Meisters. Er dirigiert die Sinfonien ohne zu redigieren. Aber die richtige Erkenntnis des Brucknerschen Stiles und die richtige Methode, diesem eigenartigen Stile die Aufführung anzupassen, hat er uns gelehrt. Er gleicht Gegensätze, die allzu schroff genommen werden können, durch kluge Dynamik aus, er findet stets das geistige Band, welches scheinbar selbstständige Themengruppen und Durchführungsteile verknüpft, ‘Episoden’ weiß er meisterlich in dem großen Linienzug als wichtige Bestandteile darzustellen; er wird, wenn die Noten ihn auch verlocken sollten, nie den Geist durch Geschriebenes unterjochen und nie eine Gegenmelodie über die thematischen Grundwerte heben, welche den organischen Fortgang bilden.<sup>56</sup>

According to Manfred Wagner,<sup>57</sup> no less than 21 lengthy critiques of the first performance of the Ninth Symphony were published, appearing in almost all the Viennese daily and weekly papers of the time. He writes cynically:

Die Sentimentalität einer neunten Symphonie, immer wieder mit Beethoven verglichen, die emotionale Hermeneutik Robert Hirschfelds, dem zu jedem Thema huldvolle Worte einfielen, die Beliebtheit des Dirigenten Ferdinand Löwe und das Gefühl, einem vor sieben Jahren zu Ende gegangenen Leben die rechte Würdigung erfahren lassen zu müssen, dürften mit Pate gestanden sein für die weitaus unpräziseren kritischen Berichte der Rezensenten. Dabei hatte der Komponist nur noch einmal ein Resümee seiner symphonischen Arbeit vorgelegt, das er nicht einmal vollenden konnte (oder wollte) und das in seiner Spannweite die Zeitgenossen hörbar als Kompendium des erreichten symphonischen Willens verstanden.<sup>58</sup>

By and large, the critiques reflected the privileged and secure position now accorded the symphonist. As Manfred Wagner’s publication of the press responses shows, the performance achieved a spectacular notoriety, advance notices appearing in the *Ostdeutsche Rundschau* of 7 February<sup>59</sup> following Löwe’s initial piano presentation at an evening of the Akademischer Wagnerverein,<sup>60</sup> a report by Robert Hirschfeld in the *Wiener Zeitung (Abendpost)* on the 10th,<sup>61</sup> and a feuilletonistic article by Karl Josef Fromm in the *Deutsches Volksblatt* on the

<sup>56</sup> Quoted in M. Wagner, *Die Geschichte...*, p. 239.

<sup>57</sup> “Bruckner in Wien”, pp. 69f., citing *idem*, ed., *Geschichte der Österreichischen Musikkritik...*, pp. 235–277.

<sup>58</sup> “Bruckner in Wien”, *ibid.* Wagner’s contention, expressed here, that the Ninth merely represented a resumé of Bruckner’s compositional technique ignores the fact that the Ninth was recognised in its time and later as one of Bruckner’s most advanced scores; cf. Doebel, pp. 184f.

<sup>59</sup> P. 7, author’s abbreviation “Wgr.”; quoted in Wagner, *Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik...*, pp. 276f.

<sup>60</sup> The piano presentation was apparently subsequently repeated prior to the performance; see also the critique of Camillo Horn, *Deutsches Volksblatt*, 12 February, p. 10; quoted in Wagner, p. 268.

<sup>61</sup> 10 February, p. 5; quoted in Wagner, p. 235.

day of the concert.<sup>62</sup> The longest and most significant subsequent critique was that of Hirschfeld himself, which appeared in the 14 February issue of the *Wiener Zeitung (Abendpost)*<sup>63</sup> and drew extensive parallels between the Ninth, Wagner's *Parsifal* and the *Schlußszene* of Goethe's *Faust*, Part II—it is significant in this respect that Hirschfeld noted an 'unconscious connection' between the theme of Wagner's 'Faust' Overture<sup>64</sup> and the opening melodic arch of the Adagio.<sup>65</sup> Many critics, among them Maximilian Muntz,<sup>66</sup> Max Graf<sup>67</sup> and Robert Wallaschek,<sup>68</sup> could not overlook the obvious significance of the number nine for the symphony and the attendant parallels with Beethoven. Other reports, among them again Wallaschek's feuilleton "Bruckner und Wolf",<sup>69</sup> a report in the *Arbeiter Zeitung (Morgenblatt)* of 14 February,<sup>70</sup> or that of "Pizzicato" in the *Wiener Sonn- und Montagszeitung* of 16 February,<sup>71</sup> are significant for relatively neutral rather than hostile stances; these are often more interesting for their objectivity and discernment than the sentimental eulogies to which Manfred Wagner refers (*supra*). However, while there was now far less opposition to Bruckner's music than during the composer's lifetime, dissenting voices were still to be heard—chief among them Max Kalbeck (1850–1921) in the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* of 14 February,<sup>72</sup> who despite his relatively positive opinion of the Fifth Symphony (first performed in Vienna five years previously, on 1 March 1898<sup>73</sup>) was by no means convinced about the Ninth.

The *Te Deum* was appended at the first performance (following an interval) as "Konzertschluß", as Löwe stressed, "aus Pietät für den Wunsch des Meisters",<sup>74</sup> and indeed the practice still continues, at least occasionally, down to the present day,<sup>75</sup> but Löwe was consequently to revoke the practice entirely, performing the symphony only in the three-movement form with which we have become most familiar. In doing so, Löwe gave rise to

---

<sup>62</sup> P. 1; quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 266ff.

<sup>63</sup> P. 1; quoted in its entirety in *ibid.*, pp. 235ff.; abridged version Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 42ff.

<sup>64</sup> *Eine Faust-Ouvertüre* (Edition Eulenburg 1968), p. 1.

<sup>65</sup> Wagner, *Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik...*, p. 237; cf. Göll.-A. IV/4, p. 45.

<sup>66</sup> *Deutsche Zeitung (Morgenausgabe)*, 13 February, p. 1; quoted in Wagner, pp. 246f.

<sup>67</sup> *Neues Wiener Journal*, 12 February, p. 7, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 262.

<sup>68</sup> In his Feuilleton "Bruckner und Wolf" in *Die Zeit* of 13 February, p. 1; quoted in *ibid.*, p. 255.

<sup>69</sup> *Die Zeit*, 13 February, p. 1; quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 255ff.

<sup>70</sup> P. 1; quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 259f.

<sup>71</sup> P. 3; quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 270ff.

<sup>72</sup> P. 1; quoted in its entirety in *ibid.*, pp. 241ff.; abridged version Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 47ff.

<sup>73</sup> See Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 26ff.

<sup>74</sup> See Robert Hirschfeld's concert programme to the first performance (*infra*), p. 3. Cf. Auer, *Bruckner* (1923), p. 336: "Aus Pietät für den Wunsch des Meisters, aber nicht als nachahmenswertes Beispiel, hat Löwe nach einer längeren Pause das *Te Deum* aufgeführt"; cf. also Göll.-A. IV/4, p. 42.

<sup>75</sup> For instance, the opening event of the 1996 Brucknerfest in Linz was a 'Klangwolke' broadcast of the Ninth with *Te Deum*.

one of the central misconceptions which have clouded the reception of Bruckner's last symphony. Despite Bruckner's intentions in composing a Finale and specifying the use of the Te Deum as a substitute in the event he should not complete it—a fact widely understood at the time, simply because he had repeated it many times over—the unfinished symphony could actually be regarded as an 'opus perfectum et absolutum'—aesthetically complete in three movements after all.

It is not going too far to claim that Löwe's audiences and critics were presented with a carefully orchestrated campaign that permitted the question of the nature of the symphony and the relevance to it of the Te Deum or the Finale to recede safely into the background, and overturned Bruckner's repeated stipulations about the use of the Te Deum—doubtless the meaning of his cryptic phrase "Für die IX. ist gesorgt".

Of particular interest is Fromm's article of 11 February, "Bruckner 'Neunte' (Zur heutigen Aufführung)", which anecdotally describes a visit (quite possibly actual) in January 1894 to the sick composer of a number of friends, among them Theodor Helm, at which—with echoes of Mozart and the Requiem perhaps?<sup>76</sup>—the composer played to them the "Abschied vom Leben" passage from the Adagio,<sup>77</sup> and explained, concerning the dedication of the Symphony, that the Ninth "g'hört dem lieben Gott—wenn er's annimmt!".<sup>78</sup> Fromm continues that, due to the ill-health of his last years, Bruckner died leaving only three movements complete:

Zur Ausführung des in riesigen Dimensionen gedachten, rein instrumentalen Finales ist der Meister nicht mehr gelangt. Nur einige sehr flüchtige und selbst für Fachleute unverständliche Skizzen dieses vierten Satzes fanden sich in dem Nachlasse. Sie gingen zuerst in den Besitz des Professors Josef Schalk über und kamen nach dessen Tod in die Hände dessen Bruders, des Hofkapellmeisters Franz Schalk, der sie als wertvolle Reliquie seines einstigen Lehrers bewahrt.

Fromm proceeded to underline the fact that the Ninth was not conceived in imitation of Beethoven's Ninth; its theme merely occurred to him in D minor, quoting the Göllicher anecdote cited in §1.1.1 supra. He explains:

Erst in der allerletzten Zeit, als auch bereits der dritte Satz, das unvergleich schöne Adagio, vollendet war und ihn sein Leiden entsetzlich quälte, sagte er eines Tages zu Ferdinand Löwe, mit dem er die Unmöglichkeit, den vierten Satz schaffen zu können, besprach, in tiefster Betrübniß: 'Und wenn ihr meine 'Neunte' einmal nach meinem Tod aufführt, dann macht, damit das Konzert doch einen Schluß hat, darnach das Tedeum'.

<sup>76</sup> See Christoph Wolff, *Mozarts Requiem: Geschichte—Musik—Dokumente—Partitur des Fragments*, Munich–Kassel–Basel 1991, pp. 124, 126f.

<sup>77</sup> Mm. 29ff.

<sup>78</sup> Here and the ensuing quotations, Fromm, as quoted in Wagner, pp. 266f.

Wie Loewe hiezu bemerkt, hätte es Bruckner, der als durchaus absoluter Musiker trotz seiner chromatisch-unharmonischen [!] Modulation nahezu ein Fanatiker der Tonalität war, zur Zeit seiner vollen schöpferischen Kraft als eine unerhörte Zumutung empfunden, wenn ihm etwa jemand geraten hätte, eine D-moll-Symphonie mit einem Chorsatze in C-dur zu schließen. Tatsächlich hat er sich auch erst in der allerletzten Zeit immer wieder und wieder angeschickt, eine Ueberleitungsmusik zum Tedeum zu entwerfen. Die meisten der Entwürfe vernichtete er jedoch wieder. Aus den vorhandenen Skizzen sind nur die Begleitfiguren der Violinen im Tedeum ungefähr zu erkennen. Alles Uebrige ist völlig unklar. . .

Reading between the lines, Fromm's assertions concerning the indecipherable 'sketchiness' of the Finale material, the sketched Te Deum transition, and the invalidity of concluding a D-minor symphony with a C-major Te Deum, probably all derive from Löwe himself. The article was obviously widely circulated and provoked allusions throughout subsequent critiques of the first performance, Max Kalbeck (*infra*) even going to the trouble of rebutting them, and indeed, continues to find echoes to the present day: a legend had been born.

The concert programme for the first performance was written by Löwe's friend Robert Hirschfeld, whose extraordinarily detailed, 16-page analysis of the symphony with no less than 40 musical examples continued the campaign of obfuscation. It provided, like Fromm's article, the basis for innumerable subsequent critiques and journal articles and established the tone and factual basis of the work's reception for decades to come.<sup>79</sup> Concerning a Finale Hirschfeld explained, closely recalling Löwe's remarks in Fromm's version, that:

Als Bruckner fühlte, dass die schwindenden Kräfte für die Gestaltung eines vierten Satzes nicht mehr ausreichten, da bemerkte er wohl, wie Löwe mittheilt, zu seinen Freunden, man könne ja, wenn das Symphonie-Fragment nach seinem Tode aufgeführt werden sollte, das Te Deum darauf folgen zu lassen. Skizzen zu einer motivischen Einleitungsmusik für das Te Deum sind vorhanden. Ferdinand Löwe, einer Regung der Pietät folgend, stellt das Te Deum, weit entfernt davon, es als Abschluss der Symphonie zu betrachten, an den Schluss des Concertes, welches die Uraufführung der neunten Symphonie Bruckner's bringt.<sup>80</sup>

The issue of the finality of the Adagio was handled by Hirschfeld, not unexpectedly, with a rhetorical entreaty to the emotions of the listener. The programme text accordingly closes with the following words:

Wüsste man nicht aus Meister Bruckner's Munde, dass dieser Satz seinen Abschied von der Welt bedeute, so müsste uns eine tiefe, nicht irrende Empfindung zu der Vorstellung hinleiten, dass mit den ergreifenden Klängen dieses letzten Satzes, der auch das

<sup>79</sup> As Cohrs' recent researches revealed, it remained the standard text for performances in Vienna until 1921.

<sup>80</sup> Robert Hirschfeld, programme to first performance of Ninth Symphony (*Anton Bruckner/ Neunte Symphonie/ Uraufführung in Wien am 11. Februar 1903/ Dirigent: Ferdinand Löwe, Vienna 1903*), p. 3.

Lebenswerk Bruckner's beschloss, die Seele aus der Welt des Leids sich befreit, um in ein besseres Reich einzugehen. Wer möchte nach diesem Ende, das den Inhalt eines ganzen Menschenlebens und Künstlerschaffens restlos ausschöpft, noch der üblichen 'Form' zuliebe einen vierten Satz erwarten?<sup>81</sup>

Fromm's and Hirschfeld's remarks were taken up by many reviewers virtually *ipsissima verba*. For instance, Maximilian Muntz wrote in the *Deutsche Zeitung*<sup>82</sup> that:

Schon während der Arbeit an diesem Satz [the Adagio] begannen ihn schwere körperliche Leiden zu quälen, die ihm die Ausführung eines vierten Satzes unmöglich machten; die Symphonie blieb in rein formeller Beziehung ein Fragment. Ihrem Inhalt nach ist sie jedoch ein vollkommen abgeschlossenes Werk, das sein künstlerisches Lebenswerk in erhabenster Weise krönt.

Similarly, the critic of *Die Lyra*<sup>83</sup> commented:

Die Symphonie entbehrt des Schlußsatzes. Der Tod hat dem Meister Halt! geboten, bevor dieser an die Ausführung des Satzes ging. Die Symphonie wird dadurch aber keineswegs zum Bruchstücke, im Gegenteil, man hat die Empfindung, als dürfe und könne dem prächtigen Gesange des Adagio nichts mehr folgen [...].

Hirschfeld carefully avoided any suggestion that the unfinished, three-movement symphony might be less than perfect in itself,<sup>84</sup> and stressed that the Te Deum was included merely out of respect for Bruckner's wishes—"denn das Sinfoniefragment gibt mit dem verklärten Ausklingen ein völlig abgeschlossenes Stimmungsbild".<sup>85</sup> Others were less convinced. Max Kalbeck's critique<sup>86</sup> referred to the symphony as a "gewaltiger Torso"<sup>87</sup> and directly confronted the issue of the intended conclusion with the Te Deum and the sketched 'transition' to it. He ironically pointed out Hans von Bülow's comment (cited in Fromm's feuilleton) that Bruckner's Ninth, like Beethoven's, would have to be in D minor and conclude with a chorus,<sup>88</sup> had proven correct;<sup>89</sup> he disputed the objection noted in Fromm's

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>82</sup> (*Morgenausgabe*), 13 February, p. 1, quoted in Wagner, p. 247; similar sentiments are expressed again later in the same article (Wagner, p. 249).

<sup>83</sup> "C. Sch.", in the issue of 1 March, pp. 131ff., quoted in *ibid.*, p. 275.

<sup>84</sup> He does, however, in a 'pre-report' in the *Wiener Zeitung (Abendpost)* of 10 Feb., p. 5 (*ibid.*, pp. 235f.) make reference to the symphony, which is, "wie die Skizzen zu dem nicht mehr ausgeführten letzten Satze zeigen, das letzte Werk des Meisters".

<sup>85</sup> *Wiener Zeitung (Abendpost)*, 14 February, p. 1; quoted in *ibid.*, p. 239.

<sup>86</sup> Quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 241ff.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 242.

<sup>88</sup> See Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 457f.; quoted in ch. 1.1. The issue had been cleverly dismissed in Hirschfeld's program (cf. p. 3).

<sup>89</sup> The matter was also raised in the longer *Fremdenblatt* article of Albert Kauders, 17 February, p. 10 (Wagner, p. 251) and by Camillo Horn in the *Deutsches Volksblatt*, 12 February, p. 10 (Wagner, p. 270).

article that Bruckner's intended conclusion with the *Te Deum* was impracticable for tonal reasons. That a D-minor symphony cannot conclude in C major, Kalbeck wrote,

scheint uns bei enem so kühnen Neuerer wie Bruckner angesichts der vielen harmonischen Gewalttaten, die sich der Komponist im Verlaufe seines Werkes erlaubt, fast wie ein pedantisches, veraltetes Verbot [...] nach dem E-dur seines Adagios, klingt das C-dur nicht besser und nicht schlechter als das D-moll geklungen haben würde, und da im übrigen reichlich dafür gesorgt ist, daß wir in der Grundtonart des Werkes nicht allzulange seßhaft befangen bleiben, so könnte irgend eine geistreiche ästhetische Erklärung den eklatanten Bruch mit der tonalen Einheit vollkommen rechtfertigen.<sup>90</sup>

Gustav Mahler had, after all, begun exploring the possibilities of progressive tonality some twenty years earlier. Yet, not surprisingly, following Kalbeck's spirited sarcasm, a defence of the *Te Deum* conclusion on tonal grounds was never seriously taken up. Ferdinand Scherber, in the *Wiener Morgenzeitung*,<sup>91</sup> looked forward to further performances of the Symphony, "Aber dann—ohne 'Te Deum'. Wann [sic] ein Meister zu reden aufhört, spreche man nicht weiter". The critic of the *Fremden-Blatt*<sup>92</sup> found the "ausgiebige Zwischenpause [...] klug und schon aus dem Grunde rätlich, weil damit allen Vergleichen mit dem Chorfinale der Beethoven'sche 'Neunten' ausgewichen wurde". Others, such as Maximilian Muntz<sup>93</sup>—although convinced like Hirschfeld that the three movements, by virtue of the "Programm des Adagios und seine absolut musikalische Durchführung", offered "einen vollkommen abschließenden Inhalt"—considered the *Te Deum* a "würdiger Abschluß des Konzertes und [...] Apotheose für Bruckner". The critic of the *Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt*<sup>94</sup> found that "Nach der Resignation des dritten Satzes der Symphonie klang das 'Te Deum' [...] fast wie ein selbstverständlich jubelnder Abschluß". Among others, Robert Wallaschek<sup>95</sup> found the Adagio to be a "Stück in Stückchen", although justified by the program of the movement (Bruckner's "Himmelfahrt") and its transcendent conclusion; overall he considered the symphony, while deeply moving, not one of Bruckner's best. On a lower journalistic level, the Catholic *Das Vaterland* found justification for both the three-movement form and the ensuing *Te Deum* in the following images of religious kitsch:

Feierlichste Stimmung tönt der erste Satz, freudiger Trotz und überlegene Heiterkeit der zweite, im dritten aber verschwebt der Geist auf immer neu aufwallenden Wolken sehnsüchtiger Melodien der Ewigkeit entgegen, bis wir ihn ganz aus den Augen verlieren. Was noch weiter. In den Himmel hinein können wir ihm [Bruckner] nicht nachschauen.

<sup>90</sup> Quoted in Wagner, pp. 241f.

<sup>91</sup> 13 February, p. 6; quoted in Wagner, pp. 273ff.

<sup>92</sup> (*Morgenblatt*), 12 February, p. 10; quoted in Wagner, p. 250.

<sup>93</sup> *Deutsche Zeitung (Morgenausgabe)*, 12 February, p. 7; quoted in Wagner, p. 246.

<sup>94</sup> "k. st." (identity not known), 12 February, p. 10; quoted in Wagner, p. 261.

<sup>95</sup> *Die Zeit*, 13 February, p. 1; quoted in Wagner, p. 257.

Die Thore schließen sich. Den vierten Satz hören nur mehr die congenialen Engelchen da hinter den Sternensphären. [...] Es bleibt uns nichts Anderes übrig, als den letzten Sieg und die Verewigung des Künstlers anstatt mit einem Requiem mit dem jubelndsten Tedeum zu feiern, das wir überhaupt besitzen.<sup>96</sup>

One the other hand, for the critic of the *Wiener Sonn- und Montagszeitung*<sup>97</sup> the Ninth remained a fragment. He unapologetically disagreed with Hirschfeld concerning the unimportance of a formal concluding movement; the opposite was true:

Im Vertrauen auf diese, sichtlich einer ehrlichen Ueberzeugung entsprungenen schönen Worte versuchte ich beim ersten Anhören des Adagio in der Generalprobe mich nur an dessen Lichtpunkte zu halten und vorläufig das ganze Stück gewissermaßen auf Credit zu bewundern. Nun aber, nachdem ich durch das nochmalige Hören bei der Aufführung dem Werke nähergetreten bin, komme ich zu der Erkenntniß: Ihr Glaube, Herr Dr. Hirschfeld, ist nicht der meine. Uebrigens kann es schon deshalb kein profanirender Gedanke sein, 'einen vierten Satz zu erwarten', der ja Bruckner selbst einen solchen für nothwendig erachtete und nur durch die schwindenden Kräfte an der Composition des beabsichtigten Finale verhindert worden ist.

It remains to examine the critique of Max Graf<sup>98</sup> who, as we have already seen, was among those to have possessed at least one fragment of the Finale score.<sup>99</sup> Graf gave an interesting item of information in his report, suggesting the possibility that he may have seen further fragments of the Finale than those contained in the material apparently viewed by Auer, subsequently transcribed by Orel or indeed, extant today. In view of the composer's failing strength, writes Graf:

[...] dachte er daran, sein 'Tedeum' an den Schluß des Werkes zu stellen, und skizzierte eine Ueberleitungsmusik, die zu diesem führen sollte. Mit Ergriffenheit haben wir diese Skizzen betrachtet, die mit zitteriger Schrift hingeworfen sind, da die kraftlose Hand den Bleistift kaum führen konnte. Die Themen lassen sich erkennen: ein Hauptthema, ein Fugenthema, ein Choral und das Quintenthema des Tedeums und einmal sogar werden alle vier Themen übereinandergestellt, eine vierfache Thürmung, wie sie schon in der achten Symphonie Bruckner's anzutreffen ist. An diese Symphonie erinnert Bruckner auch mit dem Adagio seiner 'Neunten', da er hier eine thematische Erinnerung eingeflochten hat.<sup>100</sup>

The second-to-last sentence would subsequently be taken up by Auer,<sup>101</sup> and the idea of the Finale concluding with or at least incorporating a thematic overlay of some kind, as we

<sup>96</sup> *Das Vaterland (Beiblatt)*, 15 February, p. 1; quoted in Wagner, p. 265.

<sup>97</sup> Under the *nom-de-plume* "Pizzicato", 16 February, p. 3; quoted in Wagner, pp. 272f.

<sup>98</sup> *Neues Wiener Journal*, 12 February, p. 7; quoted in Wagner, pp. 262ff.

<sup>99</sup> See §1.2.6.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 263.

<sup>101</sup> See §1.3.8 *infra*.

will see in the next chapter, found its way into many performing versions of the Finale. Handed down to Samale and Mazzuca with the endorsement of Langevin,<sup>102</sup> it would also find its way into the Aufführungsfassung of the Finale, where remains more as a logically or analytically derived than philologically validated element.<sup>103</sup>

#### 1.3.4. Early opinion concerning the Finale and the Te Deum.

The manner in which the eulogistic wording of Hirschfeld's concert programme and critique, rather than some of the more sober evaluations of other critics, was subsequently adopted and developed by other pro-Bruckner writers can be seen from the following reports. Placed in context, they constitute an illuminating insight into the manner in which psychological resolution was sought for an issue which obviously continued to represent a slight but niggling aesthetic flaw in what was otherwise regarded as the transcendent musical perfection of the work. Nearly all of the reviews make some sort of reference to the problem. A later review in the Vienna *Wochenschrift* recalled Graf's statements:

Für den vierten Satz hinterließ er nur einige Skizzen, und da er den Flügelschlag des Todes schon verspürte, seine Kräfte nicht mehr hinreichend fand, das Finale zu componieren, ordnete Bruckner, wie Löwe mittheilt, seinen Schülern an, daß, wenn das Symphoniefragment nach seinem Tode ausgeführt werden sollte, man das 'Te Deum' für Soli, Chor, Orchester und Orgel als Ersatz für das fehlende Finale nehmen könne.

Bruckner habe selbst, nach Max Graf, an einer motivischen Ueberleitungsmusik gearbeitet, die das Adagio thematisch mit dem Chorwerke verbinden sollte.<sup>104</sup>

Arthur Neißer raised the issue of the finality of the Adagio conclusion in the following rhetorical fashion:

Ob nicht dieser Abschluß so innerlich und äußerlich befriedigend ist, daß die einem persönlichen Wunsche des Meisters entsproßene Hinzufügung seines Tedeums die Andachtstimmung grausam zerstören mußte, das möchte ich zum mindesten als Frage aufwerfen. Ja, wenn Bruckner die skizzierte Überleitung zum Tedeum durchgeführt hätte! So aber erschien mir die Aufführung des Tedeums, [...] nicht viel anders als eine ziemlich äußerliche, wenn auch gut gemeinte Pietät gegen den Meister, eine Pietät, die mit jener echten, inneren, die Ferdinand Loewe bei der schlechthin meisterhaften Leitung des schwierigen Werkes erfüllte, nicht harmonieren will.<sup>105</sup>

<sup>102</sup> See §§1.3.10 and 1.4.13. See also AP, E/138, where Auer's allusions to Graf's statements are quoted from the 1923 and 1934 editions of the one-volume biography.

<sup>103</sup> See further discussion in chs. 3.1 and 3.3.

<sup>104</sup> J. Strauss, "Anton Bruckner's Neunte Symphonie. Uraufführung am 11. Februar 1903...", *Wochenschrift für Kunst und Musik* (Vienna) 1, no. 11 (22 February 1903), p. 101. The source for Graf's remarks concerning an 'Ueberleitungsmusik' was presumably the latter's concert critique in the *Neues Wiener Journal*, 12 Feb. 1903, p. 7, quoted in Wagner, p. 263.

<sup>105</sup> "Anton Bruckner's Neunte Symphonie (Uraufführung in Wien)", p. 317.



However, the wording of the first paragraph of Löwe's preface to the Doblinger score, which appeared in August 1903 is the most significant early source and for later conductors probably the most significant. The document bears witness, first and foremost, to Löwe's own convictions regarding the aesthetic pointlessness of concluding with the *Te Deum*. It reads—with perceptible echoes of Löwe's previous statements in Fromm's article—as follows:

Anton Bruckner's Neunte Symphonie, deren vollendete drei Sätze hiemit der Öffentlichkeit übergeben werden, sollte (der ursprünglichen Absicht des Meisters nach) durch ein rein instrumentales Finale beschlossen werden. Durch schwere körperliche Leiden zu häufigen und oftmals andauernden Unterbrechungen der Arbeit gezwungen, musste aber Bruckner mehr und mehr befürchten, sein letztes Werk nicht mehr beenden zu können. Allmähig [sic] mochte so in ihm der Entschluss gereift sein, den vollendeten drei Sätzen als Finale sein TE DEUM anzufügen. Skizzen zu einer gross angelegten Ueberleitungsmusik sind uns erhalten; was ihnen zu entnehmen ist, läßt jedoch nur andeutungsweise die letzten Absichten des Meisters errathen.<sup>106</sup>

Löwe then felt himself obliged to state that:

Erachteten es nun die Veranstalter der URAUFFÜHRUNG [...] als ein Gebot der Pietät, der Symphonie das *Te Deum* folgen zu lassen, so erscheinen doch auch Aufführungen ohne einen solchen Schluß durchaus berechtigt; und dies um so eher, als das Werk in der vorliegenden Form sehr wohl als ein Ganzes zu wirken vermag.

Herewith it can be seen that any question of a fourth movement, whether one was conceived by the composer or not and whether Bruckner ever intended the linkage with the *Te Deum* or not, could be considered safely closed. The manuscripts in question were in the possession of Franz Schalk, safely removed from public scrutiny; Bruckner's specifications concerning the *Te Deum* could be brushed off as mere hearsay.

It is scarcely surprising to learn that, following the first performance in Vienna in February 1903, Löwe seems not to have performed the *Te Deum* with the first three movements again, if one is to judge by a critique by Wilhelm Kienzl of a performance given by Löwe in Graz the following year.<sup>107</sup>

Er [Löwe] sah aber bald ein, daß die Symphonie dieses äußerlich angefügten, im Stil überdies nicht recht dazu passenden Schlußsatzes durchaus nicht bedürfe, ja daß das Adagio seinem Wesen nach eigentlich die letzte Aussprache des großen Adagio-Komponisten hat sein müssen, Man führte also seither nur die drei Sätze aus.

<sup>106</sup> Here and in the following quotation: orthography of the original.

<sup>107</sup> See Appendix to Wolfgang Suppan's article "Kienzl—Savenau": "Bruckner-Rezensionen von Wilhelm Kienzl", in: *BrSympBer 1984: Bruckner, Wagner und die Neudeutschen in Österreich*. Linz–Vienna, 1986, p. 198.

Although Auer nonetheless alludes to a number of festival performances of the Ninth with *Te Deum* in the following years,<sup>108</sup> Kienzl's critique provides clear indications of the manner in which the music of the Adagio was heard at the time, the emotional and religious connotations evoked by it, and the manner in which an apparent formal flaw was gradually transformed into an aesthetic asset:

Das Adagio zieht den Schleier von den letzten und höchsten Dingen; es ist von so inbrünstiger Erlösungssehnsucht erfüllt und blickt mit der Unempfindlichkeit eines brechenden Auges in das blendende, flutende Sphärenlicht des Himmels, dessen ruhige und wunschlose Seligkeit mit seherhaftem Geiste von dem nur mehr zum Teile dem irdischen Leben angehörigen innig-frommen Künstler vorgefühl werden, so daß man nach seiner Anhörung nach nichts weiterem mehr verlangt.<sup>109</sup>

We should not overlook that these 'enlightened' expressions of faith in the conceptual integrity of a three-movement Ninth were made in opposition to what was apparently common knowledge at the time: Bruckner had stipulated that performances of the Ninth were to include the *Te Deum*, he did so repeatedly to many acquaintances, and almost every writer makes reference to it at some point. As Nigel Simeone has shown,<sup>110</sup> Universal Edition, which subsequently acquired the rights to the Bruckner symphonies, went as far as to issue the Doblinger score of the Ninth bound together with the *Te Deum* in one volume: 2- and 4-hand piano and pocket score versions were all released in this form.<sup>111</sup> What Löwe did in overturning Bruckner's stipulations was, in essence, an act of artistic appropriation fully in accord with his editorial activity in publishing a heavily altered score without reference to the extent of his editorial interventions—interventions which, had they been made public, would probably not have caused the scandal one might nowadays expect, but would certainly have provided ammunition for Bruckner's many critics.

The views of the early pro-Bruckner feuilletonists found their way directly into the first generation of Bruckner literature, written as it was almost exclusively by the composer's devotees. For Max Morold<sup>112</sup> the Ninth was Bruckner's "letzte, unvollendete und dennoch keiner Ergänzung bedürftige Symphonie";<sup>113</sup> elsewhere the same writer, in a stream of purple prose characteristic of the writing of the time, saw the incompleteness of the Ninth

<sup>108</sup> Göll.-A. IV/4, p. 52.

<sup>109</sup> Suppan, quoting Wilhelm Kienzl, p. 198

<sup>110</sup> "Viennese Music Publishing at the End of the Nineteenth Century—Bruckner and the Small Businessman", paper given at the Bruckner Symposium *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner II*, University of Manchester, 1–4 April 1996. A useful complete listing of Bruckner editions up until the 1930s was included in the handout.

<sup>111</sup> According to Simeone's handout, these were U.E. edition 2987 (piano 2-hands), 2988 (piano 4-hands) and 2990 (pocket score), all of which would have been issued c. 1911. Cohrs located a surviving copy of one of the pocket edition scores in 1997.

<sup>112</sup> The pen name of Max von Millenkovich-Morold (1866–1945), writer and later Hofrat.

<sup>113</sup> *Anton Bruckner*, Leipzig 1912, p. 12.

Symphony as a symbol for Bruckner's supposed difficulties with his Finale movements,<sup>114</sup> and took the next dialectic step in the process of arriving at an 'aesthetic resolution' to the 'problem' of the unfinished symphony:

Manche finden das Adagio der Neunten von Bruckner sei nicht so schön gefügt und so einheitlich aufgebaut wie die langsamen Sätze seiner übrigen Symphonien. Darauf erwidre ich, dass das Adagio der Neunten auch kein Mittelsatz, kein Adagio im gewöhnlichen Sinne ist, dessen Aufgabe im Organismus des Ganzen hier vielmehr schon von der mächtig ausgedehnten Gesangsgruppe des riesenhaften ersten Satzes übernommen wurde; sondern dieses Adagio, der Schwanengesang des Meisters, sein 'Abschied vom Leben', ist in jedem Sinne—biographisch und ästhetisch genommen—ein Finale, ein echt Brucknersches Finale, eine letzte grosse Auseinandersetzung, ein von Rückschau und Vorahnung sehnsüchtig bewegtes nochmaliges und endgültiges Erflehen und Ertragen des Sieges und der Verklärung. Wem da die sonst bei Bruckner vorausgesetzte ideale Ruhe des eigentlichen Adagios zu kurz zu kommen scheint, der frage sich, ob Bruckner ihm jemals mehr zu Herzen ging und ob er ihm je mit strengerer Logik Grösseres zu sagen wusste.<sup>115</sup>

In many respects the endpoint of this process of coming to terms with the incompleteness of the Ninth was the recognition that the unfinished Ninth represented a tragic defeat, however much that defeat may have been beyond the artist's control. But this recognition could still be—indeed, had to be—harmonised with an obligatory justification of the artistic integrity which must *ipso facto* underlie the musical artwork. Rudolf Louis was to write in this vein:

Im Jahre 1891 hatte der Meister seine 9. Symphonie begonnen. An ihrer Vollendung hing sein ganzes Herz, und es ist wohl möglich, daß die Beziehung zu dem symphonischen Schwanengesang seines großen Vorgängers [...] dahin mitwirkte, daß ihn die Befürchtung, er müsse seine "Neunte" unvollendet hinterlassen, so außerordentlich peinigte.

Daß es ihm aber trotz aller der Todeskrankheit abgerungenen Anstrengungen nicht beschieden sein sollte, diesen seinen letzten Herzenswunsch in Erfüllung gehen zu sehen, daß die Neunte wirklich Torso bleiben mußte, das mag uns anmuten wie ein Symbol, in dem sich die ganze Tragik dieses Künstlerschicksals alles sagend zusammenfaßt. Kämpfen, Ringen, Streben, nimmermattende Arbeit um den höchsten Preis des irdischen Daseins mit voller Einsetzung höchster Kräfte und außerordentlicher Fähigkeiten—und schließlich doch ein Zusammenbrechen kurz vor dem Ziele, ein vorzeitiges Ermatten, noch ehe die zitternde Hand den Siegeskranz hätte fassen können: das war Bruckners Los. Aber auch hier fehlt dem Tragischen nicht das versöhnende Moment. Gerade mit dem Werk, das äußerlich ein Torso geblieben ist, hat Bruckner, wie vielleicht in keiner seiner früheren symphonischen Schöpfungen, die innere Vollendung erreicht, die absolute Harmonie zwischen Wollen und Vermögen, das Ziel restlosen Gelingens.<sup>116</sup>

<sup>114</sup> "[...] Bruckner [hat] auch im höheren künstlerischen Sinne mit dem Finale niemals ganz 'fertig' werden können, wofür die Nichtvollendung der neunten Symphonie (ohne Finale) ein bedeutsames Symbol sei" ("Das Brucknersche Finale", *Die Musik* 6 (1906–07), p. 28).

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35.

<sup>116</sup> *Bruckner*, Munich 1918, pp. 179f.

Fritz Grüninger's pietistic *Anton Bruckner: Der metaphysische Kern seiner Persönlichkeit und seiner Werke* states, as usual, that "nur Skizzen" existed for a Finale.<sup>117</sup> His discussion of the Adagio concludes with the now familiar sentiments:<sup>118</sup>

Was könnte uns ein Finale nach diesem ergreifendsten Lebensfinale noch sagen?! Es war dem Meister nicht mehr beschieden, das Finale der Neunten zu vollenden, weil sein Künstlerberuf erfüllt, weil seine ihm von der Vorsehung bestimmte Aufgabe gelöst war, die Aufgabe nämlich, Kampf und Sieg einer Gott suchenden Menschenseele in heiliger Tonkunst zum überzeugendsten Ausdruck zu bringen [...]

Aus Bruckners tiefstem Wesen ist es daher erklärbar, daß er als einzigen, würdigen Schluß seiner Neunten sein 'Tedeum' aufgeführt wissen wollte, weil auch dieses wie die Neunte dem lieben Gott geweiht ist, dem, wenn auch nicht in Widmungen, so doch im Kerne das gesamte Lebenswerk des frommen Meisters gilt [...]

In an even more sentimentalist vein, mention must here be made of one of the more popular examples of 'Bruckner-Belletristik'. Austrian writer Rudolf List's *Kleine Bruckner-novelle*<sup>119</sup> recounts Bruckner's last months in the Belvedere and the composition of the Finale, closing with the following passage:

Das Finale wird fertig. Das weiß er ein für allemal. Und wenn er Tag und Nacht frierend beim Klavier sitzen müßte. Der Herrgott hat es ihm geschafft. Es ist ein Heiliger Auftrag.

Dann wird Anton Bruckner wieder ganz kleinlaut, weil es ihm vorkommt, als hätte er noch hundert und mehr Tage Arbeit, um die Sache fertigzubringen. Es wird schon gehn, tröstet er sich, nimm dich nur recht zusammen.

Er nimmt sich zusammen. Zwischen Frösteln und Fieberschauern arbeitet er weiter. Es geht immer langsamer. Die Gedanken kreisen denselben Weg. Endlos gleichen sich Motive. Die Takte fallen ineinander. Mißton an Mißton, hämmern sie sich quälend in sein Ohr. Hinter dem Klavier stehen Tausende und johlen. Seine Kritiker haben recht: Bruckner komponiert wie ein Betrunkener.

Er zerreißt den letzten Bogen.

Man findet den Meister am Klavier gesunken. Man bringt ihn zu Bett. Der Tod krallt sich um ihn wie eine wilde Katze. Er aber komponiert weiter.

Er hat das Finale seiner 'Neunten' fix und fertig. Es gibt keinen Mißklang mehr.

Und braucht es gottlob nimmer schreiben. Die Engel halten es schon in ihren sanften, weißen Händen. Und mit ihnen musiziert er es als sein himmlisches, sein ewiges Tedeum.<sup>120</sup>

As inconceivable as it may appear to us today, such writings were not uncharacteristic of the reception modes of the period, and stylistically by no means as far distant from normative

<sup>117</sup> 2nd edition, Augsburg 1949, p. 46.

<sup>118</sup> p. 248.

<sup>119</sup> Oberösterreichischer Landesverlag Ried, 1932–53.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 43ff.

modes of musicological discourse as we might think.<sup>121</sup> In this environment, as in popular journalism, a ‘good story’ was more important than simple truth. Partsch sums up the problem of the older reception of Bruckner’s music in the following terms:

Es ist evident, daß in erster Linie die Generation der zwanziger und dreißiger Jahre reale Gegebenheiten mit Kitsch, falsch verstandener Apologetik und mystischen Vorstellungen anreicherte bzw. verdeckte. Diese Phänomene fallen ebenso in das Gebiet der Brucknerforschung, denn die merkwürdig verschwommenen Vorstellungen waren bekanntlich lange Zeit zumindest im Popularbereich Leitbilder für das Verständnis des Menschen und Künstlers Bruckner. Sie waren gleichzeitig der Ausgangspunkt für eine rege belletristische Literatur. Hinweise auf außermusikalische Erfahrungen sollten hierbei das Verständnis erleichtern und umgekehrt eben diese außermusikalische Schicht legitimieren und beweisen.<sup>122</sup>

The Ninth Symphony was also recognised from the outset as one of the most harmonically complex works that Bruckner had written. This resulted in a number of analytical essays, among them those of Bernhard Ziehn concerning the origin and analysis of the opening chord of the Scherzo<sup>123</sup> or Hans A. Grunsky’s laudatory formal analysis of the first movement, “Der erste Satz von Bruckners Neunter: Ein Bild höchster Formvollendung”.<sup>124</sup> But with regard to any fourth movement the Ninth fared no better in ‘serious’ musicological studies than in the memoir literature or the popular press. Ernst Kurth’s vast two-volume study<sup>125</sup> devotes considerable space to the Ninth; throughout his discussion of it (as well as elsewhere), however, the paucity of accurate biographical data or reference to the compositional process provides a discomfiting reminder of how greatly a purely synchronic approach can err—no matter how impressive its insights into the compositional artefact. Kurth’s Bruckner was, after all, the Bruckner of the Löwe and Schalk arrangements; scarcely anything was known of Bruckner’s original MSS, certainly nothing of the Finale of the Ninth. Nor were significant inquiries made: even Kurth drags out the same eternal platitudes, mere facts are not permitted to cloud the issue:

Als dann Bruckner spürte, daß ihm die Beendung mit einem vierten Satze nicht mehr beschieden sei, und er an dessen Stelle das Te Deum wies, war er auch bis in diese letzte Verfügung durchaus künstlerischer Gestalter; denn die drei symphonischen Sätze waren

<sup>121</sup> Cf. concerning the popular and popularist literature surrounding Bruckner, E. W. Partsch, “Der Musikant Gottes: Zur Analyse eines Stereotyps”, in Grasberger, Renate, and Erich Wolfgang Partsch, *Bruckner—skizziert*, pp. 235ff.

<sup>122</sup> *Bruckner—skizziert*, pp. 254f.

<sup>123</sup> “Ueber den ersten Akkord im Scherzo der neunten Sinfonie von Bruckner”, *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* nos. 28–29 (10–17 July 1903), p. 467.

<sup>124</sup> *Die Musik* 18 (1925/26), pp. 21–34, 104–112.

<sup>125</sup> *Bruckner*, Berlin 1925.

als Weltschöpfung beendet, und ihnen konnte nur noch ein Werk der überwundenen Welt, durch die geöffneten Himmel ausflutender Lobgesang folgen.<sup>126</sup>

It is even more disappointing is to read in his discussion of the conclusion to the Adagio that:

Wenn auch die Finaleskizzen nicht recht ahnen lassen, was Bruckner mit einem Endsatz noch vorhatte, so ist doch das Werk kein Torso; denn die Musik schuf sich selbst ihrer Vollendung entgegen, als das Enderlebnis mit dem Adagio nahte, es hätte sonst andere Gestalt gefunden.<sup>127</sup>

Probably Kurth never laid eyes on the Finale sketches;<sup>128</sup> the wording is obviously taken directly from Löwe's preface. However, the convenience of what are, for us, glaring clichés, the characteristically glib ease with which earlier 'serious' writers, not merely critics and journalists, dealt with their subject matter generally and the issue of the Finale specifically, gives pause for thought, particularly when we recall that until recently such highly subjective apologia were adopted unquestioningly by later, supposedly better-informed and more objective critics and scholars.

With Kurth it can be seen that an endpoint in thinking had been reached concerning the role of the Adagio, arriving at an unquestioning conviction that not only had Bruckner not left any significant drafts for a Finale but even if he had they were irrelevant. The Adagio conclusion was so compelling, so overwhelmingly sublime as to leave the listener fully convinced that musical closure had been achieved and the symphony had come to an end. Nor was the idea of including the Te Deum significant. Its performance was looked upon as an irrelevant or unnecessary adjunct; it was stylistically and tonally unsuited to function as a finale to the symphony, moreover (and practical considerations should not be overlooked) with choir and soloists, it added significantly to the expenses of mounting the work. The parallels with the Beethoven Ninth created by such performances may also have been too obvious for those attempting to promote Bruckner as a composer in his own right, rather than a Wagner or Beethoven epigone.

By the 1930s a realisation of the degree to which Bruckner's original scores had been reworked by the editors of the first editions opened up new prospects for a better

---

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 662.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 736. A recent response to Kurth's analysis of the Adagio of the Ninth was made by Mariana Sonntag in a paper presented at the first American Bruckner symposium, Connecticut College, New London, 21–24 February 1994 (mentioned by Andrea Harrandt, "Erstes Bruckner Symposium in den USA", *ÖGM-Mitt* 27 (Dec. 1994), p. 58. Auer notes (Göll.-A. 2/1, p. 20) that Kurth proofread for him; presumably, however, this would have been some time after publication of Kurth's *Bruckner*.

<sup>128</sup> Although, as pointed out in the preceding chapter, Kurth was, at least at some stage, in possession of the folio ÖNB 38.846 given by Bruckner to Stradal. Stradal died in 1930, five years after the appearance of Kurth's *Bruckner* so that it is possible that Kurth only came into possession of this curious page subsequent to publication. The folio (Facs. C/324) contains a number of arithmetical calculations, and is scarcely a sketch, although regarded by Stradal as a "Berechnung des Verhältnisses der Takte" of the Finale—cf. §2.1.6.

understanding of Bruckner's music, but this was an understanding that alas, despite the first performance of Bruckner's original score of the first three movements in 1932 and Orel's publication of the sketches and drafts in 1934, would not extend to encompass a renewed concern with the Finale.

### 1.3.5 The "Streit um den 'echten' Bruckner" and the Gesamtausgabe, then and now.

The "Streit um den 'echten' Bruckner" (Auer) of the 1920s and 30s, in the resolution of which the first performance of the original score of the Ninth in 1932 and its subsequent publication in 1934 were to play a significant role, was a complex interplay of aesthetic views, personal and state politics and ideologies by which a forty-year-old performance practice was overturned and a new one instated, but also in which what were then new concepts in performance and musicology, such as that of *Werktreue*, were tested against established performance tradition and aesthetic preference. It was also a coming of age for text-critical scholarship, in which the published versions of the symphonies, particularly those of the Fifth and Ninth, about which writers such as Max Morold,<sup>129</sup> August Halm,<sup>130</sup> Karl Grunsky,<sup>131</sup> Erich Schwebsch<sup>132</sup> and most of all Ernst Kurth (*supra*) had written such laudatory analytical screeds, and which for thirty years had been assumed to correspond to the form in which Bruckner left them were proclaimed as the inauthentic arrangements of competent but by no means 'divine' hands.<sup>133</sup>

Since work began on this study, the issue of the authorship and authenticity of the first editions was reopened in the pages of musicological journals, an indication of the increasing degree to which the positivist discipline of musicological text critique had begun to open itself to political and cultural discourse. The issues involved are more far reaching than can be dealt with here in anything more than cursory fashion, yet their significance for the 1930s reception of the Ninth, the manner in which the symphony became a test case for the GA, and the dilemma of modern text-critical scholarship are central to the reception of the Ninth and fundamental to the approach of this study to it. The ensuing discussion has been subdivided

---

<sup>129</sup> *Anton Bruckner*, Leipzig 1912.

<sup>130</sup> *Die Symphonien Anton Bruckners*, Munich 1913.

<sup>131</sup> Karl Grunsky (*inter alia*), *Bruckner's Symphonien. Erläutert mit Notenbeispielen; nebst einer Einleitung "Bruckner's Leben und Schaffen" von Dr. Karl Grunsky (Meisterführer 4)*, Berlin 1907; Karl Grunsky, *Bruckners Symphonien*, Berlin 1908; *idem*, *Anton Bruckner*, Stuttgart 1922; *idem*, *Das Formproblem in Anton Bruckners Symphonien*, Augsburg 1929; *idem*, *Formenwelt und Sinngefüge in den Bruckner-Symphonien*, Augsburg 1931.

<sup>132</sup> *Anton Bruckner. Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnis von Entwicklungen in der Musik*, Stuttgart 1923.

<sup>133</sup> The principle sources for this issue were, until discussion reopened in the 1990s, Auer's "Der Streit um den 'echten' Bruckner im Licht biographischer Tatsachen", *ZfM* 103, no. 5 (May 1936), pp. 538–545; vol. 99, no. 10 (Oct. 1936), pp. 1191–1196, *passim*, and Alfred Orel, "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner", *DMK* 1 (1936–37), pp. 193–222. See also the article by Constantin Floros, "Historische Phasen der Bruckner-Interpretation", *BrSympBer* 1982, pp. 93–102 *passim*.

into five subsections: the foundation of the GA (1), its history during the Third Reich (2) and post 1945 (3), modern reassessments of the problem (4), and attempted conclusions (5).<sup>134</sup>

*The foundation of the Gesamtausgabe*

Setting aside for the moment the political aspects of the question which have been discussed at length by Gilliam, Korstvedt and Solvik, among others,<sup>135</sup> it was inevitable that musicologists in the 1920s and 1930s would have wanted to see the original MSS of a composer given pre-eminence over arrangements. The question as to what constituted the ‘real Bruckner’ was decided in the 1930s not significantly along aesthetic lines, even less along political ones—although the greater orchestral clarity and clearer structures of the original scores were welcomed by the cleaner, more ‘objective’, if not also more ‘fascist’ interpretative approaches of 1930s conductors—but on philological grounds, the basis for which was the by then well established axiom of the “Fassung letzter Hand”, the composer’s autograph, promulgated by late nineteenth-century editors such as Heinrich Schenker.<sup>136</sup> This would ultimately be emphasised by Haas, who maintained, as Morten Solvik has written,

that Bruckner’s artistic intentions had been stifled by external influences and, until now, willfully suppressed; thus, it was the mission of the edition to return to Bruckner’s original texts and provide a ‘liberation of the true symphonic will of the Master’.<sup>137</sup>

Critical opinion against the undeclared re-instrumentations of the first editions had begun to appear by the late 1910s. According to Auer, Göllicher had already called for the publication of the original scores in an address held at an “akademischen Brucknerfeier” at the University of Vienna in October 1906,<sup>138</sup> but the issue was not aired in print until 1919, apparently. In that year the German musicologist Georg Göhler published a polemic<sup>139</sup> in which allegations concerning the innumerable discrepancies to be found between the piano arrangements and orchestral scores of Bruckner’s works were made, accusing Universal Edition, which had progressively taken over the rights to Bruckner’s works from the original

<sup>134</sup> The following account of the 1930s revolution in Bruckner reception was begun long before the issue of the validity of the first editions was reframed in the mid 1990s in political terms. As has been pointed out (§1.0.2), these issues were until very recently largely ignored in German and Austrian scholarship, the first detailed rebuttal to appear being Wolfgang Doebel’s *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen* (2001), which approached the the first-edition question comprehensively, using both stylistic critique and historical documentation.

<sup>135</sup> See the literature cited in §1.0.2.

<sup>136</sup> See Georg von Dadelsen’s article “Die ‘Fassung letzter Hand’ in der Musik”, *AcMus* 33 (1961), pp. 1–14, discussed in §1.4.1.

<sup>137</sup> “The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P. ...”, p. 367.

<sup>138</sup> “Der Streit... (I)”, p. 538.

<sup>139</sup> “Wichtige Aufgaben der Musikwissenschaft gegenüber Anton Bruckner”, *ZfM* 1 (1919), pp. 293–5; quoted at length in Nowak, “Die Anton Bruckner Gesamtausgabe: Ihre Geschichte und Schicksale”, *BrJb* 1982/83, pp. 33f.; cited also in Auer, “Der Streit... (I)”, p. 538, and Orel, “Original und Bearbeitung...”, p. 193. See discussion in Doebel, pp. 222f.



firms of Eberle, Guttman, Rättig and Haslinger since the early years of the century,<sup>140</sup> of what Göhler scathingly termed “österreichische Schlamperei”.<sup>141</sup> Göhler concluded:

Nach allem scheint bisher schlimmste Unwissenschaftlichkeit, Eigenmächtigkeit und persönliche Eitelkeit sich in Bruckner-Fragen breit gemacht zu haben. Die Musikwissenschaft muß dieses Nest einmal gründlich ausräuchern und mindestens dafür sorgen, daß das Jahr 1927 uns eine einwandfreie, strenge wissenschaftliche Ausgabe der Brucknerschen Partituren bringt.

To judge by Alfred Orel’s response,<sup>142</sup> the discrepancies in the Bruckner editions were already well known to Viennese musicological circles at the time: Guido Adler had frequently made reference to them in university lectures, in the early 1920s Orel investigated the printed version of the First Symphony in university workshops, and an attempt was made even then to initiate new publications of the scores which, according to Orel, failed not only on the grounds of cost (an issue raised by Bruckner’s publishers) but “an dem Widerstande Ferdinand Löwes und Franz Schalks”:

[...] Bei einer Besprechung [...] zeigte Löwe durch Fernbleiben seine ablehnende Stellung, F. Schalk aber lehnte unter Einsatz seiner großen Autorität als Mitglied des engsten Brucknerkreises die Revision der Druckausgaben nach den Handschriften ab, da diese nicht den letzten künstlerischen Willen Bruckners darboten [...].

It would appear that little could be achieved until natural attrition and the expiration of copyright in 1926, thirty years after Bruckner’s death, had taken its course.

Other developments meanwhile gave impetus to the realisation of a critical Bruckner edition. An early “Bruckner-Bund in Wien” first formed in 1912 was consolidated into a “Bruckner-Bund” in 1921, the 25th anniversary of Bruckner’s death; numerous other local societies formed throughout Austria and Germany in the ensuing years.<sup>143</sup> Perhaps it is less than coincidence that in St. Florian in November 1925, the same year as Ferdinand Löwe’s death, an “Internationaler Brucknerbund” was initiated under the chairmanship of Max Auer.<sup>144</sup> At a meeting of all local society representatives on 9 November<sup>145</sup> 1927 in Leipzig,

<sup>140</sup> See Egon Wellesz’ account of the early history of Bruckner publications in, “Anton Bruckner and the process of musical creation”, *MQ* 24 (1938), pp. 265ff. Gustav Mahler was instrumental in encouraging Universal Edition to take over the rights to Bruckner’s works.

<sup>141</sup> Göhler, p. 292.

<sup>142</sup> “Bruckner Ausgaben: Eine Erwiderung”, *ZfM* 1 (1919) pp. 422f.; “Original und Bearbeitung...”, p. 193.

<sup>143</sup> Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 69ff. Since this study was begun the history of the IBG and early Bruckner GA has been established more accurately through the research of Morten Solvik into the IBG archives, which have only become accessible in recent years; see pp. 362ff. of his “The international Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P...”. The ensuing references to publications of Auer or Nowak are hence largely of documentary significance.

<sup>144</sup> Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 81ff.; see also Göll.-A. II/1, pp. 360ff.

<sup>145</sup> Nowak (p. 34) gives October.

this initial body formed an umbrella organisation, the “Bruckner-Gesellschaft E. V.,” which on 17 February 1929 in Vienna was renamed the “Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft” (IBG), with its chief organ, also founded in the same year, the *Bruckner-Blätter*.<sup>146</sup> From the outset, one of the central concerns of the Bruckner-Gesellschaft was not merely the propagation of Bruckner’s music but the publication of a complete critical edition of Bruckner’s works.<sup>147</sup> In the third paragraph of the Society’s proclamation we read that:

Als wichtigste Aufgabe hat sie [die Gesellschaft] sich die Herausgabe des Gesamtwerkes von Bruckner gestellt; eine peinliche genaue, traditionsgeleitete Textkritik wird das Werk Bruckners von allen fehlerhaften Überbleibseln reinigen und den Urtext liefern, der als Grundlage für künftige praktische Ausgaben zu dienen hat.<sup>148</sup>

The IBG found a willing associate in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, which now undertook to publish the original MSS, many of which were, of course, held in its keeping and to which Bruckner had bequeathed the autographs of his principal works with the request that they be duly cared for and made available to publishers as required (§1.1.4) Robert Haas, then Director of the Musiksammlung, together with Alfred Orel, were subsequently to become chief editors of what would become the first ‘Kritische Gesamtausgabe’.<sup>149</sup> Of prime importance was the establishment, by strict ‘scientific’ method, of the validity of the original scores and their sources, as opposed to what was seen as the arbitrary nature of the first editions. Franz Grasberger explained the significance of the editorial policy which the GA initiated:

Die Eigenart von Bruckners Arbeitsweise und die fremden Eingriffe erforderten für die Editionspraxis ganz neue Methoden, insoferne, als Originalhandschriften, Skizzen und Erstdrucke einer vergleichenden und kritischen Betrachtung unterzogen werden mußten, um die von Bruckner gemeinte Werkgestalt edieren zu können. Damit war zum erstenmal in der Geschichte musikalischer Gesamtausgaben eine strenge Quellenkritik eingeführt. In der Veröffentlichungspraxis hat dies bewirkt, daß in den Bänden der Gesamtausgabe nicht nur der Text der Partitur enthalten ist, auch die Skizzen sind in die Publikation miteinbezogen worden. Dem philologisch genauen Text der Partitur wurde sodann ein umfassender Vorlagenbericht beigefügt, der mit einer exakten Quellenbeschreibung alle Arbeitseigentümlichkeiten festhält, Quellenzusammenhänge herstellt und so die Entstehungsgeschichte des Werkes rekonstruieren kann.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup> Nowak, “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe...”, p. 34.

<sup>147</sup> Auer, “Der Streit... (I)”, p. 538. See here and subsequently Nowak, “25 Jahre Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft”, *Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 23ff., and the more detailed account in *idem*, “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe...”, pp. 34ff., as well as Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 91ff.

<sup>148</sup> Nowak, “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe...”, p. 34.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35.

<sup>150</sup> “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe”, *ÖMz* 21 (1966), pp. 533f.; similarly Nowak, “Die neue Gesamtausgabe der Werke Bruckners”, *Ges. Aufs.* p. 11.

However, the realisation of such aims was to prove a long and tedious process. As initial negotiations with Breitkopf und Härtel came to nothing, the ÖNB entered into partnership in April 1928 with the firm of Benno Filser (Augsburg–Leipzig–Vienna), with whom the scores of the Requiem (WAB 39) and Missa Solemnis (WAB 29) appeared in 1930 as the initial instalment (vol. 15) of the new edition.<sup>151</sup> Two years later, volume 9, the first edition of the original Ninth Symphony, score, orchestral parts and *Kritischer Bericht*,<sup>152</sup> edited by Alfred Orel, were nearing publication when Filser Verlag declared bankruptcy.<sup>153</sup> The publication had to wait a further two years, eventually appearing in 1934.

It is important to realise that the Bruckner GA was originally envisaged as maintaining an important distinction between practical and ‘wissenschaftliche’ editions of the symphonies, inclusive of the Ninth, despite the fact that its first edition was brought out long after Bruckner’s death. Until April 1932 no-one appears to have been at all convinced that Bruckner’s “Urfassung” of the Ninth, or of any other symphony, represented a viable performance text.<sup>154</sup> Schalk, the first honorary president of the IBG, concurred in the publication of Bruckner’s original score of the Ninth, but “nur für wissenschaftliche Zwecke”, and gave Orel access to the Finale material held by him for that reason. Shortly before his death, Schalk, the last representative of the ‘old guard’, had nonetheless been persuaded to conduct a performance of the original score before an invited audience.<sup>155</sup> Following his death on 3 September 1931, the task of preparing the performance was handed on to Hausegger, who on 2 April 1932 presented the two versions in the Munich Tonhalle before a closed sitting of the IBG, a performance that unexpectedly demonstrated the eminently defensible and musically superior character of Bruckner’s original.<sup>156</sup> Auer explained that

---

<sup>151</sup> See the facsimile prospects of the edition series in Nowak, “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe...”, pp. 47ff.; text quoted also in Göll.-A. IV/4, pp. 94f.

<sup>152</sup> Also entitled *Vorlagebericht* in the correspondence, and what would later be retitled a *Sonderdruck*, the *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie* volume itself, as we have seen (§1.2.6), had had to be revised and expanded due to the sudden availability of the Schalk material in late 1929.

<sup>153</sup> Fortunately, the orchestral material of the first three movements was already prepared and could be used for the first performance of the work in Munich in April 1932; indeed, as correspondence in F60 BRGA 10/3 reveals, Filser had already released the score and parts for sale prior to final corrections having been made by the GA editors; this material had to be recalled, work on the edition being concluded by the firm of Oskar Brandstetter in Leipzig.

<sup>154</sup> This is confirmed by much correspondence in F60 BRGA; see also Doebel, for instance, pp. 227ff.

<sup>155</sup> Auer, “Der Streit... (I)”, p. 538.

<sup>156</sup> Göll.-A. IV/4, p. 110. A recording of a Hausegger performance of the Ninth with the Munich Philharmonic from April 1938 was recently rereleased on CD (Preiser Records, 1995, Mono 90148). Franz Zamazal noted (letter to the author dated Linz 18 April 1995): “Hier ist nichts von Weihrauch, Mystik und Ähnlichem zu spüren. Es gibt nur romantische Musik. Ich finde, hier paßt das von Ihnen erarbeitete Finale gut dazu.” Concerning Hausegger’s Bruckner interpretation, see Rolf Agop, “Siegfried von Hausegger (1872–1948): Erinnerungen eines 36 Jahre jüngeren Schülers”, *BrJb* 1989–90, pp. 303–308. Agop (p. 305) was apparently made responsible for the preparation of the orchestral material for the first performance of the original Ninth in early 1932.

selbst im engsten Freundeskreise war die Meinung verbreitet, daß der Torso in der vom Meister hinterlassenen Form nicht lebensfähig, ja unaufführbar sei. Man schloß von dem jahrelangen körperlichen Verfall des Meisters auf den Verfall seiner geistigen Kräfte. [...]

Die Aufführung [...] brachte das überraschende Ergebnis, daß Originalfassung nichts weniger als 'unaufführbar', sondern geradezu an Farbenpracht und Kontrastwirkung die Bearbeitung Löwes weit übertrifft und daß man bei der Gegenüberstellung beider Fassungen geistig geradezu von 'zwei Welten' sprechen kann.<sup>157</sup>

It was on the basis of this performance that the IBG made its unanimous decision to proceed with publication of the orchestral material, not merely the score, of the Ninth with Filser. However, that firm's financial collapse led the IBG in early 1933 to found its own company, the 'Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag der Internationalen Brucknergesellschaft' (subsequently MWV), initially for the sole purpose of ensuring publication of the Bruckner GA.<sup>158</sup> Volume 9, with its attendant "Sonderdruck" of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* finally appeared in 1934.<sup>159</sup>

### *The Gesamtausgabe during the Third Reich*

With the appearance of the first volume of the symphonies, so Nowak wrote, "[brach] ein teilweise sehr heftig und persönlich geführter Streich aus[...]":

Es zog sich bis in die Tageszeitungen hin und löste ein Für und Wider aus, das sehr ungute Verhältnisse herbeiführte und von allen daran Beteiligten, vorab von Haas, viel Nervenkraft verlangte. Es spielten damals dabei neben musikwissenschaftlichen Problemen auch die Zeitverhältnisse eine spürbare Rolle. Die Jahre 1930 bis 1938 gehörten ja nicht gerade zu den ruhigsten in Österreich.<sup>160</sup>

—nor, one would have thought, the years after 1938. On 6 June 1937 a bust of Bruckner was unveiled by Hitler in the "Walhalla", Ludwig I's pantheon of German greatness in Regensburg, an event which marked, in Hansen's words, the "Höhepunkt und eigentlicher Durchbruch der 'völkischen' Heroisierung und Verinnerlichung Bruckners".<sup>161</sup> The NSDAP had been heavily lobbied over the placement of the bust by the IBG; its president Max Auer took the occasion to bestow upon the Führer the society's first "Ehrenmedaille".<sup>162</sup> Joseph

<sup>157</sup> "Anton Bruckners IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung", pp. 861f. Auer confirmed that the original scores were initially regarded as unperformable in "Der Streit... (I)", p. 538. Concerning the first performance of the Ninth, *ibid.*, pp. 538f.

<sup>158</sup> Here and the foregoing: Nowak, "Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe...", pp. 35ff.

<sup>159</sup> Discussion see §1.3.6 *infra*.

<sup>160</sup> Nowak, p. 35.

<sup>161</sup> p. 37.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 156f. See the advance notice of the placement of the bust, permission having been granted by Adolf Hitler, in Göll.-A. IV/4, p. 129; see also Gilliam's account of the ceremony in "The Annexation of Anton Bruckner: Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation", *MQ* 78, no. 3 (Fall 1994), pp. 584ff.

Goebbels's address, as Gilliam has shown,<sup>163</sup> built on existing associations between Bruckner and nationalistic German aspirations, promulgating a vision of the symphonist as representative of the ideals of pure Teutonic music, *gottgläubig* rather than Catholic, and symbolic of the unity of the German and Austrian peoples. Goebbels also announced financial support in the form of an ongoing subvention of 10,000 RM for the Bruckner GA which, as accounts reveal, was obviously feeling the impact of the high publication costs of these huge works. The crux of Goebbels' speech in practical terms was the following:

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 Originalfassungen seiner Symphonien einen namhaften Beitrag zur Verfügung zu stellen, bis das Gesamtwerk des Meisters in der von ihm geschauten Form vorliegt.<sup>164</sup>

Presumably, as Korstvedt has noted, “the pursuit of imagined textual purity resonated with the National Socialist obsession with race.”<sup>165</sup>

Bruckner's music was now to be harnessed to the greater glory of the Reich and Bruckner's fellow Upper Austrian Adolf Hitler. Josef Wulf, writing in the early 1980s, claimed that “Bruckner gehört zu den klassischen Fällen, bei denen das Dritte Reich einen großen Komponisten und seine Meisterwerke ohne jeden Grund mit großangelegter Propaganda und allen Prinzipien politischer Werbung für Zwecke des Regimes mißbrauchte”<sup>166</sup>—alas, not entirely without any reason, since Bruckner in his own time, however reticent and apparently disinterested he appears to have been in all matters not relating to music, certainly associated with, and allowed himself to be championed by, reactionary, conservative and anti-intellectual elements—elements which would subsequently come to hold immense political power.<sup>167</sup> While until recently the issue of Bruckner's appropriation during the Third Reich

---

<sup>163</sup> “The Annexation of Anton Bruckner: Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation”, *MQ* 78, no. 3 (Fall 1994), pp. 584–609 *passim*. See also the further material cited in §1.0.2.

<sup>164</sup> Quoted in Paul Ehlers, “Das Regensburger Bruckner-Erlebnis,” *ZfM* 104 (1937), p. 747; cited by Korstvedt, “Bruckner in the Third Reich”, p. 157, fn. 59.

<sup>165</sup> “Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich and After: An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception”, *MQ* 80, no. 1 (1996), p. 145. However, the number of performances of Bruckner's music during the years 1933–1945 appears to have fallen proportionately in comparison with the period 1919–1933, as Erik Levi has shown (see his *Music in the Third Reich*, Table, p. 217). Further research may reveal whether this can be seen as an indication of the disparity between official policy and practical concert-programming, or can be seen as a consequence of the controversy over the new scores.

<sup>166</sup> *Musik im Dritten Reich: Eine Dokumentation*, Frankfurt—Berlin—Vienna 1983, p. 155.

<sup>167</sup> As noted by Korstvedt; see for instance his “Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich and After: An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception” *MQ* 80 (Spring 1996), p. 133, or his *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony*, Cambridge 2000, pp. 64ff. See also Margaret Notley, “Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style and Politics in Late Nineteenth-

was largely ignored by mainstream Bruckner scholarship, Hansen made an important claim for its dismissal:

[D]ie Tatsache, daß der Aufstieg Bruckners zu einem faschistischen Idol nur der Endpunkt war einer breiten nahezu geschlossenen konservativ-nationalistischen Traditionsbildung seit Ende des vergangenen Jahrhunderts, daß die nazistischen Ideologen nichts zu erfinden, sondern nur aufzugreifen, zu vergrößern und in konkrete kulturpolitische Strategie einzufügen brauchten, was reaktionärer Irrationalismus überlang vorbereitet hatte—dies zwingt dazu, sich mit der größtenteils deprimierenden Wirkungsgeschichte Bruckners in Praxis und Theorie noch immer auseinanderzusetzen.<sup>168</sup>

That contemporary images of Bruckner could be so utterly appropriated by Nazi propaganda purposes was clear, according to Hansen:<sup>169</sup>

In nicht einmal nur extremen Darstellungen erscheint Bruckner als Prophet völkisch-rassischer Wiedergeburt Groß-Deutschland, des Sieges 'schollenhaft'-beständigen Lebenswillens über dekadente Zivilisation. Die ideologische Konstruktion, auf der Basis langfristiger regressiver Klischeebildung, bedurfte auch nicht der geringsten 'sachlichen' Korrektur, um faschistischer Ungeist zu werden. Angesichts der apologetischen Suggestion eines 'göttlich-reinen' Bruckner gab es nichts, was hätte irritieren können: weder unbequeme Äußerungen [...] noch 'kompromittierende' persönliche Beziehungen.

Remarkable as such interest in a composer on the part of a political party appears, given Bruckner's minor status today, it must be recalled that by 1938 the IBG, according to Solvik,<sup>170</sup> had over 3,200 members. By 1947 Max Auer's single-volume Bruckner biography had been printed in five impressions and a total of 26,000 copies,<sup>171</sup> an unheard of figure for the biography of even a major composer. Bruckner's increasing significance was also mirrored in the number of scholarly articles published concerning him. As Korstvedt notes, the *Zeitschrift für Musik* in the 1920s published less than a dozen relevant articles. The number rose sharply from 1932 onwards; in 1936 alone no less than twenty-one articles related to Bruckner appeared.<sup>172</sup>

The Ninth itself perfectly exemplified the Nazis' attitude towards music. As Gilliam points out, the Ninth was cited in an essay by Friedrich Herzog entitled "Was ist deutsche Musik?"<sup>173</sup> alongside Bruckner's Fifth, Bach's *Well Tempered Clavier* and *Kunst Der Fuge*, Beethoven's Ninth and third *Leonore* Overture and Wagner's *Tristan*, as "specific examples

Century Vienna", *19th-Century Music* 17, no. 2 (Fall 1993), pp. 107ff., and "Volksconcerte in Vienna and late Nineteenth-Century Ideology of the Symphony", *JAMS* 50, nos. 2–3 (Summer–Fall 1997), pp. 421–453.

<sup>168</sup> p. 20.

<sup>169</sup> p. 21.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 364.

<sup>171</sup> Figures taken from the impressum page of the 1947 edition.

<sup>172</sup> Korstvedt, "Bruckner in the Third Reich", p. 154, fn. 29.

<sup>173</sup> "Erkenntnisse und Folgerungen", *Die Musik* 26 (1934), p. 802.

of the Teutonic paradigm.”<sup>174</sup> “German art”, Gilliam writes, “became a holy art, and music its most sacred manifestation. The view of music as a sacred art was hardly a Nazi construct; the notion prevailed throughout late-nineteenth-century Germany and was held by composers and philosophers alike.”<sup>175</sup> Accordingly, Bruckner’s symphonies

were deemed a religious experience, and only those who shared the same blood and soil could fully comprehend the message. Nowhere is this phenomenon better exemplified than in the Viennese *Dunkelkonzerte* of the early 1940s, in which the darkened Wiener Konzerthaus was transformed into a sacred space where listening to Bruckner became tantamount to attending church. [...] [O]ne such program [...] suggests these strong religious overtones: before intermission (in a partially darkened hall) Mozart’s *Regina coeli*, after intermission (in a fully darkened hall) Bruckner’s Ninth, the only symphony that Bruckner dedicated to God himself.<sup>176</sup>

Shortly after the Anschluß the IBG was renamed the ‘Deutsche Bruckner Gesellschaft’,<sup>177</sup> MWV Wien was liquidated and its role as publisher of the Bruckner GA transferred to a new MWV in Leipzig under the direction of the firm of Oskar Brandstetter which, as Solvik points out,<sup>178</sup> maintained close ties to the Ministry of Propaganda. In the same year Haas and Orel finally came to a parting of the ways over their differing text-critical approaches, as Solvik has explained.<sup>179</sup> In March 1936, as the result of a particularly vehement critique of Schalk’s version of the Fifth Symphony, Haas lost the good-will of the conductor’s widow Lili who, as we have seen (§1.2.6), refused to hand over her late husband’s significant stock of Bruckner MSS. A ‘deal’ with her attempted by Orel which would have given him sole rights over their publication was vetoed by Haas, who took the opportunity to assume, in effect, complete control of the GA from that point on. Such machinations aside, it must not be forgotten that in 1935 alone Haas had published three further volumes of the symphonies (both versions of the First, the Sixth and the Fifth, together with their critical reports)—whatever one makes of his Nazi affiliations and personal and

---

<sup>174</sup> Gilliam, p. 590. Herzog’s article drew special attention to the slow movement of the Ninth and the fugal Finale of the Fifth: “fugue and chorale were essential to [Bruckner’s] musical expression, and his epic symphonic designs were conceived on a scale unprecedented even for their own time” (*ibid.*, pp. 590f.).

<sup>175</sup> p. 595.

<sup>176</sup> p. 596. A facsimile of the program from the concert of 15 November 1940 cited by Gilliam is given on the facing p. The concert was, incidentally, conducted by Weisbach, who premiered Oeser’s Performing Version of the Finale in Leipzig in 1941 (see §1.4.5).

<sup>177</sup> See Solvik, p. 366.

<sup>178</sup> Pp. 365ff.

<sup>179</sup> p. 367. See also in regard to the following the discussion by Wolfgang Doebel, pp. 262ff. Cf. also Nowak’s much-censored version of events in “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe...”, p. 39. Research on the internal affairs of the IBG during this period, based on the F60 BRGA and other ÖNB Fonds, was first presented by Morten Solvik in a paper “The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P.”, given at the Bruckner conference held in Manchester in April 1996; his “The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P...” appeared in print two years later.

editorial philosophies, a remarkable display of painstaking philological perseverance and unmitigated hard work.<sup>180</sup> Nowak, as we have seen (§1.2.3), undertook his revision of the Orel edition in 1935 (see the ensuing §1.3.6, as well as ch. 3.1), becoming Haas' assistant and writing for him damning reports on the shortcomings of Orel's work.<sup>181</sup>

Orel may not have possessed the text-critical ardour of Haas or Nowak, but his conception of the text-critical problem was more circumspect and more differentiated. He wrote in 1936:

Daß die 'aufführungstechnischen Zutaten' auf die Helfer Bruckners zurückgehen, ist fast sicher. Wenn Bruckner ihnen zustimmte, ist dies vielleicht daraus zu erklären, daß der Meister darin nicht das Wesentliche seines Werkes sah, und dem Urteil der 'Praktiker' vertraute. Der Vergleich mit den Handschriften zeigt, daß in dieser Hinsicht zu weit gegangen wurde. Diese Zutaten auszumerzen, sie zumindest als solche kenntlich zu machen ist die unabweisliche Pflicht musikwissenschaftlicher Forschung gegenüber einem der größten Meister deutscher Tonkunst. Die Handschriften Bruckners sind für die posthum erschienenen Werke zweifellos die einzige Textgrundlage; für die bei Lebzeiten Bruckners herausgegebenen Werke sind sie aber der Wegweiser, der—solange die Stichvorlagen nicht wieder auftauchen—dem Forscher die schwere Aufgabe erleichtert, in größtem Verantwortungsbewußtsein, vielleicht gerade im Vergleich mit den ohne Bruckners Mitwirken und Wissen nach seinem Tode entstandenen Ausgaben diese Zutaten als solche zu erkennen, sie kenntlich zu machen und die Übergriffe aus dem Partiturbild zu tilgen. Ebensowenig wie alle Abweichungen der Druckausgaben als Entstellung oder Fälschung zu werten sind, ebensowenig können die bisherigen Druckausgaben nach der derzeitigen Sachlage ohne weiteres als authentisch erklärt werden. Aber auch die Entscheidung, ob die bis jetzt bekannten Handschriften die Fassung letzter Hand darstellen, kann nur fallweise, nicht im allgemeinen getroffen werden.<sup>182</sup>

Far from simply endorsing the first editions Orel was therefore proposing a methodology by which the original MSS might serve as a guide to assessing which alterations Bruckner might have endorsed in the first editions published during his lifetime, thereby allowing one to 'clean up' the published editions rather than replace them. Orel also considered that many factors pointed to the legitimacy of Löwe's 1889 edition of the Fourth Symphony as a text revised and sanctioned by Bruckner.<sup>183</sup> By the end of the 1930s, however, Haas had begun to take a more radical view of the primacy of the autographs, regarding it as his personal mission to rid Bruckner's music of the deleterious influences of Jewish arrangers and publishers. His racial paranoia is evident from an unpublished typescript from April 1938, quoted by Solvik:

---

<sup>180</sup> Nowak, p. 38.

<sup>181</sup> Several typescripts survive in F60 BRGA 68; further discussion in §3.1.1.

<sup>182</sup> Alfred Orel, "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner", pp. 221f. As Solvik's notes the article unleashed a storm of protest on the part of Haas.

<sup>183</sup> "Original und Bearbeitungen bei Anton Bruckner", p. 222; discussion by Solvik, p. 167.



Der Sinn dieser Gesamtausgabe unterscheidet sich nach meinem von Anfang an festgelegten Plan so tiefgreifend von den bisher üblichen liberalistischen Gepflogenheiten der musikalischen Philologie, daß ich selbstverständlich den stärksten jüdischen Widerspruch und Widerstand reizen mußte. In zwölf langen Kampffahren sah ich mich daher genötigt, meine Auffassung gegen den jüdischen Musikverlag, gegen die jüdische Presse und auch leider gegen manche arische Mitläufer dieser Mächte zu verteidigen. Heute kann ich mit Stolz darauf verweisen, daß es mir durch vollsten persönlichen Einsatz nicht nur gelungen ist, dieses Werk vor Unterdrückung, Vernichtung oder Verstümmelung zu bewahren, sondern es vielmehr in aller Welt zur Geltung zu bringen, insbesondere im deutschen Musikleben.<sup>184</sup>

The degree to which Haas, himself a Nazi party member, saw his musicological activities as a reflection of the goals and philosophy of the N.S.D.A.P. can also readily be observed in such public statements as the last paragraph of the introduction to ‘his’ score of the Eighth Symphony, dated Vienna, April 1939:

Zur inhaltlichen Bedeutung der Achten sei hier nur kurz des deutschen Michel-Mythos gedacht, in den sich Bruckner seit 1885 wundersam eingesponnen hatte. Seine Verklärung ist das Finale mit dem mystisch-technischen Kunststück des Kontrapunkts der vier Symphonietemen am Ende. Die Deutung dieses Mythos erscheint mir in der großdeutschen Idee als geschichtlicher Geisteshaltung gegeben. Es ist ein *Zeichen der Vorsehung, daß die wiederhergestellte Partitur gerade in diesem Jahr als Gruß der Ostmark erklingen kann.*<sup>185</sup>

Similar sentiments can be found expressed in the even more strongly worded preface to Haas’ edition of the Second Symphony—written, as Solvik notes, in March 1938, literally as Hitler’s troops marched into Austria—and which concludes with the words: “For this edition must also serve the performance practice needs of today and thus serve the time that Bruckner had hoped would come. That this day has arrived must be obvious to everyone.”<sup>186</sup> For Solvik, Haas’ editorial claim that all first-edition texts were spurious and that a single, ‘ideal’ text could be reconstructed as an amalgam or ‘Mischfassung’ from the autograph sources (as he attempted to do notably in his editions of the Second and Eighth) rested on a fundamentally mystical, anti-intellectual stance—his identification with Bruckner’s “symphonische Lebenstragödie”:

The path to uncovering the ‘original’ version lay [...] not in engaging in dusty philological research [...] but in achieving an inner empathy with Bruckner’s spirit. Haas was free to choose between various versions of the Second Symphony because he had discovered the inner logic, the spiritual center of Bruckner’s musical mind. This

---

<sup>184</sup> Quoted by Solvik, pp. 379f., fn. 40.

<sup>185</sup> Brought to the author’s attention by Cohrs; emphasis added.

<sup>186</sup> Quoted by Solvik, p. 371.

fundamentally anti-intellectual stance disturbs us when identified with the editor of a critical edition [...].<sup>187</sup>

Haas' reliance on the "instinct of the soul"<sup>188</sup> (Schwebsch) in editing musical sources, while by no means unique, was certainly an extreme example of the manner in which Nazi ideology, with its recourse to the irrational and mystical, permeated cultural activity in the Third Reich. A simple equation between Haas' anti-Semitic and text-critical stance is simplistic, however. Orel too, wrote (or, perhaps, was reduced to writing) diatribes against the Jewish infiltration of Viennese music culture.<sup>189</sup> It was characteristic of the time, in which everything took on political significance, the consequences of a refusal to toe the party line demotion, dismissal or worse.<sup>190</sup>

It is also important to note that Haas' opinions concerning the validity of the autographs were not unquestioningly accepted, even by his presumably even more ideologically motivated party superiors. Solvik cites the text of a speech given by Heinz Drewes of the Propaganda Ministry in 1944, recalling the tone of Orel's more cautious and measured approach to the sources:

Ob die zu Bruckners Lebzeiten hervorgetretenen Fassungen den Willen des Meisters nur unter dem Zwang der Beeinflussung durch wohlmeinende Freunde oder als freie Willensentscheidung nach Durchkämpfung der Diskussion mit ihnen darstellt oder ob die jetzt als Urfassungen herausgegebenen Lesarten das allein getreue Abbild seiner künstlerischen Inspiration darstellen, ist nicht so einfach zu entscheiden [...] [s]o muß doch gesagt werden, daß die Frage weder generell entschieden [...] noch wie der gordische Knoten mit dem Schwert des Alexander kurz und bündig durchhauen werden kann, da ja in einzelnen Fällen der früheren Fassung jetzt nicht eine einzige Urfassung gegenübersteht, sondern manchmal nicht weniger als vielleicht ein halbes Dutzend voneinander widersprechenden Lesarten, aus denen die neue sogenannte Urfassung eine durchaus individuelle Entscheidung des Bearbeiters [...] darstellt, also auch vor der Nachwelt sehr wohl als Quelle weiterer Irrtumsmöglichkeiten wird angesehen werden können.<sup>191</sup>

The relation of Bruckner's music and scoring to that of Wagner was a further issue which emerged as part of this debate, and one which did have political ramifications for the nationalistic thinking of the time. Given that Wagner represented the ideals of national-socialist music, what could be wrong with editors who had made Bruckner's music sound more Wagnerian? The vehemently National-Socialistic Wagner analyst Alfred Lorenz, in his

---

<sup>187</sup> Pp. 372f.

<sup>188</sup> Erich Schwebsch, cited by Solvik, p. 373.

<sup>189</sup> See his "Das Wiener Musikleben im Neuaufbau", *Die Musik*, May 1938, p. 543; quoted in: Wulf, *Musik im Dritten Reich*, pp. 167ff.

<sup>190</sup> Solvik (pp. 374f.) also points out that Haas' anti-Semitism was selective, exceptions being made for personal friends. This presumably would also apply to Orel, a student of Guido Adler, whom he never directly repudiated.

<sup>191</sup> Solvik, pp. 381f., fn. 56.

article “Zur Instrumentation von Anton Bruckners Symphonien”,<sup>192</sup> took up the issue of “Gruppenprinzip” versus “gemischter Klang” in Bruckner’s music,<sup>193</sup> pointing out (quite correctly) that Bruckner by no means invented the concept and citing Wagner’s *Parsifal* as the *locus classicus* for the Romantic deployment of what was originally a Baroque technique. Lorenz proceeded to identify by statistical means a progression away from the simpler “Gruppenprinzip” model in favour of mixed orchestral colours in the 1890 revision of the First Symphony. Accordingly, he argued for the likelihood that Bruckner himself was at least partly responsible for, and would certainly have approved, the changes made by Schalk in the first edition of the Fifth, concluding:

Man hat ja aus den oben zusammengestellten Änderungen in der I. Symphonie gesehen, daß das Streben ‘klare’ Farben in ‘gemischte’ umzuwandeln, in Bruckners Alter größer war, als die Lust, ‘gemischte’ Farben zu vereinfachen, daß also seine Schüler, wenn sie ihn in diesem Streben bestärkten, nicht *gegen* seinen Geist, sondern *in seinem Sinne* gehandelt haben.<sup>194</sup>

Frank Wohlfahrt, on the other hand, in his “Der Ur-Bruckner”,<sup>195</sup> took the opposite stance. Not only had the early editors gone too far, but their rescorings and cuts had misled contemporary commentators to view Bruckner more as a Wagner epigone and composer of formless programme music than he really was. Hence, “Es ist nicht zuviel gesagt, wenn im Falle Bruckners jene Bearbeitungen seiner Symphonischen Werke aus zweiter Hand das Verständnis für seine Kunst nicht nur erschwert, sondern hinausgezögert haben”.<sup>196</sup> In writing characteristic of the newer, ‘cleaner’ approach to Bruckner (but which did nothing to decrease the prevalence of mystical, revelatory views held of scores such as the Ninth), Wohlfahrt concludes:

Grundsätzlich betrachtet unterscheiden sich die Bearbeitungen von den Originalen nicht nur in einer Entstellung der formalen Absichten Bruckners, sondern in einer Trübung der klangfarbigen Architektur. Ihre Klarheit antasten, heißt auch den Geist dieser Musik in seiner ‘Veranschaulichung’ nicht verstanden zu haben. Und das ist eigentlich das Wesentliche.<sup>197</sup>

Apart from the publications of Haas and Orel themselves, the most important and thorough musicological investigation of the original scores and Bruckner’s orchestration in general during this period was that of the 1938 dissertation of Fritz Oeser, *Die Klangstruktur*

---

<sup>192</sup> *ZfM* 103, no. 11 (Nov. 1936), pp. 1318–1325.

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1318.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1324; emphasis original.

<sup>195</sup> *DMK* 2 (1937), pp. 144–151.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 144.

<sup>197</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 150.

*der Bruckner-Symphonie: Eine Studie zur Frage der Originalfassungen*,<sup>198</sup> although Oeser does not discuss the Ninth in detail.<sup>199</sup> Oeser does not stress a ‘Wagnerian’ approach to the re-instrumentation on the part of the arrangers, simply that “Es war der Zweck der Bearbeitungen, gerade die von Bruckner gewollten Schroffheiten des originalen Klangbildes abzuschleifen”.<sup>200</sup> One of the earliest articles on Bruckner of any significance to appear in English, Egon Wellesz’ “Anton Bruckner and the Process of Musical Creation”,<sup>201</sup> goes into some detail concerning Bruckner’s evolution of thematic material in the Adagio of the Ninth, using Orel’s transcriptions of this material from the 1934 edition as examples.<sup>202</sup> While applauding the aims of the GA in making the original scores available and thereby permitting scholarship a far greater insight into Bruckner’s compositional method, Wellesz came out in defence of the first editions, claiming the validity of the cuts made in them,<sup>203</sup> while the original scores demonstrated a limited understanding of orchestral instruments and of the players’ need for adequate performance directives.<sup>204</sup> It is interesting to note reflections made upon this article in 1942 by Geoffrey Sharp,<sup>205</sup> who compared Wellesz’s defence of the first-edition scores with use of the GA for propaganda purposes. “It should not be necessary to postulate any such defence as this,” he wrote, “but the present regime in Germany has made a political gambit of the Critical Edition and, as we know only too well, what the politician says is not evidence.”<sup>206</sup>

#### *Developments post-1945*

Following the destruction of Brandstetter in Leipzig during the last years of the war, the GA’s centre of operations was moved to Wiesbaden, where a number of volumes continued to appear as late as 1949. A further series of reprints followed in Leipzig in 1951 and 1952, brought out by an opportunistic “VVV Volks- und Buch-Verlag Leipzig, Abteilung Bruckner Verlag”.<sup>207</sup> In the wake of the catastrophes of 1944–45—among them the destruction of the building housing the Musiksammlung on 12 March 1945—the IBG, and with it MWV Wien and the GA, were to make a fresh start.<sup>208</sup> In March 1946 Leopold Nowak was appointed

<sup>198</sup> Diss. Phil., Univ. Leipzig, publ. Leipzig 1939.

<sup>199</sup> The majority of Oeser’s examples are taken from the middle-period symphonies.

<sup>200</sup> p. 28.

<sup>201</sup> Pp. 265–290.

<sup>202</sup> Wellesz, pp. 276ff.

<sup>203</sup> !—*ibid.*, pp. 284f.

<sup>204</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 285ff.

<sup>205</sup> “Anton Bruckner: Simpleton or Mystic?”, *MR* 3, pp. 46–54.

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

<sup>207</sup> Nowak, “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe...”, pp. 40ff.

<sup>208</sup> Not surprisingly, neither Haas nor Orel had anything further to do with the GA, although both survived well into their seventies, Haas dying in 1960, Orel in 1967.

Director of the Musiksammlung of the ÖNB, and was subsequently to initiate the ‘second’ GA,<sup>209</sup> the “blaue Reihe” as it is known, the first volume of which—again the Ninth Symphony—appeared in 1951. Grasberger wrote:

Leopold Nowak hat es sich zur Aufgabe gemacht, die bereits vorhandenen Bände der Gesamtausgabe in einer zweiten, revidierten Ausgabe zu edieren, den Text durch Erschließung neuen Quellenmaterials zu vervollkommen und die bisher noch nicht bearbeiteten Werke zu veröffentlichen. Er bekennt sich zu einer vollkommen korrekten philologischen Methode, die vom früheren Herausgeber manchmal dadurch verlassen wurde, daß er verschiedene Fassungen zu einer einzigen Werkgestalt vereinigte und damit den Boden der Werktreue verließ.<sup>210</sup>

Nowak furthermore, as pointed out by Korstvedt,<sup>211</sup> attempted to reclaim a Catholic Bruckner from the *Gottgläubigkeit* foisted upon him by Goebbels. Characteristic of the general atmosphere of *Verdrängung* that followed the Nazi era, a code of silence was imposed from within scholarship upon issues relating to the political and cultural reception of Bruckner’s music—one that lasted for the better part of fifty years—during which period it remained a largely isolated subgroup within musicological discourse. As Hansen pointed out:

Ein gutes Jahrzehnt nach Kriegsende war Bruckner noch immer, in der Aufführungspraxis wie in der Publizistik, eine vorrangig österreichische bzw. deutsche Angelegenheit [...]. Es war dies auch eine Folge des irrationalistischen Brucknerkults, der andere Nationen brüskieren, beunruhigen, letzten Endes bedrohen mußte—und sollte.<sup>212</sup>

Gilliam similarly commented that:

Articles on Bruckner continued to appear in German and Austrian journals immediately after the war, though not nearly as many as had appeared during the heyday of the Nazi campaign. Postwar studies took on a more positivistic tone; references to race and soil gave way to editorial issues and analytical problems. German scholars felt unobliged to apologize for Bruckner the man, given the fact that he was neither an ardent German nationalist nor anti-Semitic. But neither did they nor their editors feel compelled to repudiate fabrications concerning Bruckner, race, and religion in Nazi-era issues of those very journals. The National Socialist problem remain largely unaddressed, a policy ultimately in dialogue with the broader *Nullpunkt* strategy of rebuilding rather than reflecting.<sup>213</sup>

This silence was itself wholly in line with the post-war axiom of writing about the music of the Austro-German canon as intrinsically apolitical ‘absolute music’—a policy which in fact

<sup>209</sup> Nowak, “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe...”, pp. 42f.

<sup>210</sup> “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe”, p. 534.

<sup>211</sup> “Bruckner in the Third Reich...” p. 147.

<sup>212</sup> P. 317. It must also be recalled, of course, that Hansen was at the time writing in another totalitarian regime—that of the GDR.

<sup>213</sup> Gilliam, p. 599.

only succeeded in stifling musicological inquiry and eventually exposing the discipline to claims of cultural isolationism, elitism and stagnation.<sup>214</sup>

### *Modern reassessments*

The extent of this suppression was bound to call forth an equal and opposing reaction on the part of scholars who, in the new atmosphere which emerged in the late 1980s, began to express suspicion that any music politically sponsored and championed to the extent which Bruckner's was in Germany and Austria in the 1930s could be 'apolitical', and began attempts to come to terms with the political and ethical implications of a scholarship that had for so long, so unquestioningly accepted such a view.

Up until this time it might have appeared to any casual observer that the issue of authenticity had long since been laid to rest. But by the mid-1990s new questions had begun to be raised about the propriety, motives and political associations of the original Bruckner GA from within the ranks of an increasingly politically aware American scholarly community, significantly removed from traditional Austro-German musicological circles.<sup>215</sup> The idea that the modern axiom of textural purity could have been applied to Bruckner's works for anything less than the purest and most objective of reasons was, for instance, described by one ingenuous German reviewer of the first American Bruckner conference in 1994 as "ein bemerkenswerter Salto mortale der Editionsphilosophie im Zeitalter des 'authentischen' Musizierens".<sup>216</sup>

In 1994 and 1996 (the centenary year of the composer's death), Bryan Gilliam, Benjamin Korstvedt and Leon Botstein, among others, published articles examining links between the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner and the first Bruckner Complete Edition,<sup>217</sup> and first raised the question as to whether the first editions of Bruckner's music really justified the musicological obloquy to which they had been relegated. At the heart of this radical restructuring of the discourse was the realisation of the extent to which the Bruckner

<sup>214</sup> This is the contention of James Hepokoski in his "The Dahlhaus Project and Its Extra-musicological Sources", *19th-Century Music* 16, no. 3 (Spring 1991), pp. 221–246 *passim*.

<sup>215</sup> Manfred Wagner, in *Anton Bruckner: Werk und Leben (Musikportraits vol. 1)*, Vienna 1995, allotted a chapter to the question of Bruckner's appropriation by the N.S.D.A.P.; as already noted (§0.1.2) the Bruckner Institute published Kreczi's study in 1986, but until recently had gone no further with any kind of study of the 1933–1945 period.

<sup>216</sup> Klaus P. Richter, in a review of the New London conference of February 1994, entitled "Posthum politisierter Bruckner", *Fonoforum* July 1994. See Andrea Harrandt, "Erstes Bruckner-Symposium in den USA" (*ÖMz* 1994, no. 6, pp. 384f.; see also *ÖGM-Mitt* 27 (Dec. 1994), p. 57–59), held in Connecticut College, New London, 21–24 February 1994, at which the American scholar Benjamin Marcus Korstvedt "untersuchte den Einfluß der faschistischen Ästhetik und Ideologie auf die Edition der Gesamtausgabe in den Jahren von 1934 bis 1944". Harrandt (*ibid.*) also mentions papers given by Bryan Gilliam and Christa Brüstle dealing with the question of Bruckner and Nazi ideology. A similar paper to Korstvedt's was that of Morten Solvik (Vienna) on "The International Bruckner Society and the N. S. D. A. P." as already mentioned.

<sup>217</sup> The articles are listed in detail in §0.1.2, the major forum being the issues of *MQ* for both years.

movement had associated itself with Nazi cultural policy and the way in which outright political means had been used to suppress the older editions and advance the cause of the autograph scores—realisations which led both Korstvedt and Botstein to dismiss the editorial work of Robert Haas as both politically and philologically untenable. As even Leopold Nowak's post-1946 Gesamtausgabe had really only continued Haas' editorial bent, the only way out of the dilemma, according to Botstein, was to institute a third Complete Edition and a wholesale return to the first editions in an attempt to escape the stain of the Nazi past:

One consequence of the Bruckner controversy is the realisation that, perhaps both in our choice of textural versions and in the way we render them in performance, we [...] may be unwittingly perpetuating a set of aural signifiers closely linked with radical evil. [...] [W]e need to distance ourselves from the Nazi appropriation of Bruckner. We need to resurrect the early versions of the music [...] By reintroducing earlier versions, a new but oddly traditional pre-Nazi Bruckner can be invented.

We ought to develop a new scholarly method with which to produce the next critical edition of Bruckner.<sup>218</sup>

A more complete account of Benjamin Korstvedt's thinking on this issue can be found in his "Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich and After: An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception"<sup>219</sup> and "'Return to the Pure Sources': The Ideology and Text-Critical Legacy of the First Bruckner Gesamtausgabe".<sup>220</sup> In both articles Korstvedt made claims for regarding the first editions as important historical texts by which to better understand Bruckner's music, although critique of the GA along ideological lines appears since then to have waned in significance.<sup>221</sup>

While there is no question that Haas' editorial policies and the collusion of the aims of the IBG and the Bruckner GA in the cultural politics of the Third Reich pose thorny problems for modern Bruckner scholarship, to draw too close a causal relationship between the advocacy of Bruckner's original scores, dismissal of the first editions and racist nationalism of the times is not only simplistic, but ultimately follows a script written by Haas who, if the surviving documents give an accurate picture, endorsed Nazi ideology and attempted to set up a dialogue between it and his own text-critical philosophies. Bruckner's original scores and the sound world they encode were not the products of Haas and of the Third Reich, no matter how appropriate the massive, monumental and at times brutal aesthetic of Bruckner's original scores may have appeared to them. Even, it should be noted, in the first editions, in which the bombast of Bruckner's language was greatly moderated, Bruckner's music fulfilled all the

---

<sup>218</sup> *MQ* 80 (1996), p. 9.

<sup>219</sup> *MQ* 80 (1996), pp. 132–160.

<sup>220</sup> In: *Bruckner Studies*, ed. Jackson and Hawkshaw, pp. 91–109.

<sup>221</sup> Cf. Korstvedt, *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony*, pp. 8, 104ff.

requirements of monumental, fascist aesthetics, and it was on the basis of these versions, not the original texts, that Bruckner's music rose to popularity. Hansen:

Quaderhaft massive Formanlage; von der Orgel her inspirierte Klanglichkeit; weit-schwingende thematische Bögen; klare, pulsierende Rhythmik; eine Harmonik, deren Dreiklangsfundamente noch dichteste Chromatik zu regulieren vermögen; die Einbeziehung von Elementen der Volksmusik und des Choral: all dies wurde als paradigmatisch für 'echte', 'reine', eben deutsche Musik ausgegeben, die dem Kunstverfall aus politischer wie rassischer 'Entartung' entgegenstände.<sup>222</sup>

While Bruckner's music was championed by largely ultra-conservative or even right-wing commentators and writers, not all Bruckner specialists sided unquestioningly with the axioms of Haas' GA, despite the fact that his views, once endorsed and funded by Goebbels, effectively became 'official policy'.<sup>223</sup> One of the most vehement proponents for a nationalist reading of Bruckner's music, Josef Schalk, had, after all, been a first-edition editor himself.<sup>224</sup> Commentators up to the late 1930s reveal no tendency to advocate original scores on the basis of any sort of 'Jewish' corruption of pure, Aryan Bruckner—such arguments only emerge in statements made by Haas long after the editorial policy of the GA had been established. As we have seen, both Siegmund von Hausegger (who held strong National Socialist affiliations) and Franz Schalk compared the original score of the Ninth with the Löwe edition and wrote glowing affidavits in favour of the latter; that it had been edited by a Jew clearly played no role whatsoever for Hausegger. Uppermost in his mind, obviously, was what was perceived as the greater effectiveness and professionalism of Löwe's orchestration and, presumably, the preconception that the autograph represented no more than a draft. The dilemma, therefore, for the Bruckner scholar and performer during the 1930s, before the matter was 'closed', perhaps peremptorily, by Haas' recourse to Nazi subvention, appears to have come down to the seemingly primitive, unsophisticated nature of Bruckner's orchestration vs. the fact that the first editions altered not only it, but many aspects of Bruckner's music which by then were coming to be seen as integral aspects of his style, including the greater degree of dissonance found in the original scores. This left many in a dilemma. Apparently with full knowledge of the extent of Löwe's alteration, but not without considerable misgivings, Friedrich Klose wrote:

Symph. IX. ist mir—ich muß das auf die Gefahr hin exkommuniziert zu werden gestehen—, in der Löwe'schen Fassung lieber. Die Art, wie in der Originalfassung die Instrumentengruppen gegenübergestellt sind und das brutale Hervortreten nackter Bläser-

---

<sup>222</sup> p. 21.

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143.

<sup>224</sup> Cf. Thomas Leibnitz, "Anton Bruckner and 'German Music': Josef Schalk and the establishment of Bruckner as a national composer", in: Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson, eds., *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, Aldershot 2001, pp. 328–340 *passim*.



Partien empfinde ich nicht mehr als Kraft sondern als Härte. Allerdings, auf den erschütternden, wie ein plötzliches Grauen vor dem Gespenst des Todes wirkenden grellen Aufschrei vor dem verklärten Schluß des Adagios in der Version der Originalfassung, dürfte nie verzichtet werden.<sup>225</sup>

### *Some attempted conclusions*

That political forces played a role in establishing the GA goes without saying; already in the early 1980s Winfried Kirsch<sup>226</sup> wrote perceptively of the Bruckner GA that:

Ihr Ziel, die Erstellung einer jeweiligen, von allen fremden Zutaten und Abstrichen bereinigten Originalfassung, von allem der Sinfonien, hatte einen ideologischen Hintergrund und kollidierte nicht nur mit den in der Aufführungspraxis etablierte Fassungen [...], sondern mußte sich auch in manchen Fällen als eine Fiktion erweisen, da eine gewisse diesbezügliche Ambivalenz bei Bruckner selbst der nachträglichen Fixierung eines endgültigen Noten-Textes nur bedingte Gültigkeit aufkommen läßt.

For Nowak, however, “[n]ur das gilt, was Bruckner selbst in seinen Partituren geschrieben hat”.<sup>227</sup> How are we to reconcile this apparent dilemma? The post-1946 edition refined Haas’ editorial principles by eschewing the ‘ideal versions’ or ‘Mischfassungen’ represented by the latter’s editions of the Second and Eighth symphonies.<sup>228</sup> However, Nowak accepted the 1890 Finale of the Third while continuing to overlook the significance of the first edition of the Fourth, the Stichvorlage of which revealed numerous autograph corrections by Bruckner in the (radically revised) score in a copyist’s hand.<sup>229</sup> Questions raised concerning the authenticity of the 1889 version of the Third Symphony were dealt with by Thomas Röder, who demonstrated the extent to which Bruckner not only condoned the radically revised and shortened Finale of that movement,<sup>230</sup> but, by means of his own corrections and rescorings, effectively endorsed it.<sup>231</sup>

Manfred Wagner usefully noted that first and subsequent versions of Bruckner’s works reflected variant compositional agendas:

<sup>225</sup> In a statement appended to Alfred Orel, “Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner”, p. 223. Korstvedt writes concerning this: “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” (“Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich...” p. 158, fn. 75).

<sup>226</sup> “Die Bruckner Forschung... (II)”, pp. 163f.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38.

<sup>228</sup> See Nowak, pp. 39f.

<sup>229</sup> See, as already mentioned, Benjamin M. Korstvedt’s dissertation *The First Edition of Bruckner’s Fourth Symphony* and his article “The First Published Edition of Bruckner’s Fourth Symphony...”, *passim*.

<sup>230</sup> In ÖNB 6081; the score of the Finale is again not in Bruckner’s but in Franz Schalk’s hand.

<sup>231</sup> See Thomas Röder, “Das ‘verstümmelte’ Finale: Zum vierten Satz von Anton Bruckners Dritter Symphonie”, *IBG-Mitt* no. 37 (Dec. 1991), pp. 11–20, Röder’s paper at the Manchester Bruckner conference (April 1996) “The 1889 version of the Third Symphony: a ‘piece of butchery’?” dealt with the question in more detail.

Die erste Fassung ist jeweils zweifellos die direkteste, persönlichste und von außen am wenigsten beeinflusste, die zweiten und späteren Fassungen sind Varianten, die den Einfluß von außen, die bessere Ausführbarkeit der einzelnen Stimmen im Orchester, die Rezeptionshaltung von Kritikern und Freunden, die mögliche Annahme durch das Publikum einbezog[en]. Es mag schon sein, daß Bruckner selbst von einer persönlichen Warte her Verbesserungen vorbedachte, wahrscheinlicher aber ist, daß ihm, der zeit seines Lebens eine ausnahmslos kurzfristige Zielvorstellung bei der Erfüllung seiner Wünsche bevorzugte, Andersartigkeit und Anpassung gar nicht als jene Diskrepanz, die wir heute erkennen, ins Bewußtsein drängten.<sup>232</sup>

Setting aside Wagner's recourse to popular psychology, the 'authenticity' of Bruckner's scores can perhaps be understood as a matter of degree, a relative rather than an absolute. Bruckner may have agreed to the publication and performance of the first editions, despite their shortcomings, as he realised that his works would otherwise simply not be published or performed; strange as it appears today, there was as yet no established path in nineteenth-century editorial practice which could have allowed him as composer to overrule the choices made 'for the better' by his editors; compromise was preferable to complete oblivion, and the path apparently taken by him, in which the modified first editions prepared the way for the eventual acceptance, forty years later, of his original, far more novel and uncompromising scores (meanwhile wisely committed into the keeping of a higher authority), reveals in hindsight that he probably made a wise choice. The first editions, in so far as Bruckner can be shown to have been involved with them, are therefore important, but are not necessarily more authentic than the autographs simply because they are later: as collaborations, even if sanctioned by Bruckner, they are in effect 'less' authentic.

Such an evaluation of textual authenticity by degrees, rather than by a totalising either/or choice, still predicates some sort of involvement on the part of the composer. A year after Korstvedt and Botstein raised their doubts about the scholarly axioms of the GA, Paul Hawkshaw, in his "The Bruckner Problem Revisited"<sup>233</sup> pointed out with admirable clarity that none of the first editions can be seen as having anything more than essentially documentary value if they emerged, to quote Hawkshaw, "as a result of the composer being deliberately removed from the circumstances of their preparation, as was the case with the first editions of the F-Minor Mass, and the Fifth, Sixth, and Eighth Symphonies".<sup>234</sup> Franz Schalk himself confessed in 1930 in his memoirs that the alterations in the first editions were made in the hope of making the works more readily accessible to players and audiences, maintaining that "the time has not yet come to consider the pioneering and still forward-looking works of the master from an exclusively historical/critical and comparative

---

<sup>232</sup> *BrLWD*, p. 396.

<sup>233</sup> *19th-Century Music* 21 (1997–8), pp. 96ff.

<sup>234</sup> P. 104; cf. Korstvedt, *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony*, p. 91.

perspective”.<sup>235</sup> Moreover (again Schalk): “Many of the changes would not be necessary today”. As Hawkshaw pointed out, “Conspicuously absent [from Schalk’s memoirs] is an attempt to justify any of the first editions on the basis of Bruckner’s involvement or endorsement.”<sup>236</sup> He went on to explain:

During the 1880s, Bruckner entered into collaborative working relationships with his students for the purposes of publication of his works. As both he and the students grew older, the latter proceeded more and more without him. Bruckner sanctioned some elements in the first editions and some he did not. [...] Given the incontrovertible and overwhelming evidence of unauthorised tampering as well as of his growing dissatisfaction with editorial procedures, the readings in the first prints must remain suspect unless their authenticity can be verified on an individual basis.<sup>237</sup>

Accordingly, the stipulations made in Bruckner’s will of 1893, in which he bequeathed his original scores to what is now the ÖNB, with the request they be made available to his publishers in the future, represents for Hawkshaw and many other scholars the final point in Bruckner’s attitude toward the efforts of his editors and, if it has any meaning at all, seems to show him moving from a psychology of acquiescence in their activities to one of apparent defiance of them.

In 2001 appeared a landmark doctoral thesis by Wolfgang Doebel, *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen: Die Konzepte der Bruckner-Schüler und ihre Rezeption bis zu Robert Haas* (Tutzing). This was the first attempt by a German scholar to comprehensively address the claims being made by US scholars such as Botstein and Korstvedt. As Doebel’s research is exhaustive and his findings far-reaching, even a brief summary of his approach to this issue cannot be made here. A few passages may suffice to point up some of the misapprehensions of the first-edition proponents:

Mit der Favorisierung der Erstdruck-Bearbeitungen gehen in den zitierten Quellen erhebliche Vorbehalte gegenüber den Partituren der (alten) Gesamtausgabe einher. Hier sind die Gründe für die Ablehnung allerdings hauptsächlich politisch motiviert. Hintergrund ist die Tatsache, daß das Projekt der Gesamtausgabe von der national-sozialistischen deutschen Regierung massive unterstützt wurde, und daß Robert Haas sich diese Vereinnahmung gefallen ließ—sicher nicht nur aus Opportunismus, sondern ebenso aus innerer Überzeugung.<sup>238</sup>

The contention that the first editions were dismissed on anti-Semitic grounds was conclusively dismissed by Doebel: “Außerdem ist eine Kongruenz zwischen Sympathie zur

---

<sup>235</sup> Quoted by Hawkshaw, pp. 105f.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.* This point was also noted by Doebel (p. 413), who pointed out that Schalk in his later years moved away from his earlier rejection of the autograph versions.

<sup>237</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>238</sup> p. 413.

nationalsozialistischen Ideologie und Verdammung der Erstdrucke und ihrer Bearbeiter bei keinem der Akteure auszumachen: So planten etwa Haas und Auer, Franz Schalk und Ferdinand Löwe als Herausgeber einzelner Bände einzubinden”.<sup>239</sup> As we have seen, even Siegmund von Hausegger had no qualms about praising the Löwe edition on its musical merits,<sup>240</sup> while Botstein’s arguments that the aesthetics of the Third Reich were responsible for the present-day monumental conception of Bruckner’s music, and his call for a return to a more ‘Schubertian’ Bruckner betray a false logic:

Diese Argumentation ignoriert, daß Monumentalität neben gemessenen Tempo und Klangpracht—nicht zuletzt durch zahlreiche Äußerungen Bruckners zur Interpretation seiner Musik belegt—zu den integralen Bestandteilen der Brucknerscher Tonsprache zu zählen ist und nicht—von wem auch immer—in sie hineininterpretiert werden muß. Folglich war die Entdeckung und in der Folge die Betonung der Monumentalität Bruckners durch die Veröffentlichung der Originalfassungen in den dreißiger Jahren die Voraussetzung für die Vereinnahmung durch die nationalsozialistische Ideologie, nicht jedoch deren Ergebnis! <sup>241</sup>

In summary, so Doebel concluded, “Dieser in jüngster Zeit besonders in den USA eingeschlagene Weg weist also in die Irre”;<sup>242</sup> “[...] die von Leopold Nowak vorgenommene Trennung gegenüber Anton Bruckner und die Nachwelt [ist] der ehrlichste Weg”.<sup>243</sup> A suitable closing word on the issue goes to Pamela Potter:

It is incumbent upon scholars to be wary of directions in scholarship that may gain in popularity because they serve the needs of a particular political agenda. [...] Above all, scholarship must remain sensitive to the exploitation of such trends toward castigating a group arbitrarily designated as a nemesis, regardless of whether that nemesis is defined by race, ethnicity, gender, intellectual orientation, or a set of beliefs.<sup>244</sup>

### 1.3.6 Alfred Orel and the *Entwürfe und Skizzen*.

As we have already seen,<sup>245</sup> the performance and publication of the Ninth Symphony unleashed a storm of controversy and often personal recriminations against both the memory of Bruckner’s first-edition editors and, from the opposing side, against Haas and the IBG and ÖNB.<sup>246</sup> However, the circumstances surrounding the publication of the companion volume

<sup>239</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>240</sup> P. 414; cf. pp. 234f.

<sup>241</sup> P. 416.

<sup>242</sup> P. 415.

<sup>243</sup> P. 416.

<sup>244</sup> *Most German of the Arts*, p. 265.

<sup>245</sup> Cf. Nowak’s account “Die Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe...”, p. 35, quoted in §1.3.4.

<sup>246</sup> Auer for instance pleads for the avoidance of personal animosities in both instalments of his article “Der Streit... (I)”, p. 545 and (II), p. 1196.

to the score of the first three movements, *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie*,<sup>247</sup> Orel's problematic analysis of the sources and even the disposition and layout of the volume itself, while not nearly as high-profile, were to have far-reaching consequences for the ensuing reception of the Ninth Symphony and its Finale.

Like Haas' editions of the other symphonies, Orel's publication of the then-known sketches and drafts for the entire symphony—rather than his publication of the completed movements of the Ninth, which appeared with only a brief foreword by way of critical report—was a remarkable feat of musicological scholarship. Yet his often misleading representation of the sources for the Ninth, however well-intended, was full of errors of philologic method as well as omissions from, and misreadings of, Bruckner's autographs, and was further obscured by numerous typographic errors. These shortcomings were recognized by Leopold Nowak,<sup>248</sup> who in 1934–35 undertook a detailed correction of the Orel edition, corrections not made public at the time and subsequently never brought to public attention, although Nowak was to cherish the intention of republishing the materials for the Ninth throughout the remainder of his life.<sup>249</sup> Only in 1984, fourteen years after Nowak's formal retirement, did the following, from its context obviously to be understood as a disclaimer, finally appear in print:

In den *Entwürfen und Skizzen* verwirklichte sich auch zum ersten Mal die Absicht der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe, alle zu einem Werk vorhandenen Skizzen mitzuteilen. Dazu muß bemerkt werden, daß ein solches Vorhaben vor dem Bearbeiter nicht zu unterschätzende Schwierigkeiten aufwirft: sie sind gerade bei der Neunten Symphonie reichlich vorhanden. Die sich daraus ergebenden Probleme zeitlicher Reihung und der Lesbarmachung der nicht selten an einer Stelle zwei- oder dreimal übereinandergeschriebenen Einfälle gleichen Rätseln, deren Lösungen oft nicht so leicht gefunden werden können.<sup>250</sup>

Having forewarned the reader concerning the likely inadequacies of the publication, Nowak goes on to be more specific. For the first time he pointed out that:

Diesem ersten Symphonieband, der ja eines der Hauptwerke Bruckners enthält, widerfuhr ein Mißgeschick: Bei seinem Erscheinen im Jahre 1934 wurde den Herausgebern bekannt, daß in der Preußischen Staatsbibliothek in Berlin noch Skizzenmaterial zur Neunten vorhanden sei. Orel war dies entgangen und so mußte seine Bearbeitung der Entwürfe, an der noch manches andere auszusetzen war, als unvollständig bezeichnet werden. Mit Rücksicht darauf, daß ein Bekanntwerden dieser

<sup>247</sup> *Vorgelegt und erläutert von Alfred Orel. Sonderdruck aus: Anton Bruckner – Sämtliche Werke/ 9. Band: IX. Symphonie D-Moll/ (Originalfassung)* Leipzig 1934, pp. 1–6 and 68–143 being reproduced in vol. II, section D. Facs. C/336 reproduces the title page of the volume.

<sup>248</sup> As noted also by Sonntag, p. iii.

<sup>249</sup> Nowak's interest, as we have seen (§1.2.6), extended well into his retirement, as evidenced by documents in F60 BRGA 68.

<sup>250</sup> "Die Anton Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe...", *BrJb* 1982–83, p. 37.

Umstände dem eben so günstig begonnenen Unternehmen schaden könnte, beschloß man, die Neuarbeitung durch Orel auf einen späteren Zeitpunkt zu verschieben.<sup>251</sup>

Of course, the proposed “Neuarbeitung” never came about, not least because the Berlin MSS were presumed lost or destroyed during the Second World War, as we have already seen. But even more crucially, the detailed and objective discussion of Bruckner’s compositional technique which should have eventuated never emerged.

The evolution of Orel’s own thinking about the Finale can be traced from an initial article published in the early 1920s which discussed four bifolios acquired by the Stadtbibliothek in 1914–15 from the widow of Cyrill Hynais, and which reveals how little Orel knew about the Finale up to this point in time.<sup>252</sup> Auer had looked through the Schalk material in 1911 and made his own notes, but had yet to publish his biography. Accordingly, Orel could merely cite the earliest major biography to appear on Bruckner, that of journalist Ernst Decsey,<sup>253</sup> which made reference to Ferdinand Löwe and Josef Schalk having found “75 Partiturbogen [...], die die Skizzen zu jenem letzten Finale enthielten” in Bruckner’s estate, and questioned how much of that material might still be extant, and whether the four Stadtbibliothek bifolios were among the 75 described in the Protokoll or separate from them.<sup>254</sup> The GA was only instituted in the late 1920s, so it is unlikely that Orel had made serious enquiries concerning the whereabouts of privately held materials much before then. We also know that an initial version of the publication was typeset before Orel gained access to the Schalk material; the green proofs for this initial version of 1928–29, were used by Orel as the basis for the much expanded and revised text.<sup>255</sup> Although the preface to the volume, “Die Entstehung des Werkes” is dated March 1934 (cf. D/4), the redrafting of the entire section dealing with the Finale obviously took place between late 1929 and 1931, during which time Franz Schalk made the Finale material available to Orel on loan.<sup>256</sup> The revised typesetting, as well as the publication of the volume was delayed by the collapse of Filser Verlag in 1932 (§1.2.6 *supra*); as surviving correspondence in F60 BRGA 10/3 reveals, the revised proofs were not completed by Brandstetter until 1933.

In line with the volumes of the GA edited by Haas, the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* was originally envisioned as the *Vorlagebericht* (i.e., *Kritischer Bericht*) on the Ninth Symphony,

---

<sup>251</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>252</sup> “Skizzen zum Vierten Satz von Bruckners Neunter Symphonie”, *Der Merker* 12, no. 19 (1921–22), pp. 411–419.

<sup>253</sup> *Bruckner: Versuch eines Lebens*, Berlin 1919, p. 110.

<sup>254</sup> Orel, p. 412.

<sup>255</sup> These are preserved in the ÖNB as Fonds F60 BRGA 34 and 35.

<sup>256</sup> Incidentally, no comprehensive photocopies of the Schalk material, which Haas collected in most other cases of Bruckner sources not held by the ÖNB (the ÖNB’s Photogramm Archiv was begun by him) and which would surely have facilitated Orel’s task, have come to light; that these were not made was presumably out of respect for Schalk’s wishes.

and is cited in this form in most of the Bruckner GA correspondence; it only appears to have been re-entitled *Sonderband zu Band 9: Entwürfe und Skizzen* shortly before its official appearance in 1934.<sup>257</sup> Replacing it in function, a brief Vorwort detailing salient features of Bruckner's autograph, such as the metrical numbers, was included in the published score of the first three movements. The name change probably reflects the fact that Orel, unlike Haas, eschewed detailed lists and discussions of the deviations of the first edition from the autograph; doubtless, as Doebel points out,<sup>258</sup> the huge task of transcribing and elucidating the material for the Finale absorbed his entire time and attention; however, since the Ninth was also the only first-edition score to have emerged long after Bruckner's death, Orel may simply have regarded a detailed comparison as redundant.

Orel opened the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* with a description of the genesis of the Ninth (D/3) using the principal dates available to him before proceeding to an analysis of paper types (D/3f.) and a brief description of Bruckner's working methods (D/5). A glance at his listing of sources (D/6) shows that he was able to obtain in all some 258 folios of drafts and sketches for the entire Ninth Symphony, his principal sources being the two StB signatures 4189 and 3791 (72 fols.), the four Nationalbibliothek signatures ÖNB 3165, 3196, 3194 and 3176<sup>259</sup> (29 fols.), and the 144 fols. of material for the Finale then still in the possession of Lili, Schalk's widow. In addition to this came a further four groups of material (7 fols. in all) likewise held in private hands (one conspicuously unnamed) and two groups of material held by the Staatsakademie für Musik and the Wiener Schubertbund (together, 6 fols.). Orel initially overlooked the five fols. for the 1st, 3rd and 4th movements of the Ninth (ÖNB 3176) that he published as a 'Nachtrag'<sup>260</sup> yet which, according to the ÖNB's inventory lists, were among a miscellany of sks. that had already been acquired by the ÖNB from the Hueber family as early as 1927.

Orel's treatment of the Finale (cf. D/64ff.) was, of course, to prove fateful for the subsequent reception of the movement. While his transcriptions of the pc. sks. (D/64–75) remain useful today, his ordering of them, and his analysis of the score material and the conclusions he drew from it were seriously flawed. Having ascertained that the surviving score material was prepared using several different standard patterns or rulings, based on an

---

<sup>257</sup> Along with two copies of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* (so-titled) with Nowak's corrections (F60 BRGA 245/15 a and b), the ÖNB holds a further early version of the volume still entitled *Vorlagebericht*, F60 BRGA 245/16 with annotations from Nowak (see further §3.1.1), and a copy of the score of the first three movements, F60 BRGA 245/14, with annotations made by Nowak presumably in the preparation for his re-edition of 1951.

<sup>258</sup> p. 186.

<sup>259</sup> Of these, the signatures 3165 and 3176 consisted of groups of unrelated sketches that had been bound together by the family of Rosalie Hueber, and were later split up by Nowak into separate signatures. See Table I, A/1f., and Table VI, A/23f.

<sup>260</sup> Pp. 140ff. of Orel's original publication; Finale-relevant material thereof see D/143 "J"

examination of the handwriting and orthography of the instrumental indications,<sup>261</sup> Orel proceeded to interpret the score material in the context of a series of ostensibly (yet even for Orel not actually) independent “Fassungen” A to E, or A to F (although F is cited by Orel only as a separate paper type, cf. D/116). In fact, with the exception of the so-called ‘Fassung A’ material, Bruckner did not rule up his own score paper at all, but merely left it to his secretary Meißner to prepare further supplies when his stock either ran out or ran low. Hence, the points at which paper rulings changed—regardless of how useful such differentiations are for posthumous elucidations of compositional process—were purely fortuitous. Although in analysing the drafts for the first movement Orel also spoke of a number of “Fassungen”,<sup>262</sup> in the case of the Finale, Orel’s (in itself quite useful) subdivision into a series of compositional phases on the basis of observed rulings were to give rise to the wholly incorrect notion that the Finale existed in a number of separate, distinct and contradictory versions. The implication, seized upon by critics ever since, was that Bruckner had never established the form of the movement at all. Three factors contributed to this misinterpretation: (a) the losses to the materials themselves, (b) the effects of the dislocations of context caused by Orel’s presentation of the materials in presumed order of composition, rather than in order of musical continuity, and finally (c) Orel’s misclassification of several bifols.—among them the egregious case of the last surviving bifol. of the score, 31E/“32”, which he categorised as a “21. Bog. E”, in contradiction to the musical content of the corresponding D-bifol., thereby throwing the continuity of the entire latter half of the movement into doubt.

Aside from this latter derailment, it was in fact perfectly clear to Orel that not all the material had survived or could have survived, as is apparent from several points in his narrative text.<sup>263</sup> On the contrary, as Orel himself pointed out (see D/64) and Haas confirmed (*infra*), the Finale, by comparison with the drafts for the Adagio, was left in a highly advanced stage of compositional evolution. On that basis alone there would, or should, have been no reason to charge Bruckner with failing powers of musical conception. It was Orel’s questionable exegesis of the score’s paper rulings as ‘Fassungen’, the problem of the late, and largely apocryptic, repeated SVE for the beginning of the Exp. and Durchf. and most of all his disastrous misclassification of the final bifol. of the score as a competing E-version of bifol. 21D that probably gave rise to his contention (D/4) of a “sonst kaum irgendwo zu beobachtende fünffache Umarbeitung der Partitur, deren letzte erhaltene Fassung aber noch immer nicht den endgültigen Text darstellen dürfte”. While Orel elsewhere acknowledged that “Es ist kein Fall bekannt, daß Bruckner selbst eine Gleichschrift eines seiner großen Werke

<sup>261</sup> See 0.3, Concerning bifol. classifications.

<sup>262</sup> “1. Die erste Partiturniederschrift”, Orel edition, p. 17, “2. Die Umarbeitung von Partiturniederschrift I zur Fassung MS”, p. 11 “Die frühere Fassung MS”, p. 17.

<sup>263</sup> See for instance D/77, 91, 103, 110, 116.



angefertigt hätte”,<sup>264</sup> the notion that the score fragments of the Finale presented an emergent score probably never occurred to him for simple reason that he was unclear about the correct collocation of 21E, which invalidated the structure of the movement as a whole and made it appear as if Bruckner had, at a late stage, drafted a radically different version of the movement, most of which, presumably, was lost. The reasonable conclusion was that major revisions were still ongoing; a definitive continuity for the movement, in any case, had not been achieved. Orel acknowledged that this was possible in the case of the first three movements too, where Bruckner’s AP obviously represented the last ‘authentic’ version, “womit keineswegs gesagt werden soll, daß der Meister, wäre ihm noch die Vollendung des Werkes beschieden gewesen, nicht nachträglich mancherlei Änderung angebracht hätte”.<sup>265</sup>

The 1934 publication further had the effect of giving official credence to Bruckner’s verbally transmitted injunction that the *Te Deum* should be performed as a substitute for the instrumental Finale, dismissing it along with Löwe’s statement that the sketches were those of a “großangelegte Überleitungsmusik zum *Te Deum*”. The existence of solid documentary evidence, as we have seen (§1.1.11), that Bruckner considered using the torso of the movement as a transition was presumably unknown to Orel, although it was to Auer. As Orel’s concluding paragraph<sup>266</sup> avers,

[a]ngesichts des weit fortgeschrittenen Stadiums der Arbeit, das die Entwürfe [...] darstellen—[...]—erscheint die auf einen Wunsch des Meisters zurückgeführte Gepflogenheit, den vollständig überlieferten 3 Sätzen als Abschluß das *Tedeum* anzufügen, zweifellos als bloßer Notbehelf. Die Bemerkung ‘*Tedeum*’ in Bogen 11 A<sup>267</sup> erlaubt im Hinblick auf die typisch Brucknersche Finalform des Satzes keineswegs den Schluß, daß es sich hier um eine Überleitungsmusik zum *Tedeum* handle. [...] Die Absicht Bruckners, die IX. Symphonie durch ein groß angelegtes Finale abzuschließen, läßt die verschiedentlich unternommenen Versuche, die Anfügung des *Tedeums* innerlich zu rechtfertigen und derart eine Verbindung zwischen den beiden 10 Jahre auseinanderliegenden Werken zu konstruieren, müßig erscheinen.

Orel then closes—almost inevitably—with a sentimentalist recourse to fate and symbolic teleology typical of the musicology of the period:

Im Gegenteil, der Adagio-Abschluß des Torsos, als den Bruckner die 9. Symphonie hinterließ, erhält durch den Gedanken, daß die rauhe Hand des Schicksals dem greisen Meister nicht allzulang vor der Vollendung des Finales die Feder entwand, symbolhafte Bedeutung.

<sup>264</sup> “Original und Bearbeitung...”, p. 218.

<sup>265</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 216.

<sup>266</sup> D/139.

<sup>267</sup> Cf. Facs. C/202; Orel D/98 (fn. of the present writer).

In summary, Orel's conclusions rested upon premises that were ultimately paradoxical. They effectively rendered Bruckner's actual symbolic intentions for the symphony—the conclusion with the *Te Deum*—null and void, while the no less symbolic—but from the composer's point of view uncountenanced—conclusion with the *Adagio* was declared meaningful. The irony of Orel's stance in dismissing the *Te Deum* is the fact that he and Haas, in publishing the original scores, were insisting upon precisely the overriding authority of authorial intent which Orel was here unwilling to grant to the composer's wishes. After all his efforts to restore and elucidate Bruckner's original text, Orel ended by endorsing the convention of an inauthentic performance tradition.

### 1.3.7 Reception in the 1930s and early 1940s.

As we have seen, the first ever performance of the 'restored' original score took place in Munich April 1932, and the first public performance, with Clemens Krauß and the Vienna Philharmonic, took place on 23 October 1932 in Vienna as the final concert of the IBG's "Wiener Fest-Tagung" of that year. In the wake of these events, with interest sparked by the eventual appearance of the delayed score and the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* in 1934, a plethora of articles was to appear,<sup>268</sup> the majority of which, however, dealt almost exclusively, and understandably, with a comparison of the radically different sound-pictures presented by the Löwe and original scores of the first three movements. Perhaps not least because the impact of the restored original score itself was so overwhelming and the controversy it engendered so great, very little response to the Orel's edition of the drafts and sketches ever appeared in print—a surprising fact considering its significance as a musicological opus—the more general (and, indeed, significant) concern with the re-establishment of Bruckner's original scores in the concert hall simply swamped the 'purely' musicological discussion of sketches and compositional process. The Munich Bruckner biographer and musicologist Oskar Lang was later to write at greater length on Orel's presentation of the Finale materials (*infra*)<sup>269</sup> but usually, where any discussion of the Finale was undertaken, as in a 1935 article by Willi

<sup>268</sup> Among them one of the earliest notices, Wolfgang von Bartels, "Münchener Bruckner-Pflege", *Br-Blätter* 4, no. 1 (Jan.–April 1932), pp. 23ff. See further: Max Auer, "Die Neunte Symphonie in der Originalfassung: Zur ersten Aufführung durch die Wiener Philharmoniker unter Clemens Krauß am 23. Oktober 1932 in Wien", *ZfM* 99, no. 10 (Oct. 1932), pp. 861–870; English transl. *idem*, "Bruckner's Ninth: The Original Version", *Ch&D* 1, no. 4 (Oct. 1933), pp. 7–11; *idem*, "Die IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung", *BrBlätter* 1934, no. 3, pp. 40–42; Paul Günzel, "Von Bruckners 'Neunter Symphonie'", *ZfM* 99 no. 5 (May 1932), p. 427; Willi Reich, "Bruckner's Ninth (the Original Version)", *Ch&D* 1, no. 6 (1935), pp. 15–16; A. Neuberg, "Das Scherzo der Neunten: Ein Vergleich beider Fassungen", *Dresdener Bruckner-Blätter* no. 3, pp. 9–14. Orel himself sought to make his research more readily accessible with his publication, in the same year as the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* finally appeared, of his concise overview "Zur Entstehung von Bruckners IX. Symphonie", *BrBlätter* 1–2 (1934), pp. 2–7; the compositional chronology is also given in his "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner", pp. 193–222.

<sup>269</sup> Lang published a brief article in 1938 on the earlier drafts for the Trios, "Zwei frühere Fassungen des Trios der IX. Symphonie von Anton Bruckner", *ZfM* 105, no. 12 (Dec. 1938), pp. 1328–1330.

Reich, it was likely to consist of a brief and laudatory review of the edition, make reference to the existence of a well-advanced series of drafts for the Finale (invariably cited as existing in “six separate versions”) and censure the notion of appending the *Te Deum* to the symphony—“alas, so frequently carried out by conductors”—a notion that “corresponds in no respect to the composer’s true intention”.<sup>270</sup>

Curiously, responses appear to have been more forthcoming in England where, in the 1930s and early 1940s, Egon Wellesz,<sup>271</sup> Dika Newlin<sup>272</sup> and later, in three publications, Hans Ferdinand Redlich<sup>273</sup> (who also gave the first English piano presentation of the Finale in 1948<sup>274</sup>) were to respond with greater interest.<sup>275</sup> But by and large, as the ensuing review of the (extensive) relevant literature reveals,<sup>276</sup> the majority of musicologists and popular writers alike simply ignored the publication and with it the question of the Finale. In a sense it is striking that the Finale attracted as little interest as it did, given that a completely unknown Bruckner movement—the intended last movement to one of his three most popular symphonies—was appearing in print for the first time.

Not surprisingly, however, Robert Haas’ Bruckner biography of 1934 represented an initial and important exception. For the first time in a general biography, Haas integrated discussion of the Finale within that of the whole symphony, which he quite accurately described as “unvollständig und umfaßt nur drei fertig abgeschlossene Sätze, das Finale ist in einem sehr fortgeschrittenen Zustand der Arbeit steckengeblieben”,<sup>277</sup> and indeed that, “Nach der Skizzenvorarbeit zum Adagio dürfte der ganze Satz im ersten Entwurf fertig gewesen sein”.<sup>278</sup> Rather than merely making an oblique reference to the existence of the movement, Haas dealt with the Finale—appropriately—in as much detail as the other, completed movements, giving a clear overview of the formal structure of the fourth movement (as sonata form) and five musical examples,<sup>279</sup> concluding (as did Orel) at the point at which the chorale enters in the Repr. accompanied by the *Te-Deum* figuration in the strings,<sup>280</sup> at which point

<sup>270</sup> Willi Reich, “Bruckner’s Ninth (the Original Version)”, pp. 15f.

<sup>271</sup> “Anton Bruckner and the Process of Musical Creation”, as quoted *supra*.

<sup>272</sup> *Bruckner—Mahler—Schoenberg*, London 1947, 1978, pp. 56 and 101f. (see quotation *infra*).

<sup>273</sup> “The Finale of Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony”, *MMR* 79 (July–Aug. 1949), pp. 143–149, *Bruckner and Mahler*, London 1955, pp. 103ff., and subsequently the Preface to the Eulenburg edn. of the Ninth Symphony, ed. H. H. Schönzeler, 1963. See *infra*.

<sup>274</sup> See §1.4.4 *infra*.

<sup>275</sup> In a sense Bruckner reception advanced more rapidly in the USA where, in 1931 a ‘Bruckner Society of America’ was founded while in the following year its organ, the journal *Chord and Discord*, first appeared.

<sup>276</sup> As will be seen in the ensuing §1.3.7.

<sup>277</sup> *Bruckner*, p. 152.

<sup>278</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 156.

<sup>279</sup> Roughly equivalent to Mus. Exx. 25a, b, c, g and m; B/23f.

<sup>280</sup> Cf. Mus. Ex. 25t, B/25.

“reißt der quellenmäßig erfaßbare Stoff ab; vor der Vollendung und Ausfeilung des Finales hat der Tod den Meister abberufen”.<sup>281</sup> Haas' statements confirm that that other great doyen of Bruckner scholarship held no doubts about either the structure of the movement or its significance.

A 1934 article by Oskar Lang dealing specifically with the drafts for the Finale<sup>282</sup> pointed out that the edition finally proved that there were indeed substantial drafts and not merely fleeting sketches for the Finale, and discussed the materials and their presentation in the Orel edition. The extent of the published materials might have led readers to assume that (despite Orel's disclaimers), a complete movement lay before them, and Lang accordingly felt obliged to warn:

daß, auch abgesehen von der fehlenden Coda ein logisch einheitliches, lückenlos zusammenhängendes Ganze[s] nicht vorliegt, daß auch die spätesten Fassungen noch kaum den endgültigen Text darstellen dürften und wir letzten Endes doch nur Bruckstücke in Händen haben, für die das bindende Band fehlt; allerdings Bruchstücke von einer Großartigkeit, Wucht und Monumentalität bereits in der Anlage, wie sie nur eine so geniale, zu letzter Klärung gereifte Schöpferkraft wie die Bruckners hervorzubringen vermochte.<sup>283</sup>

That the sources might not permit a comprehensive view of all that Bruckner had written was not raised, however. Lang's article proceeded to paraphrase the Exp. of the movement in the characteristically purple prose typical of the time. Unlike Haas, Lang made no assertions as to the form of the movement—perhaps because its structure was not apparent from anything less than a detailed study of Orel. A number of passages of the article are instructive as an indication of the subjective, metaphysical modes of listening in which Bruckner's music was then received. Lang wrote of the movement's opening measures:<sup>284</sup>

Schon dieser Anfang bannt wie mit magischem Zauber, indem er noch einmal die Auflösungsstimmung des vorhergehenden Adagiosatzes beschwört. Aus geheimnisvollen Urgründen aufsteigend ertönen Klänge, die uns das Abscheiden der Seele von allem Irdischen auf der Schwelle des Todes und jenes Hinübergleiten ins Überirdische als vorgeahnte Wirklichkeit mit einer Intensität erleben lassen, die uns erschauern macht. Entbunden von allen Fesseln der Materie verharren wir in einem seltsam körperlosen, dämmerhaft ungewissen Schwebezustand auf der Grenze zwischen Leben und Sterben, zwischen Diesseits und Jenseits, der aber umwittert ist von Ahnungen des Vergangenen und Kommenden und in seiner visionären Transzendenz mystische Zusammenhänge offenbart.

---

<sup>281</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 157.

<sup>282</sup> “Die Entwürfe zum Finale der 9. Symphonie Anton Bruckners”, *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 61 (1934), pp. 445–447.

<sup>283</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 445; ensuing quotes pp. 446f.

<sup>284</sup> The first mm. of Mus. Ex. 25a, B/23, corresponding to his musical example; see further Exx. 25b, e and g.

The monumental Hauptthema is cited by Lang as being more typical of the third theme groups (“siehe Finale der 7., 1. Satz der 3. Symphonie”) and, while the ensuing transition and “Seitenthema” is “lückenhaft und unvollständig [...], sodaß man sich keine eindeutige Vorstellung davon machen kann”, the chorale is described by Lang in the following inspired terms:

Eherne Ruhe und ekstatische Berauschtigkeit sind hier zu einer Einheit verschmolzen, wie sie in so großartiger Weise selbst bei Bruckner nicht allzu häufig ist; es ist eine Musik, jenen Sphären zugehörig, die Goethe im ‘Prolog im Himmel’ des Faust erschloß, wie aus unendlichen Himmelshöhen herab tönender Gesang der Erzengel, die die Werke Gottes loben, die, ‘herrlich sind wie am ersten Tag’.

Eine letzte Stufe reifsten Meistertums ist hier erreicht, ein höchster Gipfel menschlicher Vollendung erklimmen, wo Allgeist und Eigenseele in reinsten Harmonie ineinander aufgegangen und eins geworden sind. In der Tat, der Eindruck ist so überwältigend, daß, hätte sich vom Finale auch nur dieser Choral erhalten, dies eine kaum noch genug einzuschätzende Bereicherung unseres Wissens um Bruckner bedeuten würde.

In summary, Lang can write that there is no question that “dieses Finale vollendet eines der Schönsten von Bruckner geworden wäre”. The proposal of the Te Deum was “lediglich ein Notbehelfsvorschlag”, as the composer “wußte natürlich genau so gut wie wir, daß die beiden Werke, deren Entstehung um ein Jahrzehnt auseinander liegt, ihrer ganzen Stilhaltung nach nicht zueinander passen, ganz abgesehen von der tonartlichen Abweichung (d-moll und C-dur).” The publication of the Finale drafts was important, because they represented “die letzten Klänge, die einer der Größten im Reiche der Tonkunst in seinem Leben vernahm, Klänge von einer Macht der Inspiration, die genugsam beweisen, daß Bruckners schöpferische Kraft bis in die letzte Tage hinein nicht geschwächt war”. While Lang maintained that an orchestral performance was not possible (“möge niemand versuchen[,] den Satz zu vollenden!”), he admonished he was in favour of the rapid publication of a four-hand or two-piano arrangement, proposing that lecture-performances be held at internal Bruckner-gesellschaft evenings. This may perhaps have been just the suggestion that led to the first presentation of the Finale by Orel’s assistant Else Kruger and Kurt Bohnen at a private IBG concert in Munich later in 1934.<sup>285</sup>

In this respect, the early reception of the Orel publication is significant for its illumination of the music reception of the period. In the initial phase, the dislocation and disappearance of Finale material, the lack of any clear awareness of its extent, and the subsequent suppression of all question of the Finale or Te Deum by the first interpreters and their apologists rendered the possibility of completion by colleagues or students—as was to be

---

<sup>285</sup> See §1.4.4. Lang wrote a further article based directly on the Orel edition, “Zwei frühere Fassungen des Trios der IX. Symphonie von Anton Bruckner”, *ZfM* no. 12 (Dec. 1938), pp. 1328–1330.

the case with works such as Puccini's *Turandot*, Busoni's *Doktor Faustus*, Berg's *Lulu* or Bartok's *Viola Concerto*—out of the question.

As Nicola Samale has suggested, however,<sup>286</sup> the Finale of the Ninth Symphony, not least due to its unusual stylistic nature, effectively 'reappeared' too late to permit completion by any composers of the period, as by 1934 musical style had moved on decisively, Bruckner's music was no longer regarded as anything like contemporary, and thinking about Bruckner's music and indeed Western art music in general was by this time imbued with a strongly nationalistic mindset, elevating the great German composers—among them, Bruckner—to a status that saw any tampering with their works as artistic sacrilege—if not cultural desecration.

It was surely the then-dominant stance toward the integrity and untouchability of the score that moved Fritz Oeser to err on the side of caution in preparing his performing version of the Exp. of the movement only—hence requiring only a bare minimum of instrumental retouchings and no supplementations of continuity—which was premiered at a Bruckner festival in Leipzig in 1941.<sup>287</sup> The prevailing cliché of the tragic incompleteness of the symphony proved more compelling than the chance of introducing a wider audience to a deeper understanding of the movement as a whole. Orel's presentation of the material, the trappings of a comprehensive and exhaustive philological documentation, and the mistaken notion that the movement existed in several different and contradictory versions, was simply too misleading, and musicologists rarely bothered to look more closely. Hence, Orel's publication ironically had the primary effect of merely endorsing the *status quo*, and did little or nothing to alter existing thinking. The Ninth Symphony, that is to say, its completed first three movements, had meanwhile ensconced itself firmly in the symphonic repertoire and became one of the composer's most highly regarded and best-known works, ranking closely in popularity to the Fourth and Seventh.<sup>288</sup> As cultural icon, it was now far removed from any uncomfortable questions as to Bruckner's intentions in writing it, how much of a fourth movement existed, whether or not one should attempt to perform it, and whether or not the symphony might be complete without it.

### 1.3.8 Max Auer and the Finale.

An important counterclaim to Orel's philologically founded assertion that the sketches nowhere imply a transition to the *Te Deum* and that the appendage of the *Te Deum* was pointless was that of the biographer Max Auer who had not only examined the Schalk MSS in 1911 (and left his own comments on them) but also made a transcription, ÖNB 19.677 (Facs.

---

<sup>286</sup> In a conversation in Vienna in April 1991.

<sup>287</sup> See discussion in §1.4.5.

<sup>288</sup> Noted for instance in Auer, *Bruckner* (1923), p. 336, 1934 edition, p. 359.

C/322ff.) of the four bifols. acquired by the StB from Hynais' estate c. 1921. Throughout the four editions of his shorter biography (1923, 1934, 1941 and 1947), Auer consistently maintained that Bruckner left substantial sketches for a fourth movement, and not only envisaged use of the *Te Deum* as a fourth movement but also conceived of using the score as a transition to the choral work, as we have discussed (§1.1.11).

The 1923 one-volume biography began with the standard line that “das Finale fertigzustellen war ihm nicht mehr gegönnt”,<sup>289</sup> endorsing the general opinion that:

Zufolge seines geistigen Inhaltes ist dieses Adagio nicht der ‘langsame Satz’, wie ihn die ‘Form’ vorschreibt, sondern, wie R. Hirschfeld und Max Morold ausführen, das wirklich vollkommen abschließende *Finale* der Symphonie und des ganzen Brucknerschen Lebenswerkes. Schon das Hauptthema dieses Satzes ist von den übrigen ersten Adagiothemen grundverschieden [...].<sup>290</sup>

We read further in the 1923 volume that Bruckner, “führte [...] bis zum letzten Tage seines Lebens den Stift, um seine ‘Neunte’ mit einem *Finale* zu Ende zu führen. Die umfangreichen Skizzen lassen erkennen, daß der Meister auch dieses Werk, wie die V. Symphonie, mit einem *rein instrumentalen Finale* und gewaltiger *Fuge* beschließen wollte. Mitten in den Arbeiten an der *Fuge* entriß ihm der Tod den Stift.”<sup>291</sup> The last sentence is presumably a conscious or unconscious echo of Bach’s purported death over the MS of *Die Kunst der Fuge*, and also an indication that, at this stage, Auer was probably unclear of the proper collocation of the Schalk or StB materials, and where the movement ended.

Following an explanation of Bruckner’s dedication of both Ninth Symphony and *Te Deum* “dem lieben Gott”, and his directive to use the *Te Deum* as the conclusion to the symphony (the wording betraying its origin in Fromm’s article, §1.3.3 *supra*), Auer continued: “Der todkranke Meister hat sogar den Versuch gemacht, eine *Überleitungsmusik* zum Tedeum zu schaffen. Die Skizzen derselben lassen ein *Hauptthema*, ein *Fugenthema*, einen *Choral* und das *Quintenthema* des *Te Deum* erkennen.” Auer then made an apparent allusion to Max Graf’s comments about the *Finale* movement (again, *supra*): “Einmal erscheinen diese Themen sogar übereinandergetürmt wie im *Finale* der ‘Achten’”, and concludes with the disclaimer: “Es ist anzunehmen, daß Bruckner bei seinem so ausgesprochenen Tonalitätsgefühl selbst wieder davon abgekommen ist, die D-Moll-Symphonie mit dem *Te Deum* in C-Dur zu schließen”,<sup>292</sup> obviously referring to the objections originally raised by Löwe and relayed by Fromm, to Bruckner’s idea of concluding with the *Te Deum*.

---

<sup>289</sup> *Bruckner* (1923), p. 311; italics here and in the following quotations original.

<sup>290</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 322.

<sup>291</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 326.

<sup>292</sup> *Ibid.*

The passage is amplified and amended in the 1934 edition, introducing references to the Orel publication, deleting comparison to the Fifth Symphony and its fugal conclusion, introducing Hans Richter as instigating use of the *Te Deum* as a *Finale*, and reorganising the order of statements:

Zwar führte Bruckner bis zum letzten Tage seines Lebens den Stift, um seine 'Neunte' mit einem *Finale* zu Ende zu führen. Die umfangreichen Skizzen lassen erkennen, daß der Meister auch dieses Werk mit einem *rein instrumentalen Finale* abschließen wollte. Hans Richter [...] hat Bruckner den Rat gegeben, das *Te Deum* als *Finale* zu verwenden [...] In den Skizzen des *Finales*, die ein Hauptthema, ein Fugenthema und einen Choral enthalten, treten gegen Ende auch die das *Te Deum* einleitenden Streicherfiguren auf. Man hat daraus geschlossen, daß der Meister damit eine Überleitung zum *Te Deum* schaffen wollte, was jedoch unwahrscheinlich ist, da, wie Alfred Orel im IX. Band der Gesamtausgabe nachweist, die Skizzen des *Finales* bis zur Koda gediehen waren. Bei dem ausgesprochenen Tonalitätssinn des Meisters ist anzunehmen, daß er ein Werk in d-Moll nicht mit C-Dur abgeschlossen hätte. Wie ungeheuer Bruckner mit der Gestaltung dieses Satzes rang, beweist die *funffache* Fassung derselben, die ebenfalls Orel nachweist. Einmal treten in diesen Skizzen alle Themen gleichzeitig übereinandergelagert auf, wie im *Finale* der 'Achten'.<sup>293</sup>

The passage remained in this form in the later editions of 1941 and 1947<sup>294</sup> with the exception of the omission of the statement concerning the suggestion of Hans Richter, which was dealt with separately. Four pages later we read that Bruckner's anxiety that he might not complete the *Finale* was assuaged by the conductor, who:

brachte ihn [...] auf den Gedanken, falls dies nicht mehr möglich sei, so möge er den Satz mit seinem *Te Deum* abschließen. Die in den *Finale*-Skizzen schon in der Durchführung auftauchenden Motive aus dem *Te Deum* und die von dem Einleitungsmotiv der Streicher aus dem *Te Deum* unrahmte Choralstelle vor der nicht mehr skizzierten Koda des ursprünglich rein instrumental gedachten *Finales* lassen ersehen, daß der Meister, nachdem er die Unmöglichkeit der Vollendung des Satzes erkannt hatte, sozusagen einen Notschluß mit dem *Te Deum* anfügen wollte, wobei die früher auftretenden *Te-Deum*-Motive den Eintritt desselben organisch herbeiführen sollten.<sup>295</sup>

The idea that Richter suggested concluding the *Finale*, rather than the symphony, with the *Te Deum*, in other words, that the *Finale* was to be used as a transition to the choral work, seems to represent the final stage in the evolution of Auer's thinking upon the matter. An intermediate step, and more likely to have been true, appears to have developed by the time he came to compile the penultimate volume (IV/3) of the Göllicherich-Auer biography, which was published in 1936. By that time Auer recognised that Hans Richter could by no means have

<sup>293</sup> *Bruckner* (1934), pp. 347f.; italics original. As noted in §1.3.4 *supra*, Auer's remarks concerning an overlay of themes are quoted in the sources for the reconstruction of the coda AP, E/138.

<sup>294</sup> Cf. *Bruckner* (1941), pp. 426.

<sup>295</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 430.



originated the notion of using the Te Deum as the fourth movement of the Symphony, as claimed in the 1934 *Bruckner*; in the 1936 volume Auer has Richter simply suggest the idea of using the Te Deum as Finale, following which Bruckner appears to have considered the idea of the transition for the first time:

Als Bruckner auch ihm [i.e., Richter] seinen Kummer wegen des unfertigen letzten Satzes der ‘Neunten’ mitteilte, gab ihm Richter, wie Meißner berichtet, den Rat, die Symphonie statt mit einem vierten Satz mit dem Te Deum abzuschließen. Der Meister war sehr dankbar, doch sah er ihn nur als letzten Ausweg an. Sobald er sich nur einigermaßen besser fühlte, setzte er sich ans Klavier, am Finale zu arbeiten. Er schien nun auch an eine Überleitung zum Te Deum zu denken und versprach sich, wie Meißner erzählt, ‘von dem weit einherschreitenden Hauptthema, vom Bläserchor hinausgeschmettert, und den darauf fern anklingenden bekannten und originellen Einleitungstakten des Te Deum, sowie den auftretenden Sängern eine ungeheure Wirkung[’]. Er wollte, wie er Meißner einigemal [sic] beim Vorspielen erzählte, gleichsam ‘an den Pforten der Ewigkeit rütteln’.<sup>296</sup>

Throughout volume IV/3, Auer repeatedly made the claim, with the overwhelming weight of the primary sources in his favour, that Bruckner not only seriously intended the Te Deum as a ‘permanent’ fourth movement to the symphony but, with the backing of reports by Meißner, Stradal and others, that he seriously considered the possibility of using the torso of the movement as a transition to the Te Deum.<sup>297</sup> The volume hence included an analysis of the Finale in some detail<sup>298</sup> that drew substantially on Orel—again with the citation of the ‘fünf Fassungen’—but went beyond that to analyse the torso of the movement—*pace* Orel, who had dismissed the idea out of hand—explicitly within the context of a transition to the Te Deum, “so daß sozusagen als Notschluß das Te Deum als Koda erscheinen sollte”.<sup>299</sup>

It is also of interest to note that in his 1934 article on the original version of the Ninth<sup>300</sup> (i.e., appearing in the same year as the second edition of his one-volume biography) Auer had used the perceivedly greater sense of ‘finality’ of the Adagio in the Löwe version to rebut the idea that the reworked score was superior to the original, confirming his argument with the fact that Bruckner intended a Finale movement to follow the Adagio. The article makes clear that, for Auer, Bruckner’s idea of a transition to the Te Deum developed as a later compromise attempt to rescue the torso of the movement. He writes:

Selbst wenn bei Löwe der Schluß des Adagios, wie behauptet wird, ‘viel ergreifender, verschwebender und abschließender’ klingt als im Original, so entspricht das nicht der

<sup>296</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 559.

<sup>297</sup> See discussion of this point in ch. 1.1 and again in chs. 3.1 and 3.3.

<sup>298</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 612ff. Auer gives three musical examples corresponding roughly with Mus. Exx. 25a, b, c, g, and t.

<sup>299</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 620.

<sup>300</sup> “Die IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung”, *BrBlätter* 1934, no. 3, pp. 40ff.

Absicht des Schöpfers, der *ja nicht abschließen*, sondern einen *Schlußsatz folgen lassen* wollte. Dieses Finale ist in jenen Stunden bis zur Coda gediehen, wo der Meister traurigen Herzens erkennen mußte, daß es mit dem Leben zu Ende gehe. Er dachte dann an einen Notschluß mit dem *Te Deum*. Während der Arbeit an der Überleitung zu diesem Werk entwand ihm der Tod die Feder.<sup>301</sup>

### 1.3.9 Reception from the late 1940s to the early 1970s.

Unfortunately, as we will see, not many authors would endorse Auer's plausible and probably roughly accurate conception of events. In her 'triple biography' of Bruckner, Mahler and Schoenberg,<sup>302</sup> Dika Newlin (herself a pupil of Schoenberg) made a brief reference to the existence of the sketches and Orel's publication, taking a refreshingly accurate view of the matter, although few modern-day scholars might agree with her claims concerning Schubert's *Unvollendete*:

The case of the Ninth Symphony must not be likened to the case of Schubert's *Unfinished* Symphony. In the latter instance, Schubert actually began to write a third movement, but was probably deterred by the realisation that the two movements which he had already composed were complete in themselves. Bruckner, on the other hand, had already finished three movements of his symphony and was only prevented from completing the Finale by his serious illness. When he realised that he probably would not live, he is said to have requested the performance of the *Te Deum* in place of the unfinished Finale. But we possess Bruckner's sketches for the Finale, and the extent to which he carried them out indicates that he would not have wished the *Te Deum* to be performed in place of the Finale unless it was unavoidable.<sup>303</sup>

A concert programme from the same year which similarly contrasts these two works, (again imputing to Schubert wisdom or good taste in not completing his *Unvollendete*) was recently unearthed by Cohrs. The programme is from the last concert of the 1946/47 Bruckner cycle of the Münchener Philharmoniker under Hans Rosbaud (27, 29 30 May, 1 June 1947) featuring Schubert's B minor followed by the three-movement Bruckner Ninth. Strikingly (particularly for a concert audience), rather than writing about the first three movements of the Ninth which were on the programme, the writer, Wilhelm Zentner, devoted over a page to "Bruckners Entwürfe zum Finale der IX. Symphonie". After citing the dates of the Finale's composition he continues:

Aus dem 181 Blättern der nachgelassenen Skizzen und Entwürfe, unter denen die Themenexposition im Umfang von 218 Takten bereits in Partitur ausgeführt ist, geht

<sup>301</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41f.; emphasis of the original. Auer concludes perceptively: "Vielleicht hat Löwe in die ganze Neunte die Idee der Parsifal-Entsagung hineingetragen und den Adagioabschluß zu subjektiv gefaßt, während Bruckner ohne Selbstbespiegelung festen Schrittes dem sicheren Jenseits entgegenging. Nicht *Ergebung* ist der Sinn des Werkes, sondern *Erhebung!*" (*ibid.*, p. 42).

<sup>302</sup> London 1947, 1978 (*supra*). Cf. the review by Winfried Kirsch, "Die Bruckner Forschung... (II)", p. 211.

<sup>303</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 101f.; see also p. 56.

hervor, daß der gesamte Satz bis auf die Schlußcoda konzipiert war, wenn er gleich, vor allem infolge Fehlens wichtiger Verbindungsteile, letztlich doch als Fragment beichnet werden muß. Nachdem es dem Meister aufgrund seines leidenden Zustandes klar geworden war, daß ihm die Vollendung des Finales nicht mehr vergönnt sollte, hat er die Absicht geäußert, die ‘eunten’ mit dem ‘Te Deum’ zu beschließen, womit dem Werke ein vokaler Abschluß nach dem Vorbilde von Beethovens letzter Symphonie geworden wäre. Schließlich hat der Komponist diesen Gedanken jedoch wieder fallen lassen, so naheliegend er vom Grundgehalt des Ganzen aus gewesen wäre.

As one of the first commentators, Zentner draws the Finale into a comprehensive programme for the whole work:

Bei jener unmittelbaren Beziehung, in der bei Bruckner Kopfsatz und Finale miteinander stehen, ist es klar, daß dies Finale, nach dem tiefschmerzlichen, nahezu verzweiflungsvollen Ausklang des ersten Satzes, die Erhebung in eine Glorie sondergleichen hätte bringen müssen. Daß dabei, den Triumph der Glaubensstreue geziemend zu versinnbildlichen, auch bei einer rein instrumentalen Gestaltung des Finales an den gewaltigen Lobgesang des Te Deums thematisch angeknüpft werden müsse, stand für Bruckner, wie die Entwürfe offenbaren, durchaus fest. Ebenso ist an einem Choral-schluß überwältigender Art, der vielleicht das erhabenste Monument Brucknerscher Religiosität geworden wäre, nicht zu zweifeln.

The article goes on to provide an outline of the Exp., but Zentner was insufficiently familiar with Orel’s text to realise that bifolds were missing rather than that Bruckner had composed fragments, maintaining that following the Exp. “die Skizzen” become “immer lückenhafter und lassen lediglich Vermutungen über die voraussichtliche weitere Formung des Finales zu.” Zentner did, however, make the following interesting speculation concerning the coda:

In der Koda wäre wohl der Choral zu seiner vollen, machtvoll gesteigerten Auswirkung gelangt, vermischt mit den Te Deum-[R]eminiszenzen, ein Ausklang, der, wäre er noch geschaffen worden, vielleicht die kühnsten unserer Vorstellungsbilder übergipfelt hätte.<sup>304</sup>

Hans Ferdinand Redlich, recognising the ontological incompleteness of the symphony in its three-movement form, treated the Finale with commendable respect, and must be hailed as one of the first outside the immediate circle of Austrian Bruckner scholars to have recognised its musical stature, despite the problems of the surviving material and the philology of the Orel edition, and to have seen through the ‘smokescreen’ of pious literary cliché which up to this point, with the exception of Orel and Auer, was virtually all that had appeared in print. In his significant “The Finale of Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony” of 1949, Redlich notes Löwe’s

---

<sup>304</sup> Zentner’s concluding paragraph makes reference to the “Urvorführung” of the Finale fragments in Munich in 1938 (correctly 1934) by Orel’s assistant Else Krüger (who had apparently died in 1946) and Kurt Bohnen—see §1.4.4. Interestingly the reviewer of that concert, Ludwig Lade, also made also made pointed reference to the allegedly fragmentary nature of Bruckner’s composition, rather than explain that pages are missing.

omission of any mention of a Finale in 1903<sup>305</sup> but dismisses out of hand the idea that Bruckner ever wanted any sort of alliance between *Te Deum* and symphony. The Finale was no “transitional bridge passage” but exists in “no fewer than six variants (in more or less complete scoring) and was completed [...] in full score up to the beginning of the coda proper”, and was a “purely instrumental finale of cyclopean dimensions, in sonata form”. His analysis proceeds to discuss five musical examples;<sup>306</sup> the movement:

represents Bruckner's last struggle with the problems of the monumental finish of his later symphonies, of which the finales of the Fifth, Seventh and Eighth tell their proud story. Every single bar of it is carried along by the overpowering sweep of an almost Michelangelesque imagination. The stupendous originality of its constructive plan in itself deserves special praise.<sup>307</sup>

The article closes with the significant words:

[...] only an orchestral performance of this fragment (in itself almost complete in full score) would permit a deeper insight into the innermost recesses of Bruckner's creative mind, struggling to record faithfully its last artistic experience, undaunted even by approaching death.<sup>308</sup>

Redlich's *Bruckner and Mahler* (1955) was the most influential early biography of these composers to appear in English. Redlich, like Haas, placed the Finale within the context of the Symphony—“Bruckner had planned this symphony as a work in four movements, conforming exactly to the structure of his preceding ten symphonies”—gave two musical examples,<sup>309</sup> again noting the ignorance of many writers concerning it,<sup>310</sup> and added “[t]hat this Finale remained incomplete is the crowning tragedy in Bruckner's career as a composer.”<sup>311</sup> In his Preface to the 1963 publication of the original score of the Ninth by Eulenberg,<sup>312</sup> Redlich expanded significantly on his 1949 article, again tracing the conspiracy of misinformation concerning the Finale back to Löwe's 1903 preface, which “proves that Bruckner's editors deliberately tried to falsify historic facts and to bemuse ill-informed posterity”.<sup>313</sup> A brief analysis of the Finale's chief features within the context of the symphony as a whole is supplied, using the same examples as in the 1949 article.

---

<sup>305</sup> Here and ensuing quotes, pp. 145f.

<sup>306</sup> These approximate to Mus. Exx. 25a (mm. 4–6), m (lower stave, first seven mm.), g (without the figuration), i (upper line, compared with the opening mm. of the *Te Deum*), and t (extended to 8 mm.); cf. B/23ff.

<sup>307</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 148f.

<sup>308</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 149.

<sup>309</sup> Pp. 103f., equating to Mus. Exx. 25a (mm. 4–6) and i (upper line).

<sup>310</sup> P. 105; see quotation *supra*.

<sup>311</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>312</sup> Edited by Hans-Hubert Schanzeler.

<sup>313</sup> Preface to the Eulenburg edition of 1963, edited by H.-H. Schanzeler, p. iv.

Redlich's claim that Bruckner could not possibly have intended the use of the *Te Deum* probably betrays a misunderstanding of Orel's closing paragraph (*supra*) as well as mistrust (or perhaps ignorance) of Auer's testimony.<sup>314</sup> Following suit, Derek Watson<sup>315</sup> would much later write of an "unjustifiable coupling of the two works [...] in fact perpetrated by Ferdinand Löwe"; Leopold Nowak, in his preface to the second GA edition of the Ninth (1951), following Orel's stance, did not find it necessary to make any mention of an intended link, musical or otherwise, between the two works. Hence, within a brief period of time, Bruckner's clear directive to use the *Te Deum* as or in place of the fourth movement had come to be blatantly disregarded.

Many musicologists writing about Bruckner appear to show little enough familiarity with the passages in Auer describing the Finale and the *Te Deum*, much less the 1934 GA publication. Redlich observed:

[...] even after Orel's publications and at a time when the Collected Edition was already well under way musicographers frequently persisted in asserting that Symphony IX simply 'lacked a finale'—as Alfred Einstein, for instance, did as late as 1947 in his *Music in the Romantic Era*.<sup>316</sup>

Even where grudging recognition of the existence of 'sketches' is made, particularly in the English-language Bruckner literature, writers proceeded to think—despite Redlich's example—as if Orel had never published the *Entwürfe und Skizzen*. Gabriel Engel effused: "Almost until his last hour on earth Bruckner worked desperately over his futile sketches toward the Finale, which he was fated to abandon, a mere sphinx-like fragment".<sup>317</sup> Werner Wolff's view on the Ninth, the *Te Deum* and everything reads as follows:<sup>318</sup>

If the Apocalypse were to be set to music, the First Movement of the Ninth could illustrate the austere tale. The Adagio stands for the transfiguration. The earth is left behind, the soul soars toward heaven. Bruckner himself was deeply moved while he was writing the Coda of the Adagio. He felt what was to come, and he had only one wish in his heart—to complete the Finale. He often prayed God to let him live long enough to finish the work. "If he does not," Bruckner remarked, "then He must take the responsibility for its incompleteness." But he was not granted grace and he did not live to finish the work.

I must confess I am rather glad the symphony suffered this fate, for there is no art expression more sublime than the Adagio. Bruckner repeatedly expressed the wish the *Te*

<sup>314</sup> Redlich's accusation that Löwe mentioned nothing of a Finale ("The Finale...", pp. 144f.) is also not entirely correct, even though the latter's remarks were certainly obfuscatory.

<sup>315</sup> *Bruckner* (The Master Musicians Series), London 1975, p. 133.

<sup>316</sup> *Bruckner und Mahler*, p. 105; see also *idem*, "The Finale...", and Preface to the Eulenburg score, p. vii.

<sup>317</sup> *The Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, Iowa City 1955, p. 89. Cf. the review by Winfried Kirsch, "Die Bruckner-Forschung... (III)", p. 223.

<sup>318</sup> *Anton Bruckner, Rustic Genius*, New York 1942, pp. 132f.; cf. Winfried Kirsch's review of a second, apparently much improved German-language edition published in 1980, "Die Bruckner-Forschung... (II)", p. 215.

Deum be substituted for the Finale, should he be disappointed in his hope of finishing the work. I do not think his wish should be respected in this instance. I did respect it for one performance and I later regretted my action.

In the otherwise commendable Erwin Doernberg we read that: "In his last two years [Bruckner] never had strength for more than scant sketches of Finale and of a transition from the Adagio to the *Te Deum* which, he sometimes thought, might be played after the symphony, should he not be spared to complete the Finale."<sup>319</sup> Elsewhere he writes wistfully that:<sup>320</sup>

It is most fortunate indeed that the work was designed with the Scherzo as the second movement, as the symphony thus ends in sublime beauty, without any impression of fragmentary conclusion. The scant sketches for the planned Finale show some contrapuntal intentions but it is not possible to deduce what kind of ending the composer would have wished for the work.

Doernberg nonetheless points out that Bruckner considered the *Te Deum* a valid conclusion:

He even worked for a while on a transition to the *Te Deum*, but it appears that the loss of tonal equilibrium disturbed him too deeply (the *Te Deum* stands in C major) for him to carry out the idea. Bruckner reverted to what was naturally the original plan: to compose a Finale. He used every moment of strength, but such moments were rare. The manuscripts of the sketches show how his hand became weaker and weaker.

The remainder of the passage is mostly more to the point:

There can be no doubt that Bruckner considered the symphony unfinished. It was alien to his nature to a symphony otherwise than with an assertion of virility and power. The Adagio ending is now familiar to us. Further, accustomed as we are to several symphonies with such endings, we are less disturbed by a quiet ending than Bruckner must have been: Tchaikovsky's 'Pathetique', Brahms' Third or Mahler's Ninth, for instance. Certainly neither Bruckner nor Beethoven would ever have chosen to end a symphony in such a manner.

The sketches to the Finale are, as we have said, too slight to be of practical use and the idea of a transition to the *Te Deum* was given up by Bruckner as unsatisfactory. One may still consider the possibility of playing the symphony in the first part of a concert and to perform the *Te Deum* after the interval.

In a similar vein, the medical journalist Dieter Kerner,<sup>321</sup> referring explicitly to the Finale material, offers the following explanation for the fact that the Ninth remained

---

<sup>319</sup> *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, London 1960, p. 109. Cf. the review by Winfried Kirsch, "Die Bruckner Forschung... (II)", p. 213.

<sup>320</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 207.

<sup>321</sup> *Krankheiten großer Musiker*, Stuttgart 1963–67, p. 162. Cf. the review by Winfried Kirsch, *ibid.*, p. 225.

incomplete together with yet another alibi for dismissing the whole issue of the Finale—an explanation as original as it is bogus:

Weil Bruckner ‘in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti’ komponierte, endet sein Werk auch nach drei Sätzen; am Schluß des Adagios tauchen Themen aus der Achten (langsamer Satz) und Siebten Sinfonie (erster Satz) auf, so daß die Frage, ob Bruckner im Ernst noch ein Finale geplant habe, müßig erscheint. ‘Für die Neunte ist gesorgt’, bemerkt er einige Zeit vor dem Tode, und wenn sich auch im Nachlaß 181 Skizzenblätter (R. Haas) zu einem letzten Satz gefunden haben sollen [!], wird man schwerlich zu der Überzeugung gelangen können, Bruckner habe ihn wirklich vollenden wollen [...].

Approaches of this nature, in which vacuous inanities are confirmed and facts dismissed as irrelevant, makes a mockery of the efforts of musicologists such as Orel to publish accurate source studies.

On the other hand, Friedrich Blume was to give lexicographic endorsement to the existence of a well-advanced score of the Finale in his brief reference to an “unvollendet gebliebenen, aber in allen wesentlichen Teilen abgeschlossenen Finale” in his forward-looking article on the composer in *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*.<sup>322</sup> Despite the indisputability of the fact that Bruckner had ‘seriously’ intended a final movement for the symphony, the apparently fragmentary, disconnected nature of the materials as Orel’s transcriptions presented them and the allegation of multiple distinct ‘versions’ of the movement—coupled with the fact that Orel’s own references to missing materials were glibly overlooked—meant that even writers familiar with the 1934 edition could continue to dismiss the Finale on the basis of the supposed fragmentary or imperfect nature of Bruckner’s conception. The matter of the missing bifolds, noted by Orel and the significance that such losses from the originally extant material might have never entered the discussion.

Despite Auer, Haas, Redlich, and Blume and despite his own familiarity with the original materials and with Orel’s publication from his corrections of it in 1934–35, Leopold Nowak made no more than the off-hand remark in his Vorwort to the 1951 revised edition of the score that, “Das Finale sollte den Skizzen zufolge sowohl eine Fuge als auch einen weitgespannten Choral enthalten”. In his 1964 Bruckner biography we read merely that, “Zum Finale sind zwar Skizzen vorhanden, aber zu ihrer Ausarbeitung ist es nicht gekommen [...]”.<sup>323</sup> He also discounted the possibility of Bruckner ever having considered using the torso of the Finale as a transition to the Te Deum: “An des Meisters Äußerung, das Te-Deum als Abschluß zu nehmen, knüpft sich die irrige Meinung, er habe eine Überleitungsmusik geplant. Aus keiner der Skizzen ergibt sich dafür ein schriftlicher Beleg.”<sup>324</sup> Eight years later Karl

<sup>322</sup> 1956, vol. 2, column 365.

<sup>323</sup> *Anton Bruckner*..., p. 85.

<sup>324</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86.

Grebe in his biography made only the even more desultory reference:<sup>325</sup> “Als Ärzte und Umwelt bereits Anzeichen von Desorientierung vermerkten und Ausfallserscheinungen nicht mehr zu verkennen waren, arbeitete er mit intaktem musikalischem Bewußtsein am Finale seiner ‘Neunten’.”

Reference to the Finale has often been accompanied by reference to completing the surviving material—note has already been made of the Lang’s admonition against any such procedure. Hans-Hubert Schönzeler in his 1970 biography wrote of the manuscripts as if they were holy relics:

A completion of the movement is unthinkable, and no one with the slightest love or respect for Bruckner would ever consider such a thing. [...] God took the pen out of his hand, and it would be going against his will to try to add to the existing three movements which are so utterly complete in their incompleteness.<sup>326</sup>

Parallel to this run attempts to discredit the surviving material itself. The considerable number of early Bruckner articles by Robert Simpson<sup>327</sup>—no less than the influence manifest in his own compositions—testify to this prominent English composer’s love and respect for Bruckner’s music. His knowledge of the Orel edition presumably goes back at least as far as the two-piano performance undertaken with Ferdinand Redlich in 1947.<sup>328</sup> In his popular *The Essence of Bruckner* (first published in 1967 and frequently reprinted since), he offered the following judgement:

Bruckner’s tendency in his mature last movements has so far been to disclose a mental background that cannot easily be disturbed by outward events [...]. In the meantime I must confess to more than scepticism about attempts to complete the Ninth Symphony, not only because the final coda is altogether missing (and it would be a bold, not to say impertinent, man who would try to compose Bruckner’s greatest climax for him) but because the sketches do not provide the momentum to support such a coda. [...] one can divine only broad outlines: it is possible to identify developmental and recapitulatory elements, but there is no real inner continuity perceptible as an organic process, no genuine coherence, and often a total absence of those inner parts that normally mean so much to the growth of a Bruckner movement. Details of this nature cannot be satisfactorily invented on the required scale by anyone but the composer himself. [...]

---

<sup>325</sup> *Anton Bruckner in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Reinbeck bei Hamburg 1972), p. 103. Cf. the review by Winfried Kirsch, “Die Bruckner Forschung... (II)”, p. 216.

<sup>326</sup> *Anton Bruckner...*, p. 108. The passage is quoted in German by Cornelis van Zwol (“Der Finalsatz der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners”, *BrJb* 1987–88, p. 34), where Schönzeler is also quoted as saying: “Anyone who completes the finale of Bruckner IX commits a sacrilege.” Cf. also the review by Winfried Kirsch, “Die Bruckner Forschung... (II)”, p. 212.

<sup>327</sup> See his “Bruckner and the Symphony”, *MR* 7 (1946), pp. 35–40, “The Eighth Symphony of Bruckner: An Analysis”, *Ch&D* 2, no. 6 (1950), pp. 42–55, “The Ninth Symphony of Anton Bruckner”, *Ch&D* 2, no. 6 (1950), pp. 115–117, and “The Seventh Symphony of Bruckner: An Analysis”, *Ch&D* 2, no. 10 (1963), pp. 57–67.

<sup>328</sup> See §1.4.4.



There is no doubt that Mahler saw his Tenth whole. Bruckner was still trying to conceive the exact nature of his finale.<sup>329</sup>

In fact the degree of textural completion of the Finale of the Bruckner Ninth is significantly greater than that of Mahler's *particello* drafts for the Tenth; an explanation for the remainder of Simpson's argument must be sought in the exigencies of the Orel edition and in its presentation of the material, in Simpson's degree of familiarity with it, and in his doctrinaire approach to Bruckner's music in general. Later, following the Rome conference in May 1987,<sup>330</sup> Simpson revised the chapter<sup>331</sup> on the Ninth Symphony, even dedicating it to Samale and Mazzuca, but remained unconvinced, still—apparently—unaware that sections such as the chorale, which he, even in his revised text, regarded as “skeletal” were fully scored out by Bruckner (even pronounced “fertig”) and remained unchanged through subsequent revisions.

Ironically, one of the few writers prepared to suggest that a fourth movement could be anything other than an anticlimax knew, on his own admission, little or nothing about the Finale. Michael Moravcsik wrote in 1973 in an article:<sup>332</sup> “It is a tremendous loss [...] that Bruckner did not live to complete to any significant extent\* the fourth movement of the ninth Symphony. After the exquisite coda of the third, a fourth movement equalling the first movement in quality would have been a superb experience.” At the asterisk a footnote was inserted by the journal's editor, who added: “Significant yes. But not, I think, in sufficient detail for anyone to construct a convincing Bruckner whole from the fragments.” Philip Barford<sup>333</sup> revealed a similar awareness that the symphony was conceived as a four-movement unity, but his comments as to the supposed inadequacy of the sketches recall those of Simpson:

There can be no doubt that had Bruckner lived to complete the finale the relationships between the movements would have been understood in their reciprocity; the musical structure of what would surely have been a massive movement would have revealed the significance of the juxtaposition of the meditative *Adagio* with the awe-inspiring depths

<sup>329</sup> *The Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, London 1969, p. 180. Cf. the review by Winfried Kirsch, “Die Bruckner Forschung... (II)”, p. 212.

<sup>330</sup> Simpson also spoke critically of the Finale materials at the Finale symposium in Rome in May 1987 (see §1.4.14), in a paper entitled “Bruckner's Unique Finale Problem” (photocopy, n. d.; copy courtesy of its author). Peter Gülke noted: “Die überlegtesten, am Schwersten wiegenden Einwände in dem lebhaften, mit viel Detailkenntnis geführten Disput in Rom kamen von Robert Simpson (Irland), der sehr genau zwischen Erkenntniswert des Unternehmens und musikalischen Defiziten unterschied, zumal einer eher ‘zitierten’ als aus dem Material neu herausgeschaffenen großen Dimension” (“Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987: Bruckner-Symposium”, *Mf* 41, no. 3, 1988, p. 243).

<sup>331</sup> Revision of Chapter 11 (originally 10) of *The Essence of Bruckner*, New York 1967. Photocopy, unpubl., n. d. (c. 1987–88; copy courtesy of the author).

<sup>332</sup> “The Coda in the Symphonies of Anton Bruckner”, *MR* 34 (1973), p. 258. Moravcsik's reflections on the coda of the Finale will be discussed in §3.3.7.

<sup>333</sup> *Bruckner Symphonies* (BBC Music Guides), London 1978, p. 60.

and often fearsome visions of the first two movements. [...] Undoubtedly the culminating glory would have conveyed the essence of this process and reconciled the conflicts leading up to it. We can only regret that we cannot hear the final synthesis.

Substantial sketches for the finale were made; but they do not adequately convey an idea of the effect Bruckner ultimately intended, especially as the all-important coda is lacking.

Finally, Derek Watson's remarks in his 1975 biography<sup>334</sup> read like a compendium of the views of Redlich, Simpson and Schoenzeler. Having made the obligatory reference to the "six variants" presented in the Orel edition and described the general form of the movement, he joins in the familiar disclaimer:

But the movement is incomplete and is not completable. Much detail of the inner parts, the sense of coherent continuity and the entire Coda are missing, and none but the composer himself could supply such elements. Bruckner simply did not live long enough to envisage this finale as a truly unified entity. What remains is a torso representing the composer's faithfully recorded finale visions; visions which were abruptly ended and not left to the world in a tangible enough form to allow performance or even speculative completion.

### 1.3.10 Contrasting views: Paul-Gilbert Langevin and Harry Halbreich.

French musicologist Paul-Gilbert Langevin's collaborative publication *Bruckner: Apogée De La Symphonie*<sup>335</sup> was the first major Bruckner study to appear in French. Strikingly, it included one of the most important and detailed discussions of the Finale to have so far appeared. Langevin's own chapter on the Ninth,<sup>336</sup> rich in fresh perspectives and intelligently assessed details, deals at some length with the Ninth and the problem of its Finale, particularly "L'énigme du Finale",<sup>337</sup> before proceeding to an analysis of the symphony including the incomplete Finale, as only Haas and Redlich had done before him. For the first time, however, Langevin went beyond their approaches and discussed, rationally and with commendable knowledge of the details of the case—details previously glossed over by all commentators—whether the movement may not have been more substantially completed by Bruckner and material lost, and whether a performing version of the whole symphony might not have some merit.

In basing his analysis and conclusions on it, Langevin had, of course, no inkling of the inadequacies of the Orel edition. He thus noted, in Orel's four-stave conflation, the existence

---

<sup>334</sup> *Bruckner* (The Master Musician Series), London 1975, p. 131f. Cf. Winfried Kirsch's review, "Die Bruckner Forschung... (II)", p. 213.

<sup>335</sup> Lausanne 1977.

<sup>336</sup> "Neuvième Symphonie, en ré mineur", *ibid.*, pp. 195–216.

<sup>337</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 196ff.

of a number of gaps and discrepancies between the ‘versions’<sup>338</sup> before proceeding to a discussion of Oeser’s text of the Exp.,<sup>339</sup> which he understood as having been intended to serve as a transition to an ensuing performance of the Te Deum, as he claims it to have first been performed:<sup>340</sup> “C’est en vue d’une telle utilisation que l’adaptateur a explicitement intitulé le morceau ‘Ueberleitung zum Te Deum’.” However, as he continues, taking the traditional view initiated by Löwe, “des considérations élémentaires de forme et de relations tonales rendent cette solution inacceptable”.<sup>341</sup> Both the Neill/Gastaldi and Märzendorfer versions are mentioned by Langevin; that of Neill/Gastaldi is briefly described.<sup>342</sup> The question is then raised as to whether the Finale materials, as presently known, may be incomplete:

En effet, selon une hypothèse récente et que nos recherches ont corroborée, le compositeur aurait pu établir au moins un schéma complet en partition réduite [...], dont les derniers feuillets pourraient se trouver encore aujourd’hui dans des collections privées, ce qui autoriserait l’espoir qu’ils soient un jour redécouverts et publiés. (La possibilité existe aussi, malheureusement, qu’ils aient été détruits au cours d’une guerre). Plusieurs arguments étayaient cette hypothèse. D’une part le temps fut largement donné au compositeur de réaliser, suivant son habitude, une telle esquisse. En outre, le feuillet considéré comme le dernier—celui qui porte le retour du choral—est d’une écriture ferme, tout à fait exempte des tremblements qui affectent les manuscrits des derniers mois: il remonte donc au moins à 1895. Et, lorsqu’on entend le morceau, la poursuite du choral semble si bien ‘couler de source’ qu’on a peine à croire que le maître ne l’ait pas mise sur le papier.<sup>343</sup>

Hence, with a brilliant stroke of intuition Langevin recognised on the basis of internal evidence that the extant MSS were most probably not an accurate representation of the full extent Bruckner’s achievement:

Nous tenons pour certain que ce feuillet n’est pas la dernière musique composée par Bruckner, et que ce qui l’occupa jusqu’au seuil de la mort, ce fut, non l’esquisse elle-même, mais bien l’instrumentation, qu’il laissa (on l’a vu) fragmentaire. Enfin, le processus historique de la redécouverte des feuillets qui nous sont parvenus autorise à penser que d’autres ont pu exister et demeurer inconnus.

<sup>338</sup> “[I]l subsiste plusieurs lacunes, ainsi que des interférences entre des rédactions successives”, p. 196.

<sup>339</sup> See §1.4.5.

<sup>340</sup> Although this is incorrect; the fragment was entitled *Finalefragment der IX. Symphonie* and first performed preceding a performance of the first three movements of the Symphony; see §1.4.5.

<sup>341</sup> P. 197; Langevin notes two performances, Leipzig 12 October 1940 and 11 July 1974; see also §1.4.5.

<sup>342</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 197. Cf. §§1.4.6 and 1.4.9.

<sup>343</sup> *Ibid.*

He then proceeds to recount the transmission of the manuscripts, only four pages of which were known at the time of Bruckner's death,<sup>344</sup> the greater part of which were handed down from Josef to Franz Schalk;<sup>345</sup> "Il est donc plausible que d'autres familiers du maître aient recueilli divers feuillets, et que l'avenir réserve encore des surprises."<sup>346</sup>

The question for Langevin, then, remained whether or not it was legitimate to make the sketches accessible to the public, and in what form. While the Mahler Tenth exists in continuous pc. sks., "Chez Bruckner, l'obstacle majeur réside—outre l'absence (provisoire ou définitive) de la conclusion—dans l'existence de plusieurs lacunes, autrement dit dans le fait que les différents fragments connus ne se raccordent pas exactement", note being made of the absence of folios (= bifols.) 15, 19, 24 and 29 in the course of the Durchf. and Repr. Only the Exp. exists as a unit, he claims (also not strictly true), while the misclassified 21E of Orel is referred to as a "section 'surnuméraire', formant une variante abrégée du développement de la fugue".<sup>347</sup> The attendant impossibility of establishing with any certainty just what form Bruckner intended to give the Finale constitutes, as Langevin pointed out, the main argument of those unwilling to allow performance of an entire completed movement (among them Hans-Hubert Schönzeler, as in his BBC broadcast of 1974<sup>348</sup>). On the other hand:

La réponse des réalisateurs et des partisans d'une restitution plus avancée consiste à observer que l'importance historique et esthétique, autant que la valeur humaine de cet émouvant testament, justifient tout effort tendant à permettre qu'il soit entendu d'un seul tenant, et par le plus vaste auditoire possible [...] Est-il besoin de soligner que nous partageons entièrement ce dernier point de vue...?

Like Haas and Redlich before him, Langevin then intelligently placed analytical discussion of the Finale in its proper context—following discussion of the first three movements. While endorsing the ubiquitous misunderstanding of six<sup>349</sup> successive versions, Langevin's interpretation of the movement<sup>350</sup> is based on analysis of the four-stave reduction of Orel (cf. D/128ff.); in his estimation: "Le plan combine celui du premier mouvement (par la fusion du développement et de la reprise) avec celui du Finale de la *Cinquième* (par la

---

<sup>344</sup> This is possibly a reference to the StB bifols. described by Orel in his 1921 article, "Skizzen zum Vierten Satz von Bruckners Neunter Symphonie" (ch. 1.2).

<sup>345</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 612. Langevin's subsequent comment, that the sketches were given to Auer in 1911 "pour l'analyser *et éventuellement la retravailler*" (italics added) is possibly a misreading: Auer certainly appears to have had no intention of writing a performing version, the material being given to him "zur Sichtung und Bearbeitung für die große Biographie" (*ibid.*).

<sup>346</sup> Langevin, p. 198.

<sup>347</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>348</sup> See §1.4.10.

<sup>349</sup> Note the numerical increase over Auer's 'fünffache Fassungen'!

<sup>350</sup> p. 208.

forme fuguée)".<sup>351</sup> The ensuing, strikingly detailed analysis invokes, as Halbreich would also stress (*infra*), the presumption of an incipient atonality in the opening material and Hauptth.: "on mesure à quel degré de liberté est parvenue l'invention musicale de Bruckner, et combien ces recherches anticipent sur le monde de l'atonalisme, voire de la série: l' 'air d'autres planètes' (du 2<sup>e</sup> *Quatuor* de Schönberg) se respire déjà ici".<sup>352</sup> Particularly significant is Langevin's subsequent observation—apparently for the first time—of a similarity between the Gesangsp. motive of the Finale and the first phrase of the corresponding theme in the first movement.<sup>353</sup> Langevin also notes, probably for the first time, the similarity of the chorale theme to the chorale in the Finale of the Eighth and the "Abschied vom Leben" theme in the Adagio of the Ninth.<sup>354</sup> Following discussion of the Te Deum motive, which "joue dans tout le Finale un rôle essentiel de trame contrapuntique", Langevin dismisses the notion that any transition to the Te Deum was ever intended; he also dismisses, Göllerich's (more correctly, Auer's) suggestion that Bruckner considered introducing a chorus into the symphony, either in the form of the Te Deum, or along the lines of Weinwurm's statement that Bruckner considered using the chorale "Christ ist erstanden".<sup>355</sup> As he concludes, "ce projet n'a donné lieu à aucun début d'exécution."<sup>356</sup> Without going into the details of the rest of Langevin's analysis (he speaks particularly highly of the exposition of the fugue), mention should be made of his recognition of the origin of the horn theme<sup>357</sup> from the principal theme of the first movement, that "assure au sein de cette reprise l'unité interne du matériau musical de la symphonie entière".<sup>358</sup>

While Langevin endorsed the absence of middle voices observed by Simpson (*supra*), he explained this simply on the basis of Bruckner's compositional method, in which the highest and lowest voices were notated first;<sup>359</sup> in conclusion he came out strongly in favour of both the music of the Finale itself and the value of presenting the work to a wider audience. He argued for this in an inspired passage which, as the first, most cogent and passionate defence of the principle behind a performing version of the Finale, deserves quotation here in full:

Un fait demeure, et nous pouvons en témoigner par expérience personnelle. Dans les très rares cas où une audition complète a été rendue possible, soit au concert, soit en privé,

---

<sup>351</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>352</sup> *Ibid.*; italics original

<sup>353</sup> Cf. Mus. Ex. 25c (B/23) and the first movement, m. 97.

<sup>354</sup> Cf. Mus. Exx. 24g and k; further discussion in §2.2.3.

<sup>355</sup> Cf. Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 615, as discussed in §1.1.3; further discussion in §3.3.6.

<sup>356</sup> Langevin, p. 209.

<sup>357</sup> Cf. Mus. Ex. 25p.

<sup>358</sup> Langevin, p. 210.

<sup>359</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211. The point is further discussed in Part Three.

les participants ont toujours été unanimes à reconnaître que la 9e Symphonie n'atteint son véritable épanouissement, et partant, sa signification réelle d'aboutissement, non seulement de l'art d'Anton Bruckner, mais du monde tonal, *que munie de son Finale, même non conclu*. L'apport de celui-ci est d'une telle richesse que tout retour à l'état antérieur (autrement dit à l'interruption de l'œuvre après l'Adagio) ne pourrait désormais être ressenti que comme une frustration. En écrivant cela, nous n'ignorons pas que nous heurtons de front la thèse de l'orthodoxie, laquelle tire un argument trop facile de l'aspect 'conclusif' de la fin de l'Adagio. Ce caractère n'est pas niable; mais il est tout aussi vrai que Bruckner a dépensé toutes ses ultimes forces vives à tenter d'édifier la *vraie* conclusion de son testament musical, et que cela *ne doit pas être en vain*. D'autant que cette conclusion, même à l'état de 'torso', contient quelques-unes des plus hautes inspirations du musicien: c'est le cas en particulier de l'émouvant choral, peut-être le plus beau que Bruckner ait écrit [...].

En revendiquant le droit pour tout mélomane d'accéder à la connaissance de l'intégralité du manuscrit brucknérien, nous nous appuyons, en dernier lieu, sur la saine curiosité intellectuelle sans laquelle tout savoir humain serait privé de son ressort essentiel et, partant, de sa capacité de progrès.<sup>360</sup>

In Langevin's final discussion, entitled "Faut-il achever la 'neuvième'?",<sup>361</sup> he contends that, while the weight of opinion still rests with the orthodox camp that holds that Bruckner's text should be kept in its incomplete form, it is indeed legitimate to outline approaches to its completion. For, as he writes, "Car plus on 'vit' cette partition, moins utopique apparaît son achèvement".<sup>362</sup>

For Langevin, the a conclusion to the Finale could be planned based on familiarity with Bruckner's preceding Finale movements, particularly that of the Eighth, with its contrapuntal overlay of the four principal themes. Langevin imagined a cumulative development of the chorale, gradually adding all of the brass and building to a point at which the theme of the first movement recurs as a cyclic gesture. "[U]n rapide reflux" (a rapid return?) should introduce the (final) peroration, where the chorale again plays a major role as in the coda of the Fifth, but crowned here by an overlay of themes, something which, after all, is not difficult to realise since: "Les données principales des différents mouvements offrent en effet tant d'affinité entre elles, qu'il paraît évident que le compositeur *les a conçues en ayant en vue l'usage qu'il allait en faire dans sa conclusion*. Une solution du type de celle proposée ici n'aurait donc rien de téméraire ni d'irrespectueux."<sup>363</sup>

Langevin then pointed out that, while such a completion by a gifted composer with sufficient talent and courage would doubtless be decried by the guardians of artistic authenticity, since similar solutions have occurred in the cases of Mozart, Busoni and Puccini.

<sup>360</sup> *Ibid.*, italics original.

<sup>361</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 212ff.

<sup>362</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 212.

<sup>363</sup> *Ibid.*, italics original.

The case here, in practical terms, is not so different, whether Bruckner himself envisioned the final conclusion in such terms or not. While it was, as he admits, becoming steadily less likely that any of the missing material would reappear, he had apparently already suggested in 1966 that a prize be awarded for the best completion of the work—a suggestion which, he claimed, would succeed in creating around Bruckner’s name “une émulation qui ne pourrait qu’être bénéfique à sa gloire”.<sup>364</sup>

Much-needed new and unbiased thinking had clearly gone into the formation of Langevin’s ideas. While he was unable to exceed the limitations imposed by the misrepresentations of the Orel edition, it is possible to see here—for the first time—an informed musical writer concerning himself deeply and personally not only with the musical material but with the issues, both ethical and technical, surrounding the completion and performance of the Finale. Langevin was to inspire Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca to begin their confrontation with the Finale<sup>365</sup> and echoes of his thinking, particularly concerning the coda, can be traced in the conclusion to their earlier score.

A more problematic approach, at the same time more superficial as regards analysis of the material and more damning of efforts to approach the score more closely, was made in the same volume by Harry Halbreich in his “Un Essai de Synthèse”.<sup>366</sup> While Langevin revealed a commendable familiarity with the materials and an intelligent awareness of the shortcomings of any interpretation based solely on a superficial reading of the Orel text, Halbreich appeared incapable of seeing beyond the exigencies of the material, preferring to draw sweeping conclusions as to both its nature and Bruckner’s inadequacies. As in Simpson’s case, it is possible to see here the ever-widening circles of critical misinterpretation to which the distortions of the Orel edition gave rise.

In Halbreich’s view, even the earlier versions of the symphonies represented imperfect or even incoherent works, ‘plus diffuses, elles sont aussi plus *confuses* c’est-à-dire moins bien caractérisées, moins profilées’;<sup>367</sup> the “états premiers” of the Third, Fourth and Eighth Symphonies:

ressemblent donc à de gigantesques *ébauches*: ceci sans aucune nuance péjorative. Le bloc de marbre n’a pas encore été taillé dans le détail, les profils les plus impérieux et mémorables demeurent prisonniers de la gangue du limon originel.<sup>368</sup>

<sup>364</sup> In the ensuing discussion given in Langevin’s book, respondent Claude Descloud, decried Langevin’s willingness to see the compositional artifact tampered with, invoking similar sentiments to those expressed by Schönzeler (*supra*): “À moins d’un égal génie, toute main qui achèvera ce Finale sera une main sacrilège” (Langevin, p. 216)

<sup>365</sup> See §1.4.13.

<sup>366</sup> In: Langevin, pp. 265–270. Cf. the review by Winfried Kirsch, “Die Bruckner Forschung... (III)”, p. 243.

<sup>367</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 266; italics original.

<sup>368</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 267.

Hence,

Les états successifs d'une symphonie brucknérienne apparaissent finalement comme une approche par étapes d'une absolue vérité musicale, comme une recherche de la précision, de la concision, de la *Fasslichkeit*, du trait caractéristique, frappant et immédiatement perceptible. [...] Dans certains cas (*3<sup>e</sup> Symphonie* notamment), la synthèse suprême n'a probablement jamais été réalisée.<sup>369</sup>

Before proceeding to what he describes as “le cas le plus problématique et la plus tragique” of the Finale, Halbreich claims that it is impossible with Bruckner and with other great masters to disassociate subjective and objective elements, proceeding to make the *a priori* and unwarranted claim that the pessimistic “Totenuhr” ending of the 1890 version of the Eighth reflected Bruckner's psychological reaction to the rejection of the symphony by Levi. In view of this, he writes, “j'ai acquis la conviction profonde que le Finale de la Neuvième n'est pas achevable, et que même les fragments existants ne sont nullement parvenus à leur état définitif”, adding in a footnote:

Bien entendu, cela ne signifie nullement que la connaissance de cette esquisse doit être réservée à un quarteron d'initiés. Au contraire, tout ce que nous en disons prouve son importance pour la compréhension universelle du compositeur; et on doit souhaiter qu'un enregistrement commercial soit promptement réalisé dans une version comprenant tout le texte existant, ainsi que les deux Trios primitifs (éd. A. Orel).<sup>370</sup>

The remainder of the article becomes increasingly speculative and, as far as the real nature of the MSS is concerned, farther from the point: Halbreich was apparently misled by the appearance of Orel's presentation and wanders further and further into rhetorical speculation. Simpson can again be heard behind the formulations: while Mahler's Tenth was conceived as far as the last measure, Bruckner, Harry Halbreich claims, “est mort en plein combat avec la matière”. Presupposing that Bruckner achieved no more than scattered fragments (which in itself scarcely suggests a close reading of the edition), Halbreich describes the opening of the Finale, after the beatific close of the Adagio, as “la tentation ultime, la plus terrible, la tentation du désespoir. C'est ‘Eli, lama sabacthani?’”. He is led to imagine

le vieil homme égrenant fébrilement son rosaire, notant dans ses carnets les nombres de Pater et d'Ave récités chaque jour, s'accrochant de ses ongles saignants à la plus dérisoire touffe d'herbe surplombant le grand trou... Non, nous ne saurons jamais si Anton Bruckner est mort dans la paix de l'âme. En tout cas, ce que nous possédons du Finale de la *Neuvième* ne permet de l'affirmer.<sup>371</sup>

---

<sup>369</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>370</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 268.

<sup>371</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 269.



Accordingly,

il est impossible de n'être pas frappé par le nombre de réminiscences d'œuvres antérieures que l'on trouve dans ces esquisses, y compris, d'œuvres aussi lointaines que la 6<sup>e</sup> *Symphonie*, achevée depuis quinze ans, jamais entendue, jamais révisée, et dont on retrouve ici un thème important du Finale. On sait l'acuité croissante de la mémoire lointaine chez les vieillards, coïncidant avec la perte de la mémoire proche. En lisant les esquisses du Finale de la *Neuvième*, j'ai parfois l'impression que le vieux maître ne se rendait plus très bien compte s'il était en train de réviser ses œuvres précédentes ou s'il était occupé à créer une œuvre nouvelle... Si Bruckner n'a pu achever ce Finale, c'est que l'absolue santé morale—plus importante que la santé physique—lui a fait défaut.<sup>372</sup>

The remainder of the article contends that Bruckner was unable to finish the movement not merely due to his mental decline but also due to the compositional problems that arose, and that the problems of the Finale echo the demise of tonality itself—something that Bruckner, Halbreich alleges, recognised at least as well as Gustav Mahler.<sup>373</sup> Whatever the philosophic value of Halbreich's 'royal road' to the evolution of atonality, his familiarity with the MSS or even with the Orel edition as displayed in this article was scarcely adequate to support the sweeping claim he based on them.

### 1.3.11 More recent stances.

The reassessment of Bruckner begun in Vienna in the late 1970s brought little or nothing in the way of re-evaluating the issues surrounding the Finale. The original edition of the *Anton Bruckner Werkverzeichnis*<sup>374</sup> even catalogued the sketches for the Finale under a separate number (WAB 143) from that of the first three movements of the Symphony (WAB 109)—a procedure which, happily, was to be abandoned in subsequent editions. As recently as 1983 Manfred Wagner could still, like Nowak 19 years before him, baldly refer to a Finale “das nicht weit über die Skizze hinauskam”<sup>375</sup> and, as we will see,<sup>376</sup> roundly condemn anyone with the temerity to suggest otherwise. Even the otherwise insightful Winfried Kirsch, writing in the same year as Wagner, conveniently rejected the whole issue with the laconic remark that, “Die Zeit, in der sich an der Frage nach einem Finale zur 9. Sinfonie Bruckners noch die

<sup>372</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 269f.

<sup>373</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 270.

<sup>374</sup> Ed. R. Grasberger, Tutzing 1977; cf. pp. 166 and 118.

<sup>375</sup> *BrLWD*, p. 209. Wagner's ensuing sentence cites the incorrect date of 1894 to which reference has been made (§1.1.6) in regard to Bruckner's calendar entry of 24th May 1895, makes the unwarranted implication that a previous sketch must have preceded this, and follows with the equally incorrect assertion that the dates “19. Mai, 14. Juni, 11. August” and “Donnerstag 21., Freitag 23. [sic], Samstag” all represent *calendar* entries from 1896.

<sup>376</sup> In “Bemerkungen zu den Ergänzungsversuchen von Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca”, *IBG-Mitt* 3 (1987), pp. 5–7; discussion see §§1.4.12 and 1.4.13.

Gemüter der Bruckner-Welt erhitzten [...] scheint vorbei zu sein”.<sup>377</sup> The matter was resolved for Kirsch with the 1934 publication of Orel which established once and for all that a Finale existed in six variants and contains no transition to the Te Deum: “Es sei als reines Instrumental-Finale in Sonatenform geplant gewesen.”<sup>378</sup>

Of the few attempts in German literature of the 1970s to reach a closer acquaintance with the Finale, mention must be made of an article by the German composer, conductor and musicologist Peter Ruzicka (b. 1948), “Annäherung an einen Torso: zum Finale der neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners”.<sup>379</sup> In 1973 Ruzicka had conducted a performance of the Oeser version following the first three movements as a transition to the Te Deum; in 1976 he prepared a radio broadcast with the Radio Symphonie Orchester Berlin for RIAS Berlin with further fragments of the score, which he apparently also reorchestrated.<sup>380</sup> His approach in the article shows no more than a passing acquaintance with the Orel edition, however, although he does invoke the Göllicherich-Auer biography—for the first time in a discussion of the Finale—citing the passage (as it appears in the biography, not in Heller’s original text) concerning Bruckner’s dedication of the symphony and his intentions to conclude the Finale with an “Allelujah des zweiten Satzes”, “damit die Symphonie mit einem Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott [...] endet” (cf. §1.1.8 *supra*). Sceptical of the ethics of completing another composer’s work, Ruzicka cites as a further difficulty in this case the fact that Bruckner:

nicht weniger als sechs Anläufe nahm, den musikalischen Verlauf dieses Finales zu entwerfen. Hier gilt es, aus den zahlreichen Verzweigungen und Verästelungen dieser Varianten diejenige Fassung auszuarbeiten, die sich im Rahmen des Satzverlaufs am ehesten als logisch-stimmig und damit ‘authentisch’ [?] erweist.

For,

Während der Expositionsabschnitt [...] relativ zweifelsfrei in seiner musikalischen Gestalt zu bestimmen ist, erscheint der weitere Fortgang des Stückes zunehmend hypothetisch. Jeder Versuch einer vollständigen Rekonstruktion des Finales wäre daher—mit weiter fortschreitender Adaptation—als reale Bearbeitung und nicht mehr nur als Ergänzung eines originalen Textes zu verstehen. So zu verfahren, ist natürliche Freiheit der Überlebenden, die möglicherweise die Chance eröffnet, zu einer Art Mitbestimmung im historisch-ästhetischen Prozeß zu gelangen.

---

<sup>377</sup> “Die Bruckner Forschung... (III)”, p. 242.

<sup>378</sup> *Ibid.* Kirsch also mentions the articles by Redlich and Halbreich, and the versions of Oeser and E. D. R. Neill (pp. 242f.): see §§1.4.5 and 1.4.6.

<sup>379</sup> *Hi-Fi Stereophonie* 18 (Feb. 1979), pp. 40–41. It may be significant that, despite the importance of the article and stature of its author, the article does not appear in a mainstream musicological journal. It was reprinted in *idem*, ed. Thomas Schäfer, *Erfundene und gefundene Musik: Analysen, Portraits und Reflexionen: Festschrift zum 50. Geburtstag von Peter Ruzicka*, Hofheim 1998, pp. 9–14.

<sup>380</sup> See §1.4.10.

Ruzicka, like Halbreich and many authors before him, was sufficiently familiar with the material to dismiss (or at least express deep doubts concerning) any attempts to come to a better understanding of the torso, yet not enough to recognise that Orel's " Fassungen " were simply work phases and that Bruckner conceived the movement very much as a continuity, and that the surviving score fragments, as Orel himself indicated, reveal gaps in their original sequence.

The end of Ruzicka's article retreats into a rhetorical cave in which the question is raised as to whether the symphony is not really complete in three movements or whether, as the musicologist Bernhard Hansen suggested, each movement can stand by itself, a situation which Hansen explained as " eine Funktion von Dauer und Gedankenfülle dieser Sätze ". Ruzicka concluded:

Ist damit möglicherweise der Grund für die Nicht-Vollendung der neunten Symphonie Bruckner'—unabhängig vom Tod des Komponisten—im Werk selbst zu suchen? Ist das Werk vielleicht nicht nur unvollendet, sondern auch unvollendbar? Ist es vom Autor nicht selbst bis zu einem Grenzpunkt des Möglichen gefördert worden, so daß jeder Gedanke an Ergänzung verfehlt sein muß, ja daß jeglicher Eingriff in diesen Torso dem Werk seinen eigentlichen Wert nehmen müßte? Der Gedanke an gestalterische Zwänge, gleichsam 'objektive' Zwänge, liegt jedenfalls nicht ganz fern.

Hence, beginning with the need to dismiss the significance of the Finale from the unity of the symphony as a whole, Ruzicka ended by calling into question the entire structure of the symphony itself as a coherent, integrated musical conception. Ruzicka's conclusions were of course based on the subjective validity of what is heard, rather than an inquiry into what the composer intended, coupled with a perpetuated misreading of the Orel edition.

The only serious study in recent times to look more closely at the Finale MSS in the Orel edition, deal with the final movement of the Ninth on an equal footing with the other three movements and integrate it into a conception of the evolution of Bruckner's symphonic style was that of Werner Notter, *Schematismus und Evolution in der Sinfonik Anton Bruckners*.<sup>381</sup> The most problematic aspect of this study, and in a sense its Achilles' heel, is Notter's definition of the 'Nullte', as Bruckner's 'first symphony', as the crucial starting point of Bruckner's evolution—although in fact, as Paul Hawkshaw demonstrated,<sup>382</sup> the (correctly) "annullierte" D-minor Symphony post-dated WAB 101.<sup>383</sup>

<sup>381</sup> (*Freiburger Schriften zur Musikwissenschaft* 14, ed. Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht), Munich–Salzburg 1983.

<sup>382</sup> See "The Date of Bruckner's 'Nullified' Symphony in D minor", *19th-Century Music* 6 (1983), pp. 252–263; see also Bo Marschner, "Die chronologischen Probleme der 'Nullten' Symphonie Bruckners", *BrJb* 1987–88, pp. 53–62.

<sup>383</sup> Rather than the 'Nullte' or the First Symphony of 1865–66, the 'starting point' of Bruckner's symphonic evolution could equally well be taken as the F-minor "Studiensymphonie" WAB 99, of 1863. The use of the 'Nullte' as a starting point for Bruckner's evolution is a serious problem for the tremendous weight of analysis,

The shortcomings of Notter's study is by no means limited to the veracity of its diachronic underpinnings, however. The tone of the study is repellently critical, sparing no opportunity to denigrate the composer over the presumed inadequacies of his formal conception and (lack of) formal evolution. While Notter can speculate as to whether the Ninth Symphony requires a Finale (without the bases for such speculation ever being brought into question),<sup>384</sup> he comes to the conclusion that,

Nimmt man die 'pyramidalen' Schlußsätze der vierten bis achten Sinfonie beim Wort und mißt sie an dem Anspruch, den sie an sich selbst stellen: die Sinfonie zusammenzufassen und abzuschließen, so muß man Bruckner vorwerfen, er habe in ihnen mit physischer Gewalt ein sinfonisches Ganzes realisieren wollen, das von den Vordersätzen bereits hinreichend umschrieben wird. Im Fall der neunten Sinfonie kann man aufatmend feststellen, daß dem Torso durch Zufall ein ähnliches Schicksal erspart geblieben ist: die auskomponierten Vordersätze machen entgegen Bruckners Einsicht und Absicht ein Ganzes aus. Statt also generell zu sagen, Bruckners Sinfonie sei kein Ganzes, weil das Finale aus ihr herausfalle, sollte man sagen, sie sei möglicherweise auch ohne Finale ein Ganzes. So gesehen verdankt sich die Vollendung der neunten Sinfonie nicht zufälligen Abwesenheit eines Schlußsatzes, sondern der Einheit ihrer vorderen Teile, — alles dessen, was vor dem ausdrücklichen Finalsatz erklingt.<sup>385</sup>

The following passage illustrates, however, as much enthusiasm for the movement as Notter reveals for any work by Bruckner:

Die faszinierende verve dieses Finales, das die Sonate mit einer Fuge multipliziert und so ein doppeltes Ganzes bildet, kommt ihm also nicht als freier Überschuß zugute, sondern wird ihm aufgezwungen, um die Vordersätze übertrumpfen zu können. Das Ergebnis dieser tour de force ist ein 'groß angelegter' Ausfluß derselben Finalideologie, die auch die monströsen Schlußsätze [!] der fünften oder achten Sinfonie auf dem Gewissen hat.<sup>386</sup>

It is nonetheless to Notter's credit that he makes a careful "Analyse der überlieferten Skizzen",<sup>387</sup> noting, as did Haas and Blume, that Bruckner left the Finale "in einem 'ziemlich weit fortgeschritten Stadium der Arbeit' [cf. Orel D/64], nämlich nahezu vollendet". Notter's analysis is worth recounting in some detail here, and reveals not only perceptive analysis but can be regarded as one of the very few attempts to view the form and thematic material of the movement in a positive light. The movement begins, for Notter,

---

formal critique and speculative conclusion that Notter proceeds to build upon the assumption that it predated the First Symphony; cf. for instance Notter, p. 21.

<sup>384</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 47f.

<sup>385</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>386</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>387</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.

mit einem motivisch-genetischen Einleitungsfeld, das weniger an den ersten Satz als an den harmonischen Humus des Scherzobeginns erinnert. Allein die Tatsache, daß hier die thematische Unmittelbarkeit des Adagios verlorengegangen ist, spricht Bände: das Finale ‘revoziert’ die Errungenschaften des langsamen Satzes und benötigt wieder Einleitungen und Vortheemen, —also Dinge, die das Adagio bereits überwunden hat.

Diese selbstständige Einleitung erinnert an die Schlußsätze der ‘nullten’ und fünften Sinfonie, die als einzige nicht nur langsame Einleitungen, sondern auch fugierte Durchführungen besitzen. Beides hängt zusammen: ein Fugenthema, wie auch das Finale der Neunten eines hat, läßt sich harmonisch schwer fixieren und benötigt eine Vorentwicklung, die es gebrauchsfertig herausarbeitet. Es sind demnach die älteren Finaleinleitungen, die dem Schlußsatz der neunten Sinfonie das Schema liefern [...]

Dennoch verweist die Einleitung negativ auf den ersten Satz. Sie bildet ein einziges quantitatives thematisches Crescendo ohne irgendwelche Bruchstellen; hier wird ein bestimmtes Verhältnis von Form und Thema festgelegt und beibehalten, während die komplizierte Vorentwicklung des ersten Satzes die Form erst nach einem spürbaren Ruck auf ihr thematisches Niveau hebt.

#### The principal theme of the Finale itself:

glänzt durch tonale Unbestimmtheit; es steht in d-Moll, klingt aber streckenweise nach B-Dur und g-Moll [...]. Es verwickelt sich zu einem Knäuel, einer motivischen Einheit, die harmonischen Zündstoff für eine eigene zusätzliche Form besitzt. Seine Funktion als Hauptthema einer Sonatenform wird um diesen harmonischen ‘Affekt’ gesteigert.

Tatsächlich erinnert das Thema mit seiner gezackten rhythmischen Lineatur und seinem aufgespeicherten harmonischen Konfliktpotential eher an ein Fugen- denn an ein Sonatenthema. In ihm knistern Spannungen, die an Ort and Stelle, nämlich im Thema selber (und nicht erst im Verlauf einer ‘multithematischen’ Form wie der Sonate) ausgetragen und erschöpft werden wollen, und die Form, die solches leistet, heißt Fuge. Die Fuge wird in diesem Satz nicht zur Sonatenform addiert und ersetzt sie auch nicht: die Sonate wird um die Fuge vervielfacht.

Although Notter misses the point that the Gesangsp., too, must have been far more substantially worked out than appears in the surviving versions,<sup>388</sup> he, apparently for the first time for a German musicologist, shows an intelligently perceptive approach to the philological problems of the MSS. He noted for instance the missing bifolio(s) at the beginning of the Durchf.<sup>389</sup> and recognised—probably for the first time ever—the significance of the metrical numbering at this point, which indicates that the first two mm. on this bifol. are the last two of a musical period, and that the same situation can be found on the next surviving bifol. However, Orel’s error concerning the identity of bifol. 31E/“32” remained unresolved<sup>390</sup> (a mistake that was only to be discovered by Samale and Mazzuca via reference to the original

<sup>388</sup> “Der unbefriedigende Zustand, in dem Bruckner den Seitensatz hinterließ, trägt viel zum Charakter des Unfertigen bei, den die fast völlig ausgearbeiteten Skizzen seltsamerweise an sich haben” (*ibid.*, p. 51).

<sup>389</sup> “so setzt der nächste erhaltene Bogen mitten darin” (*ibid.*, p. 52).

<sup>390</sup> “Bruckner hat, so scheint es, einen Alternativepilog komponiert, dessen Anfang verschollen ist” (*ibid.*, p. 52).

MSS)—perhaps on the basis of this Notter assumed that the remainder of the movement was unfinished rather than simply had pieces missing. Hence, the “Reprise der Gesangspartie, wie Bruckner in seine Skizzen schrieb, läßt sich genauso wenig rekonstruieren wie ihre Exposition”;<sup>391</sup> “[a]uch der Übergang zum dritten Thema blieb unfertig”.<sup>392</sup>

The overriding tenor of Notter’s discussion remained, however, the formal and structural inadequacies of Bruckner’s symphonic solution—perhaps a necessary compensation to the previous idolisation of the composer; perhaps also a music-analytical counterpart to the iconoclasm of the Viennese Bruckner revisionists of the same period. Notter remained most critical of the absence of true formal evolution in Bruckner’s symphonic Finales and their formal elaboration, suggesting that it is ultimately only by force that Bruckner achieved structural unity:

In jedem seiner Finales probiert Bruckner eine neue Lösung durch; es gibt keinen Satztyp, den er so mannigfach variiert hätte, doch alle früheren Werke versagen an dieser Stelle gleichermaßen. Die Schlußsätze sind zwar ebenso schematisiert wie die Eingangssätze, aber ihre Schemata legen keine Evolution zurück in dem Sinn, daß sie—auch mit Unterbrechungen—aufeinanderbauen; sie zehren von der Evolution der anderen Sätze, statt selber durch sie hindurchzutragen.

Offensichtlich ist dies der falsche Weg, das Finalproblem anzugehen [!], den Bruckner aus irgend einem Grund nicht verlassen konnte; so hält er zäh daran fest, seinen Schlußsatz mit allerlei Absichten und Funktionen regelrecht zu überschwemmen. Keiner der vorderen Sätze zerfällt so stark in einzelne, auch stilistisch verschiedene Passagen (die monumental-statische Einleitung, die kontrapunktische Durchführung, die choralartige Apotheose usw.). Die Vordersätze entwickeln ihren Reichtum aus der Auseinandersetzung ihrer Themen mit der Form,—aus ihren eigenen Schemata; das Finale hingegen bekommt seinen schematischen Reichtum von einer Instanz zugestanden, die entschieden hat, daß ihm dieser Reichtum im Interesse der Gesamtsinfonie zusteht.<sup>393</sup>

In its overriding focus on issues of musical structure, Notter’s approach tells us much—probably more than we wish to know—about what Notter himself regarded as the requisite elements of a good symphony and what Bruckner should or should not have done to achieve them, but leaves us no better informed about what Bruckner himself may have wished to achieve or what the composer himself regarded as important: is this kind of super-critical positivism any more productive than the *schwärmerisch* tone and mystical metaphors of an Oskar Lang?

Finally, mention should be made of the thought-provoking approach made to the Finale by musicologist and conductor Peter Gülke (b. 1934) in his *Brahms—Bruckner: Zwei Studien*

---

<sup>391</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>392</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55.

<sup>393</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56; cf. also Notter’s statements concerning the conclusion of the Finale of the Eighth, p. 110.

of 1989,<sup>394</sup> the Bruckner essay of which, entitled “Bruckner: Von seiner Neunten Sinfonie aus gesehen”, recalls in its recourse to medieval philosopher Jakob Böhme<sup>395</sup> and others the metaphysics of an earlier era of Bruckner reception, but at a deeper level and coupled with significantly greater insight into the compositional processes of the composer.<sup>396</sup> Concerning the conclusion of the Adagio and the Finale Gülke notes perceptively that:

So sehr man sich hüten muß, das factum brutum des fragmentarisch gebliebenen Finales a posteriori zur Intention umzufälschen—daß der Adagio-Schluß mehr ist als ein Schluß nur dieses Satzes, Ausklang von mehr als dem hier Abgehandelten, läßt sich so wenig überhören wie simpel strukturell begründen. Immerhin entspricht es der Dimensionierung der vorangegangenen Eskalation, auch sie nicht nur Ergebnis des in dem Satz Angelegten, sondern eine Überschreitung, in der die hinter den Individuationen der je einzelnen Sinfonien gelegene ‘Hauptmusik’ durchzuschlagen scheint, die ‘eigentliche’, sie alle idealtypisch in sich summierende Sinfonie, an der Bruckner auf dem Umweg über das einzelne Werk immer gearbeitet hat.<sup>397</sup>

Gülke’s reflections, particularly on the issues of period structure and mutation in Bruckner’s music, represent insightful and sympathetic assessments of the composer’s achievement and stand in bold contrast to Notter’s highly critical approach. The pertinence of his conclusions are weakened by a number of factual errors, however. Among them is his reference to the climactic dissonance of the Adagio (m. 206), as a “Neuntöneklang”;<sup>398</sup> although the chord in question is not in fact any such ‘synthetic’ chord in the sense of the climax of Mahler’s Tenth Symphony Adagio, but, as we will see (§2.1.3), a theoretically valid (in terms of the theory of the time), complete dominant thirteenth in C# minor—i.e., in Bruckner’s didactic terminology, a ‘Siebenklang’.<sup>399</sup> Gülke also explains that the Finale—presumably on the basis of the typographic error in Manfred Wagner’s text, noted in §1.1.6—was begun by Bruckner in May 1894,<sup>400</sup> hence prior to completion of the Adagio; *pace* Gülke, however, that Bruckner’s phrase “neue Skizze” in the calendar notice suggests the existence of a previous sk. is contradicted by the composer’s own remark “*erstes Mal* Finale”.

A further lapse concerns Gülke’s reference to an “im Finaleentwurf der Neunten nur als Dimension notierten ‘16 Takte’ [...] in einer als Fuge intendierten Passage”.<sup>401</sup> Bruckner’s

<sup>394</sup> Publ. Kassel–Basel. Thanks to Prof. Gülke for his kind gift of a copy of the typescript prior to its publication.

<sup>395</sup> See Gülke, p. 75 and again, pp. 136f.

<sup>396</sup> The eloquent prose of this essay has already been cited in §1.1.1. Cf. nonetheless Othmar Wessely’s remarks on Bruckner’s alleged mysticism, “Bruckner—ein Mystiker?”, *BrJb* 1989/90, pp. 213–218.

<sup>397</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 114.

<sup>398</sup> P. 83.

<sup>399</sup> The lapse is noted by Walter-Wolfgang Sparrer in his review of *Brahms—Bruckner: Zwei Studien*, in *NZfM* 151, no. 9 (Sept 1990), p. 52. See further the discussion of Bruckner’s “Terzschichtung”, §2.1.3.

<sup>400</sup> P. 139.

<sup>401</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 134 and again, p. 141.

MSS themselves make no such reference to '16 Takte'—Gülke obviously took the words from Orel's own four-stave conflation of the MSS (cf. D/135) in which the length of "Bg. 19 D" is given as 16 mm;<sup>402</sup> moreover, the passage to which Gülke refers—within the context of explaining Bruckner's "Quadratur der Musik"—occurs ironically in the middle of an unusual passage of three-measure periods.<sup>403</sup> While such errors by no means invalidate the contentions based upon them, they remind us that writers expounding their own, however relevant and insightful reflections about what a composer may have thought and why he wrote as he did, must base their thinking firmly on accurate observation and assured fact.

A further recent publication to deal with the Ninth Symphony<sup>404</sup> was Wolfram Steinbeck's *Anton Bruckner, Neunte Symphonie d-Moll*.<sup>405</sup> Here at last, one might have thought, the author of a monograph entirely devoted to a discussion of the symphony might have taken the opportunity to properly research the question of the fourth movement. The opposite was the case: in effect, Steinbeck silenced the composer by treating the question as simply irrelevant. His position on the question of the 'completion' of the symphony, for instance, was that, "Die Neunte ist ein Torso, und der Adagio-Schluß bezeugt—so wie er ist, fast verklärend—*Bruckners Verstummen*".<sup>406</sup> Concerning the notion of the Te Deum being used as a conclusion to the symphony, Steinbeck claimed, "[n]ur falsches Pathos und musikalisches Unverständnis machen glauben, daß der Schein viersätziger Vollständigkeit, auch wenn er nur als Behelf deklariert wird, durch Anfügen des Te Deums bewahrt werde. Das Gegenteil trifft zu: es entlarvt."<sup>407</sup> The Finale itself was accorded the most peremptory treatment, dismissed, without a single musical example, in a few brief paragraphs referring to the Orel edition, the ubiquitous fallacy of the five (or six?) versions, and the work of Samale and Mazzuca.<sup>408</sup> He concluded:

Wie auch immer die ästhetischen Belange solcher Komplettierungsversuche einzuschätzen sind, —immerhin macht sie das umfangreiche und bedeutende Material zum Schlußsatz aufführbar, *selbst wenn man es als Finale nicht verwenden mag*. Authentisch und vollendet ist die Neunte nur bis zum Adagio. Und dies ist in mehrfachen Sinne ein geeigneter Schlußsatz für Bruckners letzte Symphonie.<sup>409</sup>

---

<sup>402</sup> Based on Bruckner's numbering through of the measures of the fugue (cf. D/110). The 16 mm. cited by Orel for the contents of Bogen 19D was therefore less indicative of any quadratic musical structure than of the 'quadratic structure'—4 x 4 mm. per bifol.—of Bruckner's 'Bogen-Verfahren'.

<sup>403</sup> Cf. AP, E/82–90; Bruckner was making his first recourse to three-m. periods here since the likewise fugal Finale of the Fifth Symphony. See further discussion of Bruckner's metrical structures in §2.1.5.

<sup>404</sup> With the exception of those related to the present writer's work; see ch. 3.4, in particular §3.4.3.

<sup>405</sup> *Meisterwerke der Musik* 60, Munich 1993.

<sup>406</sup> Steinbeck, p. 11, as quoted by Partsch in *IBG-Mitt* no. 43 (December 1994), p. 36; italics added.

<sup>407</sup> Steinbeck, *ibid.*; quoted by Partsch, p. 37.

<sup>408</sup> Further remarks by Steinbeck will be cited in the latter context; see §1.4.13.

<sup>409</sup> Steinbeck, p. 11; italics added.



Thus, even with a performable Finale, any sort of approach to Bruckner's own conception of the Ninth Symphony in four movements was somehow still 'less valid' than a performance concluding with the Adagio; the Finale remained for Steinbeck an irrelevant appendage to a work essentially 'vollendet' in its first three movements. Rather than expressing curiosity about what the composer might have intended or what might have been, a German musicologist here faithfully fulfilled what he saw as his foremost duty: to preserve and uphold the canon at all costs.<sup>410</sup>

### 1.3.12 Towards a 'Wirkungsgeschichte' of the Ninth Symphony.

As the question of a 'Wirkungsgeschichte' of the Ninth and of Bruckner's music in general would justify a doctoral thesis in itself, discussion here has been limited to a brief overview and two cases in which a clearly identifiable response to the Bruckner Ninth was made. Gustav Mahler (1860–1911), in both his Ninth and to a lesser extent the unfinished Tenth Symphony, was to pay obvious homage to the Adagio of Bruckner's Ninth, while Austrian composer Gottfried von Einem (1918–1996), in his *Bruckner Dialog* for orchestra, Op. 39 (1971), was to salvage the Finale's spiritual nexus, its chorale, incorporating it in a profoundly moving and musically meaningful way as the most obviously 'borrowed' element of a score which, in Manfred Wagner's words, represents an "Auseinandersetzung mit Widmungscharakter".<sup>411</sup>

While numerous innovative elements can be found in Bruckner's music, it is easy to generalise about their possible influences on later composers and more difficult to pick out specific elements or compositional features of the Ninth which may have been adopted consciously or otherwise by later composers with demonstrable links to Bruckner. The question of the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Bruckner's music, particularly in regard to its influence on the avant-garde of this century, has been discussed in a number of articles. It constituted a central issue at the ABIL Symposium of 1981, entitled "Die österreichische Symphonie nach Anton Bruckner", of particular interest here being papers given by Rudolf Stephan and Robert Schollum dealing with Bruckner's influence on later symphonists.<sup>412</sup> A detailed study of Bruckner's influence on the Second Viennese School, Schoenberg's evaluation of Bruckner,

<sup>410</sup> As noted by Partsch (p. 37), Steinbeck's monograph appeared only shortly before the Aufführungsfassung, to which Steinbeck nowhere makes reference, despite its premiere performance two years before and the articles that appeared subsequently in the *ÖMz* (see ch. 3.4, in particular §3.4.3).

<sup>411</sup> *BrLWD*, p. 398; further discussion *infra*.

<sup>412</sup> Rudolf Stephan, "Über den Einfluß, den Anton Bruckner ausgeübt hat", in: *BrSympBer 1981* (Linz–Vienna 1983), pp. 41–48; Robert Schollum, "Symphonie—Umkreisungen eines Themas mit Ausblicken auf unsere Zeit", in: *BrSympBer 1981*, pp. 75–92.

and the nature and extent of progressive elements in Bruckner's style was made some years later by Constantin Floros at the 1987 Leipzig Gewandhaus Symposium.<sup>413</sup>

Beyond the immediate sphere of influence exercised by Bruckner's music (and teaching) upon largely Viennese composers of ensuing generations, one of the underlying problems for the formulation of a factual, rather than speculative *Wirkungsgeschichte* is the difficulty of discerning between varying degrees of influence, their modes of transmission and the difference between, on the one hand, genuine and specific compositional response and on the other the overriding influence of stylistic musical evolution in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Bruckner's originality as an orchestral composer was disguised in the re-instrumentations and cuts of the first editions of his music, and advanced by conservative, often reactionary critics, appropriated by fascist ideology, his music was largely disregarded. Yet, as we will see, much of what Bruckner set out to achieve, and which was recognised in his own time as unique, was taken further by Mahler, and it was Mahler's music, rather than Bruckner's, that came to be seen as progressive and forward-looking. Yet Mahler's music, without the model Bruckner provided, could never have been written.

In an article from the late 1970s, Siegfried Thiele<sup>414</sup> claimed that the significance of Bruckner for twentieth-century composers had been overlooked, while Mahler's was emphasised. Limiting himself to the Third Symphony (itself a problematic choice, due to the pre-eminent influence of the Beethoven Ninth in this symphony), he isolates a number of musical elements—"strukturelles Instrumentierung, rhythmische Differenzierung des Einzelklanges, wechselnde Dichte und Intervall-Metamorphosen", tracing their ramifications in the music of Bartók and Lutoslawski, for which these parameters have "herausragende Bedeutung". He concluded that it was apparent

daß die vielfältigen Beziehungen zwischen Bruckner einerseits und der Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts andererseits zwar unleugbar präsent, aber auch nicht so zu verstehen sind, daß außer ihnen nichts wesentlich anderes in der neuen Musik sich entwickelt hätte [!].

Die vorangehend besprochenen Phänomene [...], sind bei Bruckner—gelegentlich nur keimhaft—so behandelt, daß die nach Polyphonisierung strebende Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts nicht umhin kann, auch das Werk dieses seltsam Unzeitgemäßen als eine ihrer Wurzeln zu verstehen.<sup>415</sup>

—thereby leaving unclear, to just what extent this root can be regarded as an actual source and not merely part of the ongoing musical developments of the time, of which Bruckner himself was only a small part. Particularly in the case of Bartók, not a word is spent on the likely or

<sup>413</sup> "Bruckner—der Progressive", in: *Anton Bruckner: Leben—Werk—Interpretation—Rezeption: Kongreßbericht zum V. Internationalen Gewandhaus-Symposium anlässlich der Gewandhaus-Festtage 1987* (Leipzig 1988), pp. 144–149.

<sup>414</sup> "Bruckner und die Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts", *NZfM* 139 (1978), pp. 396–403.

<sup>415</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 403.

possible means of the transmission of such influences: with what works of Bruckner might Bartók have actually been familiar?

Manfred Wagner, in his essay “Musik von gestern—Provokation für heute: Zum Einfluß Anton Bruckners auf die musikalische Gegenwart”<sup>416</sup> wrote at length on the topic of the parallels between several elements in Bruckner’s style, noting the increasing recognition of Bruckner’s significance for contemporary composition since the newer interpretative style of Bruckner performance emerged in the 1970s, a search for influences and anticipations hitherto more the domain of the Mahler scholar.<sup>417</sup> Wagner discusses such compositions as Klaus Huber’s *Turnus* of 1974 and the *Bruckner-Dialog* of von Einem from the same year,<sup>418</sup> both works written explicitly as compositional responses to Bruckner, as will be discussed later. He claimed parallels in the “Prinzip der Entwicklung” exemplified in the beginnings of Bruckner’s symphonies and Stockhausen’s “Erforschung des Klanges”,<sup>419</sup> with Ligeti’s concept of an ‘imaginären musikalischen leeren Raumes’,<sup>420</sup> and the exploration of limited dynamic ranges, with reference to the Ligeti’s *Atmosphères* of 1961, *Lux aeterna* of 1962 and the Second String Quartet of 1968;<sup>421</sup> further parallels to contemporary composition can be found in Bruckner’s treatment of characteristic intervals, particularly the fifth, his structuralism, apparent “Zerstücktheit” and construction of large-scale structures through the use of units and formal blocks, while his extended use of recurrent motives or compositional modules throughout a composition can be found in the works of minimalist composers such as Terry Riley. Although not so-termed by Wagner, Bruckner’s adherence to extended ostinato patterns is being indicated here.<sup>422</sup> Surely, however, the parallels drawn by Wagner between Bruckner’s general pauses and Cage’s exploration of silence, particularly in the latter’s *4’33’’* must be regarded as far-fetched.<sup>423</sup> By way of summary, Wagner maintained that:

Bruckner selbst versuchte, diese Errungenschaften von der Erforschung der Klangmaterialien einerseits und einer synthetisch aufzubauenden Architektur andererseits in einer dialektischen Kombination zum Gewebe zu verbinden. Für die Zukunft der Musik, für heute also, dürften die Bewußtseinsvorgänge ungleich wichtiger gewesen sein als die

---

<sup>416</sup> *BrLWD*, pp. 397ff. An earlier version can be found in the eponymous article, *Musik-Konzepte*, nos. 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 71–85.

<sup>417</sup> *BrLWD*, p. 397.

<sup>418</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 398.

<sup>419</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>420</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 400.

<sup>421</sup> See also Andrea Harrandt’s report, on a paper given at the first American Bruckner symposium (Connecticut College, New London, 21–24 February 1994) by Amy Bauer, and attempting “die Einflüsse Bruckners in der Orchestermusik György Ligetis nachzuweisen” (“Erstes Bruckner Symposium in den USA”, *ÖMz* 49, no. 6 (June 1994), p. 385, also in *ÖGM-Mitt* Dec. 1994, p. 58).

<sup>422</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 400ff.

<sup>423</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 398.

oftmals zitierten, streng formalen Erweiterungen des III. Themas oder die Integrierung des Choral.<sup>424</sup>

Mathias Hansen pointed out that:

Thieles Ansatz weicht [...] allen Fehldeutungen aus, welche unmittelbar-vordergründige Vergleiche und Zusammenhangskonstruktionen zwischen Brucknerscher und zeitgenössischer Musik verführerisch nahelegen—wie sie etwa in Manfred Wagners abwegiger Behauptung auftauchen, daß Bruckners ‘Schichtdenken’ eine Entsprechung in den Modellen der seriellen Musik hätte [...] usw.<sup>425</sup>

Thiele's approach is echoed in an article by Michael Adensamer tracing the impact of innovative elements of Bruckner's style as exemplified in the opening of the Adagio of the Ninth.<sup>426</sup> Adensamer notes that it is first and foremost moments of great expressive intensity which are the “eigentlich zukunftsweisenden”, and “Diese müssen—um die Intensität zur Form kommen zu lassen—traditionelle Formen sprengen”.<sup>427</sup>

Adensamer proceeds to illustrate that it is precisely those points in the Adagio of the Ninth, “wo er im Sonatensatz gegen das Schema komponiert, die zukunftsweisenden sind”,<sup>428</sup> leaving unresolved the issue as to whether the Adagio is really in sonata form or not. Accordingly, he claims the opening interval of the Adagio (the minor ninth) as: “die hörbare Überschreitung der durch die Oktave gesetzten Grenzen. Deshalb ist dieser erste Schritt so ausdrucksstark, weil er Grenzen sprengt. Das Wort Ausdruck deutet ja das Sprengende an.”<sup>429</sup> The opening paragraph of the movement is interpreted within the framework of its non-traditional, forward-looking elements; the climax of m. 17 is seen—rather than as a dominant eleventh chord on F#, with the third omitted—as a root-less “Aufeinanderschichtung von vier Quinten”, “ein in sich ruhendes Gebilde, das von sich aus—trotz dissonanten Charakters—

---

<sup>424</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 404.

<sup>425</sup> Hansen, p. 322.

<sup>426</sup> “Bruckners Einfluß auf die Moderne (mit Beispielen aus dem Adagio der 9. Symphonie)”, *BrJb* 1980, pp. 27–31. Cf. Kirsch's review of the article, “Die Bruckner-Forschung... (II)”, p. 254: “Inwieweit es möglich sein wird, über solch punktuelle Gegebenheiten hinaus, kompositorische Komponenten Bruckners in größerem Umfang als ‘zukunftssträchtig’ zu definieren oder etwa gar als Rechtfertigung ‘moderner Schreibweise’ zu benennen, sei noch dahingestellt; einige Zweifel seien aber doch schon erlaubt. Vielleicht läßt sich ‘das Moderne’ an Bruckner viel eher an Gustav Mahler aufzeigen, und die Größe des Komponisten Bruckner erlebt keinerlei Einbuße, wenn man sie allein aus ihrer Zeit heraus definiert und dabei feststellt, daß das Brucknersche Werk im besten Sinne des Wortes Abschluß bedeutet, und zwar historisch unmittelbar vor jener ‘Katastrophe’ aus der allein Neues entstehen konnte.” Oddly however, Kirsch re-examines Adensamer's efforts in a quite contradictory and far more positive light: *ibid.* (III), pp. 243f.

<sup>427</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>428</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>429</sup> *Ibid.*

keine Auflösung verlangt; ein Akkord, der in der traditionellen Harmonielehre nicht zu finden ist".<sup>430</sup>

While the origin of such chords in Bruckner—as we shall see<sup>431</sup>—can in fact be found in nineteenth-century harmony textbooks, Adensamer's method of extracting 'zukunftsweisenden' elements of Bruckner's music and seeing it, post hoc, through the medium of subsequent analytical methodologies overlooks the firm grounding of this music in the harmonic and formal theory of the early and mid-nineteenth century. In making recourse to such theoretical models, Bruckner was not so much 'destroying' traditional form as re-interpreting and expanding older conceptions of it. Later we find the same measures described by Adensamer as static, undynamic and non-thematic, contradicting "der vom Wesen her dynamischen Sonatensatzform",<sup>432</sup> yet passages of extended harmonic stasis such as these can be found repeatedly in Beethoven and Schubert as well as numerous other elements of Bruckner's language. What is obviously required, before such elements can be isolated as original, unique and progressive, is a more secure placement of Bruckner within the stylistic continuum of the nineteenth century, an approach more successfully realised in Floros' 1987 essay "Bruckner—der Progressive", mentioned above. For Floros, the progressive tendencies of the time, the "Erweiterung der Tonalität", found their most obvious manifestation in Bruckner's harmonic style, "ebenso kühn wie 'logisch'", in particular his predilection for dissonance, for "lang angehaltene Nonen- Undezim- und Tredezimklänge, die er besonders gern an Höhepunkten seiner Sätze einsetzt". [...] Überhaupt ist die Neunte ein Werk, das man als Stück Neue Musik betrachten und analysieren sollte."<sup>433</sup> The complete thirteenth chord of the climax of the Adagio represented for Floros:

ein Nonplusultra an Modernität. Er stieß mit ihnen in Ausdrucksbezirke vor, die bereits den Expressionismus ankündigen [...] So gesehen muß es ein Rätsel bleiben, warum Schönberg die Progressivität der Brucknerschen Musik offenbar nicht erkannt hat.<sup>434</sup>

—although Floros overlooked the fact that the chord in question, which Löwe expunged from the first-edition score, remained unknown for 38 years after its composition. Norbert Nagler<sup>435</sup> similarly cited the opening of the Adagio of the Ninth as a direct link to Schoenberg's "emancipation of the dissonance".

---

<sup>430</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

<sup>431</sup> See §2.1.3.

<sup>432</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

<sup>433</sup> p. 147.

<sup>434</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 147f. See the further discussion of such chords in §2.1.3.

<sup>435</sup> "Bruckners gründerzeitliche Monumentalsymphonie: Reflexionen zur Heteronomie kompositorischer Praxis", *Musik-Konzepte*, nos. 23–24, Jan. 1982; pp. 114f.

Like Wagner and Adensamer, Floros' approach to the problem of Bruckner's influence raises the issue of how the 'unzeitgemäß' character of Bruckner's music was received in its own time. It is significant, and in fact scarcely surprising, that it was most often precisely those elements regarded by Bruckner's first editors, performers and audiences as alienating and therefore customarily either ameliorated or eliminated in the first-edition scores, which emerged as the more significant for later compositional styles, either as actual models for which a known 'vector of influence' can be demonstrated, or as indirectly related precursors, part of the broad evolutionary lineage of modern music.

Definite influences can, of course, be traced in the music of the composers immediately succeeding Bruckner, although in many cases little work has been done on an entire generation of competent composers, overshadowed in their historic significance by the parallel or subsequent development of the Second Viennese School. A complicating factor was the greater impact of Richard Wagner upon not only works of the operatic but also the orchestral repertoire, within which broader stylistic category Bruckner's music was, at least until the 1930s, customarily viewed. Among the more minor composers to reveal the immediate influence of Bruckner's style, mention must be made of Bruckner's pupil Friedrich Klose,<sup>436</sup> who wrote no symphonies but a number of tone poems for orchestra (the opening theme of his grandiose Jugendstil oratorio, *Der Sonnengeist* (1918) pointedly recalls the motto theme of Bruckner's Third Symphony), the Austrians Franz Schmidt<sup>437</sup> and later Johann Nepomuk David,<sup>438</sup> the German composer Richard Wetz,<sup>439</sup> August Halm<sup>440</sup> and even Siegmund von Hausegger.<sup>441</sup> Other symphonists of the period such as Felix Woyrsch<sup>442</sup> were more influenced by the symphonic legacy of Brahms rather than Bruckner. The impact of Bruckner on the other major North German composer of the period, Max Reger (1873–1916), is similarly difficult to establish (perhaps surprisingly, considering the fact that both composers were organists); the orchestral style of Richard Strauss (1864–1949), perhaps the representative composer of the period, while surely owing something to Bruckner's monumental symphonic conception, remains curiously intractable when it comes to establishing links of any specificity. The impact of the uncompromising nature of Bruckner's symphonic conception rather than of specific components of his style on composers of the

---

<sup>436</sup> 1862–1942.

<sup>437</sup> 1874–1939; four symphonies.

<sup>438</sup> 1895–1977; eight symphonies. See further concerning these and more minor Austrian symphonic composers of this century, Robert Schollum, "Symphonie—Umkreisungen eines Themas mit Ausblicken auf unsere Zeit", pp. 81ff.

<sup>439</sup> 1875–1935; three symphonies.

<sup>440</sup> 1869–1929; two symphonies.

<sup>441</sup> 1872–1948, several tone poems.

<sup>442</sup> 1860–1944; several orchestral tone poems and six symphonies.

twelve-tone school such as Arnold Schoenberg (1874–1951), and later Ernst Krenek (1900–1991) has been demonstrated by Rudolf Stephan.<sup>443</sup> An evaluation of the varying degrees of compositional response to Bruckner made by later symphonists outside the Central European tradition, such as Jean Sibelius,<sup>444</sup> Carl Nielsen,<sup>445</sup> Charles Ives<sup>446</sup> among many later American symphonists, or in England Vaughan Williams,<sup>447</sup> the remarkable Havergal Brian<sup>448</sup> and more recently Robert Simpson,<sup>449</sup> if demonstrable at all, lies even further outside the confines of the present overview. Many factors combined to limit the sphere of Bruckner's influence—first and foremost the cultural isolation created around his music by the conservative critics who advanced it and right-wing ideology with which it came to be associated. As Hansen pointed out, and as we have already noted:<sup>450</sup>

Ein gutes Jahrzehnt nach Kriegsende war Bruckner noch immer, in der Aufführungspraxis wie in der Publizistik, eine vorrangig österreichische bzw. deutsche Angelegenheit [...]. Es war dies auch eine Folge des irrationalistischen Brucknerkults, der andere Nationen brüskieren, beunruhigen, letzten Endes bedrohen mußte—und sollte.

Bruckner's music was also largely ignored by conductors and composers in the United States, although not for ideological reasons, as there appears to have been little awareness in America of his Nazi associations. Bruckner was marginalised there, as Gilliam observed, “because his compositional style was alien to the Brahmsian paradigm of logic, balance and economy so prevalent in the American academy of the time”.<sup>451</sup> Hence, the most immediate, significant and best validated assertions of links remain those which can be established between Bruckner and Mahler—for the latter's Ninth and Tenth Symphonies are both, in many ways, ‘silent’ homages to Bruckner's Ninth.

It should not be overlooked that Mahler was by no means an uncritical devotee of the older composer, despite demonstrable compositional borrowings and his enthusiasm for, in particular, the *Te Deum*.<sup>452</sup> Rudolf Stephan<sup>453</sup> quotes Natalie Bauer-Lechner's diary concerning a conversation held by her with Mahler in the summer of 1893:

---

<sup>443</sup> “Über den Einfluß, den Anton Bruckner ausgeübt hat”, pp. 43f.

<sup>444</sup> 1865–1957; seven symphonies.

<sup>445</sup> 1865–1931; six symphonies.

<sup>446</sup> 1874–1954; four symphonies.

<sup>447</sup> 1872–1958; nine symphonies.

<sup>448</sup> 1876–1972; 32 symphonies.

<sup>449</sup> Born 1921; nine symphonies.

<sup>450</sup> p. 317; quoted in §1.3.5 *supra*.

<sup>451</sup> “The Annexation...”, p. 600.

<sup>452</sup> §1.1.3 *supra*.

<sup>453</sup> “Mahlers Bruckner-Interpretation”, in: *BrSympBer 1982: Bruckner-Interpretation*, Linz–Vienna 1983, p. 103.

Bei Bruckner wird man freilich durch Größe und Reichtum der Erfindung hingerissen, aber auch jeden Augenblick durch ihre Zerstücktheit gestört und wieder herausgerissen. Ich kann das sagen, da du weißt, wie sehr ich Bruckner trotzdem verehere, und was in meiner Macht steht, werde ich immer tun, daß er gespielt und gehört werde.

Mahler is frequently recorded elsewhere as having described Bruckner as “ein einfältiger Mensch—halb Genie—halb Tröttel”<sup>454</sup>—an *infame dictu* which in fact originated with Hans von Bülow.<sup>455</sup> On the documentary basis of Mahler's surviving conducting scores of Bruckner's Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Symphonies as well as the often indignant critiques written of his interpretations by Theodor Helm and others, Ernst Hilmar<sup>456</sup> pointed out that Mahler made savage cuts in Bruckner's scores, for instance in the Sixth Symphony, of which he gave the first performance in Vienna in 1899. In the Fifth Symphony, which Mahler first performed in February 1901, he made even more substantial cuts, particularly in the first and second movements, along with numerous changes of instrumentation, dynamics and tempo indications. According to Hilmar,<sup>457</sup> Mahler missed in this score (which we nowadays regard as one of Bruckner's most compellingly constructed), “den logischen Aufbau, die Einheit des Ganzen und sah darin eher Zufälligkeiten als innere Kontinuität”. Mahler's attitude to Bruckner did not go uncriticised in his own time. A particularly vitriolic diatribe in the (anti-Semitic) *Deutsche Zeitung* of 18 March 1900<sup>458</sup> accused Mahler of negligence in not performing more Bruckner, and moreover, of performing him badly:

Als Sie aber zum Leiter der philharmonischen Concerte berufen wurden, was thaten Sie da und was hätten Sie thun müssen? Wußten Sie wirklich nicht, daß Sie als solcher für Liszt und vor allem für Bruckner etwas thun mußten? Und was haben Sie für diese gethan? Für Liszt? Erröthen Sie, wenn Sie es vermögen! Und für Bruckner? Haben Sie bloß der starken Bewegung, der für ihn im Gang ist, nachgegeben, wenn Sie zwei, sage ganze zwei Symphonien herausgebracht haben in all der ganzen Zeit? Und wie haben Sie sie herausgebracht? Ueberdies noch schlecht, ja, Sie haben sie zugrunde dirigiert.

Yet whatever Mahler may have thought of Bruckner's music and however he may have interpreted it, his enormous debt to the elder composer remains unchallenged. Constantin Floros in his “Bruckner und Mahler: Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede”,<sup>459</sup> an attempt to

<sup>454</sup> Ferdinand Pfohl, *Gustav Mahler: Eindrücke und Erinnerungen aus den Hamburger Jahren*, Knud Martner, ed., Hamburg 1973, p. 15; quoted among others by Floros, “Von Mahlers Affinität zu Bruckner”, in: *BrSympBer* 1986, Linz–Vienna 1989, p. 110.

<sup>455</sup> See §1.0.4.

<sup>456</sup> “Schade, aber es muß(te) sein’: Zu Gustav Mahlers Strichen und Retuschen insbesondere am Beispiel der V. Symphonie Anton Bruckners”, in: *Bruckner-Studien: Festgabe der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum 150. Geburtstag von Anton Bruckner*, ed. Othmar Wessely, Vienna 1975, pp. 187–201. Kirsch (“Die Bruckner-Forschung... (IV)”, p. 25) regards Hilmar's article very positively.

<sup>457</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 195; see also ensuing pages.

<sup>458</sup> P. 1, Anonymous, “Ein offener Brief an Gustav Mahler”.

<sup>459</sup> In: *BrSympBer* 1981, pp. 21–29 passim.



better delineate the links between the two composers, noted the prevalence of Bruckner reminiscences in several works of Mahler, among them echoes of Bruckner's Seventh (Finale) in the opening movement of Mahler's Sixth and the slow movement of Bruckner's Fourth in the opening movement of Mahler's Second.<sup>460</sup> However, it remains difficult to discern, *pace* Floros, to what extent these are unconscious or conscious reminiscences as opposed to reworkings of common elements of melodic and tonal usage. Floros is on safer ground in noting the significance of Bruckner's chorale themes (as in the Finale of the Fifth) for Mahler—although curiously the influences of Bruckner's Third Symphony, on the most obviously 'Brucknerian' of Mahler's symphonies, the Second, is not mentioned<sup>461</sup>—and the unquestionable impact made on Mahler by Bruckner's *Te Deum*.<sup>462</sup> Here it is surely not far-fetched to observe a response in the "Veni, Creator Spiritus" of Mahler's Eighth, as Floros investigated in his 1986 paper "Von Mahlers Affinität zu Bruckner".<sup>463</sup>

Othmar Wessely,<sup>464</sup> in discussing and relativising the problematic "Paarbildung" of Anton Bruckner–Gustav Mahler, emphasised the vastly different thought worlds and professional milieus inhabited by the two composers. Like Hilmar,<sup>465</sup> Rudolf Stephan, in his article "Mahlers Bruckner-Interpretation",<sup>466</sup> also discussed Mahler's retouchings and cuts in Bruckner's scores, and noted that Mahler's instrumental alterations often worked in favour of re-establishing the sonic character of Bruckner's original scores (whether coincidentally or not). Stephan concluded that: "Die Architektur Bruckners blieb Mahler fremd, der Klang Bruckners hat ihn tief berührt."<sup>467</sup> In any case: "Der Schlußsatz der Neunten Mahlers ist sicher das sichtbarste Zeichen der tiefen Verbundenheit".<sup>468</sup>

Mahler first heard the Bruckner Ninth in Salzburg in summer 1906 under the baton of Richard Strauss, noting in a letter to Alma Mahler (18 August 1906):<sup>469</sup> "Zur Feier Mozarts wurde die IX. von Bruckner aufgeführt [...] Salzburg bebt vor Begeisterung. Es war eine Art musikalischer Frühschoppen-Rettich mit Salzstangel. Nachher wurde jedenfalls viel Stigelbräu getrunken." While it is certainly possible, as Floros writes, "daß das scheinbar

---

<sup>460</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 24ff.

<sup>461</sup> See, however, Rudolf Stephan's article "Zum Thema 'Bruckner und Mahler'", *BrJb* 1981, pp. 138 (quoted *infra*), where several further, often more significant similarities are discussed, including the Second Symphony of Mahler.

<sup>462</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>463</sup> Pp. 110f.

<sup>464</sup> "Anton Bruckner und Gustav Mahler", *ÖMz* 32, no. 2 (Feb. 1977), pp. 57–67.

<sup>465</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 201.

<sup>466</sup> *BrSympBer* 1982, p. 108.

<sup>467</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>468</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>469</sup> Alma Mahler, ed., *Gustav Mahler: Erinnerungen und Briefe* (Amsterdam 1940, 2nd edition 1949), p. 365; quoted in Floros, "Von Mahlers Affinität zu Bruckner", p. 117, fn. 39.

geringschätziges Urteil auf die Aufführung und den festlichen Rahmen bezieht"<sup>470</sup> (and probably Mahler was already familiar with the work from a printed score), it is certainly not apparent from this report that Mahler had much sympathy for the work; perhaps it is significant that he was subsequently never to conduct it. What Floros, and indeed all previous commentators did not know, was that Alma had suppressed part of Mahler's comments. According to Henri-Louis De La Grange, the full *passus*, in his translation, is as follows: "In honour of Mozart, Bruckner's IXth was performed the day before it was Beethoven's Vth). This work is the height of nonsense (*Unsinn*). Salzburg quivered with enthusiasm [...]"<sup>471</sup> *Unsinn*, underlined in Mahler's original, is a sad assessment of a work that cannot but have influenced Mahler profoundly. Was this music perhaps too blatantly close to aspects of Mahler's own inner emotional life—one thinks of the musical world of his Second Symphony in particular—to allow him to make a more even-handed assessment of it? As De La Grange himself noted, "Mahler's harsh verdict on Bruckner's Ninth is tempered by the fact that the Finale of his own Ninth clearly bears the mark of the lasting impression that Bruckner's final Adagio had made on him."<sup>472</sup>

Mahler's identification with Bruckner perhaps went beyond the obvious musical affinities. As Floros writes in reference to Bruckner's remarks (quoted in §1.1.1) about not wishing to begin his Ninth Symphony, "Auch Mahler hatte eine abergläubische Furcht vor dem Begriff Neunte Symphonie".<sup>473</sup> The following passage concerning the 'naïvety' of Bruckner's dedication of his Ninth Symphony to God is of interest:<sup>474</sup>

Auf die Frage Natalies und Justines, ob es wahr sei, daß Bruckner seine letzte Symphonie 'dem lieben Gott' widmen wollte, erwiderte Mahler: 'Das ist sehr gut möglich, und er meinte das jedenfalls ernst und gläubig, wie es bei seiner Einfalt nur sein konnte.' Dabei erinnerte sich Mahler, wie Bruckner ihm bei seinem vorletzten Besuche, wo er ihn schon sehr leidend fand, sagte: "Ja, Lieber, jetzt heißt's fleißig sein, daß wenigstens die Zehnte [gemeint ist die Neunte<sup>475</sup>] noch fertig wird, sonst werd' ich dem lieben Gott schlecht bestehen, vor den ich bald kommen werde! Und er wird mir sagen: 'Wozu, Bürschel, hab ich dir denn so ein Talent gegeben, als daß du mir zum Lob und Preis singen sollst? Du hast aber noch viel zu wenig gemacht!'"

As is well known, Mahler's own strategy for avoiding the portentous title of 'Ninth Symphony' was the categorisation of his *Das Lied von der Erde* (1908), his next major work after the Eighth, as a 'symphony'; his 'actual' Ninth, completed in 1910, was hence already

<sup>470</sup> Floros, *ibid.*

<sup>471</sup> *Gustav Mahler, Volume 3: Vienna: Triumph and Disillusion (1904–1907)*, Oxford 1999, p. 442.

<sup>472</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>473</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 112f.

<sup>474</sup> Alma Mahler, ed., p.137; quoted in Floros, p. 110. No date for the visit is known.

<sup>475</sup> Note of Floros: the passage is however, another indication that the "Nullte" was probably, up until its 'annulment' in June 1895, still regarded by Bruckner as part of his symphonic canon.

his Tenth. While the significance of yet another Ninth was not lost on Mahler any more than it would be on subsequent reviewers of the first performance of Mahler's last completed symphony (the reviewer Julius Korngold<sup>476</sup> for instance pointed out the obvious connections with Beethoven and Bruckner, extending as far as choice of key, and that one accordingly expects a Ninth Symphony to be a 'Glaubensbekenntnis'<sup>477</sup>), Mahler's conclusion of the symphony with an extended Adagio represented, as Korngold noted,<sup>478</sup> an obvious and surely intentional homage to the Ninth of Bruckner, and a reflection of the Finale-function of the Adagio in what had by 1907 already become the standard performance tradition for the symphony (i.e., without the *Te Deum*). As Rudolf Stephan notes in his "Zum Thema 'Bruckner und Mahler'"<sup>479</sup> "Der Schlußsatz seiner [Mahlers] Neunten erweist [...] zur Genüge, wie stark das Werk Bruckners in ihm weitergewirkt hat." Stephan proceeds to compare<sup>480</sup> the opening of the Bruckner and Mahler Adagios, noting the greater length of Mahler's upbeat gesture: Löwe's phrasing is significant in Mahler's reshaping of Bruckner's motivic ninth into one of Mahler's "Aufschwungsfiguren, die weniger selbst etwas sind als auf etwas Komendes hinweisen."<sup>481</sup>

Finally, according to Peter Bergquist,<sup>482</sup> the full impact of Mahler's confrontation with the Adagio of the Bruckner Ninth is borne out by the initial Adagio of the Mahler Tenth, Bruckner's last Adagio being "clearly one of the Tenth's most direct antecedents". Hence, as Bergquist suggests, the long, sinuously expressive line of the violas at the outset of the Adagio of the Mahler Tenth can be regarded as an even further extension of what was, originally, Bruckner's opening gambit in the Adagio of his Ninth.<sup>483</sup> Stephan claims:

Das Adagio der Neunten Symphonie ist Mahlers erster großer langsamer Satz seit der Vierten. Was diese Sätze voneinander unterscheidet—und mehr noch den Schlußsatz der Neunten von den "kleinen" langsamen Sätzen der Fünften und Sechsten, die mehr der Sphäre der Rückert-Lieder entstammen—, ist der durch die neuerliche Befassung mit Bruckners Symphonik, jetzt mit dem später gewonnenen neuen Ausdrucksbereich, eine ganz neue Dimension. Es ist ein neuer, ein bis dahin ganz unbekannter Ton in Mahlers Symphonik gekommen, ein Ton, der nicht ephemerer Natur war, sondern, soweit sich das

---

<sup>476</sup> 1860–1945; music critic; father of the composer Erich.

<sup>477</sup> *Neue Freie Presse* (Vienna), 26 June 1912, p. 10; quoted in Manfred Wagner, *Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik...*, p. 387.

<sup>478</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 388.

<sup>479</sup> *BrJb* 1981, p. 138.

<sup>480</sup> p. 141.

<sup>481</sup> Concerning the origin and evolution of this figure in Mahler's works, see Kurt von Fischer, "Die Doppelschlagfigur in den letzten zwei Sätzen von Gustav Mahlers 9. Symphonie: Versuch einer Interpretation", *AfMw* 32 (1975), pp. 99–105.

<sup>482</sup> "The First Movement of Mahler's Tenth Symphony. An analysis and examination of the sketches", *The Music Forum* 5 (1980), p. 341.

<sup>483</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 340f.

Erkennen läßt, auch noch für die Konzeption der Zehnten konstitutiv bleibt. Mahlers Spätwerk—so bezeichne ich das letzte Werkpaar, die Neunte und die Zehnte—ist ohne diese Symphonie Bruckners nicht vorstellbar.<sup>484</sup>

While it might also be tempting to see the polychords in the Adagio of the Tenth Symphony of Mahler (cf. mm. 203ff. thereof) as direct descendents of the climax of the Adagio of the Bruckner Ninth,<sup>485</sup> one must recall that the Ninth as Mahler knew it—in the Löwe version—had no complete dominant thirteenth chords, and it is unlikely that Mahler ever had access to the original manuscript. The problem of the impact of the first-edition versions on the reception of and compositional response to Bruckner's music by composers in the first decades of this century—a period which might have been more strongly influenced by Bruckner's music had it been known and performed in its original form—remains an important one, and largely overlooked in the several studies discussed here.

While the reception history of the Finale in its several known performing versions will be discussed in the ensuing chapter, a single 'explicit' case of homage to the Finale is the *Bruckner Dialog*, Op. 39 (publ. Boosey & Hawkes, 1974) by Austrian composer Gottfried von Einem. As Manfred Wagner explained, the *Bruckner Dialog* represents, as does any work citing another composer's music, an "Auseinandersetzung mit Widmungscharakter":

Zitat in der Musikgeschichte bedeutet nämlich immer Auseinandersetzung, sei es in ironischer oder ernst gemeinter Absicht. Vermutlich also haben die Komponisten der Gegenwart [...] einige Kriterien erkannt, die für die zeitgenössische Musik Geltung haben, Ansätze vielleicht, die heute erst zu ihrer vollen Durchformung finden.<sup>486</sup>

Von Einem's personal views concerning the symphony and on Bruckner are fundamental to an understanding of this work. In a conference paper given by the composer in 1981<sup>487</sup> we read that "Die Komposition von ausgedehnten Symphonien ist, nach dem Werk Gustav Mahlers (der Brahms und Bruckners klassizistische Formen zu erweitern, zu variieren, zu bereichern versuchte), zufällig geworden: weil die Anordnung der Sätze, vor allem die Art des Finalsatzes, schablonenhaft wirkt".<sup>488</sup> For von Einem: "Bruckners Kraft liegt im Einfall, nicht in der Form. Seine melodischen, harmonischen und rhythmischen Eingebungen hätten jede Form außer der der eisern gefügten und transplantierbaren aufnahmefähigen viersätzigen Wiener Symphonie gesprengt."<sup>489</sup> Yet, as Robert Schollum has pointed out, von Einem's orchestral music makes no obvious break with traditional symphonic form. While known

---

<sup>484</sup> p. 142.

<sup>485</sup> Cf. Bergquist, p. 341.

<sup>486</sup> *BrLWD*, p. 398.

<sup>487</sup> "Die Symphonie nach Anton Bruckner: Vom Standpunkt des Komponisten", in: *BrSympBer 1981: Die österreichische Symphonie nach Anton Bruckner*, Linz–Vienna 1983, pp. 11–12.

<sup>488</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>489</sup> *Ibid.*

principally for his operas, his orchestral works include two programmatically titled symphonies—the ‘Philadelphia’ and ‘Wiener’, Opp. 28 (1960) and 49 (1976) respectively—styled by Schollum, albeit with some reservation, as ‘neo-classical’, as well as a number of shorter orchestral works, among them the *Bruckner Dialog*, written for the opening of the Brucknerhaus, Linz, on 23 March 1974, but completed three-and-a-half years earlier on 11 October 1971.

As Rudolf Klein<sup>490</sup> pointed out, von Einem’s adoption of Brucknerian stylistic elements in several of his later works is—*pace* Manfred Wagner—more a question of underlying disposition than of an intentional and conscious act of homage. Von Einem’s style, Klein proposed, is “melodisch orientiert” in a manner similar to that of Bruckner: “er verzichtet zwar ebensowenig auf die Kräfte der Harmonik, läßt sie aber durchaus nicht im klassischen Sinne statisch-symmetrisch wirksam werden; im Grunde, im musikalischen Grunde, ist auch er ein ‘Barockmensch’.”<sup>491</sup> Klein noted further parallels between Bruckner and von Einem in their dramatic use of motoric tension, in von Einem’s increased use of musical ‘space’, his predilection for pure orchestral colours, and in his capacity to grow entire symphonic structures organically from simple roots: “Diese prozessuale Fortschreiten ist in der Spätphase der Symphonik mindestens ebenso deutlich wie die Abrundung durch Symmetrie, und für die Charakterisierung Gottfried von Einems ebenso ausschlaggebend wie für die Anton Bruckners.”<sup>492</sup> Klein was presumably thinking here of what will later be discussed (ch. 2.2) as Bruckner’s “Mutationsverfahren”, which he likewise found echoed in von Einem’s thematic processes:

Gemeint sind etwa Ähnlichkeiten aufgrund von Mutationen in der Tonfolge, für deren Bezeichnung es kein Wort der Fachsprache gibt, gemeint sind vor allem auch Ähnlichkeiten in der tonalen Struktur melodischer Partikel, die auch bei Veränderung in der Tonwahl und Tonfolge fühlbar sind. Solche Veränderungen der motivisch-thematischen Substanz kommen bei Bruckner häufig vor, und sie sind geradezu das zentrale Element der Inhalt-Form-Symbiose bei Gottfried von Einem.<sup>493</sup>

As Klein points out, “Themen—in diesem Fall ein Gedanke aus Bruckners Skizzen zum vierten Satz der *Neunten Symphonie*—[lassen sich] in einen anderen Kontext übernehmen, als Zitat, als Ausdruck der Verehrung, als Parodie etc.”,<sup>494</sup> but Klein’s detailing of the underlying affinity between the two composers adds a deeper level to the analysis of a work that

---

<sup>490</sup> “Anton Bruckner und Gottfried von Einem” *BrJb* 1981, p. 103.

<sup>491</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 104.

<sup>492</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 104f.

<sup>493</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.

<sup>494</sup> p. 103.

incorporates Bruckner's material less as a stylistically disparate foreign body than as an immediate stylistic forebear.

The Finale chorale and its attendant crotchet–quaver triplet ostinato is strongly integrated into the structure of this c. 15-minute work, although its initial introduction in the original scoring (“Tempo ordinario”, pp. 10ff. of von Einem's score), at the end of a tortured, restless *Steigerung*, has the same intense character as its first appearance in the Finale itself. The instrumentation of the *Bruckner Dialog* is the same as that of the middle symphonies of Bruckner (Fifth and Sixth), with the sole addition of the piccolo in certain passages, so the eight horns of Bruckner's original scoring in the Ninth are reduced to four. Otherwise, however, von Einem's scoring of the chorale remains true to that of Bruckner. On the chorale's first appearance von Einem quotes the ‘second’ appearance of its principal phrase (cf. Orel, D/97, mm. 3ff.), that moving immediately to the interrupted cadence and the descending line in the bass with which Bruckner concluded the chorale in the Exp. (D/98). This gives the impression that the chorale emerges as a ‘consequent’ to von Einem's foregoing ‘antecedent’. The first 17 mm. of the chorale subsequently appear some 25 pages later (“in tempo ordinario”, p. 38), following a reflection upon this event. The first 8 mm. are heard in an altered, *piano* scoring and the remainder in original instrumentation, following which the triplet ostinato is taken up and developed in a virtuoso display of motivic transformation. The entire chorale subsequently recurs (“Tempo ordinario”, p. 50) in its original scoring, dissonantly overlaid by a previously introduced, repeated-note motive; the triplet patterns are again taken up, then the final measures of the chorale again, before the gestures of the opening sequence (“Allegro, tempo del inizio”, p. 69) recur, initiating a final appearance of the chorale (“Pesante molto”, p. 87) in a higher key, but with its motoric force and luminescent power broken. The piece dies away on pathetic fragments of the chorale and its descending line.

Von Einem's *Bruckner Dialog* testifies to the profound impact Bruckner's music, generally, and the Finale in particular, had on its composer, and remains the one composition known to the present writer to have used the musical material of the Finale in this manner. At a formal level it can be regarded as a study of the problem of musical homage and compositional response to the music of a past master; at a deeper level it suggests, in its obsessive circling around the cyclopean thematic block of the chorale, an almost resentful response to the overwhelming, inescapable and by no means always benign influence of the music of the past. In this reading, von Einem's use of the chorale is symbolic of a confrontation with the great expressive force of Bruckner's music, just as it appears to have been originally used by Bruckner to connote confrontation with the ‘sacred’ or ‘numinous’.<sup>495</sup>

---

<sup>495</sup> Cf. §1.0.3.

### 1.3.13 Conclusions.

The foregoing review of this work's reception history has inevitably been confined, by and large to a discussion of views expressed in connection with the 'canonical' three-movement Ninth Symphony. As writers have rarely made reference to the Finale other than to claim its assumed irrelevance to the symphonic argument of the 'aesthetically complete' first three movements, the preceding journey through the almost 100-year reception history of the Ninth 'and its Finale' has amounted largely to a recital of alibis for the fourth movement's neglect. The degree to which legend, cliché and bias are entrenched in even current reception modes becomes even clearer when we turn to an evaluation of the largely negative responses to performing versions of the Finale, as will be seen in the ensuing chapter. With few exceptions, only recently<sup>496</sup>—and not least in the wake of repeated performances of the Finale, it must be said—has the original symphonic unity of a four-movement Ninth begun to enter discussion.

Early Bruckner reception evolved within a pre-scholarly, journalistic milieu in which fact and fiction were inextricably interwoven; in this environment, the legend of futile sketches by a dying composer and of an unfinished but symbolically complete *opus ultimum* were never critically examined. Nourished by identification with the mystique surrounding Bach's *Kunst der Fuge*<sup>497</sup> or Mozart's Requiem,<sup>498</sup> they became profoundly entrenched in established views of the work. With the publication and performance of the first edition in 1903, Ferdinand Löwe and Robert Hirschfeld actively promoted the blatant falsehood that composition of a 'transition' to the Te Deum had not advanced very far, that anything following the sublime Adagio was in any case redundant, and that the composer's 'pious' injunction concerning the Te Deum could be justifiably ignored. The existence of extensive MSS for a well-advanced, independent fourth movement was suppressed, the loss of some of these MSS, which at that stage might well have been recovered had concerted action been taken, was left to lie.

The ensuing reception of the symphony from this standpoint can be said to fall into two broad phases, pre- and post 1934, each of which can be summarised under three headings: i. knowledge concerning the MSS of the Finale; ii. opinion concerning Bruckner's statements concerning the Te Deum; iii. opinions on conclusion with the Adagio. Reception from 1903 to 1934 can be summarised as follows:

---

<sup>496</sup> See ch. 3.4.

<sup>497</sup> See Peter Schleuning's study of the cult of the last compositional fragment, *Johann Sebastian Bachs 'Kunst der Fuge'*, pp. 1ff., 169ff. and 197ff.; see further concerning both Bach and Mozart's final works, ch. 1.4, fn. 2.

<sup>498</sup> See Christoph Wolff, *Mozart Requiem: Geschichte—Musik—Dokumente—Partitur des Fragments*, pp. 9ff. and 115ff. See also concerning the role of legend in the reception history of Mozart's music, Gernot Gruber, *Mozart und die Nachwelt*, Munich–Zurich 1987, *passim*.

- i. Lack of awareness of any significant sks. or drafts for the Finale or for a Te Deum transition, enhanced by Löwe's suppression of the truth and the inaccessibility of the original MSS, held in private hands.
- ii. While the Te Deum had been suggested as a finale by the composer, who had even worked on a transition to it, performance of the choral work was unnecessary or even inadvisable due to the tonal and stylistic disjunction between it and the symphony—a belief underpinned by the stylistic dichotomy between Bruckner's original orchestration of the Te Deum and that of the (unacknowledged) arrangement of Löwe's orchestral version.
- iii. The Adagio was actively promoted as constituting an aesthetically satisfying and symbolically conclusive end to the symphony.

Post-1934 the standard line became that:

- i. Numerous sketches and drafts for an independent, instrumental Finale existed after all, but in several different and presumably contradictory versions, representing a 'failed' attempt, whether by reason of inherent compositional shortcomings (intransigence of the material) or the composer's old age (senile dementia). The 'sketches', as they were referred to, should not be completed ('sacrilegious' infringement of canonic status), and were in any case 'uncompleteable'. Haas, Lang, Blume, Langevin and Redlich, who interpreted the Finale as a significant part of the conception of the symphony, and to varying degrees encouraged its better understanding, represented marginal voices; the majority of musicologists showed continued to show little or no interest in the movement.
- ii. It was 'unlikely' or even 'impossible' that the Te Deum could have been suggested by the composer. Its performance was in any case not justified, for whatever reasons one might choose to give (tonal and/or stylistic discontinuity, perhaps even the unmentioned issue of the similarity of such performances to those of the Beethoven Ninth). This view was emblematic of a new, more 'rational' age of Bruckner interpretation that wished to eschew entanglement of the 'absolute symphonist' in religious mysticism and presumably thereby avoid any contamination of the nationalist icon by Catholic dogma.
- iii. The Adagio conclusion continued to provide a neat, 'tragically' symbolic ending for the symphony—the view promoted by Orel himself in the *Entwürfe und Skizzen*.

Hence, it can be seen that the Orel edition did little or nothing to alter opinion concerning the nature and perception of the Ninth Symphony as a whole. Little interest was shown save by isolated authors in the original, four-movement conception of the symphony.



For most the issue of the Finale remained, as it is still, a blind spot, irrelevant for the concert-goer and quickly glossed over in a generalised Bruckner biography.

Only more recently were revisions to these views made on the part of a few writers curious enough to look a little harder. It may be significant for what could be termed the ‘herd mentality’ of orthodox musicology that it took the unbiased approach and plain commonsense of, in the main, non-German-language writers such as Redlich and Langevin—both standing outside the narrow continuum of mainstream Bruckner reception and research—to look more deeply and critically at issues which the majority of writers, under the weight of an overwhelming burden of tradition, were either unwilling or unable to tackle.

A number of points concerning some of the views of the Finale cited here merit brief rebuttal—in particular, the question of the validity or suitability of the *Te Deum* as a conclusion to the symphony.

“Für die IX. ist gesorgt”, Bruckner’s cryptic assurance cited at the outset of the chapter—probably implying the provision of the *Te Deum* as substitute Finale—ironically underlines the unwillingness of generations of commentators to concede that the composer intended the Ninth to find its symbolic conclusion and spiritual closure in a “Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott”.<sup>499</sup> The illogical nature of the problem is revealed in the passage from Orel discussed at the conclusion of §1.3.6, in which Orel unwittingly rejected the authorial fiat of the composer—Bruckner’s insistence upon using the *Te Deum*—in deference to a ‘symbolic’ conclusion with the Adagio. Despite the weight of primary literature based on a innumerable verbally transmitted statements by the composer—Bruckner must have repeated it to everyone with whom he came in contact—the question as to the precise reasons why Bruckner considered the *Te Deum* a suitable Finale for the Ninth Symphony has never been seriously examined.

The stated reasons for the alleged unsuitability of the *Te Deum* as a Finale to the symphony also bear closer investigation:

Firstly, as Cohrs has pointed out,<sup>500</sup> the stylistic disparity between the *Te Deum* and the first three movements of Bruckner’s original score of the Ninth is by no means as unbridgeably vast as commentators have suggested. The *Te Deum* transports us to a ‘new world’ following the Adagio, certainly, but then so does the Finale. While the orchestration of the 1903 edition, with its refined, quasi-Wagnerian scoring clashes markedly with Bruckner’s monolithically scored *Te Deum*, the stylistic schism between it and the Ninth in its original orchestration is by no means as disturbing. On the other hand, the harmonic and motivic links

---

<sup>499</sup> For this reason it was adopted as the title of an article detailing the publication project on the Ninth in the Bruckner GA; see Appendix VI.

<sup>500</sup> This matter was first discussed in conversations with the author in Bremen, 1992. See for instance Cohrs’ comments concerning this in Appendix II.

and allusions between the two works are numerous and significant. Bruckner's marking of a number of cuts in the score of the Finale may also have been intended for its use as the *Überleitung* which Stradal claimed to have heard Bruckner improvise (see §3.1.11).

Secondly, it is inevitably overlooked that the E major Adagio is even farther from supplying satisfactory tonal closure to a work in D minor than the C-major *Te Deum*. Although lost in the ensuing tidal wave of the apologetics of Bruckner's supporters, Max Kalbeck's ironic critique of Fromm's claim that the *Te Deum* could not be used to end symphony for tonal reasons (§1.3.3 *supra*), was entirely apposite. Ending the symphony with the *Te Deum* in C major is no worse than ending it with the Adagio in E major; it was moreover perfectly clear that Bruckner himself regarded a fourth movement as essential. Performances of the Ninth concluding with the *Te Deum*, as do still occur from time to time,<sup>501</sup> easily reveal the credibility of Bruckner's original 'Notlösung'. Tonally, the much maligned key sequence is perfectly acceptable: in performance the massive C major beginning to the *Te Deum* produces an overwhelming impression of 'arrival'—presumably the insistent D minor of the first movement and Scherzo, despite the intervening E major of the Adagio, forms a kind of vast extended cadence (II–I) into the C major of the choral work. It is perhaps no coincidence that both the 150th Psalm and *Helgoland* end with the same II–I cadential progression.

Two points remain. Firstly, *pace* Halbreich (and to some extent Langevin)—the alleged incipient 'atonality' of the Finale is simply factitious. The Ninth does reveal 'centrifugal' harmonic tendencies, as we will see in ch. 2.2; yet, despite its high degree of dissonance, the fourth movement is also more stark and austere in its confirmations of D as its tonal centre than even the first movement; we are simply not in possession of all the pieces. There would never have been any question for Bruckner that the tonal argument of the Finale would have resolved itself, firmly and emphatically, in D major; that final apotheosis—*vide* Notter—would have arrived with such force as to overwhelm all previous instability. A large amount of commentary concerning the Finale, including the contention that Bruckner left only disjointed fragments, can be discounted simply as unqualified extrapolation of a superficial reading of the Orel edition. Had we never known the last 100 or so measures of the Finale of the Eighth speculation would doubtless also have arisen about Bruckner's anticipation of the downfall of tonality, or his 'inability' to achieve an overriding sense of key in that work.

Secondly, exception must be taken to the views of Simpson concerning the textural nature of the fragments, and for similar reasons. No composer goes to the trouble of scoring out lengthy passages of music, complete in every detail, and expects them to be interpreted as 'skeletal'. The chorale—like the rest of the movement—was obviously conceived

---

<sup>501</sup> For instance, Deutsche Gramophon–Unitel's 1991 release of von Karajan's 1978 performance of both works with the Vienna Philharmonic.

‘monumentally’, not ‘skeletal’. Eliminating the basis of the contention that the materials represent isolated and contradictory compositional fragments brings into question the objections of many writers to the musical material of the Finale. The reasons for which the Finale MSS have been dismissed as apparent sketches and their validity discounted, and the unwillingness of commentators to concede any significance to them has as much to do with the radical nature of the score as it does with the legends propagated by Löwe and Hirschfeld, the losses from the MSS and the presentation of the movement in the Orel edition.

Finally, that the Orel edition failed to alter popular and even presumably informed musicological opinion regarding the Finale is scarcely surprising, given the reception modes at the time. These, however, have continued to dominate musicological thinking about the movement almost down to the present day. No single critical edition could prevail against the hundreds of concert programs, guides and popular biographies published since 1903 in which the early topoi of Hirschfeld and others were reproduced *ad nauseam*; the entire process of aesthetic evaluation, moreover, focussed on the perception of musical works as perfected wholes, almost forecloses against any interpretation of a work as fragment. The Adagio, therefore, provides such a compelling end to the symphony because no one has ever been accustomed to hearing anything following it.<sup>502</sup> Any wide-scale reassessment of the Ninth Symphony as a work conceived in four movements hence requires the critical mass generated by repeated performances of the symphony with Finale, not merely the publication and analysis of the sources, essential as that is. Only in recent times, as we will see in ch. 3.4, have repeated performances of the Aufführungsfassung, accompanied by informed and factually worded programme notes and backed up by publication of the movement in the GA, enabled audiences and critics to see the movement, and the symphony itself, in a new light. The willingness with which an entire symphonic movement has been disregarded or explained away and the lack of interest shown in the movement save on the part of a small ‘lunatic fringe’—largely arrangers and performing musicians rather than musicologists—reveals the extent to which performance tradition, aural impression and sheer legend has held sway against the attempts of all too few to present a more accurate picture.

---

<sup>502</sup> The record critic Bernhard Jacobson, in a programme text for a recording of Schubert’s String Quintet in C (EMI, 1983, CDC 7 47018 2) wrote the following: “Hindsight is a faculty, or perhaps one should say disease, that record annotators seem excessively prone to. Confront one of us with a work written shortly before its composer’s death, and the immediate firing off of a salvo of adjectives like ‘autumnal’ and ‘valedictory’ and of phrases about ‘awareness of impending doom’ is as predictable as anything in Pavlov. In Schubert’s case, such responses have been forthcoming also to works written years before his death: the B minor Symphony, in particular, simply by virtue of having been left unfinished, has provoked any number of commentators into pious inanities to the effect that the composer left it so because he realised that the two completed movements formed an ideal, unimprovable unity on their own.”

## 1.4

### Performing Versions of the Finale, 1934–1990

In den 1934 von Alfred Orel veröffentlichten Skizzen finden sich 172 vollständig und 268 teilweise orchestrierte Takte, um kleinere Skizzierungen vermehrt insgesamt ein 580 Takte umfassendes Material; dieses ausschließlich als ein durch das factum brutum von Bruckners Tod tabuisiertes Trümmerfeld anzusehen und nicht als Aufforderung zu intensiver Beschäftigung, erfordert ein gehöriges Maß von orthodoxer Verstocktheit. Zwangsläufig gerät derlei Beschäftigung rasch an die Frage, wie sich das Material etwa im Sinne Bruckners zu einem Ganzen ordnen oder wenigstens den Plan eines solchen durchschimmern lasse. Das erfährt man am genauesten unter dem Druck eines praktischen Anliegens, eben einer hypothetischen Orchestrierung. Sehr wesentliches einer Musik begreift sich erst dann, wenn man sie in der Dimension erlebt, in die sie hineingedacht war.

—Peter Gülke<sup>1</sup>

#### 1.4.0 Apologia.

THE practice of supplementing or completing the work of another composer has a long history. If works such as Mozart's Requiem, Puccini's *Turandot*, Mahler's Tenth Symphony or Berg's *Lulu* have found a certain level of acceptance in the concert hall and opera house, the disrespect in which many purists hold the practice says much about present-day views on musical originality, aesthetics, ethics and ownership.<sup>2</sup> The ensuing discussion,

---

<sup>1</sup> "Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987: Bruckner-Symposion", *Mf* 41 (1988), p. 243.

<sup>2</sup> An extensive literature exists concerning the 'quasi-canonical' unfinished works of the concert repertoire; the following brief list represents a very limited selection: Concerning Bach's *Die Kunst der Fuge*: Walter Kolneder, *Die Kunst der Fuge: Mythen des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Wilhelmshaven 1977–83; Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht, *Bachs Kunst der Fuge: Erscheinung und Deutung*, Munich–Zurich 1984; and Peter Schleuning, *Johann Sebastian Bachs 'Kunst der Fuge'*, Kassel–Basel 1993. Concerning the Mozart Requiem: Christoph Wolff, *Mozarts Requiem: Geschichte—Musik—Dokumente—Partitur des Fragments*, Munich–Kassel–Basel 1991; Thomas Baumann, "Requiem, but No Piece", *19th-Century Music* 15, no. 2 (Fall 1991), pp. 151–165; and Benjamin G. Cohrs, "Neues Licht auf ein altes Problem: Mozarts Requiem—Fragment und seine Komplettierungen", *Klassik heute* 4/2000, pp. 32–37. Concerning the Schubert 'Unvollendete': Joseph Müller-Blattau, "Schuberts 'Unvollendete' und das Problem des Fragmentarischen in der Musik", in: *Das unvollendete als künstlerische Form: Ein Symposium*, ed. J. A. Schmoll, G. Eisenwerth, Bern, n. d., pp. 141–153; Franz Schubert, *Symphony in B minor ("Unfinished")*: *An Authoritative Score—Schubert's Sketches—Commentary—Essays in History and Analysis*, ed. Martin Chusid, New York, 1971, 1968; concerning the Schubert reconstructions by Brian Newbould, Roy Howat, "Schubert's unknown symphonies: a review article on the restorative work of Brian Newbould", *Musicology Australia* 18 (1995) pp. 52–59; and finally concerning the unfinished piano works, Richard Kramer, "The Hedgehog: Of Fragments Finished and Unfinished", *19th-Century Music* 20 (Fall 1997), pp. 134–148. Concerning the Mahler Tenth: Deryck Cooke, "Mahler's Tenth Symphony: Artistic Morality and Musical Reality", *MT* 102, no. 1420 (June 1961), pp. 351–354, *idem*, "The Facts Concerning Mahler's Tenth Symphony," *Ch&D* 2, no. 10 (1963), pp. 3–27; Peter Bergquist, "The First Movement of Mahler's Tenth Symphony: An analysis and examination of the sketches", *The Music Forum* 5 (1980), pp. 335–394; Susan M. Filler, "The Case for a Performing Version of Mahler's Tenth Symphony", *JMusRes* 3, nos. 3–4 (1981), pp. 275–293; Theodore Bloomfield, "Die vier Versionen der Zehnten Symphonie von Mahler", *Das Orchester*, Nov.

however, will limit itself to the nature and reception of the several ‘transcriptions’, ‘performing versions’, ‘completions’ or ‘reconstructions’ known to have been made of the Finale of the Ninth by composers, conductors and musicologists since publication of the Orel edition of the surviving sketches and drafts in 1934; discussion of the development and reception of the Samale *et al.* version since 1990 has been reserved for Part Three, as it is contingent upon philological perspectives dealt with in that section.<sup>3</sup> The dates pertinent to the ensuing discussion can again be found in Table IV (A/14ff.), while Table V, Significant Versions of the Finale, 1940–1988 (A/18ff.), presents an analysis of the treatment of the source materials in three important versions of the Finale for which scores were accessible.<sup>4</sup>

A discussion of the terms involved provides a useful starting point.

### 1.4.1 Terminological clarification.

The central problem of the unfinished musical score has been eloquently expressed by Gülke:

Musik ist darauf angewiesen, fertiggestellt zu sein. Eine nicht fertiggestellte Partitur eines großen Meisters pflegt in der Musikgeschichte (und dafür ist das Finale der Neunten Bruckners das allerbeste Beispiel) eine Katastrophe zu sein. Die Skizze eines Malers ist dagegen immer noch eine Offenbarung.

Damit Musik überhaupt real erklingen, real vorhanden sein kann, muß sie in Partitur gebracht sein, muß der Kompositionsvorgang abgeschlossen sein [...].<sup>5</sup>

The most neutral, least connotatively laden term for an attempt to permit an incomplete score to be realised in sound is ‘performing version’ (perhaps more accurately ‘performable version’), in German, ‘Aufführungsfassung’. The work in question, especially if an orchestral

---

1986, pp. 906–910; Colin Matthews, “The Tenth Symphony and artistic morality”, *Muziek & Wetenschap* 5 (1995/96), no. 3, pp. 309–319. Concerning Berg’s *Lulu*, see Attila Csampai and Dietmar Holland, eds., *Alban Berg: Lulu: Texte, Materialien, Kommentare*, Reinbeck bei Hamburg 1985; Karl Harb, “Immer wieder eine Herausforderung: Jugendarbeit für das Musiktheater: Bergs ‘Lulu’ in Brüssel, eine Aufführung und ein Kongreß”, *Salzburger Nachrichten* 26 Feb. 1988. Among a number of studies to examine the question of unfinished works as a genre see: Klaus Conrad, “Das Problem der Vorgestaltung”, in: *Das unvollendete als künstlerische Form: Ein Symposium*, ed. J. A. Schmoll, G. Eisenwerth, Bern, n. d., pp. 35–45; Georg von Dadelsen, “Die ‘Fassung letzter Hand’ in der Musik”, *AcMus* 33, no. 1 (1961), pp. 1–14; Wolfgang Plath, “Bemerkungen zum Thema ‘Skizze—Entwurf—Fragment’”, *Mf* 45 (1992), pp. 275–278. See also Schleuning’s study of the eighteenth-century origins of the cult of the fragment in his *Johann Sebastian Bachs ‘Kunst der Fuge’* (*supra*).

<sup>3</sup> The ensuing discussion assumes a degree of familiarity with the Finale materials as they are presented in the Orel edition, a perusal of vol. II, D [Orel] is hence recommended to the reader. The main thematic material of the Finale has been reproduced separately for ease of reference, in Mus. Ex. 25 (vol. II, B/23ff.); occasional reference to these and other examples will also be made in the following. As the Orel edition represented the principal source for the performing versions discussed here, references to the Finale material, particularly the bifol. classifications, have been kept in the form used by Orel.

<sup>4</sup> As noted *infra*, facsimile reproductions of examples from these scores could not be included for reasons of copyright and space limitations.

<sup>5</sup> “Vollendet—Unvollendet. Einige Anmerkungen zur IX. Sinfonie Anton Bruckners. Referat vom 12. Mai 1987 auf dem Symposium des Österreichischen Kulturinstituts, Rom” (unpubl., copy courtesy of its author).

work, may already be completed in all compositional details in short score and hence require only instrumentation, or greater or lesser degrees of compositional supplementation as well.

The German term 'Ergänzung' (supplementation, addition: there is no single English equivalent) best covers the nature and intention of such attempts at achieving a performing version of an orchestral score left incomplete. This may, when a certain conception of the intended extent of the finished work is known, introduce a further dimension, namely that of 'Fertigstellung' or even 'Vervollständigung', the inadequate English equivalent for both being the 'completion'. The fact that a work may not have been 'completed' precisely as its composer would have wished does not automatically disqualify the results, however. That many highly regarded works exist in several versions, not least among them the Bruckner symphonies, reveals that the conception of a single authentic work of art established in every detail for all time is meaningless; that so much musicology is ultimately predicated upon the need to establish 'authentic texts' should not blind us to that fact. Nowak himself recognised:

Es ist eine bekannte Tatsache, daß Komponisten an ihren fertiggestellten Werken Änderungen vornehmen. [...] Man braucht nur an Beethovens "Fidelio" erinnern, oder [...] das "Marienleben" von Hindemith; der Beispiele dafür gäbe es eine ganze Menge.

Für die Werkgeschichte bedeutet dies, daß ein bereits als abgeschlossenes betrachtetes Ganzes neuerdings in Arbeit genommen wird, daß also der Arbeitsprozeß sich fortsetzt und Nachträge kleineren oder größeren Ausmaßes entstehen, die das Werk verändern. Das ist aber nicht nur für die Geschichtsschreibung wichtig, sondern auch für die Praxis, für das Musikleben, denn man muß sich dann unter Umständen für eine der vorliegenden " Fassungen " entscheiden.<sup>6</sup>

Wolfgang Plath explains:<sup>7</sup>

Man pflegt ein Kunstwerk als etwas zu betrachten, das *i s t* . Das Kunstwerk, sagt man, ist einzig, es ist vollkommen oder auch vollendet. Und jedenfalls ist es etwas Fertiges, sonst wäre es nicht vollendet oder vollkommen.

Another approach is necessary, one more suited to the music historian, according to which "wäre das Kunstwerk nicht primär etwas, das ist, sondern etwas, das geworden ist". Every work of art possesses its own "Entstehungsgeschichte"—

Ob es einzig und einmalig sei, bleibe dahingestellt; aber jedenfalls gibt es Stadien, in denen das Kunstwerk eben nicht oder noch nicht fertig und keineswegs vollkommen und vollendet vorliegt. Die Betrachtung des Kunstwerks als etwas Werdendes oder Gewordenes ist notwendig eine andere, als wenn ich es mit etwas Seiendem zu tun habe.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> "'Urfassung' und 'Endfassung' bei Anton Bruckner", *Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 34f.

<sup>7</sup> "Bemerkungen zum Thema 'Skizze–Entwurf—Fragment'", *Mf* 45 (1992), p. 275; emphasis original.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

In a significant article on this question<sup>9</sup> Georg von Dadelsen pointed out, concerning modern editorial practice, that “Die von der Praxis bevorzugten Ausgaben waren seit der zweiten Hälfte des vergangenen Jahrhunderts ‘bearbeitete’ Ausgaben”; he traces the exclusive concern of the modern editor with the “Fassung letzter Hand”, i.e., the finished, ‘perfected’ autograph score of the composer, back to the editorial approach of Heinrich Schenker:

Seine analytischen Interpretationen der großen Kompositionen des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts gehen von der Vorstellung des Vollkommenen aus. Sie unterstellen, daß die Meisterwerke in jedem Falle endlich eine auch im kleinsten Detail endgültige Form gefunden hätten. Jede Note, jede Ausdrucksnuance stünde darin unverwechselbar an ihrem Platz. Schenkers Analyse will zeigen, wie der Meister nur eben so und nicht anders hätte komponieren können. Die ‘Fassung letzter Hand’ fällt für ihn also zusammen mit der Idee einer endgültigen Fassung. Gegenüber dem Werke Beethovens, der Ausgangspunkt seiner Untersuchungen, war diese Vorstellung nicht unberechtigt. Sie mußte sich aber den Schöpfungen anderer Komponisten und Epochen gegenüber als unzutreffend erweisen.<sup>10</sup>

Von Dadelsen went on to demonstrate the problems inherent in this approach using the works of Schumann, Beethoven and Bach. He might as well have cited Bruckner, however: the belief that the completed autograph score somehow magically represents a perfected endpoint, an unalterable ‘fiat Dei’, while the intermediate steps leading to it are of no significance is nowhere more misplaced than in reference to this composer. What constitutes such an endpoint, given the profusion of multiple published and authentic versions of a single work?<sup>11</sup> Clearly the assumption itself is at fault.

The question becomes particularly vexing when one turns to the issue of unfinished works and their validity, mostly due to the connotation of a further term used in this context, namely ‘Vollendung’, which—significantly more than its English counterpart ‘completion’—carries the connotation of consummation, of arrival at wholeness and perfection. That something has been ‘vollendet’ therefore carries with it the implication that it has not merely been ‘completed’ but attained an unsurpassable aesthetic perfection, something to which, at best, only the original composer could aspire. The commonplace use of the term in relation to what are essentially practical ‘performing versions’ therefore brings a potential for severe misunderstanding, as Gülke pointed out:

Im deutschen Begriff ‘Vollendung’ ist ja nicht nur impliziert, daß da etwas zum Abschluß gebracht worden ist, sondern es ist auch impliziert, daß es auf jeweils vollendete Weise zum Abschluß gebracht worden ist. Die Folge ist fast eine Art Hypostasierung eines Gegenstandes, der, wie uns Bruckners neunte Sinfonie lehren kann,

<sup>9</sup> “Die ‘Fassung letzter Hand’ in der Musik”, *AcM* 33 (1961), p. 5.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Nowak’s attempt, in the article quoted above, to delineate the multitude of terms used for Bruckner’s symphonies and their reworkings, a confusion noted long before by Max Auer.

in der Sprache und in unserem begrifflichen Denken, glaube ich, größer und radikaler ausfällt als in der Wirklichkeit.<sup>12</sup>

Hence, while the Finale of the Ninth remains ‘unvollendet’—as is any incomplete work—the idea that any attempt to arrive at a performing version must therefore be an attempt to achieve its ‘Vollendung’ (and disqualified as outrageous temerity) betrays a misunderstanding of what a ‘completion’ is, surely, intended to be.<sup>13</sup>

A completion—that is to say, the attempt to ‘close’ a composition left ‘open’ for whatever reason by its composer, should not automatically be construed as an attempt to appropriate the composer’s prerogatives. If so it becomes an ‘arrangement’, a term which encompasses the widely disparate German terms ‘Einrichtung’ and ‘Bearbeitung’. In many cases, where for instance a work (a) never advanced conceptually beyond the stage of scattered sketches, (b) was left in a fragmentary state by its composer (no matter how clear his own conception) or (c) was irrevocably corrupted or mutilated in its transmission—that is to say, where insufficient evidence obtains concerning the final form of the work—no alternative than that of ‘arrangement’ exists—aside, of course, of that of presenting the fragments as they are<sup>14</sup>—it remains an ‘Einrichtung’ (which, like its broader English equivalent, ‘arrangement’ is not sufficiently precise enough to rule out misunderstanding). Despite the commonplace use of the term ‘Vollendung’ for the completion of unfinished works, its connotations make it unsuitable as the title of any serious musicological undertaking. One is more justified in speaking of an ‘Ergänzung’, or supplementation of an unfinished work, at best a conjectural ‘Fertigstellung’ or ‘Vervollständigung’, both of which imply that something has been completed or brought to an endpoint. ‘Vollendung’ is better avoided. Better still, perhaps, is the even less connotatively loaded term ‘Aufführungsfassung’ or performing version, the intention of which is simply to make performance of the score possible—although such apparently ‘minor’ considerations as dynamics or articulation may be just as important as the completion of musical texture or continuity. The ensuing discussion therefore refers generally to ‘performing versions’ of the Finale.

---

<sup>12</sup> “Vollendet—Unvollendet...”. See also his recent article “Die mögliche und unmögliche Vollendung: Bruckners Fassungen oder: keine Ende”, *ÖMz* May 1996, pp. 330–335.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. the discussion of this point by Cornelis van Zwol in “Der Finalsatz der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners: Ein Referat in Utrecht (15. November 1986); ein Symposium in Rom (11. bis 12. Mai 1987)”, *BrJb* 1987–88, p. 31.

<sup>14</sup> That option was utilised in the Chandos recording of the Ninth with the Carragan completion (see §1.4.12), although to what extent this procedure facilitates access to Bruckner’s music by a wider audience, without any sort of commentary having been provided is open to question. A better solution is to perform the fragments with such a commentary—the course taken in the *Dokumentation des Fragments* (see ch. 3.2).



### 1.4.2 The term ‘reconstruction’ and the Finale.

A ‘reconstruction’ is properly speaking possible only to the extent to which a work or movement was already completed by the composer and later dismembered, lost or otherwise rendered generally inaccessible: logically, only that which was already existed in ‘constructed’ state can be ‘reconstructed’, although, of course, in general usage the term has a broader connotation. Orel’s publication of the material in 1934, inasmuch as it attempted to order and analyse the surviving material and re-establish its compositional history and continuity, was itself a reconstruction. Orel’s attempted conflation of the last compositional phase into a 4-stave *particello* “Übersicht” was certainly a reconstruction,<sup>15</sup> one which assimilated many errors made by Orel in the course of his analysis.

Although first used in connection with the Ninth by Neill and Gastaldi in their 1962 score of the Finale (§1.4.6 *infra*), and later, more justifiably, for the *Ricostruzione* published by Samale and Mazzuca in 1986, the epithet ‘reconstruction’ applies with greatest justification to the score of the Finale entitled *Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen* first published in the Bruckner GA in 1994, reproduced here in vol. II, section E. The decision by MWV to publish the Finale in the Bruckner GA in this form was based on a recognition of the fact that, contrary to accepted belief, the surviving fragments of the Finale score represented not merely a collection of sketches, nor even a draft, but the *emergent autograph score* of the movement,<sup>16</sup> which, although subsequently dismembered, was left by the composer in a highly advanced state—an in fact simple and straightforward observation from the surviving material, the evidence for which has been presented in ch. 3.1.

The *Aufführungsfassung* of Samale/Phillips/Cohrs/Mazzuca published by the authors in 1992, reproduced here in vol. II, section G and discussed in ch. 3.3, took this reconstruction of Bruckner’s score as its basis but went beyond it to attempt to realise the continuity of the entire movement as its composer might have done, inclusive of supplementations of compositional continuity, orchestration, tempi, dynamics and articulation. Coupled with greater stringency of methodology than that shown by previous efforts, this score was the endpoint of a long developmental process begun by Samale and Mazzuca in the early 1980s;<sup>17</sup> its intention was also less an end in itself as an attempt to permit an impression of the intended four-movement structure of the Ninth Symphony. Despite Orel’s publication, but also because of its shortcomings, and because musicological interest had never been fostered by performance, the symphony’s intended structure and meaning had been radically

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Orel, D/128: “Um die Übersicht zu erleichtern, sei noch die (soweit die Entwürfe erkennen lassen) letzte Fassung (E) auf 4 zeilige Systeme zusammengezogen wiedergegeben.”

<sup>16</sup> Cf. correspondence by MWV to the author, *Aktennotiz über Gespräche zwischen Herrn John Phillips und Herrn Dr. Herbert Vogt am 23. und 25. Mai 1991*: “1.) Die Forschungen von Herrn Phillips über das unvollendet gebliebene Finale gipfeln in der Erkenntnis, daß Bruckner den Satz komplett konzipiert hat, daß aber nicht alle Manuskriptbögen erhalten (bzw. greifbar) sind.” See discussion in Part Three.

<sup>17</sup> See points listed in §1.4.14 *infra*.

misconstrued by early apologists seeking to justify performances of the work in three-movement form. The close relationship between musicological and critical attention and performance tradition is central to this problem. Performances of the Samale *et al.* Aufführungsfassung since 1991, as ch. 3.4 shows, have proven at least as crucial as publication of the Finale score in the Bruckner GA in generating the necessary momentum to shift critical awareness—provided audiences and critics can be persuaded to relinquish old beliefs. Moreover, it is through the medium of practical performance that the intended conception of the Ninth Symphony can most readily be glimpsed. For this reason the score of the Aufführungsfassung and its reception represents one of the main *foci* of this study.<sup>18</sup> The second performing version of the Finale, the *Dokumentation des Finale-Fragments* (ed. Phillips, 1999, 2001, included in vol II and discussed in ch. 3.2) effectively builds on the reconstruction of Bruckner's autograph score (the AP) and in turn provides a foundation for the more speculative Aufführungsfassung.<sup>19</sup> This most recent realisation of the Finale confirms the essential viability of Bruckner's concept of the Finale in the form which the composer left it. It does not attempt to complete the movement's instrumentation beyond realising the existing clues left by Bruckner, and permits compositional continuity, where it cannot be directly reconstructed from other sources, to break off between the surviving fragments. The lacunae nonetheless provide useful opportunities to educate the audience as to the Finale's form, compositional history and transmission.<sup>20</sup>

#### 1.4.3 The methodology required by a performing version of the Finale.

Given the gaps in the surviving score of the Finale, the absence of a coda, and the varying degrees of textural completion within the surviving fragments, the extent to which it is possible to arrive at a continuous, performable version of the movement—as opposed to leaving the work as a series of fragments, or to what Gülke aptly termed 'Drauflosbrucknern,' i.e., free composition in a Brucknerian style—can be regarded as contingent upon the number of the following methodological steps invoked by the would-be editor/completer/arranger. Each of these steps can be seen as *increasingly exclusive* of recourse to creative, 'free' solutions and the introduction of foreign, however appropriately 'Brucknerian', material.

---

<sup>18</sup> It was originally intended to publish the score of the Aufführungsfassung (at that stage entitled 'Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung') with different note sizes in order to indicate the provenance of the musical text. However, the division between source and supplementation ultimately embodied in the separate publication of (a) the reconstructed 'Urtext' (the AP; with attendant monograph and facsimile edition) and (b) performing version (the AF, and later DdF), came to represent useful methodological and nomenclatural distinctions doing equal justice to the demands of philological stringency and practicability. Typographical distinctions were usefully employed in the score of the *Dokumentation (infra)*; cf. in Part Three the editorial principles of the AP, DdF and AF (chs. 3.1–3.3) and history of the three publications (ch. 3.4).

<sup>19</sup> This is despite the fact that it was published almost a decade later and for practical purposes borrows the dynamics, tempo, articulation, etc. of the AF.

<sup>20</sup> See ch. 3.2 and publication history since 1990, §§3.4.7–3.4.9.

- i. A thorough understanding of Bruckner's methods of harmony and voice leading, and of analytical studies of Bruckner's works dealing with his compositional methods.
- ii. The consideration of written or reported statements by the composer as to his intentions and other significant insights about the work to be gleaned from the biographical literature, as for instance the statements transmitted via Bruckner's doctor Richard Heller.
- iii. The use of detailed musicological comparison with Bruckner's other scores, the so-called 'Analogverfahren',<sup>21</sup> in gaining structural insights, supplementing compositional texture, orchestration, tempi and dynamics.
- iv. The use of analytical factors in reconstructing the missing bifols. of the score.
- v. Comparison with Bruckner's pc. and continuity drafts, making possible the reconstruction of the compositional continuity of several of the missing bifols.
- vi. Accurate correlation of the surviving score fragments.

In discussing the known attempts to arrive at performing versions of the Finale, including those which rank best as transcriptions or compilations, it is disappointing to note how little of any such methodology has been observed. The ignorance of even a modicum of Bruckner's compositional technique, the realisation of his orderly procedure in what was an intentional *score*, not merely a collection of loose drafts, by numbered, largely 16-m. bifols.—a fact that cannot be overlooked the moment that analyses of the material in any sort of detail are made—or his constant scrutiny of period structure via the metric numbering of each measure, is sadly apparent in the majority of the versions known to the present writer, as is any grasp of the text of the 1934 publication.

In most cases, as has already been pointed out (in §0.1.2 and elsewhere), the Orel edition itself represented a major obstacle to better understanding the original MSS, and it is principally the misunderstandings arising from the almost unanimous opinion of reviewers that the surviving materials for the Finale represented nothing more than sketches that have so completely derailed critical reception of the movement and its performing versions until the present. For Timothy Jackson for instance, writing with no better knowledge of the material than that presented in 1934, made the assumption that the Orel edition transcribed only contextless fragments in any case, and that its textual inadequacies ultimately invalidated all attempts at 'reconstruction':

If the extant sketches do not constitute a synthesis, modern completers do Bruckner a considerable disservice by patching together the extant fragments and by claiming that such quilts correspond to Bruckner's intentions. Furthermore, comparison of Orel's tran-

---

<sup>21</sup> See further discussion in §1.4.14 *infra*, and in ch. 3.3.

scriptions with the sources reveals his many simplifications and omissions of significant detail. It is, therefore, doubly disturbing to find the completers basing their 'reconstructions' on Orel's not always reliable transcriptions.<sup>22</sup>

The same fundamental view informs, as we shall see, most of the objections to performing versions of the Finale. Jackson's dismissal of the question of completions would be correct were only his asseverations concerning the nature of the Finale manuscripts—concordant with his supposition that “At the time of his death, the logic of the whole argument still seems to have eluded him”<sup>23</sup>—actually true; that the Finale score represented an integral manuscript, an emergent autograph, is the only basis on which the undertaking of a performing version can be justified. Despite claims to the contrary,<sup>24</sup> up until the research work done by Samale and Mazzuca on the originals no one appears to have considered MSS worth the effort of closer acquaintance; yet, as Susan Filler wrote in evaluating the pros and contras of a completion of the Mahler Tenth, “the test of the case should rest on knowledge of the score itself”.<sup>25</sup>

It is for this reason—and also because reproduction of portions of the original scores as a basis for their analysis would have further extended the second volume—that discussion of the known Orel-based attempts at completions or performing versions of the Finale has been kept brief. Frequently, prefaces or other texts by the arrangers prove more informative and insightful than the musical efforts themselves. Of the efforts to achieve some form of integrated, continuous score from the fragments presented in the Orel edition, only the Oeser, Carragan and Samale/Mazzuca versions called for independent analysis:<sup>26</sup> 's Gravesande, Schönzeler and Josephson provided their own analyses, while the remaining materials to which the writer had access (Neill/Gastaldi, Walker, Fine) did not justify more detailed treatment. Table V, Significant Versions of the Finale, 1940 to 1988 (A/18ff.) shows the extent to which the three widely disparate approaches by Oeser, Carragan and Samale/Mazzuca/Cohrs were based on the common substrate of the original materials which, even given the errors of Orel's transcription and collocation, still constituted the fragments of a *score*, not merely *sketches*.

<sup>22</sup> “Bruckner's Metrical Numbers”, *19th-Century Music* 14 (1990), p. 128.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* Cf. Simpson's maintenance of compositional shortcomings in the Finale material quoted in the previous chapter. Jackson's statements correspond with his readiness to transfer analytical findings in his article on Bruckner's sketch of the brief motet *Vexilla Regis* to larger scale, symphonic forms. The sketches of *Das Deutsche Lied*, *Helgoland* as well as the Finale give every evidence that Bruckner, *pace* Jackson, continued to see movements as a whole and could “achieve a synthesis of the component parts” (Jackson)—including the Finale. It is possible to glimpse here the extent to which Orel's publication has proven a stumbling block, even for serious musicologists.

<sup>24</sup> As for instance those made by Märzendorfer; see §1.4.9 *infra*.

<sup>25</sup> Filler, p. 275.

<sup>26</sup> A score of the Märzendorfer version was not available for analysis. See §1.4.9 *infra*.

#### 1.4.4 Early piano presentations.<sup>27</sup>

Performances of the more complete portions of the score appear to have begun shortly after publication of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* by Orel in 1934. Oskar Lang's article of that year<sup>28</sup> claims the material insufficient to warrant orchestral performance, but nonetheless concludes:

Weit über das historisch wissenschaftliche Interesse hinaus verdient diese Finalemusik geistiger Besitz aller Verehrer des Meisters zu werden. So hoffen wir, daß bald ein vierhändiger Auszug sie auch der Allgemeinheit zugänglich macht oder noch besser vielleicht eine Bearbeitung für zwei Klaviere. In dieser Form wäre auch eine orientierende Aufführung mit entsprechendem Einführungsvortrag an internen Abenden der einzelnen Ortsgruppen der Bruckner-Gesellschaft durchaus denkbar.<sup>29</sup>

The suggestion was acted upon rapidly, a two-piano transcription of the Finale material being presented by Orel's assistant Else Krüger and Kurt Bohnen at a concert organised in the same year by Lang's 'home' chapter of the IBG in Munich.<sup>30</sup> The following extract is taken from a review of that performance:

Die Skizzen und Entwürfe zum letzten Satz sind zusammen mit den Entwürfen zu den übrigen Sätzen der IX. Symphonie unlängst im Auftrag der I. B. G. durch Alfred Orel herausgegeben worden. Orel hat seinem Kommentar zu den Entwürfen dankenswerterweise den Versuch einer Rekonstruktion des letzten Satzes nach dem vorhandenen schriftlichen Material beigelegt. Die Krügersche Übertragung folgt diesem Rekonstruktionsversuch in allen Teilen, mit Ausnahme einer einzigen Takteinschiebung, die übrigens als solche kenntlichgemacht ist. Von zwei Gesichtspunkten aus war es nun wichtig, den Eindruck, so wie er sich durch sorgfältiges Studium der Entwürfe gewinnen läßt, durch die Aufführung nachzuprüfen. *Der letzte Satz ist nicht nur als Ganzes ein Fragment, er ist fragmentarisch auch in seinen Teilen.* Das ist die erste Einsicht, in der der Hörer durch die Wiedergabe bekräftigt wird. Gegen den fragmentarischen Charakter spricht keineswegs die Ausgeführtheit einzelner Teile oder Gruppen. Es ist gewiß, daß andere Teile kompositorisch noch mehr oder weniger unausgeführt sind; zwischen einzelnen Teilen fehlen die Verbindungsstücke, manches wäre kompositorisch noch ganz anders ausgewertet worden, wenn der Tod Bruckner nicht vorzeitig die Feder aus der Hand genommen hätte. Als Belegstück mag die als zweites Thema fungierende, von Bruckner in den Skizzen als 'Gesangspartie' bezeichnete melismatische Wendung dienen; so, wie sie ist, hat sie vorläufig nur *andeutenden* Charakter, sie ist melodisch noch ganz *unausgeformt*. Oder: die Fuge; nachweislich fehlen in der Skizze 16 Takte.

<sup>27</sup> Reference will be made in the following to the above-cited study by Dutch Bruckner scholar Cornelis van Zwol, "Der Finalsatz der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners. Ein Referat in Utrecht (15. November 1986); ein Symposium in Rom (11. bis 12. Mai 1987)", *BrJb* 1987–88, pp. 31–38. Cf. also Gunnar Cohrs, "Kompletierungsversuche eines Torsos. Zu den verschiedenen Fassungen von Bruckners Neunter Sinfonie." *FonoForum* August 1988, pp. 18f.

<sup>28</sup> "Die Entwürfe zum Finale der 9. Symphonie Anton Bruckners", as quoted in §1.3.7 *supra*.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 447.

<sup>30</sup> As recorded also in Göll.-A. IV/4, p. 123. Unfortunately neither in Göll.-A. nor in the review quoted below is any date given. Cf. van Zwol, pp. 31f. A Munich concert programme of 1947 quoted in §1.3.9 made reference to this performance, incorrectly citing it as having taken place in 1938.

Nehmen wir einmal an, diese fänden sich heute an irgend einem Ort: wir wären auch dann noch über den eigentlichen Plan Bruckners im Unklaren, die Fuge wäre auch dann erst höchstens bis zur Durchführung vorgerückt und der an die 16 fehlenden Takte anschließende Teil—darauf muß hingewiesen werden—steht mit der Fuge in einer sehr lockeren Verbindung. Gewiß ist übrigens—darauf hat schon Orel aufmerksam gemacht—, daß (trotz der Ostinato-Reminiszens an das Te Deum) Bruckner den letzten Satz symphonisch hätte abschließen lassen.<sup>31</sup>

Significant is the reviewer's difficulty in accepting the abstraction of the Gesangsp., although it was written three times by Bruckner in precisely this form,<sup>32</sup> as well as the relative brevity of the fugue. Although the possibility is voiced that some of the material may be missing, the reviewer found it impossible to rise above the subjective impact of such a 'fragmentary' performance—as already noted, "Musik ist darauf angewiesen, fertiggestellt zu sein". The appraisal and assessment of any aesthetic object tends to presuppose its conceptual integrity as a 'closed system'.

The following disclaimer, perhaps harking back to Lang's desire to see a piano edition and at least 'IBG-internal' performances, appeared in a later issue of the same journal; the reactionary tendencies which decreed the Finale should remain 'Augenmusik', the sole provenance of musicologists and specialists, were already at work:

Dem aus München [...] eingesandten Bericht [...] <sup>33</sup> ist ergänzend, bzw. berichtend hinzuzufügen, daß die 'Hauptauffindung' der Skizzen zum Finale [...] Herrn. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Robert Haas zu danken ist, der auch ihre Veröffentlichung ermöglicht hat. Eine Ausführung der Skizzen widerspricht aber der im Vorlagenbericht von den Herausgebern niedergelegten Rechtsanschauung, was hiermit ausdrücklich betont werden soll.<sup>34</sup>

The two sentences, of course, effectively contradict each other: presumably the performance was not at all 'made possible' by Haas, who probably reacted to news of the performances with an aggressive assertion of territory, pointing out that they were in breach of the GA's copyright.

Fourteen years later, Hans Ferdinand Redlich, whose services to the Finale have already been noted (§1.3.9), performed Orel's four-system compilation on piano on 17 September 1948.<sup>35</sup> According to Redlich's preface to the Eulenburg score of the Ninth Symphony,<sup>36</sup> this

<sup>31</sup> Ludwig Lade, "Bruckners Entwürfe zum Finale der Neunten (Münchener Urvorführung)", *BrBlätter* no. 4 (1934), p. 8. Italics added. It is striking that not even Orel's assistant, apparently, was sufficiently informed about the edition to have recognised, and informed her audience, of the crucial distinction between fragments having been composed by Bruckner, and missing bifols.

<sup>32</sup> Namely ÖNB 6086/2<sup>r</sup> and bifols. 4A and 4C/"5", Facs. C/33, 148f., 152f.; Orel D/66 and 76. The problem was already mentioned by Lang, p. 446.

<sup>33</sup> The original cites here a previous report in *BrBlätter* nos. 3/4 (1935), p. 30; it has not proven possible to trace the issue, and it remains unclear as to whether this was a misprint for the report cited earlier.

<sup>34</sup> [Anonymous], *BrBlätter* 1936, no. 1, final page.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. van Zwol, p. 33.

was given together with Robert Simpson; according to Redlich's article "The Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony",<sup>37</sup> it was given as a piano solo by Redlich alone. It seems clear, however, that no "Kompletierung," as van Zwol suggests,<sup>38</sup> was presented here, merely Orel's conflation of the surviving score fragments, as in the 1934 'Urvorführung'.

#### 1.4.5 Fritz Oeser.

In 1940 a performing version of the first 220 measures of the Finale (i.e., up to the introduction of the Te Deum motive in the flute and the beginning of the Durchf.) was prepared by Austrian musicologist Fritz Oeser (1911–1981) and first performed during the "Zweites Leipziger Brucknerfest", 10–13 October 1940. The "Finalefragment der IX. Symphonie", as it was entitled, dutifully provided with the cautious subtitle "Studienmäßige Uraufführung", was aired on 12 October 1940 in the Leipzig Gewandhaus by the Großes Orchester des Reichssenders Leipzig under that orchestra's Generalmusikdirektor Hans Weisbach, *preceding* a performance of the first three movements.<sup>39</sup> Van Zwol notes that the work was further performed during the Second World War and again as recently as 11 July 1974 in Stuttgart for the Bruckner sesquicentenary, possibly based solely on Langevin's statements to that effect (cf. §1.3.10 *supra*). But as already noted (*ibid.*), Langevin's assumption that the work was entitled "Ueberleitung zum Te Deum" and first performed in that function does not appear to be correct. According to Cohrs,<sup>40</sup> the Oeser realisation was, however, performed as a transition to the Te Deum in October 1981 (see §1.4.10 *infra*) by Peter Ruzicka, who had prepared a radio broadcast version of the Finale fragments some years before.

Oeser's 27-p. score was originally published by the Bruckner Verlag of Wiesbaden and is still available as hire material via Bärenreiter/Alkor Edition. Pages 18–25 reproduce pp. 92–99 of the Orel edition (the fully scored chorale passage, cf. D/92ff., with dynamics and articulation added). The handwritten remainder contains certain instrumental additions—even in some cases where Orel reproduced rests by Bruckner himself—, essential dynamics, and articulation. A 2-p. preface by Oeser, entitled "Einrichtung für die Praxis" and dated Leipzig, October 1940, cites the significant additions and alterations to the text of the Orel edition. Clearly no reference to the original material was made, however, all of Orel's

---

<sup>36</sup> "I had publicly performed (with Robert Simpson's assistance) the finished portion of the Finale in London," (London–Zurich 1963), p. vii.

<sup>37</sup> P. 149, fn.: "The synthesis of all the extant versions of the finale was publicly performed in a piano solo arrangement by the present writer [i.e., Redlich] in his lecture on 'Bruckner's Ninth Symphony', given for the Exploratory Concert Society at the St. Martin's School of Art, London, September 17, 1948."

<sup>38</sup> p. 33.

<sup>39</sup> Van Zwol, pp. 32f. Cf. also Friedrich Blume, who refers to the first performance in Leipzig in "Bruckner", *MGG*, cols. 373–4.

<sup>40</sup> This information according to an unpubl. chronology of the Finale after Bruckner's death.

notational and interpretational misreadings being faithfully reproduced. Table V presents a brief analysis.

Oeser's lengthy and detailed programme notes for the Leipzig performance include considerable information concerning the editor's approach as well as his beliefs regarding Bruckner's intentions:

Noch zwei Jahre nach dem Abschluß des Adagios hat Bruckner, immer von Krankheit behindert, um einen Finaleabschluß der IX. Symphonie gerungen, der in seinem Gehalt dem erdrückenden Katastrophen-Ausklang des I. Satzes nicht nur die Waage hält, sondern ihn nach der Seite der Verherrlichung und der Dur-Glorie weit überstrahlen sollte. Ein solches Ende war für Bruckner über die rein musikalischen Erfordernisse hinaus selbstverständlich, besonders in einem Werke, das bewußt als Abschluß eines mühevollen und gesegneten Schaffens erkannt und in ebenso kühner wie demütiger Gebärde 'dem lieben Gott' gewidmet war. Als er spüren mußte, daß ihm die Vollendung des Satzes nicht vergönnt sein würde, äußerte er daher die Absicht, die Symphonie mit dem Lob- und Dankgesang des Tedeums, seines großen 'Rechtfertigungs'-Werkes, abzuschließen—ein Gedanke, der höchst sinnvoll dem Grundgehalt des Werkes entsprach, wenn auch unter dem Gesichtspunkt der reinen Musik und ihrer Stilgrenzen eine Ausführung fragwürdig war und von Bruckner schließlich fallen gelassen wurde.<sup>41</sup>

Angesichts dieser Absicht ist nun die Frage vordringlich, was eigentlich vom Finale schon niedergeschrieben war und erhalten blieb. Es ist dies viel mehr als man nach der älteren Überlieferung vermuten konnte. [...]<sup>42</sup>

A brief analysis of the surviving material follows, in which Oeser speaks of the 218-m. (actually 220-m.) Exp.<sup>43</sup> as "dieses auch formal in sich ziemlich abgeschlossenes Bruchstück" (despite the problems of establishing the continuity of the Gesangsperiode<sup>44</sup>). The performance of the fragment could be justified only as an "Ausnahmedarbietung":

Mit Nachdruck sei aber betont, daß es sich dabei nicht darum handeln kann, den Konzertprogrammen eine 'interessante Neuigkeit' einzuverleiben, sondern einzig und allein darum, unser Wissen um Bruckners Wesen und Schicksal zu bereichern und zu vertiefen und Ehrfurcht vor dem schmerzlichen Ringen zu erwecken, dem die letzte Erfüllung versagt blieb."<sup>45</sup>

<sup>41</sup> That Bruckner ever decided *against* the appendage of the Te Deum for aesthetic reasons is nowhere recorded. Again, the primacy of an assumedly unimpeachable aesthetic perspective can be seen here.

<sup>42</sup> Quoted from van Zwol, p. 32.

<sup>43</sup> In fact, Bruckner writes "2. Th[eil]" above the measure in which the Te Deum motive enters in the flute; hence, strictly speaking, the Oeser version actually breaks off in the Durchführung, as mentioned.

<sup>44</sup> Oeser's solution to the asperity of the Gesangsperiode was to 'pad out' the beginning of bifol. 5B by introducing a slightly altered form of the 'lyrical counterpoint' (cf. Mus. Ex. 25d) into the 2nd violins (see Table V). This, as well as Oeser's dismissal of the remainder of the score fragments, was to arouse the critical censure of Hein's Gravesande: see §1.4.8 *infra*.

<sup>45</sup> Van Zwol, p. 32



In an ensuing lengthy passage concerning the details of the requisite “Einrichtung für die Praxis”, Oeser is at pains to establish that his efforts in no way “um eine der sattsam bekannten ‘Bearbeitungen’ handeln könnte, die sich womöglich noch erkühnte, Unvollendetes und nicht zu Vollendetes doch noch zu beenden”, but that the “Einrichtung sich im ganzen von Willkür und Anmaßung freihalten konnte”.<sup>46</sup> Typically, while asserting that the remainder of the score is far more “skizzenhaft” than the Exp., Oeser’s notes close with the *sine qua non* of Finale reception that saw the musical fragment as a symbol of human mortality:

Aus der seltsamen Eintönigkeit seines Rhythmus, der nicht umsonst schon in der VIII. Symphonie die ‘Totenuhr’ symbolisierte, sprechen ebenso wie aus den fahl leuchtenden Harmonieketten Todesnähe und der Hinübergang in den Bezirk, wo das Werk und seine Geltung versinken. So ist das Finale in seiner Grundstimmung nur die andere Seite des Adagios, das für uns den Ausklang der Symphonie bildet und das gerade angesichts des unvollendeten Finales heute als Sinnbild für das Fragmentarische menschlichen Daseins überhaupt die Herzen ergreift.<sup>47</sup>

The critique by Ludwig Lade<sup>48</sup> discusses the performance in the same pietistic tone typical of the period. The following extract is characteristic:

Der für einige weihevollere Augenblicke gehobene Vorhang vor dem ewigen Geheimnis schließt sich wieder, und uns bleibt nur zu ahnen, welcher grandiosen Wunderbau voll glühender Klanginbrunst, mündend in eine gewaltige Fuge und in die Gloriole des Chorals Bruckner errichtet hätte [...].

Todesnähe, doch ohne jede Bitternis des Scheidenmüssens, sondern voll Ahnung des Unendlichen, ein Hinausgehobensein über alle irdische Begrenztheit spricht aus diesem tragischen Dokument eines Ringens, das auch im Nicht-mehr-Vollbringen kraft unerschütterlicher Glaubensgewißheit sich die Märtyrerkrone des von seiner Mitwelt verkannten Genies erwarb. General Musikdirektor Hans Weisbach (Wien) bereitete mit von eigenem Pathos durchtränkten Einführungsworten stimmungsmäßig auf das Erklingen des Bruchstückes vor, das sich zu einem ergreifenden Ereignis gestaltete.

#### 1.4.6 Edward Neill and Giuseppe Gastaldi.

In 1962 the Italian team of Dr. Edward D. R. Neill and Giuseppe Gastaldi produced a more substantial score of 439 mm., in most cases with no attempt at completion of the missing bifolds. They simply copied out as much as possible of the score as published by Orel, making transitions using other score material (not the pc. sks.) or even where absolutely necessary deleting measures (as in the Durchf.) to make possible some kind of join. There are occasional instrumental additions but more frequently convenient reductions to strings or (as in the

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> Cf. the review of Fritz Bouquet, “Der Tod trat in die Werkstätte”. Bruckner-Entwürfe zum Klingen gebracht”, *Mainzer Anzeiger* 18th Oct. 1940.

passage following the Exp. Hauptth., Orel's 3. Bg. A, D/76) to a literal unisono for the entire orchestra—despite the fact that obvious indications of Bruckner's scoring and texture exist. The essential continuity of the score can be traced from the 4-stave conflation given by Orel (see D/128ff.). As mentioned, 3. Bg. A is scored out in a literal unison throughout, a patently absurd piece of orchestration. In the Exp. Gesangsp. Neill/Gastaldi opt for the 5. Bg. B solution as taken by Oeser (cf. D/130), but at the end of that section use an earlier discarded version, Bg. 7 B, in place of the later 7 C (D/131; cf. D/79, 91). In the Durchf., Bg. 13 is omitted entirely and 12C made to join directly to 14<sup>g</sup>. Bg. E (cf. D/133). 5 mm. are then deleted from the beginning of 15 D to enable some semblance of harmonic link up with the end of 14<sup>g</sup>. E (D/134). The missing bifol. in the fugue is simply cut, as 's Gravesande would later do, the music jumping from the end of 18 D to the beginning of 20 D (Orel D/135). In the Repr. Gesangsp., the missing Bg. 24 D cited as "16 Takte" by Orel (D/138) was filled in with 18 mm. of material freely adapted from 5. Bg. B in the Exp., while the second gap in the Repr. Gesangsp. (D/138) was obviated by cutting from the end of m. 12 of 26 F to the beginning of 29 E. Only the most essential dynamic markings and articulation were added, and the score simply breaks off at the (supposedly) last bifol., Orel's 29. Bg. E.

The unpublished handwritten score<sup>49</sup> is accompanied by a preface in which, among other things, the arrangers explain the discontinuities of the surviving fragments as the result of Bruckner's declining health:

L'esame degli schizzi rivela infatti numerose lacune nella orchestrazione, lacunae che diventano sempre più frequenti specialmente verso la parte conclusiva, il che è probabilmente dovuto al progressivo deterioramento delle condizioni di salute del compositore.<sup>50</sup>

Presumably for this reason, the arrangers felt perfectly justified in linking, as far as possible, one bifol. with whichever succeeding bifol. happened to be extant, in total disregard of the bifol. and metrical numbers published in Orel (inclusion of which alone might have clarified many things for them), presumably under the assumption that no other material ever existed. The 4-p. preface describes the score as a reconstruction more than a transcription or arrangement,<sup>51</sup> although any reconstruction attempting, as this one does, to make the contents of bifol. 20 adjoin those of bifol. 18 scarcely qualifies for the term: it is hence, in all essentials, merely a compilation.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Title: *A. Bruckner/ Sinfonia No. 9 in Re min./ Finale/ Ricostruzione a cura di G. Gastaldi & E. D. R. Neill*. 78 pp., 439 mm. (measure numbers incorrect from c. m. 10 onwards), photocopy of handwritten score; four-page typescript preface by E. D. R. Neill (undated) briefly citing (pp. 3f.) instrumental additions, but without references to sources. Copy courtesy of Maestro Samale. Cf. also van Zwol, p. 33.

<sup>50</sup> *Preface*, p. 2

<sup>51</sup> "Si tratta dunque di una *ricostruzione* più che di trascrizione o arrangiamento" (emphasis original), *ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. van Zwol, p. 33, who claims the score was never performed. Cohrs, however, in the account of his involvement with Bruckner and the Finale, *Bruckner-Arbeit 1982–1992: Ein Chronologischer Kurzbericht*

### 1.4.7 Arthur D. Walker.

In the late 1960s, musicologist and music librarian Arthur D. Walker (b. 1932), while a student of Redlich's at the University of Manchester, made a partial compilation of the Finale score materials from Orel, apparently without attempting to link the fragments as if the gaps left by the lost bifolds did not exist. This 'completion'—some 78 loose pp. of full score or sketch in pencil—is itself unfinished and fragmentary, breaking off shortly before the Repr. Gesangsp. (at the end of m. 6 of Orel's 23. Bogen D, D/115) and including a number of further score fragments copied from the Orel edition, principally Orel's No. 22 (D/84ff.), the earlier version of the opening of the movement.<sup>53</sup> Walker seems to have made some effort to bridge the gap in the Durchf. using what Orel classified as 13<sup>a</sup>. Bg. E and 13<sup>b</sup>. Bg. E (Orel D/122f.), but never completed. Redlich apparently realised that the early pc. sks. published in the Göllerich-Auer biography<sup>54</sup> were not included in the Orel edition, incorrectly interpreting them as being intended for the coda—they are in fact early drafts for the beginning of the movement; again Walker never got beyond their transcription.

Walker's efforts are, however, significant from the point of view that this score is the first known in which Bruckner's metrical numbers were taken at their word and underlaid. They appear throughout most of Walker's draft, in some cases under empty measures: the missing bifol. between Orel's 14<sup>g</sup>. Bogen E (cf. Orel D/123f.) and 15. Bogen D (D/103), for instance, is given as 8 mm. with the metrical numbers written underneath empty measures, the missing bifol. in the fugue, likewise, is given as only 8 mm. instead of the 16 indicated in Orel (cf. D/110; also D/135, "16 Takte"). But there is no indication of any philologic procedure having been followed and only in very few cases have further instrumental parts, tempi, dynamics or phrasing been added.

---

(unpubl., Feb. 1993), p. 3, speaks of the existence of a private tape of a reading. Cf. also the introductory essay to the score by Edward D. R. Neill, "Notre Realisation du Finale de la 9e Symphonie", in: Langevin, Paul-Gilbert (ed.), *Bruckner: Apogée de la Symphonie*, Lausanne 1977, pp. 261–264, and the references in the previously quoted discussion of the Ninth Symphony by Langevin himself, pp. 197 and 198.

Incredibly, Manfred Wagner (*BrLWD*, p. 346) actually cites this score rather than the Orel edition in making analytical reference to the Finale, which supposedly "weist sogar daraufhin, daß Exposition und Durchführung sowie Reprise fast ein identisches formales Vorgehen haben".

<sup>53</sup> Copy with the present writer courtesy of its author. Title page: *A. Bruckner. / Symphony IX. / Finale / A D Walker*. Cf. van Zwol, p. 33. William Carragan, in *Anton Bruckner: Ninth Symphony: Finale. Notes and Essays* (a brochure including a chronology and essays "The Enigma and Challenge of Bruckner's Ninth" by Jack Diether and "The Fulfilment of Bruckner's Ninth—the Finale" by Carragan, 1984, unpubl.) errs in suggesting that a performance of this score by the Hallé orchestra in 1970 was planned and did not materialise merely due to the untimely death of Barbirolli. Walker explained in a letter to the present writer of 13 March 1990 that Redlich suggested he (Walker) should show the score to Barbirolli. Following a concert of the first three movements of the Ninth Barbirolli merely stated to Walker that "he would see when I had completed it". Walker continues: "With the death of Redlich I did less and less work on it, [...] finally abandoning it on the death of Sir John Barbirolli 18 months later".

<sup>54</sup> Vol. IV/3, facing p. 592, now ÖNB 6007, Facs. C/27ff.

### 1.4.8 Hein 's Gravesande.

In 1969 the Dutch composer, conductor and piano teacher Hein 's Gravesande (1916–1970) prepared a continuous score of some 481 measures following in part the same methodology as that used by Neill and Gastaldi, again without making any significant attempt to go beyond the score materials as published by Orel. On the other hand, the supposedly 'concluding' appearance of chorale (cf. D/126) was continued for the first time modulating back into a *fff* D major 4 mm. after the end of Orel's 29. Bg. E in a brief coda of 17 mm., with a kind of thematic overlay—essentially a kind of tonic-major *Klangfläche* as at the conclusion of VIII/4, using the initial horn theme and Hauptth. of IX/1 (cf. mm. 5, 63 thereof) together with the opening motive (Ex. 25a), Te Deum motive (25i) and chorale figuration (25g) of the Finale. Curiously, 's Gravesande exchanged Bruckner's trumpets in F for trumpets in C. The 64-p., somewhat roughly handwritten score, entitled *Anton Bruckner: Finale: 9e sinfonie. d moll / orkestpartituur*, cites a number of dates on its last p. ("21-3-69" to "23/6/'69") and is accompanied by a 2-p., type-written preface by its editor dated "voorjaar 1969".<sup>55</sup>

The score was first performed in Den Haag on 8 November 1998 by the Viotta Jeugd Orkest under Wim Bredenhorst as part of a symposium entitled "De Onvoltooiden—Die Unvollendeten" dealing with Schubert's Eighth, Bruckner's Ninth and Mahler's Tenth.<sup>56</sup> According to van Zwol, following 's Gravesande's unexpected death the score found its way into the Gemeinde-Museum of Den Haag; score and parts were typeset by Donemus in Amsterdam in conjunction with the performance<sup>57</sup> and are now available for hire through Carus Verlag.<sup>58</sup> In his preface, 's Gravesande mentions destroying a preliminary score immediately after completing the second definitive version,<sup>59</sup> and outlines briefly his approach to the Orel edition. He also refers to the Oeser version, which, according to him, was unjustified in breaking off at the end of the Exp., and also, in (allegedly) confusing Orel's 'versions' of the Finale, suggests parallels with Haas' combining the versions of the Eighth:

De partituur die Dr. Frits Oeser verzorgde reikt slechts tot aan de epiloog, dit is volkomen onjuist daar Bruckner verstrekkende schetsen ontworpen heeft en geïnstrumenteerd tot in de Coda. Bovendien heeft Oeser alle Fassungen die Bruckner maakte volkomen door elkaar gegooid en tevens in de eerste groep van het zangthema thema's geplaatst die in de reprise thuis horen.

<sup>55</sup> Copy of the score and information courtesy of Cornelis van Zwol (including two letters to the author, dated Amersfoort 19/7/88 and 5/2/1989, and later letters of 4/6/96 and 26/8/96 pointing out corrections); cf. also "Der Finalsatz...", p. 33.

<sup>56</sup> "Symposion 'De Onvoltooiden—Die Unvollendeten.' Eine 'Bruckner'-Premiere in Den Haag", *IBG-Mitt* 51 (Dec. 1998), pp. 22–23.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> Information courtesy of Cohrs.

<sup>59</sup> According to van Zwol ("Symposion 'De Onvoltooiden...' ", p. 22) this was in fact the third version.

Dit laatste, is iets wat men ook Haas verwijten kan, door in zijn uitgave van de 8ste sinfonie de eerste en tweede bewerking doorelkaar te halen.

Critique is directed at Oeser's frequent use of differential dynamics, although where 's Gravesande found reference to a 'maestoso' in the materials published by Orel is not clear:

Ook de dynamiek van Oeser heeft op vele plaatsen iets on-Bruckners: bv. door niet in alle groepen FF of zelfs FFF te schrijven, wat Br.[uckner] in alle Original-Fassungen heeft gedaan. De dynamiek van Oeser gaat zo de kant op van de leerlingen Löwe—J. en F. Schalk.

Ook ontbreekt in de Oeser partituur de tempo aanduiding. Hierover is geen enkel duister punt, daar Bruckner duidelijk op een van de schetsen schrijft: "maestoso".

Essentially 's Gravesande maintained the order and choice of bifol. sources given in Orel's 4-stave conflation (see D/128ff.), but again without devoting much thought to the underlying philology or references to missing material. In the Exp. Gesangsp. Orel's 5. Bg. B was used without the 'Erweiterung' (D/130). At the beginning of the Durchf. 13. Bg. E was used with minimal instrumental additions. 'S Gravesande entirely overlooked Orel's reference to a missing bifol. ("(?) Takte", D/134) between 14<sup>g</sup>. Bg. E and 15. Bg. D, and likewise the "16 Takte" missing from the continuity in the fugue. In both of these cases he simply linked up the two bifols. on either side of the gap (cf. D/134, 135<sup>60</sup>), any harmonic continuity let alone musical integrity resulting from this primitive procedure being purely a matter of chance. In the Repr. Gesangsp. the missing Bg. 24 D, again specifically cited as "16 Takte" by Orel (D/138), was bridged simply by repeating the last 2 mm. of 23 D a tone lower; the second gap in the Repr. Gesangsp. (D/138) was bridged with 6 mm. by repeating the last 4 mm. of 26 F a tone lower, then inserting 2 mm. of timpani and lower-string *tremolo* prior to the beginning of Bg. 29 E.

Significant, finally, for 's Gravesande's conception of the movement is the following Vormoverzicht, included in his preface:

maat 1–50	inleiding
maat 51–82	1e thema met overgangsgroep
maat 83–162	2e thma met overgangsgroep
maat 163–210	3e thema
maat 211–226	slotgroep [this
maat 227–274	doorwerking
maat 275	begin fuga met reprise 1e thema tot maat 364
maat 365–408	reprise 2e thema
maat 409	begin Coda (Coda 1, waarin reprise 3e thema)
maat 465	Coda 2 (tot slot, waarin de thema's van 1e en 4e deel en tirme van het 'Te Deum')

<sup>60</sup> On the other hand, the bifol. 21. Bg. E underlaid at this point by Orel (D/136f.) was correctly ignored by 's Gravesande.

From this outline of the much-reduced movement it is evident that the arranger must have understood the 'Coda' to include the Repr. of the chorale, a curious conception of what are in Bruckner always patently distinct formal divisions, but presumably also a misreading of Orel's philology, taking the musical material at face value and ignoring Orel's explanatory remarks.

#### 1.4.9 Ernst Märzendorfer.

Austrian conductor Ernst Märzendorfer (b. 1921) first performed his 670-m. completion of the movement in the Stephaniensaal, Graz, with the Grazer Philharmonisches Orchester on 23, 24 and 25 November 1969, conducting the work again on 8 December 1970 in the Opernhaus am Karl-Marx-Platz in Leipzig and again in Innsbruck in 1980, for which last performance he apparently made heavy cuts.<sup>61</sup>

Märzendorfer had apparently been inspired to complete the Finale by Manfred Blumauer's programme notes for a performance of the first three movements of the Ninth which he had conducted in January 1968. Märzendorfer explained:<sup>62</sup>

Dabei wurde mir klar, daß dieser Satz wirklich fertig gewesen sein mußte, als Bruckner starb—so reich ist das überlieferte Material—und daß Bruckner lediglich nicht mehr zu einer Gesamtedition in Form einer Partiturreinschrift kam.

The first performances in Graz were announced as "Finalsatz der 9. Sinfonie / (Uraufführung nach den Manuskripten der Österreichische Nationalbibliothek und der Stadtbibliothek Wien)"; according to Märzendorfer, only one point in the score appeared in none of the score pages in the ÖNB and StB (which Märzendorfer allegedly consulted)—the 30-m. conclusion:

Diese Takte sind jedoch in Bruckners Bänden [?], in Form einer Generalbaßskizze vorhanden [apparently that of D/127, no. 46 I]. Da Bruckner ansonsten diesem Plane treu folgte, waren diese Takte mit einer fast an Sicherheit grenzenden Wahrscheinlichkeit nach Analogie zu ergänzen.

Kein Takt, kein Ton, der nicht streng aus dem vorliegenden Material dieses Finalsatzes belegt werden könnte.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Verbal information concerning the Innsbruck performance was supplied by Ernst Märzendorfer (see below); for the remaining dates see van Zwol, "Der Finalsatz...", pp. 33f. According to Cornelis van Zwol (letter dated 19/7/1988), the work was later performed in East Berlin and "maybe somewhere else too" (van Zwol), but this was corrected by him in a letter dated 4/6/96 to read "Leipzig"; apparently there were no performances in Berlin. Langevin also mentions the Märzendorfer version (§1.3.10 *supra*).

<sup>62</sup> In a statement directed to the Grazer Musikverein, who organised the performances, quoted by Manfred Blumauer in the programme notes.

<sup>63</sup> As Märzendorfer acknowledges in the ensuing paragraph (not quoted here), Hofrat Nowak permitted Märzendorfer access to the MSS and agreed to their performance, apparently (as Nowak was to state to the present writer in May 1991, three days before his death) solely for reasons of personal friendship.

Märzendorfer's score, which was only briefly viewed by the present writer,<sup>64</sup> is best described as a 'free collation' rather than as the 'Kompilation' which van Zwol terms it.<sup>65</sup> Orel's careful philology was largely discarded and the material treated largely as if it were contextless *disjecta membra*. Although reference to the MSS was claimed to have been made, it can surely not have been significant or thorough. Although unhampered by any linguistic barrier in following Orel's philology (such as one might have excused on the part of non-German arrangers), Märzendorfer's collage-like treatment of the material,<sup>66</sup> effectively appropriated Bruckner's compositional material while general disregarding its formal integrity, and ranks as one of the more serious indignities perpetrated upon the movement. Fragments were displaced, repeated, mm. marked by Bruckner as rests and so reproduced by Orel disregarded, instrumentation freely deleted or altered. As in 's Gravesande's score, Märzendorfer simply extended the chorale at the end of the Repr., modulating from the end of Orel's bifol. 29E via the sketch mentioned so as to end in D major without the composition of an independent coda. Whatever the aesthetic virtues of the resultant mosaic, the methodology of Märzendorfer's approach leaves much to be desired.<sup>67</sup>

The Märzendorfer performances in Graz, which significantly coupled the Finale with the Beethoven First Piano Concerto and First Symphony of Mahler rather than placing it in the context of its sister movements of the Ninth, received mixed reviews. Of the nine critiques known to the present writer no less than three cordial reports appeared from the pen of Manfred Blumauer,<sup>68</sup> a further two were equally complimentary,<sup>69</sup> one (an advance notice) relatively neutral,<sup>70</sup> others<sup>71</sup> more sceptical. That of Harald Kaufmann,<sup>72</sup> who penned by far

<sup>64</sup> At a meeting in the lobby of the Hotel Astoria in Vienna on 9th Feb. 1990, Märzendorfer proved unwilling to let the score out of his hands, even for purposes of a more detailed analysis. It also proved impossible to obtain a tape recording of the Graz performances, although one is known to exist.

<sup>65</sup> Van Zwol (p. 33) cites the use of the term from Märzendorfer's entry in the Riemann *Musiklexikon, Personenteil L–Z, Ergänzungsband* (Mainz 1975), p. 106.

<sup>66</sup> Märzendorfer's score was partly handwritten, partly (as in the case of the Oeser version) pasted together using photocopies of the Orel pages, in many cases simply added or deleting instrumentation over the printed text.

<sup>67</sup> A statement in Carragan's *Notes and Essays* that performances of a completion by Märzendorfer never eventuated is incorrect.

<sup>68</sup> See Blumauer, "Weitreichende Wirkungen. Zur Grazer Bruckner-Aufführung", *Südost Tagespost* (Graz), 22nd Nov. 1969; *idem*, "Bruckner-Uraufführung und mehr: Die Musikvereinskonzerte unter Ernst Märzendorfer: Finalsatz zur 'Neunten', Beethoven, Mahler", *Südost Tagespost*, 26th Nov. 1969; and *idem*, "Bruckner-Uraufführung in Graz: Die erste Präsentation des von Ernst Märzendorfer kompilierten Schlußsatzes der 'Neunten'", *Salzburger Nachrichten*, 26th Nov. 1969.

<sup>69</sup> Karl Haidmayer, "Anton Bruckner wurde uraufgeführt: Ernst Märzendorfer im Musikverein", *Kleine Zeitung* (Graz), 26th Nov. 1969; and Ewald Cwienk, "Für Bruckner nach-gedacht: Ernst Märzendorfer stellte ein Finale zur 'Neunten' her und vor", *Kurier* (Vienna), 26th Nov. 1969.

<sup>70</sup> [Anonymous], "Bruckners 'Neunte' erstmals mit Original-Finale in der Vervollständigung durch Märzendorfer", *Kurier* (Vienna), 25th Nov. 1969. The report refers to Märzendorfer's undertaking, "das mit der Zusammensetzung eines Mosaikbildes aus einzelnen Steinchen vergleichbar ist".

the longest and most detailed report, is significant in its egregiously misinformed description of the Orel publication as “dieses bruchstückhafte, ungeordnete Durcheinander beschriebenen Notenpapiers, ebenso die höchst anfechtbare Ideenskizze, mit der Alfred Orel einen möglichen Gesamtverlauf<sup>73</sup> des Satzes ahnbar machen wollte”, and which permitted “keine Hoffnung auf Entschlüsselung der Sinnzusammenhänge aufkommen”. While holding the ‘Rekonstruktion’ to be “außerordentlich respektwürdig”, he concluded perceptively that:

Es ist möglich geworden, über den Finalsatz ernsthaft zu reden. Das ist sehr viel. Es wird vermutlich nicht möglich sein, ihn dem Repertoire zu gewinnen: Das Odium des Annäherungswertes und des Fremdeingriffes, worauf ein auf Prestige und Sicherheit ausgerichtetes museales Musikleben mit Ablehnung zu reagieren pflegt, wird dem ebenso entgegenstehen wie das Werk selbst, das auch in den nachweisbar von Bruckner gearbeiteten Teilen von unterschiedlicher Qualität ist.

#### 1.4.10 The radio productions by Hans-Hubert Schönzeler and Peter Ruzicka.

In 1974 the German-born, Australian-educated musicologist and conductor Hans-Hubert Schönzeler (b. 1925) recorded only the more complete sections of the score with the BBC Northern Symphony Orchestra in Manchester, deleting Oeser’s instrumental additions to the Exp. and adding a further six fragments; this recording was broadcast by the BBC on 17 November.<sup>74</sup> In October 1973 the German composer, conductor and musicologist Peter Ruzicka (b. 1948) performed the Oeser version as a transition to the Te Deum, following the first three movements of the Ninth.<sup>75</sup> In 1976 Ruzicka prepared a broadcast for RIAS Berlin with the Radio Symphonie Orchester of that city, again consisting of the Exp. together with further fragments, but unlike Schönzeler, adding even more significantly to Bruckner’s instrumentation than Oeser, for instance in the Exp. chorale, where Ruzicka disregarded Bruckner’s rests in the woodwind staves.<sup>76</sup> But a ‘Ruzicka version’ *per se* does not exist.<sup>77</sup>

Shortly before his death in 1989, Schönzeler prepared the following statement concerning his radio version, published the following year, which, in light of the opinions held by

<sup>71</sup> See Dr. L. W., “Anton Bruckners Neunte vollendet? Uraufführung unter Ernst Märzendorfer in Graz”, *Linzer Volksblatt*, 29th Nov. 1969, p. 8; and Hansjörg Spies, “Graz: Ernst Märzendorfer bearbeitete Bruckner-Finale”, *Kärntner Tageszeitung*, 2nd Dec. 1969.

<sup>72</sup> “Das Ereignis einer Bruckner-Uraufführung 1969: Märzendorfer rekonstruierte das Finale der Neunten—Orchesterkonzert im Grazer Stephaniesaal”, *Neue Zeit*, 26th Nov. 1969. Van Zwol (p. 34) cited this report as an indication that the performances had received bad reviews overall.

<sup>73</sup> Meaning presumably Orel’s “Übersicht” (D/128–139) mentioned above.

<sup>74</sup> Van Zwol, p. 34. Also mentioned by Langevin (§1.3.10).

<sup>75</sup> Information according to Cohrs, as previously noted (§1.4.5 *supra*).

<sup>76</sup> Van Zwol, p. 34.

<sup>77</sup> Van Zwol, *ibid.* As Intendant of the Radio-Symphonie-Orchester, Berlin, Ruzicka was later to organise the 1986 Werkstatt concert in which the Samale/Mazzuca version was first performed (see §1.4.14 *infra*). Ruzicka’s article “Annäherung an einen Torso”, cited in §1.3.11, was also significant in drawing the attention of Cohrs to the primary literature concerning the Finale and the references to an “Allelujah des zweiten Satzes”.



him concerning completions of the Finale (see §1.3.9) as well as its detailed explanation of his editorial procedures, is of sufficient significance for the overall reception history of the movement to justify inclusion in entirety.<sup>78</sup>

In jüngster Zeit sind erneut Debatten über das Finale von Bruckners IX. Symphonie entstanden, und dabei ist mein Name in Abhandlungen und Vorträgen mehrfach als einer derer, die dieses Finale ‘rekonstruiert’ oder ‘orchestriert’ hätten, erwähnt worden. Dem ist nicht so, und ich möchte hiermit die Tatsachen ein für alle mal klarstellen.

Im Dezember 1971 habe ich mit dem (damaligen) BBC Northern Symphony Orchestra Bruckners Neunte in der üblichen Form aufgenommen, und diese Aufnahme wurde im Mai 1972 gesendet. Dieselbe Aufnahme wurde 1974 wiederum von der BBC aufs Programm gesetzt, und der Produzent, Dr. Robert Simpson (genau wie ich ein Gegner jeglicher Vervollständigung des Finales), trat an mich heran mit der Idee, ob man nicht auf diese Aufführung einen Vortrag über das existierende Material folgen lassen sollte, um Musikern und Musikliebhabern einen Eindruck zu vermitteln, was Bruckner bei diesem Finale vielleicht vorgeschwebt haben mag. Ich willigte ein, machte mich an die Arbeit und stellte sechs bzw. sieben Fragmente in Partitur nach Bruckners eigenem Autograph und nach Orels Revisionsbericht in der ersten Gesamtausgabe her. Diese sieben Fragmente (ebenfalls unter meiner Leitung 1974 mit dem BBC Northern Symphony Orchestra aufgenommen) wurden dann in einen Vortrag von etwa 45 Minuten von Paul Hamburger eingeflochten, und am 17. November 1974 im BBC Radio 3 unmittelbar anschließend an eine zweite Aussendung meiner oben erwähnten Aufnahme der IX. Sinfonie ausgestrahlt.

Für das erste (und längste) dieser Fragmente, die 229 Takte lange Exposition des Satzes, bediente ich mich der 1940 hergestellten Fassung von Fritz Oeser. Diese basiert ebenfalls auf Orel, doch da es sich um eine Aufführungsfassung handelt, hat Oeser gewisse Stellen aus Analogiegründen stärker instrumentiert. Alle diese Zutaten habe ich ausgemerzt und auch am Ende keinen tonalen Abschluß gebracht, sondern habe Bruckners eigenen angedeuteten Übergang (über as-moll [cf. Orel D/101] zur Durchführung) beibehalten, so unbefriedigend das klingen mag. Diese von mir eingespielten Fragmente sollten ja schließlich nur klingende Beispiele im Rahmen eines musikwissenschaftlichen Vortrages sein. Was die anderen sechs Fragmente (I–VI) anbelangt, so habe ich mich bei meiner Einrichtung einer spielbaren Partitur restlos auf Orels Ausführungen gestützt, und alle Anmerkungen, Seitenzahlen usw. beziehen sich auf seinen Revisionsbericht, veröffentlicht in der ersten Gesamtausgabe.

Im Einzelnen:

I:	16 Takte	14g. Bogen E (S. 123–4) <sup>79</sup>
II:	64 Takte	15. Bogen D / -de von Bogen 13 / 16. Bogen C (S. 103–5) & 17 <sup>c</sup> . / 18. Bogen D (S. 109–10)
III:	64 Takte	20. / 21. / 22. / 23. Bogen D (S. 111–15)
IV:	16 Takte	21. Bogen E (S. 125)
V:	32 Takte	25. Bogen D / 26. Bogen F (S. 116)
VI:	32 Takte	29?. Bogen E (S. 126)

<sup>78</sup> “Zum Finale von Bruckners Symphonie Nr. IX”, *IBG-Mitt* no. 32 (June 1989), pp. 5f.; the article was kindly drawn to the attention of the present writer by Cohrs.

<sup>79</sup> The page numbers cited here correspond to the Orel reprint in vol II section D.

Ich möchte hiermit völlig klarstellen, daß ich bei dieser Einrichtung keine einzige Note hinzugefügt habe, die in Orels Ausführungen nicht als autographes Bruckner dargestellt ist. An vereinzelt Stellen, wo Bruckner keine genauen Instrumentenangaben eingezeichnet hat, sondern nur 'Holz' oder 'Blech' vermerkt hat, habe ich diese, so gut ich konnte, ausgeschrieben. Natürlich mußte ich auch, der Spielbarkeit wegen, häufig Dynamik und Phrasierungsbögen hinzufügen. Da ich keinerlei Versuch einer 'Vervollständigung' oder 'Orchestrierung' vorgenommen habe, klingen einige Fragmente natürlich ziemlich dürftig; aber Zweck der Übungen war ja, dem Zuhörer darzustellen, wieviel von Bruckners eigenschriftlichem Material zum Finale uns erhalten ist.

Noch ein Weiteres ist zu sagen. Aus den von Orel dargebotenen Skizzen geht ganz klar hervor, daß Bruckner die Durchführung-cum-Reprise bereits weitgehend zu Papier gebracht haben muß, daß uns aber mehrere Bögen nicht erhalten sind. Die dadurch entstehenden Lücken habe ich NICHT ausgefüllt und habe auch an den Stellen, wo offensichtlich das Anschlußblatt verloren ist, den Abschluß des Vorhergegangenen einfach so ausgespielt, wie es uns zur Verfügung steht, ohne tonalen Abschluß. Daß gewisse Fragmente dadurch sozusagen 'mit einem Bein in der Luft' aufhören, war unvermeidlich, aber meiner Meinung nach war es im Rahmen dieses Vortrags das einzig Richtige.

Ich hoffe, daß ich damit alle Zweifel behoben habe und in Zukunft nicht mehr bezichtigt werde, eine 'Rekonstruktion' fabriziert zu haben.

Significantly, Schönzeler's editorial procedure of presenting the fragments as they stand—described by him as “das einzig Richtige”—would find a corollary in the present writer's later edition of a “Dokumentation des Fragments”. However, the above statement is significant from a number of standpoints:

- i. Schönzeler, as is apparent from the defensive tone of this statement, pointedly distanced himself from those responsible for 'fabricating' a 'reconstruction'—although, of course, even Orel's ordering and transcription of the materials is by its nature a 'reconstruction'—the word is presumably used here in allusion to the Samale 'Ricostruzione' (*infra*).
- ii. In following Orel's “Revisionsbericht”<sup>80</sup> Schönzeler adopted all the elder scholar's philological errors and misconceptions, for instance the inclusion of the “21. Bogen E (S. 125)” out of sequence in the middle of the Repr., the misconception of the Exp. Gesangsp. or the listing of “29?. E” (in fact two bifols.) as “32 Takte”. Also omitted are many other passages surviving either in score or sketch which Schönzeler would have been fully justified in including, such as the SVE for the beginning of the Durchf., which would have given a more comprehensive and accurate account of the surviving score material. Schönzeler, of course, left important issues unaddressed, for instance how one goes about presenting important pc. sketch material which does not survive in notation in

---

<sup>80</sup> Presumably a reference to the original title of Orel's *Entwürfe und Skizzen*, as noted in §1.3.6.

score, and whether making a distinction between score and sk. is in the interests of an accurate presentation of Bruckner's material anyway.

- iii. Sublimely paradoxical is Schönzeler's emphatic declaration ("Ich möchte hiermit völlig klarstellen") that not a note has been added, yet that "an vereinzelt Stellen, wo Bruckner [...] nur 'Holz' oder 'Blech' vermerkt hat" notes *have* been added to the score. As will later be observed in the editorial principles of the 'Dokumentation' (§3.2.1), carrying out such verbal directives as far as possible is in fact the only justifiable procedure if one is not to *subtract* compositional information from the surviving material.
- iv. Of significance, finally, is Schönzeler's observation that material is missing from the sources that have come down to us—in itself patently clear from Orel's presentation, but until now effectively overlooked—again, a significant step forward.

While it is not clear how much of the above-quoted statement was included in the original broadcast text of 1974<sup>81</sup> and how much was added by way of justification in 1989, Schönzeler remains the first musicologist to have attempted to give any sort of philologically justified account of his presentation of the materials in audible form.

#### 1.4.11 Marshall Fine.

The earliest known completion attempt by an American was made in 1977–79 by the music teacher and musician Marshall Fine, then a Masters student at the University of Michigan.<sup>82</sup> This score, 746 mm. in length, is considerably less stylistically credible than William Carragan's later effort, and clearly a student work in regard to harmony, voice-leading, counterpoint and instrumentation, so that a more detailed analysis is scarcely justified. Fine made major supplementations of the Durchf.,<sup>83</sup> amounting to its complete recomposition, and appended an enormous coda,<sup>84</sup> little or none of which reveals much understanding of the original materials or of Bruckner's symphonic style. No utilisation of Bruckner's metrical numbers is apparent; no awareness shown of Orel's accompanying text, indeed, of anything more than the bare notes of the edition, although its 'obvious errors' were nonetheless 'corrected'. Fine also chronicled his apparently Promethean labours on this undertaking in a kind of diary,<sup>85</sup> the tone of which would scarcely appear less pretentious had it been written

<sup>81</sup> It has not proven possible to obtain a tape or transcript of the broadcast.

<sup>82</sup> Full title of Fine's score: *Finale to Anton Bruckner's/ Symphony No. 9/ in D minor./ Completed and orchestrated from the composer's sketches by/ Marshall Fine./ Op. 13;* dated 1978–79. Handwritten, 31 pp. Copy with the present writer courtesy of its author.

<sup>83</sup> 130 mm.

<sup>84</sup> 135 mm. from the end of Orel's 29E; though it is not really clear where Fine's coda begins.

<sup>85</sup> Title: *The completion of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony;* 44-page typescript.

by Wagner in recounting the creation of the *Ring*.<sup>86</sup> This document is nevertheless of interest in mentioning that completions were made or attempted by Viennese pianist Paul Badura-Skoda as well as by members of American orchestras.<sup>87</sup> The information was obtained by Fine from a University of Michigan, School of Music professor, Dr. Gwynn McPeck, who mentioned three attempts, dating from the 1930s, the first by Lucien Cailliet, principal oboist in Stokowski's Philadelphia Orchestra, which was apparently too Wagnerian; the second by a member of Koussevitsky's Boston Symphony Orchestra; the third by a member of the Cleveland Orchestra. At least one of these attempts appears to have been read in rehearsal. There is little doubt that further attempts to complete the movement may yet come to light.

#### 1.4.12 William Carragan.

The first performance of the completed version of New York State physics professor William Carragan (b. 1937) took place in Carnegie Hall on 8 January 1984 with the American Symphony Orchestra under Moshe Atzmon.<sup>88</sup> Carragan had been occupied with the score since 1979, his acquaintance with the Orel edition being made at the instigation of American Brucknerphile Jack Diether.<sup>89</sup> An early presentation of the completion as a work in progress had been made in New York on 15 June 1979 with co-pianist Paul Nudelmann and a further piano presentation at a meeting of the New York Mahlerites on 20 March 1983.

The orchestral premiere in New York was followed by a "West Coast premiere" on 1st December 1984 under Keith Clark; the European performance, co-produced by Dutch Radio NCRV Hilversum, took place in form of a direct broadcast by the Utrecht Symphony Orchestra under Hubert Soudant from the Music Centre Vredenburg, Utrecht, on 16 April 1985. A preliminary orchestral presentation took place in the Concertgebouw on 14 April.<sup>90</sup> Later the same year (28–30 August), Yoav Talmi with the Oslo Philharmonic recorded, for the first time ever, a four-movement Ninth with Carragan's version of the Finale on the Chandos label. Unfortunately this recording gave very little documentation and included a somewhat misleading recording of only that material which, as Carragan understood it, had been scored

---

<sup>86</sup> For instance, p. 14: "1.40 a.m. Discovered that there are not enough string parts to cover the running sixteenths. Well, if the strings are otherwise occupied, the winds will do!"; p. 16: "I must constantly remind myself that Wagner tubas are written in key signatures"; p. 27: "Who needs an orchestration course when experience seems the best teacher?"; p. 30: "I am still stuck on the woodwind writing. This is something I have still not assimilated fully, whereas Bruckner always wrote excellently for woodwinds", etc. The present writer is not unjustified in quoting this astonishing document, considering that its author seriously submitted it to ABIL for publication.

<sup>87</sup> P. 37. Nothing further has been brought to light during the present writer's Vienna researches on this matter, however; such a version may well have consisted of a piano or two-piano realisation of Orel's conflation.

<sup>88</sup> As noted by van Zwol (p. 34) the premiere was originally planned with the American Philharmonic Orchestra under Rohan Joseph; this orchestra, however, went bankrupt before the performance.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. William Carragan, *Notes and Essays*.

<sup>90</sup> Van Zwol, p. 35; see also Maarten Brandt, "Carragans voltooiing van Bruckners Negende. Europese première van het Utrechts Orkest", *Mens&Mel* 40 (May 1985), pp. 224–230.

by Bruckner.<sup>91</sup> The Austrian premiere, organised with the assistance of the Brucknerbund für Oberösterreich, followed in St. Florian on 15 June 1986 with the Brucknerorchester Linz under Kurt Eichhorn.<sup>92</sup>

The significance of Carragan's version, as one of the first to realise the potential of completing Bruckner's fragments within the outlines of a full-scale symphonic movement as opposed to a merely shovelling together the available material, is undeniable. The score,<sup>93</sup> which integrates the fragments as published by Orel with more extended attempts to complete the gaps and compose a convincing coda, comprises, according to the copy in possession of the present writer, 705 bars, 30 per cent of which, according to Carragan, represented supplemented material.<sup>94</sup> Carragan would appear to have shown a better understanding of Orel's philology than others before him, for instance recognising the significance of the fact that bifols. of the score were apparently missing rather than never composed. As he wrote in the 1987 Foreword: "The gaps in the music—some are due to lost pages, two short ones due to incomplete composition [?], and the coda which may or may not have been sketched out by Bruckner—were all filled in as part of the completion."<sup>95</sup> He went on to detail these gaps,<sup>96</sup> also noting the use of Orel's sketch No. 12 (D/72) in his coda and citing as the model for the string writing in his mm. 673–680 what he describes as "a magnificent but sadly isolated sketch (No. 44) for the continuation of the fugue"—the 'sketch' is in fact Orel's misclassified

---

<sup>91</sup> See the CD text, Noel Goodwin, *Bruckner Symphony No. 9 in D minor; with Finale, completed by William Carragan (World Premiere Recording) plus Original Sketches of 4th Movement* [CD booklet], London: Chandos Records, 1986. CHAN 8468/9. Dietmar Holland deplored what he described as the "dürftige Hüllentext" with its lack of any reference to the sources, in place of which "wird der Mut Carragans und sein Verdienst um Bruckner herausgestrichen. Gerade in diesem Fall wäre eine sachlich fundierte Information nötig, denn wer kennt schon die Quellenlage? Wie dem auch sei, man fragt sich beim Anhören der Skizzen, wem das ohne Kommentar eigentlich nutzen soll" ("Bruckner-Raritäten" [review of recording by Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra of the Carragan version of the Finale], *NeueMZ* 36 (June–July 1987), p. 29).

<sup>92</sup> See the strikingly positive review of Gerhard Ritschel, "Kurzkritiken: Anton Bruckners Neunte viersätzig", *ÖMz* 41 (1986), p. 593.

<sup>93</sup> *Anton Bruckner / IX. Symphonie D—Moll Finale. / vollendet von William Carragan. / Partitur*. Troy, New York: 1983. The handwritten score (136 pp.); includes a single-page Foreword by Carragan (English and German) dated May 1987. Published 1987 under the auspices of the Bruckner Archive; copy courtesy of David Aldeborgh of the Bruckner Archive (New York).

<sup>94</sup> Cf. *Notes and Essays*. According to van Zwol (p. 34) 450 mm. are by Bruckner, the remaining 255 mm. by Carragan, in part with recourse to Bruckner's original materials.

<sup>95</sup> See, however, the article by Scott Cantrell, "Unfinished Business: Completing the Orchestral Classics", *Symphony Magazine* 35, no. 6 (1984), p. 16, quoting Carragan from the program notes written for the premiere: "Parts of the movement are fully worked out—in some cases as far as a fifth revision—while others consist of the string parts alone with some indications of the winds. In this manner the Finale is composed from the beginning nearly through to the coda, with five gaps which give every indication of being due to missing pages rather than to an incomplete conception. Indeed, the end of the sketched material is abrupt, and it is conceivable that the movement was in a sense actually finished, needing only supplementary orchestration and editing, the final bifolios being simply lost."

<sup>96</sup> See the overview in Table V.

bifol. 21. Bg. E (D/125). The Foreword<sup>97</sup> also reveals that—despite its perhaps inadvertently presumptuous title of “Vollendung” and the ‘hype’ surrounding its presentation—Carragan’s approach was well intended:

The purpose of the completion is to present Bruckner’s final utterances faithfully, in such a way that the listener experiences the music as part of a unified Brucknerian symphonic structure. Accordingly the sketches are retained without alteration, each in what appears to be its most fully thought-out form, and are supplemented both vertically and horizontally in a manner consistent with Bruckner’s compositional methods. [...].

Little critical approval was generated by Carragan’s score.<sup>98</sup> Taking as a basis his 1987 revision<sup>99</sup> (see Table V), it can be seen that Carragan attempted to bridge the fragments partly by the insertion of material taken from other movements or by schematic repetition of foregoing material, rather than working towards a deeper understanding of the continuity of the material presented in Orel, which mere transcription of the draft score scarcely exhausts. In one case only—the missing bifol. 24, mm. 433ff. of his score—did Carragan make recourse to the original pc. sks.<sup>100</sup> Curiously, he recognised that most of the bifols. were 16 mm. in length,<sup>101</sup> yet the next logical step, that the missing bifols. constituted an originally numbered series, could not have been composed in isolation to one another, and that most of the missing bifols., like the surviving ones, probably also had a standard length of 16 measures, was not grasped. Hence he cited what he called a “short gap”—his reasoning for regarding it as ‘short’ is not clear—in the Exp. Gesangsp. (mm. 93ff.), filling it out with 6 mm. of his own composition and then repeating the 1st 2 mm. of the following bifol.. A “long gap” in the Repr. of the third group was also posited, filling the position of a single missing bifol. with no less than 50 mm. in order to achieve which he was forced to schematically repeat elements of the Exp. (see Table V, mm. 481ff.). Most egregiously Bruckner’s metrical numbers, which so assist in the collocation of score and pc. materials, was completely ignored, and that many of the ‘continuity drafts’, though misleadingly published by Orel as single lines, constituted accurate pointers in the direction of Bruckner’s thinking rather than discarded, isolated attempts with ‘negative validity’ for a would-be completion, was considered in only one instance (the beginning of the Durchf.; see Table, mm. 227ff.).

---

<sup>97</sup> Citing here that of May 1987.

<sup>98</sup> Cohrs notes (*Bruckner-Arbeit...*, p. 2) the rejection by both Halbreich and Langevin of Carragan’s score, who noted numerous mistakes taken over from Orel’s publication.

<sup>99</sup> This score, while dated 1987, is apparently identical to that recorded by Chandos in 1985; for example, it already incorporates the recommendation of Cohrs, made after the Utrecht performance in April of that year, concerning the propriety of citing an ‘Allelujah’ motive in the concluding measures (see §1.4.16 *infra*).

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Orel’s text, D/116, top of page, where Orel himself outlines the likely missing contents.

<sup>101</sup> Quoted in Scott Cantrell as “four-page *folios* of 16 measures each” (p. 16); in the 1987 Foreword to the score he also uses folio for bifol. With the exception of bifol. 1, all score bifols. with more than 16 mm. appear to be later expansions.

What is not immediately apparent from the presentation in Table V is that Carragan's limited knowledge of Bruckner's harmonic and period structure, as well as the shortcomings of his own contrapuntal and instrumental skills, effectively undermined what could have been an effective, if not wholly philologically defensible, approach. In the last analysis the impression given by this score is one of disturbing stylistic disparity: the 'stitching' between sections is painfully obvious, while the closing section of the coda (mm. 657ff.), attempting an overlay of themes in D major makes a complete departure from stylistic credibility, described by reviewer Dietmar Holland, as a "*Salto mortale* in die Welt des Richard Strauss und am Ende gar der Filmmusik Hollywoods [...], daß einem schier die Spucke wegbleibt".<sup>102</sup> Cohrs was acknowledged in the 1987 foreword for his influence on the end of the coda (the introduction of a hallelujah-like trumpet fanfare in the 1987 revision of the score<sup>103</sup>), which—alas—does nothing to improve the stylistic credibility of the closing passage. Dietmar Holland concluded that:

Die völlig freie Coda, die Carragan 'komponierte', hat mit ihrem geballten Pathos und oberflächlichen Lärmen nichts mit Bruckner zu tun. Der Zweifel an der Vollendbarkeit des Fragmentarischen wird durch diese Fassung keineswegs zerstreut. Man sollte beim Coda-Eintritt einfach abbrechen.<sup>104</sup>

Paul Turok praised Carragan's maintenance of "the dignity and mystical fervour of Bruckner's work" and his orchestration of a "convincing Brucknerian sound", but:

unfortunately it must be said that his completion of the finale is unconvincing. The connective tissue he provided sounds like the sort of thing Bruckner was doing in his early symphonies. [...] Also—and this is perhaps an even more severe flaw—Carragan's incorporation of ideas from other Bruckner works in the movement's final summation (the composer had evidently indicated his intentions in the sketches) is miscalculatedly short-winded, a characteristic not ordinarily found in Bruckner.<sup>105</sup>

Thor Eckert, Jr., similarly demurred, although possessing less knowledge to back up his claims than he seemed to assume:

Carragan has put together a version of the finale, a movement that most Brucknerians are convinced cannot be finished, despite the extensive notes and sketches left by the composer. Carragan's efforts only reconfirmed the general consensus. There are moments of interest, but generally the themes introduced lack the long Brucknerian line, and the development of them is merely hypothetical—there is no way of knowing how

---

<sup>102</sup> Dietmar Holland, p. 29.

<sup>103</sup> As noted above; the inclusion of a brief phrase can already be heard in the Chandos recording. According to a letter by Cohrs to the present writer dated Hameln, 24 Aug. 1988, Cohrs brought this matter to the attention of Carragan following the Utrecht performance of the latter's version in April 1985.

<sup>104</sup> Dietmar Holland, *ibid.*

<sup>105</sup> Review of Chandos recording of Bruckner Ninth Symphony with Carragan's completion of the Finale, by the Oslo Philharmonic, Yoav Talmi, conductor, *Ovation* (year and issue not known; c. 1985), p. 38.

the composer would have treated them in the overall fabric when he actually put the movement together. And the mighty coda is all fabrication, or imitation of earlier codas, since that is one of the five large chunks missing from the sketches altogether.<sup>106</sup>

Manfred Wagner's critique of the recording was more scathing. Compared to the recently premiered Samale/Mazzuca version, for which Wagner wrote programme notes,<sup>107</sup>

Alles in allem ist Carragans Vervollständigung weniger üppig, eher schülerhaft satzmäßig und knapper, ändert nichts an der aufgeworfenen Problematik.

Ich verstehe bis heute nicht, was einen Musiker oder Musikologen dazu bewegen kann, um jeden Preis die torsohaft hinterlassene Neunte zu vollenden. [...] diese letztlich vom Komponisten her gesehen doch wie ein Rechenexempel versuchte Komplettierungsaufgabe verstehe ich nicht. Der immer eingewandte Süßmayr-Vergleich ist nicht gültig, weil Süßmayr selbst Komponist war und—es tut mir leid—wesentlich mehr vom kompositorischen Handwerk verstand, als ich bislang auch nur bei einem der Bruckner-Vollender gefunden habe. Vielleicht aber geht es auch bei Bruckner deswegen nicht, weil er ausgerechnet jener Komponist war, der selbst mit seiner Eigenhändigkeit gar nicht zu Rande kam (davon zeugt ja das Dilemma der Fassungen), und daß uns deswegen nur übrigbleibt, in einer auf Bruckner projizierten musikalischen Logik zu denken, die er selbst gar nicht besaß und die er nicht nur bei der Komposition, sondern auch in der Durchsicht seiner Werke immer wieder selbst in Frage stellte.

Natürlich mag, wem immer es Spaß macht, die Komposition von William Carragan ihre Zuhörer finden. Nur—was davon von Anton Bruckner ist, ist ein sehr unvollständiger Themenkatalog, der nun, symphonisch aufgeblasen, irgendwie verkettet wird. Letztlich kann man, wenn man so denkt, auch die Skizzenbücher Beethovens im Konzertsaal aufführen lassen. Ob dies wirklich Sinn gibt?<sup>108</sup>

Leaving aside the issue of Manfred Wagner's misconceptions concerning the sources, it should nonetheless be pointed out in Carragan's defence that, however his achievement in his work on the Finale is assessed, he was later to be awarded the Bruckner Medal by the Brucknerbund für Oberösterreich for his philological work on the early versions of the Second Symphony.<sup>109</sup> The present writer believes it is this research, far more than his work on the Finale, which testifies to this scientist and amateur musicologist's genuine interest in Bruckner and his concern with the promotion and better understanding of his music.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>106</sup> "Mostly Mahler" [concerning performances of Mahler Tenth and Bruckner Ninth], *Ovation* 5 (Apr. 1984), p. 29.

<sup>107</sup> See §1.4.14 *infra*.

<sup>108</sup> In review of Chandos recording by Oslo Philharmonic under Yoav Talmi of Bruckner Ninth with Finale completed by Carragan, *NZfM* 149 (July–Aug. 1988), p. 84.

<sup>109</sup> Documented on CD by Kurt Eichhorn with the Bruckner-Orchester Linz for Camerata Tokyo in 1991; both the 1872 and 1873 scores are destined for publication with MWV in the Bruckner GA.

<sup>110</sup> Perhaps Carragan has not yet finished with his Finale. An invitation was made in August 1995 by John Proffitt (Houston) to the authors of both Carragan and Samale *et al.* versions to place their Finales on a CD performed by the Seattle Symphony Orchestra, in response to which Carragan reputedly showed interest in revising his version—whether or not with the intention of using the present writer's philological insights is not known. As of the time of writing nothing further has eventuated.



### 1.4.13 Nors S. Josephson.

A further completion begun in the U.S. in the late 1970s has only come to light more recently, that of Nors S. Josephson, a Prof. Emeritus of Music History at California State University at Fullerton. A copy of his score, bequeathed to the ÖNB as gift in 1992,<sup>111</sup> was found by chance in the ÖNB by Cohrs in September 2000. It bears the title *Anton Bruckner/ Symphony No. 9: Finale/ An orchestral reconstruction by/ Dr. Nors Josephson*. According to a letter from Josephson to Cohrs, Josephson worked on his 645-m. version from 1978 to 1991; it received its first performance at the Hot Springs Music Festival, Hot Springs, South Dakota, on June 4 1997 with Richard Rosenberg conducting.<sup>112</sup> The performing material is apparently available for hire via Carus Verlag; no CD recording as yet exists.

According to information provided by Josephson, he was motivated to work on the movement after reading about the sketches in the 1970s. His commendably detailed and informative Vorwort, dated “Fullerton, California/USA /im Frühjahr 1992”, which underscores the seriousness of his involvement with the sources, merits quotation in full:

Die vorliegende Ausgabe vom Finale zu Bruckners 9. Symphonie ist das Ergebnis einer zehnjährigen Arbeit an diesem Werk. Als Grundlage dienten die Skizzen und Partitur-entwürfe in der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, der Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek und der Wiener Hochschule für Musik und darstellende Kunst, von denen mir die genannten Institutionen freundlicherweise Mikrofilme bzw. Photokopien zur Verfügung stellten. Ebenso unentbehrlich war Alfred Orels 1934 erfolgte Veröffentlichung dieser Quellen als Teil der Bruckner’schen Gesamtausgabe; für die mir übersandte Kopie dieses Bandes sei an dieser Stelle der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Wien, nochmals mein herzlichster Dank ausgesprochen.

Wie allgemein bekannt, ist die Exposition des Finales (Takte 1–236) noch fast vollständig von Bruckner in Partitur ausgeführt worden. Es fehlen einzig die Übergangstakte 93–8 und 233–6 (letztere vier Takte sind allerdings in der Oboenstimme notiert). In der Durchführung (T. 237–382) sind Bruckners zwei verschiedene Anläufe in T. 246ff. (vgl. Orels Ausgabe, S. 134, 1. und 2. Notensysteme, T. 4) zwecks stilistischer Einheitlichkeit und motivischer Konzentration in der vorliegenden Ausgabe vereint worden. Außerdem mußten T. 309–24 der Fuge rekonstruiert werden, und zwar aufgrund der Terzsequenzen des Fugenhauptthemas in T. 277ff. und der angedeuteten Cis/cis-b-moll-Modulation in der Oesterreichischen Nationalbibliothek SM [Mus. Hs.] 3194, Folio 14<sup>r</sup> (eine Skizze zu diesem Abschnitt). Ansonsten ist die Durchführung meistens in einer Kurzpartitur für Streicher (mit einigen zusätzlichen Andeutungen für Bläser und Blechinstrumente) notiert, mit Ausnahme der vollständig orchestrierten Takte 237–46, 265–6 und 325–30. (Die für Hörner gesetzten Harmonien in T. 331–6 sind von Bruckner für Tuben beabsichtigt gewesen.)

<sup>111</sup> Signature ÖNB 91.772-4°. Bound, 156-page score, computer typeset, with single-page Vorwort in German and English. Copy of the score courtesy of the ÖNB and ABIL via Cohrs, to whom the present writer is also indebted for a more detailed analysis of Josephson’s score.

<sup>112</sup> No reviews of the performance had been obtained as of time of writing.

Ähnliches gilt von der Reprise, T. 383–555, von der T. 389–404, 437–79, 512–22 und 539–55 in Bruckners durchlaufender Kurzpartitur (wiederum meistens für Streicher notiert, mit Ausnahme der Bläser- und Blecheintragungen in 480–511 und 523–38) fehlen. Diese Abschnitte sind streng nach Bruckners ausgedehnten Skizzen zu diesen Abschnitten in SM 3194, Folien 14<sup>v</sup>–15<sup>r</sup> (zu T. 389–404 und 437–47) und 2<sup>r</sup> (diese mit “Umkehrung”) bezeichnete Skizze bezieht sich womöglich auf die kontrapunktische Umkehrung des Seitenthemas aus T. 145ff. in 458–79), sowie SM 6085, Folio 19 (Bruckners eigenhändige Numerierung, zu T. 512–9, vgl. auch Orels Teilveröffentlichung dieser letztgenannten Skizzen auf S. 64, 3.–4. Notensysteme und 127, 3. Notensystem) ergänzt worden. Außerdem sind T. 539–55 dem Ende der Exposition (nämlich T. 207–26) nachempfunden.

In der fehlenden Koda, T. 555–644 sind die ersten Hauptmomente dem Anfang der Exposition (so dem Hauptthema in T. 4–6ff. und dem Übergang in 21–50; vgl. T. 555–75 und 576–88) nachgebildet. Zudem werden kontrapunktische Gegenmotive aus der Fugue (vgl. die 1. Violine, T. 293ff. in 589ff.) und der Koda zum 1. Satz, T. 539–67 (vgl. Finale, T. 602ff.) als höhepunktartige Effekte eingeführt. Zum Schluß werden dann noch etliche Triolenmotive aus den zwei Außensätzen miteinander verbunden. Die Choralapotheose in T. 616ff. (vgl. 171ff.) ist übrigens bereits in SM 6085, Folio 21<sup>v</sup> angedeutet (hinabsteigende Sopranmelodie in Ganznotenwerten,  $g''' = g'' = fis'' = e'' = d''$  über einem D-Orgelpunkt).

Josephson cites the original materials as well as the Orel edition as his sources, yet it becomes clear from a closer examination of his score that many of Orel's oversights have simply been passed on, in some cases with even greater liberties taken with the material and with less apparent insight into Orel's philology having been shown, than in the Carragan version. Despite presumably having the evidence of Bruckner's bifol. numberings in front of him, Josephson still overlooked, for instance, the evidence that Bruckner did not undertake “zwei verschiedene Anläufe” for the Durchf., where in Josephson's realisation only the first 9 mm. of Orel's 14<sup>g</sup>. Bg. E are used (Orel D/123f.<sup>113</sup>), abutting directly on to the 2nd m. of 15 D (D/103). Apparently, Josephson was simply not clear about Bruckner's bifol. and renumbering procedures, and may have assumed some sort of error on Orel's part. However, Josephson's recourse to the pc. sketches in order to fill gaps left by missing bifols. is commendable, as in the last three of the missing 16 mm. of the fugue, a bifol. otherwise completed on the basis of the sequence of thirds begun in the preceding bifol., a solution which would also be used by Samale and Mazzuca (*infra*). As in Carragan's version, the first missing bifol. in the Repr. Gesangsp. ([24/“25”]) was reconstructed as 16 mm. from the ÖNB 3194 sks. and 5. Bg. B of the Exp. The missing [27/“28”], however, as in Carragan, is inflated to a freely composed length of 43 mm. Josephson here used Orel's Skizze K (D/75) but only from the 7th m., linked to the end of 26. Bogen F (D/116), harmonised and treated as a *diminuendo*, then meandering back via 3 mm. of string *tremolo* to schematically repeat the Steigerung to the

<sup>113</sup> Despite Josephson's references to the original materials, for the sake of continuity with the foregoing discussions of Performing Versions discussion here continues to use the Orel edition as a point of reference.

chorale a fourth higher (cf. Orel D/80, 2nd system, continuing on D/92), joining up with 29. Bg. E (D/126) via a more or less freely composed Durchf. of the dotted motive of the introduction. Josephson does, however, appear to have recognised Orel's misnumbered 21. Bg E as 31E/"32", a continuation of the chorale Repr. (Carragan, it may be recalled, used elements of this, but in the coda of his movement), freely composing an intervening lost [30/"31"] as 11 mm. Josephson's Repr. concludes with recourse to the last mm. of 11 A (cf. D/99); the 98-m. coda begins over a D pedal point, with motives from the beginning of the Durchf. (8 mm.), then the introduction of the movement (34 mm.), building into a cadential section with motives from the fugue (13 mm.), a passage based on the concluding mm. of IX/1 (12 mm.), a final D-major 'apotheosis' (31 mm.) using dotted rhythms, the opening horn motive of IX/1 (as in 's Gravesande) and the horn theme of the Finale (cf. Ex. 25p).

In general, Josephson's 'orchestral reconstruction' is less thickly scored and less bombastic, more 'other-worldly' in character than Carragan's. Stylistically however, in regard to compositional supplementations, orchestration and counterpoint, it is even less convincing.

#### 1.4.14 Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca.<sup>114</sup>

Encouraged by French Bruckner specialist Paul-Gilbert Langevin,<sup>115</sup> Italian conductor and composer Nicola Samale (b. 1941) and composer Giuseppe Mazzuca (b. 1939) began research on the Finale in 1983. Far from exhibiting the *laissez-faire* approach that had characterised most attempts at completing the Finale, their concern with textual accuracy soon led them to recognise the shortcomings of the Orel edition and the impossibility of achieving an adequate solution by anything less than the most exhaustive study of the originals. They decided, accordingly, to research as much as they could then access of the available sources.<sup>116</sup>

The substantial (36-p.) *Introduction to the Finale of Anton Bruckner's Ninth Symphony*, published by Ricordi in 1986,<sup>117</sup> reveals, in contrast to the efforts of those already discussed, a

<sup>114</sup> As already noted, while the Aufführungsfassung constitutes the final 'definitive' version of the *Ricostruzione* of Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca published by Ricordi, Milan, in 1986, the earlier version has nevertheless a performance and reception history separate from that of the subsequent score, which was to incorporate the research of the present writer, begun in 1990. Accordingly, the history of the *Ricostruzione* up until 1989 is hence dealt with here and in §1.4.14 *infra*, the history of its successor in ch. 3.4.

<sup>115</sup> As already discussed in §1.3.10. In his article "Wie Bruckners Symphonien vor das Publikum treten sollten oder: Das Suchen nach der Idealfassung" (in: *BrSympBer 1980: Die Fassungen*, p. 39), Langevin confesses: "[...] es gibt einen Fall, mit dem ich mich sogleich näher beschäftigen werde, denn er liegt mir am Herzen, und das ist das Finale der Neunten."

<sup>116</sup> This research was undertaken in Vienna in 1984 or early '85. The implication that material may have been withheld from them by the ÖNB at this time may be correct—an experience not at odds with the experience of other Bruckner specialists during the incumbency of Leopold Nowak and for some time after—although it appears that they at least had access to the principal signatures in question, probably to 6085–87; see also §1.4.16 *infra*. Nowak and Vogg also declined publication of the Samale/Mazzuca score which was offered to MWV at this time; out of this resulted the fateful publication with Ricordi that was subsequently to create such difficulties for the later, more 'definitive' version of the Samale score (see §3.4.7).

<sup>117</sup> Translated from Italian into English by Katherine Silberblatt Wolfthal.

serious and musicologically responsible approach to the task, and—needless to say—a complete assimilation of all details of Orel's representation of the complex philology which previously, to both musicologists and critics alike, appears only to have been ignored or misunderstood. Indeed, Samale and Mazzuca made several discoveries of their own and were able to correct errors in Orel's transcription and interpretation of the material.

The *Ricostruzione*, as it was called, this time not without some justification, was published as hire material by Ricordi, Milan in 1986, constituting a 171-p., 711-m. score handwritten by Samale with layout correlating to the original MSS (i.e., mainly 4 mm. per p.), with larger notes used for Bruckner's originals, smaller ones for the additions, references to bifol. classifications and, where necessary, underlaid systems showing the origin of material taken from the pc. sks.<sup>118</sup> The metrical numbers were underlaid (and utilised) throughout, including in the coda. A brief analysis can be found in the outline of the score given in Table V; while this is based on the 1988 revision of this score by [Benjamin] Gunnar Cohrs and Nicola Samale, the structural revisions at this stage principally concerned the last measures of the coda.<sup>119</sup>

The salient features of the Samale/Mazzuca score are as follows:

- i. The authors recognised, as any reader with the patience to follow the intricacies of Orel's explanations can assess for himself, that the surviving score bifols. constituted a *numbered sequence* from what must have been an originally integral score,<sup>120</sup> and that Bruckner proceeded by largely 16-m. bifols..<sup>121</sup>
- ii. They realised in several cases that the gaps in this sequence could be closed by collocation of the preliminary pc. sks. or later continuity drafts, and that Bruckner's metrical numbering had a crucial role to play in the score's reconstruction (cf. in particular mm. 225ff., 275ff., 357ff., 437ff., 573ff.).<sup>122</sup>
- iii. While the problems contingent upon the missing bifols. in the Gesangsp. and by Bruckner's expansion thereof were not yet definitively solved (for instance, the

<sup>118</sup> The editorial procedure was outlined in the authors' *Introduction* to the score, Milan 1987, p. 5.

<sup>119</sup> See §1.4.16 *infra*. The 1988 score contains numerous minor additions in Cohrs' handwriting, particularly modifications of tempo and interpretational directives such as (m. 354) "allmählich belebter", (m. 399) "Mit äußerster Kraft", etc.

<sup>120</sup> However, this essential information, which could easily have forestalled much of the ensuing negative critique, was not stated plainly by the authors either in the *Introduction* or in their unpublished paper "Anmerkungen zur Rekonstruktion des Finales der 9. Symphonie Anton Bruckners", read at the Rome symposium, May 1987—the idea that the score represented was not merely a draft but an emergent, definitive autograph constituted a crucial aspect of the Finale's critical re-evaluation.

<sup>121</sup> *Introduction...*, p. 5.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. also *Introduction...*, p. 4: "It was necessary, first of all, to fill the gaps left by eight folio sheets [correctly, eight bifols.] that were missing at different points in the score, This we were able to do thanks to the metrical numbers that Bruckner characteristically marked under each bar of the sketches, providing valuable structural indications for linking the sheet before the gap with the one following."

- crucial bifol. 2F, ÖNB 19.645, not in Orel, was not examined by them), a credible solution to the continuity of the section was attempted by reworking the contents of 5D (mm. 93ff.), which suggested an expansion of the passage in question, incorporating the lyrical counterpoint in Bruckner's original pc. sk. and using a 4-m. fragment originally drafted by Bruckner on bifol. 15C (Orel D/102) and pencilled in on the final p. of 4C (Facs. C/154; cf. Orel D/91).
- iv. Comparison with the original MSS brought significant insights into the conclusion of the movement. Samale and Mazzuca recognised that what Orel had called "29.<sup>?</sup> Bg. E" (sic—D/126) was in fact two bifols. of 16 mm. each, ÖNB 6087/67–8 and /69–70 (Facs. C/309ff.). They further realised that Orel's classification of bifol. ÖNB 6087/71–2 (now 31E/"32"; Facs. C/317ff.) as "21E" (mm. 557ff. of their score) had been incorrect, and accordingly reconstructed an intervening 16-m. bifol. "31" partly as an inversion of the chorale theme (mm. 541ff.).
  - v. The coda—the original conception of which drew substantially on the remarks of Langevin<sup>123</sup>—was ushered in with recourse to the Hauptth. of the first movement (mm. 587ff.), analogous to the Finales of the Fifth and Eighth Symphonies, as suggested by the triplet rhythm of the horn theme with which bifol. 31E/"32" breaks off. The pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/7<sup>r</sup> (Facs. C/6; cf. later version, Mus. Ex. 14) was used at the outset of the coda as in Carragan's score, although in a more credible manner (mm. 593ff.).
  - vi. The idea of overlaying the themes of the symphony in the coda—a suggestion of Langevin's,<sup>124</sup>—following Max Auer's claim<sup>125</sup>—was introduced with greater stylistic credibility than it had been by Carragan<sup>126</sup> (mm. 625ff.; cf. later version in Mus. Ex. 16).
  - vii. Use was made (mm. 641ff.) of the reference to the chorale in the Gesangsp. Repr. (Orel's no. 37, first four mm., D/116; Mus. Ex. 25q) as a final triumphant D-major enunciation of that theme (8 mm.; cf. Mus. Ex. 17).
  - viii. This was linked (mm. 649ff.) with the beginning of the pc. sk. ÖNB 6085/45 (Orel no. 46, II a; D/127; cf. Mus. Ex. 18, first three mm. only) to form a progression leading to the climax of the movement (30 mm.). The ÖNB 6085/43<sup>r</sup> sk. (Orel no.

<sup>123</sup> P. 212 (quoted in §1.3.10 *supra*). See also the brief analytical outline of the passage given by Wolfram Steinbeck (quoted *infra*).

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>125</sup> Auer's wording, in turn, followed that of Max Graf (see §§1.3.4 and 1.3.8 *supra*). The AP, E/138, cites Auer's wording.

<sup>126</sup> Carragan incorporated the themes (including the chorale) into a diatonic progression with dubious stylistic results; in the Finale of the Eighth Symphony, Bruckner reduces the themes to motivic fragments within a sustained C-major *Klangfläche*.

- 46 I; D/127), later to prove significant for the coda, was used in an early draft (1984–85<sup>127</sup>) but subsequently discarded in favour of a stylistically credible passage of Samale's own composition, using tritone progressions and a final cadence (m. 678) borrowed from VIII/4 (see letter *Zz* thereof).
- ix. The final peroration (mm. 679ff.), using a *Klangfläche* built from variants of the Te Deum motive, ended with mutations of the opening motive of the movement and, like the first movement, with the stridency of open fifths. It seemed impossible to the authors—unlike Carragan—to end the movement triumphantly, given the catastrophic nature of the ending of the first movement and climax of the Adagio<sup>128</sup>—the *locus classicus* for such a conclusion was, after all, the eminently Brucknerian model of the Mozart Requiem. In the 1986 score, the final tonic pedal point was 33 mm. long (8 mm. *ff*, followed by a 16-m. crescendo and final 9-m. *fff*); the idea of ending with a longer musical *laudatio* (41 mm.) and of using what Bruckner himself appeared to call the “Allelujah des zweiten Satzes” was introduced in 1988 at the urging of Cohrs (see §1.4.16 *infra*).
  - x. While Samale appears to have intuitively recognised, and often consciously used, many aspects of Bruckner's mutation technique,<sup>129</sup> Korte's *Brahms—Bruckner* remained unknown to him. The somewhat over-elaborate orchestration, though manifestly more accomplished and stylistically more convincing than that of Carragan, could at times be described as an expressionist recasting of Bruckner's at times more massive, schematic approach in the extant portions of the Finale, and permitted less favourable comparison with the completed movements of the Ninth, either in regard to instrumentation or textural detail.
  - xi. Nonetheless, the authors recognised the validity of taking a methodological approach to the completion of unfinished passages (whether in reference to the completion of instrumental texture or, in fewer cases, of actual compositional continuity) comparing passages to analogous, completed passages in the Finale, the rest of the Ninth or elsewhere—the so-called *Analogverfahren*.<sup>130</sup>
  - xii. In regard to tempi, dynamics and articulation, the 1986 score already represented a significant step forward over all other versions in terms of authenticity, even if

---

<sup>127</sup> See *infra*.

<sup>128</sup> Concerning this and other aspects see Carlo Boschi's interview with the authors, “Bruckners negende nog weer eens anders voltooid (Gesprek mit N. Samale en G. Mazzuca)”, *Mens&Mel* 41 (June 1986), pp. 252–260.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. ch. 2.2.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. the wording of the *Introduction...*, pp. 4f.: “We systematically compared the first stage of Bruckner's elaboration and the final version as it appears in the printed editions of the Symphony, and set up our work like an equation, attempting to define the unknown quantity. The use of patterns [i.e., motives] and rests is not, therefore, the mere fruit of our imagination, but follows a criterion of stylistic equivalence to the richly elaborated final version of Bruckner's late symphonies and choral works with orchestra.”

somewhat too detailed, resembling in its numerous modifications of tempi the retouched versions of Schalk or Löwe (compounded by subsequent revisions of Cohrs and Samale). The *Analogverfahren* was applied here too, the movement's opening tempo indication, for instance—"Bewegt, doch nicht schnell"—being added by analogy with the Finales of the Fourth, Sixth and Eighth symphonies.<sup>131</sup>

The published score was preceded by an earlier effort, dated "5 Ottobre 1984", revised "25 Febbraio 1985" and entitled "A. Bruckner: Sinfonia n. 9 Finale completato da Nicola Samale e Giuseppe Mazzuca (1985)". The 54-p., 675-m. MS reveals uniform notation and lacks both the page-by-page correlation with the original score material and underlaid systems, but includes metrical numbers and references to the provenance of the material. In the copy deposited with the present writer,<sup>132</sup> the score is followed by a 37-p. typescript entitled "Introduzione al nostro completamento del Finale della IX Sinfonia di Bruckner", dated "Roma 15 Gennaio (1985) / Nicola Samale e Giuseppe Mazzuca". This was the text subsequently translated into English by Katherine Silberblatt Wolfthal and published by Ricordi in 1986, as mentioned, under the title *Introduction to the Finale of Anton Bruckner's Ninth Symphony*.<sup>133</sup> This insightful document, no less than the score itself, ranks as one of the most important contributions to a better understanding of the Ninth and Bruckner's compositional processes since the 1934 publication, including insights into the structure, compositional technique and musical content of not just the Ninth Symphony but Bruckner's stylistic development as a whole.<sup>134</sup>

Moreover, the *Introduction* broaches, perhaps for the first time ever, the question of the integrity of the Ninth Symphony as a work in four movements—an issue which was to become the motivating factor behind the present writer's research. In an opening *excursus* demonstrating the thematic links between the first three movements and the Finale, the authors concluded:<sup>135</sup>

The thematic and structural relationships with the first and other movements continue; in fact they intensify in the course of the development and recapitulation. The cohesiveness of the Symphony's compositional conception, and the organic nature of the four-movement complex are clear from even a first, summary analysis. We therefore cannot share

<sup>131</sup> See *Introduction...*, p. 6.

<sup>132</sup> Copy courtesy of Cohrs.

<sup>133</sup> 36 pp. Unfortunately there were numerous translational misinterpretations, oversights and omissions in the Ricordi publication; these were in part corrected in a subsequent German translation made by Cohrs (see §1.4.16 *infra*), which was never unpublished. Samale/Mazzuca's commentary in MS was dedicated to Paul-Gilbert Langevin for his encouragement and moral support; in publication this had to be addressed to his memory, the French musicologist having died in June 1986.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. §§1.0.3, 2.2.3.

<sup>135</sup> *Introduction...*, p. 4; see discussion in §2.2.4; the passage is also quoted in the author's "Neue Erkenntnisse...", p. 122.

the opinion of those who believe that the Ninth Symphony, as it is normally performed, that is with only the first three movements, is an ideally complete piece with an artistic unity of its own. Our attempt at reconstruction was not made with any presumption of being able to overcome such a serious loss, but simply in an effort to contribute, with the greatest possible commitment to philological rigour and stylistic pertinence, to enhancing our understanding of this Symphony as it was originally conceived: as a unitary four-movement complex.

The Samale/Mazzuca score was accorded an initial studio production by the Hessischen Rundfunk conducted by Eliahu Inbal in December 1985, and first broadcast on 3 January 1986.<sup>136</sup> The first public performance was given by the Radio-Sinfonie-Orchester Berlin under Peter Gülke, as the subject of a Werkstatt concert organised by Sender Freies Berlin on 18 February 1986,<sup>137</sup> the performance being prefaced by an enthusiastic introductory speech by Gülke and followed by a round-table conference with Samale and Mazzuca, Gülke and Rudolf Stefan, moderated by Peter Ruzicka.<sup>138</sup>

In his opening speech Gülke made reference to Viennese critic Wilhelm Sinkovicz, who had written a particularly offensive article<sup>139</sup> in advance of the concert itself. The article merits quotation here as an indication of the extent to which understanding of the material published in Orel had deteriorated, and against what degree of prejudice the Finale has had to fight. Sinkovicz railed:

Bei aller Neugier, die mit drei herrlichen Sätzen des Werkes und acht hervorragenden authentischen kompletten Brucknersymphonien nicht auskommen will, ist das "Wiederstellungsunwesen" doch nichts als ein fauler Musikzauber: Die vorliegenden Aufzeichnungen Bruckners, die in der Nationalbibliothek archiviert sind, lassen endgültige Schlüsse über die Gestalt des Finalsatzes wirklich nicht zu.

To which one can only ask whether the critic had ever actually studied the materials in the Nationalbibliothek. After making comparison to the successes of Alfano's completion of *Turandot* and Cerha's of *Lulu*, Sinkovicz continued:

Die Bruckner-Vervollständiger aber arbeiten mit unübersichtlichem Material, das gerade gut genug war, um Gottfried von Einem einige Melodien für seine "Bruckner-Dialoge" zu liefern, aber nicht dafür, irgendwelchen experimentierfreudigen Musikern Gelegenheit zu geben, Bruckner neu zu komponieren. [...]

---

<sup>136</sup> The present writer is grateful for information supplied by Cornelis van Zwol concerning this point.

<sup>137</sup> As already noted (above), the concert was instigated by Prof. Peter Ruzicka. Cf. Apel, and Rudolf Stephan, "Eine wichtige Bruckner Aufführung in Berlin", *ÖMz* 41 (1986), pp. 176–77.

<sup>138</sup> Copy of the broadcast (by Sender Freies Berlin) courtesy of Prof. Gülke

<sup>139</sup> "Und wieder kein Bruckner. Anmerkungen zur 'Vollendungswut' von Musikern", *Die Presse* (Vienna), 10th Jan. 1986.



After distributing a side-blow to Deryck Cooke for his work on the Mahler Tenth (described as a “veritable künstlerische Bruchlandung”), the tirade concluded:

Jetzt wird uns also wieder einmal das Finale der Neunten Symphonie von Anton Bruckner geschenkt. Mit einem Nachteil: Es wird wieder nicht von Anton Bruckner sein.

Rudolf Stephan’s report on the performance was significantly better informed:<sup>140</sup>

Orel hat das Verdienst, die komplizierte Überlieferung geordnet zu haben. Seine Arbeit ist grundlegend, auch wenn jetzt, durch das Auftauchen weiterer Bögen und die Entzifferung bislang für unentzifferbar gehaltener Eintragungen, sich die Quellenlage etwas verbessert hat. Samale und Mazzuca haben bei ihrer gründlichen Quellenarbeit, die ihrem Ergänzungsversuch zugrundeliegt, dazu bemerkenswerte Beiträge geliefert. Vor allem gelang es ihnen, den bislang dunklen Anfang der Durchführung aufzuklären, also den gesicherten Bestand an einer entscheidenden Stelle zu vergrößern.

Das Ergebnis ihrer Arbeit verdient Respekt und Anerkennung. Weite Strecken der Partitur—95% der Exposition—sind noch von Bruckner selbst ausgearbeitet [...], die Formdisposition ist bis zum Ende der Reprise so gut wie eindeutig, und auch für die Coda gibt es Hinweise, die von Samale und Mazzuca genutzt werden. Es ist unstrittig, daß die Partitur, hätte Bruckner sie vollenden können, in vielen Details anders ausgesehen hätte, das Ganze jedoch, das Bruckner stets vor Augen gestanden hat, wird durch die Rekonstruktion deutlich. Und dazu noch eine Fülle von ganz außerordentlichen Einzelheiten. So wird jeder, der diese Rekonstruktion gehört hat, froh sein, eine solche Fülle bedeutender Musik neu gehört zu haben und wünschen, ihr bald wieder zu begegnen.

Yet even when viewed in a ‘positive’ light, discussion of the efforts of Samale and Mazzuca revealed the persistence of opinions vastly more speculative than the arrangers’ approach. Hans Apel’s account of the podium discussion which followed the performance touched upon one of the points raised, namely the question of Bruckner’s daring harmonic experiments such as the ‘nine-note’ chord in the Adagio,<sup>141</sup> concluding that:

Es war ihm offensichtlich unmöglich, darüber hinauszugehen. Er hat deshalb nur Berge von Skizzen und fertigen Teilstücken zum 4. Satz hinterlassen. Die Uraufführung des bisher umfangreichsten Rekonstruktionsversuchs förderte einen echten Bruckner zutage. Ob man diesen Satz aber als Krönung der neunten, der letzten und kühnsten Sinfonie Bruckners ansehen kann, scheint dennoch fraglich.<sup>142</sup>

Further performances under Eliahu Inbal followed, firstly in Milan on 22 and 23 May 1986 with the Orchestra Sinfonica di Milano della Radiotelevisione Italiana in the Sala Grande del Conservatorio Giuseppe Verdi, and subsequently in Frankfurt on 11 and 12

<sup>140</sup> “Eine wichtige Bruckner-Aufführung in Berlin”, *ÖMz* 41 (1986), p. 177.

<sup>141</sup> As we have seen, the climactic dissonance of the Adagio in fact contains only seven notes, being a complete dominant thirteenth in C# minor.

<sup>142</sup> “Ein musikalisches Geheimnis wurde am Dienstag gelüftet. Uraufführung eines Bruckner-Fragments”, *Die Wahrheit* (Berlin), 20 Feb. 1986.

September with the Frankfurt Radio-Sinfonie-Orchester. This version was brought out by Teldec on a double-CD set, somewhat curiously coupled with Bruckner's Fifth Symphony.<sup>143</sup>

Unfortunately, no proper report on Samale's and Mazzuca's researches nor any documentation of the sources themselves—lack of which had already been regretted by Dietmar Holland<sup>144</sup>—appeared in the programme notes to the Frankfurt performances or in the CD-booklet. Instead, both of these texts were—fatefully—commissioned by the Hessischen Rundfunk from a high-profile Bruckner specialist as sceptical about the nature and results of Samale's and Mazzuca's efforts as he was uninformed about the original MSS and their presentation in Orel—Manfred Wagner.<sup>145</sup> Characteristic of Wagner's dedicated iconoclasm—unflinching in demolition of the image of the 'Musikant Gottes' and cheerfully imputing to the composer both the worst character traits and grossest musical incompetency—Wagner developed in these notes an elaborate intellectual argument that, as Bruckner's works lacked any form of inherent compositional logic,<sup>146</sup> so any attempt to complete them could only be fruitless; even their publication in a musicological edition—let alone their supplementation and performance—would have been against his wishes.<sup>147</sup>

Even the authors' approach to their task was misconstrued and twisted. Samale and Mazzuca appear to have been unaware in writing their *Introduction* of the real urgency of correcting misapprehensions concerning the nature of the compositional artefact: the structure of the 'score' left by Bruckner was perfectly clear to them; whether they regarded it at that stage as a 'draft' or as an 'autograph' is by comparison immaterial. For Manfred Wagner, however—no matter how impressive the intellectual construct set up to dismiss the issue—the objection to Samale's and Mazzuca's work began with the simple, inaccurate presupposition common to so many critics that the materials themselves, far from being even a draft score, were simply isolated sketches that permitted no apparent order or structure to emerge.

---

<sup>143</sup> The Finale has since (early 1996) been re-released by Teldec in a boxed set of Inbal's complete recordings of the Bruckner symphonies—with no indication whatsoever as to the authorship of the Finale!

<sup>144</sup> In his review of the Talmi recording of Carragan's version, quoted above.

<sup>145</sup> See Manfred Wagner, CD booklet to: *Anton Bruckner: Symphonie Nr. 5 B-dur; Finale der 9. Symphonie d-Moll, Rekonstruktion von Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca*. Radio-Sinfonie-Orchester Frankfurt, conducted by Eliahu Inbal (Frankfurt: Teldec 8.35785 ZA, 1987). Furthermore, the text was reprinted by ABIL with minor alterations as "Bemerkungen zu den Ergänzungsversuchen von Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca", *IBG-Mitt* no. 3 (1987), pp. 5–7. While Wagner's lack of knowledge of the Orel edition and the sources is evident from the ensuing discussion, reference deserves to be made to Wagner's apparent ignorance of the nature of the Bruckner sources revealed by his use of the terms "Skizzenhefte" and "Skizzenbüchern" in connection with Bruckner's MSS in his review of Claudia C. Röthig's dissertation, *Mf* 34 (1981), p. 112.

<sup>146</sup> This belief is based—according to Wagner—on the fact that the various versions of the symphonies appear to handle their material differently within their own logical processes, although with no apparent perceivable reason.

<sup>147</sup> CD booklet, p. 8; cf. "Bemerkungen...", p. 7. In fact, one could easily turn the argument around and claim that therefore any form of the work is valid, and that Bruckner accepted the arrangements of his disciples merely in order to hear his works *performed*, which surely is the reason why a composer writes music!

Given the simplicity of that misapprehension, the elaborate and far-reaching conclusions concerning Bruckner's compositional style and procedure that were extrapolated from it are hair-raising in their magnitude, and remind us that misconceptions about the Finale can have wider ramifications. Wagner's text merits quotation at length<sup>148</sup> as an example of such musical-logical reasoning—and of the dangers inherent in placing 'Deuteln' before 'Fakteln':<sup>149</sup>

Hatte schon Alfred Orel bereits versucht, die Entwürfe und Skizzen so zu ordnen, daß der geplante Ablauf des Finalsatzes erkennbar wurde, so setzen Samale und Mazzuca konsequent auf ihre Findung eines Analogieverfahrens, das sie an den ersten drei Sätzen der 9. Symphonie im Vergleich von Skizzen und endgültiger Partitur zum obersten Gesetz erhoben. Demgemäß mußten sie—ganz im Gegensatz zu Orel [?]-nahezu alle Skizzenblätter verwerten und, eingezwängt in ihr Analogieverfahren, zu einer Art vollständigem Bauplan gelangen. [...]

Samale und Mazzuca haben sich für die Ergänzung entschieden und—liest man die Einführung zu ihrem 'complementato del finale' genau—durchaus einsichtige Argumente für ihre Arbeit artikuliert, einsichtig in Harmonielehre und Stimmführung und relativ logisch für den Kenner von Kompositionslehren des 19. Jahrhunderts. Was sie außer acht ließen, war nur die Besonderheit des Komponisten Anton Bruckner. Bruckner nämlich hatte es schwer mit seinen Werken, weswegen die bis heute anhaltende Diskussion um die Fassungen seiner Symphonien entstand. Ausgangspunkt für diese Schwierigkeit ist seine neurotische Haltung gegenüber der Perfektion seines Werkstils. [...] Ergebnis dieser neurotischen Haltung war fortwährende Korrektur der bereits fertiggestellten Werke [...].

*Aus dieser Arbeitshaltung heraus ist—ganz im Gegensatz beispielsweise zu Süßmayrs Ergänzung am Mozart-Requiem—eine werkimmanente Logik Anton Bruckners nicht nachzuvollziehen.*<sup>150</sup> Diese Logik im Sinne musikwissenschaftlicher Kausalität versagte bereits bislang an den von Bruckners eigener Hand fertiggestellten Fassungen und zwingt dem seriösen Musikforscher auf, wirklich nur zur Kenntnis zu nehmen, was Bruckner selbst niederschrieb und alle anderen Einschübe, Beisätze, Veränderungen außer acht zu lassen.<sup>151</sup> Bruckners kompositorisches Denken nämlich dürfte ein ganzheitliches gewesen sein im Sinne der Projektion einer Vorstellung, aber kein detailliertes in der Konstruktion, wie wir es von Mozart her kennen. Deswegen war für ihn die Schreibtätigkeit im letzten der Augenblick des Entstehens der Musik, das Durchstreichen oder Überkleben ihre Auslöschung und das immer wieder angesprochene periodische Zählen die Kontrollinstanz nach der Fixierung.<sup>152</sup> Ganz anders als bei Brahms und wahrscheinlich auch bei Mahler entzieht sich diese Art der Werkkonstruktion einer ablaufenden, inhärenten Logik, es sei denn, des Schöpfers eigene Hand erzeugt mit der Niederschrift seiner Gedanken jene Kausalität, die der Forscher oder der Interpret in der Nachvollziehung der Noten als 'brucknerlogisch' empfindet. [...] Dementsprechend ist—abgesehen von aller Werteinschätzung, ob Ergänzungen überhaupt erlaubt seien oder nicht—

<sup>148</sup> CD notes, pp. 6ff.; cf. "Bemerkungen...", pp. 5ff.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. Gernot Gruber's remarks, in "Schlußdiskussion", ed. Wolfgang Partsch, *BrSympBer 1992*, p. 203.

<sup>150</sup> Italics added.

<sup>151</sup> But what then, for instance of Josef Schalk's cuts in VIII(90)/4 that Bruckner agreed to (or not), or III(89)/4, in Franz Schalk's handwriting?

<sup>152</sup> Again an incorrect generalisation: in several cases the metrical numbers precede the thematic draft.

im Fall Bruckner festzuhalten, daß Ergänzungen jedenfalls nur das Denken des Ergänzenden widerspiegeln können und keinesfalls der Anspruch erhoben werden dürfte, Brucknerschem konstruktiven Denken zu entsprechen. Folgedessen hatte Alfred Orel zweifelsfrei recht als er nicht wagte, die vorliegenden Skizzen in einer endgültigen Reihung auszurichten.<sup>153</sup> Daß die Skizzen veröffentlicht wurden, bedeutete zweifellos eine Arbeitsaufforderung an die Musikwissenschaft, wäre andererseits aber Bruckner bestimmt nicht recht gewesen, weil er—ganz im Gegensatz zu manchen anderen Komponisten—nur sein geschriebenes Ergebnis, das er dementsprechend auch nur mit bestimmten Termini versah, als Ausdruck seines kompositorischen Willens akzeptierte.<sup>154</sup>

This text, which reads more like whole-hearted repudiation than sympathetic introduction, particularly in the absence of any information citing the substantial philological work of the authors, handicapped the reception of Samale and Mazzuca's efforts from the outset.<sup>155</sup> Given Wagner's efforts it is not surprising that—despite the quality of Samale and Mazzuca's work—few reviewers reacted to the Teldec recording with the sort of enthusiasm initially displayed by Rudolf Stephan. Wolfgang Birtel's review of the recording<sup>156</sup> noted Wagner's scepticism concerning Bruckner's alleged "nicht nachvollziehbare werkimmanente Logik" and "ganzheitliche Konzeptionsweise", in defence being forced to fall back upon reference to Ruzicka, quoting his article "Annäherung an einen Torso":<sup>157</sup>

"Der Torso der neunten Sinfonie [...] entzieht sich dem Zugriff späterer Generationen. Allein eine begrenzte 'Annäherung' erscheint möglich—sie ist allerdings legitim und fruchtbar." Trotz aller Einwände: Inbals Annäherung bleibt diskussionsfähig und lohnt in jedem Falle die Auseinandersetzung, zumal sich der Chefdirigent mit seinem RSO Frankfurt musikalisch engagiert für das ergänzte Fragment einsetzt.

The reviewer Gerhard Rohde took a different approach to Wagner in dismissing Samale's and Mazzuca's work by drawing attention to the differing intensity of formal linkage created by the fourth movements of Bruckner's symphonies, echoing Ruzicka's views: "Und da gerade in der neunten Sinfonie die drei Sätze einen hohen Grad an formaler Selbständigkeit

<sup>153</sup> In particular the last sentence is uninformed: Bruckner himself numbered the score bifols. in question, himself drafted the movement in order of continuity in pc. format, both of which Orel clearly recognised and mirrored in his presentation of the material.

<sup>154</sup> Yet it was precisely Bruckner who was prepared to content himself with radical adaptations of his music by his editors, and even to see his works published in this form. If anything, this would suggest precisely the opposite to Wagner's generalisations which, if anything, suggest a desperate attempt to keep the Finale MSS out of public view and serious consideration. Jackson ("Bruckner's Metrical Numbers", p. 123) also noted and took exception to Wagner's remarks; cf. §2.1.5.

<sup>155</sup> Samale and Mazzuca wrote a point-by-point rebuttal of Wagner's critique in a letter to the Viennese musicologist (date unknown); the letter is even disparagingly mentioned in Wagner's review of the Carragan recording quoted above.

<sup>156</sup> *NZfM* 149 (July–Aug.), p. 84.

<sup>157</sup> *Hi-Fi Stereophonie* 18 (Feb. 1979), p. 141 (cited in §1.3.11 *supra*).

erreichen—jeder könnte im Grunde für sich allein stehen—, mutet die Anstrengung um den Finalsatz fast ein wenig wie eine liebenswürdige Donquichotterie an.”<sup>158</sup>

Apart from the reports on the Rome conference (*infra*), only considerably later—in 1993, and shortly before publication of the present writer’s researches and of the ‘new’ score of the Finale<sup>159</sup>—was a more informed discussion of the Finale and of Samale’s and Mazzuca’s work to emerge. This came in the form of a publication on the Ninth Symphony by German musicologist Wolfram Steinbeck which,<sup>160</sup> as a counterbalance to the above justifications of misinformed opinion and as a brief but largely accurate summary of the facts, also deserves quotation at length:

Alfred Orel hat in kriminalistischer Arbeit die erhaltenen Aufzeichnungen zum Finale gesichtet, geordnet und mit Kommentaren ediert. Und zur besseren Übersicht hat er seiner Ausgabe eine fortlaufende Einrichtung der jeweils letztgültigen Entwürfe auf vier Systemen angefügt. Erst in jüngerer Zeit sind daran Korrekturen vorgenommen worden, vor allem durch den äußerst akribischen Rekonstruktions- und Komplettierungsversuch durch N. Samale und G. Mazzuca [...].

Nach Orel sind fünf verschiedene, aufeinander aufbauende Fassungen zu unterscheiden (A–E), die zudem jeweils verschiedene Korrekturschichten aufweisen können. Überwiegend handelt es sich schon um Partiturentwürfe, allerdings in unterschiedlicher Vollständigkeit.

Der letzte Komplettierungsversuch ist der schon genannte von Samale und Mazzuca von 1986. Hier läuft das Satzende nach Steigerung und Choralthema auf den dreifachen Fortissimo-Durchbruch des Höhepunktthemas aus dem Kopfsatz hinaus [...], bringt noch einmal, nun ebenfalls als Höhepunkt, den Choral mit der Te Deum-Begleitung und mündet schließlich in einen Epilog, in dem über dem vielfachen kontrapunktierten Te Deum-Motiv das Oktavsturmotiv, das ja tatsächlich das gesamte Werk bestimmte, den Schluß in leerem Quint-Oktavklang herbeiführt.

Yet even Steinbeck concludes:

Wie auch immer die ästhetischen Belange solcher Komplettierungsversuche einzuschätzen sind, —immerhin macht sie das umfangreiche und bedeutende Material zum Schlußsatz aufführbar, selbst wenn man es als Finale nicht verwenden mag.

—“nicht verwenden mag”. Yet why cannot a reconstructed Finale be permitted to function as it was intended to? What overwhelming force prevents such critics from rethinking their attitudes?

<sup>158</sup> “Auch Anton Bruckner entgeht den Vollendern nicht: Die neunte Sinfonie mit dem vierten Satz unter Eliahu Inbal aufgeführt”, *NeueMZ* 35 (Dec. 1986), p. 44.

<sup>159</sup> As noted by Erich Wolfgang Partsch, in his review of the following in *IBG-Mitt* no. 41 (Dec. 1993).

<sup>160</sup> *Anton Bruckner, Neunte Symphonie d-Moll (Meisterwerke der Musik 60)*, Munich 1993. The conclusion of the passage has already been quoted in §1.3.11.

### 1.4.15 The Rome Symposium.

On 11 and 12 May 1987, a symposium dealing with the numerous completions of the Ninth was held by the Austrian Institute of Culture in Rome under the title “Die Entwürfe und Skizzen der IX. Symphonie Anton Bruckners.”<sup>161</sup> The idea of a symposium at which all previously known versions could be discussed and compared was initiated by Paul-Gilbert Langevin at the suggestion of Cohrs (in October 1984); as earlier plans to hold the symposium in Paris and Berlin fell through, the event in Rome was organised by Samale and Langevin.<sup>162</sup>

Several eminent Bruckner specialists appeared for the occasion (others, significant by their absence, would appear to have cancelled owing to the poor organisation of the event).<sup>163</sup> Papers were given by Edward Neill (over his first ‘reconstruction’); William Carragan (“Structural Aspects of the revision of Bruckner’s symphonic finales”, read in its author’s absence by David Aldeborgh). Samale and Mazzuca presented their *Ricostruzione*,<sup>164</sup> Mario della Chiesa a comparison of the Carragan and Samale/Mazzuca versions, Gülke his paper “Vollendet–Unvollendet. Einige Anmerkungen zur IX. Symphonie Anton Bruckners.”<sup>165</sup> Further contributions came from the late Jack Diether (read by his widow), Cohrs, who spoke on Bruckner’s drafts for the Trio of the Ninth, Robert Simpson (“Bruckner and his Unique Finale Problem”,<sup>166</sup> in which he appears to have been the most critical as regards the compositional quality of the surviving material<sup>167</sup>), Josette Leone Gomel, Erich Nowotny, Gianfranco Zaccaro, Saviero Franchi, Daniele Calcagno, Alberto Basso and Cornelis van Zwol.<sup>168</sup> Unfortunately, the intention of publishing these papers was never realised.<sup>169</sup>

<sup>161</sup> See van Zwol, pp. 36f.; see also *ibid.*, p. 31, where reference is also made to a symposium held in Utrecht (Vredenburg), 12–16 November 1989, on the question “Darf unvollendet vollendet werden?”.

<sup>162</sup> According to Cohrs, *Bruckner-Arbeit*, p. 2. See also an anonymous “Pressecommuniqué [concerning] Internationales Symposium über das Thema ‘Das Problem des Finales in den Symphonien Anton Bruckners. Vorführung des Finales der IX. Symphonie nach der Rekonstruktion von Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca. 11. und 12. Mai 1987 am Österreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rom”, photocopy; dated Padua, 13th March 1987. Copies of this and several other documents concerning the Rome symposium courtesy of Cohrs (Bremen) and Erich Nowotny (Kronstorf).

<sup>163</sup> As noted by van Zwol, p. 36; among them were Prof. Horst Haschek (IBG President), who had been asked to chair the conference; his position was taken by Dr. Ernst Kubin (at that time manager of ABIL) and Dr. Luigi Bellingardi of the Italian Bruckner Society.

<sup>164</sup> “Anmerkungen zur Rekonstruktion des Finales der 9. Symphonie Anton Bruckners”. Photocopy, unpubl.

<sup>165</sup> Quoted at the outset of this chapter. The title is taken from a copy of Gülke’s text sent to the present writer by its author; van Zwol (p. 37) cites the title as *Zur Problematik von Fragment und Vollendung bei Bruckner*.

<sup>166</sup> Copy with the present writer courtesy of its author.

<sup>167</sup> As noted by Peter Gülke, “Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987: Bruckner Symposium”; see discussion of Simpson in §1.3.9 *supra*.

<sup>168</sup> Van Zwol, *ibid.*, p. 37.

<sup>169</sup> According to van Zwol (*ibid.*, confirmed in a letter of 4/6/96), Erich Nowotny prepared a “Kurzfassung” of some of the papers given; a copy apparently resides with ABIL, though the present writer has not seen it. The present writer is indebted to Herr Nowotny for providing copies of a number of unpublished documents concerning the symposium, including the Pressecommuniqué, biographies of Samale and Mazzuca, notes on William Carragan’s paper, etc. See also Peter Gülke, “Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987: Bruckner Symposium”, and

In many respects the Rome symposium underscored the problems so far encountered in the reception of the Finale, paramount among which must be mentioned the dubious or at least controversial nature of any concern with the ‘taboo’ of the Finale, possibly reflected in the absence of several Bruckner luminaries.<sup>170</sup> Krones observed that:<sup>171</sup>

Bruno Kunz, Direktor des [Österreichischen] Kulturinstitutes, hatte sich nicht gescheut, auch die Hauptvertreter der österreichischen Bruckner-Forschung einzuladen [...] doch wurde die gute Absicht nicht belohnt—keiner der eingeladenen Bruckner-Experten hatte sich in die Höhle des Löwen gewagt. Somit sei gleich vorweggenommen: Es ist durchaus legitim, “Fertigstellungen” nicht gut zu heißen, doch sollte man die Diskussion nicht von vornherein verweigern; schließlich besitzen solche Unternehmungen doch zumindest einmal rein musikwissenschaftliches Interesse.

Four years were to pass before the revised Samale/Mazzuca Finale was heard in Austria. The Rome conference further underscored the fact that until this time, and except for the relatively brief research sojourns of Samale and Mazzuca and later Samale and Cohrs in Vienna, little first-hand research had been undertaken on the MS sources themselves or the primary literature. Hence, surprisingly little reference appears to have been made to the original material—one would have thought, the central focus of the conference—except in the brief research done by Samale and Mazzuca on the Finale, and by Cohrs on the Trios of the Ninth. Krones wrote of Samale’s and Mazzuca’s work that: “Der hohe philologische Maßstab der beiden Autoren garantierte [...] eine vertiefte Befassung mit der Skizzen, wobei neue Zuordnungsversuche durchaus überzeugend vorgetragen wurden.”<sup>172</sup>

The reports also underline the fact that little further understanding of the exigencies of the Orel edition came to light. Gülke, for instance, mentions an indication allegedly by Bruckner of an empty 16 mm. in the middle of the fugue,<sup>173</sup> also making references to the climactic chord of the Adagio as containing nine notes.<sup>174</sup> Van Zwol’s remark that, since the publication of the Orel edition in 1934, “kann jeder einen Eindruck bekommen, wie weit Bruckner mit seiner Arbeit gekommen war”,<sup>175</sup> cannot be given unqualified assent, the fault

Hartmut Krones, “Symposium zur ‘Fertigstellung’ von Bruckners IX. Symphonie im Österreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rom”, *ÖMz* 42 (1987), pp. 521f.

<sup>170</sup> Noted by Gülke, “Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987...”.

<sup>171</sup> “Symposium zur ‘Fertigstellung’”, p. 521. According to the verbal report of Dr. Maier (ABIL), however, the cancellations were merely due to the poor organisation of the event. Despite the interest the topic could be expected to generate, the issue of the Finale was not raised at any symposium held by ABIL until ‘Todesjahr 1996’; even then it was framed within the wider topic of “ Fassungen—Bearbeitungen—Vollendungen”, again, suggestive of the taboo-like nature of the Finale question, which could easily have justified a symposium in itself.

<sup>172</sup> “Symposium zur Fertigstellung...”, p. 521.

<sup>173</sup> In “Vollendet—Unvollendet” and again in *Brahms—Bruckner*, p. 134, p. 83.

<sup>174</sup> *Brahms—Bruckner*, p. 83; the oversight is noted in the review of this book by Wolfgang Sparrer, *NZfM* 9 (1990), p. 52.

<sup>175</sup> P. 31. In a letter of 4/6/96 van Zwol pointed out: “My statement about Orel does not say ‘in the best way’. I only meant to say, nobody could after 1934 go on [saying] about the Finale [that there] were only some sketches

does not lie wholly with the Orel edition but simply with an inadequate reading of it. No mention, for instance, was made of the fact that MSS have been lost, as Orel himself pointed out; the issue of the nature of the materials—sketch, draft, score, etc.—would also appear not to have entered discussion. Krone's report, for instance, noted the inevitable speculative questions that could be expected to arise, given such uncertainty—would Bruckner ultimately have 'used' all the 'sketches' in such a fashion, what might he have discarded, what further inspirations might have occurred to him?—as well as the objections of Simpson to alleged shortcomings in the materials (also noted by Gülke<sup>176</sup>). Krones nonetheless claimed positively:

Die Tatsache, daß Bruckners Genius in jedem Takt, in jeder Phrase präsent ist, macht die Begegnung aber dennoch zu Gewinn. So bleibt die Hoffnung, daß sich auch in Österreich bald ein größeres Publikum mit dem vorgestellten Ergebnis auseinandersetzen kann—ein 'halber' Bruckner ist immer noch sehr viel und daher der Aufführung wert.<sup>177</sup>

Gülke's report brought some well-formulated words for the critics of such efforts:

Schon der Erkenntnisgewinn, den Samale/Mazzucas Arbeit erbringt, ist so gewaltig, das prinzipieller Einspruch hiergegen sich desavouiert als *Denkfaulheit im Gewande von Demut*. Allemal besteht die Crux solcher Vervollständigungen darin, daß diejenigen, die sie unternehmen, wohl der Maßgabe verpflichtet sind, was der Meister getan hätte, und zugleich genauer als jeder andere wissen, inwiefern sie dieser nicht genügen können. Ihnen vorzurechnen, inwiefern sie hinter jenem zurückbleiben, erscheint u. a. insoweit unredlich, als dabei unterstellt ist, sie hätten unter gleichem Anspruch zu Ende zu komponieren beansprucht; noch unredlicher freilich die Annahme, über Wert und Unwert werde entschieden anhand der Tatsache, ob sich das Ergebnis im Musikleben durchsetzen werde. Fraglos hat Bruckner mit dem Adagio der Neunten und ganz und gar mit dessen Ausklang in kaum überbietbarer Weise Ende und Abschluß komponiert. Ähnliches freilich ließe sich auch von den langsamen Sätzen der vorangehenden Sinfonien sagen—manche Sicherheit der Beurteilung verdankt sich vornehmlich dem Wissen darum, wie es um die Stellung oder Authentizität der betreffenden Passage bestellt ist. Am Kriterium 'brucknerisch' hängt allemal viel subjektives Ermessen: Das gesamte Trio der Neunten etwa klingt viel weniger im Normalverständnis 'brucknerisch' als lange Passagen der Rekonstruktion.<sup>178</sup>

He concluded, in a manner similar to Krones:

Selbst wenn wir Fragmente (ganz und gar nach den Maßgaben eindeutiger Authentizität) verlorengaben müssen, bleibt das unschätzbare Verdienst von Versuchen wie demjenigen

---

of minor importance—as was the case (and still sometimes is in Austria!!) by Brucknerians who know better now.”

<sup>176</sup> “Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987...”.

<sup>177</sup> p. 522.

<sup>178</sup> “Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987...”, italics added.



von Samale/Mazzuca, daß sie uns einen deutlichen Begriff davon geben, was da verlorenging.<sup>179</sup>

#### 1.4.16 Nicola Samale and Gunnar Cohrs.

Nicola Samale was to continue revision of his score over the following years, later working with German conductor and musicologist Gunnar (later Benjamin Gunnar) Cohrs (b. 1965), at the time a music student in Hameln and later Bremen.<sup>180</sup>

Cohrs first became interested in the Bruckner Ninth in January 1982, one of his first points of contact being Ruzicka's article "Annäherung an einen Torso" quoted earlier. Mention has been made of his suggestion to Carragan in 1985 concerning the incorporation of some kind of 'Allelujah' theme in the latter's Finale completion, for which the quotation of the passage by Ruzicka from Göllicherich-Auer was his immediate source. He had managed to find a copy of the Orel edition, and began studying what he described as the "verwirrend dargestellten Materials".<sup>181</sup> Already in 1983 he had learnt of the sources of the Ninth via correspondence with ABIL and had written letters to both Hofrat Nowak and Brosche requesting access to the MSS, but was unable to gain access to them at that time.<sup>182</sup>

Cohrs began work on performing versions of the drafts for the Trio of the Ninth in 1984; his first efforts were performed by his Jugendstreicherorchester Hameln in May 1985.<sup>183</sup> The careful and thorough nature of his approach, instructive in its comprehension of the extent of the Orel edition's shortcomings, can be seen in the following extract from his early *Kommentar* on the Trio scores:<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>180</sup> The principal dates and quotations in the following are taken from Cohrs, *Bruckner-Arbeit 1982–1992. Ein chronologischer Kurzbericht* (unpubl., February 1993), pp. 2f. The document was written at the suggestion of the present writer, to clarify the chronology and extent of his involvement with the Finale and the Performing Version. Cohrs later changed his name to Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs.

<sup>181</sup> *Bruckner-Arbeit...*, p. 2.

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*: "Trotz Nowaks Empfehlung antwortet Brosche, die Skizzen blieben bis zur Neuveröffentlichung in der Gesamtausgabe gesperrt". Concerning the limited accessibility of the MSS for Samale and Mazzuca see §1.4.14 *supra*.

<sup>183</sup> The work was subsequently revised, working from copies of the original MSS, for the Rome Symposium, score and commentary were completed in July 1988 under the title *Anton Bruckner / Zwei Trioentwürfe zum Scherzo der IX Symphonie: Trio in F & Trio in Fis (1892–3). Partitur und Kommentar. Vorgelegt von Gunnar Cohrs (1987–88)*, later revised and published by Doblinger in 1997 in editions for solo viola and orchestra and solo viola and organ. Cohrs' work subsequently appeared in the Bruckner GA as ancillary volume to Band 9, *Entwürfe zum zweiten Satz und Trio mit Viola-Solo / Studienband*, MWV 1998. Carragan also completed performing versions of the Trios; these were first performed under Manfred Mayrhofer in Gmunden in May 1987. See *Anton Bruckner / Zwei Intermezzi für Orchester und Viola-Solo / (Nachgelassene Trios zum Scherzo der IX. Symphonie) / vollendet von William Carragan. Partitur*. Troy, New York: © 1985, photocopy of handwritten score, with a single-page foreword by William Carragan dated August 1987; copy with the present author courtesy of David Aldeborgh.

<sup>184</sup> Cohrs, p. 30.

Die editorischen Bemühungen Alfred Orels um das Werk Anton Bruckners sind von unbestreitbarem Wert. Da mit einer Neuausgabe der "Entwürfe und Skizzen" [...] in absehbarer Zeit nicht zu rechnen ist, geschweige denn mit einer Faksimileausgabe, bildet seine Veröffentlichung eine unabdingbare Grundlage für jeden, der sich mit den Quellen zur neunten Sinfonie befaßt.

Umso bedauerlicher ist, daß die Ausgabe der Entwürfe mit Fehlern durchsetzt und überaus korrekturbedürftig ist! Zu dieser Feststellung mußte auch Nicola Samale im Laufe seiner philologischen Untersuchungen der Manuskripte im Vergleich zu Orels Ausgabe gelangen, und ein ähnliches Bild ergab sich auch bei meiner Arbeit, in deren Verlauf ich gleichfalls Manuskripte mit Orels Veröffentlichung verglich.

Bei einer musikwissenschaftlichen Skizzenedition setzt man seitens des Herausgebers größtmögliche philologische Strenge voraus. Man kann es daher keinem Musikwissenschaftler verdenken, auf eine solche Edition zu vertrauen. Leider muß im vorliegenden Fall festgehalten werden, daß alle Arbeiten und Ergänzungsversuche, die allein auf Orels Edition basieren und nicht die Autographe heranziehen, keinen gültigen Anspruch auf Authentizität erheben können.

Cohrs goes on to detail the specific problems of the Orel presentation:<sup>185</sup>

Zunächst ist die Aufteilung und Anlage von Orels Umschrift ungeschickt gewählt. Sie berücksichtigt des Komponisten eigene Aufteilung eines Entwurfbogens nicht [...]. Vielmehr werden die Systeme fortlaufend gedruckt. Dies mag aus Gründen der Papierersparnis verständlich sein, läßt aber viele Absichten Bruckners im Dunkeln.

Orel unterschlägt vor allem gern Leersysteme, auch wenn sie von Bruckner mit Pausen versehen waren. Dadurch kommen Bearbeiter in die Verlegenheit, Stimmen auszuschreiben, die Bruckner gar nicht vorgesehen hatte. Bei einer solchen Komprimierung der Systeme kommt es auch oft zu einer Verwechslung von Systemen oder der falschen Zuordnung instrumentierter Stimmen. Bruckner zählt oft in seinen Systemen von links nach rechts, verweist auf bestimmte, so abzuzählende Takte, bringt Hinweiskürzel an. Sein ganzes System von Weisern, Wiederholungen, Überspringen (vi-de), Ergänzungen und anderes bleibt aus Orels Umschrift oft unklar. Dies geht im Falle der Finaleskizzen soweit, daß durch eklatante Fehler Orels der Satzverlauf ganz unverständlich bleiben muß. Dadurch sieht für viele Musikwissenschaftler der Finaleentwurf weitaus fragmentarischer und unzusammenhängender aus, als er in Wirklichkeit ist. [...]

In October 1984, again via ABIL, Cohrs became acquainted with French musicologist Paul-Gilbert Langevin, to whom he made the suggestion of a symposium, "das alle bisher bekannten Fassungen miteinander konfrontieren soll". Langevin's efforts to hold the symposium in either Berlin or Paris initially met with a favourable response from Berlin, although of the original plan only the Werkstatt concert and podium discussion were ultimately to be realised.<sup>186</sup> Cohrs's contact with Langevin was to lead to a long and fruitful

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31

<sup>186</sup> Langevin and Samale were consequently to begin what were ultimately fruitful negotiations with the Österreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rome (§1.4.15 *supra*).

friendship and collaboration with Nicola Samale, whom he first met in Berlin in February 1986 at the premiere of the *Ricostruzione*.

In May 1987, shortly following the Rome symposium, Cohrs began work with Samale on revision of the score, in the same month visiting Nowak in Vienna and making a first brief acquaintance with the ÖNB and StB materials.<sup>187</sup> In the following summer he translated the Samale/Mazzuca *Introduction* at the request of Samale, who hoped to better publicise the score in German-speaking circles. The translation was completed in early 1988, but attempts to have the translation published by Ricordi failed.<sup>188</sup>

The first fruits of Samale's and Cohrs's collaborations, according to Cohrs the "1., revidierte Fassung" of the *Ricostruzione*, were incorporated into the production of the Finale by Radio NCRV in Hilversum on 2 and 3 September 1987, with the Netherlands Radio Philharmonic Orchestra under Hubert Soudant, who had conducted the European debut of the Carragan version.<sup>189</sup> The recording was first broadcast the following year on 6 September 1988. At the time this recording was made Samale was still unconvinced about the 'affirmative' major-key ending suggested by the composer's statements and which were being urged upon him by Cohrs; during the ensuing work phase in Hameln and Hanover on what was to become their "2. revidierte Fassung", Cohrs was able to convince Samale of the D-major "Allelujah", which was first introduced into the coda in the form of a brief trumpet fanfare.<sup>190</sup>

Cohrs began correspondence with the present writer in early June 1988, contact being made via the mediation of Peter Gülke.<sup>191</sup> In August of the same year Cohrs' brief but enthusiastic article appeared, "Komplettierungsversuche eines Torsos. Zu den verschiedenen Fassungen von Bruckners Neunter Sinfonie", which began by quoting Bruckner's words concerning the "Allelujah des zweiten Satzes", tracing the motive from VII/2 via the 'non confundar' of the Te Deum and trumpet fanfare of VIII/4 to the "Hallelujah" of Psalm 150.<sup>192</sup>

<sup>187</sup> Who, according to the *Bruckner-Arbeit...* (p. 3) "sich weigert, über das Finale zu sprechen".

<sup>188</sup> Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca. *Anton Bruckner/ Finale der IX. Sinfonie. Kommentar zur vollständig ergänzten Aufführungsfassung. Ins Deutsche übertragen von Gunnar Cohrs*. Unpubl. photocopy, n. d. (mid-1987).

<sup>189</sup> Cf. van Zwol, p. 36.

<sup>190</sup> As can also be found in the later revision of the Carragan score, cf. §1.4.12 *supra*.

<sup>191</sup> The author had written to Gülke at the instigation of his then doctoral supervisor Prof. Andrew McCredie. By 1996, the extent of the correspondence with Cohrs had amounted to a file over 10 centimetres thick, not including drafts and copies of articles; more recent correspondence was mostly by email. Cohrs (*Bruckner-Arbeit...*, p. 3) dates the correspondence as beginning in August; the date of the first letter to the present writer is, however, 10 June 1988.

<sup>192</sup> *FonoForum* Aug. 1988, p. 18; the title was an intentional allusion to that of Ruzicka's article; pp. 18–19 also reproduce the last measures of the Rome 1988 revision. Cohrs was later to sketch (in October 1989) an "Allelujah" phrase in minims; this sketch was unknown to the present writer when he conceived the origin of the "Allelujah" in May 1990 as an augmentation of the phrase in VIII/Trio. See chs. 3.3, 3.4.

In October 1988 Samale, with Cohrs' assistance, recorded the "2. revidierte Fassung" of the Finale along with the other movements of the Ninth with the Polish National Radio Symphony Orchestra in Kattowitz.<sup>193</sup> A further performance also took place in Italy, following which work began on a "3. revidierte Fassung".<sup>194</sup>

However, all these revisions, like the vast majority of the alterations from 1987, with the exception of the expansion of the final peroration and the addition of the short Allelujah motives introduced into it, were almost entirely incidental, involving numerous and multi-faceted, details of texture, scoring, dynamics and articulation.<sup>195</sup> Only in rare cases did the revisions involve major alterations of scoring, harmonic progressions, counterpoint, voice leading or reassess the philological problems determining musical continuity. Hence, despite their long association, Samale and Cohrs never produced a new 'score' as such but rather an impressive body of revisions to the pre-existing version of 1986. Pertinent here are comments by Nowak concerning the better definition of the term 'Fassung':

An der fertigen Partitur können nun Änderungen vorgenommen werden. Sie sind von verschiedener Natur: Instrumentation, Form, Stimmführung usw. Solange sie nicht zu Fertigung einer neuen Partitur führen, wird lediglich der augenblickliche Zustand der 1. Fassung geändert. Es entsteht also ein 2. Zustand.<sup>196</sup>

According to this principle, the '3. Zustand' of the Samale/Mazzuca *Ricostruzione*—the "2., revidierte Fassung" according to Cohrs—that has been presented in Table V.<sup>197</sup>

During the further examinations of the original materials undertaken by Samale and Cohrs in Vienna in April 1989, a new perspective was to emerge. This arose in the form of the then newly acquired 'Stradal-Blatt', ÖNB 38.846 (see Facs. C/324), which was to foster in the authors the suspicion that Bruckner had used some kind of "Berechnung des Verhältnisses der Takte" in composing the Finale.<sup>198</sup>

Hence, most of the subsequent 1989 revisions stemmed from Cohrs' conviction that Bruckner had used elaborate mathematical permutations of 'fundamental numbers' or

<sup>193</sup> This being produced on the 2-CD set Melodram 98912. No reviews are known.

<sup>194</sup> *Bruckner-Arbeit...*, p. 3.

<sup>195</sup> The author was sent copies of the revisions in late 1989—a centimetre-high pile of loose notes, jottings and orchestral retouchings. It was essentially the '3., revidierte Fassung' that was given a two-piano presentation by Maestro Samale and the author in Bremen in January 1990; see ch. 3.4

<sup>196</sup> "'Urfassung' und 'Endfassung' bei Anton Bruckner", *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 35, emphasis original. Cf. Doebel's clarification of the definitions and relationship of terms such as Werk, Fassung, Zustand, etc., pp. 77ff.

<sup>197</sup> The score on which the analysis is based is entitled, in full: *Anton Bruckner / IX. Sinfonie: Finale*. 719 mm., 173 pp.; in Samale's handwriting, incorporating much of the Ricordi publication (Samale/Mazzuca 1983–86), with revisions 1987–88 by Samale/Cohrs; dated (p. 173): "New ending / Roma 1988 / Cohrs/Samale" (copy courtesy of Cohrs). Later revisions to mm. 641–648 (the chorale) and mm. 679–727 (the expanded, D-major peroration; undated) are in the handwriting of Cohrs and derive from 1989.

<sup>198</sup> See concerning this the further more general discussion in §2.1.6.

‘Grundzahlen’ to determine the total numbers of measures, proportions, number of structural elements and arrival points of each movement, a highly speculative idea which—ironically, given that scholar’s concern with philological meticulousness—appears to have begun with Leopold Nowak. In several articles,<sup>199</sup> Nowak advanced the thesis that Bruckner had worked, albeit unconsciously, like the *Baumeister* of a gothic cathedral, founding the proportions of his works on specific numbers with quasi-numeric symbolic connotations. For the Ninth the numbers 9 and 37 appeared particularly significant: particularly noticeable is that significant disjunctures appear in both the first movement and the Adagio 37 mm. before the end,<sup>200</sup> raising the possibility of an analogous ‘Schlußbaustein’ in the Finale. 37, interestingly enough, is the ‘Grundzahl’ of the Vienna *Stephansdom*.<sup>201</sup>

Inspired by this striking new perspective on Bruckner’s compositional approach, Cohrs published a number of articles on the question of numeric constants in the symphonies, the first of which appeared in *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* in July 1990.<sup>202</sup> The section of the Finale most influenced by these speculations was inevitably the coda, which, as the most expendable (and expandable) part of the score, was in one of the final conceptualisations massively extended, bringing the total number of measures for the movement from the 719 of the 1988 version to an enticingly Trinitarian 729 (9 x 9 x 9).<sup>203</sup> Interesting as these speculations were, the further revisions to the coda undertaken during Cohrs’ sojourn in Rome in August–September 1989 were to prove Procrustean, stretching out an already only dimly-glimpsed and largely supplemented coda and compromising the methodology and legitimacy of the undertaking.

Leaving aside the problematic issues of 1989–90, however, Cohrs’ contributions to the definitive version of the Finale were overwhelmingly positive, chief among them his recognition of the significance of ending with an affirmative “Allelujah”, and the possibility of the final ‘Schlußbaustein’ of the movement having been 37 mm. long, analogous to IX/1 and IX/3. As we have seen, the 1987–89 revisions did not by and large extend as far as

---

<sup>199</sup> For example, “Anton Bruckner Formwille, dargestellt am Finale seiner V. Symphonie”, *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 43ff. or “Studien zu den Formverhältnissen in der e-Moll-Messe von Anton Bruckner”, *ibid.*, pp. 160ff.

<sup>200</sup> The division is particularly convincing in the case of the Adagio.

<sup>201</sup> See Eduard Castle, “Geheimnisvoller Stephansdom”, *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 13 Nov. 1940.

<sup>202</sup> “Der musikalische Architekt: Zur Bedeutung der Zahlen in Bruckners 5. und 9. Sinfonie”, pp. 19–26; other articles and discussion thereof see §2.1.6. At the request of the present writer, speculation concerning the measure numbers in the performing version of the Finale was almost wholly omitted from these publications. A more detailed discussion of the question has been reserved for the general examination of the issue of form, period structure and metrical numbers in §§2.1.4–5.

<sup>203</sup> The ‘expansion’ is partly documented in Cohrs’ 1989 revisions, including (a) a reharmonisation of the chorale (mm. 641–648) and (b) mm. 679–727 (expanded final peroration), both in Cohrs’ handwriting. The measure numbers of the first three movements were reduced to “GZE” (Cohrs: “Grundzeiteinheiten”, obtained by rebarring each movement to correspond to the tempo of the first), amounting, interestingly enough, to 1,369 or 37<sup>2</sup> (cf. “Der musikalische Architekt...”, p. 25).

fundamental alterations of concept and perspective, such as subsequently came into play through the new philological perspectives, including the author's identification of the pc. sks. for the coda in early 1990. However, the quality of Cohrs' philological work, since 1997 attested to by the Studienband on the Scherzo movement and since 2000 by the new edition of the first three movements of the Ninth (MWV 2001) and the completion of the first proper Kritischer Bericht for the symphony, should be given full credit.<sup>204</sup>

#### 1.4.17 Conclusions.

It is not with the intention of discrediting any of the earlier performing versions that we have wished to proceed. Setting aside the fundamental error of assuming the validity of the Orel edition, many of these versions provide insights into the phenomenology of the material and some constitute significant achievements. But, with the best will in the world, even a superficial comparison of these scores with Samale's and Mazzuca's efforts reveals to what extent, given a detailed reading of Orel, a proper evaluation of the extant materials and careful adherence to the composer's style, a more philologically accurate and stylistically convincing reconstruction of Bruckner's score became possible—not merely a integration of the fragments into a more or less speculative, quasi-Brucknerian whole.

Concerning the manner in which the performing versions have tended to determine the reception of the Finale, three main issues emerge:

- i. The problems created by misinformation concerning the sources, for which an inadequate reading by musicologists of the Orel version, and not merely by the arrangers, must be held responsible.
- ii. What Gülke referred to as “subjectives Ermessen” on the part of critics concerning the ‘authenticity’ or otherwise of the sonic impression, criticism descending in some cases to outright bias and the promulgation of disinformation concerning the nature of the compositional artefact and activities of the arrangers.
- iii. The postulate fundamental to much musicology and which has only begun to decline in significance since the early 1990s, that reifies the musical texts of ‘great composers’ as cultural icons far removed from any evaluations as to their greater or lesser degree of success as musical compositions, and renders them as ‘untouchable’ as the sacred texts of any religion—the very derivation of the term ‘canon’ in relation to artistic repertoires.<sup>205</sup> As Lydia Goehr pointed out, the

<sup>204</sup> The author also gratefully acknowledges the insights and assistance Cohs generously provided. For instance, in March 1995 and later again in the same year (as well as in 1999 and 2000), Cohrs undertook many research requests for the author in Vienna in the course of his researches, as well as assisting with many requests for items of information from the ÖNB Musiksammlung, ABIL and others.

<sup>205</sup> See Wilhelm Erauw, “Canon formation: some more reflections on Lydia Goehr's *Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*”, *AcMus* 70 (1998), no. 2, in particular, pp. 113ff.

modernist musicological credo was developed in the early part of the nineteenth century as the proponents of instrumental music strove to better the status of this new art form within German culture, ascribing to it qualities of sublimity and ineffability. The musical ‘work’ emerged, and with it the notion of a perfected musical text.<sup>206</sup> The corollary to this reification of the completed musical work, paradoxically, was that the unfinished music of even a great composer, by virtue of its exclusion from the category of the ‘vollendet’, became infinitely *unworthy* to be placed on any sort of par with a completed work, and although accorded the status of a kind of ‘holy relic’, was removed from any possibility of consideration as an artistic achievement in its own right.

Underlying these factors, one of the most fundamental reasons why performing versions of the Bruckner Ninth Finale have been dismissed or rejected comes down to a more basic problem pragmatically described by Nicholas Slonimsky in his entertaining *Lexicon of Musical Invective* as the “Phenomenon of Non-Acceptance of the Unfamiliar”:

Many [critics] are men of great culture, writers of brilliant prose, who, when the spirit moves them, excel in the art of imaginative vituperation. They are adept at figures of speech, and they apply metaphorical language with considerable inventiveness to demolish the musical transgressors. Their only failing is that they confuse their ingrained listening habits with the unalterable ideal of beauty and perfection<sup>207</sup>

—or in this case, ‘authenticity’. Not merely music critics, but musicologists as well, with whom their profession is often closely associated, are capable of going to considerable lengths to justify views held uncritically and based on what are no more than ingrained listening habits in order to avoid the effort of having to re-evaluate long-held opinions. Ample confirmation will be found in the subsequent history of the Aufführungsfassung in ch. 3.4.

Musicological stringency, no less than professional ethics, renders it imperative that attempts to arrive at performing versions of unfinished works be built on a scrupulously accurate and detailed knowledge of available sources, their philologically defensible interpretation, an exhaustive knowledge of the composer’s stylistic development and the available primary and secondary literature, and should also properly document their procedures. Equally, critique of such efforts, in order to claim any kind of validity, must start from a commensurately accurate knowledge of the sources and understanding of the editors’ activities.

---

<sup>206</sup> See Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Musical Museum*, *passim*.

<sup>207</sup> *Lexicon of Musical Invective: Critical assaults on composers since Beethoven’s time*, 2nd edn., Seattle and London 1965, pp. 3f.





PART TWO

BRUCKNER AS THEORETICIAN

AND COMPOSER



## 2.0

### Prolegomena

Without Bruckner it is questionable whether Sechter's authority in theoretical matters would have survived much beyond his death. [...] The facts were undeniable: Bruckner was indeed an important, if controversial composer; and Sechter's teachings were to him the indispensable *Wissenschaft* of composition.

Bruckner taught throughout his life in capacities ranging from early experiences in small town schools to his later position at the Vienna Conservatory, his private students in Vienna, and his lectures at the University of Vienna. But never did he teach composition as we know it. His influence as a composer was unrelated to his pedagogical activities and thus, although influential, he created no school of composition. In Bruckner we see the inevitable end result of the ever-widening gap between theory and compositional practice which extended throughout the nineteenth century. In his pedagogical activities Bruckner once again shows his eighteenth-century outlook. However, due to the problematic relationship between the theory he taught and the music he wrote, it can only be seen as an anachronism.

—Robert Wason<sup>1</sup>

Wir kommen zu den *Fünfklingen*. Die Sechs- und Siebenklänge schenken wir uns. In der IX. Symphonie verwende ich Siebenklänge mit Auslassung von Terz und Quint und vollständiger Auflösung.

—Anton Bruckner<sup>2</sup>

#### 2.0.1 Introduction to Part Two.

WHAT, if anything, does Bruckner's well-documented study and teaching of harmony, counterpoint, form, and metrical structure tell us about his compositional style? Robert Wason rightly points out in the passage cited above that this is a subject for a study of its own, yet despite the superabundance of information in the form of innumerable first-hand accounts, studies, and not least of all the surviving documentation of Bruckner's MSS, an appropriately comprehensive study of the theoretical aspects of Bruckner's compositional method has yet to be made. Unquestionably this subject is a huge one: only broad outlines can here be given, and the most general conclusions drawn.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Viennese Harmonic Theory from Albrechtsberger to Schenker and Schoenberg* (Studies in Musicology 80), Ann Arbor 1985, pp. 67f. Italics original. Wason continues: “[t]he division between theory and practice also means that the influence of Sechter's theory upon Bruckner's composition—if indeed there really is any—is difficult to determine. That imposing topic—appropriate to a more specialized Bruckner study—will not be discussed here.”

<sup>2</sup> Bruckner, ed. Schwanzara, *Vorlesungen*, p. 169; quoted by Wason, p. 73. Emphasis original.

The period in which Sechter lived and taught in Vienna was characterised by the isolation of theoretical teaching from compositional practice. As Manfred Wagner, has noted, in contrast to the significance of Fux and Schoenberg, both important composers and theoreticians who lived before and after the period in question,

ist nichts zu vermerken bei Beethoven, Schubert und Bruckner, den herausragenden österreichischen Komponisten. Wohl sind sie musikalisch die Fortschrittlichsten [...], ohne sie ist, was nach ihnen kommt, kaum denkbar, aber theoretische Lehrmeinungen, Tonsatzschulen, Anweisungen zum Komponieren produzieren sie nicht. Dies gilt auch vollinhaltlich für Anton Bruckner trotz seiner 20 Jahre dauernden Tätigkeit als Universitätslehrer. Nichts Eigenes lehrt er, sondern gibt nur weiter, was ihn selbst gelehrt worden war. [...] Dieses Phänomen, das seinesgleichen sucht, ist die deutlichste Beweis jener Diskrepanz zwischen Theorie und Praxis, wie Wien sie damals aufweist.<sup>3</sup>

The inadequacy of the arch-conservative tradition of Viennese fundamental bass for the analysis of so much 19th-century music was due not only to its preservation of older, largely outmoded formal concepts, but also to the fact that it was not even seen as necessary that it be adequate to the music of the period, remaining, as Manfred Wagner has shown, tied to the conservatism of church music and thereby the “Unveränderlichkeit des kirchlichen Denkens”.<sup>4</sup> The publication by Bruckner's principal teacher Simon Sechter,<sup>5</sup> *Die Grundsätze der musikalischen Komposition*,<sup>6</sup> can justly be said, in terms of developments within compositional practice, to have been obsolete by the time of its publication<sup>7</sup>—Sechter's “Strenge und sein handwerkliches Können [...] sind die letzte Transposition barocker Arbeitsmethode in die neue Ära künstlerischen Selbstverständnisses”, as Wagner wrote,<sup>8</sup>—yet Bruckner never went substantially beyond the confines of its remarkably conservative theoretical system in his own teaching. Writers have tended to explain this in terms of Bruckner's belief in authority and his observance of a clear demarcation between theory and practice, and accordingly his lack of interest in any attempts to make Sechter's system more

<sup>3</sup> *Die Harmonielehre der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 38)*, Regensburg 1974, p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28. To this must be added the generally reactionary and repressively conservative character of the Austrian *Vormärz*, characterised by Metternich's diplomatic and Kolowrat's social policies.

<sup>5</sup> 1788–1867. Born in Friedberg, South Bohemia, where he studied with Kozeluch and Hartmann, Sechter was appointed First Court Organist in 1825, and in 1851 Professor of Thoroughbass and Counterpoint at the Conservatorium; he was succeeded in this position by Bruckner in 1868. Unquestionably one of the most influential teachers of the 19th century, Sechter taught Bruckner harmony and counterpoint from 1855 to 1861: Bruckner required three years for “Generalbaß- und Harmonielehre”, completed simple counterpoint in 1859, double, triple and quadruple counterpoint in 1860, and canon and fugue in 1861. Cf. Ernst Tittel, “Simon Sechter. Zum 100. Todestag am 10. September 1967”, *ÖMz* 22 (1967), pp. 550–551; Willi Reich, “Simon Sechter im eigenen Wort”, *NZfM* 132 (1971), pp. 539–541.

<sup>6</sup> 3 vols., Leipzig 1853–54.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Martin Vogel, *Beiträge zur Musiktheorie des 19. Jahrhunderts (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 4)*, Regensburg 1966, p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

relevant to his personal compositional practice. For Bruckner, allegedly—having composed solely within this antiquated tradition for the first forty years of his life—“[blieb] keine andere Wahl, als genau diesen Zeitraum schweigend, was sein künstlerisches Produktionsvermögen betrifft, zu überbrücken.”<sup>9</sup>

But the notion that an impermeable division existed between the compositional and theoretical realms in Bruckner’s compositional thinking, firstly, is contradicted by considerable evidence, both anecdotal and documentary; secondly, it can be regarded as symptomatic of the manner in which most scholars have ignored the compositional development of his mature style which, despite the liberating compositional stimulus he received from his first exposure to Wagner’s music in the early 1860s, emerged by degrees from the stylistic and theoretical milieu in which he trained. Moreover, Bruckner’s life-long teaching of theory reveals small but significant divergences from Sechter which testify to independent thought on his part, and perhaps even connote the prompting of compositional imperatives.

The ‘Trennung’ Bruckner maintained between theory and composition was thus less an unbridgeable gulf within his musical ego than an interactive zone or ‘Spannungsfeld’ between two polarities, between what he referred to as “Wissenschaft” and “Kunst”. Our understanding of the interaction between these two domains has been obscured, both by the strict didactic techniques which Bruckner, like Sechter before him, espoused, as well as by the fact that Bruckner, although he taught throughout his life, rarely had students advance beyond relatively basic studies in harmony and counterpoint. Bruckner never taught composition as such, nor would he have regarded it as particularly important to do so; moreover—and in this respect the title of this section is something of a misnomer—Bruckner never expounded his ‘own version’ of fundamental bass theory; it is nonetheless possible to locate considerable ‘implicit’ evidence as to his thinking. What interests us here is the influence which the apparently archaic theoretical model which Bruckner learned and taught may have had upon Bruckner’s highly advanced music, and how he himself rationalised this apparent paradox.

The extent to which it becomes necessary to problematise Bruckner’s separation of composition and theory becomes clearer when one compares his music with that of his immediate predecessors and most important models and stylistic influences. “Der Umstand der scharfen Trennung zwischen Theorie und Praxis, zwischen Komposition und Kompositionslehre [...] ist in Wien ohne Einschränkung gültig” wrote Manfred Wagner. “Selten ist in der Musikgeschichte so eindeutig das ‘Verbergen’ eines musiktheoretischen Konzeptes nachweisbar wie bei Beethoven und Schubert [...]”<sup>10</sup> Yet Warren Kirkendale<sup>11</sup> demonstrated

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Beethoven's lively interest in music theory and its role as a stimulus and catalyst for the late works,<sup>12</sup> even tracing the origin of a specific form of thematic variation in the *Große Fuge*, Op. 131,<sup>13</sup> back to the theoretical writings of Sechter's predecessor Albrechtsberger;<sup>14</sup> Schubert in his last year, as is well known, began studies in counterpoint with Sechter, cut short by his illness and untimely death.<sup>15</sup> Why then should we be justified in assuming that Bruckner's music bears little or no trace of his music-theoretical training and lifelong teaching practice—where, despite the influence of Wagner, so many aspects of Classical and Baroque musical language survive?<sup>16</sup>

### 2.0.2 Outline.

The purpose of this section in regard to the reconstruction of the Finale and the re-assessment of the Ninth Symphony resides in its attempt to better understand Bruckner's compositional process and the methodological approaches on which it depended. An important task for Bruckner scholarship remains to address the deficit that obtains in regard to the analytic comprehension of his in many respects unique music, which has always taken second place to attempts to come to terms with its content and 'meaning', and, more latterly, much needed positivist resolutions of the complex problems of both misconstrued biography and misconstrued musical texts. Manfred Wagner wrote in 1981:<sup>17</sup> "bis heute blieben Detailuntersuchungen Brucknersche Werkspezifika entweder gänzlich oder wurden in eine Sprache verschlüsselt, die mystisch-philosophisch dem zu erklärenden Phänomen beizukommen trachtete."<sup>18</sup> Moreover, Bruckner, as we have seen, came to be marginalised in American, and thereby, to a great extent, in later Anglo-American musicology, "because his compositional

<sup>11</sup> In his study of *Fugue and Fugato in Rococo and Classical Chamber Music*, revised and expanded 2nd edn., translated from the German by Margaret Bent and the author, Durham, N. C. 1979.

<sup>12</sup> P. 223. As in Bruckner's case, no complete documented study of the Beethoven's knowledge of older music had been made; Kirkendale noted (pp. 211ff.) that reminiscences in Beethoven's music could provide a key to composers known to him (p. 221).

<sup>13</sup> Namely "Unterbrechung".

<sup>14</sup> Beethoven copied out all the examples of Albrechtsberger's *Anweisung*, as Kirkendale explains (pp. 261f.).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. for instance, Maurice Brown, "Sechter, Simon", in: *NG* (1980) vol. 17, p. 99.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. for instance, Walter Gerstenberg, "Bruckners Symphonie—damals und heute", *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 177, where the significance of a "verborgene Linien, die Bruckner zur spätbarocken Musik geleitet haben" is discussed; see also Carl Dahlhaus, "Bruckner und der Barock", *NZfM* 124 (1963), pp. 335–336, or Günter Brosche, "Anton Bruckners Traditionsbewußtsein", *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 430–43. Peter Schleuning (*Johann Sebastian Bachs "Die Kunst der Fuge"*, pp. 215ff.) similarly demonstrated the role of sixteenth-century music and theoretical speculation in the late works of Johann Sebastian Bach. Concerning Bruckner's apparent use of Baroque *Figurenlehre* alongside his amalgamation of progressive elements, see Othmar Wessely, "Vergangenheit und Zukunft in Bruckners Messe in d-Moll", *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 413ff.

<sup>17</sup> "Zur Interpunktion in der Musik Anton Bruckners", *BrJb* 1981, p. 53.

<sup>18</sup> The lack of concrete, analytical approaches to Bruckner's music probably encouraged its reception as mystical and irrational in the 1920s and 1930s and can perhaps even be seen to have, by omission, paved the way for its political and ideological annexation under the Third Reich.

style was alien to the Brahmsian paradigm of logic, balance and economy so prevalent in the American academy of the time” (Gilliam<sup>19</sup>). In particular the attitude of Heinrich Schenker, one of the most influential theoreticians of the twentieth century, who, despite his admiration of the man, became one of the staunchest critics of the composer, profoundly influenced the analytical reception of Bruckner’s music, the structure and aesthetics of which, it must be said, Schenker profoundly misconstrued.<sup>20</sup> To a considerable extent Schenker’s critical rejection of Bruckner’s music was also founded on his rejection of Sechter’s theoretical model, which, as Eybl has noted, was based on entirely contrary premises to those which Schenker came to espouse.<sup>21</sup> Hence, Sechter’s ‘antiquated’ theory was more likely to be seen as a liability; as Schenker fulminated: “Vielleicht ist bei keinem Schaffenden des vergangenen Jahrhunderts so deutlich der Einfluß falscher Theorien und sinnlosen Unterrichts nachzuweisen wie bei Bruckner.”<sup>22</sup>

Bruckner scholarship is finally beginning to address this problem. The ensuing discussion therefore revisits the long-recognised ‘otherness’ of Bruckner’s style by attempting to re-assemble—not unlike the reconstruction of the fragments of the Finale—the apparently disparate shards, many of which were long considered irrelevant, of what was once a whole artistic and creative personality (which doubtless included many internal contradictions), and to demonstrate an analytical approach using terminology and concepts in regard to harmony, counterpoint, form and period structure which the composer himself might have recognised, and the relevance of which are substantiated by the evidence of Bruckner’s MSS, his training and teaching as well as their applicability to the analysis of his music.<sup>23</sup> In some respects this enacts a proposal made by Franz Grasberger over a quarter of a century ago:

Sehr nützlich dürfte es sein, Befund und Methode von Bruckners Arbeitsweise genau unter Beobachtung zu nehmen. Es entsteht dadurch eine gewissermaßen emotionsfreie

---

<sup>19</sup> “The Annexation...”, p. 600, cf. §1.3.12.

<sup>20</sup> According to Martin Eybl (“Grandiose Isolierzellen...”, pp. 140). Heinrich Schenker (1868–1935) studied harmony with Bruckner in 1887/88 and counterpoint 1888/89. See Heinrich Schenker, “Über Anton Bruckner”, Oswald Jonas, ed., *Der Dreiklang* 7 (Oct. 1937), pp. 166–176; Hellmut Federhofer, “Heinrich Schenkers Bruckner-Verständnis”, *AfMw* 39 (1982), pp. 198–217, and Martin Eybl, “Grandiose Isolierzellen...”, *passim*.

<sup>21</sup> “Sechter erfaßte den musikalischen Satz als geregelte Abfolge von Akkorden, Schenker als Stimmgefüge” (Eybl, p. 141). However, Eybl proceeds, quoting Klose, to question the extent to which Bruckner’s compositional practice ensued from his theoretical training—precisely the point of Schenker’s critique, and another instance of the all-too exclusive manner in which Bruckner’s “Trennung” of composition and theory has been understood.

<sup>22</sup> Heinrich Schenker, “Über Anton Bruckner”, p. 166; cf. also p. 168: “Bruckners sämtliche Werke sind trotz ihres heute wirklich ganz einzig dastehenden symphonischen Gedankenfluges einfach schlecht geschriebene Werke.”

<sup>23</sup> As Hermann Beck wrote concerning the appropriateness and utility of theory to musical analysis, wrote, “Werkanalyse, im Rahmen von Musiktheorie betrieben, sollte [...] in höherem Grade die Kompetenz der Theorie im Auge haben, also das Werk in dem Zusammenhang der jeweils relevanten Theorie und ihrer Analyseverfahren stellen [...]. Im Gefolge der traditionellen musiktheoretischen Lehren kann dagegen Werkanalyse nur sinnvoll sein, wenn sie mit Kenntnis und im Bewußtsein der besonderen historisch-bedingten Relativität der Theorien geführt wird” (*Methoden der Werkanalyse in Musikgeschichte und Gegenwart*, Wilhelmshaven 1974, pp.146f.).

Arbeitsbasis, die durchaus nicht im Formalprinzip sich erschöpfen muß aber gereinigte Ausgangspunkte schaffen kann.<sup>24</sup>

Nowak similarly advocated the application of Sechterian techniques to the analysis of Bruckner's music: "Besonders aufschlußreich wirken sich Untersuchungen aus, wie weit mit Sechters Methode die Kompositionen Bruckners erklärt werden können",<sup>25</sup> examples of which will be discussed in §§2.1.2 and 2.1.3. To avoid misinterpretation, it should be stated categorically that the claim is not being made here that Bruckner's musical language can be derived wholly from the vocabulary of the 'strenge Satz' or 'Palestrinastil',<sup>26</sup> since against the influence of Austrian church music and theoretical traditions must be balanced the impact made by the most progressive composers of the nineteenth century—foremost among them, of course, Richard Wagner. Yet, considering the remarkable nature of this fusion, there have been surprisingly few studies attempting to deal in any comprehensive manner with the origins of Bruckner's musical language. The relationship between Bruckner's theoretical understanding and his compositional technique, admittedly a vast field, has so far tended to be examined only in regard to specific aspects, and until recently remained prone to *a priori* assumptions of a rigid and impermeable separation between the two realms, essentially silencing discussion of this complex and fascinating topic. The evidence speaks of a far more fruitful interaction between the two, as the opening sections of the following chapter attempt to outline in regard to aspects of his harmonic practice (§§2.1.1–3). An important initial attempt at evaluating Bruckner's reconciliation of Sechterian theory and Wagnerian innovation along these lines was made recently by Graham Phipps.<sup>27</sup> Less well understood remain the ramifications of Bruckner's early theoretical training in regard to the formal conception of his symphonic works (§2.1.4), while studies published since this thesis was begun have revealed the significance for Bruckner's compositional method of his use of 'metrical numbers'—long dismissed as representing little more than evidence of obsessive-compulsive tendencies on the part of the composer (§2.1.5). Scholars such as Timothy

<sup>24</sup> "Neue Aspekte des Bruckner-Bildes", *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 429f.

<sup>25</sup> "Probleme der Bruckner-Forschung", *Ges. Aufs.* p. 183.

<sup>26</sup> Winfried Kirsch, for instance, wrote of a 1969 dissertation of Karl Unger (*Studien zur Harmonik Anton Bruckners: Einwirkung und Umwandlung älterer Klangstrukturen*, diss., Heidelberg 1969; abstract, see *ÖMz* 25 (1970), pp. 87–88) that "nicht die durchaus originelle und einsichtige Grundidee der Schrift—die theoretische Herauslösung der Brucknerschen Harmonik aus dem Bann der zeitgenössischen schulmäßigen Harmonielehre—, sondern die daraus resultierende Konsequenz—die sehr weit getriebenen Ableitung der Brucknerschen Harmonik aus harmonischen Gesetzmäßigkeiten und Vorstellungen der alten Vokalpolyphonie sowie deren Interpretation—, scheint das Problem der Arbeit zu sein" ("Die Bruckner-Forschung seit 1945 (III)", pp. 213f.).

<sup>27</sup> "Bruckner's free application of strict Sechterian theory with stimulation from Wagnerian sources: an assessment of the first movement of the Seventh Symphony", in: Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson, eds., *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, Aldershot 2001, pp. 228–258. Unfortunately, the publication became available only shortly before the submission of this dissertation; the arguments developed here were formulated without reference to it.



Jackson,<sup>28</sup> Thomas Röder<sup>29</sup> and most recently and comprehensively Wolfgang Grandjean<sup>30</sup> have confronted, and to a great extent resolved, the problem of why and how Bruckner used this unique analytical tool, to a great extent resolving the problem of the theory/composition dichotomy in this area and significantly enriching our understanding of Bruckner and his music in the process. An assessment will also be made of the as yet speculative idea that Bruckner used symbolic numbers to determine the proportions of his music (§2.1.6).

Of great significance, obviously, for the reconstruction of Bruckner's textures in the Aufführungsfassung of the Finale remains the recognition by Werner F. Korte<sup>31</sup> of a comprehensive *Mutationsverfahren* underlying Bruckner's mature compositional practice, of which the Finale of the Ninth, by virtue of its tightly organised motivic vocabulary, provides one of the 'purest' examples, and in many respects represents an endpoint in terms of the saturation of the compositional structure by this process. Here again Bruckner appears as an 'implicit' theoretician or analyst, at many points consciously using such techniques to strengthen the unity of his music and its web of motivic interconnection. Again, chapter 2.2 can present no more than an overview of this topic, but goes beyond the scope of previous studies by making a more detailed analysis of the *Mutationsverfahren* as it appears to operate in the Ninth Symphony (§2.2.2), and reviews the relationship of this process to Bruckner's use of thematic quotation and allusion (§2.2.3) and his conception of the Ninth Symphony (§2.2.4).

### 2.0.3 Literature.

Foundational to several of the concepts developed in this section was the insightful and progressive view of the composer outlined in Alfred Orel's 1940 publication *Anton Bruckner: Das Werk—Der Künstler—Die Zeit*.<sup>32</sup> The fact that more comprehensive attempts have not yet been made to arrive at a better and more detailed understanding of the interface between theory and composition in Bruckner's teaching and works is all the more astonishing given that the literature features a plethora of primary texts and associated studies concerning his

---

<sup>28</sup> "Bruckner's Metrical Numbers", *19th-Century Music* 14, no. 2 (Fall 1990), pp. 101–131; in particular p. 104, where Jackson suggests Bruckner was indeed concerned with the relationship of theory to practice. Cf. also Jackson's article on the development of Bruckner's thinking about hidden octaves in his music, "Bruckner's *Oktaven*: the problem of consecutives, doubling, and orchestral voice-leading", in: Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson, eds., *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, Aldershot 2001, pp. 30–66.

<sup>29</sup> Röder, "Eigenes angewandtes Nachsinnen—Bruckners Selbststudium in Fragen der Metrik", in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 107–122.

<sup>30</sup> Wolfgang Grandjean, *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner (Publikationen des Instituts für Musikforschung 25)*, Tutzing 2001. Sincere thanks is due to Benjamin Cohrs for making the opening sections of this text available shortly before the conclusion of this thesis.

<sup>31</sup> *Bruckner und Brahms: Die spätromantische Lösung der autonomen Konzeption*, Tutzing 1963.

<sup>32</sup> Vienna–Leipzig 1925.

theoretical studies.<sup>33</sup> Those relevant to Sechter's theory of fundamental bass and Bruckner's teaching of it are listed here; texts relating to other aspects of Bruckner's theoretical training and compositional method are cited in chapters 2.1 and 2.2.

The vast majority of the surviving accounts relate to Bruckner's teaching of harmony.<sup>34</sup> Among these, Alfred Orel's *Ein Harmonielehrkolleg bei Anton Bruckner* presents the annotations of Bruckner's student Carl Speiser, while Ernst Schwanzara stenographically recorded the final lectures of Bruckner at the University of Vienna between 1892 and 1894 in *Vorlesungen über Harmonie und Kontrapunkt an der Universität Wien*, attending the entire course three times over to ensure the accuracy of his notes. This is by far the more substantial and comprehensive of these two accounts, and significantly more accurate in regard to detail;<sup>35</sup> it must be borne in mind, however, that Bruckner's university lectures were intended largely for a lay audience rather than for musicians or composers, and also that Bruckner, while maintaining the essential structure of his approach, omitted some material of a more advanced nature.<sup>36</sup> A further important source which perhaps represents the opposite problem are the six volumes of harmony and counterpoint exercises left by Josef Vockner (1842–1906), Bruckner's successor as organ professor at the Conservatorium and the only private student to have undertaken the “ganze Studien” of harmony and counterpoint under him.<sup>37</sup> Unfortunately, few statements by the composer are preserved in these otherwise valuable sources, which remain in private hands;<sup>38</sup> moreover, Schenk and Gruber, in their study of

<sup>33</sup> See in particular Ernst Tittel, “Bruckners musikalischer Ausbildungsgang”, in: *Bruckner-Studien: Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, Franz Grasberger, ed., Vienna 1964, pp. 105–111 (research to some extent now superseded), the works by Zeleny and Schwanzara (listed *infra*) and more comprehensively and recently Robert Wason, *Viennese Harmonic Theory from Albrechtsberger to Schenker and Schoenberg* (*infra*).

<sup>34</sup> These are, in chronological order: Ernst Decsey, “Anton Bruckner als Lehrer der Sechterschen Theorie: Erinnerungen und Beiträge”, *Die Musik* 6, no. 4 (1906–07), pp. 191–204; Friedrich Eckstein, *Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*, Vienna 1923; Friedrich Klose, *Meine Lehrjahre bei Anton Bruckner: Erinnerungen und Betrachtungen*, Regensburg 1927; Max von Oberleithner, *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*, Regensburg 1933; Alfred Orel, *Ein Harmonielehrkolleg bei Anton Bruckner*, Berlin–Vienna–Zurich 1940; Anton Bruckner, *Vorlesungen über Harmonie und Kontrapunkt an der Universität Wien*, ed. Ernst Schwanzara, Vienna 1950; Dika Newlin, “Bruckner the Teacher”, *Ch&D* 2, no. 9 (1960), pp. 35–38; William Waldstein, “Bruckner als Lehrer”, in: *Bruckner-Studien: Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, Franz Grasberger, ed., Vienna 1964, pp. 113–120; Erich Schenk and Gernot Gruber, “‘Die ganzen Studien’ zu Josef Vockners Theorieunterricht bei Anton Bruckner”, in: *Bruckner-Studien. Festgabe der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum 150. Geburtstag von Anton Bruckner*, Othmar Wessely, ed., Vienna 1975, pp. 349–377; Hellmut Federhofer, “Rafael Loidols Theorie-Kolleg bei Bruckner 1879/80”, in: *Bruckner-Studien: Festgabe der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum 150. Geburtstag von Anton Bruckner*, ed. Othmar Wessely, Vienna 1975; Rudolf Flotzinger, “Bruckner als Theorielehrer an der Universität”, in: *Anton Bruckner in Lehre und Forschung*, Regensburg 1976; Andrea V. Harrandt, “Harmonielehrunterricht bei Bruckner—Zu zwei neu aufgefundenen Vorlesungsmitschriften”, in: *BrSympBer 1988: Anton Bruckner als Schüler und Lehrer*, Linz–Vienna 1990, pp. 71–83.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Schwanzara, pp. 4f., which takes exception to several points of Orel's *Ein Harmonielehrkolleg*.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Schwanzara, p. 64, Stradal, “Erinnerungen...”, p. 855, Wason, p. 80.

<sup>37</sup> Schenk and Gruber, pp. 374f. The dates in Vockner's studies show that this covered twelve years (1876–1888), although lessons appear to have been more sporadic in later years. See concerning Vockner, Norbert Tschulik, “Der Bruckner-Schüler Josef Vockner”, *BrJb* 1989/90, in particular p. 291.

<sup>38</sup> They were given to Schenk by Vockner's son (*ibid.*, p. 350); they do not appear in the catalogue of the ÖNB.

them, necessarily limited themselves to a discussion of the harmony exercises. Vockner's two volumes of materials representing Bruckner's approach to counterpoint, poorly represented elsewhere as well, were not included in their discussion.<sup>39</sup>

Alongside these and several more minor sources must be mentioned the memoirs of Bruckner's other private students, the most significant of which are accounts by Bruckner's Conservatorium student Ernst Decsey and his private students Friedrich Eckstein and Friedrich Klose.<sup>40</sup> Eckstein saw little or no apparent contradiction between Bruckner's theoretical thinking and compositional practice, but Klose did: the latter's *Meine Lehrjahre bei Anton Bruckner* devoted considerable space to his harmony and counterpoint studies with Bruckner, but remained highly sceptical of the value of Bruckner's teaching.<sup>41</sup>

In contrast, few studies survive of Bruckner's teaching of counterpoint.<sup>42</sup> Part of the reason for this is that the counterpoint component was gradually reduced from Bruckner's university teaching, about which we are significantly better informed than Bruckner's private or Conservatorium teaching.<sup>43</sup> Bruckner's copy of Marpurge's *Abhandlung von der Fuge*, edited by Sechter, which Bruckner used autodidactically during the Kronstorf period if not later under Sechter, indicates Bruckner's close study of it.<sup>44</sup> Klose<sup>45</sup> explained that in his counterpoint lessons Bruckner took Cherubini's *Cours de contrepoint*<sup>46</sup> as a basis, which included examples by Cherubini, Fux and Marpurge, and reveals Fux's approach:

zwei-, drei- und vierstimmig, dann den Kanon in verschiedenen Formen, den doppelten Kontrapunkt in den Intervallen von der None bis zur Quinzezime [...], schließlich die

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Schenk and Gruber, p. 352.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. the listing of articles in fn. 34 *supra*.

<sup>41</sup> "Was ich an solchem Unterricht bemängle, ist lediglich die allzu einseitige Betonung des Theoretischen auf Kosten des Künstlerischen" (p. 93). Bruckner appears to have had his own reservations about Klose, according to Stradal nicknaming him "Der Egoist" ("Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit", *ZfM* 99, no. 10, Oct. 1932, p. 856). Eckstein, on the other hand, regarded the Sechterian "Zwangsjacke" (Klose) as providing both compositional stimulus and practical assistance (pp. 11f.); this is echoed by Decsey (p. 204).

<sup>42</sup> Among the studies listed above see in particular those of Eckstein, Klose, and Harrant, as well as those of Zeleny, Eybl and Federhofer listed in fn. 50 *infra*. As noted, Schenk and Gruber did not deal with Vockner's exercises in counterpoint.

<sup>43</sup> Schwanzara (p. 60) noted the extreme curtailment in Bruckner's university teaching plan of the counterpoint component, which was reduced from 1881 onwards to only two to three hours, and dealt only with the most fundamental concepts; his account of Bruckner's single lecture on counterpoint from July of the 1891/1892 year covers a total of 4 pp. While conclusions overly dependent on the records of Bruckner's university teaching should perhaps be avoided, it is reasonable to claim, with Wason, that Sechter's harmonic system "became considerably more 'harmonic' in Bruckner's hands" (p. 71). Elisabeth Maier ("Neue Bruckneriana aus Privatbesitz", *IBG-Mitt* 36, June 1991, pp. 6ff.) reported on the discovery of a volume *Meine Kontrapunktstudien bei Anton Bruckner 1882–1884* by Carl Führich, the first complete summary of Bruckner's teaching of counterpoint at the Conservatorium (see *infra*).

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Tittel, "Bruckner's musikalische Ausbildungsgang", p. 106f.; cf. Wason, pp. 68ff.

<sup>45</sup> Pp. 80ff.; as noted by Zeleny, p. 466.

<sup>46</sup> The text of the work is in fact by Jacques-Fromental Halévy, German translation by Franz David Christoph Stölpel, Leipzig 1835/36.

Fuge. Er ist ein ungemein knappes, übersichtliches Lehrbuch, irgendwie in der Sachlichkeit mit Sechter verwandt; wenn es auf Fux beruht, so ist es doch präziser, Begründungen für die Regeln und alle Überflüssigkeiten fehlen.<sup>47</sup>

We also know from Carl Führich's annotations of Bruckner's teaching of counterpoint at the Conservatorium that Bruckner's teaching of counterpoint began with the "5 Gattungen des alten Contrapunktes".<sup>48</sup> Tittel claimed that Bruckner was the "erste oberösterreichische Großmeister [...], der den Fuxschen *Gradus* nicht benützte", writing that research had not established whether he was familiar with it from other sources;<sup>49</sup> the Führich annotations confirms Klose's assertion that he was.

In addition to these essential source texts, a large number of studies exist of both the Viennese thoroughbass tradition as well as Bruckner's grounding in and teaching of that tradition, the most reliable and comprehensive being the studies by Walter Zeleny, Manfred Wagner and again Robert Wason.<sup>50</sup> Both Tittel and Wason give relatively complete listings of Bruckner's textbooks, which highlight the intensely conservative nature of Bruckner's training,<sup>51</sup> while the ÖNB holds a small remnant of Bruckner's copies (see Table I): Sechter's

<sup>47</sup> Zeleny, *ibid.* See also concerning Eckstein's summary of his extensive contrapuntal studies with Bruckner, *Erinnerungen*, pp. 57ff.

<sup>48</sup> Maier, "Neue Bruckneriana", p. 8.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. "Bruckners musikalischer Ausbildungsgang", p. 110; cf. Federhofer, "Heinrich Schenkers Bruckner-Verständnis", pp. 214f.

<sup>50</sup> See: Ernst Tittel, "Bruckners musikalischer Ausbildungsgang"; *idem*, "Wiener Musiktheorie von Fux bis Schönberg", in: *Beiträge zur Musiktheorie des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Martin Vogel, ed. (*Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* 4), Regensburg 1966; Walter Zeleny, *Die Historischen Grundlagen des Theoriesystems von Simon Sechter* (*Wiener Veröffentlichungen zur Musikwissenschaft* 10, ed. Othmar Wessely), Tutzing 1979; Manfred Wagner, *Die Harmonielehre der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (*Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* 38), Regensburg 1974; Elisabeth Maier and Franz Zamazal, *Anton Bruckner und Leopold Zenetti* (*Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien* 3, ed. Franz Grasberger), Graz 1980; William Earl Caplin, "Harmony and Meter in the Theories of Simon Sechter", *Music Theory Spectrum* 2 (1980), pp. 74–89; Robert Wason, "Schenker's Notion of Scale-Step in Historical Perspective: Non-Essential Harmonies in Viennese Fundamental Bass Theory", *Journal of Music Theory* 27, no. 1 (1983), pp. 49–73; *idem*, *Viennese Harmonic Theory from Albrechtsberger to Schenker and Schoenberg* (*Studies in Musicology* 80), Anne Arbor, Michigan 1985; Hellmut Federhofer, "Heinrich Schenkers Bruckner-Verständnis", *AfMw* 39 (1982), pp. 198–217; Martin Eybl, "Grandiose Isolierzellen und rasselnde Fugenmechanik—Zu Schenkers Kritik an seinem Lehrer Bruckner", *BrSympBer 1988: Anton Bruckner als Schüler und Lehrer*, Linz–Vienna 1992, pp. 137–145. Several further articles are to be found in *BrSympBer 1988: Bruckner als Schüler und Lehrer*, Linz 1992.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Wason, p. 68, who cites Tittel's "Bruckners musikalischer Ausbildungsgang", pp. 105f. The following list, based on these two sources, summarises the texts used by Bruckner during his studies:

- i. August Johann Baptist Dürrnberger, *Elementarbuch der Harmonie und Generalbaßlehre* (Linz, according to Tittel, probably 1841, but notes its use by Bruckner in the first Linz period, 1840–41). Tittel ("Wiener Musiktheorie...", pp. 188f.) and Wason (p. 71) both note that Dürrnberger's simpler presentation of the material (intervals presented before chords, for example) provided a basis for Bruckner's approach in his university teaching.
- ii. Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg, *Handbuch bey dem Generalbasse und der Composition* (Berlin, 1755–58, 3 vols.); the work was given to Bruckner by Dürrnberger and used in Windhaag, 1841–3.
- iii. Daniel Gottlob Türk, *Anweisung zum Generalbaßspiel*, (first published 1791, 2nd edition 1800; this edition appears to be that cited in Göll.-A. I, p. 220 cf. II/1, p. 343), although according to Tittel, Bruckner probably used the Tobias Haslinger reprint, which appeared between 1832 and 1837, while Wason

*Grundsätze* (ÖNB 3174), Dürrnberger's *Elementar-Lehrbuch* (ÖNB 28.246) and Sechter's edition of Marpurg's *Abhandlung von der Fuge* (ÖNB 28.275), as already mentioned. The abundant marginalia of these texts still awaits a proper evaluation.<sup>52</sup> A number of important accounts of Bruckner's teaching remain in MS, including no fewer than five unpublished MSS by Bruckner's student Friedrich Eckstein, comprising in part a three-volume *A. Bruckners System der Musiktheorie*, held by the ÖNB (28.443–7; see Table I). Along with Eckstein's attempts to faithfully convey Bruckner's theoretical thinking may be noted a number of attempts to update or reform Sechterian theory and better adapt it to music using extended tonality. These date from the late 1870s onwards and include texts by Karl

---

(p. 162) notes the discrepancy and suggests, on the basis of other authorities, the date of the Steiner edition (that cited in Göll.-A. II/1, p. 343) as 1822, that of the Haslinger reprint as 1828. This work was in any case that used by Bruckner during the lessons he took during the Kronstorfer period, 1843–5, with Leopold von Zenetti (1805–1892, organist and *regens chori* in Enns; cf. Göll.-A. I, pp. 218ff.).

- iv. Daniel Gottlob Türk, *Von den wichtigsten Pflichten eines Organisten, ein Beitrag zur Verbesserung der musikalischen Liturgie* (1787), a work recommended to Bruckner by Zenetti.
- v. Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg, *Abhandlung von der Fuge* (originally published Berlin 1753–4, edited by Sechter, Vienna 1843; undated according to Wason, p. 68); this was used autodidactically by Bruckner during the Kronstorf period and again during the period of instruction with Sechter, 1855–61.
- vi. Simon Sechter, *Die Grundsätze der musikalischen Komposition*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1853–4), used during the Sechter period. Zeleny (p. 466) points out that volume I of the *Grundsätze* was not entitled 'Harmonielehre' but "Die richtige Folge der Grundharmonien", while volume II dealt with the ordering of harmony into rhythm (cf. §2.1.5) and volume III with two- and three-part harmony. The material of volume III properly pertained to volume I: the division was occasioned by the work's publication history, as Sechter at first did not expect all parts to be published, and thus selected only the most important for publication first. Zeleny (p. 286) and Phipps (p. 228, fn. 4) both cite the MS of a fourth, unpublished section of Sechter's *Grundsätze* entitled *Vom Canon*, held in the Archives of the Gesellschaft der Musik; a further MS, *Von der Fuge*, is regarded as lost; both probably formed the basis for Bruckner's studies with Sechter in these areas.
- vii. Adolph Bernhard Marx, *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition praktisch-theoretisch*, 4 vols. (Leipzig 1837), which formed the chief text during Bruckner's instruction with Otto Kitzler.

Wason (p. 68; cf. his more detailed list of sources, pp. 162f.) confirms Tittel's list with the addition of Marpurg's *Handbuch bei dem Generalbasse und der Composition* (Berlin 1755–60), on the basis of a reference in Friedrich Eckstein's unpublished notes, *Anton Bruckners Universitäts-Vorlesungen über Harmonielehre, gehalten 1884–86 zu Wien* (ÖNB Mus. Hs. 28.445 A). See also Elisabeth Maier's summary of Bruckner's theoretical and compositional influences during his early musical training, "Originalgenie oder Epigone? Zum Problem der künstlerischen Beeinflussung bei Bruckner", *BrJb* 1994/95/96, pp. 91–98. Röder ("Eigenes angewandtes Nachsinnen...", p. 107) mentions also Heinrich Christoph Koch, *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition* (3 vols., Rudolstadt 1782, 1787, 1793), of which Bruckner owned only the first two volumes. In addition to these come the texts of Lobe and Richter, apparently used previous to, then later alongside Marx during Bruckner's studies with Kitzler (cf. §2.1.4); Grandjean (*Metrik und Form...*, p. 161) suggests that Bruckner may also have been familiar, presumably via Sechter, who knew the text, with Anton Reicha's *Vollständigen Lehrbuch der musikalischen Composition* (transl. by Carl Czerny, Vienna 1832; originally published as the *Traité de mélodie*, Paris 1814; cf. §2.1.5).

Of all of these texts, Auer lists only the *Anweisung zum Generalbaßspiel* of Türk and the *Elementarlehrbuch der Harmonie und Generalbaßlehre* of Dürrnberger as included in the remnant of Bruckner's estate received by Göllicher from Bruckner's sister Rosalie Hueber (Göll.-A. II/1, pp. 336ff.).

<sup>52</sup> These were referred to by Jackson, "Bruckner's Metrical Numbers", p. 104. Röder uses the marginalia in vol. 2, *Von den Gesetzen des Taktes* of Sechter's *Grundsätze* as a basis for his discussion of Bruckner's metrical conceptions, in "Eigenes angewandtes Nachsinnen", pp. 107ff.; cf. §2.1.5.

Mayrberger<sup>53</sup> (which followed Sechter relatively closely and apparently even found Wagner's approval<sup>54</sup>), then, at greater variance from Sechter, Joseph Schalk<sup>55</sup> (of whose efforts Bruckner did not approve<sup>56</sup>) and, as late as the turn of the century, Cyrill Hynais<sup>57</sup> and Georg Capellen.<sup>58</sup> Such efforts to update or reform Viennese fundamental bass theory ultimately remained barren, since historically speaking, an approach to music theory and composition claiming to supply comprehensive 'analysis' won out over one intended solely to impart technical 'craft'.<sup>59</sup>

Nonetheless, while the fundamental bass tradition had become inadequate to supply a conceptual foundation for the increasingly chromatic musical language of the later nineteenth century, it was far from inadequate in imparting the ground rules for its composition; Bruckner's case makes this abundantly clear, as we will see. And if Bruckner's acquaintance with Sechter represented "ein entscheidendes Erlebnis in seinem künstlerischen Werdegang",<sup>60</sup> as Schwanzara claimed, Bruckner's subsequent confrontation with Wagner's *Tannhäuser*, coming at the end of the ensuing period of study with Otto Kitzler, was no less consequential:

Hingerissen von den berausenden Harmonien und Melodien, erkannte Bruckner voll Staunen und Begeisterung, daß Wagners großartiges Werk eine geniale Erfüllung von

---

<sup>53</sup> *Lehrbuch der musikalischen Harmonik*, Preßburg–Leipzig 1878, and *Die Harmonik Richard Wagner's an dem Leitmotiv aus 'Tristan und Isolde' erläutert*, Bayreuth 1882. Mayrberger's approach is discussed in Wason, *Viennese Music Theory*, pp. 84ff. Concerning the reform attempts of Mayrberger and Schalk, cf. also Tittel, "Bruckners musikalische Ausbildungsgang", p. 110, and *idem*, "Wiener Musiktheorie...", pp. 186f.

<sup>54</sup> As reported by Schwanzara, p. 33, and Eckstein, p. 33.

<sup>55</sup> Of several shorter theoretical writings see for instance "Das Gesetz der Tonalität", *Bayreuther Blätter* 11 (1888), pp. 192–7, 381–7; 12 (1889), pp. 191–8; 13 (1890), pp. 65–70. These are discussed in Wason, *Viennese Music Theory*, pp. 102ff.; see also Wason's "Josef Schalk and the Theory of Harmony at the End of the Nineteenth Century", in: Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, eds., *Bruckner Studies*, Cambridge 1997, pp. 122–139.

<sup>56</sup> Decsey, p. 202: "aus reinem Instinkt [...] sprach sich Bruckner dagegen aus und opponierte selbst Schalk, sein Generalissimus, aufs heftigste: er empfand, dass mit dem diatonischen System Sechter stehe und falle." However, Decsey is far from fully reliable; Zeleny noted (p. 468) that: "Im journalistischer Schwung nimmt man's nicht so genau." Decsey here omitted to state that Sechter already had an interpretation of expanded tonality, third-related progressions etc., as enharmonic modulations; here, Bruckner was simply stating that he did not want to see chromatic progressions reduced to diatonic roots by means of forced explanations, as Schalk was attempting to do. Schalk's example, quoted by Decsey, involved the analysis of a B♭-major  $\frac{6}{3}$  chord within G major as a ♭13th chord on D (Decsey, pp. 202f., cf. Wason's discussion of this in *Viennese Music Theory*, *ibid.*).

<sup>57</sup> "Die Harmonik Richard Wagner's in Bezug auf die Fundamentaltheorie Sechter's", *Neue Musikalische Presse* 10, nos. 4–7 (1901), pp. 50–52, 67–69, 81–82, 97–100. See Wason, pp. 100ff.

<sup>58</sup> *Ist das System S. Sechter's ein geeigneter Ausgangspunkt für die theoretische Wagnerforschung? Streitschrift (Sammlung Musikwissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen 2)*, Leipzig 1902.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. for instance Tittel, "Bruckners musikalischer Ausbildungsgang", pp. 107f.

<sup>60</sup> Schwanzara, p. 21. Wason (p. 164) notes Schwanzara's view that Sechter's theory provided the basis of Bruckner's compositional technique without following up on a number of clues that he himself presents, but which were admittedly peripheral to his intentions.

Sechters entsprechend weiterentwickelten Theorien sei und daß er selbst nun mit Sechterschem Rüstzeug ein Meisterwerk schaffen könne.<sup>61</sup>

The extent of the self-emancipation that Bruckner achieved in his symphonic works post-1867 should not cause us to lose sight of the fact that, as Doebel notes,<sup>62</sup> Bruckner was already 38 when he first came into contact with Wagner's music, an age at which many aspects of his musical thinking were already fully formed—Doebel even places this conflict in connection with Bruckner's nervous collapse of 1867.<sup>63</sup> Bruckner's 'sublime' solution to this confrontation with the musical 'Other' was not to renounce but to synthesise the profound conservatism of his social and musical upbringing with the music of the Neudeutsche school and Wagner—herein lies the secret of Bruckner's uniqueness. "Diese Einheit", Doebel notes,

charakterisiert die künstlerische Vision Anton Bruckners, eine in höchstem Maße eigenständige und dabei urtypische Vision des symphonischen Klanges und der Form, welche Bruckner mit der Schöpferkraft seines Genies in all seinen Symphonien konsequent und doch jedesmal aufs neue umzusetzen verstand.<sup>64</sup>

The theorist Graham Phipps, in his analysis of the first movement of the Seventh in terms of a "free application of strict Sechterian theory with stimulation from Wagnerian sources"—an accurate and productive evaluation of the relationship—draws parallels between Wagner's harmony and motives in *Tannhäuser* and other works with passages in Bruckner's Seventh, even underlying indications of fundamental bass roots, as in the examples from the Ninth discussed here.<sup>65</sup> His approach demonstrates the value of examining Bruckner's music from the standpoint of his theoretical practice and complements the author's approach to aspects of Bruckner's harmonic practice in the Ninth.

Nonetheless: if Bruckner's mature compositional style was founded on an extension of Sechterian principles, his continued espousal of Sechterian theory in his University teaching, which continued to 1894, represented an in many respects paradoxical survival of what was by then seen as an antiquated and irrelevant theoretical model. As Wason has shown,<sup>66</sup> fundamental bass theory would be historically supplanted on the one hand by Schoenberg,

---

<sup>61</sup> Schwanzara, *ibid.* Concerning the impact of Wagner upon Bruckner, exhaustively discussed in the literature, see Constantin Floros, "Bruckners Symphonik und die Musik Richard Wagners", in: *BrSympBer 1984: Bruckner, Wagner und die Neudeutschen in Österreich*, Linz-Vienna 1986, pp. 177–183; Rudolf Stephan, "Bruckner und Wagner", in: *BrSympBer 1984: Bruckner, Wagner und die Neudeutschen in Österreich*. Linz-Vienna 1986, pp. 59–65; Andrea Harrandt, "Bruckner und das Erlebnis Wagner", *IBG-Mitt* no. 38 (June 1992), pp. 5–15. See Doebel, pp. 44–76, particularly 74ff.

<sup>62</sup> P. 76.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> P. 76.

<sup>65</sup> Pp. 232ff. As noted above, this article only became available shortly before the conclusion of this study.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Wason's conclusions concerning "The 'Bruckner problem'", *Viennese Music Theory*, p. 84.

who in fact maintained many elements of Sechter's *Stufentheorie*,<sup>67</sup> and on the other by the *Schichtenlehre* of Bruckner's vehement critic, Heinrich Schenker.<sup>68</sup> The task here will be less to demonstrate its inadequacy as a tool for the analysis of late-nineteenth-century music than to explore the extent to which it operated for Bruckner as a crucial component of his compositional technique.

---

<sup>67</sup> See Arnold Schoenberg, *Harmonielehre*, 3rd edn. Vienna 1922, pp. 69ff., where Schoenberg discusses varying strengths of chord progressions, strikingly recalling the principles of fundamental bass theory.

<sup>68</sup> Wason, pp. 133ff. Cf. Schenker's *Harmony*, edited and annotated by Oswald Jonas. transl. by Elizabeth Mann Borgese, Chicago–London 1954.



## 2.1

### Bruckner's "Musikalische Architektur"

NB. daß die Werke auf wissenschaftlich-kontrapunktischer Grundlage beruhen.

—Anton Bruckner<sup>1</sup>

#### 2.1.1 The relationship between theory and composition.

FUNDAMENTAL to any discussion of the role of theory in Bruckner's compositional practice is his frequently invoked *Antrittsrede* at the University of Vienna, drafted in November 1875 and delivered at the beginning of summer semester in 1876.<sup>2</sup> Of any of Bruckner's recorded writings or verbal statements, this enlightening if cryptically worded document comes closest to expounding any sort of coherent theory or philosophy or composition. We read:

Wie Sie selbst aus verschiedenen Quellen wissen werden, hat die Musik innerhalb eines Zeitraumes von zwei Jahrhunderten so kolossale Fortschritte gemacht, sich in ihrem inneren Organismus so erweitert und vervollständigt, daß wir heute—werfen wir einen Blick auf dieses reiche Materiale—vor einem bereits vollendeten Kunstbau stehen, an welchem wir eine gewisse Gesetzmäßigkeit in den Gliederungen desselben sowie eine gleiche von diesen Gliedern dem ganzen Kunstbau gegenüber erkennen werden. Wir sehen, wie das eine aus dem anderen hervorwächst, eines ohne das andere nicht bestehen kann und doch jedes *für sich* wieder ein Ganzes bildet.

So wie jeder wissenschaftliche Zweig sich zur Aufgabe macht, sein Materiale durch das Aufstellen von Gesetzen und Regeln zu ordnen und zu sichten, so hat ebenfalls auch die musikalische Wissenschaft—ich erlaube mir, ihr dieses Attribut beizulegen—ihren ganzen Kunstbau bis in die Atome sezirt, die Elemente nach gewissen Gesetzen zusammengruppiert und somit eine Lehre geschaffen, welche auch mit anderen Worten die musikalische Architektur genannt werden kann.

In dieser Lehre bilden wieder die vornehmen Kapitel der Harmonielehre und des Kontrapunktes die Fundamente und die Seele derselben.

Nach dem Vorausgelassenen werden Sie, meine Herren, mir zugeben müssen, daß zur richtigen Würdigung und genauen Beurteilung eines Tonwerkes, wobei zuerst erforscht werden muß, wie und inwieweit diesen ebenerwähnten Gesetzen in demselben entsprochen wurde, sowie zum eigenen Schaffen—nämlich eigene Gedanken musikalisch korrekt verwirklichen, sie belebend machen—vor allem die volle Kenntnis von der

---

<sup>1</sup> In a telegram of 7 June 1891 to Hermann Levi, requesting him to write a reference on his works; Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 180.

<sup>2</sup> According to Schwanzara (p. 52; cf. pp. 47ff.), this must have been 24 April 1876. Both Jackson ("Bruckner's Metrical Numbers", pp. 101f., "Bruckner's *Oktaven*", pp. 35.) and Grandjean (*Metrik und Form...*, p. 14; see *infra*) discuss the insights into Bruckner's compositional and theoretical thinking provided by this document.

erwähnten Musikarchitektur, beziehungsweise von den Fundamenten dieser Lehre notwendig ist.<sup>3</sup>

Schwanzara's account of Bruckner's dealings with the university<sup>4</sup> reveal that Bruckner fought against considerable odds—above all the opposition of Eduard Hanslick, who regarded such subjects appropriate only to a trade school—to have the teaching of harmony and counterpoint accepted there.<sup>5</sup> Bruckner also claimed in an appeal to the academic Senate of 12 January 1877 to have what was initially granted as an unpaid professorship converted into a salaried one,<sup>6</sup> “daß Harmonie und Contrapunkt wirkliche Wissenschaften sind”. His request would never have been agreed to, of course, had the University not seen some value in Bruckner's lectures—eleven years later, in November 1891, the University was to grant him not only an honorary doctorate in music, but also one in philosophy.<sup>7</sup> At the *Festkommers* of 11 December 1891 held in Bruckner's honour, the Rector of the University, Adolf Exner, pronounced the celebrated words:

Wo die Wissenschaft haltmachen muß, wo ihr unübersteigliche Schranken gesetzt sind, dort beginnt das Reich der Kunst, welche das auszudrücken vermag, was allem Wissen verschlossen bleibt. Ich, der Rector magnificus der Wiener Universität, beuge mich vor dem ehemaligen Unterlehrer von Windhaag!<sup>8</sup>

This can be seen as more than simply laudatory rhetoric; one could also note Bruckner's curious words in his acceptance speech on this occasion: “Mich aber hat der liebe Herrgott zur Kunst bestimmt und aus Liebe zur Wissenschaft wählte ich mir die musikalische Wissenschaft”.<sup>9</sup> If anything, Exner's words demonstrate not only that the distance existing between theory and composition in the Viennese thoroughbass tradition, but also Bruckner's advocacy of harmony and counterpoint as science was far more an accepted and legitimate part of the philosophy of knowledge at the time than many scholars of music theory have tended to recognise. The notion of *Fortschritt* implied a recognition of the role of science in all things; even musical composition, therefore, could be seen as having a rational, ‘scientific’ foundation, codified as “Wissenschaften”, and abstracted and studied independently from the

---

<sup>3</sup> Göll.-A. IV/1, pp. 369ff.; cf. also Schwanzara, pp. 53ff.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 34ff.

<sup>5</sup> Probably, as Jackson notes, “Bruckner's systematic studies of octaves and metrical structure are related both to his scientific interests and his efforts to legitimise music as a ‘science’ in a university setting” (“Bruckner's *Oktaven*”, p. 36).

<sup>6</sup> Schwanzara, p. 74. From 1880 Bruckner received an annual remuneration of 800 Gulden, later increased to 1200 (*ibid.*, p. 73).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 72.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74; cf. §1.1.3.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78. See also Auer's remarks in Göll.-A. IV/1, p. 519: “So ward sein Studium *streng wissenschaftliche Arbeit*. Es ist gar kein Zweifel, daß sich Bruckner der wissenschaftlichen Fundierung seines Könnens voll bewußt war” (emphasis original).

application of that knowledge as "Kunst". Bruckner's unshakeable belief in the scientific nature of fundamental bass theory was thus very much in accord with the spirit of his time.

Moreover, according to Bruckner's opening lecture, the component disciplines of harmony and counterpoint constituted nothing less than a compelling and comprehensive "Musikarchitektur", a descriptive synonym, perhaps used with pedagogic intent, for "musikalische Wissenschaft", subsuming, in the first instance, the component fundamental 'musical sciences' of harmony, counterpoint, and perhaps metrical regulation which Bruckner studied so exhaustively with Sechter—the 'pure' musical sciences—beyond which existed a further domain of 'applied' sciences, including form and instrumentation, which Bruckner studied with Kitzler.<sup>10</sup> It is difficult to know whether Bruckner was intentionally playing here on Friedrich Wilhelm Schelling's famous pronunciation of architecture as "erstarrte Musik";<sup>11</sup> however, the term does not simply imply the regulation of metrical structures, in other words, of *Satzbau*. While Bruckner's phrases "eine gewisse Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Gliederungen" could imply reference to metrical structures, "bis in die Atome sezirt" obviously refers to the scientific investigation and analysis of the minutiae of harmony, counterpoint and voice leading; moreover, Bruckner never discussed the metrical regulation of music in his university lectures. Nonetheless, and probably intentionally, the term brings to mind Bruckner's own music, in which this 'architectural' musical science made possible the construction of great edifices in sound.

The relationship between the theory and practice of musical composition, as reflected in Bruckner's Antrittsrede and Exner's words, appears to have been understood by at least some of Bruckner's memoirists and students. However, in time the points in common that did exist between the two came to be overlooked, and Sechter's system seen only as an "anachronism", in Wason words. Tittel maintained that:

Selten läßt sich der Einfluß der handwerklichen Kunstlehre auf die Ausbildung eines musikalischen Genies so handgreiflich nachweisen, wie bei Bruckner. [...] Eben so selten ist aber auch die spätere vollständige Trennung von Theorie und Kompositionspraxis. Bruckner vermag beide Bereiche auseinanderzuhalten, indem er Musiktheorie als Wissenschaft lehrt, das eigene Schaffen jedoch als persönliches Ingenium hütet, das niemals mit der Theorie vermengt werden darf.<sup>12</sup>

This is on the face of it perfectly correct, though not exclusively so. Tittel was at variance with the facts when he went on to maintain that Bruckner's separation of theory and his own composition

---

<sup>10</sup> The distinction is also reflected in A. B. Marx's division in *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition* of the latter as "angewandte" musical composition.

<sup>11</sup> Mathias Hansen, "Über Nutzen und Nachteil von Metaphern: Anton Bruckner und das 'Architektonische'", *MuG* 36 (Oct. 1986), p. 523.

<sup>12</sup> Tittel, "Bruckners musikalischer Ausbildungsgang", p. 105.

gelang ihm [...] in einem solch perfekten Maß, daß ihm niemals der Gedanke kam, seine eigenen Werke nach der "Sechterschen Zwangsjackentheorie" zu analysieren. Im Gegenteil, das oft verbürgte Wort, das dem verschmitzt lächelnden Meister in den Mund gelegt wird: "Wann i komponier, mach i 's anders", beweist die vollkommene Souveränität des schaffenden Genius gegenüber der handwerklichen Lehrpraxis.<sup>13</sup>

Since the surviving records of Bruckner's teaching deal largely with elementary musical materials, it is easy to imagine a conceptual separation if we compare it to his immeasurably more complex harmonic practice. Yet there is ample evidence that Bruckner 'thought' musically in such theoretical terms, that he saw no inherent contradiction between what he taught and what he composed, and that he resorted on occasion to the inspection or analysis of harmony by theoretical means. That more evidence of such practices is not found in his MSS testifies to Bruckner's internalisation of these principles, suggesting that he made only personal memoranda in unusual situations.

Thus, comments by Bruckner such as "Segn's, meini Herrn, dos ist die Regl, i schreib' natürl'i net a so",<sup>14</sup> or his remarks to Klose, "Freiheiten, gibt's keine; wenn mir aber später einmal Einer was bringt, was so ausschaut wie das, was wir hier in der Schule gemacht haben, den schmeiß' i naus",<sup>15</sup> simply reflect traditional approaches to music pedagogy,<sup>16</sup> one which Bruckner adopted from his own teachers—the processes inherent within tonal harmony and voice-leading were first exhaustively mastered in 'pure' form, the "strenge Satz".<sup>17</sup> The surviving documentation of Bruckner's teaching reveals that what he regarded as "Wissenschaft" lay in the systematic and encyclopaedically thorough exploration of every detail of voice leading in every conceivable harmonic situation—an eighteenth-century mindset which understandably frustrated those of a more mercurial frame of mind, such as Klose. But while the 'rules' could subsequently be broken in free composition—and indeed, their more rigorous proscriptions might have to be overlooked in order to permit creative

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 110; cf. similar statements, *ibid.*, p. 111, and in his "Wiener Musiktheorie...", pp. 188 and 189.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Heinrich Federhofer, "Fux's *Gradus ad Parnassum* as Viewed by Heinrich Schenker", *Music Theory Spectrum* 4 (1982), p. 67; the anecdote is quoted by Schenker in *Harmonielehre (Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien, Part I)*, Stuttgart and Berlin 1906, p. 228. This remark, Federhofer wrote, "must have suggested [to Schenker] a doubtful validity of a method whose longevity was apparently based on assumed authority rather than objective reasons. A critical mind such as Schenker's must have questioned the meaning and importance of the technical precepts of strict counterpoint as well as a correlation between didactic method and actual practice of composition."

<sup>15</sup> Klose, *Meine Lehrjahre*, p. 40.

<sup>16</sup> Von Oberleithner (p. 26) compares Sechter's system to the training undertaken by dancers or athletes.

<sup>17</sup> For instance, Stradal ("Erinnerungen...", p. 857): "Wehe dem, der es wagte, vor Beendigung aller Studien etwas zu komponieren." A request sent to Bruckner in April 1895 to write a reference for a candidate for an academic position in music aesthetics at the university, Franz Marschner, met with the full brunt of Bruckner's indignation over what he saw as the inadequacy of Marschner's musical training: "Im ersten Jahre 'einfacher Contrap[unkt]' mit der Hauptaufgabe: einfache Fuge!!! Im zweiten Jahre: Doppelfuge als Hauptaufgabe!!! Darüber zu sprechen wäre unnütz. Wo bleibt da alles Vorangehende und dann alles Folgende!!!" (Theophil Antonicek, "Anton Bruckner als akademischer Gutachter", *BrJb* 1982–83, p. 83).

thought to break through—the underlying principles remained as the substrate of compositional technique. Otto Kitzler notes Bruckner's delight on discovering some "seinen früheren Satzstudien bei Sechter zuwiderlaufende musikalische Wendung oder Gestaltung";<sup>18</sup> Schwanzara's account of a lecture in which Bruckner dealt with 'verbotene verdeckte Intervalle' suggests an enigmatic, almost whimsical attitude on Bruckner's part to some of the more abstruse rules of orthodox voice-leading.<sup>19</sup>

There is also a wealth of anecdotal evidence as to the manner in which Bruckner, despite his own strict policy of separation of theory and composition, referred to his own compositions in his teaching<sup>20</sup>—one of the most telling of these is his comments on the use of "Sechs- und Siebenklänge in der IX. Symphonie", cited at the outset of this chapter.<sup>21</sup> We also read in Schwanzara that:<sup>22</sup> "Bruckner verwies [...] auf eine Stelle in der III. Symphonie, wo er eine Dissonanz nicht auflöst und diese Stelle trotzdem gut klingt". According to Stradal,<sup>23</sup> Bruckner played through music from the Seventh Symphony during a lecture; Partsch, quoting Meißner,<sup>24</sup> observed that Bruckner "bekanntlich im Entstehen begriffene Kompositionen im Unterricht besprach bzw. Passagen daraus vorspielte." According to another pupil, Kerschagl, Bruckner played passages of the Eighth over to his University class.<sup>25</sup> An anecdote by Decsey<sup>26</sup> reveals that Bruckner was still thinking in terms of practical compositional problems during his Conservatorium lessons, remarking on one occasion on his arrival about the problem of whether or not to double a passage of parallel six-three chords in the woodwinds at the octave, lest parallel fifths arise<sup>27</sup>—Bruckner's concern with parallel and hidden fifths in his own music is perhaps the best recognised aspect of his concern with theoretical

<sup>18</sup> Kitzler, p. 29; quoted in Eybl, p. 141.

<sup>19</sup> "(*Ernst und leise:*) Ich möchte doch die Herren gerne sehen, die die Lehre von den Quinten aufgestellt haben als ein Weltkuriosum. Schade, daß man nicht die Photographien hat, sonst würde ich mir kaufen. (*Nachdenklich:*) Das ist sehr interessant. Sie haben ein Ohr gehabt nicht wie wir und haben gesagt: 'Das ist schlecht', und alle sind ihnen gefolgt, trotzdem sie keine Herrscher waren. Das ist wirklich interessant. (*Versunken vor sich herblickend. Dann heiterer, wie schadenfroh:*) Aber in allem haben sie doch nicht recht gehabt. (*Befriedigt schmunzelnd, denn wenn dem Meister auch jede Regel heilig war, so war er doch froh, sie aus besonderem Anlaß außer acht lassen zu können.*) Es gibt unter den verdeckten Intervallen doch erlaubte, und zwar: [...]" (Schwanzara, p. 123; italics original). As Jackson noted, "[I]ike Brahms, Bruckner recognized that not *all* consecutives are 'bad', since they appear in the masterworks of the greatest composers" ("Bruckner's Oktaven, p. 63).

<sup>20</sup> Wason's claim (p. 78) that Bruckner never discussed his own works in teaching not at all true; Wason himself cites Bruckner's reference to the use of "Sechs- und Siebenklänge" (p. 73).

<sup>21</sup> As Floros noted, Bruckner seems to have stated this quite pointedly ("Bruckner—der Progressive", p. 147).

<sup>22</sup> p. 153.

<sup>23</sup> "Erinnerungen...", p. 856.

<sup>24</sup> "Anton Meißner...", p. 57.

<sup>25</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, pp. 14f. According to Partsch (*Bruckner—Skizziert*, p. 150), the anecdote dates to 1886/87.

<sup>26</sup> p. 193. However, Zeleny notes the general unreliability of Decsey's account in regard to finer details of Bruckner's theory teaching: "Im journalistischer Schwung nimmt man's nicht so genau" (Zeleny, p. 468).

<sup>27</sup> Significantly, this was during the course of the composition of IX/1. A possible candidate for the progression in question could be the descending string passage at m. 450.

considerations, although until recently it was frequently cited as nothing more musically significant than a symptom of his frequently invoked obsessive-compulsive disorder.<sup>28</sup> Stradal asserted, however:<sup>29</sup> “Außerdem bedenke man, daß der Meister noch zur Zeit, als er die größten seiner Werke niederschrieb, sich mit allen möglichen kontrapunktischen Studien beschäftigte und eigentlich nie aufhorte, zu lernen und sich zu bilden.” Eckstein even claimed that Bruckner's practice of notating harmonic roots as small noteheads under chords was not limited to theoretical exercises:

Bruckner hat nicht allein bei seinen Schülern, auch bei solchen, die im Kontrapunkt weit fortgeschritten waren, streng auf diese Art der Notierung gehalten, ich habe sogar des öfteren gesehen, daß er selbst in seinen eigenen Partituren, während er an diesen arbeitete, nicht allein die Takte der Perioden numerierte, sondern mitunter auch die Fundamentaltöne, sei es in solchen schwarzen Notenköpfen, sei es mit Hilfe von Buchstaben, notierte.<sup>30</sup>

Decsey endorsed such statements but, presumably in order to avoid the implication of pedantry on Bruckner's part, claimed that such means were used only for revision and inspection. It is probably fair to say that such good intentions have tended to cloud more balanced assessments of these issues.<sup>31</sup>

In fact, Bruckner's entire creative process, from initial sketch to completed score, was permeated by countless theoretical checks and balances; Bruckner used these means to actively regulate and refine the composition as it emerged. While the present writer has found

<sup>28</sup> Von Oberleithner (p. 32) noted concerning Bruckner's revision of the First Symphony: “dabei verfiel er aber der Manie sogenannte nachschlagende Quinten und -Oktaven zu suchen, kurz de Arbeit machte ihn mehr nervös, als später die an der IX. Symphonie”; Bruckner's work on the final version of the Finale of the Third was similarly described by Josef Schalk in a letter of 10 June 1888 to his brother: “Jetzt plagt ihn mit der Heftigkeit einer Wahnvorstellung die Sucht seinen Satz von Oktavenfortschreitungen zu reinigen. Dabei vertrödelt er viele Zeit, müht sich entsetzlich, ist aber gegen jeden Einwand Löwe's oder meinerseits unerschütterlich” (Leibnitz, *Anton Bruckner und Die Brüder Schalk*, p. 134; quoted by Doebel, p. 96, and by Jackson, “Bruckner's Oktaven”, p. 48. Klose (*Meine Lehrjahre*) relayed similar concerns. Cf. Jackson's discussion of Bruckner's study and regulation of voice leading in his “Bruckner's Oktaven”, where he argues that Bruckner's intentions were not to eliminate all doublings, but to ‘regulate’ (i.e., check) them, and thereby “‘approve’ certain consecutives as ‘permitted’ momentary doublings and ‘desired’ reinforcements, and ‘disapprove’ and ‘eliminate’ others as undesired” (p. 48).

<sup>29</sup> “Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit”, *ZfM* 99, no. 12, p. 1073.

<sup>30</sup> *Erinnerungen*, p. 30. The passage is frequently invoked; most recently, for instance, by Phipps (p. 230).

<sup>31</sup> Decsey wrote: “So frei er als Schaffender verfuhr, so pedantisch-genau verfuhr er als Lehrender. Mann kann zum großen Teile mitunterschreiben, was Dr. Franz Marschner [...] in seinen [...] *Erinnerungen* [...] überliefert: ‘Bruckner war keineswegs der Ansicht Schalks, daß sich die Harmonik der ‘neuen Richtung’ nach Sechterschem System erklären liesse. Er war also bewusster Empirist und Naturalist bei seinen eigenen Tonschöpfungen.’ Das heißt: Empirist und Naturalist, soweit es auf die Konzeption ankam; hinterher sah er Akkordverbindungen in eigenen Partituren mit den Augen Sechters an und prüfte bisweilen Bläsersätze gerne auf die richtige Folge der Fundamente, die Führung der Stimmen hin. Deutlich fallen hier die Elemente des künstlerischen Schaffens auseinander: das synthetische Element, der ‘Einfall’, und das analytische, die Kritik des Einfalls [...]” (“Anton Bruckner als Lehrer der Sechterschen Theorie”, p. 195). This is reminiscent of Nowak's much later but equally inaccurate claim (§2.1.4 *infra*) that Bruckner's use of metrical numbers was limited to the inspection of music already composed.

scant evidence of the use of the "Fundamentstönchen" cited by Eckstein in Bruckner's MSS,<sup>32</sup> innumerable instances of other notational methods can be cited. They include:

- i. Bruckner's lifelong use of diagonal marks or *Kustoden* to indicate voice-leading in his scores, particularly at cadences or at page turns in textures involving numerous parts—a usage which can be found in Dürrenberger's *Elementar-Lehrbuch*;<sup>33</sup>
- ii. Tonbuchstaben and thoroughbass figuration occur frequently as indications of chords or pedal points—dozens of instances can be found among the Finale MSS reproduced here; a striking example, ÖNB 6086/4<sup>r</sup> (Facs. C/37), contains extensive memoranda of compositionally 'abstracted' tritone progressions—most likely considerations of enharmonic spellings;
- iii. indications of prevailing key or harmony in complex harmonic situations, usually referred to as "Fundament", for instance in IX/3, at letter Q (*q.v.*), where Bruckner wrote in the lower margin of the AP "Orgelp[unkt] Cis m[oll]"; 4 mm. later the note "Cis Terz d[es] Fund[aments]" appears;<sup>34</sup>
- iv. memoranda of inspections and doubtless also alterations of voice leading, frequently dated, can be found in more complex textures and in completed scores; the AP of *Helgoland* is particularly rich in these; cf. among the Finale MSS, Facs. C/319, ÖNB 6087/72<sup>r</sup>, where Bruckner noted (page centre) in reference to the string parts "1. 4. g.[gut]" and in the right margin: "Alles/ 1 u[nd] 4/ gut/ I. Violine/ gut/4 und 3/gut";
- v. references to formal divisions, for instance (again citing the Finale MSS), "Gesangsp." (C/152), "Fuge" (C/277), "Choral/ 2. Abtheilung" (C/312), or to particular technical features, "Gesang – obl.[igat] m.[it] 1. Violine" (C/198), "Ba[s]so 1/2 Tact später" (C/283), etc.; and finally
- vi. the ubiquitous metrical numbers, testifying to Bruckner's constant attention to the design of the metrical structure—cf. §2.1.5. Here too marginal annotations play a role in enabling us to assess Bruckner's concern with the theoretical justification of unusual features. Röder, for instance,<sup>35</sup> discusses a passage in the Trio of the Third, m. 14, where in the 1876 revision Bruckner noted "NB Fund:[ament] auf 6

<sup>32</sup> A good example occurs under the opening chord of the pc. sk. of the Scherzo, ÖNB 3196/1<sup>r</sup>; cf. §2.1.3 *infra*.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Jackson's extensive study of the principles by which Bruckner appears to have regulated voice leading in such situations, in his "Bruckner's *Oktaven*".

<sup>34</sup> Neither annotation is patently clear. That at letter Q probably observes that the passage, with pedal point on G#, is 'in' C# minor; that at m. 203 perhaps suggests that the c# replaces the third of the chord (b#) at this point.

<sup>35</sup> "Eigenes angewandtes Nachsinnen", pp. 120f.

Tact neu und noch Fortd.[auer] auf den 7. als Syncope”, an indication that the harmony beginning there is extended irregularly into the following measure.<sup>36</sup>

Furthermore, although most of the time in his lectures, as von Oberleithner wrote, “[j]eder Hinweis selbst auf Meisterwerke war vermieden”, Bruckner clearly endorsed the analysis of Wagner’s music along Sechterian lines, casually pointing out at a university lecture that “auch in den Werken Wagners überall die Fundamente der Harmonie auffindbar seien und [...] daß dieser Nachweis ein lockende Aufgabe wäre”.<sup>37</sup> Franz Schalk was of the opinion that “[d]er reine strenge Satz zieht sich bis in Bruckners allerletzte Werke hin, er hat ihn nie völlig verloren.”<sup>38</sup> An observation found in the memoirs of Anton Meißner from Bruckner’s last years is also noteworthy: “Wie ein Hoher Priester verwaltete er die Sechtersche Theorie vom Fundamentalbaß. Noch bei seiner ‘Neunten’ äußerte er sich mir gegenüber hinsichtlich einer besonders kühnen Harmoniewendung: ‘Du, dös kann i a vorm Sechter verantworten!’”<sup>39</sup> All of these statements, their credibility substantiated by their origin from several different sources, demonstrate the profound integration of theoretical considerations into the composer’s compositional thinking and *vice versa* well into the last years of Bruckner’s life.

That Bruckner could have taught out of an attitude of unquestioning passive obedience and belief in authority while necessarily dismissing or contradicting such a theoretical model in composing must therefore be founded on a misapprehension—namely, that a music-theoretical approach, in order to have any validity, must constitute a comprehensive conceptual framework for the music to which it applies. This was not manifestly the case with Viennese fundamental bass theory, which saw itself more as a craft foundational to compositional practice, but which it did not attempt to justify, circumscribe or comprehensively explain. Bruckner understood compositional technique as founded on fundamental principles which formed the basis for any aesthetic evaluation of music as ‘good’, and hence likely to endure, or condemned it as technically and therefore aesthetically defective. The following comments by Bruckner from Schwanzara’s stenographic records are instructive:

Den Beethoven nannten sie seinerzeit das musikalische Schwein, er gehört ins Irrenhaus. Ich denke mir: nur hin, nur her, nur schreiben, nicht rechts und nicht links schauen. Bis der (Hanslick) das versteht, bin ich längst schon hin. Bald nennen sie mich Narr, bald Meister. Die sollen schreiben, soviel sie wollen. Wenn das, was ich schreibe, gut ist, wird es bleiben; wenn nicht, so wird es zugrunde gehen.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Jackson, “Bruckner’s metrical numbers”, p. 112, similarly cites an annotation by Bruckner in the Andante of the Second Symphony, “das Fortdauer des Fundaments in geraden Tacten—[es] sind Sincopen”.

<sup>37</sup> P. 27; cf. Karl Mayrberger’s analytical approach to Wagner; sources noted in §2.0.3.

<sup>38</sup> Franz Schalk, *Briefe und Betrachtungen*, p. 83.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Partsch, “Anton Meißner...”, p. 58.

<sup>40</sup> Schwanzara, p. 159.



Such a mindset was deeply rooted in the past. Baroque theorists recognised a relationship between a *stylus antiquus* (or *gravis*) and a *stylus modernus*, in which stylistic features forbidden within the strict style were regarded as legitimate within the wider confines of a freer approach.<sup>41</sup> Strikingly, even Heinrich Schenker came to espouse a similar approach to the study of 'pure' counterpoint.<sup>42</sup> Sechter's system echoed this division in its classification of progressions and modulations into the ancient genera of diatonic, chromatic and enharmonic.<sup>43</sup> There was thus provision within Sechter's system, with its detailed regulation of harmonic movement in progressions based solely on diatonic scale-steps, for the most harmonically free and complex music imaginable—an aspect frequently overlooked by its critics. Much of Wagner's and Bruckner's later music falls into this category.

Rather than considering it necessary to assume irreconcilable contradictions between theory and composition, a number of earlier authors appear to have been convinced of many creative, fruitful aspects embodied within the theoretical approach.<sup>44</sup> Ernst Kurth, as Zeleny noted,<sup>45</sup> recognised that Sechter's system must have constituted for the creative artist no foreign, isolated body of knowledge of purely theoretical knowledge, but "begriffliche Grundauffassungen, die ihm ganz und gar lagen, die er aus seinem eigenen Musikgefühl bestätigt fand, und die seine Musik *durchdringend und sichtbar beeinflussten*".<sup>46</sup> Walter Wiora asserted:

---

<sup>41</sup> See, for instance, the writings of Christoph Bernhard, Joseph Müller-Blattau, ed., *Die Kompositionslehre Heinrich Schützens in der Fassung seines Schülers Christoph Bernhard*, Kassel 1963. See also Walter Hulse, ed., "The Treatises of Christoph Bernhard", *The Music Forum* 3 (1973), pp. 1–196.

<sup>42</sup> Federhofer (*ibid.*) pointed out that Schenker, in his critique of Fux (and paralleling his critique elsewhere of Sechter), did not take into consideration the final chapter of Fux's *Exercitii V Lektion septima*, which makes it clear that Fux similarly understood a correlation between *stylus antiquus* and *modernus*. Federhofer: "For Schenker a new function of harmony and counterpoint arose. The former was determined by the new significance attributed to the scale degree (*Stufe*) and the resulting dismissal of conventional drill; the latter was reduced to an exposition of the principles of part writing [...] involving the usual forms of contrapuntal instruction such as imitation, canon and fugue". According to Schenker the study of counterpoint "should not impart a particular style of composition so much as guide the ear of the music student into the infinite world of musical *Urprobleme*"; Schenker thus "sets counterpoint apart as 'a preliminary training for actual composition' in order "to move the ideal and actual essence of either into proper focus" (Federhofer, *ibid.*, pp. 67ff.). Fux's intention "was to illustrate in the *stylus antiquus* a significance of principles of part writing that rose above style epochs." (p. 69). "Like Fux, Schenker was convinced that composition was founded in an order of the universe determined by unalterable norms" (*ibid.*).

<sup>43</sup> See the division of vol. 1 of the *Grundsätze*, which formed the basis for Bruckner's teaching, and moves from "Diatonisches Fortschreiten in der Dur-Tonleiter" ("Erster Theil", pp. 9ff.) through to "Chromatisches Fortschreiten in der Moll-Tonleiter und die enharmonischen Verwechslungen" ("Vierter Theil", pp. 163ff.); Schwanzara provides a useful summary (pp. 22ff.).

<sup>44</sup> Wason (p. 164), for instance, notes Schwanzara's opinion that Sechter's theory provided the basis of Bruckner's compositional technique, without following up on the many clues he presents.

<sup>45</sup> Zeleny, pp. 471f.

<sup>46</sup> *Bruckner* (Berlin 1925), p. 101; italics added. "Wenn Bruckner immer wieder zu den sogenannten Klangfundamenten zurückgriff, die gehemnisreichen Urverbindungen der Akkorde vorwärts, rückwärts wie an einem Punkt festhaftend durchdrang, so schien er damit als Theoretiker ganz trocken zu sein; er war es ebensowenig wie er als Lehrer gewesen ist. Er fühlte bloß Leben in solchen Dingen, die für andere Naturen leere Formeln sein

Bruckner hat so gründlich wie kaum ein anderer der großen Musiker die Theorie der Musik studiert und gelehrt. Und wenn auch die Lehre Sechters, an die hauptsächlich er sich hielt, rückständig war, so faßte er doch durch sie hindurch das Überzeitliche. Seine Skizzen mit ihren Periodenzahlen und die Notizen über das Fortschreiten der Stimmen bekunden, wie er mit theoretischer Besinnung schuf. Für seine kontemplative Versenkung in die Urphänomene aber sind jene Stellen in den Symphonien bezeichnend, in denen Grenzwerte des Klanges oder leere Quinten und Oktaven auftönen und so gleichsam Pfeiler des Tonreiches bloßgelegt werden. Musiktheorie ist ihm Betrachtung des Grundrisses der Tonwelt.<sup>47</sup>

Dahlhaus likewise maintained, more soberly, that:

[D]ie Töne bildeten für ihn eine geordnete Welt, die man bis in ihren letzten Winkel kennen mußte, ehe man sich das Privileg erwarb, das Gegebene aus Eigenem ergänzen zu dürfen. Für Bruckner waren die Regeln des Kontrapunkts keine bloße Methode, um musikalisch denken zu lernen, kein Umweg, den man vergessen durfte, wenn das Ziel erreicht war, sondern Gesetze einer Naturordnung der Musik.<sup>48</sup>

While Bruckner scholars of Dahlhaus' and Wiora's generation recognised the general significance of this philosophy for Bruckner's compositional practice, they were not always in a position to understand how this relationship actually functioned for Bruckner. Only recently have scholars begun to reveal the extent to which Bruckner's day-to-day compositional practice was underpinned by the ideas he attempted to delineate in his *Antrittsrede*. The most salient contribution to date is perhaps Wolfgang Grandjean's *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner* (2001), which for the first time comprehensively explains the manner in which Bruckner's compositional structures—of which harmony and counterpoint represented “die Fundamente und die Seele”—were regulated by the constant analytical overview provided by the metrical numbers. The solution to the enigma of the metrical numbers represented a kind of Rosetta Stone for the understanding of Bruckner's unique compositional technique. The significance of the theory/composition dichotomy for the analysis of Bruckner's music was aptly summed up by Grandjean in the following passage:<sup>49</sup>

Komponieren ist Denken in musikalischem material und in musikalischen Strukturen [...]. Die normative Instanz ist dabei die (in musiktheoretischer Literatur und auf mündlichem Wege tradierte) ‘explizierte’ Theorie. Unzweifelhaft hatte diese normative Instanz großen Einfluß auf Bruckners kompositorisches Denken; seine durch verinnerlichte Autoritätsgläubigkeit geprägte Persönlichkeit war dafür anfällig. —Analyse ist Nachvollzug des kompositorischen Denkens, Verstehen der ‘implizierten’ Theorie eines

---

müssen. [...] Darum war hier für Bruckners Theorie kein brüchiger Untergrund, sondern immer neu belebter Quellgrund, belebt aus innerer Anschauungskraft. Theorie heißt Anschauung. Auf diesem Wege drang er zum letzten Wesen der Musik, das ihn ganz neue Satzregeln und Technik spielend auswerfen ließ” (*ibid.*, p. 171; quoted in Zeleny, p. 471).

<sup>47</sup> Anton Bruckner 1824-1896, p. 67. Eckstein's *Erinnerungen* (p. 60) conclude with similar sentiments.

<sup>48</sup> “Bruckner und der Barock”, *NZfM* 124 (1963), p. 336.

<sup>49</sup> P. 13.

Werks und Übersetzung in begriffliche Sprache. In dem Spannungsfeld von Inspiration und theoretischem Normenbezug ist die Klärung der Beziehung von implizierter und explizierter Theorie unabdingbare Voraussetzung jeglicher Analyse.

Gegenstände von Bruckners theoretischer Reflexion waren, wie aus den Partituren zu erkennen: die Stimmführungsregeln (Oktav- und Quintparallelen), der Stufengang der Harmonik, die Syntax-Metrik, die Instrumentation und die Motivik-Thematik (durch Anmerkungen zur motivischen Arbeit, zu Umkehrungen und ähnlichem). Davon haben aufgrund der allgegenwärtigen Ziffern und der verbalen Anmerkungen die metrischen Reflexionen die deutlichsten Spuren hinterlassen. Die metrischen Ziffern sind Zeugnisse der formalen Gestaltung seiner Werke, und daher ein unverzichtbares Werkzeug für das Verständnis seiner Musik bzw. für die musikalische Analyse.

Beweggrund der theoretischen Aktivitäten Bruckners war letztlich das Bestreben, ein 'perfektes' Werk zu schaffen, und dazu gehörte vor allem die theoretische Richtigkeit, die 'wissenschaftliche' Fundierung der Komposition.

Grandjean identified three facets in his approach which can be regarded as useful for approaching other areas of Bruckner's compositional technique: (a) the explicit theory acquired during his study years and applied in his analysis of other scores, (b) the documentary evidence to be found in his own scores, and (c) an 'implicit theory' behind his works, ascertainable by analysis.<sup>50</sup> Echoes of this threefold approach will be found throughout the remainder of the chapter. Far from being irrelevant to one another, Bruckner's adaptations of Sechter's harmonic model in his teaching practice and his apparent creative application of theoretical constructs in his music reveal his concern with narrowing, however marginally, what Wason referred to as the 'ever-widening gap between theory and compositional practice which extended throughout the nineteenth century'.<sup>51</sup> It is probably fair to say that Bruckner's adherence in his teaching to Sechter has skewed our perceptions of the nature and extent of Bruckner's contribution to fundamental bass theory.<sup>52</sup>

### **2.1.2 Harmonic theory in Bruckner's teaching and compositional practice.**

As we have noted, not least because most of the surviving records of Bruckner's system of harmony are student notes from the University lectures, there is relatively little evidence of Bruckner's teaching of more advanced topics. Schwanzara's account, having devoted nearly 100 pages and 110 musical examples to diatonic progressions in the major<sup>53</sup> and almost 50 pages and 45 examples to diatonic progressions in the minor,<sup>54</sup> deals with the musically vast field of modulation in a mere 15 pages<sup>55</sup> and 37 musical examples, of which chromatic

---

<sup>50</sup> P. 15.

<sup>51</sup> P. 68.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Wason's summary of Bruckner's theory teaching, p. 84.

<sup>53</sup> Pp. 129–222.

<sup>54</sup> Pp. 223–268.

<sup>55</sup> Pp. 269–283.

modulation is covered in 2 pages and 2 musical examples, while enharmonic modulation is generously allotted 6 pages and (strikingly) 20 examples—significantly more space, relatively speaking, than Sechter gives to it.<sup>56</sup> Vockner's account, although less elementary, reveals a similar situation.<sup>57</sup> There is sufficient evidence from the fact that Bruckner deviated to an extent from Sechter's model<sup>58</sup>—for instance the inclusion in Eckstein's notes of examples of the enharmonic respelling of minor triads as a means of modulation<sup>59</sup>—to show that Bruckner saw value in including in his own teaching, and integrating into his theoretical model, techniques that he had discovered in Wagner.<sup>60</sup>

Bruckner's teaching otherwise generally mirrored Sechter's division and weighting of material. Situations involving greater harmonic complexity were not excluded from this system, merely dealt with peripherally if at all, since they were simply beyond the needs of elementary students. This is important for the context within which Bruckner's statements can be interpreted. For instance, his frequently encountered remarks concerning the importance of progressions proceeding by diatonic roots, such as his remarks to Decsey that “Die richtige Ordnung der Fundamente ist das Geheimnis des klassischen Stils” do not represent any sort of historicist delineation of musical style. When Bruckner stated, also according to Decsey, that he was only prepared to accept departures from the strictures of fundamental theory “für die dramatische Musik”,<sup>61</sup> he could not have been referring to all of Wagner's music, since according to von Oberleithner, as we have seen, he commented to his university class on the value of reading Wagner's music in terms of fundamental bass theory—comments which, as we have seen elsewhere, must have applied equally well to his own music.

Hence, while the distinction between ‘klassischer Stil’ and “dramatische Musik” reflects Sechter's (and Bruckner's) pedagogic categorisation of progressions or modulations into

---

<sup>56</sup> Cf. the discussion in Schwanzara, pp. 277ff., in particular pp. 282ff., which deals with his Musical Examples nos. 209–214. Cf. also Sechter, *Grundsätze* I, pp. 201ff., “Von den enharmonischen Verwechslungen”. Wason (p. 80) was thus perhaps misleading in stating that “[b]ecause most of the surviving records of Bruckner's system of harmony are student notes from the University lectures, there is little material dealing with more advanced topics. Schwanzara's notes, for example, contain a mere two pages concerning chromaticism”. While Bruckner's treatment of the chromatic mode followed Sechter closely, the diatonic minor mode was taught in greater depth by Bruckner, including progressions involving both ascending and descending forms of the melodic minor scale. Tittel (“Wiener Musiktheorie...”, p. 189) gives a useful summary of Bruckner's divergences from Sechter.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Schenk and Gruber, p. 352. Hans-Dieter Klein, “Philosophische Hypothesen zum Aussagegehalt von Anton Bruckners Musiksprache”, *BrJb* 1981, pp. 115–136, which includes a discussion of the chromaticism vs. Sechter dichotomy in Bruckner's thinking.

<sup>58</sup> As noted by Schenk and Gruber, p. 352.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Wason, p. 79, who notes that the examples recall Wagner's *Todesverkündigung* motive from *Walküre*..

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Schwanzara's summary (pp. 22ff.) of the structure and content of the *Grundsätze*.

<sup>61</sup> Decsey: “nur für die dramatische Musik wollte er ein Abweichen von der Strenge der Fundamentallehre erlaubt wissen” (p. 195, also preceding quotation).

diatonic, chromatic and enharmonic categories or modes<sup>62</sup> is crucial to an understanding of Bruckner's attitude to theory and composition, it has been misinterpreted. Sechter's *Grundsätze* includes an example of chromatically ascending diminished sevenths in which, as Sechter wrote, "[u]m die Begründung durch eine Fundamentfolge kümmert man sich nicht und lässt es durch die Mehrdeutigkeit entschuldigen"<sup>63</sup>—probably a case of "dramatische Musik" in which Bruckner accepted that fundamental bass reading, "das Geheimnis des klassischen Stils", would be beside the point. Statements such as those of Decsey (above), Wason ("Bruckner clearly followed Sechter in demanding that the fundamentals of all chromatic chords always be diatonic"<sup>64</sup>), or Zeleny ("Die Geschlossenheit des Sechterschen Systems ergibt sich insbesondere aus der Forderung, daß jedem Satze (sei er harmonisch oder kontrapunktisch, sei er einfach oder zusammengesetzt, diatonisch oder chromatisch) ein diatonischer Satz mit richtiger Fundamentfolge zu Grunde liegen müsse"<sup>65</sup>) are by no means as limiting as they appear since, as both Sechter's and Bruckner's teaching examples reveal, definitions of what constituted diatonic fundamentals common to any one key need only last for two chords, before moving to another tonal centre via related harmonies. Zeleny noted that for Wagner's music "gilt was Sechter über die Enharmonik sagt":<sup>66</sup>

Überhaupt wird bei den enharmonischen Verwechslungen (mit Ausnahme des in den ersten drei §§ Angeführten) auf keinen Zusammenhang der Fundamente mehr gesehen, sondern ein jeder nur irgend eine Freiheit habende Accord wird ganz willkürlich gebraucht und auf das Vorausgegangene keine besondere Rücksicht genommen<sup>67</sup>

—the "Ausnahmen" Sechter here refers to are the examples of his three earlier subsections on enharmonic modulation (pp. 202–209) in which the progressions, although requiring enharmonic notation, move from one key to another in such a way that at each step a chord common to two keys is used, as in Sechter's examples of both diatonic and chromatic

---

<sup>62</sup> This is to an extent a simplification; Schenk and Gruber likewise refer to "Tongeschlechter" (p. 352). Bruckner structured at least his later university teaching into diatonic progressions in major and minor, followed by three categories of "Verwechslung" or "Tonwechslung" (modulation), i.e., to keys of the same scale (diatonic), to any keys, via progressions in fifths (chromatic) and finally modulation via enharmonic means, principally the diminished seventh. Sechter's extensive treatment of part movement by chromatic steps (*Grundsätze* I, pp. 119ff.) does not appear in Schwanzara, although Bruckner clearly taught it elsewhere, as for instance Eckstein shows (p. 49).

<sup>63</sup> *Grundsätze* I, *ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> Wason, p. 80.

<sup>65</sup> Zeleny, p. 480

<sup>66</sup> p. 469.

<sup>67</sup> *Grundsätze* I, p. 217. Significant also is Sechter's disparaging metaphor (p. 218) on the nature of enharmonic modulation: "Die enharmonischen Verwechslungen in der weitesten Ausdehnung sind die natürlichen Feinde der gesunden Melodie, dafür ist ihre Wirkung geheimnisvoll und überraschend. Sie sind das Bild der grossen Welt, worin das Familienleben untergeht und wo die Täuschungen häufig vorkommen, und auch das unwichtige in einem gewissen Glanze erscheint; dafür aber kann man dabei nicht erkennen was Hauptsache oder Nebensache ist" (also noted by Klose, p. 53).

modes.<sup>68</sup> Of course, even the most elaborate chromatic music can be read in these terms, which reveal that Sechter's system was in principle far more open-ended, more 'progressive' than it has traditionally been regarded. While space precludes more detailed discussion of Bruckner's pedagogical approach to "enharmonische Verwechslungen", Bruckner's greater emphasis on such elements perhaps supports the idea that he was by no means content to relinquish the rules more immediately appropriate to the diatonic and chromatic categories of progressions—namely movement by fundamental steps of fourths or fifths—when dealing with enharmonic progressions, as even Sechter was prepared to do.

The most accurate clue to the relationship of theory to Bruckner's compositional practice, therefore, is probably Kitzler's assertion—that Bruckner recognised "daß Wagners großartiges Werk eine geniale Erfüllung von Sechters entsprechend weiterentwickelten Theorien sei und daß er selbst nun mit Sechterschem Rüstzeug ein Meisterwerk schaffen könne."<sup>69</sup> In the following passage, quoted by Zeleny,<sup>70</sup> Kurth put his finger on the issue of how fundamental bass theory functions in Bruckner's style:

Bruckner faßte seine noch so abenteuerlichen Modulationen wie die Tonartskreise selbst von dem zentral beherrschenden Grundklang aus zusammen. Dabei bleibt die dominante Verwandtschaft das Grundprinzip, das überall hineingehört wird, auch wo es äußerlich nicht vorhanden ist, über alle Alterationen, mediantische, chromatische Fortschreitungen hinüber, und wie sich zeigte, selbst über Sequenzrückungen, Erscheinungen also, die an sich völlige Aufhebung tonartlicher Zusammenhänge bedeuten könnten. Dieses Durchhören der dominantischen Verwandtschaft und ihr Offenbarwerden über auch größere Abstände hinweg oder durch starke Einstellungen hindurch ist zweifellos einer der Hauptzüge, die ihn innerlich an Sechter fesselten. Für ihn blieben alles im Grunde eine elastische Erweiterung von Sechters Zwischenfundamenten und überhaupt seiner Zurückführung komplizierter Klangbewegungen auf fictive einfachere Schritte [...].

The techniques of fundamental bass movement, coupled with its careful regulation of metrical structure, thus contribute significantly to the impression of sublimity, grandeur and measured tread that Bruckner's music maintains throughout even the most harmonically complex passages. As Orel claimed,

[i]n der immer noch mit dem klassischen Fundamentalsatz zusammenhängenden, durchaus auf ihm fußenden Harmonik Bruckners lief aber letzten Endes der stets

<sup>68</sup> One of these begins C major–F minor–D♭ major–F♯ minor etc. Phipps (p. 229) cites a harmonically similar example of a canon modulating through all keys in Sechter's unpublished *Vom Canon* (cf. §2.0.3, fn. 51), noting that "application of enharmonic spellings [...] allows for a direct connection between diatonic harmonies in all possible keys" (*ibid.*; see also Phipp's fn. 5); the examples in part III of Sechter's published *Grundsätze* reveals that the *Vom Canon* example does not represent an isolated case.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. §2.0.3.

<sup>70</sup> Zeleny, pp. 471f., where the location in Kurth is given incorrectly as p. 171.

festzustellende Eindruck planvollen harmonischen Gestaltens und nicht uferlosen Fortschreitens der Klangwellen, der seinen Werken eigen ist.<sup>71</sup>

This can be borne out by an analysis of many highly chromatic passages of Bruckner's music using Sechterian principles of fundamental progression—we will shortly examine the opening harmonic sequences of the first three movements using this approach. Firstly, however, it should be pointed out that such analysis, while rarely encountered in Bruckner's MSS, was manifestly undertaken on occasion.

A particularly interesting instance of the theoretical 'Rechtfertigung' of an enharmonic progression by Bruckner himself may be found in the AP of Psalm 150, m. 112, where he wrote under the fourth beat "(F)/a/ces/es/ges/f".<sup>72</sup> The harmony in this measure, however, is written as a B<sup>7</sup> chord (f#/a/b/d#), while the harmony in the following measure is an E<sup>b</sup>-major  $\frac{6}{3}$ . Bruckner's explanation thus permits the progression to be understood enharmonically, with the interpolation of a "Zwischenfundament" (B<sup>b</sup>), as a series of "Quintfallen", F–(B<sup>b</sup>)–E<sup>b</sup>.<sup>73</sup>

Such maintenance on Bruckner's part of what has often been seen as nothing more than the cumbersome pedantry of Sechter's Zwischenfundamente is placed in better perspective when one bears in mind the efforts by Bruckner's contemporaries and successors to 'update' Sechter's model, in particular to expand the provenance of the diatonic category of progressions (i.e., extend tonal functionalism) by attempting to read harmonies not based on the principal scale degrees as more closely related to the tonic, and thereby effect a degree of compromise with Riemann and *Funktionslehre*. We have already referred to the attempts of Josef Schalk to explain enharmonic progressions involving non-diatonic fundamentals as complex chords over diatonic roots.<sup>74</sup> Georg Capellen's critique of Sechter rejected the use of the seventh degree as a fundamental bass, along with Sechter's assertion that every chromatic progression is derived from a diatonic one, the interpolation of "Zwischenfundamente" and of

<sup>71</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Das Werk...*, p. 8; quoted by Zeleny, pp. 472f. Cf. also Schwanzara, who maintains that Bruckner's teaching followed Sechter closely in this respect: "Sonst stimmen beide überein, zum Beispiel in der bemerkenswert einfachen Annahme, daß allen natürlichen Akkordverbindungen bloß die Fundamentalschritte des Quintsprunges (auf- und abwärts) und des Terzsprunges (ebenfalls auf- und abwärts) zugrunde liegen und daß auf diesen wenigen Fundamentalschritten auch das stufenweise Steigen und Fallen von Fundamentsfolgen beruht, indem dabei ein "Zwischenfundament" weggelassen wird" (p. 57).

<sup>72</sup> ÖNB 19.484/10<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>73</sup> The same harmonic situation and an analogous marginal note recur in the AP at mm. 120 and 128. Coincidentally, this is the same enharmonic progression which, as Jackson shows ("Bruckner's Metrical Numbers", pp. 121f.), was accorded great significance by Bruckner in the metrical conception of *Vexilla regis* (mm. 25ff.) as figurative of the paradoxical words "et morte vitam protulit". Jackson pushes the bounds of credibility, however, when he suggests in the same article, concerning the A<sup>b</sup> chord at m. 30, that "Even Bruckner [...] may have been able to view this chord as 'bIV' in E Phrygian" (fn. 69, p. 130); in doing so Jackson confuses Schenkerian axioms with compositional intentions. Composers were obviously able to 'see beyond' the many localised modulations necessitated by the foreground readings of fundamental bass theory—otherwise such music would never have been written. However, there is no evidence whatsoever that Bruckner would have imputed to a theoretical reading the task of ultimately validating a compositional idea.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. §2.0.3, fns. 56 and 57.

root movement by tritone.<sup>75</sup> This last aspect of Sechter's system remains indicative of the manner in which a particular conception of harmonic movement profoundly infiltrated Bruckner's compositional practice; many progressions in Bruckner's music are simply not interpretable within fundamental bass parameters if one rules out root movement by tritone, among the most obvious indications being the innumerable tritone progressions in the Finale.

It must also be pointed out that any attempt to 'explain' Bruckner's harmony solely by recourse to Sechter is as inadequate as the wholesale preclusion of his influence. Phipps' article "Bruckner's free application of strict Sechterian theory with stimulation from Wagnerian sources", which approaches the music of the Seventh Symphony from the compositional standpoint of its allusions to Wagner and theoretically from the standpoint of Schoenberg's later adaptations of fundamental bass and voice-leading theory, proves an instructive approach to the nature of Bruckner's modification of Sechter in his compositional practice.<sup>76</sup> Earlier writers tended to limit themselves to the discussion of specific cases in which Sechterian influence could not be demonstrated. Zeleny,<sup>77</sup> for instance, pointed to the role of leading-note progressions in Bruckner's bass lines ("der Baßton als Leitton ist eine Eigentümlichkeit Bruckners") particularly (here he cites Orel), the use of "trugschlußartige Fortschreitung als Verbindungsmittel zweier tonartlich unterschiedener Teile",<sup>78</sup> a harmonic and structural innovation which features frequently in Wagner's music, of course. There is also what may be regarded as the reverse of such progressions, namely a phenomenon which has been referred to as "Tonspaltung" (Nowak) or "Kernspaltung" (Gülke), the 'fission' of a note, as it were, into its chromatic neighbour tones. Nowak used an architectural simile to explain this effect:

Tonspaltung [...] ist ein für Bruckner kennzeichnendes Kompositionsmerkmal. In ihr aber liegt der Keime für Bruckners 'Weitenbewußtsein'. Es ist, wie wenn man in einem großen, wohlgegliederten Bauwerk um eine Ecke geht und plötzlich, als neuen, unerwarteten Anblick in ein weites Gewölbe oder in eine Kuppel hineinsieht.<sup>79</sup>

Gülke amplified the concept in regard to the use of this progression in the opening paragraph of the first movement of the Ninth (mm. 18f.) which, as the earliest surviving pc. sk. for the Ninth reveals (see Nowak's transcription, C/361), would appear to have represented the 'harmonic germ' of the work:

---

<sup>75</sup> Capellen, *Ist das System S. Sechter's ein geeigneter Ausgangspunkt für die theoretische Wagnerforschung?*, pp. 6ff. Eckstein (p. 29) defended the same approaches. Zeleny pointed out that Capellen's reform was self-defeating: "gerade die Möglichkeit, den Tritonus auf einfache und grundlegende Weise in die Tonart aufzunehmen, spricht für Sechter" (p. 470). Newlin ("Bruckner the Teacher", p. 52) also noted Capellen's rejection of Sechter as a basis for the analysis of complex chromatic music.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. particularly pp. 230f.

<sup>77</sup> P. 473.

<sup>78</sup> Orel, *Anton Bruckner: Das Werk...*, p. 10, quoted by Zeleny, *ibid.*

<sup>79</sup> "Bruckners Begriff der 'Weite' in Anton Bruckners Musik", *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 130. Oskar Loerke also referred to the concept (*Anton Bruckner: Ein Charakterbild*, Berlin 1938, repr. 1976, p. 104).



Doch eben, da das d wie endgültig und unverrückbar festgezurrert erscheint, geschieht, was nach so eindringlicher, graphisch-karger Fixierung sich fast wie eine Kernspaltung ausnimmt: Der Ton birst, der Einklang fährt in die zunächst liegenden Tonstufen es und des auseinander—ein ebenso elementarischer wie unfunktionaler Vorgang, fast möchte man sagen: ein Unfall, eine wild und regellos aufschießende Protuberanz.<sup>80</sup>

Yet even this advanced compositional resource can be traced back to a strikingly similar progression in Bach's F-major Toccata, BWV 540, a work which Bruckner played and knew well.<sup>81</sup> At m. 204 of the Toccata, following a 7-m. dominant preparation, Bach sidesteps a cadence into D minor by moving to a chord of B $\flat$ <sup>7</sup> in 3rd inversion, the bass thus moving from A to A $\flat$ . Bruckner's use of this progression in the Ninth (commencing from the tonic instead of the dominant) represents a harmonic conflation of a primarily melodic nexus which Bruckner invoked in various forms throughout his compositional career; some of the more significant instances of these are summed up in Ex. 23, The "Nebenton complex" in Bruckner's works. The melodic topos of two usually chromatic neighbour tones circling around the dominant or tonic of the key occurs in a rich variety of thematic and harmonic contexts, from the Hauptth. of II/1 (Ex. 23a), through multiple instances in the Fifth (23b–d), the principal themes of both VI/1 (23e, where it defines the Phrygian-mode quality of the theme), VII/1 (23f), the Adagio of the Eighth, and the concluding fugue of Psalm 150. Significantly, the Ninth presents both melodic and harmonic conflations of this nexus: the "Kernspaltung" of the opening harmonic progression of the first movement (23i); the further conflation of the two chromatic neighbour tones g $\sharp$ /b $\flat$  simultaneously against what amounts to a "verschwiegenes Fundament" (A) in the celebrated chord that opens the Scherzo movement (23j; cf. 1b, discussion *infra*); and finally a number of instances of both chromatic and diatonic neighbour-tone sequences in both the Hauptth. (23k) and Gesangsp. (l) of the Adagio. The Finale also contains significant instances of its use: cf. for instance the progression in the Durchführung of the fugue, AP E/84, mm. 3–4, summarised in Ex. 8b, and Bruckner's apparent recall of the progression in the coda, E/141, 3rd br.; cf. Ex. 19.<sup>82</sup>

Ex. 1a–c explains how the opening passages of each of the first three movements of the Ninth Symphony, despite their remarkably progressive harmonic character, may be explained in terms of chromatic or enharmonic modulation, maintaining root movement, largely by

<sup>80</sup> *Brahms–Bruckner: Zwei Studien*, p. 77. Similarly: "Fast ließe sich vom Zerbersten des d zu des und es sagen, die Sekund sei zunächst nur eine Umschreibung, ein anderer 'Aggregatzustand' desselben Tons [...]" (*ibid.*, p. 117). See the discussion of this passage and its role as a harmonic determinant for the work in §2.2.4.

<sup>81</sup> Auer's listing of Bruckner's numerous Bach organ works from Bruckner's estate (Göll.-A. II/1, pp. 336f.) does not cite the F-major Toccata; however, Bruckner not only performed the work but also improvised upon it at the Royal Albert Hall, 2 August 1871, during his London concert tour (Göll.-A. IV/1, p. 146). See also Stradal's "Erinnerungen", pp. 854ff., pp. 971ff., and the discussion of the influence of other composers on Bruckner in Doebel, pp. 41ff. Allusions in the Finale to Bach's D-minor and F-major Toccatas BWV 545 and 540 are noted in §§3.3.6 and 3.3.7.

<sup>82</sup> These are referred to further in the course of Part 3, cf. particularly §§3.2.6 and 3.3.6.

ascending or descending intervals of perfect or diminished fifths, from degree to degree of particular scales: these have been underlaid in the same fashion as often found in Sechter's analyses of such progressions.<sup>83</sup> Ex 1a, with the exception of the "Kernspaltung" of mm. 18/19, illustrates that this opening harmonic gambit, which has such powerful ramifications for the harmonic and tonal structure of the whole work,<sup>84</sup> is a relatively straightforward progression—but not if read in D minor. An appropriate fundamental bass reading requires the interpolation of "Zwischenfundamente" only in mm. 18 and 20. The modulation from D minor to E♭ at mm. 18–19 is 'chromatic', since E♭ is not a scale degree of D minor (the pivot chord, B♭, is present only as *Zwischenfundament*); from mm. 21 to 26, however, the progression can be categorised as a 'diatonic' modulation from E♭ minor via C♭ major to the dominant of D♭ minor.<sup>85</sup>

The remaining two examples are more complex. Ex. 1b, the opening harmonic progression of the Scherzo, represents a striking case of both chromatic and enharmonic modes and stretches the application of Sechterian methodology (but equally any other kind of harmonic analysis, it could be added) to the utmost. The enigmatic 'Scherzo chord', e/g♯/b♭/c♯, which dominates the movement, presents a unique case in Bruckner's output of Sechterian *Alterationsharmonik*, in which notes of any chord can be sharpened or flattened at will.<sup>86</sup> The most straightforward reading is that the chord constitutes a dominant ninth with omitted fundamental (i.e., a diminished seventh), but with the seventh raised (g♯). Equally, conflating as it does elements common to both A (c♯/e) and E (e/g♯/b♭<sup>87</sup>) triads, it can be seen

---

<sup>83</sup> In his university lectures (see Schwanzara's musical examples) Bruckner used Arabic ordinals to denote scale degrees; elsewhere he used Roman numerals, as did Sechter. Major keys, or more properly scales (*Tonleiter*) are denoted here with capital letters, minor with the addition of 'm'. The *Zwischenfundamente* have been bracketed and are not fully figured—Bruckner does not figure them at all in the Schwanzara examples, where the progressions themselves are figured rather than the fundamental basses, as here.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. §2.2.4.

<sup>85</sup> Theoretically, the modulation can be read from m. 19 without reference to C♭ major (as I, III, VI, I, IV in E♭ minor); C♭ major has been retained because of the significance of the harmony at m. 21; a number of other readings are also possible.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. for example Eckstein's discussion of chromaticism and modulation, pp. 49ff. Cf. also Manfred Wagner, *BrLWD*, p. 359: "Bruckners zeitgemäßer Anteil an der tonalen Sprache des Jahrhunderts war die Alterationsharmonik, die das letzte Stadium der Funktionsharmonik darstellte."

<sup>87</sup> Often called a 'half-diminished triad', this chord forms the basis for Sechter's "Zwitterakkord" (Wason: "hybrid chord"), or in modern terminology an augmented sixth; such chords are derived by Sechter by chromatic alteration of diatonic progressions. Cf. Sechter, *Grundsätze I*, pp. 186ff.; Schwanzara, p. 27; Schenk and Gruber, p. 373; Wason, pp. 55f. Bruckner did not deal with the *Zwitterakkord* in his university lectures. In his usage the chord is often used as a means of enharmonic modulation, as it can be interpreted as having two roots a tritone apart, normally approached and quitted by fourth or fifth—cf. the dominant seventh chord mentioned in Psalm 150 *supra*, which in traditional English-language terminology would be said to constitute a 'German' augmented sixth. Further instances of Bruckner's use of the chord as a modulatory device are encountered below. See also Bernhard Ziehn, "Ueber den ersten Akkord im Scherzo der neunten Sinfonie von Bruckner", *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* no. 28–29 (10–17 July 1903), p. 467: who noted "Sollte wirklich noch niemand bemerkt haben, daß das Scherzo [...] mit demselben Akkord beginnt wie der Tristan?" Ziehn listed numerous examples of earlier

as sharing two roots.<sup>88</sup> This at first glance curious interpretation is borne out in Bruckner's pc. sk. for the Scherzo, ÖNB 3196/1<sup>r</sup>,<sup>89</sup> where, in a rare example in Bruckner's compositional MSS of what Eckstein referred to as "Fundamentstönchen", Bruckner notated both an e and an A as stemless crotchets in the bass stave under the chord, writing above it "E Fund.[ament] Vorhalt auf Dom[inante]".<sup>90</sup> This is enigmatic, since it is difficult to read the c# as anything other than a member of an A-major triad according to Sechterian principles (which, unlike those of Rameau, did not recognise the existence of an independent *sixte ajoutée* or  $\frac{6}{5}$  chord). Bruckner's remark probably implies that he thought of the chord as a suspension of an E-based chord superimposed onto the dominant A, thus conflating secondary dominant and dominant. This appears to be a unique case. It is also significant that, in what appears to be the initial sk. for the opening of the Scherzo, ÖNB 28.224/1<sup>r</sup>,<sup>91</sup> the chord appears as e/g#/b♭/d; the alteration of the d to c#, as it appears (with no sign of alteration) in ÖNB 3196, establishes from the outset the c# which runs as an internal pedal point throughout the passage.

While there is no question that the passage can be most readily interpreted as a series of passing chords between the initial "Leitklang" and its resumption at m. 35—together with D minor, a chord which, as Grandjean notes in his analysis,<sup>92</sup> dominates the whole movement—it is possible even here to underlay a meaningful sequence of fundamentals. The first progression at m. 13 is a straightforward case of "Quintfallen", using Bruckner's terminology in his university lectures;<sup>93</sup> the progressions at mm. 23, 27 and 31 can all be read as cases of Quintsteigen within F# minor and G#, whereby the chord at mm. 13ff. can be read as common to D and F#, that at mm. 23ff. as common to F# and G#.<sup>94</sup> The d# at m. 31, becomes at m. 35 the basis of an eleventh chord, whereby the progression comes full circle and the original Leitklang recurs with the addition of e♭. This again constitutes a kind of "Zwitterakkord" with two roots a tritone apart; it can be read (see brackets in the example) either as a more regular eleventh chord on e♭ or as an altered ninth chord on A, in which manner it functions as a

---

occurrences of the chord with varying resolutions. The chord can also be encountered in the Finale in a variant form, as a passing-note B♭ under a C#-major triad; cf. AP, E/64, m. 1.

<sup>88</sup> Bruckner may have understood this chord as representing a special case of a Zwitterakkord; Göllerich reported him saying of it: "'Wann's *Das* erleb'n, werd'n sie sich giften—aber da hör' ich schon nix mehr davon, da bin ich schon im Grab!'—urteilte *Bruckner* selbst über die Probleme, die dieses *Tanz-Märchen* der 'Zunft' zu lösen gibt" (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 477; emphasis of the original).

<sup>89</sup> Reproduced in Cohrs, ed., *Studienband zum Scherzo and Trio*, p. 5.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Cohrs, *ibid.*, p. 78.

<sup>91</sup> Reproduced in Cohrs, *ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>92</sup> *Metrik und Form...*, p. 163.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Schwanzara, p. 179, where Bruckner explains that all progressions come down to falling or rising fifths or thirds.

<sup>94</sup> The d in the mm. 23ff. chord represents less of a problem for a reading of this chord as a subdominant with minor ninth than one might expect. For instance, Bruckner's listing of thirteenth chords in Schwanzara's account (see his Example no. 140) includes an eleventh chord with augmented triad, C/e/g#/b/d; the basis tenets of fundamental bass theory appear, however, to be satisfied once satisfactory movement of roots is established.

dominant preparation for the ensuing D pedal point at m. 43; the situation recurs just prior to the Repr. at mm. 153ff. The opening chord also recurs within the Hauptth. at mm. 47ff. (Exp.) and 165ff. (Repr.) in a further more dissonant incarnation above a D pedal.

The opening of the Adagio presents perhaps the most harmonically complex passage in the symphony, and the most difficult to reconcile with fundamental bass principles; yet even here, as Ex. 1c shows, there is nothing which actively contradicts them, and much that is instructive and insightful in a Sechterian reading. Bruckner's enharmonic spellings compared with the interpretations of root movement given here—cf. the first minim in m. 4—could suggest that he did not proceed from Sechterian principles in composing the passage, which the sources reveal to have been a particularly long and complex process,<sup>95</sup> yet in fact the bass Ab here was originally spelled G#.<sup>96</sup>

Unravelling the complex web of chromatic passing notes throughout the first 4 mm. nonetheless reveals a series of fundamental steps proceeding exclusively by “Quart-” or “Quintfallen”, with the interpolation of “Zwischenfundamente” required in only two cases (mm. 2, 3). The e/g/a#/c chord (fundamental F#), in m. 2 becomes by enharmonic change e/g/bb/c, providing the necessary pivot to the following “key” of F. By the end of m. 3 the music has moved toward C#; the chord on the second minim of m. 4 constitutes an irregularly resolved “Zwitterakkord”,<sup>97</sup> which here, read as a ninth chord on C#, looks back to the preceding G# chord and simultaneously forward, as a seventh chord on G, to the ensuing D. The remainder of the passage, which returns to a strongly Myxolydian-coloured E major, is harmonically more straightforward; as is well known, it recalls Wagner's use of the “Dresdener Amen” topos as the *Gralsmotiv* in *Parsifal*.<sup>98</sup>

### 2.1.3 “Terzschichtung” and the ninth chord.

Perhaps the most telling indication of the role that theoretical considerations played in the development of Bruckner's musical language, and which filtered back into his teaching, is the emphasis placed both in his teaching and compositional practice on chords of the ninth, eleventh and thirteenth, referred to by Bruckner in his university teaching as “Fünf-, Sechs- und Siebenklänge”.<sup>99</sup> The notion that a relationship may have existed between Bruckner's use

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Orel's exegesis of the composition of the Adagio, *Entwürfe und Skizzen*, pp. 61f.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 62, no. 41.

<sup>97</sup> The chord could have been resolved in a more orthodox fashion by “Quintfallen” onto F# (root movement C#–F#) or C (G–C).

<sup>98</sup> Bruckner's earliest sks. for the movement (cf. §1.1.2, e.g., Cracow, fols. 32<sup>v</sup> and 33<sup>r</sup>) originally used this progression in stepwise form ending on the fifth of the chord, which recalls Wagner's usage more closely and also more similar to Bruckner's allusions to the motive at the end of the first phrases of his choral works *Vexilla regis* (cf. C/343) and *Träumen und Wachen*.

<sup>99</sup> In the following, the chords in question are referred to when more appropriate by their German names; ‘ninth chord’ has been used generally, however, to avoid the clumsiness of “Septnonakkord”, according to which thir-

of five-, six- and seven-note chords in his compositions and his emphasis on them in his theory teaching was first advanced by Orel:

Der von Hugo Riemann bekämpfte Grundsatz des Terzenaufbaus [...] findet in Bruckner demnach einen theoretischen Vertreter, der trotz seines Grundsatzes der Scheidung von Theorie und Praxis gerade in dieser Hinsicht auch in seinen Werken den Beweis für die Akkordentstehung durch Terzenüberschichtung gibt.<sup>100</sup>

The principle of building chords via the addition of thirds was one of the most significant differences between Sechter's system and its treatment in Bruckner's hands. While Zeleny<sup>101</sup> perhaps somewhat cryptically remarked that Sechter's "größter Schüler [...] ist ein treuer Anhänger seines Lehrers aber dessen Schüler und Biographen teilen diesen Standpunkt nicht", Schwanzara explains in which specific aspects Bruckner went his own way:

So nimmt er zum Beispiel abweichend von Sechter, der nur zwei Stammakkorde anerkennt (Dreiklang und Septakkord), noch einen dritten Stammakkord an, nämlich den Septnonakkord. Diesen erklärt Sechter als ein Vorhaltsgebilde, [Bruckner] spricht aber dieses Gebilde stets als Septnonakkord an und räumt ihm die Eigenschaften eines richtigen Akkordes ein.<sup>102</sup>

According to Orel, "Die Auffassung des Septnonakkordes als Stammakkord durch Bruckner steht [...] in Gegensatz zu Sechter, stimmt jedoch mit der Auffassung Dürrnbergers überein".<sup>103</sup> As clarified by Wason:

In Sechter's system, the ninth is always the product of suspension, there are no inversions of the ninth chord, and scale-degree ninth chords can only occur in sequence through delayed resolution of a suspension beyond the change of bass. Moreover the dissonances of the eleventh and thirteenth do not form chords. In Bruckner's system, on the other hand, the ninth chord is a "fundamental harmony"; the eleventh and thirteenth are on

---

teenth chords would become 'Nonseptundeztredezakkorde'. Vockner's notes (cf. Schenk and Gruber, facsimile, p. 377) suggest that Bruckner may have used the terms "Non", "Undez" and "Tredez" to refer to the construction of what he commonly referred to as "Fünfklang", "Sechsklang" and "Siebenklang" respectively.

<sup>100</sup> *Ein Harmonielehrkolleg...*, p. 52.

<sup>101</sup> p. 472.

<sup>102</sup> p. 57. Cf. Bruckner's introductory remarks, *ibid.*, p. 128: "Dreiklang, Vierklang und Fünfklang sind die drei Stammakkorde der Musik. Sechs- und Siebenklänge kommen nur nebenbei vor." Concerning Bruckner's apparent fascination with the ninth chord, Eckstein (*Erinnerungen*, p. 14) quotes a *Tantum ergo* by Bruckner's with "frei eintretende Non" and also draws attention to Brünnhilde's "Ruhe, ruhe Du Gott" in Wagner's *Götterdämmerung*, Act 3 (Dover edition, p. 569), of which Bruckner appears to have been particularly fond: "Hatte er mich doch auch immer wieder auf jene Stelle am Schlusse der 'Götterdämmerung' gemacht, wo bei Brünnhildens Worten: 'Ruhe, ruhe, Du Gott!' die frei eintretende große None sogar mit ihrem Auflösungsston zugleich erklingt" (p. 16).

<sup>103</sup> *Harmonielehrkolleg*, *ibid.* According to Wason, Bruckner's theoretical practice of building up chords in thirds derived from Marpurg rather than Sechter (p. 165, fn. 36)—although significant differences existed (*ibid.*). Schwanzara confirms (p. 58) that Bruckner held in part to the teaching of Dürrnberger.

some occasions the result of suspension, while on others they are part of a six- or seven-note chord on the dominant.<sup>104</sup>

While Sechter only grudgingly agreed to the possible existence of a *Septnonakkord* as anything more than the result of a suspension,<sup>105</sup> Bruckner, even in his University teaching,<sup>106</sup> devoted considerable space to the construction and resolution of the ninth chord, excusing his omission of more detailed discussion of the chords of six and seven notes, as we have seen.<sup>107</sup> Bruckner's inclusion of the ninth chord among the *Stammakkorde*, which enabled him "to explain progressions harmonically which Sechter had explained melodically",<sup>108</sup> his concern with its resolution, and, in the notes of Eckstein and Vockner,<sup>109</sup> even with resolutions of eleventh and thirteenth chords, testify to Bruckner's willingness to reassess Sechter's theoretical principles in this area, as elsewhere.

Bruckner's modification of Sechter's model in this respect represents a re-assimilation by Bruckner of elements of an even older theoretical tradition. It reveals that he thought deeply about the problem. It also leaves open the possibility that such revisions to Sechter's model, like the more detailed approach to enharmonic modulation, may have been made at the prompting of compositional imperatives. It is hard to see why Bruckner would have attempted

---

<sup>104</sup> Wason, p. 73. However, Schwanzara suggests this issue was somewhat more complex. Following his lengthy account of Bruckner's explanation of the appropriate resolution of Un- and Tredezimakkorde (pp. 169ff.), Schwanzara conjectures (p. 175): "Vielleicht hat Bruckner seine Darlegungen über die satztechnisch Einwandfreie Behandlung auch des Nonenakkordes so ausführlich gehalten, um damit zu rechtfertigen, warum er—in Gegensatz zu anderen Harmonielehrern—den Nonenakkord für einen höchst beachtenswerten, selbständigen Akkord hält und ihn zu den Stammakkorden rechnet. Sechter zum Beispiel zählt bloß Drei- und Vierklang zu den Stammakkorden. Aber [Sechter] meint [*Grundsätze* I, p. 30], daß man der das Eintreten der Oktave verzögernden Non 'eine, zwar uneigentliche, Selbstständigkeit beilegen kann, indem man den Zusammenklang von Grundton, Terz, Quint, Sept und Non einen Septnonaccord nennt'. In der Folge räumt aber Sechter diesem 'Zusammenklang', den er stets als Septnonakkord anspricht, alle Eigenschaften eines richtigen Akkordes ein". Nonetheless Tittel misrepresented Sechter's position in writing that the theoretician's "Dissonanzbildung und -erklärung erfolgt konstruktiv, weil der schematische Terzenaufbau durchaus mechanisch vor sich geht und in einer schier unerschöpflichen Fülle zu Sept-, Non-, Undezim- und Tredezimakkorden führt" ("Bruckners musikalischer Ausbildungsgang", p. 109); there is little indication in the *Grundsätze* of such thinking; it does, however, feature strongly in other treatises of the period. This is all the more curious in that Tittel elsewhere specified as Bruckner's deviations from Sechter's model: "die Akkordtürmung in Terzen und die Bevorzugung von Nebenseptakkorden. — Betonte Anerkennung von Non-, Undez- und Tredezakkorden, Behandlung von fünf- und sechsstimmigen Sätzen", etc. ("Wiener Musiktheorie von Fux bis Schönberg", p. 189).

<sup>105</sup> Sechter, *Grundsätze* I, p. 30; cf. Wason, p. 71. Bruckner was not the only composer of his generation to concern himself with the ninth chord; the theoretical writings of the North German composer Felix Draesecke (1835–1913) feature a tract entitled *Einige Gedanken über den großen Nonenakkord* (self-published; n. d.).

<sup>106</sup> Schwanzara's account of Bruckner's teaching in regard to the Septnonakkord covers a total of 10 pages, pp. 169–178.

<sup>107</sup> Schwanzara, p. 169.

<sup>108</sup> Wason, p. 73.

<sup>109</sup> Vockner's notes reveal that Bruckner covered the field exhaustively with him, with exercises for resolutions of ninth, eleventh and thirteenth chords, and even "Mögliche Umkehrungen" of these chords (Schenk and Gruber, pp. 357f. and 370, facsimile, p. 377). Despite his stated intention to omit the treatment of eleventh and thirteenth chords, his university teaching on the construction and resolution of the ninth chord included a much abbreviated treatment of the material (Schwanzara, pp. 169–178, examples 66–75, 140). Cf. Wason, pp. 71ff.

to extend Sechter's system if it was for him merely an abstracted methodology of technical training having nothing in common with free composition. Wason, for instance, nowhere attempts to explain why Bruckner should have departed so radically from his teacher in adopting the ninth chord as a Stammakkord, or why, in an elementary course, he should have allotted considerable time to its resolution and even touched upon the resolution of six- and seven-note chords. Having largely discounted the idea that Bruckner's theoretical thinking had much, if anything to do with his compositional activity,<sup>110</sup> Wason ingenuously remarks that "there are certainly passages in Bruckner's music which seem to suggest that he thought of such dissonances as producing a 'chord', at least on the dominant. Measures 102–23 of the first movement of the Seventh Symphony certainly seem to suggest such a sonority"<sup>111</sup> (this is the same passage of music as quoted by Orel<sup>112</sup>). Wason moreover cites a MS source, ÖNB 6072A (Facs. C/360, *q.v.*), in which Bruckner experimented inversions of eleventh and thirteenth chords, and invokes Bruckner's above-quoted reference to the use of such six- and seven-note chords in the Ninth.<sup>113</sup> This evidence deserves to be taken at face value.

In fact, the Ninth represents a virtual lecture-room demonstration of the possibilities of such theoretical constructs. Inversions of the complete ninth chord emerge in IX/1 at mm. 381ff., where Bruckner places the ninth in the bass; he resolves the chord at m. 387 onto an F-minor  $\frac{6}{3}$  chord. At letter W of the first movement, Bruckner sustains a Tredezim with third and fifth omitted for no fewer than 10 mm. We have already noted the use of what is effectively an Undezim on E $\flat$  with only the third omitted in the Scherzo (mm. 35ff., cf. Ex. 1b; the chord recurs before the Repr., mm. 153ff.). Bruckner builds this chord via the addition of thirds; it subsequently becomes, from the standpoint of its leading-note function and resolution, to D a 'double root' chord recalling the opening altered chord of the movement. The Adagio exhibits both Undezim (with omission of the third) in the famous passage at letter A, and the Tredezim in various configurations from letter Q, with a complete Tredezim at the climax of m. 206. Although the Finale appears overall less dependent on the use of 'Mehrklänge' as a harmonic resource, a number of such constructions occur, for instance a complete ninth chord, AP E/84, mm. 3ff., and three instances of Undezim, AP E/76, mm. 3f. (with root omitted), E/94, mm. 1f. (Undezim on A $\flat$  with ninth omitted), and the apparent notation of an Undezim in the coda (E/141, br. 2), as will be discussed in Part Three.<sup>114</sup>

Few of these harmonic constructions effectively resolve; most remain as 'towering precipices'; to go beyond them may have appeared impossible, even to Bruckner; they

<sup>110</sup> As quoted at the outset of §2.0.1.

<sup>111</sup> Wason, p. 72.

<sup>112</sup> *Ein Harmonielehrkolleg*, pp. 53f.

<sup>113</sup> p. 73.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. for instance §§3.1.10, 3.2.7, 3.3.5.

therefore contribute to what Kurth regarded as the work's characteristic "Steilstrebigkeit".<sup>115</sup> Equally significant, however, if less immediately obvious, is the use of such chords with resolutions as part of an ongoing musical progression. We have already made mention of the irregular resolution of the B<sup>9</sup> chord at m. 381 of IX/1 onto an F-minor<sub>4</sub><sup>6</sup> (root movement by tritone, as recurs constantly in the Finale). Irregular resolutions of ninth chords also occur at letters B and H of the Trio (F<sup>#9</sup>—G minor<sub>3</sub><sup>6</sup>). At m. 15 of the Adagio, just prior to letter A, Bruckner builds up a complete Bb<sup>b9</sup> in third inversion<sup>116</sup> and in the following m., maintaining the same bass, builds this into a thirteenth chord with omitted third. In the following m. this resolves onto the celebrated F<sup>#11</sup> chord, which again omits the third.<sup>117</sup> In the Finale the complete C<sup>b9</sup> chord of E/84 resolves to a Db<sup>b7</sup>; the dominant eleventh chord at E/76 resolves to D minor, maintaining the eleventh as the root of the chord's resolution; the Ab<sup>11</sup> of E/94 resolves to a C-minor<sub>4</sub><sup>6</sup>; and the eleventh chord indicated in the coda sk., E/141, again resolves, eventually, to the tonic (3rd br.).

Finally it should be noted that the principle of Terzschichtung was by no means a late nineteenth-century innovation. We have already seen that Bruckner derived such thinking from his study of Dürnberger or Marpurg; it thus represented an older theoretical tradition, presumably intended as a pedagogic demonstration of the principles of Terzenaufbau, which Bruckner reclaimed as a compositional resource. Manfred Wagner, in discussion of the *Akkordlehre* in the Viennese fundamental bass tradition, claimed that:

Die Kluft zwischen Musik und Musiktheorie [...] wird in der Behandlung der Akkorde besonders deutlich. Der alte Akkord des Generalbasses scheint im Wiener Raum wesensbestimmend, auch wenn einzelne Komponisten der theoretischen Lehre schon weit voraus sind. Wien katalogisiert und systematisiert die Akkorde im monistischen Sinn [...]. Auch ist diese Tendenz in Sinne des Generalbasses durchaus verständlich: Es geht nicht in erster Linie um die innere Dynamik einer kompositorischen Leistung [...], sondern um das Erlernen eines gründlichen Handwerks.<sup>118</sup>

In his discussion of Justin Heinrich Knecht's *Theoretische, praktische Generalbassschule*,<sup>119</sup> Wagner referred, as what he called the "unsinnigen Konsequenz des Terzenbaus", to the listing of no less than 3600 "Akkorde der praktischen Musik", citing among those listed 132

<sup>115</sup> *Bruckner*, p. 667.

<sup>116</sup> I.e., assuming the 4th horn's ab<sup>1</sup> as bass note.

<sup>117</sup> It is not clear whether Bruckner would have regarded root movement here enharmonically as Bb/A#—F#, i.e., a falling third (a rare progression of roots in Bruckner's complex progressions), or perhaps as movement by the augmented fifth Bb—F#, i.e., a special case of Quintsteigen. The corresponding passage in the coda builds only into what is in effect a complete ninth chord on C (m. 217f.); its resolution at letter T can be regarded either as movement to E or A, so presumably the progression at letter A is also a case of root movement by third. The transition to the chorale theme in the Finale concludes with a similar third-related progression of roots from C to E; cf. AP E/41; the equivalent passage in the Repr. reverses the progression, i.e., Gb—D; cf. E/124.

<sup>118</sup> *Die Harmonielehre...*, p. 37.

<sup>119</sup> 2nd edition, Bozen 1838 (cf. M. Wagner, *Die Harmonielehre...*, p. 47).



examples of "Septimenakkorde als Urakkorde",<sup>120</sup> 72 "Nonakkorde als Urakkorde", 84 "Non-septimakkorde als Urakkorde", 72 "Undecimakkorde", 60 "Tredecimakkorde als Urakkorde", and 36 "Tredecim-Undecim-Non-Septimakkorde."<sup>121</sup>

While it is by no means likely that Bruckner was familiar with Knecht, he was certainly familiar with this theoretical tradition. It is only a small step from here to his rehabilitation of such thinking in his theory teaching, and thence to the exploitation of such chords as a compositional resource—or *vice versa*. Bruckner's theoretical teaching concerning 'Mehrklänge' probably reflects his interest in such constructs for their own sake as well as the role of the ninth chord as a theoretical device to better explain harmonic progressions via harmonic rather than melodic means. The influence of Bruckner's compositional models should not be disregarded here either, as providing both compositional stimulus and the authority of tradition for a composer obsessed with the justification of his creative procedures; one could point, for instance, to the complete D-minor Tredezim in first inversion that occurs at m. 208 of the Finale of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, the first chord of the so-called *Schreckensfanfare*. And August Stradal, in discussing Bruckner's musical preferences and influences, emphasised Schubert, describing him as Bruckner's "Hausgott", and citing the significance of the "Great" C-major Symphony, of which, as he claimed, the "oft wiederholenden Nonen- und Undezimakkorde bei den Steigerungen" influenced Bruckner's music.<sup>122</sup> Bruckner's revisions of Sechter's system may well have emerged as a response, primarily, to his confrontation with Wagner and his need to find greater theoretical justification for his own music, however; despite his significant departures from and expansions of the theoretical model he acquired from the fundamental bass tradition, that no essential dichotomy between the theoretician and composer Anton Bruckner existed has been adequately substantiated here. While it remains unfortunate that Bruckner never attempted to put forward a clear statement of the manner in which he adapted fundamental bass theory in his own music, his willingness to encompass in his teaching aspects of more advanced harmonic practice testifies to the interaction between the theoretical and compositional facets of a musical mind profoundly preoccupied with the need to theoretically account for compositional practice and implies a significantly more unified approach by Bruckner to theory and composition than has been recognised by scholars until now. The following passage from Alfred Orel deserves citation at length as a summary of the impact of Sechter the theoretician upon Bruckner's harmonic practice:

Die Lehre Sechters fußte noch auf Grundsätzen, die sich aus weit zurückliegenden Zeiten herleiten. Es wurde das Wort geprägt, Sechters Lehrbuch sei schon bei seinem Er-

---

<sup>120</sup> Knecht's category of "Urakkorde" is the same as Sechter's and Bruckner's "Stammakkorde", after Wason, "essential chords".

<sup>121</sup> *Die Harmonielehre der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 38)*, Regensburg 1974, p. 38.

<sup>122</sup> "Erinnerungen", p. 974.

scheinen veraltet gewesen (Decsey [*Versuch eines Lebens*, Berlin 1919], S. 37). Gewiß, im Jahre 1853 hatte Wagner schon seinen 'Lohengrin' geschaffen, der Komponist dieser Zeit war den Fesseln der strengen Fundamentallehre schon entwachsen, allein es ist fraglich, ob das Buch auch für den Lernenden veraltet war. Für Bruckner gewiß nicht. Anderen drohte allerdings die Gefahr, entweder in dem Netz von Vorschriften und Verboten zu ersticken oder all den theoretischen Kram von sich zu werfen und einzig auf der Grundlage des eigenen musikalischen Empfindens aufzubauen. Bruckner hatte aber in seiner ruhigen Stetigkeit die Ausdauer und die Kraft, wohl auch den nötigen Autoritätsglauben, um das Sechtersche Gebäude bis in seine letzte Schlupfwinkel kennzulernen, diese Theorie schließlich in dem Maße zu beherrschen, daß sie ihm nicht mehr Fessel, sondern reicher Besitz wurde. Man braucht nur die Beispiele über den chromatischen Satz zu betrachten, die Friedrich Eckstein seinem ausgezeichneten Büchlein [...] beigibt, um das landläufige Urteil über Sechters Rückständigkeit zumindest im Resultate, wenn schon nicht im Wege, etwas anzuzweifeln. Die Rückständigkeit ist nicht auf die gebotenen Möglichkeiten, sondern darauf zu beziehen, daß die Betrachtung von einem überwundenen Standpunkte ausgeht, die inneren Voraussetzungen der Kompositionstechnik damals schon ganz andere geworden waren. Hatte nun jemand, wie es bei Bruckner zutrifft, die Kraft des naiven Schaffens vereint mit hoher künstlerischer Potenz, wobei die Sechtersche Lehre nur sicheres Fundament, nicht aber vorangesetzter Canon war, dann konnte jenes satztechnische Wundergebäude entstehen, das in Bruckners Meisterwerken entgegentritt. Ohne Sechter hätte Bruckner vielleicht kaum jene klangvolle Blechsätze geschrieben, ohne Sechter hätte die Baßführung Bruckners wohl nie diese ruhige Zielsicherheit, die weit gespannte Konstruktion erhalten. Nicht umsonst findet man in den Handschriften Bruckners den Rand außerhalb der Notenlinien voll beschrieben mit Notizen und Versuchen über die Möglichkeiten, die Stimmen im Notentext von Akkord zu Akkord fortschreiten zu lassen. Ohne die Kontrolle der doppelt-chromatischen Schritte und vielfachen Alterationen Sechters wäre kaum jene freieste und doch stets gewährte Tonalität der Harmonik Bruckners möglich gewesen. Die Sechtersche Schule gehört zu den notwendigen Voraussetzungen des Personalstils Anton Bruckners.<sup>123</sup>

Those words were written in 1925; since then it has proven possible to add only significant details to the general accuracy of Orel's assessment.

#### 2.1.4 Bruckner's formal concepts.

While we have always been well-informed about Bruckner's training in harmony, and to a lesser extent counterpoint, the so-called *Kitzler Studienbuch* represents a vitally important and, until recently, virtually unknown source for Bruckner's early studies in 'applied' composition; Paul Hawkshaw has written substantially on this important resource.<sup>124</sup> The MS, known to Nowak but not previously accessible to scholars, remains in possession of a Munich family. Its 163 fols. contain sketches, theoretical and other annotations, compositions and

<sup>123</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Das Werk, der Künstler, die Zeit*, Vienna–Leipzig 1925, pp. 127f.

<sup>124</sup> See Paul Hawkshaw, "Das Kitzler Studienbuch: Ein unschätzbare Dokument zu Bruckners Arbeitsweise", in: *BrSympBer* 1995, Linz 1997, pp. 95–109; see also the somewhat expanded English version, "A Composer Learns His Craft: Anton Bruckner's Lessons in Form and Orchestration, 1861–63", *MQ* 82 (1998), pp. 336–361.

compositional fragments in varying degrees of completion. They bear dates from Christmas 1861 to (mainly) 10 July 1863, on which date Bruckner noted the completion of an "Ouvertüre—dann Symphonie u[nd] Psalm", these being the G-minor Overture WAB 98, the F minor symphony WAB 99 and the setting of Psalm 112 (WAB 35); the much later date of 13 April 1868 also appears.

The *Studienbuch* reveals Bruckner to have had a conservative but systematic grounding in the essentials of musical composition, form and instrumentation. As noted in Kitzler's memoirs,<sup>125</sup> Bruckner initially used the popular compositional textbook of the organist and Director of Music at Leipzig University, Ernst Friedrich Richter, *Die Grundzüge der musikalischen Form und ihre Analyse*.<sup>126</sup> This is borne out by the *Studienbuch*, fols. 1–9<sup>v</sup> of which follow Richter precisely, examining the study of form through cadences and modulation within 8-m. periods, two and three-part song-form, irregular and extended periods, the Scherzo and Trio, étude, variations and rondo form. Later A. B. Marx' famous compositional treatise was used,<sup>127</sup> which Bruckner himself did not own; he apparently used Kitzler's copy.<sup>128</sup>

Significantly, Kitzler appears not to have dealt with sonata form on the basis of Marx, apparently because Bruckner was already familiar with it from his earlier study of Johann C. Lobe's *Lehrbuch der musikalischen Komposition*.<sup>129</sup> Bruckner's terminology and to all intents and purposes his concept of sonata form hence remained that of Lobe. The *Studienbuch* uses Lobe's terms for the names of sonata-movement sections throughout, for instance "Thema- and Übergangsgruppen" and "Gesangsgruppen"; terms such as "Hauptthema" "Gesangsperiode" and "Schlußperiode" (or "-gruppe"), with minor variations, remained constants throughout Bruckner's career—a further instance of his often-invoked 'Beharrungstendenz'.

---

<sup>125</sup> *Musikalische Erinnerungen, mit Briefen von Wagner, Brahms, Bruckner und Richard Pohl*, Brünn 1906, p. 29.

<sup>126</sup> Leipzig 1852.

<sup>127</sup> Adolf Bernhard Marx, *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition* (4 vols.), 5th edn., Leipzig 1858.

<sup>128</sup> Hawkshaw, "Das Kitzler Studienbuch", p. 104. This is borne out by Auer's inventory of the theoretical texts found in the remnant of Bruckner's estate which Göllicherich received from Bruckner's sister Rosalie Hueber (cf. Göll.-A. II/1, p. 336). Of these, Auer lists only the following music-theoretical texts: Türk's *Anweisung zum General-Baß-Spiel* and Dürnberger's *Elementarlehrbuch der Harmonie und Generalbaßlehre* (*ibid.*, p. 343). Among further significant items cited in Auer's list, mention may be made of: Bernhard Kothe, *Abriß der Musikgeschichte and Musiklexikon*, A. B. Marx, *Ludwig van Beethoven: Leben und Schaffen and Anleitung zum Vortrag Beethovenscher Klavierwerke*, and Robert Hirschfeld, *Das kritische Verfahren* Ed. Hanslicks (*ibid.*). Auer also notes (*ibid.*) Bruckner's investigations of metrical structure in a number of printed scores found in his estate: these are cited in §2.1.5; further ASS and scores were cited in §1.0.3.

<sup>129</sup> Leipzig 1850. It is significant that both the Richter and Lobe texts were still sufficiently popular and well-respected to have been in use as late as the 1880s, as explained by Schwanzara (p. 5), who used both texts himself. However, these texts were long out of print by the turn of the century, as Hawkshaw pointed out (p. 104, citing Kitzler's *Musikalische Erinnerungen*, p. 29, and also referring to Bruckner's letter of 8 Oct. 1863 to Weinwurm, *Ges. Briefe* (Auer), p. 51).

As a result of his close, formalistic adherence to what was by the late nineteenth century a somewhat archaic notation of sonata form, Bruckner continued throughout his symphonic output to divide sonata-form movements into two rather than three divisions. Leonard Ratner explained that:

Most analysis has taken its thematic content to be the principal parameter; this has been explained as being constituted from two principal themes which are presented, developed, and restated; this results in a *three-part* form. Classic theorists, on the other hand, explained the form of a long movement as a harmonic plan, with two large phases of action, resulting in a *two-part* form.<sup>130</sup>

Astonishingly, considering his massive expansion of the form in all other respects, Bruckner's use of the two-part division was based on the older, eighteenth-century plan:

The *two-part* division of sonata form arises from its harmonic contour, represented by a movement away from the tonic and then an answering return to it. The three-part division rests upon thematic layout—*exposition*, *development*, and *recapitulation* of themes. The two-part harmonic division recognizes the *dynamic* aspect of the form, since it focuses upon harmonic periodicity; the three-part melodic division is *static*, concerned with identifying and placing themes. Moreover it does not account for the unique rhetorical elements of the classic style that enabled sonata form to attain its breadth and organic unity.

Classical theorists all described the form as bipartite. Nevertheless, the separation of part II into two major sections was recognized. Koch, 1793, divides part II into two “Hauptperioden”; Momigny, 1806, while retaining a basic two-part division, compares the form of a movement to an architectural configuration of a dome and two wings. The three-part division, as well as the probable first use of the term sonata form, was sponsored by Adolph Bernhard Marx, 1841–1857; his views were decisive in establishing the thematic view of sonata form. The two-part versus three-part controversy continued through the 19th century. Lobe, 1858, and Tovey in the present century represent the former, while the majority of theorists have adopted the latter.<sup>131</sup>

The persistence of this older concept of two-part sonata form in Bruckner's thinking is reflected by the references throughout his *skts.* and scores to a clear structural division between a first and second “Theil” or “Abtheilung”, the latter most often indicated in score (often verbally noted in the *pc. skts.*), by the double barline placed roughly a third of the way through virtually every first and last movement, as well as the Scherzos and Trios—both the latter being characteristically either ABA or miniature monothematic sonata forms. Nowhere in the surviving MSS do we find references to the nomenclature of the three-part division (or subdivision of the second part)—as Exposition, Durchführung or Reprise—despite the fact

---

<sup>130</sup> Leonard G. Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style*, New York 1980, p. 217; italics original.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 220f.

that drawing distinctions between the three is often analytically useful.<sup>132</sup> Despite their delineation of individual formal units, Bruckner's movements tend to define their overall shape by means of key structure—that is, by a sense of harmonic departure, return and closure, than by thematic recapitulation. In opposition to the striking degree of structural clarity—often virtual cessation of a sense of musical impetus, even complete silence—allotted to the end of each theme group, the Exp. and beginning of the coda, the resumption of the principal theme of the first movement is almost never preceded by a clear structural caesura in Bruckner's first movements or finales.

This is of great significance for the analysis of Bruckner's music. Rarely does the Repr. of the Hauptth. constitute the most dominant event of the movement as it invariably does in orthodox sonata form; frequently it is elided or disguised. As Ratner notes:<sup>133</sup> "While a strong return to the tonic at the beginning of the recapitulation has dramatic force, it is not essential to the harmonic unity of the form, since the end of part II provides the confirmation". The 'disorientation' created for the listener by the absence of a clear signpost at the beginning of the Repr. in such huge movements nonetheless probably contributed significantly to the accusations of formlessness levelled at Bruckner's music.<sup>134</sup> Marx, in his elucidation of sonata form, even made a point of stressing the importance of this division for the overall comprehensibility of the structure: "Allein die Scheidung des zweiten und dritten Theils ist [...] so wesentlich, dass wir sie nicht übergehen können, ohne die Anschauung der Form zu stören und ihren Vernunftgrund aus den Augen zu verlieren".<sup>135</sup> Kitzler's apparently casual omission of Marx's exposition of sonata form in Bruckner's theoretical training thus proved to be of considerable music-historical significance. Just as remarkable appears the fact that, if Bruckner ever noted the discrepancy between his approach and that of his models, particularly the Beethoven symphonies, he chose to remain true to his own path.

Why then did Bruckner persist with his two-part formal division? It may be possible to explain what has generally been regarded as Bruckner's 'conflation' of Durchführung and Reprise (in fact the very terms are, in a sense, irrelevant) by thinking through the compositional factors involved. Since the Durchf. concerns itself largely with the Hauptth. and invariably rises to a climax at which the Hauptth. reasserts itself, a further, structurally

---

<sup>132</sup> This study usually refers to what Bruckner called the "1. Theil" as the Exposition, due to the familiarity of that usage, but refers either to the "2. Theil" or Durchführung/Reprise depending on which is more appropriate in context. As noted in §0.2.1, the German terminology has been retained as more appropriate.

<sup>133</sup> p. 229.

<sup>134</sup> Martin Eybl ("Grandiose Isolierzellen und rasselnde Fugenmechanik—Zu Schenkers Kritik an seinem Lehrer Bruckner", *BrSympBer 1988: Anton Bruckner als Schüler und Lehrer*, Linz–Vienna 1992, p. 137) provides a concise summary; see also Floros, "Thesen"; see also Floros, "Thesen über Bruckner", pp. 5ff. As Dahlhaus has noted, "Die zentrale Kategorie konservativen Denkens war in der Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts der Formbegriff" (*Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, p. 212). See also Doebel, pp. 27ff.

<sup>135</sup> Adolf Bernhard Marx, *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition* (4 vols.), 5th edn., Leipzig 1858, vol. 3, "Dritter Abschnitt", fn. to p. 221.

distinct Repr. of the Hauptth. becomes redundant. Furthermore, the Durchf. itself, for instance in IX/1, often begins by recalling the opening theme and/or compositional texture of the movement, giving the impression of a Repr. from that point onwards, albeit, in this case as elsewhere, interspersed by an extensive series of Durchführung-like episodes. The analytical misapprehension of treating the Durchf. as a separate unit beginning at letter J, with a Repr. beginning at letter S, which actually marks the Repr. of the Gesangsp.<sup>136</sup> (preceded by a huge dominant preparation from letter R) seems to have begun with Auer,<sup>137</sup> yet as he later recognised, “Vor allem ist die Anordnung der Themenfolge in der Durchführung eine wechselnde und in den späteren Werken erscheint die Durchführung mit der Reprise verzahnt und verkoppelt als Auswirkung der übermächtig wirkenden Entwicklungstendenz”.<sup>138</sup> For Kurth, the climax of Durchf. was also the entry of the Repr.: the two were “verwoben”;<sup>139</sup> Orel similarly referred to a “Verschmelzung” of Durchf. and Repr.<sup>140</sup> Grunsky took a Lorenzian approach, actually more appropriate, dividing the first movement of the Ninth into two “Hauptstrophen” and a coda.<sup>141</sup> Robert Simpson, apparently on the basis of remarks by Ferdinand Redlich,<sup>142</sup> similarly spoke of the structure of IX/1 as representing the sequence Statement–Counterstatement–Coda,<sup>143</sup> and this comes closer to reflecting our actual experience of the movement. Korte similarly appears to have understood Bruckner’s conception without being aware of its historical roots in the older tradition of sonata form:

Das thematisch Erschaffene ist kaum erfunden, als es schon beginnt, sich zu verwandeln. Auf dieser Basis werden die alten Werkvorstellungen von Durchführung und Reprise als Funktionsbestimmungen der Sonatensatz-Struktur praktisch aufgehoben. Bruckner rech-

---

<sup>136</sup> Cf., for instance, Karl H. Wörner: “Die Reprise verzichtet auf den Themenbogen A, sie ist zweiteilig” (*Das Zeitalter der thematischen Prozesse in der Geschichte der Musik*, = *Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* 18, Regensburg 1969, p. 123). Similarly, Sonntag (*The Compositional Process...*, p. 299) claims that “Bruckner reverses the Exposition in the Recapitulation, restating the first theme group not at the beginning of the Recapitulation, but at the end of the movement”—a problematic assertion, given that the Hauptth. does not even appear in the coda to any significant degree.

<sup>137</sup> 1923, p. 319.

<sup>138</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 624.

<sup>139</sup> p. 695

<sup>140</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Das Werk—Der Künstler—Die Zeit*, pp. 94f.

<sup>141</sup> Hans A. Grunsky, “Der erste Satz von Bruckners Neunter: Ein Bild höchster Formvollendung”, *Die Musik* 18 (1925–26), p. 25. See concerning the application of Lorenz’s analytical principles (Bogen, Bar etc.) to the analysis of Bruckner’s music, Stephen McClatchie, “Bruckner and the Bayreuthians; or, Das Geheimnis der Form bei Anton Bruckner”, in Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, eds., *Bruckner Studies*, Cambridge 1997, pp. 110–121.

<sup>142</sup> The “development section and recapitulation [are] telescoped into one large section [...], resulting in the overall picture of a huge two-part movement with Coda appendix” (Preface to the Eulenburg edn. of the Ninth, 1963).

<sup>143</sup> For instance, in “The Ninth Symphony of Anton Bruckner”, *Ch&D* 2, no. 6, 1950, p. 116, or *The Essence of Bruckner*, p. 184.

net noch mit diesen Vokabeln [?], muß sie aber anders lesen, da er ihnen den Sinn seiner Möglichkeiten gibt.<sup>144</sup>

Thereby, as Korte explains, "hat die alte Vorstellung der 'Durchführung' in diesem Ordnungsverfahren nur noch den Wert einer Nominaldefinition, eines Traditionsgebrauches":<sup>145</sup>

Im ersten Satz der Neunten kann man den Eindruck haben, als sei die Dreisatz-Anlage in eine Zweisatz-Ordnung überführt: die 'Durchführung' und die 'Reprise' [...] bilden einen Zusammenhang, der unmittelbar zu B' und C' führt. So entsteht die Anlage A – B – C / A' (als Durchführung und Reprise) – B' – C'.<sup>146</sup>

Significant also is Bruckner's division of his slow movements. Bruckner here used a formal model derived from that of the Beethoven Ninth, essentially a set of two contrasted theme groups, but repeated not once but twice, with increasing variation. If we may roughly summarise Bruckner's 'formal archetype' for his first and last movements, following Korte's plan, as a two-section alternation of three themes, ABC || ABC + coda, then that of his adagios can be thought of as a three-section alternation of two themes, AB || AB || A(B) + coda. The third section here, taking considerably greater liberty in its disposition of thematic materials, invariably forms a massive climax.<sup>147</sup> The formal plan of the Adagio of the Ninth, an endless source of debate for analysts,<sup>148</sup> was, as the pc. sks. clearly demonstrate, conceived by him in three "Abtheilungen": we find, for instance, "Anfang 2. Abth." (StB 4189/45<sup>r</sup>), at what

<sup>144</sup> P. 35. Cf. Warren Darcy's application of Hepokoski's principle of sonata deformation, "Bruckner's Sonata Deformations", in: Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, eds., *Bruckner Studies*, Cambridge 1997, pp. 256–277; his approach, however, assumes that Bruckner accepted tripartite sonata form as normative—doubtless not the case.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 50.

<sup>146</sup> P. 51. See further §2.2.2.

<sup>147</sup> Benjamin Korstvedt (*Bruckner: Eighth Symphony*, Cambridge 2000, pp. 39f.) mentions the derivation of the form from Beethoven and summarises the formal design of the Adagio of that symphony as three 'cycles'.

<sup>148</sup> As noted by Floros ("Zur Deutung der Symphonik Bruckners: Das Adagio der Neunten Symphonie", p. 90), who in his analysis follows Bruckner's division of the movement in the sks. into "drei Abteilungen und einen Schlußteil [i.e. coda]". Cf. for instance Michael Adensamer, "Bruckners Einfluß auf die Moderne", which claims (p. 27) that Bruckner is at his most progressive where he contradicts a sonata-form structure—which on the evidence of the MSS had nothing to do with Bruckner's formal intentions here. The structure of IX/3 is complicated by the fragmentation of the thematic material and inclusion of the "Abschied vom Leben" chorale—significantly, Bruckner himself referred to the "sechs Hauptthemen des Adagio" relatively early in the movement's conception (Schwanzara, p. 202; cf. §1.1.2). In his analysis, Floros regarded the statements of the "Abschied vom Leben" chorale theme which appear at letters B and L as "Fremdkörper" or "hapax legomena" (i.e., elements which do not recur later in the movement; cf. Floros: "*Hapax legomena* nennt August Boeckh [...] Wörter, 'welche überhaupt nur einmal, an einer bestimmten Stelle vorkommen'", *Bruckner und Brahms*, p. 204, fn. 69). Dahlhaus was to refute this approach in regard to similar passages in the Finale of the Eighth in his "Bruckner und die Programmmusik", pp. 10ff., where he points to Bruckner's use of motivic transformations in unifying such material; the Repr. of the Gesangsp. in IX/4, reveals an even more dense structure of interpolated quotations (cf. §3.3.6). In fact, the chorale theme transforms itself in the course of the Adagio of the Ninth in preparation for its transfigured recurrence as the Schlußp. of the Finale. Cf. also Adolf Nowak, "Die Wiederkehr in Bruckners Adagio", in: *Anton Bruckner: Studien zu Werk und Wirkung: Walter Wiora zum 30. Dez. 1986*, C.-H. Mahling, ed., Tutzing 1988.

became letter E, and “Anfang 3. Abth.” (StB 4189/46<sup>r</sup>) at what became letter M. The “2. Abtheilung” corresponds essentially with the first in regard to the order in which the two main formal elements, Hauptth. and Gesangsp., are presented, thus constituting a counterstatement to the first. The third section reverses this sequence so as to begin with the Gesangsp., reintroducing the Hauptth. at letter Q before closing with a coda (letter R). The coda then combines elements of Hauptth. and Gesangsp. in a process which could be described as ‘thematic deliquescence’, but also—hitherto overlooked—anticipates the Finale which was intended to follow.<sup>149</sup>

With exception of the Fourth and Fifth Symphonies, both Scherzo and Trio in all Bruckner’s symphonies are in effect miniature single-subject sonata forms—again, a structural model derived from that used by Beethoven in his Ninth;<sup>150</sup> here, however, Bruckner usually does pause and create a sense of stasis or establish other structural division at the point of the Repr., perhaps confirming the fact that Bruckner’s unorthodox procedures in his three-subject sonata movements were intentional and fulfilled a structurally significant function.

In the fourth movement of the Ninth, as we will see,<sup>151</sup> Bruckner in effect returns to a more orthodox sonata-form structure, yet this is merely because the Durchf. introduces a new theme, the Te Deum motive (cf. AP E/53), and introduces a quite separate Durchf. of elements of the Gesangsp. (E/72) prior to the clearly marked return of the Hauptth. as the subject of a fugue (E/77)—where we hear a Repr. as beginning. Both sks. and score of the movement, however, refer only to 1st and 2nd “Theil”, “Abth.” or “Abtheilung”.<sup>152</sup>

### 2.1.5 Period structure and metrical numbers.

The ubiquitous metrical numbers in Bruckner’s MSS represent perhaps the most tangible evidence for the role of theoretical reflection in the compositional process, a field of Bruckner scholarship which within the last fifteen years, after decades of total neglect or misprision, has been at last been adequately confronted and to a great extent elucidated by the work of Thomas Röder,<sup>153</sup> Timothy Jackson,<sup>154</sup> more tangentially Paul Hawkshaw,<sup>155</sup> and most

<sup>149</sup> Cf. discussion of the ‘Herankomponierung’ of the Finale Hauptth. in the following chapter, §2.2.2.

<sup>150</sup> See Winfried Kirsch’s comparative summaries of the form of Bruckner’s Scherzo movements, “Das Scherzo bei Brahms und Bruckner.” In: *BrSympBer 1983: Johannes Brahms und Anton Bruckner*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1985, pp. 165f.

<sup>151</sup> §2.0.4. See also ch. 3.3; a formal overview of the Aufführungsfassung is given in Table XVI; ensuing references here and in ch. 2.2 are to Bruckner’s AP.

<sup>152</sup> Cf. Facs., sks. C/16, 18, 19, 20, 25, score C/205, 312.

<sup>153</sup> *Auf dem Weg zur Bruckner-Symphonie: Untersuchungen zu den beiden ersten Fassungen von Anton Bruckners Dritter Symphonie*, Diss. phil. Erlangen, 1984; published as *AfMw* Beiheft 26, Stuttgart 1987; and “Eigenes angewandtes Nachsinnen—Bruckners Selbststudium in Fragen der Metrik”, in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 107–122.



recently and comprehensively Wolfgang Grandjean in his publication *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner*.<sup>156</sup> As the subject is now far better understood, a few comments on the evolution of scholarly thinking on the subject and a broad outline of Grandjean's conclusions will suffice before turning to an examination of the salient aspects of period structure and Bruckner's use of metrical numbers in the Ninth.

As Grandjean notes in his summary of the relevant literature,<sup>157</sup> the now established term "metrische Ziffern" originated with Orel,<sup>158</sup> but only recently have scholars formed any sort of complete picture of their evolution and intended purpose within Bruckner's compositional technique. For Klose, for instance,<sup>159</sup> Bruckner remained trapped "in einem Schematismus primitivster Rhythmik [...], beim Komponieren die Takte von vier zu vier sogar numeriert, um sich ja nicht gegen das Gesetz des geradetaktigen Periodenbaues zu vergehen". Implying there was something 'unmusical' about their use, Nowak, who undertook studies of Bruckner's metrical analyses of Beethoven's Third and Ninth (*infra*), felt it necessary to assert that they were used in his scores only for purposes of revision: "Man darf nicht der Meinung sein, daß Bruckner nach ihnen komponiert habe; er hat nicht konstruiert, sondern damit nur geprüft"<sup>160</sup>—in direct contradiction to the evidence of many sks. that the metrical numbers were notated simultaneously, or even prior to the initial musical idea, for which the MSS for the Finale of the Ninth provide many examples. Röthig saw in the metrical numbers little more than a naive attempt to structure and simplify the music:

Sein Ringen um Form beweisen die fortlaufenden Ziffernreihen unter den Takten. Doch war der Versuch des metrischen Aufbaus weder künstlerisches Ziel, noch schematische Voraussetzung, die überwunden werden mußte, sondern nur seine naive Anpassung an

---

<sup>154</sup> "Bruckner's Metrical Numbers", *19th-Century Music* 14, no. 2 (Fall 1990), pp. 101–131; cf. also his "Bruckner's Rhythm: Syncopated Hyperrhythm and Diachronic Transformation in the Second Symphony", in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV 1995, pp. 93–106.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. in particular his "Weiteres über die Arbeitsweise Bruckners während seiner Linzer Jahre: Der Inhalt von Kremsmünster C 56.2.", in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 143–152 *passim*; "A Composer Learns His Craft: Anton Bruckner's Lessons in Form and Orchestration, 1861–63", *MQ* 82 (1998), in particular pp. 360f., and "An Anatomy of Change: Anton Bruckner's Revisions to the Mass in F Minor", in: Jackson, Timothy L., and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Bruckner Studies*, Cambridge 1997, in particular p. 17.

<sup>156</sup> *Publikationen des Instituts für Musikforschung* 25, Tutzing 2001.

<sup>157</sup> *Metrik und Form ...*, p. 11. Grandjean analyses the reception history of the metrical numbers from Orel onwards in more detail on pp. 24ff.

<sup>158</sup> *Anton Bruckner. Das Werk—Der Künstler—Die Zeit*, Vienna 1925, p. ix.

<sup>159</sup> Pp. 55f.

<sup>160</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Musik und Leben*, p. 61.

einen Formschematismus, mit dessen Hilfe er die großen Verhältnisse in seinem Werk begradigen bzw. vereinfachen wollte.<sup>161</sup>

Other scholars tended to view them largely as a symptom of Bruckner's obsessive-compulsive tendencies or his numeromania.<sup>162</sup> In what he regards as a particularly egregious oversight, Grandjean<sup>163</sup> notes that Korte did not take them into consideration. Manfred Wagner, in dismissing the efforts of Samale and Mazzuca in reconstructing the Finale of the Ninth, as we have seen (§1.4.14), assumed Nowak's position, that the metrical numbers merely represented a *post hoc* psychological confirmation of music already composed, paradoxically using it as evidence of the absence of considered compositional activity: thus, Bruckner's music lacked any kind of "werkimmanente Logik".<sup>164</sup> Gülke,<sup>165</sup> although referring to Bruckner's "Zählzwang" as "neurotisch", perceptively noted in his *Brahms–Bruckner* that:

Der Zusammenhang zwischen Bruckners quadratischer Metrik und seinem Zählzwang—'Er war bestrebt, alles, was ihn vom rechten Weg der Tugend hätte abbringen können, durch die Magie des Zählens zu bannen' (Norbert Nagler)—erscheint so triftig, daß Gefahr besteht, es bei ihm als Erklärung bewenden zu lassen und diese 'Magie' zu einer gewissermaßen anthropologischen Grundbegebenheit seines Komponierens hinaufzustilisieren, zu dessen allem Weiterfragen entzogender zweiter Natur.<sup>166</sup>

This is perceptive: Bruckner scholarship had indeed dismissed the metrical numbers too readily. Even the *Bruckner Handbuch* of 1996, as Grandjean points out,<sup>167</sup> includes an entry on "Zahlensymbolik" but not on "Metrische Ziffern", the widespread avoidance of the discussion symptomatic of confusion over the meaning of the term and the purpose of the numbers. The metrical sequences outlined by Bruckner's metrical numbers are certainly not 'phrases', as they were referred to by Edward Murphy, the first scholar to publish a complete

---

<sup>161</sup> Claudia Catharina Röthig, *Studien zur Systematik des Schaffens von Anton Bruckner auf der Grundlage zeitgenössischer Berichte und autographischer Entwürfe*, Diss., Göttingen 1977; published Kassel 1978 (*Göttinger Musikwissenschaftliche Arbeiten* 9), p. 349.

<sup>162</sup> See concerning this, variously referred to as "Zahlenmanie", "Zählwut" or "Zählzwang", for instance, von Oberleithner, pp. 64ff.; Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 158, Neumayr, p. 298, who mentions its recurrence in Bruckner's later years; Eva Marx, "Bad Kreuzen—Spekulationen und kein Ende" (in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 31–39) gives a useful summary and analysis of the existing documentation, including the reports of Klose, Eckstein and von Oberleithner. The view of Bruckner as obsessive-compulsive became prominent in the 1960s and 1970s; see for instance Karl Amadeus Hartmann and Waldemar Wahren, "Briefe über Bruckner" (*NZfM* 126 (1965), pp. 272–276; 334–338; 380–387), or Erwin Ringel, "Psychogramm für Anton Bruckner" (in: *BrSympBer 1977: Anton Bruckner zwischen Wagnis und Sicherheit*, Linz–Vienna 1978, pp. 19–26). See also Jackson, p. 102.

<sup>163</sup> p. 25.

<sup>164</sup> Cf. §1.4.14.

<sup>165</sup> "Der schwierige Jubilar", p. 549.

<sup>166</sup> Pp. 84f.

<sup>167</sup> p. 26.

listing of the metrical numbers in all the symphonies,<sup>168</sup> which he then analysed statistically; Jackson's term 'grid' is more appropriate in many situations, while Grandjean avoids the term "Perioden", preferring the more comprehensive "Gruppen".<sup>169</sup>

Thomas Röder, in the chapter "Metrik" in his 1987 publication *Auf dem Weg zur Bruckner-Symphonie*, was the first to recognise that Bruckner's use of the numbers incorporates two components or aspects, a "zählende" (numbering) and a "gewichtende" (weighting), and to elucidate their use as an analytical tool in Bruckner's revision process.<sup>170</sup> As Röder subsequently showed,<sup>171</sup> Bruckner's study of Sechter's *Von den Gesetzen des Taktes* (*Grundsätze* II, 1. Teil) does not appear to have covered the entire text.<sup>172</sup> In any case, the work in which metrical numbers were first used by Bruckner, his vocal quartet of 1861 *Du bist wie eine Blume* (WAB 64), may have illustrated to him, as Röder suggests,<sup>173</sup> the shortcomings of Sechter's approach in its application to vocal music. As Caplin notes,<sup>174</sup> however, Sechter's insights into the relationship between harmony and metre were nonetheless insightful and progressive, so that here again here it becomes possible to posit causative links between progressive aspects of Sechter's theoretical model and Bruckner's subsequent stylistic development:

[A]t a time when most theorists merely continue the eighteenth-century concern with how individual dissonant structures are metrically placed, Sechter's interest in the way progressions of consonant harmonies can articulate meter marks a significant advance in the theory of harmonic-metrical relationships.<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup> "Bruckner's Use of Numbers to Indicate Phrase Lengths", *BrJb* 1987–88, pp. 39–52; cf. also Gülke, *Brahms—Bruckner...* pp. 86f, 88; Sonntag likewise refers to "Bruckner's habit of numbering measures to delineate phrases" in her review of Röder's *Auf dem Weg zur Bruckner Symphonie*, *JMusRes* 9 (1989), p. 193.

<sup>169</sup> p. 23.

<sup>170</sup> Cf. Grandjean, p. 27.

<sup>171</sup> "Eigenes angewandtes Nachsinnen—Bruckners Selbststudium in Fragen der Metrik", in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 107–122.

<sup>172</sup> Klose, for instance (pp. 53f.), noted that Bruckner omitted *Von den Gesetzen des Taktes* in teaching; he also made little reference to musical syntax in his University teaching, which was limited, as we have noted, entirely to harmony.

<sup>173</sup> p. 117.

<sup>174</sup> William Earl Caplin, "Harmony and Meter in the Theories of Simon Sechter", *Music Theory Spectrum* 2 (1980), pp. 74–89.

<sup>175</sup> p. 89. Similarly: "Sechter's ideas of rhythm, almost entirely derivative of eighteenth-century models, have been virtually ignored by historians of rhythmic theory" (p. 75); *Von den Gesetzen des Taktes in der Musik* "directly confronts a central issue of musical composition: how should harmonies be distributed within the measures of a work? Sechter's attempt to answer this question yields what may be the first detailed investigation into the metrical placement of harmonic structures" (*ibid.*); and: "the value of Sechter's prescripts lies in their expression of fundamental principles relating harmony and meter, principles that can function as norms of analysis, not inviolable laws of composition" (*ibid.*).

Röder notes that Bruckner initially went his own way in regard to the metrical structure of his music, mainly structuring his music intuitively, and often irregularly.<sup>176</sup> Underlays of metrical numbers are virtually absent from Bruckner's Linz compositions; Hawkshaw reports on composition sketches for the *Gloria* of the F-minor Mass, however, which use a continuous numbering of measures, and which inevitably had to be corrected many times over as Bruckner made structural changes.<sup>177</sup> Bruckner's later use of metrical numbers, as Grandjean points out,<sup>178</sup> also present a practical solution to the problem of keeping track of each measure in a large movement throughout complex phases of compositional activity and structural alteration, transfer from sketch to score, recopying, re-allocation of space where bifolios were removed and replaced etc., without having to continually renumber all subsequent measures—a solution to which Bruckner's experience in the F-minor Mass may have contributed. From this point of view, the numbers play a central role in the reconstruction of the Finale, as we will see. Moreover, in the mid-1870s, as Röder points out,

zog eine erneute Reflexion gerade des temporalen Aspekts der Musik den Komponisten erneut in den Bann. Harmonische Kombinationen waren wohl kein Problem; Bruckner mag jedoch gespürt haben, daß die virtuose Verkettung von Klängen, die Kunst jedem Akkord eine große (nicht unbedingt beliebige, aber doch undeterminierte) Anzahl weiterer Akkorde folgen zu lassen, ohne weitere Bindekraft gerade in der Instrumentalmusik die Stringenz des Ablaufs gefährden kann. So begann Bruckner nicht die Abfolge des harmonischen Fundaments sondern die Taktgruppen einer schriftlichen Kontrolle, oder, wie er sagte, "Regulierung" zu unterziehen.<sup>179</sup>

Röder thus confirms that the metrical numbers became an essential part of the compositional process in light of Bruckner's increasing evasion of obvious quadratic, antecedent-consequent phrase structures in his music and use of comprehensive developmental procedures, coupled with ever longer multi-period musical structures, such as *Steigerungen* borrowed from Wagner and Beethoven.<sup>180</sup> Just as Bruckner never in effect renounced Sechter's harmonic models, but merely extended them, his music called for the development of more advanced regulatory mechanisms in order to validate and refine the expanded compositional structure and proportions of his music. In addition to this came the attempt to

---

<sup>176</sup> "Eigenes angewandtes Nachsinnen", p. 119.

<sup>177</sup> "Weiteres über die Arbeitsweise Bruckners während seiner Linzer Jahre: Der Inhalt von Kremsmünster C 56.2.", pp. 145f.

<sup>178</sup> p. 23.

<sup>179</sup> p. 120.

<sup>180</sup> Cf. Doebl (p. 70), who relates Bruckner's use of "Steigerungszügen" in his Adagio movements or the *Steigerungen* leading into the Hauptth. of III/1, V/1 or IX/1 to Wagner's usages in *Tristan*, *Rheingold* or *Götterdämmerung*. Moreover, "Der Beginn des Kopfsatzes aus der IX. Symphonie Beethovens [...] wurde zu einem Modell vieler Brucknerscher Steigerungszüge und bestimmte die Gestaltung der Anfänge des ersten und vierten Satzes der III. Symphonie, des Finales der IV. Symphonie sowie des ersten Satzes der IX. Symphonie" (*ibid.*, pp. 42f.). See further concerning Bruckner's debt to Beethoven, §1.0.3 and §2.2.4.

make his music "faßlicher", as Bruckner underlined a remark in Sechter's *Von den Gesetzen des Taktes*,<sup>181</sup> by enhancing its metrical regularity. Gülke noted,<sup>182</sup> for the eventual impact of this greater metrical regularity on the mature style and its reception, that:

Der im vornherein rastrierte Zeitverlauf sichert ein Gehäuse, worin Bruckner, dem Hörer zumindest die Erfüllung seiner Zeiterwartung verbindlich zusichernd, um so leichter all jene Neuerungen und Subtilitäten der harmonischen Führung und der Motivvariation unterbringen kann, worin der vermeintlich Unzeitgemäße Zeitgenosse ist wie nur irgend-einer.

The beginning of Bruckner's solution to the issue of metrical structure coincides with his revision of the Second, Third and Fourth Symphonies in 1875–76, when Bruckner appears to have re-assessed one of the more intractable shortcomings of Sechter's metrical theories in application to large-scale symphonic structures via studies of Beethoven's Third and Ninth,<sup>183</sup> coming to the conclusion that the metrical close of the music had to stand in a meaningful relationship to its harmonic conclusion. While Sechter considered the concluding, even-numbered measure with which a cadence concludes "gut" (i.e., strong), Bruckner realised that cadences must fall on odd-numbered measures, and that the even-numbered measures remain "schlecht" (weak). The final, even-numbered measure of a phrase, as Röder writes, "in weitesten Sinn dominantisch, zielgerichtet zu verstehen, unterstützt die Bindung zum nächsten Glied der potentiell 'unendlichen' Kette".<sup>184</sup> Thus, as Grandjean points out,<sup>185</sup> Bruckner developed views on metrical structure for his own practical purposes from the concepts he was taught, together with his own "angewandtes Nachsinnen" (Röder).

Bruckner's resolution of this problem in his own music reflects wider issues of the manner in which music is structured. Andrew Imbrie,<sup>186</sup> in discussing the problem of metrical ambiguity in Beethoven's music, cites Edward T. Cone: "The classical phrase has often been

<sup>181</sup> Noted by Röder, "Eigenes angewandtes Nachsinnen", p. 111.

<sup>182</sup> *Brahms-Bruckner*, pp. 86f.

<sup>183</sup> See Nowak's articles on Bruckner's metrical examinations of the Beethoven Symphonies, "Metrische Studien von Anton Bruckner an Beethovens III. und IX. Symphonie", *Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 105–115 and "Anton Bruckners Eroica Studien", *Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 257–265, where Bruckner's approach appears mainly to have been concerned with establishing the length of the final metrical units in a movement or section. Nowak wrote: "Befremdend mag es erwecken, daß Bruckner so ganz mechanisch die Acht-Takt-Perioden aneinanderreicht, ohne Rücksicht auf Motive und Melodien" (p. 259). Auer cites Bruckner's investigations of period structure confirming the use of prime-numbered final periods in Bruckner's *Österreichisches Volks- und Wirtschaftskalender* for 1876 (Göll.-A. IV/1 pp. 440f.); he also mentions a piano and vocal score of Beethoven's *Missa Solemnis* from Bruckner's estate with metrical numberings throughout the *Gloria* (Göll.-A. II/1, p. 341). Bruckner further investigated the period structure of the "Schmiedelied" from the First Act of Wagner's *Siegfried* (Göll.-A. II/1, p. 339), as well as the "Qui tollis" of Cherubini's Mass in C (Robert Haas, *Anton Bruckner*, p. 34; cf. Jackson, p. 105).

<sup>184</sup> "Eigenes Angewandtes Nachsinnen", p. 120.

<sup>185</sup> P. 15. Jackson suggests that Bruckner's renewed theoretical interest at this time may have related to his appointment to the University (pp. 103f.).

<sup>186</sup> "'Extra' Measures and Metrical Ambiguity in Beethoven." In: *Beethoven Studies*. Alan Tyson, ed. New York 1973, p. 45.

analysed as an alternation of strong and weak measures, on an analogy with strong and weak beats within a measure. In other words, the larger rhythmic structure is treated simply as metric structure on a higher level.”<sup>187</sup> This, of course, is reminiscent of Hanslick’s claim that the classical principle in music represents “Rhythmus im Großen”,<sup>188</sup>—in other words, musical syntax is rhythm ‘writ large’<sup>189</sup>—a process of self-replication, reminiscent of fractal geometry, it could be added, which perhaps Bruckner recognised, if the words of his *Antrittsrede* “eine gewisse Gesetzmäßigkeit in den Gliederungen desselben sowie eine gleiche von diesen Gliedern dem ganzen Kunstbau gegenüber” may be so interpreted. In Grandjean’s formulation, as summarised by Cohrs,<sup>190</sup> the basis of Bruckner’s musical syntax is thus the model of the ‘Takt im Großen’; in essence, a transference of the structure of the (individual) measure, as if via augmentation, to higher syntactic levels. The following principles of metrical organisation can be seen as implicit within Bruckner’s compositional practice, and represent constants of his later musical style:

- i. The beginning of any group of measures always represents the “Schwerpunkt höchster Ordnung”; units subordinate to this are less important. Bruckner’s music ‘swings’ between heavy (odd-numbered) and light (even-numbered) measures, thereby forming symmetries within the music.
- ii. Harmony, melody, motivic design and rhythm all constitute parameters for the effects of this weighting within the syntactical structure of the music, as do instrumentation and dynamics.
- iii. Not only do new formal sections or groups of measures begin on a metrical ‘first measure’; the final tonic enters at the same point. The music always concludes with a heavy, in other words odd-numbered, measure.

It must be borne in mind, however, that Bruckner’s use of the technique was practical and empirical in nature rather than speculative or theoretical; it also altered over the course of time.<sup>191</sup> For instance, Bruckner accepted odd-numbered or “unregelmäßige” periods in his

---

<sup>187</sup> *Musical Form and Musical Performance*, New York 1968, p. 26. Noting the interest of theorists in ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ measures in Beethoven, Imbrie points out significantly that discussion has been “hampered by a persistent confusion, not only over appropriate criteria, but over the nature of rhythm and meter”; cf. Grandjean, p. 26.

<sup>188</sup> Cf. Dahlhaus’ discussion in *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, p. 305; cf. Grandjean, pp. 20f.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. Jackson’s analysis of Bruckner’s use of hyperrhythm, “Bruckner’s Rhythm: Syncopated Hyperrhythm and Diachronic Transformation in the Second Symphony”, in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 93–106.

<sup>190</sup> “Anton Bruckners mißverstandene ‘musikalische Architektur’: Marginalien zu Konzeption, Interpretation und Rezeption von Bruckners Sinfonien”, paper written for the Bruckner Symposium, Linz, September 2002. Cf. Grandjean, pp. 21f.

<sup>191</sup> “Man darf sich überhaupt unter ‘Bruckners Metrik’ weder ein geschlossenes, stringentes, noch ein durch die Jahre wandelbares System vorstellen” (*ibid.*).

works at an earlier stage, later avoiding them almost entirely.<sup>192</sup> The constants underlying his procedures are logical and straightforward, however, and have more to do in the first instance with the relation of harmonic movement to 'strong' and 'weak', i.e., odd- or even-numbered measures, than with the use of particular lengths of phrases or periods. From this point of view, Bruckner's use of metrical numbers corresponds more strongly with the concept of a metrical "grid" introduced by Jackson; in many cases of more regular and consistent sequence of 8-m. periods, however, the metrical numbers decline in significance as analytical tools.

Moreover, in regard to point ii. of the above summary, it must be pointed out that the metrical numbers in themselves often provide little analytical leverage in regard to the finer structures of the music, where a group of measures numbered 1–8 may consist of an almost infinitely variable combination of smaller structural units, which may directly determine the 'weighting' of the measures within it in a way that metrical numbers cannot specify. Writing in 1989, before most of the ground-breaking studies of Bruckner's metrical numbers had appeared, Gülke perceptively noted (presumably from his standpoint as both conductor and musicologist) that metrical analysis cannot be divorced from motivic material, particularly when varying lengths of motivic phrases are involved or, for instance, when Bruckner uses rhythmic alterations such as truncation, diminution or augmentation (see §2.2.2):<sup>193</sup>

Allerdings ist es nur der heutzutage wachsenden Unsensibilität für metrischen Gruppierungen zuzuschreiben, daß man die Brucknerschen Zählungen so mechanisch gelesen hat, wie sie sich wohl graphisch darstellen, obwohl sie musikalischer anders verstanden wurden. Wer sich vertieft in die Gruppen, viertaktigen Abläufe, der wird schnell feststellen, daß da sehr genau unterschieden ist zum Beispiel zwischen einem komplexen Viertakter, zwei Achttaktern und vier Eintaktern. Und mit deren Wechsel arbeitet Bruckner unaufhörlich. Weil er im 'Vordergrund' der 'zählenden Zeit'—will man die beiden griechischen Zeitbegriffe 'chronos' und 'aion' verwenden, auf der Ebene des chronos—kategorisiert, sitzt man der Suggestion purer Regelmäßigkeit nur allzuleicht auf. Hinter diesem 'Vordergrund' aber arbeitet eine Qualität von Zeit, unabhängig von aller abzählenden Viertaktigkeit; sie wird von uns im Erlebnis Brucknerscher Musik auch richtig wahrgenommen. Kein Mensch, der die Ballung des Tutti erlebt, welches am Beginn der Neunten Symphonie zum ersten Unisono hinführt, wird das als tödlich regelmäßigen viertaktigen Verlauf empfinden. Realiter findet eine Akzeleration statt. Sie beginnt mit komplex auskomponierten Viertaktern, geht dann zu Zweitaktern und endlich zu Eintaktern und Halbtaktern über. Es ist, könnte man das Nacheinander der Zeitfolge vergessen, wie eine Umkreisung eines Zentrums in immer engeren Bahnen, als Zentrum das d, mit dem das Unisono beginnt. Gerade, weil der Vordergrund so einfach nach dem Kinderliedschema Eins, zwei, drei, vier rubriziert erscheint, kann sich dahinter eine ganz andere Art von Zeitlichkeit etablieren. Vielleicht sollte das Reden bei Bruckner bei

<sup>192</sup> Cf. Jackson, pp. 104f.

<sup>193</sup> "Über die Zeitgenossenschaft Bruckners." In: *BrSympBer 1987: Die Fassungen*, Linz–Vienna 1989, p. 20.

Strafe verboten werden, sofern nicht immer mitgedacht wird, wie diese sich aufteilt, bezogen auf Großtakte sich in 'Taktwechseln' organisiert.<sup>194</sup>

Of this, Bruckner's metrical numberings and their analysis can give only broad outlines. In such situations it is not possible to isolate the study of Bruckner's metrical structures from the structural dimensions of his use of the Mutationsverfahren; unfortunately, Grandjean does not deal more extensively with the relation of metrical numbers to Bruckner's use of metrical escalation of this kind.<sup>195</sup> Significant for his elucidation of the problem of what the metrical numbers do refer to, however, is his distinction between melodically and harmonically dominated music. This is a concept borrowed from Anton Reicha,<sup>196</sup> a theorist with whom Sechter was familiar, who proposed three categories of musical compositions: "harmonische Tonwerke", in which melody plays a limited role, such as in choral works, fugues, etc.; "Tonwerke, wo die Melodie Hauptzweck ist", such as in songs; and "gemischten Tonwerke", in which passages of both kinds appear, as in most instrumental music. Grandjean noted that Bruckner's metrical numbers at times vary between an orientation upon melodic elements or harmonic ones: melodically determined groups tend to constitute asymmetrical structures with longer melodic phrases and functional, cadentially orientated harmony which changes more quickly, while harmonically determined groups tend to have quadratic internal structures, short repeated motivic phrases, non-functional harmony, and a slower rate of harmonic change.<sup>197</sup> While Grandjean's analysis of the Scherzo of the Ninth as a "primär harmonisch bestimmte Komposition" proceeds almost entirely from the latter point of view,<sup>198</sup> the first movement represents a case of "'gemischte' Metrik". For instance, the opening 18 mm. of the symphony, which Bruckner numbered twice, can be read either as 2 + 8 + 8 in terms of their 'harmonic' syntax, or 'melodically' as 8 + 10 mm., according to Bruckner's subsequent alteration of the numbers.<sup>199</sup> The ensuing passage, the harmonic structure of which was discussed above (§2.1.2), constitutes for Grandjean a case of melodic syntax in which no obvious quadratic 'grid' structure can be interpreted. From m. 541 in the coda of IX/1 (*q.v.*), Bruckner underlays two sets of metrical numbers, 3–12, and 1–8; 1–2. The first is in accord

<sup>194</sup> Cf. also Gülke's references to 'chronos', *Brahms–Bruckner*, p. 89 and metrical escalation, p. 125.

<sup>195</sup> The presumable explanation for this is that the phenomenon is not found in the Sixth, the work on which Grandjean focuses.

<sup>196</sup> *Vollständigen Lehrbuch der musikalischen Komposition*, Paris 1814, German translation by Carl Czerny, Vienna 1832; cf. Grandjean, p. 161.

<sup>197</sup> P. 174.

<sup>198</sup> Pp. 162ff.

<sup>199</sup> P. 175. The 'shortcomings' for analysis of Bruckner's metrical numbering system become apparent when one compares the opening of the movement with that of its "2. Theil" (letter J) where, in order to correspond with his revised numbering of the opening measures, Bruckner would have had to begin this group with a "3". He likewise numbers mm. 239–240 "13 14" (the subsequent period extends only to "6") when in fact they correspond with mm. 227f. Such "Ungereimtheiten" in Bruckner's use of metrical numbers militate against a too categorical and extensive analytical reading of them; they were clearly no more than a "Mittel zum Zweck".



with the fact that the passage simply extends an ongoing melodic phrase beginning two mm. earlier, the other with the fact that the 8-m. extension of G-minor harmony from m. 541 creates the impression of a new metrical downbeat at that point.<sup>200</sup>

As a work dominated to a great extent by harmonic structures and a powerful 'harmonic agenda', it is not surprising that Bruckner's period structures in the Ninth show a high degree of regularity—there are relatively few departures from regular period structures, those divisible by 4, according to figures given in Edward Murphy's study, comprising 74.5 per cent of the periods used in the first three movements.<sup>201</sup> The use of the 12-m. period also plays a greater role in the Ninth than in any of the preceding symphonies.<sup>202</sup> This relates in part to Bruckner's use of 12-m. periods as extensions of 8-m. periods in *Steigerung* passages, such as in the lead-up to the *Exp. Hauptth.*, mm. 27–62 (3 x 12 mm.), the impact of which has much to do with the fact that Bruckner interrupts the expectation of metrical regularity three times over, successively breaking the motive lengths from 2 m. (m. 27) to 1 m. (m. 51) to  $\frac{1}{2}$  m. (m. 59); the lead-up to the resumption of the *Hauptth.* in the "2. Theil" (mm. 321–332) functions in the same way. The opposite tendency, in which an extension of the 12-m. period represents a "pacification" of musical events and a 'stretching out' of Gülke's "aion" (experienced time), may be found preceding the *Exp. Gesangsp.* (mm. 85–96) in the second *Durchf.* episode (mm. 291–302), at the climax of the movement (mm. 387–398), and preceding the *Repr.* of the *Gesangsp.* (mm. 409–420). The opening 42-m. *Steigerung* of the *Scherzo* forms a 'near-perfect' metrical escalation sequence, falling into two groups of 8 mm. (interspersed by three 2-m. 'Vorhänge', mm. 1f., 3f. and 13f.), then two groups of 4, four groups of 2, and finally four groups of 1 m. each,<sup>203</sup> i.e., (2 + 2 +) 8 (+ 2) + 8 || 4 + 4 || 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 || 1 + 1 + 1 + 1. As noted by Grandjean in his analysis of the *Scherzo* of the Ninth, Bruckner's *Scherzi* represent predominantly harmonic compositions, a tendency which increases throughout his output; that of the Ninth is almost entirely harmonically organised.<sup>204</sup>

Bruckner's tendency to structure his music along harmonically oriented lines reaches its apex in the *Finale*, as the surviving material reveals, where the musical texture of both introduction and principal material is dominated by the use of short melodic fragments and extended harmonic progressions. Melodically oriented metrical structures are notable by their absence. While the metrical numbers in this movement, together with Bruckner's *Bogenverfahren* provide vital clues for the reconstruction of the surviving fragments of Bruckner's

<sup>200</sup> Grandjean, pp. 177ff.

<sup>201</sup> Based on the information given in "Bruckner's use of numbers to indicate phrase lengths", Appendix II, p. 51.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>203</sup> As noted by Gülke, *Brahms–Bruckner*, p. 125, who omits reference to the added 2-m. groups.

<sup>204</sup> Grandjean, pp. 162f.

originally continuous score (and will be extensively discussed in Part Three), a number of aspects of Bruckner's use of metrical numbers in the Finale may be noted.

It becomes clear from even a brief glance at the material for the Finale that metrical numbers represented a crucial part of the compositional process.<sup>205</sup> Bruckner's many D-, F- and E-ruling versions of bifolio 1 (Facs. C/71–106) reveal a long series of variant readings of the metrical underlay of the movement's opening, and attest to his preoccupation with finding a fully appropriate underlay to the metrical structure of this harmonically and structurally enigmatic passage. In the music of the first and third theme groups especially, including the Durchf., 8-m. periods constitute a rule broken mainly at points of structural discontinuity.

Here again, the *Steigerung* preceding the *Hauptth.* occasions the use of a 12-m. period;<sup>206</sup> here, however, the final 12 mm. are preceded by 2 + 4 + 8 + 4,<sup>207</sup> the last 4 of which form a structural unit with the ensuing 12, so that in effect the musical escalation towards the *Hauptth.* could be regarded as 'counterbalanced' (or even contradicted by) a metrical deceleration: 2 + 4 + 8 + 16.<sup>208</sup> The structure of the *Steigerung* preceding the chorale represents a 'higher-order' irregular syntactic unit of 24 mm. made up of three 8-m. periods;<sup>209</sup> a further sk., ÖNB 3194/3<sup>f</sup> (C/6), probably intended for the coda,<sup>210</sup> constitutes a perfectly structured 24-m. escalation pattern, beginning with 8 groups of 2-m. phrases (16 mm.), followed by 8 groups of 1-m. phrases (8 m.). The chorale itself falls into regular structures of 8-m. phrases,<sup>211</sup> the first three of which Bruckner numbered additionally from 1 to 24, presumably in order to gain a greater overview of the structure; similarly continuous numberings of measures can be found in the fugue which marks the Repr. of the *Hauptth.*<sup>212</sup> and the chorale Repr.<sup>213</sup> Both Exp. and Repr. *Gesangsp.* represent complex problems for the reconstruction which will be addressed in Part Three; particularly in the Repr., Bruckner

---

<sup>205</sup> Grandjean (p. 23) notes this in connection with the "allenthalben vorkommenden leeren, aber mit Ziffern versehenen Systeme im Partiturentwurf des Finales"; however, he cites as examples pp. 65ff. of the AP, in which the metrical numbers have been hypothetically supplemented under the measures of lost bifolios in square brackets. Gülke made a similar error in referring to an annotation of "16 Takte", supposedly by Bruckner, in the fugue (see fn. 219 *infra*). The fact remains, however, that many pages of Bruckner's MSS do reveal the notation of metrical numbers prior to musical text; moreover, they were, as Grandjean claims (*ibid.*), of great practical assistance in the compositional process.

<sup>206</sup> Cf. AP E/8ff.

<sup>207</sup> From E/4, m. 1.

<sup>208</sup> This may relate to Bruckner's striking marking of the final 4 mm. before the *Hauptth.* as "dim. ed. accel.", where Bruckner elsewhere marks "cresc. sempre" and often "riten.", as in IX/1.

<sup>209</sup> E/35ff.

<sup>210</sup> Cf. transcription E/138, discussion §§3.1.8 and 3.1.10; cf. also the further discussion of the progression in the reconstruction of the coda, §3.3.7.

<sup>211</sup> E/41ff.

<sup>212</sup> E/85, fn. 1; cf. E/89; see further *infra*.

<sup>213</sup> E/129, fn. 1; cf. E/133.

intentionally interrupts the expectation of 8-m. period structure by the interpolation of 4-m. quotation-like elements.<sup>214</sup>

Of special interest is Bruckner's recourse in the *Durchführung* of the fugue<sup>215</sup> to recurrent 3-m. periods, used here virtually for the first time since the likewise fugal Finale of the Fifth, which was composed almost twenty years earlier.<sup>216</sup> The reason in both instances for this departure from metrical propriety is essentially the same. In the fugal exposition of the Fifth, the answer 'interrupts' the 4th-m. cadence of the subject, but an overall 8-m. periodicity is maintained by the insertion following the 4-m. answer of a further m. before the next entry of the fugue, producing a 3 + 5 structure.<sup>217</sup> In the Ninth the fugal exposition maintains a regular period structure with entries of the 4-m. subject and answer every 4 mm.; in the fugal *Durchführung* the 4-m. subject is truncated to 3 mm.; the 3-m. phrase length is maintained for the ensuing 12 surviving measures; its use probably extended into the following lost bifol.<sup>218</sup>

On at least one occasion in the Finale Bruckner appears to have 'mapped out', surveyor-like a metrical structure or, more accurately, a general conception of musical space, prior to the music which would fill it.<sup>219</sup> This can be found on the isolated Cracow sk. for the Finale (C/49, *q.v.*), in which, as will be explained further,<sup>220</sup> Bruckner appears to have estimated the amount of musical time required prior to an extended harmonic progression, notated here as F–b $\sharp$ , which he had evidently already determined upon as forming the climax of the coda. The contents of this space were subsequently developed in further sketches (ÖNB 6085/45 and /47, C/45f.), while the cadence itself was drafted in more precise metrical terms on 6085/43<sup>r</sup> (C/47) where, at the bottom of the page, apparently written earlier, Bruckner still notated the tritone progression as "f / ces /sehr lang".

<sup>214</sup> See further the reconstruction of both passages, described most completely in §3.3.6.

<sup>215</sup> E/82ff.

<sup>216</sup> Cf. Murphy, *ibid.*

<sup>217</sup> According to the Haas/Nowak *Kritischer Bericht* on the Fifth (p. 19), Bruckner first grouped the measures of the entire fugue—originally drafted before Bruckner began using metrical numbers consistently as a compositional tool—in rather wholesale fashion into large regular metrical units; for instance, the fugal exposition, from letter A, was first numbered 6 + 2 + 6 + 2, then 8 + 8 + 4. He subsequently refined this grouping, which runs counter to the musical structure, to read 3 + 3 + 2 + 3 + 3 + 2, then 6 + 4 + 6 + 4. The passage from letter J–K was similarly first underlaid as 8 + 4, then revised as 6 groups of 3 mm.; K–L also first underlaid with 6 groups of 8, then regrouped using smaller units. In the Finale of the Ninth the addition of the continuous grouping of measures was probably undertaken simultaneously with the shorter groups in order to ensure the overall maintenance of odd-numbered measures as downbeat measures.

<sup>218</sup> Cf. §3.1.10, concerning E/85–88, and §3.3.6, concerning mm. 343–358.

<sup>219</sup> Gülke elegantly alluded to Bruckner's 'pneumatic' conception of musical space in conjecturing the existence of "riesenhafte, im Leeren kreisende, ins Leere greifende Mechanismen" (*Brahms–Bruckner*, p. 141; cf. also p. 134), unfortunately basing his remarks on the annotation "16 Takte" notated not by Bruckner but by Orel in his "Übersicht" (D/135) as an indication of a missing 16-m. bifolio.

<sup>220</sup> Bruckner appears to have followed a pre-existent sk. for the expansion of the opening of the "2. Theil" of the movement in the upper staves with the coda sketch; cf. the explanation of the figures in the upper right hand corner in §3.1.8, Work phase 3, and §3.1.10, paragraphs concerning E/139–142, and §3.3.7.

### 2.1.6 The numerology hypothesis.

The speculative idea that some form of numerologically significant structural determinant number, a 'Verhältniszahl' or 'Grundzahl', could have been invoked consciously or unconsciously by Bruckner in determining the proportions and structures of his music appears to have been initiated—perhaps ironically, given his lifelong preoccupation with text-critical philology—by Leopold Nowak. The notion represents a curious and so far unsubstantiated transplantation into the Romantic era of a hermeneutic tradition more germane to the medieval period or the Renaissance. Nowak's speculations, articulated in three articles dealing with the proportions of the E-minor Mass and Fifth Symphony,<sup>221</sup> were initially taken up by Alfred Dokalik,<sup>222</sup> then more extensively by Cohrs;<sup>223</sup> most recently the idea was resuscitated in an article by Leopold Brauneiss on the Seventh;<sup>224</sup> a rather circumspect article by Elisabeth Maier even appeared on the subject of "Zahlensymbolik" in ABIL's 1996 publication *Bruckner Handbuch*. Nowak wrote of the Finale of the Fifth:

So läßt sich zwanglos der ganze Satz auf die Verhältniszahl 30 beziehen. Bruckner folgt damit intuitiv den Baugrundsätzen der gotischen Baumeister, die ihren Kathedralen ebenfalls eine Zahl zugrunde legten. Alles an diesem Bauwerk war dann ein Vielfaches oder ein Teil dieser Zahl. Daraus entstanden aber 'harmonische' Verhältnisse und diese 'Verhältnisse' sind Ausdruck eines geistigen 'ordo', der seine letzten Beziehungen schließlich in einer Harmonie der Welt in einer Lehre von der Harmonik finden muß.<sup>225</sup>

Nowak here makes plain that his thinking reflected the then (1961) still-prevalent comparison of Bruckner's symphonies with Gothic architecture—views probably lent endorsement by the largely unexplained phenomenon of Bruckner's metrical numbers, as well as the writings of Hans Kayser, the founder of the Institut für Harmonikale Grundlagenforschung at the then

---

<sup>221</sup> "Der Begriff der 'Weite' in Anton Bruckners Musik" (*Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 126–139, particularly p. 135, fn. 3), where Nowak made curious comparisons of the size and proportions of the rooms and halls with which Bruckner was familiar in his earlier years with the spatial dimensions of his music. Two further studies, "Anton Bruckners Formwille, dargestellt am Finale seiner V. Symphonie" (*Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 43–46) and "Studien zu den Formverhältnissen in der e-Moll-Messe von Anton Bruckner" (*Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 160–175) applied the notion of 'Grundzahlen' to the analysis of these works. Kirsch ("Die Bruckner-Forschung seit 1945 (IV)", p. 16) writes: "Erscheint schon aus den verschiedensten Bereichen zusammengezogene wissenschaftstheoretische Basis an sich recht fragwürdig, so ergeben sich hinsichtlich der analytischen Beweisführung dieser Grundideen an der e-moll-Messe—wie bei den parallelen Untersuchungen des Verfassers zu den Sinfoniesätzen—weitere Zweifel."

<sup>222</sup> "Auswahl und Darbietung der Sinfonien Bruckners an der AHS (III)", *Musikerziehung* 28, no. 5 (1975), pp. 206–212; the article is in fact concerned with numerological proportions in the Seventh.

<sup>223</sup> "Der musikalische Architekt: Zur Bedeutung der Zahlen in Bruckners 5. und 9. Sinfonie", *NZfM* 151 (July–Aug. 1990), pp. 19–26; "Zahlenphänomene in Bruckners Symphonik: Neues zu den Strukturen der Fünften und Neunten Symphonie", *BrJb* 1989–90, pp. 35–76; "Anton Bruckner als musikalischer Architekt", in: *Bruckner Klang Bau*, eds. Stadt Bochum and Bochumer Symphoniker, Bochum 1992, pp. 106–117.

<sup>224</sup> "Zahlen und Proportionen in Bruckners Siebenter Symphonie", *BrJb* 1994–96, pp. 33–46.

<sup>225</sup> "Anton Bruckners Formwille...", *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 45.

Hochschule für Musik und Darstellende Kunst in Vienna.<sup>226</sup> Nowak's thinking may have been influenced by an anonymous report referring to an interest by Bruckner in the Vienna Stephansdom, dating from 1892:

Ein anderer Korrespondent teilt uns mit: Unser Anton Bruckner, der altehrwürdige Symphoniker, trägt sich mit der Absicht, seinen neun Sinfonien [i.e., presumably including the 'Nullte'] eine zehnte hinzuzufügen, und zwar die 'gotische'. Um in die richtige Stimmung zu kommen, geht er seit Tagen in und um die Wiener Stephanskirche und studiert deren edle Bauformen.<sup>227</sup>

This seems to have been coupled for Nowak with the notion that the proportions of the Stephansdom are based on a "Grundzahl" of 37, with which Nowak presumably became familiar from an article he cites which was published in 1940.<sup>228</sup> It is by no means certain that Bruckner could have been familiar with such information, however.<sup>229</sup> These ideas were taken up by Cohrs, who went on to establish the operation of no less than three 'Grundzahlen' for the Ninth, namely 7, 9 and 37. While acknowledging that multiples of such numbers could be occurring at significant points in the composition by chance, he nonetheless concluded:

In jedem Falle handelt es sich bei den gefundenen Zahlenphänomenen um eine weitere, bislang kaum erkannte, wenn auch vielleicht nur kleine Facette in Bruckners Kompo-

<sup>226</sup> Cf. for example *Akroasis: Die Lehre von der Harmonik der Welt*, Basel 1946; *Lehrbuch der Harmonik*, Zurich 1950. Of interest also is Margarete Riemschneider, *Das Geheimnis der Numinosen Zahl*, Munich 1966, and Konrad Hecht, *Maß und Zahl in der gotischen Kunst*, New York 1979; an older, still significant text is that of Ernst Moessel, *Die Proportion in Antike und Mittelalter*, Munich 1926.

<sup>227</sup> *NeueMZ* (Stuttgart–Leipzig) 13, no. 16 (1892), p. 187; noted in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 269. Ernst Kurth (*Bruckner*, p. 673) seized on this information in his exegesis of the Ninth as "Musik der Gotik" (p. 676). Cf. also discussion of the links with the neo-Gothic architecture of Bruckner's own time, Andrea Harrandt, ed., "Schlußdiskussion", *BrSympBer* 1985, Linz, 1988, p. 175.

<sup>228</sup> Eduard Castle, "Geheimnisvoller Stephansdom", *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 13 Nov. 1940; see also Rupert Feuchtmüller, *Der Wiener Stephansdom*, Vienna 1978, pp. 181ff., who refers to a further article by Castle, "Die Wiener Stephanskirche, eine Symphonie in Stein". In fact, the Stephansdom is simply founded on a measurement unit of 37 Vienna feet. While, as Feuchtmüller notes, this number itself must have had profound religious significance for its builders, being the gematric number of Christ (cf. Maier, *Bruckner Handbuch*, p. 495), but far more important for the building's actual proportions are the units formed by multiples of this "Schlüsselzahl", among them, the width of the nave (111 Vienna feet, i.e., 37 x 3), the width across the towers (222), the overall length (333) and the height of the towers (444), as noted by Cohrs, "Der musikalische Architekt", p. 23). These numbers, incidentally, form the harmonic relationship of 1:2:3:4—known since Pythagorean times as the *tetraktys*. Cf. Jamie James, *The Music of the Spheres*, London 1993, pp. 29ff.

<sup>229</sup> Most of the knowledge concerning the *Grundzahl* appears only to have been rediscovered by measurements of the building made by Franz Kieslinger and Eduard Castle in the 1940s. The author wrote to Professor Feuchtmüller on the subject in April 1990, receiving the response that it was unlikely, in his opinion, that Bruckner could have known the significance of the number 37 for the Stephansdom in the 1890s. If Bruckner consciously used the number 37 in the Ninth (see §3.3.7) on being inspired by his visits to the cathedral, it represents a remarkable case of creative intuition.

nieren, die einmal mehr staunen über die gedankliche Tiefe und Vielfalt des Genies Anton Bruckner hervorruft, dem man mit Ehrfurcht gegenüberstehen muß.<sup>230</sup>

The idea that preternatural compositional skills that would be necessary to consciously establish such numbers while doing justice to all the other compositional parameters of symphonic form appears from this to represent an attractive element of this concept. In addition to this comes the fascination of such mysterious 'verborgenes Wissen' and its links with the arcane and esoteric. Leopold Brauneiss, in establishing a Grundzahl of 34 for the Seventh Symphony, claimed that:

Die verschiedentlich auftauchenden und unterschiedlich konkretisierten Verweise auf Handwerk und christliche Symbolik verbindende Traditionen namentlich der gotischen Baukunst—die Behauptung also, Brucknersche Symphonien seien ebenso auf Grundzahlen aufgebaut wie gotische Kathedralen—gehen letztlich auf antike Anschauungen von der allgemeinen regulativen Kraft der Zahlen zurück.<sup>231</sup>

However, these intriguing speculations remain just that. It should be borne in mind that the use of numerical symbolism in older music and the idea of a crypto-semantics based on it was not recognised in the nineteenth century and only rediscovered in the twentieth. What Douglas Jarman says concerning Alban Berg's recourse to numerical symbolism therefore probably applies equally well to Bruckner:

Berg kann diese Tradition schwerlich gekannt haben, da Chiffren und Kryptogramme in der Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts nur spärlich verwendet wurden und die Zahlensymbolik in Mißkredit gefallen war und während des Barocks fast gänzlich aus der europäischen Musik verschwand. Das Ausmaß, in dem die Zahlensymbolik im Mittelalter und in der Renaissance ein Bestandteil der Kunst gewesen ist, wurde erst nach Bergs Tod klar.<sup>232</sup>

Somewhere, one should expect, there should be substantial evidence, via Sechter or other theoreticians Bruckner studied, for a continuation of some existing tradition; moreover, there should be evidence from the manuscripts of Bruckner's consistent use of these techniques. Such evidence, if it exists at all, can be found only sparingly. There is no independent evidence that Bruckner knew about the Grundzahl of the Stephansdom, for instance; even if he did, little trace remains in Bruckner's scores or sketches of the many

---

<sup>230</sup> "Zahlenphänomene in Bruckners Symphonik: Neues zu den Strukturen der Fünften und Neunten Symphonie", *BrJb* 1989–90, p. 51.

<sup>231</sup> P. 45. See for instance among publications on the issue of well-attested usages of symbolic numbers in music, which contrast with the speculative efforts required to link Bruckner with the use of such techniques: Charles W. Warren, "Brunelleschi's Dome and Dufay's Motet", *MQ* 59, no. 1 (1973), pp. 92–105; Hans-Josef Irmen, *Mozart—Mitglied geheimer Gesellschaften*, Mechernich 1988; Douglas Jarman, "Alban Berg, Wilhelm Fliess und das geheime Programm des Violinkonzerts", *ÖMz* 40, no. 1 (Jan. 1985), pp. 12–21; Craig Wright, "Dufay's Nuper rosarum flores, King Solomon's Temple, and the Veneration of the Virgin", *JAMS* 47, no. 3 (1994), pp. 395–441.

<sup>232</sup> "Alban Berg...", p. 21, fn. 1.

mathematical calculations that would have been required to intentionally establish such occurrences of numbers during the compositional process. The few instances that can be found of such calculations appear to be the exceptions that prove the rule. Jackson,<sup>233</sup> for instance, cites a marginal calculation in a pc. sk. for IX/3, StB 4189/45<sup>r</sup>, “ $30/2 = 15/2 = 7.5 \times 4 = 30$ ”, but for which he can establish no relevance.<sup>234</sup> The one piece of alleged evidence adduced by Cohrs (and Brauneiss) is the single fol. ÖNB 38.846 (Facs. C/324), which contains a brief calculation claimed by Stradal to be a “Berechnung des Verhältnisses der Takte im letzten Satze der IX. Symphonie”. In fact, the calculation contains a basic mistake in arithmetic:  $33 \times 12$  does not equal 496 but 396, and none of the figures—30, 10, 33, 12, 5, 15—have any ostensible significance for the Finale of the Ninth, or crop up subsequently in any of the numerous marginal annotations. More likely, the calculations of 38.846 were something far more prosaic—one could perhaps speculate that they had to do with the amount of music paper Bruckner needed to buy or rule up for the composition of the score—and if Bruckner intentionally concealed all evidence of such working (as could be claimed, in line with the idea of such techniques constituting a ‘hidden knowledge’), he would scarcely have given this folio to Stradal. The numerous marginal notations of figures found in the Finale sources—cf. the facsimiles—invariably have to do with pragmatic issues like the distribution of measures over the pages of a bifol.; several of these are in fact significant for the reconstruction of the score, and will be discussed in Part Three.

Like Cohrs before him, Brauneiss speculated on the supposed significance of these few figures in making what amounts to a major claim about the nature and methods of Bruckner's approach to composition. The fact remains, however, that musical scores are full of numbers, and one can readily find innumerable instances of certain numbers—whether reckoned in measure numbers, multiples of measures or groups of notes—and select those possessing some sort of significance. The opportunities expand exponentially when, firstly, relatively simple numbers are used; and secondly, when multiple numbers are drawn upon (for instance 7, 9 and 37 in the case of Cohrs' analysis of the Ninth).<sup>235</sup> We should also have abundant evidence from the MSS that Bruckner composed with such preoccupations in mind. In fact, his MSS should be literally covered in mathematical computations; yet there is precious little

<sup>233</sup> “Bruckner's Metrical Numbers”, p. 104, where Jackson suggests, with Nowak, that Bruckner may have “used simple ratios to generate the proportions of his metrical grid”. Jackson can establish no link between marginal numbers on the sk. of *Vexilla regis* and the proportions of that work, however (*ibid.*); the same appears to apply in other cases of marginal numbers in the MSS for the Ninth—see following fn.

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*, see Jackson's fn. 29. This is very much Jackson's interpretation of this annotation, however; the distribution of the numbers suggests similarities with a calculation on Finale bifol. 1<sup>b</sup>C (C/59, q.v.), which is probably no more than a summary of the distribution of mm. on that bifol.

<sup>235</sup> Brauneiss (pp. 45f., fn. 21) explained the role of the number 34 in the Seventh as a reference to the 34,000 ‘Vater unser’, ‘Ave Maria’ and ‘Ehre sei dem Vater’ required of the faithful as a condition of entry into heaven in a widely distributed pietist text of the time, *Der himmlische Hof*—cited by Leopold Kantner in “Die Frömmigkeit Anton Bruckners” as was discussed in §1.1.9.

evidence from the autograph scores of the earlier works nor from the more extensive later sources that Bruckner ever composed in this manner. Bruckner normally did not even go to the trouble of undertaking a continuous numbering of a finished movement, he made no summaries that we know of, of the lengths of periods of a whole work or movement, nor do we find evidence that measures were added or subtracted from drafts or scores at revision stage for anything other than metrical or structural reasons. Hence, it is more than likely that the numbers discovered by scholars such as Nowak and Cohrs simply occur by chance, as by-products, as it were, of the fact that Bruckner's music is highly and consistently structured and builds structurally into larger-scale units determined not only by 8-m. period structures but by the sum of additional units—halves, quarters or smaller units of that length. It is perfectly possible—in fact, it amounts to a major preoccupation of humankind—to attempt to impose meaning, order and symbolic intent upon what is simply random. The occurrence of 'symbolic numbers' in Bruckner's music, where it cannot be ascribed by standard documentary methods to the conscious compositional intentions of the composer, is more likely a product of this well-meaning but ultimately obfuscatory hermeneutic approach.

This view, of course, by no means contradicts the idea that proportions exist in Bruckner's music, for both listener and analyst, as they do in all music, and that Bruckner perhaps consciously, but certainly intuitively, fine-tuned his musical structures according to certain mathematical proportions. Such 'harmonic proportions' as well as the Golden Mean may well play a role in our perception of temporal process in music—as they do in art and architecture.<sup>236</sup> However, as enticing as the supposition of symbolic 'Grundzahlen' or similar links with pre-modern thinking may be for the notion of Bruckner as an 'architect' of symphonic 'cathedrals', and as much as that might resonate with other residues of Baroque and pre-Baroque thinking in his music, Bruckner's MSS offer precious little evidence for the claim that the composer consistently or even occasionally used 'Grundzahlen' as a component of his compositional technique.

### 2.1.7 Conclusions.

Setting aside this issue, the thesis that Bruckner's music reflects an impermeable division between his theoretical thinking and compositional practice—despite the acceptance of a wide and consistently observed gulf between theory and composition in the Viennese thoroughbass tradition—cannot be maintained. Analysis on the composer's own terms, as we have attempted to undertake here, clarifies much that at first seems obscure in Bruckner's style, and

---

<sup>236</sup> Kind acknowledgements go to Professor Dr. Werner Schultze (Vienna), then of the Institut für Harmonikale Grundlagenforschung of the Hochschule für Musik und Darstellende Kunst, Vienna, for his assistance with this question in the early 1990s. Harry Halbreich undertook an analysis of Bruckner's Sixth on the basis of the Golden Mean, "Bruckners Sechste: kein Stiefkind mehr", in: *BrSympBer 1982: Bruckner-Interpretation*, Linz–Vienna 1983, pp. 85–92.



amply demonstrates the utility of approaching the exegesis of his music through an understanding of his theoretical thinking. As Floros wrote: "Wie bei kaum einem anderen Komponisten ist bei Bruckner eben Archaisches und Modernes, Barockes und Romantisches, Altertümliches und Zukunftsweisendes integriert."<sup>237</sup> This bold synthesis—"Albrechtsberger Arm in Arm mit Richard Wagner", as Hanslick once described his music<sup>238</sup>—predestined it to the critical and analytical obloquy which has characterised its reception.

Bruckner's epic symphonism thus represents an autonomous musical conception anchored as much in the Baroque as in the Romantic period, but with many unique features developed by him as a consequence of his fusion of two such fundamentally dissimilar styles. Despite all its innovatory elements, the technical foundation on which Bruckner's compositional style was built remained indebted to his rigorous harmonic and contrapuntal training in the Viennese thoroughbass tradition. To this must be added the influence of many Baroque modes of thought and musical influences, transmitted via the highly conservative musical training which Bruckner underwent as a church musician. Theoretical constructs such as complete eleventh- or thirteenth-chords found their way into his music, while impulses from compositional practice infiltrated his teaching of harmony, as suggested by the greater status given by him to the ninth as a 'Stammakkord'. His consistently observed formal terminology, adopted from Lobe and Richter, explains the differences between his handling of sonata form and that of most of his compositional models; his use of metrical numbers, adapted from Sechter's progressive thinking on the relation of harmony and metre, played a crucial role in the construction and refinement of his monumental musical structures. As Kirkendale demonstrated with regard to Beethoven, the notion of the unfettered Romantic genius must make way for a more complex understanding of the assimilative musician, looking both forward and back, intensely occupied with the technical aspects of his craft.

---

<sup>237</sup> "Thesen über Bruckner." *Musik-Konzepte*, nos. 23–24 (Jan. 1982), p. 5; quoted by Cohrs, "Marginalien zu Bruckners Finale" (unpubl.).

<sup>238</sup> In his review of the premiere of the F-minor Mass, *Neue Freie Presse*, 13 November 1894; quoted in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 440.

## 2.2

### Motivic-Thematic Process

Authentische Beziehungen zu Bruckner dürften sich erst eröffnen, wenn die radikalen Veränderungen seines Kompositionsbegriffs auf der Basis der Variantentechnik erkannt und angenommen würden.

—Mathias Hansen<sup>1</sup>

#### 2.2.1 The Mutationsverfahren.

WHILE considerable information on the theoretical foundation of Bruckner's harmonic and, to a lesser extent, structural approaches has come down to us and, as we have seen, offers significant insights into his compositional technique, an understanding of the motivic processes underlying his music was only arrived at much later. Like the general incomprehension of the nature of Bruckner's handling of sonata form, this had fateful consequences, as Bruckner's music was attacked as often on the grounds of what was regarded as its confused thematic processes—again, notably by Schenker.<sup>2</sup>

The key to the long-overdue analytical rapprochement with the motivic-thematic process in Bruckner's music was provided by Werner F. Korte, whose *Bruckner und Brahms: Die spätromantische Lösung der autonomen Konzeption*<sup>3</sup> at last furnished an adequate analytical model for these 'micro-processes' of Bruckner's compositional technique. Curiously, it has as yet by no means been accorded the status it deserves. Mathias Hansen, one of the first scholars to recognise the full significance of Korte's insight into the essentially unique character of Bruckner's music, pointed out that:

Obwohl das Buch vor einem Vierteljahrhundert erschienen ist, haben seine analytischen Ergebnisse bisher nur geringes Interesse gefunden: ein Großteil der seither veröffentlichten Bruckner-Arbeiten scheinen sie überhaupt nicht zur Kenntnis genommen zu haben. Dies ist um so unverständlicher, je dringlicher immer wieder die Forderung ausgesprochen wird, das analytische Defizit in der Bruckner-Forschung zu überwinden.<sup>4</sup>

The rather desultory reception so far accorded to Korte's work is perhaps in line with the notable absence of discussion of Bruckner's compositional technique in general.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Bruckner*, p. 324.

<sup>2</sup> See in particular the summary of Schenker's views in Jonas, ed., "Heinrich Schenker: Über Anton Bruckner", *passim*, as well as their discussion in Eybl, "Grandiose Isolierzellen und rasselnde Fugenmechanik", *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> Tutzing 1963.

<sup>4</sup> *Bruckner*, p. 333, fn. 47: cf. the critique in §3.0.2 of later studies of Bruckner's compositional technique based on the sources for the Eighth and Ninth Symphonies.

Astonishingly, the two major dissertations to deal with Bruckner's compositional technique in the Eighth and Ninth, respectively those of Claudia Catharina Röthig<sup>5</sup> and Mariana M. Sonntag,<sup>6</sup> make no mention of the Mutationsverfahren. Adolf Nowak referred to the organic processes underlying Bruckner's music, including mutation, in his "Zur Analyse Brucknerscher Symphonik";<sup>7</sup> the process is sufficiently obvious and ubiquitous in Bruckner's music that one does not need to have read Korte in order to recognise its significance as a constructive principle—both Samale and the current author, for instance, independently arrived at similar conceptions of Bruckner's motivic transformation techniques from analysis of the scores alone. Erwin Horn likewise discussed what amounts to the Mutationsverfahren in his "Evolution und Metamorphose in der Achte Symphonie von Anton Bruckner",<sup>8</sup> without making a single reference to Korte. The author's "Neue Erkenntnisse" (1992) broadly outlined the Mutationsverfahren with examples of its application in the Finale;<sup>9</sup> his "Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren" (1995) dealt in part with the sources of *Helgoland* and outlined the extent of the use of the process in the Ninth.<sup>10</sup> In the same year, Grandjean published a more detailed study of Bruckner's compositional techniques in *Helgoland* in his "Anton Bruckners 'Helgoland' und das Symphonische";<sup>11</sup> curiously, reference to the mutation concept in his more recent *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner* is almost conspicuous by its absence. Korstvedt also invoked Korte to advantage in his *Bruckner: Symphony No. 8*.<sup>12</sup> Up to now, however, no substantial follow-up study has yet been undertaken.

To briefly summarise Korte's thesis, a stylistic development can be traced in Bruckner's music in which the 'classical' paradigm of thematic exposition in quadratic, antecedent-consequent melodic periods was abandoned in favour of an all-encompassing generative process that simultaneously met the dictates of form, continuity, unity, motivic variation and the capacity to expressly lead into, foreshadow, or conversely allow to appear without forewarning, new motivic or thematic material. As we have seen, this new, ultimately all-encompassing motivic process, like the "virtuose Verkettung von Klängen" referred to by Röder (§2.1.4), demanded new techniques of metrical regulation in order to counterbalance its

<sup>5</sup> *The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner*, 1987.

<sup>6</sup> *Studien zur Systematik des Schaffens von Anton Bruckner auf der Grundlage zeitgenössischer Berichte und autographischer Entwürfe* cf. details and further discussion in §3.0.2.

<sup>7</sup> *NZfM* 135 (1974), pp. 674–676.

<sup>8</sup> *BrJb* 1989/90, pp. 7–33; cf. also his "Metamorphose des Hauptthemas der Achten Symphonie im Scherzothema", in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 123–128.

<sup>9</sup> "Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners", *BrJb* 1989/90, pp. 165f. A much expanded version of the passage is found in §2.2.2.

<sup>10</sup> *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 162f., cf. also Table 2 (p. 167), an earlier version of Ex. 2b.

<sup>11</sup> *Mf* 48, no. 4 (1995), pp. 349–368.

<sup>12</sup> *Cambridge Music Handbooks*, Cambridge 2000, cf. in particular pp. 31f.

essentially chaotic, endless transformational potential (concerning which, as Grandjean pointed out, Korte completely overlooked the evidence of Bruckner's metrical numbers). Bruckner's music consisted for Korte of a series of "Werkstücken", derived from one or more discrete initial motivic cells or "Kernzeilen" by means of a process Korte termed "Mutation", in which phrases were altered, usually step-wise, in regard to a particular aspect or 'parameter', such as interval, intervallic direction, or rhythm, and those alterations then become the basis for further such variations—a procedure referred to by Dahlhaus as "Trennung der Parameter".<sup>13</sup>

As Dahlhaus showed, the concept not coincidentally recalls Adorno's identification of a "Variantentechnik" in the music of Mahler;<sup>14</sup> it has roots in analytical models first advanced in the 1950s by Rudolf Reti,<sup>15</sup> who identified techniques of thematic transformation and the use of "melodic cells" from medieval composers through to the Viennese classics and Brahms.<sup>16</sup> The notion has long been an integral part of developmental procedures within the sonata tradition, but was first made into the essential principle of whole movements and works by Brahms as well as by Liszt and Wagner, in which sequential treatment of shorter, self-contained motives becomes an essential feature of thematic exposition as well as development procedures. Dahlhaus elsewhere<sup>17</sup> traced the development of the concept from the Liszt tone poems through to Schoenberg's concept of the "entwickelnde Variation",<sup>18</sup> defined by Dahlhaus as "das Verfahren, aus einem begrenzten Material, im Extrem einem einzigen Intervall, weitreichende Zusammenhänge herauszuspinnen." Hansen explained that in Bruckner,

[d]ie Mehrdeutigkeit verschiedener kompositorischer Elemente, verklammert von rhythmischer Invarianz, bedingt eine nicht minder charakteristische musikalische Entfaltung, eine Bewegungsweise der Musik, die sich von der klassischen Entwicklungstechnik, von motivisch-thematischen Verarbeitungsprozessen grundlegend unterscheidet. An die Stelle von Entwicklungen durch Verarbeitung tritt ein umfassendes Mutationsverfahren: der invariable Bereich (ein formellhafter Rhythmus) erscheint durch den variablen in immer anderer Beleuchtung, ohne seine motivische (sprich: vorrangig rhythmische) Prägnanz auszuwechseln oder zu verlieren. Mutation bedeutet also praktisch eine lediglich quantitative Veränderung eines Gegebenen, Gesetzten, eine permanente Verwür-

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 23f. Carl Dahlhaus, "Bruckner und die Programmmusik: Zum Finale der Achten Symphonie", in: *Anton Bruckner: Studien zu Werk und Wirkung: Walter Wiora zum 30. Dez. 1986*, ed. C.-H. Mahling, Tutzing 1988, pp. 23f.

<sup>14</sup> "Bruckner und die Programmmusik", p. 27.

<sup>15</sup> *The Thematic Process in Music*, New York 1951.

<sup>16</sup> Reti, p. 253; cf. for instance, p. 244, where Reti claims that "classical music would never have become what it is if this principle had not been applied consciously."

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts (Neues Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft 6)*, Wiesbaden-Laaber 1980, pp. 197ff.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 212.

felung der variablen Details bei prinzipieller Wahrung eines invarianten Kerns. Mutation erzeugt demzufolge keine diskursiv musikalische Bewegung, sondern Aneinanderreihung, Addition von situativen Ereignissen und Ereignisfolgen, zwischen denen durch kettenartige Verhakung der Details ein Höchstmaß an Zusammenhang, zugleich aber auch eine ständige Übergangsbeziehung geschaffen werden.<sup>19</sup>

It should be noted, however, that the parameter of rhythm is by no means as universally invariant as both Dahlhaus and Korte assume—presumably for the sake of the clarity of their argumentation—since techniques involving rhythmic variation along several lines (augmentation, diminution, interpolation etc.) are commonplace in Bruckner’s music. To Korte, the mutation process also appeared to have modified Bruckner’s use of sonata form, the Repr. becoming under the impact of these processes a continuation of the Durchf., so that, as he writes, “[d]as thematisch Erschaffene ist kaum erfunden, als es schon beginnt, sich zu verwandeln. Auf dieser Basis werden die alten Werkvorstellungen from Durchführung and Reprise als Funktionsbestimmungen der Sonatensatz-Struktur praktisch aufgehoben”.<sup>20</sup> In fact, as we have seen, Bruckner’s new motivic-thematic procedures were not the cause, but simply correlated with Bruckner’s two-part conception of sonata form (§2.1.4), since despite his vast expansion of formal structure and consistent inclusion of a third group, Bruckner was still operating with the older formal model, defined firstly as a binary structure, and secondly as a sequence or tour of keys rather than themes.

A number of scholars have addressed the question as to the impact of, on the one hand, Bruckner’s contrapuntal training and, on the other, his improvisational techniques on the thematic and structural techniques of the symphonies.<sup>21</sup> Though to examine such claims in detail would lead too far afield, it is not an unreasonable assumption, given that Bruckner was prepared to maintain the eighteenth-century two-part division of sonata form against the evidence of his symphonic models, that he would also have tended to work with what were for him the known techniques of his contrapuntal training and improvisational practice in developing his thematic material—Bruckner approached symphonic composition, after all, via the medium of the orchestral mass.<sup>22</sup> In writing of the role of improvisation for the development of Bruckner’s music, Orel suggested that:

<sup>19</sup> Pp. 148f.

<sup>20</sup> P. 35; cf. §2.1.4.

<sup>21</sup> One of the few more detailed reports of Bruckner’s organ playing is that of Stradal, in his “Erinnerungen”, pp. 857ff. See Alfred Orel, “Bruckner und Bach”, *BrJb* 1981, pp. 39–49; see also Helmut Rösing, “Gestalt und Wiederholung in Bruckners Sinfonien”, *BrJb* 1981, pp. 17–25. Hansen regarded Bruckner’s improvisation as a “kompositionstechnische Schmiede oder Rüstkammer”, in which “wesentliche Elemente der späteren Werke ihre charakteristische Gestalt erhielten” (*Bruckner*, p. 122). “[E]s kommt noch hinzu, daß sich aus dieser Spielpraxis wesentliche kompositionstechnische Eigenheiten und Elemente der künftigen Sinfonien herausbilden” (p. 118).

<sup>22</sup> Two dissertations c. 1960 (i.e., pre-Korte) dealt in varying degrees with Bruckner’s contrapuntal and developmental techniques: Klaus Trapp, *Die Fuge in der Deutschen Romantik von Schubert bis Reger* (Diss. Frankfurt am Main, 1958; photocopy, unpubl.) and Horst-Günther Scholz, *Die Form der reifen Messen Anton Bruckners* (Diss. Marburg 1960, publ. Berlin 1961).

Der frei gestalteten, nicht mehr so melodisch als vielmehr harmonisch bestimmten Entwicklung des Thematischen—“Bruckner läßt die Harmonie entscheiden (A. Halm)—seiner ‘Durchführung’, die mit all den Aufbaumitteln der Symphonik Bruckners, Vergrößerung, Umkehrung, Erweiterung und Zerlegung des Themas, charakterischer Veränderung, Durchsetzung mit Gegenstimmen, in allmählicher Steigerung des wellenförmigen Fortschreitens des musikalischen Geschehens [...] folgte als krönendes Ziel wohl die glanzvoll triumphale Wiederkehr des Themas mit der aus den Symphonien wohlbekannten Apotheose des Hauptgedankens. [...] Die mit den Mitteln strenger Kontrapunktik höchst gesteigerte thematische Arbeit dient im Wesen der Erfüllung harmonischen Geschehens und nicht umgekehrt.<sup>23</sup>

Orel was surely correct in this respect. Here again it is useful to recall Reicha’s division between “melodische” and “harmonische Tonwerke”, and the fact that passages of Bruckner’s symphonic music can generally be categorised as one or the other.<sup>24</sup> Almost throughout Bruckner’s harmonically orientated music, the melodic outline of a motive is modified to match the surrounding texture; moreover, it is possible in many cases to identify specific and often rigorously implemented techniques of motivic transformation which, as we will see, by and large correspond to the contrapuntal manipulations of Baroque canonic and fugal techniques such as imitation, inversion, diminution, augmentation, *stretto* or *per arsin et thesin*. Alongside these appear procedures which to greater or lesser degrees are more specifically characteristic of Bruckner’s music, such as motivic fragmentation or the reduction of a motive to its rhythmic substrate.<sup>25</sup> Thus contrary to its role in classical counterpoint, motive in Bruckner’s music is frequently subordinate to harmonic or even periodic design—to be expected perhaps, given his derivation of orchestral counterpoint from a pre-existent harmonic substrate.<sup>26</sup> The flexibility the motive was forced to assume under the duress of constant harmonic change and the complexity of chromatic harmony also meant that the

<sup>23</sup> “Bruckner und Bach”, p. 48.

<sup>24</sup> Overall, however, and particularly viewed in terms of the more progressive aspects of Bruckner’s style, harmonically orientated passages are the more important. Concerning the extent to which harmonic drive creates its own structure within Bruckner’s music, see Carl Dahlhaus, “Ist Bruckners Symphonik formbildend?”, *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 19–26.

<sup>25</sup> For Norbert Nagler this represented a metaphor for Bruckner’s ‘necrophilic tendencies’. Quoting from two non-German authors, he claims: “Soweit ich die Fachliteratur zu dem hier behandelten Gegenstand kenne, haben lediglich zwei Autoren, A. Machabey und U. Duse, mit großer Sensibilität erspürt, daß Bruckners Nekrophilie dessen kompositorische Praxis prägt. Die Umformung der Nekrophilie ‘geschieht’—nach Aussagen von Duse—stets ‘dann, wenn das Gestalt annimmt, was Machabey “einen der eigenartigsten Aspekte des rhythmischen Primats in einigen Symphonien Bruckners” nennt, und was als Entfleischungsprozess der Themen definiert wird, die “am Ende auf ihr rhythmisches Skelett reduziert werden, und die in dieser Form in der Finalcoda der Partituren triumphieren, die sie bis dahin nährten”.’ Alles, was noch Leben verheißt, beginnt dabei abzusterben: Zurück bleibt ein Knochengestüst, das von der lebenslänglichen Abtötung der Begierde zeugt. Kaum ein anderer Komponist des 19. Jahrhunderts hat so eindringlich die Todverfallenheit des Lebens exponiert, wie dies Bruckner getan hat” (Nagler, “Bruckners gründerzeitliche Monumentalsymphonie”, p. 117).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Friedrich Neumann, “Zum Verhältnis von Akkordik und Melodik bei Anton Bruckner” *BrJb* 1981 S.167–170. Cf. also concerning the nature of contrapuntal texture and motivic development in Bruckner, Kurth, pp. 519f.

clarity of thematic construction assumed by the monumental style—the ready recognisability of themes—necessitated the additional profile of greater dynamic contrast and textural variation—cf., for instance, the overwhelming orchestral unisons with which Bruckner tends to announce principal themes. Blume noted a decade or so before Korte that:

Blockartig werden die Komplexe gegeneinander gestellt; die Kontraste dieser Gegenüberstellung werden im Laufe der Zeit immer massiver. Durchführungsteile bringen regelmäßig die kompliziertesten Verwicklungen des thematischen Materials, das jedoch fast nie im Beethovenschen Sinne ‚entwickelt‘, sondern meist kontrapunktisch verwoben und übereinandergeschichtet wird.<sup>27</sup>

Rather than being the central, dominating elements of the movement, therefore, themes themselves became, to a considerable extent, subordinate to the overriding developmental surge of harmonic change and motivic transformation. “[D]adurch”, as Dahlhaus writes, “daß Simplizität und Verästelung aus derselben Wurzel stammen, [wird] die Monumentalität überhaupt erst von einer Fassadenstruktur zu einem von innen heraus begründeten Stil erhoben”.<sup>28</sup> “Der Eindruck,” therefore,

daß ein dichtes Gewebe von Beziehungen sich ausbreitet, [...] bildet das Korrelat zu einer Formkonzeption, die von ‘Blöcken’ ausgeht, deren charakteristisches Moment der Rhythmus ist. Wenn sich in der Tendenz zum ‘Block’ die Monumentalität der Brucknerschen Technik manifestiert, so wird durch die Assoziationsmethode, die das architektonisch Geschichtete gleichsam mit einem Netz von motivischen Beziehungen überzieht [...].<sup>29</sup>

The consequences of this approach are clearly recognisable in the Ninth, as we will see, in which the mutation process reaches beyond the boundaries of ‘Werkstücke’ to achieve a subliminal unity, but without detracting from the all-important plasticity of the compositional ‘blocks’. Moreover, the expanded span of these thematic transformations and carefully designed textural details which underlie the principal themes and their developmental treatment in part counterbalances the ‘centrifugal’ tendencies of increasingly chromatic harmony and the increasingly autonomous and more clearly profiled “Werkstücke”, thus forming a kind of ‘gravity field’ enhancing the cohesion of the composition.

### 2.2.2 Motivic-thematic process in the Ninth.

Until now, Bruckner’s application of the “Trennung der Parameter” principle or, as Korte referred to its use by Bruckner, “Mutationsverfahren”, has been more frequently invoked than discussed and analysed in detail. The attempt will be made here to outline a systematic

<sup>27</sup> Blume, col. 377.

<sup>28</sup> *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, p. 225.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 227.

classification for Bruckner's use of these techniques as they appear in the Ninth Symphony, the work in which we find them operating most consistently and stringently, and with least resort to 'free' contrapuntal techniques or to quadratic, antecedent/consequent phrase structures. In the process, the component elements of the Mutationsverfahren reveal their origin in the contrapuntal manipulations—inversion, augmentation, diminution and imitation at varying intervals—in which Bruckner was extensively trained by Sechter and which, for his duties as church organist, were his daily bread. Bruckner's notion of what constituted 'symphonic'—reflected, for instance, in his "Notabene" to Levi, "[d]aß die Werke auf wissenschaftlich-kontrapunktischer Grundlage beruhen",<sup>30</sup> or his titling *Helgoland* a "symphonischer Chor"—probably related to some extent to the rigorousness of the application of these principles, not merely the length or sublimity of content of the work. As Grandjean pointed out,

[e]in Chorwerk, das die Bezeichnung symphonische verdient [...], müßte sich Hinsichtlich der Orchesterbehandlung, der Formgestaltung im Großen und der motivisch-thematischen Verfahren an den gleichzeitig entstandenen Symphonien messen lassen.<sup>31</sup>

Bruckner's conception of the Ninth as his masterwork<sup>32</sup> thus probably relates to the extent and complexity of his use of contrapuntal techniques throughout the work, which were to culminate in the remarkably rigorous motivic and contrapuntal conception of the Finale and its conflation of chorale and fugue—cf. §2.2.4 *infra*. Overall, however, assuming there is some justification in imputing a kind of 'teleology' to Bruckner's use of the Mutationsverfahren, the procedures found in their clearest form in the Ninth can probably be regarded as paradigmatic for Bruckner's use of the technique in general, including its often less rigorous application in the earlier compositions.

The application of the Mutationsverfahren in Bruckner's music can be said to fall into two categories, not entirely exclusive of one another, but which reflect the two essential stages in which Bruckner composed: first, the establishment of the essential 'musical continuity', comprising, as we will see (ch. 3.1), the leading melodic line and often its bass and harmonic support; and second, the filling out of the musical texture.

In regard to the first stage, the manner in which the Mutationsverfahren manifests itself within the essential musical continuity was probably a largely unconscious, intuitive process. The forward motion of the music, particularly in harmonically orientated passages, is maintained by the constant transformation, by various means, of one or more of what Korte referred to as "Kernzeilen". Korte's principal example is the derivation of the Hauptth. of

<sup>30</sup> Quoted at the outset of ch. 2.1.

<sup>31</sup> "Anton Bruckner 'Helgoland' und das Symphonische", p. 350; cf. also p. 363.

<sup>32</sup> See for instance, Bruckner's statement in Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 258: "Die Neunte wird mein Meisterwerk. Den lieben Gott bitt' i' nur so viel, daß er mi' so long leben läßt, bis s' fertig is'", discussed in §1.0.3.



VIII/1 from the initial 3-m. phrase in the vlc. and cb.;<sup>33</sup> however, the principle, as we have seen in the metrical organisation of musical syntax as “Rhythmus im Großen”, constitutes a self-replicating process operating within several musical dimensions at once, from the level of the smallest motivic units, as in the case of the VIII/1 Hauptth., which itself emerges by processes of motivic extension from an initial F–G♭ ‘particle’ or, after Korte, “Kurzzeile”,<sup>34</sup> by processes summarised by him as “Zeilen-Addition”, “Reihung” and “Kettung”, through to the organisation of entire thematic groups, three of which then constitute an “Abtheilung”<sup>35</sup>—here Korte betrays his indebtedness to Lorenz and Grunsky. This ‘higher level’, moreover, is by no means limited to individual works, but forms a network of thematic allusions extending throughout Bruckner’s output. Some of these allusions constitute little more than ‘satz-technische’ or structural topoi, others link Bruckner’s sacred and symphonic works, permitting a degree of semanticisation of Bruckner’s music, as will be further discussed in §§2.2.3 and 2.2.4. Higher levels of thematic organisation can also be found, for instance, in an examination of the thematic elements of *Helgoland*,<sup>36</sup> in which, despite the varying word-rhythms and declamatory forms necessitated by the textual underlay, common elements recur in varying thematic constructions.

While Korte’s syntactic model of Bruckner’s symphonic language is both too abstract and formalistic, as well as simplistic in its comprehensive hierarchical structure—usually more than one motive is in use at any one time, for instance, while Korte also allotted an inadequate role to freer melodic structures<sup>37</sup>—it remains the most appropriate summary of Bruckner’s compositional structures so far developed. Most of Bruckner’s music can be seen to be built up via repetitions or, as we shall refer to them, ‘iterations’, of one or more motives with often increasing degrees of variation or ‘mutation’ into what we may call ‘cycles’. These lead into, or even transform themselves into, new thematic material, or conversely culminate in passages of greater or lesser musical stasis, either climactic or quiescent.

Secondly, the Mutationsverfahren functions at a textural level—an aspect of its use ignored by Korte. Bruckner’s more elaborate polyphonic textures obviously depend on the use of such techniques throughout, usually with one or more motives in use at any one time. Even in more functionally stratified textures, with more or less clear differentiation between leading line(s), bass and accompaniment, Bruckner appears to rely on largely conscious contrapuntal manipulation, frequently involving imitation of the principal melodic lines, usually in

---

<sup>33</sup> Korte, pp. 24f.

<sup>34</sup> See Horn, “Evolution und Metamorphose in der Achten Symphonie von Anton Bruckner”, pp. 7f.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Korte, p. 65.

<sup>36</sup> See Grandjean’s listing of the themes in “Anton Bruckners ‘Helgoland’ und das Symphonische”, *passim*.

<sup>37</sup> A good instance of this is, as demonstrated by Grandjean (pp. 162ff.), the Scherzo, in which it is difficult to identify more than the most general motivic ideas—rhythm, arpeggiation, etc.; the compositional structure here is almost entirely dependent upon harmonic movement.

melodically simplified mutations, in subordinate instruments. These too can be reduced to a number of simple motivic manipulations.

Turning to the analysis of the mutation procedures as they are found in the Ninth, it is possible to group Bruckner's "Trennung der Parameter" techniques into four categories (cf. Ex. 2, legend). The first two categories comprise procedures affecting either melodic or rhythmic parameters; a third group covers procedures affecting both parameters; the fourth set, loosely termed 'interrelational', encompasses procedures defining the relationships between two or more motive statements and summarises the manner in which the music (i) creates continuity, (ii) texture, or (iii) anticipates subsequent thematic material:

1. Melodic procedures. The rhythm here remains invariable, only interval structures are altered. Intervallic variation (int.), perhaps the most frequently encountered motivic procedure of all, frequently involves the widening of a motive's intervals; Bruckner often 'compresses' more complex interval structures in subordinate voices into what almost amounts to rhythmic reductions. Inversion (inv.) and complete reduction to rhythm (red.) are also frequently encountered; the latter, incidentally, constitutes a classical technique of symphonic rather than contrapuntal writing, being frequently found in the horn and trumpet parts of classical scores. The most obvious instance of reduction to rhythm in Bruckner is probably the "Todesverkündigung" fanfare of VIII(90)/1 (letter V).
2. Rhythmic procedures. Here melodic intervals remain invariant, while rhythm is altered. Rhythmic variation (rhy.) is less frequently encountered than intervallic variation; more frequent here are Bruckner's use of augmentation (aug.) and diminution (dim.), both of which are self explanatory (both also occur in partial forms), and *per arsin et thesin* (p.a.e.t.)—essentially rhythmic displacement of a motive, in which a phrase previously beginning on a strong beat now begins on a weak, or vice versa.
3. General procedures, involving both melodic and rhythmic parameters, include the more frequently encountered interpolation of notes within phrases (interp.); its opposite, excision (exc.) is far more rare. Motivic extension (ext.) amounts to a frequently encountered 'free' technique, usually involving the addition of notes to the end of the motive; its opposite, truncation (trunc.) involves the abbreviation of a motive, usually via the deletion of notes. 'Acephalous' truncation is also found, in which a note or notes are omitted from the beginning of a motive.
4. Interrelational procedures cover the relationships between two or more motives in the same voice, or between motives in separate voices. Of these, *Reihung* and sequence (i) constitute the two essential forms of relations between two or more iterations of a motive within a single melodic line: *Reihung* (there is no equivalent term in English) covers motivic iteration at a constant pitch level (of which *ostinato* can be regarded as a special case), while in sequence, subsequent

iterations occur at lower or higher pitch levels. Imitation, stretto and Spiegelbild (ii) all describe relations between statements of the same motive in two or more parts, stretto being a special case of imitation, as is Spiegelbild, the simultaneous imitation of a motive by its inversion.<sup>38</sup> Finally, Herankomponierung and Aufbereitung (iii), both terms used by Korte, represent important longer-term motivic-thematic strategies, probably used intentionally by the composer, in which entries of new thematic material are anticipated in some form, either by ‘preparation’, i.e., leading into a thematic statement by transforming current motives into the new thematic material (Herankomponierung), or by ‘foreshadowing’ forthcoming thematic material by ‘intercutting’ some reference to it into earlier passages (Aufbereitung); the two are not always clearly distinguishable from each other.

It should also be mentioned that mutational processes can be either ‘constructive’ in their application, leading from states of lesser motivic complexity and differentiation to greater, as in the opening *Steigerung* of IX/1, or ‘dissolutive’, as in the coda of the *Adagio*. Techniques such as rising sequence and progressively shorter motivic truncations heighten tension, while increasing phrase lengths or augmentation dissipate it. Furthermore—and this is a function of the consistency with which Bruckner applies these techniques in the Ninth—the music often proceeds by altering no more than one or two mutational parameters at any one iteration. Out of this circumscribed set of basic procedures, Bruckner derived, at times probably consciously, at other times intuitively, virtually the entire continuity and texture of his music. Especially significant in the *Finale* is the limited extent of ‘free counterpoint’; here almost all elements are rigorously deduced from pre-existing musical materials. The logical rigour of these processes prove, of course, of great assistance in the reconstruction of the movement. A more or less complete motivic analysis of the opening of IX/1 (Ex. 2a), a summary of the transformations undergone by the ‘Kopfmotiv’ of IX/3 (2b), and an analysis of the process by which Bruckner spans the *Adagio* and *Finale* in leading up to the *Hauptth.* of the final movement (Ex. 2c) must suffice here as a summary of the salient aspects of the above.

Firstly, concerning Ex 2a: Bruckner begins the motivic journey of the Ninth Symphony with the presentation of two interlocking motives: (a) a dotted motive, (b) a rising and falling interval. The *trp./timp.* entries at mm. 8, 12, etc. can be regarded as truncations and augmentations of (a); the second iteration of (b) represents an intervallic variation, the third and subsequent iterations a truncation and diminution of the motive. At m. 19, Bruckner departs from strict mutational procedures in a motivically free passage which, as we will see

---

<sup>38</sup> There are of course a multitude of ‘canonic’ techniques not included in these three categories, for instance, imitation at varying intervals or by diminution or augmentation.

(§2.2.4), foreshadows many harmonic characteristics of the whole work. The absence of motivic procedure here is in line with Grandjean's observation (see §2.1.4) that this passage represents a melodically rather than harmonically orientated passage; the sketches for the movement also reveal that this passage was drafted before the preceding.<sup>39</sup> The final phrase (mm. 24f.) nonetheless anticipates the stepwise falling fourth of the new motive pair (c–d) introduced in the 1st vln. at m. 27. The ensuing sequence, imitated by the ob. from m. 32, and heightening the level of motivic activity by interpolated quavers, prepares the falling stepwise motive of the Hauptth., while the truncation of the ob. line at 36 and 38 prepares the falling octave (e) at m. 39, which will subsequently unite with the dotted rhythm—cf. the initial motive (a)—to form the 'Kopfmotiv' of the Hauptth. (f). Increasing interpolation and intervallic variation of (c) from m. 51 prepares the chromatic version of the motive at m. 66; at m. 59, the last stage before the entry of the Hauptth., (c) is diminished. These principal elements of the motivic design are all underlaid from letter A onwards by an increasingly elaborate network of motivic allusions and imitations in subordinate voices.

Ex. 2b takes a different approach by summarising the variety of forms assumed by a single motive, the 'Kopfmotiv' of the Adagio, showing the extent to which simple, usually stepwise mutational manipulations over an entire movement bring forth a wide variety of motivic forms. The example and ensuing commentary here should be read against the score, since the uses to which the Kopfmotiv are put are, of course, matched by an equally elaborate transformational sequence of other motives, notably the rising quaver sequence of m. 2, which recurs throughout the movement in innumerable configurations.

The majority of the procedures to which the Kopfmotiv is subjected fall into the melodic category, where rhythm remains largely invariant, although coupled most often with diminution and truncation. Characteristic of the motive's intervallic variations is a powerful tendency to widen its motives, a concrete expression of the "Streckungsgedanken" Kurth identified throughout the Ninth.<sup>40</sup> Again, Bruckner tends to alter motives in only one or two parameters at any one iteration within a given cycle; more extensive transformations usually coincide with the beginning of a new cycle. The opening 8 mm. of the movement again constitute a largely melodically orientated group. The sequence beginning at m. 9 features imitation between truncations of the motive in ob. and hrn.; from 13, *stretto* is added to the imitation procedure and diminution to the truncation. At mm. 17ff., rhythmic variation creates an apparently new motive, yet these measures can be seen as a form of *Spiegelbild* imitation between a near-original variant of the truncated Kopfmotiv in the hrns. and an inverted

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Nowak's transcription of this sketch Facs. C/361; further discussion in §3.1.3.

<sup>40</sup> P. 667. Adolph Nowak ("Die Wiederkehr in Bruckners Adagio", p. 169) describes the entire first group of the Adagio as "wesentlich geprägt vom Charakter der Non".

rhythmic variant thereof in the fls. and vlms.<sup>41</sup> The ensuing passage of sudden quiescence (mm. 25f.) represents a case of Bruckner's use of motivic truncation and diminution in *diminuendo*. The use of more exact forms of *Spiegelbild* in the "2. Abtheilung" of the movement can be found at m. 85; *Spiegelbild* returns to characterise the passage from m. 93 onwards, subsequently combining with imitation at the distance of one measure and later (m. 101) at the half-measure. Variants here (cf. hrn., mm. 98, 101) present characteristic cases of 'near' reduction to rhythm. More exact variants of the motive recur at mm. 105ff., again imitated in inversion; the ensuing passage to m. 120 again presents stepwise transformations of motives in sequence. The passage from m. 163 introduces a double imitation sequence between vlc./cb., 1st vln. and fls. to which further truncation and diminution, and finally augmentation, is later added.

The *Kopfmotiv* reappears for the last time in the movement at its climax, mm. 199ff., where a complex orchestral *Klangfläche* is dominated by imitation of the *Kopfmotiv* between the bass instruments and trps., culminating in *Reihung* of motive truncations in both instrumental groups and partial augmentation of the final statement of the motive in the bass. The ensuing passage as far as letter T motivically recapitulates the opening sequence leading to letter A; the motive's use ceases entirely at this point.

Finally, concerning Ex. 2c, we have already noted the description of Kurth and others of the coda of the *Adagio* as an "Auflösungsvorgang" (§1.1.11); here Bruckner gradually attenuated motivic density and harmonic tension in a remarkably sustained passage of 'thematic deliquescence'. Equally, he undertook something almost totally overlooked until now: a subtle but patently clear *Aufbereitung* in the tubas, mm. 225f., of the tritone progressions which open the *Finale* (motive b). These are themselves 'herankomponiert' via the syncopated falling intervals in the clars. 2 mm. before, which in turn are diminished, truncated mutations of the augmented, inverted *Kopfmotiv* of the *Adagio* *Gesangsp.* (letter T; cf. letter M).

Further links between the close of the *Adagio* and the opening of the *Finale*, summarised in Ex. 2d, i and iii, reveal that Bruckner tied the movements of the symphony together via the interval of the sixth.<sup>42</sup> The falling dotted motive (a) of the *Finale* thus recalls earlier configurations of rising or falling sixths in connection with the pitches d, e $\flat$  and c $\flat$  and double dotted rhythm in IX/1; its stepwise transformation into motive (d) of the monumental 'spiral' construction of the *Finale* *Hauptth.* (cf. Ex. 2c) constitutes a clear case of the great care with which Bruckner proceeded up to the very end of his compositional work on the *Finale* and roundly contradicts the notion that the *Finale* MSS demonstrate any diminishing of Bruckner's

<sup>41</sup> Here the summary given in Ex. 2b is particularly incomplete: the new motive in vlms. and fls. echoes a rhythmically similar configuration in the trps. at the half measure.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. further §3.1.8; remarkably, these have almost entirely eluded analysts to date.

creative powers or analytical insight. As will be demonstrated in chapter 3.1, the entire sequence of mm. 19–51,<sup>43</sup> with the addition of the motivic augmentation in the tbas. at mm. 31ff., marked by Bruckner “Gesang aus Thema”, was first composed quite late in the genesis of the movement, with the composition of bifol. 2F and its subsequent recopying on “2”E and “3”E. Prior to this Bruckner used a simpler and less motivically unified transition, effectively and augmentation of motive (c) of the above analysis in octaves.<sup>44</sup>

As here, almost every revision which Bruckner carried out in the later compositional phases of his work on the Finale demonstrates a more profound recognition of the potential for such internal motivic relationships and a further attempt to realise them more clearly and cogently. Such techniques are encountered in the Finale in three forms; in addition to the techniques of Herankomponierung and Aufbereitung already discussed a further kind of Aufbereitung can be found, in which Bruckner contrapuntally overlaps new material with the preceding. This can be seen at the end of the Gesangsp. in the Exp. (E/32), where the characteristic texture of the chorale (*tremolo* in lower strings, short notes in cb.) is sub-imposed under the dotted rhythm and flowing quavers of the Gesangsp. material.<sup>45</sup> Further examples of these techniques will be discussed in Part Three.

### 2.2.3 Quotation, allusion, and the Mutationsverfahren.

As useful as it is as an explanation of its working processes, the mutation model by no means comprehensively accounts for Bruckner's music. To examine the problem of the relation of its apparently programmatic elements to formalist analysis, a brief digression is appropriate.

#### *Excursus: Programmatic vs. absolute music*

The most pointed critique of Korte's analytical approach emerged in the 1980s in the re-assessment of Bruckner's symphonic compositions from the standpoint of literary hermeneutics by Floros, whose *Brahms und Bruckner: Studien zur musikalischen Exegetik*<sup>46</sup> represented an important early attempt at the reclamation of so-called ‘absolute music’ from the formalist approaches of post-war musicology. The extent to which Bruckner may have been influenced by the music of Liszt, reckoned with other composers of the ‘Neudeutsche’ school, or used musical semantics of the kind Floros imputed to him, met with considerable

<sup>43</sup> As noted in Ex. 2c, measure numbers here refer for the sake of simplicity to the score of the Performing Version (AF); cf. vol. II, section G. The relevant passage appears in the AP from E/5 onwards.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Orel, D/87f., D/91.

<sup>45</sup> Bruckner originally included a third feature characteristic of the chorale, the triplet figuration of the strings, in the fls.; however, this must have been replaced (cf. Bruckner's horizontal Strich and the apparent contradiction of the voice leading) by the altered 2nd vln. line, which continues onto the following (later) bifol. 7C/“8”; cf. further concerning these pages, §3.1.10.

<sup>46</sup> Wiesbaden 1980; see also *idem*, “Zur Deutung der Symphonik Bruckners: Das Adagio der Neunten Symphonie”, *BrJb* 1981, pp. 89–96, and “Die Zitate in Bruckners Symphonik”, *BrJb* 1982/83, pp. 7–18.

controversy, including a celebrated exchange between Floros and Rudolf Stephan.<sup>47</sup> Dahlhaus, too, pointed out the shortcomings of an analytical approach proceeding along the lines of hermeneutics alone by noting, as indices of presumed programmatic intent, departures from norms of sonata-form practice when such departures need not be regarded as such, applying “Trennung der Parameter” concepts to reveal structuralist explanations for the occurrence of features which Floros refused to admit within a normative musical scheme.<sup>48</sup> Gülke likewise noted perceptively: “Ein Großteil der Diskussion um [Bruckner’s] ‘Programme’ oder, vorsichtiger, um das was seine Musik angeregt haben könnte oder nachträglich zu assoziieren erlaubte, krankt an der Vernachlässigung der Frage, auf welche Weise sie zu ‘meinen’ vermag”.<sup>49</sup> Inherent in any musical style are certain structural topoi that cannot be isolated from its basic vocabulary. Wessely noted that Floros’ approach was not new:

Die Parallelen, die zwischen [Liszt’s] und Bruckners Schaffen vor allem von August Göllerich und Max Auer gesehen wurden, halten einer ernsthaften Prüfung nicht immer stand. Sie haben ihre Wurzeln, besonders in den Kirchenwerken, bestenfalls in Gegebenheiten des Zeitstils. Greifbar bleibt jedenfalls, den Untersuchungen von Constantin Floros zufolge, nur der Einfluß von Liszts Graner Messe auf Bruckners Kirchenmusik und die Übernahme von Liszts selbst so bezeichneten “tonischen Symbol des Kreuzes” aus dessen *Legende von der Heiligen Elisabeth*.<sup>50</sup>

Even here, however, it must be said that Floros’ attempt to assign a semantic intention on Bruckner’s part to a “tonisches Symbol des Kreuzes”<sup>51</sup>—a three-note motive, ascending second, ascending third, allegedly borrowed from Liszt’s *Granermesse*<sup>52</sup>—was by no means convincing. In at least five of the seven occurrences in Bruckner’s music quoted by Floros<sup>53</sup> no clear meaning can be assigned to Bruckner’s supposed use of the motive—why, for instance, did Bruckner not use it more consistently at references to Christ, or to the crucifixion? Why does it so anomalously appear in VIII/4 as the opening phrase of the Gesangsp., something for which Floros himself can offer no convincing explanation, while he ascribes a “religiöse

---

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Floros, “Diskussionsbeitrag zum Thema Bruckner und Liszt”, in: *BrSympBer 1986: Bruckner, Liszt, Mahler und die Moderne*, Linz-Vienna 1989, pp. 181–188; Stephan, “Bruckner und Liszt: Hat der Komponist Franz Liszt Bruckner beeinflusst?”, *ibid.*, pp. 169–180; see further Ottmar Wessely, “Bruckner und Liszt”, *ibid.*, pp. 67–72.

<sup>48</sup> “Bruckner und die Programmusik: Zum Finale der Achten Symphonie”, in: C.-H. Mahling, ed., *Anton Bruckner: Studien zur Werk und Wirkung: Walter Wiora zum 30. Dezember 1986*, Tutzing 1988, pp. 7–32.

<sup>49</sup> *Brahms—Bruckner*, p. 136.

<sup>50</sup> Wessely further: “Es ist dies ein kurzes, aufsteigendes Motiv mit Stufenfolge große Sekunde–kleine Terz, das sich bei Bruckner seit der e-Moll-Messe von 1886 immer wieder, bis hin zum langsamen Satz der Neunten Symphonie (WAB 109) von 1894 beobachten läßt” (p. 70); cf. Floros, *Brahms und Bruckner*, pp. 167ff.; further discussion *infra*.

<sup>51</sup> *Brahms und Bruckner*, pp. 169ff.

<sup>52</sup> E.g., *Gloria*, mm. 327ff.

<sup>53</sup> *Brahms und Bruckner*, Tafel XXIII, p. 170.

Semantik” to the “Feierlich innig” phrase at letter L?<sup>54</sup> In two further cases cited by Floros the motivic connection is so tenuous that sheer coincidence—given the thousands of measures of music from which these few instances have been culled—is the more likely explanation. Here Stephan’s pragmatism supplies a necessary corrective.<sup>55</sup> More convincing, perhaps, is Floros’ identification of “Auferstehungssignale” and “Gerichtsmotive”<sup>56</sup> and his thesis<sup>57</sup> that Bruckner’s *misere* motive is derived from the *Dona nobis pacem* of Liszt’s *Graner Messe*. Yet here too, Stephan pointed to significant differences and anomalies between Liszt’s and Bruckner’s approaches,<sup>58</sup> noting that the four notes in question appear already at earlier points of the *Graner Messe*, where they perform a leitmotivic function. Bruckner avoids the use of the four notes at the first appearance of the word “miserere” in the D-minor Mass; they first appear at the repeat of the word (*Gloria*, m. 100):

Es darf also nicht ohne weiteres als Hauptmotiv angesprochen werden. Es gehört vielmehr zur selben Motivenklasse wie die anderen diesen Worten applizierten Tonfolgen [...] Dem Motiv selbst kommt also hier, im Gegensatz zu seiner Verwendung in der Messe Liszts, keinerlei herausragende Bedeutung zu. Es ist sogar fraglich, ob die Tonfolge im Zusammenhang von Bruckners d-Moll-Messe überhaupt sinnvoll als selbständiges Motiv bezeichnet werden kann. Bei Liszt hat es, wenn man will, leitmotivische Bedeutung, bei Bruckner jedoch nicht: Bei Liszt erscheint es in mannigfacher Rhythmisierung, also nach den Prinzipien Themenmetamorphose, die für die symphonischen Dichtungen typisch sind, umgestaltet. Die Zitate des Motivs in späteren Symphonien Bruckners besagen—bei der Struktur und bei der Herkunft der Tonkonstellation—so gut wie nichts.

In Stephan’s opinion,<sup>59</sup> the motive in question derived from academic counterpoint, belonging to the same class of motives as the four-note principal motive of the Finale of the “Jupiter” Symphony of Mozart. The “Viertonfolge” is found often in pedagogic texts, for example, Albrechtsberger’s *Anweisung*. Floros’s naming of this “Tonkonstellation” “ein religiöses Motiv” thus explains nothing: it could just as well be called a “Friedensmotiv” in Liszt; as a religious motive it is of no significance whatsoever in the early C-minor quartet and in III/1. The significance of the motive’s appearance in the Adagio of the Ninth could just as

---

<sup>54</sup> P. 222; cf. also p. 210. Floros notes (*ibid.*, p. 207) that Bruckner wrote “zart, schwärmerisch” over this phrase in the sks.—without explaining why Bruckner should have given such an uncharacteristically ‘profane’ marking to what is in his view a religious allusion.

<sup>55</sup> Kirsch (“Die Bruckner Forschung... (II)”, p. 244) was of the opinion that Floros reached his conclusions somewhat too readily: “Und doch kommen dem Leser an vielen Stellen Zweifel, ob es sich der Verfasser mit seinen [...] Schlußfolgerungen nicht mitunter doch etwas zu leicht macht. [...] Vielleicht liegt auch hier in der Mitte die ‘Wahrheit’, die aber sehr viel komplexer sein dürfte, als sie in der bisherigen Literatur insgesamt dargestellt wurde.”

<sup>56</sup> Pp. 43, 50.

<sup>57</sup> Pp. 44, 51.

<sup>58</sup> p. 171.

<sup>59</sup> p. 173.



well be explained, so Stephan suggested (presumably sarcastically), as a reminiscence of his instruction in counterpoint.

Stephan dealt similarly with the notion of a “tonisches Symbol des Kreuzes”: the very place where it could have been of significance, for instance in the *Crucifixus* of the F-minor Mass, Bruckner uses a similar motive, but robbed of its very peculiarity, the ascending third. Thus, “[d]ie von Floros bei Bruckner nachgewiesenen Stellen zeigen, daß Bruckner diese Tonfolge weder als Leitmotiv auffaßte noch sie in besonderen Zusammenhang mit der Vorstellung von Kreuz brachte”.<sup>60</sup> “Musikalisches Denken ist Denken in Tonbeziehungen und Tonkonstellationen”, Stephan concluded, stressing the difference between music merely composed to text and meaningless without it, and music for which the text remains inessential to its comprehension—Liszt exemplified the former, Bruckner the latter.<sup>61</sup>

Some years later, Gernot Gruber re-opened the question of the relationship between Korte’s structural analysis and Floros’ musical hermeneutics.<sup>62</sup> In doing so, he showed the extent to which Korte’s structural and Floros’ contentual analysis could be reconciled, and even considered complementary, within the framework of a hermeneutic model proceeding from the standpoint of our own understanding of this music rather than the composer’s. As Gruber noted, Korte’s model was ultimately an abstraction, excluding such parameters as dynamics and orchestration and therefore, necessarily, their impact on the destiny of the motive. A conceptualisation of Bruckner’s music as an ever-evolving motivic continuum by no means accounts for the numerous points of disassociation, abrupt discontinuities and juxtapositions of dynamic extremes that characterise it—even Korte was ultimately forced to accept the concept of “eine epische Bilddemonstration” and admit a “Doppeldasein von autonomem Konzept und notwendigem bilddeutlichen Bezug” in order to come to terms with this shortcoming.<sup>63</sup> However, Floros himself acknowledged that “Bruckners ‘Programme’ bestehen aus einer Reihe nur lose miteinander verknüpfter Bilder, die nicht unbedingt eine streng logisch fortschreitende ‘Handlung’ konstituieren”,<sup>64</sup> which fundamentally is not so dissimilar from Korte’s conclusion (*supra*), although obviously arrived at from an opposite point of view—in Floros’ case, the inadequacy of Bruckner’s ‘programmes’, in Korte’s the

---

<sup>60</sup> P. 174. Other citations of the Kreuzsymbol suggested by Floros are dismissed by Stephan as more likely being Gregorian derivations (pp. 174–5).

<sup>61</sup> P. 179. In his “Diskussionsbeitrag zum Thema Bruckner und Liszt”, pp. 181f., Floros rejected Stephan’s claim that Bruckner did not know the score of Liszt’s *Graner Messe* in his Linz period, establishing a series of correspondences between it and Bruckner’s orchestral masses. Concerning the use of the “tonisches Symbol des Kreuzes”, however (p. 186), none of Floros’ rebuttals appear particularly convincing.

<sup>62</sup> “Zum Verhältnis von Strukturanalyse, Inhaltsdeutung und musikalischer Rezeption. Exemplifiziert an Bruckners Achter Symphonie”, in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 129–142.

<sup>63</sup> Korte, p. 69.

<sup>64</sup> *Brahms und Bruckner*, p. 232.

inadequacy of formalist precepts. The very attempt to accept Bruckner's statements about the 'Inhalt' of his music at face value leads back, therefore, to the realisation that they can provide no single, unified 'programme' that gives the music extra-musical unity or which the music merely 'serves'. Blume's statement, that Bruckner "darf [...] nicht einseitig in die Alternative: Programmusiker oder absoluter Künstler hineingestellt werden"<sup>65</sup> remains sage advice; more suitable approaches to the specific problems of this music must be sought.<sup>66</sup>

### *Quotation and the Mutationsverfahren*

Setting aside the problem of Bruckner's literary 'programmes', his use of quotations can be said to permit a semantic interpretation of his music, though only a limited one. They achieve this less by encoding precise meanings into the music than by weaving a fabric of allusion and reminiscence, one as much determined by hermeneutics as by musical structure. Quotations or allusions almost never arise as isolated structures in Bruckner's music; their use cannot be understood aside from the Mutationsverfahren and the techniques of Herankomponierung and Aufbereitung which govern their appearances—least of all in the Ninth. The semantic content of most of them is characterised by the ontological nature of the musical gesture itself, typified by such fundamental musical topoi as *anabasis* (as in Bruckner's *non confundar* motive, his "Allelujah" motive, or the Dresden Amen or *Gralsmotiv*), *catabasis* (as in his many configurations of the stepwise descending tetrachord, see *infra*), while the Te Deum motive for instance, by virtue of its 'endless' repetition and use of the 'perfect' intervals of octave and fifth, may be construed as a symbol of eternity (again, discussed *infra*). In addition to this come elements from Baroque *Figurenlehre*, such as Bruckner's ubiquitous dotted rhythms—the *majestas* topos.<sup>67</sup> It is far harder to read a clear and unequivocal 'Aussage' from brief configurations of pitches which are in themselves musically 'neutral', such as even the *miserere* motive or the alleged use of Liszt's "tonisches Symbol des Kreuzes"; the danger of misrepresentation exists here in attaching semantic meaning to what may be merely chance occurrences. This limits the extent to which we can simply 'read off' the occurrences of such allusions as if they formed a structured narrative or even a unified, closed group of ideas.

This becomes apparent from an examination of the extensive quotations, reminiscences or allusions found throughout the Adagio and Finale, as Adolph Nowak observed,<sup>68</sup> and which exceed those of any previous work. A listing for the Adagio alone would comprise:

---

<sup>65</sup> "Bruckner", *MGG*, col. 377.

<sup>66</sup> Gruber cites as appropriate, but by no means exclusively so, Wiora's application of the theological concept of the 'numinous' to the interpretation of Bruckner's music (p. 141); cf. §1.0.3.

<sup>67</sup> See Manfred Wagner, "Der Quint-Oktavschrift als 'Maiestas'-Symbol bei Anton Bruckner", *KmJb* 59 (1972), pp. 97–103, as well as his *BrLWD*, pp. 362ff., "Zur Systematik von Melodiemodellen Bruckners".

<sup>68</sup> "Die Idee von Abschied und Vollendung prägt sich im Adagio und Finaleentwurf aus, wobei Reminiszenzen eine wichtige Rolle spielen" ("Die Wiederkehr in Bruckners Adagio", in: C.-H. Mahling, ed., *Anton Bruckner. Studien zur Werk und Wirkung: Walter Wiora zum 30. Dezember 1986*, Tutzing 1988, p. 168).

- i. an apparent, though not clearly specified, “Allelujah” motive, mm. 5f.;<sup>69</sup>
- ii. the “Dresden Amen” or *Gralsmotiv*, mm. 7f.;
- iii. a disputed quotation of the “tonisches symbol des Kreuzes”, trps., letter A;
- iv. Bruckner’s “Abschied vom Leben”, mm. 29ff.;
- v. the also-disputed “Viertonfolge” (rising fourth–falling third–rising second) at m. 45, the Kopfmotiv of the Adagio Gesangsp. theme, which, in augmentation, later inverts into the *miserere* motive (*infra*);
- vi. the *Kyrie* of the F-minor Mass, mm. 139f.;
- vii. a further incarnation of the ‘Abschied von Leben’ chorale, mm. 155ff.;
- viii. the inversion of the Kopfmotiv of the Gesangsp., mm. 181, which thereby becomes the *miserere* phrase from the D-minor Mass (*Gloria*, mm. 100f.), also quoted in III(90)/1, mm. 227ff.; the phrase recurs here later, following the climax of the movement (*infra*);
- ix. an apparent, possibly significant allusion to the *non confundar* motive,<sup>70</sup> although in the minor, in the ‘rising horn fifth’ progression at m. 197, just prior to the climax of the movement;
- x. the Aufbereitung of the Finale’s tritone progressions (cf. §2.2.2 *supra*), mm. 225f.;
- xi. the conclusion of the coda, from letter X, which actually recalls early sks. for the opening of the movement,<sup>71</sup> appears to allude to the Adagio of the Eighth. More instructive, however, as to Bruckner’s reminiscence technique is a statement recorded by Göllicher: “Die drei Tuben-Akkorde aus dem Finale der siebten Symphonie (vor Buchstabe V [i.e., at mm. 233f.<sup>72</sup>]) am Ende des Adagio erklärte er Göllicher, habe er nie so herrlich gehört als unter Dr. Muck in Berlin. Zur Erinnerung daran habe er sie hier aufgenommen.”<sup>73</sup> Bruckner heard the Seventh for the last time in Berlin in January 1894, according to Göllicher “kurz vor Vollendung des Adagio der Neunten”;<sup>74</sup> the quotation is from m. 151 of VII/4.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. concerning the origins of this phrase, cf. Ex. 21, further discussion in §3.3.7. That the opening rising minor ninth of the Kopfmotiv, which appears to recall the principal motive of Wagner’s *Faust Ouvertüre*, represents any sort of deliberate Wagner ‘quotation’ is unlikely, given the derivation of this motive from quite different motivic origins in the sks.; this is more clearly apparent from the Adagio sks. found among the Cracow sks. than from the sources transcribed by Orel (cf. Orel, *Entwürfe und Skizzen*, p. 52).

<sup>70</sup> Cf. concerning the *non confundar* motive, M. Wagner *BrLWD*, p. 383; Lang, “Das ‘non confundar’ Motiv in Bruckners Werk”, *ZfM* 103, no. 10 (Oct. 1936), pp. 1180–83; and Grandjean, “Anton Bruckners ‘Helgoland’ und das Symphonische”.

<sup>71</sup> Orel, *ibid.*

<sup>72</sup> The rehearsal letters in the Löwe version do not match those of the original score. Letter V corresponds to letter Y of the GA edition.

<sup>73</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 459.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 498.

An equally substantial list could be made of the quotations and allusions in the Finale, which will be discussed in greater detail in the course of analysis of the MSS and the movement's reconstruction. The most obvious include the allusion to the Adagio (E/3, mm. 5ff.; cf. IX/3, mm. 73ff.); what might be referred to as an *Et surrexit* topos (E/35), the combination of timpani tremolo and repeated notes in the cb., found in both D- and F-minor Masses in the extended orchestral *Steigerungen* preceding the setting of those words; the chorale itself (E/41ff.); the Te Deum motive (E/53ff.); a possible reference to the first-movement coda of Beethoven's Ninth (mm. 427ff.; E/82f.); the string figuration of both the "Aeterna fac" of the Te Deum and of VI/4 (E/96ff.); the horn theme (E/98, m. 3ff.; cf. Ex. 9, discussion in §3.1.8, Work phase 3); an allusion to the hymn *Christ ist erstanden* (E/116; cf. Ex. 11, discussion in §3.3.6, Excursus: *Christ ist erstanden*); and finally, in the surviving material for the coda, references to the Eighth Symphony (E/138, I). Almost all of these motives can be traced through varying incarnations; our focus here in showing the extent to which these gestures can and can not be used as semantic tools will be limited to one, albeit one of the most important in Bruckner's semantic repertoire, namely that of *catabasis*.

Bruckner's use of this motive—and again this is significant in the extent to which any such topoi permit of 'precise meaning'—differs somewhat from the implication imparted to it by Walter Kimmel in his useful study "The Phrygian Inflection and the Appearances of Death in Music".<sup>75</sup> The Phrygian inflection is defined by Kimmel as: "a cluster of melodic, harmonic, and structural configurations which [...] produce gestures universally recognised by composers [...] as appropriate and adequate in contexts of death".<sup>76</sup> Kimmel concludes<sup>77</sup> that such configurations possess these associations "ontologically, so to speak, as characteristics inherent in the very nature of the musical system itself". He lists several forms of the Phrygian tetrachord, including a chromatic version;<sup>78</sup> the variants used in the Third Symphony (cf. Ex. 24f, nos. 2–4), according to Kimmel, would fall into the category of augmented forms of the Phrygian tetrachord.

Bruckner's long recognised use of just this phrase—stepwise descent through a perfect fourth, typically using the Phrygian tetrachord—differs from Kimmel's in a way that reveals the problems of attaching explicit meanings to such phrases. There is no question that Bruckner would have been familiar with the use of configurations such as the lamento bass by Baroque composers in contexts of death; his conception of the motive's 'meaning' appears somewhat different, however.

---

<sup>75</sup> *College Music Symposium* 20, no. 2 (1980), pp. 42–76. See also the response of R. J. Hoyt, Letter to the Editor, *College Music Symposium* 22, no. 1 (1982), pp. 196–198.

<sup>76</sup> "The Phrygian Inflection", p. 44.

<sup>77</sup> p. 75

<sup>78</sup> p. 46.

Floros<sup>79</sup> was apparently the first to note what he regarded as the derivation of the *Feierlich innig* phrase occurring at letter L of VIII/4 from the *Asperges me* (WAB 3) of 1845, ascribing to its use in the Eighth a religious implication based on the original underlay of that motet, “Domine hysopo et mundabor” (Psalm 51, verse 9; cf. Ex. 24a). Just as significant, however, would be a connection of the phrase with the “Libera me” (WAB 22) or “Kyrie eleison” (F minor Mass—cf. Ex 24b and d); all these uses of the motive suggest the association of the catabasis with repentance or penitence in using stepwise descent through the Phrygian tetrachord. In the *Agnus Dei* of the D-minor Mass (Ex. 24c) Bruckner hypostrophises this descent, beginning on the third of the key (in G minor) and extending the phrase through a scale of two octaves and a third.<sup>80</sup> That the ‘meaning’ of the phrase in the Eighth is considerably less specific is revealed by the similar use of the catabasis in the major in *Locus iste* (WAB 23, Ex. 24e) where, if anything, the use of the motive can connote no more than a general religious response—humility before the divine presence, as distinct from penitence. Similarly generalised meanings can perhaps be ascribed to less obviously significant occurrences of extended catabasis phrases using mixed tetrachords within the chorale of III/4 (Ex. 24f, nos. 1–3), and perhaps even, in chromaticised form, in the “Perger” Präludium (WAB 129, Ex 24g). The opening alto line of the Phrygian-mode *Vexilla regis* (Ex. 24i) could again be construed as humility before the vision of Christ’s cross. It is perhaps in a more generalised sense of connoting awe or wonder in the presence of the sacred that Bruckner uses the motive in the *Feierlich innig* phrase in the Eighth (Ex. 24h).<sup>81</sup>

It is in the Ninth, however, that both Phrygian- and major-mode forms of the catabasis motive take on a fresh significance. We could identify firstly the notion of repentance/humility coupled with the awareness of impending death, as in its appearance within the first, Phrygian-mode phrase of the *Abschied vom Leben* theme in the Adagio (mm. 29–32, Ex. 24k). It is not necessarily far-fetched to see anticipations of this in the chorale passage of interpolated descending phrases just prior to the coda of IX/1 (mm. 505ff., Ex 24j), with further appearances of the Phrygian descent in more extended form occurring later in the Adagio (mm. 139/140ff., Ex. 24l), which is also a quotation of the *Kyrie* of the F-minor

<sup>79</sup> *Brahms und Bruckner*, pp. 207f.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Bruckner’s use of four stepwise descending quavers in the main motive of the *Agnus Dei* of the F-minor Mass, (f–c)–ab–g–f–e. In the D-minor Mass the entire final movement is dominated by the tetrachord descent—cf. even the final phrase of the chorus, mm. 128ff., in which the leading note in the alto, rather than ascending to the tonic, descends to the dominant: d–c#–b–a.

<sup>81</sup> Note should also be made of two well-profiled catabasis phrases occurring in *Das Deutsche Lied* (cf. C/348f., mm. 55ff. and 63ff.) for which no religious semantic connotation can be readily postulated, illustrating the limitations of proceeding by such means of identifying phrases as a key to an alleged semantic meaning; here, however, the ‘purity’ of the instances cited in Ex. 24 is, as it were ‘corrupted’ by the inclusion of incisive dotted rhythms (connoting grandeur or majesty) and the use of altered intervallic structures. The phrase at m. may also have been borrowed by Bruckner from Kalliwoda’s *Der Deutsche Gesang* (cf. §1.1.2); research has yet to confirm this.

Mass<sup>82</sup>) and which acts as an *Aufbereitung* for the longer descents of the motive at mm. 155ff. (Ex. 24m), which again use mixtures of longer and shorter rhythmic values but within the same instrumental line. Then, at mm. 33ff., in the second, major-mode phrase of the “Abschied vom Leben” theme (*Adagio*, mm. 33ff.; Ex. 24k), the catabasis motive appears as its own major-mode counterpart—the answer to prayer, the ‘descent’ of Divine grace, which in the *Finale* will achieve its final glorious apotheosis as the chorale theme (Ex. 24o). Here grace itself appears to the soul, in the form of the saviour.<sup>83</sup>

None of the above is intended, of course, as a proscriptive attempt at establishing either intentionality on Bruckner’s part nor any sort of ‘ultimate meaning’. What we are left with is perhaps best thought of as a rough approximation in words of precise musical facts. Yet in grappling with these aspects of Bruckner’s compositional style, we are also struggling with the manner in which musical structure and signification play with our own capacity and willingness to impute semantic meaning to them. As this section has shown, harmony is bound up with metrical structure, metrical structure with thematic-motivic process, and thematic-motivic process with Bruckner’s quotation technique. Our own terminological and analytical separations of these parameters and willingness to set up hermeneutic interpretations of what the music ‘means’ in opposition to more comprehensive approaches are due at least in part to the enormous difficulty of tackling these huge, multilayered texts, the complex, imperfect synthesis these works exemplify, and its derivation from multiple, disparate sources. If, as Jackson pointed out, “[t]he scholarly study of Bruckner’s metrical grid analyses” represented “a major imperative for future Bruckner research”<sup>84</sup> back in 1990, then the development of a more comprehensive analytical approach to Bruckner’s music capable of doing equal justice to metrical structure, thematic-motivic process, analysis and hermeneutics, must remain a central challenge for Bruckner scholarship in the twenty-first century.

#### 2.2.4 On Bruckner’s conception of the Ninth.<sup>85</sup>

We have already considered the extent to which Bruckner appears to have conceived the Ninth as a kind of religious counterpart to Beethoven’s more secular but still transcendent Ninth (§1.0.3). While what ultimately unifies Bruckner’s symphonies, their ‘highest-order determinant’ so to speak, arguably remains the convention of their four-movement structure, this is

---

<sup>82</sup> The phrase can be understood in mutational terms as a statement (1st ob.) with imitation in diminution (1st hrn.). Augustinus Franz Kropfreiter noted the quotation in “Das Kyrie der f-Moll-Messe im *Adagio* der Neunten Sinfonie”, *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 439–440. Ernst Kurth also noted (*Bruckner*, p. 734) links between the “Abschied vom Leben” theme and earlier works: *I/2*, m. 19 and woodwind at m. 21; the *Agnus Dei* of the F-minor Mass, last 2 mm. (cf. *Kyrie*).

<sup>83</sup> For Adolph Nowak (p. 170), the chorale, “der auf dem Quartgang des *Kyrie* bzw. des Abschiedsgedankens beruht”, symbolised the merging of “der religiösen Grundform der Bitte mit der des Lobgesangs”. Cf. §2.2.4 *infra*.

<sup>84</sup> “Bruckner’s Metrical Numbers”, p. 123.

<sup>85</sup> An earlier treatment of this issue by the author can be found in his “Neue Erkenntnisse”, pp. 119ff.

closely bound up in the Ninth with an overriding ‘infra-musical’ intention on the part of the composer—according to the instructive report by Kluger quoted in §1.1.9, the idea of a “Huldigung vor der göttlichen Majestät”. Yet even without Bruckner’s dedication or other references we would have clear idea of what this music is about by virtue of the religious semantics with which instrumental music had become associated since it first assumed its ‘mantle of transcendence’.<sup>86</sup> Here, however, such associations take on a greater concreteness than is the case, even, in Beethoven’s Ninth.

As a result of this semantic burden, any analysis of musical process in Bruckner’s final symphony evokes a metaphysical interpretation, although one which many modern commentators have been at pains to avoid. Yet perhaps this is not a liability after all. Bruckner himself would scarcely have made a distinction in composing between musical considerations and those arising from his conception of the work; if so, to separate formalist considerations from hermeneutic ones cannot do justice to the composer’s intentions. The parameters of ‘absolute music’ are inadequate to explain a work determined from the outset by these compositional imperatives. The challenge for meaningful analysis is to attempt to recapture something of the original unity of compositional conception.

As Franz Grasberger implied (§1.1.1), Bruckner probably considered his entire mature output, certainly the ‘canonical’ works cited in his Will, as an integrated whole, underlaid and unified by the net of thematic allusions and links we have described. Comparison of the fully scored sections of the Finale, the first three movements of the Ninth and other choral works of the last period, particularly *Helgoland* and *Das Deutsche Lied*, is instructive as to the extent of recurrent melodic and structural topoi in these late works. Throughout the Ninth these topoi accord with a number of component themes: awe and homage before the majesty of God, retrospective and farewell, closure, heights of religious ecstasy and depths of fear and abasement, the contemplation of death, judgement, purgatory and salvation. We also know that the Ninth was not intended to “go gentle into that good night”,<sup>87</sup> but culminate in a “Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott”—either the conclusion of the Finale itself or its substitution by the Te Deum. In Bruckner’s original conception the Ninth was designed around its Finale in much the same way as the Fifth—both works focus on a massive final movement synthesising sonata form, fugue and chorale.

Floros was right in maintaining that the Adagio was “keine ‘absolute Musik’, sondern eine autobiographisch inspirierte Komposition, die den Todesahnungen eines Menschen, seinem religiösen Glauben und seiner Hoffnung auf Gottes Erbarmen ergreifenden Künstlerischen Ausdruck verleiht”,<sup>88</sup> yet it becomes evident that this statement must be taken much

---

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Kurth’s discussion of the links between transcendence and absolute music, pp. 256ff.

<sup>87</sup> From a poem by Dylan Thomas, quoted in the Epilogue.

<sup>88</sup> “Zur Deutung...”, p. 194.

further when we consider the role of the Finale in the conception of the symphony. The coda of the Adagio traces a gradual dissolution of motivic identity. Rather than being in any respect the end of the work's narrative thread, however, Bruckner manifestly intended this music to lead into the music of the Finale, where he renders motivic and harmonic parameters down to their most quintessential and radical form, immersing the listener, via a continual series of harmonic ambiguities, in an enigmatic musical medium.<sup>89</sup> To paraphrase August Halm, "hier beginnt nicht ein Musikstück"—rather, music itself ends.<sup>90</sup> If, as Bruckner's specification of the tuba theme as an "Abschied von Leben" suggests, the Adagio represents a leave-taking from earthly life,<sup>91</sup> the Finale could be construed as a kind of *purgatorio*, charting the progress of the soul after death, the record of an encounter with the minatory as well as redemptive force of the Divine. This was by and large the interpretation accorded the movement by one of its earliest commentators, Oskar Lang, as we have seen (§1.3.7). While Manfred Wagner stressed the 'compendium character' of the Ninth,<sup>92</sup> Doebel rightly recognised that the work (he was writing only of the first three movements) incorporates, alongside its retrospective aspects many innovatory features, most notably harmonic ones.<sup>93</sup> Probably at no point in his entire output was Bruckner more innovatory than in the Finale. Here, dominated far more by the imperatives of an inner 'programme' than by the notion of writing a dutiful summation of his compositional technique, he explored a musical dimension beyond the normal confines of his symphonic style—doubtless a contributing factor, together with the fragmentation of the sources, for the misunderstanding and incomprehension the movement has encountered.

The idea that the symphony represents a contemplation of last things and hence a confrontation with death is borne out by the highly 'entropic' nature of its tonal structure, another structural aspect of the symphony widely overlooked to date, which bears all the hallmarks of late-Romantic 'centrifugal' tendencies adumbrated by Kurth.<sup>94</sup> The harmonic

---

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Mus. Ex. 25a, vol. II, section B.

<sup>90</sup> "Zum erstmal bei Bruckner empfinden wir ganz die Heiligkeit des Ursprünglichen; etwas wie Schöpfungsglut glauben wir einzuatmen, wenn wir von den ersten Tönen seiner siebten, neunten, vierten Symphonie umschlossen werden. Wir spüren es: hier beginnt nicht ein Musikstück, sondern die Musik selbst hebt an" (*Die Symphonie Anton Bruckners*, Munich 1914, p. 42). Robert Simpson made a suggestion of this kind concerning the Finale in a revision of chapter 10 of his *The Essence of Bruckner*.

<sup>91</sup> The idea that the Adagio represents an "autobiographisch inspirierte Komposition" is discussed by Floros in "Zur Deutung der Symphonik Anton Bruckners...". This concept extends into the Finale; as Adolph Nowak observed: "Die Idee von Abschied und Vollendung prägt sich im Adagio und Finaleentwurf aus, wobei Reminiszenzen eine wichtige Rolle spielen" ("Die Wiederkehr in Bruckners Adagio", in: C.-H. Mahling (ed.), *Anton Bruckner. Studien zur Werk und Wirkung. Walter Wiora zum 30. Dezember 1986*. Tutzing 1988, p. 168).

<sup>92</sup> In *BrLWD*, p. 360, Wagner notes that no new compositional models are introduced in the Ninth; cf. concerning the character of the late works, *ibid.*, pp. 358f.

<sup>93</sup> p. 184.

<sup>94</sup> *Romantische Harmonik und ihre Krise in Wagners Tristan*, Berlin 1923, p. 300. Dahlhaus writes: "Kurths Terminus 'zentrifugal' besagt, daß die Haupttonart weniger ein Ziel sei, den die Nebentonarten zustreben, als ein tragender Grund, vor dem sie sich abheben." "Gibt es ein Geheimnis der Form bei Richard Wagner?" In: C.



character of the Ninth is foreshadowed in a remarkable manner in the opening progression of the first movement, cf. mm. 18–27, which proceeds remorselessly away from the D-minor delineation of the opening passage towards a tonal ‘anti-pole’, first encountered in the astonishing shift via “Kernspaltung”, the  $d-d\flat/e\flat$  progression at m. 19, and the extended  $C\flat$  major at mm. 21f., to descend to the tritone  $A\flat/G\sharp$  at m. 25, the furthest remove from the home tonality. This entire progression, along with the ensuing enharmonic change to an E-major  $\frac{6}{3}$  at m. 27, could be seen as nothing less than a tonal agenda, a generative principle for the entire work. Hans Grunsky noted as early as 1926 that “Die Harmonik des ersten Satzes [...] beruht auf der ungeheuren Spannung zwischen  $d$  und  $Ces$ ”;<sup>95</sup> in fact, this conflict permeates the entire symphony in its constant recourse to extreme keys, notably the use of  $F\sharp$  major and E major as the tonalities of the Trio and Adagio, and progressions juxtaposing D minor with this opposing end of the tonal spectrum.<sup>96</sup> Virtually the only full-blown V–I cadence in D minor in the entire symphony is that at the end of the Exposition statement of the Hauptthema, mm. 74/75. The Scherzo movement throughout avoids obvious functional harmony within D minor; even the intended resumption of D minor (which in performance falls some twenty minutes later) at the entry of the Hauptth. in the Exp. of the Finale is reached via a Phrygian-mode ‘clausula’, rather than a functional harmonic cadence.<sup>97</sup> The dominance of the tritone and the pitch class  $A\flat/G\sharp$  extends to the use of  $g\sharp$  as the altered pitch of the opening chord of the Scherzo. The Gesangsp. of the Adagio is in  $A\flat$  (tonally and thematically the point of farthest remove from the D minor of the opening movements); the climax of the Adagio is built on  $G\sharp$  (as the dominant of  $C\sharp$  minor). The tritone progressions which dominate the Finale are prefigured in the climax of the first movement,  $B^9$ – $F$  minor  $\frac{6}{3}$  (mm. 381ff.); Bruckner introduces them in the coda of Adagio, as we have seen, and appears to have intended to conclude the symphony with a monumental tritone progression as well.<sup>98</sup>

Intentional tonal symbolism can also be seen to have been at work in the tonal design of the work. Oskar Loerke proposed that Bruckner’s use of sharp and flat keys can be read as representative of light and darkness;<sup>99</sup> symbolism of this kind can be encountered in Bruckner’s early *Germanenzug* (WAB 70), where, as Nowak noted, “[r]omantisch wirkt allein

---

Dahlhaus (ed.), *Das musikalische Kunstwerk (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 23)*. Regensburg 1970, p. 182.

<sup>95</sup> “Der erste Satz von Bruckners Neunter: Ein Bild höchster Formvollendung”, p. 29. Kurth (p. 702) similarly regarded “Klangrückung in kleine Terzen” as characteristic of IX/1.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. for instance, of many progressions throughout the symphony mm. 105–108 of the first movement, where  $F\sharp$  major alternates with D minor  $\frac{6}{3}$ . Significant also is the virtually total absence of D minor from the Adagio, as well as the persistence of E as a tonal centre within the Finale.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. the Autograph-Partitur of the Finale, vol. II, E/10f.

<sup>98</sup> E/141; cf. discussion in §3.1.8 as well as chapters 3.2 and 3.3 concerning its interpretation and realisation in the performing scores.

<sup>99</sup> *Anton Bruckner: Ein Charakterbild*, Berlin 1938, repr. 1976, p. 104.

[...] der Tonarten-Wechsel im Mittelstück: ‘In Odins Hallen wird es Licht’”.<sup>100</sup> Here, F# minor and B major are juxtaposed with the principal tonality of D minor; the same situation recurs in the Ninth. Kurth referred to “das Aufglühen plötzlicher Kreuztonartswendung (meist Fis- oder Cis-Dur)” or equally extreme flat tonalities at allusions to Christ or redemption.<sup>101</sup> Jackson proposed that Bruckner used enharmonic symbolism to connote both sin and redemption in Bruckner’s 1884 setting of *Christus factus est*;<sup>102</sup> Nowak noted Bruckner’s frequent composition of the name of Christ in sharp keys;<sup>103</sup> Klaus von Trapp even regarded the chorale in the Finale of the Fifth Symphony as a “Christus-Erscheinung” (in contrast, its movement’s fugal theme symbolised ‘menschliches Ringen’);<sup>104</sup> identical symbolism could be postulated for the Finale of the Ninth, where the chorale enters in the ‘light key’ of E major as a virtual “Christus-Erscheinung”.

Moreover, Bruckner broke dramatically in the Finale, as we will see, with many aspects of his standard formal schemata, deriving introduction, Hauptth. and Gesangsp. from the same material: an obsessively persistent double-dotted rhythm, associated in both Hauptth. and Gesangsp. with chains of falling sixths.<sup>105</sup> The rhythm reflects a double meaning: both Divine *majestas* as well, perhaps, as retribution, rapid alternations of dotted rhythms being used in the Baroque as onomatopoeic of chastisement,<sup>106</sup> again perhaps figurative of purgatory. The movement’s harmonic character is established by the falling tritone progression of bass-less first-inversion triads (Ex. 25a). The Hauptth. (25b), more elemental than even that of the first movement, is not a theme at all, properly speaking, but a *Gestalt*, constructed of three layers of sequences: rising minor thirds outlining a series of falling thirds, which in turn outline a series of falling sixths. Motivic differentiation is avoided in favour of something more primal and elemental: an invocation of centrifugal, spiral motion, suggesting to the modern mind the way in which matter at the subatomic level resolves into pure, rotational energy.<sup>107</sup> The

---

<sup>100</sup> “Anton Bruckner, der Romantiker”, *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 156.

<sup>101</sup> p. 179.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. §2.1.2, “The Enharmonics of Faith”, *passim*; see also his “Bruckner’s Metrical Numbers”, p. 121, concerning the use of similar symbolism in the motet *Vexilla regis*.

<sup>103</sup> “Der Name ‘Jesus Christus’ in den Kompositionen von Anton Bruckner”, *Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 77–87, particularly p. 82.

<sup>104</sup> *Die Fuge in der Deutschen Romantik von Schubert bis Reger*, Diss., Frankfurt am Main 1958, photocopy, unpubl., p. 134.

<sup>105</sup> See concerning the form of the Finale the overview of the Performing Version given in Table XVI.

<sup>106</sup> See for instance the recitatives “Erbarm es Gott” (following Christ’s flagellation) from Bach’s *Matthäuspassion*, or Handel’s “All they that see him laugh him to scorn” from *The Messiah*, to name two well-known instances with which Bruckner would have been familiar. See concerning Bruckner’s debt to Baroque *Figurenlehre*, Othmar Wessely, “Vergangenheit und Zukunft in Bruckners Messe in d-Moll”, *passim*.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Werner Notter, as quoted in §1.3.11: “Es verwickelt sich zu einem Knäuel, einer motivischen Einheit, die harmonischen Zündstoff für eine eigene zusätzliche Form besitzt... Tatsächlich erinnert das Thema mit seiner gezackten rhythmischen Lineatur und seinem aufgespeicherten harmonischen Konfliktpotential eher an ein Fugen- denn an ein Sonatenthema” (*Schematismus und Evolution in der Sinfonik Anton Bruckners*, p. 50).

“musica humana” (Gülke<sup>108</sup>) of the Gesangsp. (25c–e) is derived from the same material, as if unable to banish its burning image, initially eschewing the lyrical depth and contrapuntal richness characteristic of the Brucknerian Gesangsp. for an expression of spiritual abasement, the obverse of the wrathful *energicum* and *majestas* of the Hauptth. Only then does Bruckner introduce a ‘theme’ in the customary sense of the word: the grandiose chorale (Ex. 25g), which is intentionally polarised against the foregoing material—etched, as it were, in fully scored brass against a motoric violin figuration which breaks free of the remorseless dominance of the dotted rhythm. The ensuing entry of the Te Deum motive (Ex. 25i) establishes an element of relative tonal stability for the first time, its characteristic fourths and fifths contrasting with Bruckner’s other motivic resources.

How did Bruckner intend to complete the movement, given this material? One could readily imagine that the chorale and Te Deum elements should finally triumph over the tonal instability of the principal material, leading it to harmonic and tonal equilibrium, as indeed the combination of the two elements in the recapitulation of the chorale (Ex. 25t). But beyond this we have the tantalising reference to an ‘Allelujah des zweiten Satzes,’ in which the Finale, and with it Bruckner’s output, was to culminate, doubtless in a glorious paean of D major. We have already noted (§1.4.14) that Samale and Mazzuca in 1986 saw the symphony in its entirety, perhaps for the first time, as a résumé of life, dedicated to ‘the good Lord’, although its true theme is the problem of man’s relationship to God and to death:

That theme is expressed in the weary resignation, but also in the rebellion and despair of the first movement; in the demonic nightmare of the Scherzo, in the labyrinth of the Adagio where the spirit finally appears lost on the threshold of Nothingness, in the Finale, where incorporeal forms at times materialise in harsh declamations and the spirit is calmed by the radiant appearance of the ‘Abschied vom Leben’, and in the Te Deum, the symbol of final redemption.<sup>109</sup>

These words were written at a stage when nothing was known about Bruckner’s intentions to conclude the work with an “Allelujah”, in fact, these tonal symbols, essentially monumentalised topoi, were to raise the movement to the plane of a “Lob- und Preislied”. By reducing the motivic stock of his thematic material to its barest minimum, Bruckner left the wider musical dimension open; the expressive power of these ‘sonic inscriptions’ looms all the larger against the infinitely mutative, motivically almost ‘neutral’ background of the falling sixths and dotted rhythm which gives the movement its drive and unity, demonstrating Bruckner’s equal concern with achieving the compositional coherence required of a Finale as well as the imperative of making the music ‘speak’. Cohrs considered:

---

<sup>108</sup> *Brahms—Bruckner...*, p. 120.

<sup>109</sup> *Introduction to the Finale of Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony*, translation by Katherine Silberblatt Wolfthal, Milan 1986, p. 2.

Auf die Spitze getrieben wird die Problematik der Defragmentierung ohne Zweifel in der Neunten Symphonie, wo Bruckner es wagt, das Sterben des musikalischen Materials als Metapher seines eigenen Sterbens zum Subjekt der Musik selbst zu machen. Nur so läßt sich auch die eigentümliche thematische Anlage des unvollendeten Finales mit seiner besessenen Wiederholung des punktierten Hauptthemas und dessen karger Umbildung in der Gesangsperiode—also die völlige Aufhebung jedes thematischen Dualismus—überhaupt erklären und rechtfertigen.<sup>110</sup>

In the Finale of his Ninth, Beethoven renounced or transformed elements of the classical finale in the setting of Schiller's ode—an 'implicitly musical' text. Bruckner's 'text' was likewise an 'inframusical' concept that went to the heart of what music is capable of expressing. For Bruckner, who is said to have spoken of God only in whispers,<sup>111</sup> this programme was 'beyond words', its nearest approximation the "Te Deum laudamus" of the Finale's substitute; its musical embodiment in the Finale was every bit as radical and daring as that of Beethoven.

Bruckner's explanation of his dedication of the Ninth<sup>112</sup> "an den lieben Gott" must therefore be taken at face value. After the dedication of the foregoing symphonies to progressively greater worldly authorities—the Seventh and Eighth to Ludwig of Bavaria and Franz Joseph of Austria respectively<sup>113</sup>—the Ninth, the masterwork, was to be reserved for an ultimate dedicatee for whom it alone was to be worthy. Its composition was to be his finest work: the extent of the sketches testifies to the enormous care and reflection Bruckner lavished upon its composition. The Ninth was proceeded by the consistent formal schemes of ten works of the same genre, probably more closely integrated than any other comparable body of symphonic music.<sup>114</sup> This 'structure', as it could perhaps be regarded, was to culminate in the Finale, the keystone of a symphonic monument. That Bruckner's intentions have been overlooked to such an extent, that so many important links, both musical and semantic, between the first three movements and the Finale have not been more widely considered, reveals how imperative it is that we reinstate this movement in the conceptual framework of musicologists, musicians and audiences.

---

<sup>110</sup> "Marginalien zu Bruckners Finale", article intended for publication in a forthcoming issue of *Musik-Konzepte* on the Finale of the Ninth Symphony (2003).

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Göll.-A. I, p. 239; IV/3, p. 21. Also Friedrich Eckstein, *Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*, Vienna, 1924, p. 23. Noted by Wiora, "Über den religiösen Gehalt...", p. 175.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. E/142.

<sup>113</sup> Cohrs pointed out recently that the musical material of each of the last three symphonies is linked to the dedicatee of each work: the Seventh, dedicated to Ludwig II, represents a homage to Wagner, the Eighth, dedicated to Franz-Joseph, focuses on nationalist themes, the "Deutscher Michel" and "Drei-Kaiser-Treffen", the Ninth, dedicated to the dear Lord, on 'last things'.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Pfitzner's sardonic remark, that Bruckner wrote the same symphony nine times over, cited by Leopold Nowak, the notorious *bon mot* reads: "Bruckner habe nicht neun Symphonien, sondern nur eine komponiert—weil sie sich alle gleichen" ("Anton Bruckner der Romantiker", *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 157)—Pfitzner was, of course, known for his scurrilous attacks on musicians of his time. Cf. in contrast Blume remarks (*MGG*, col. 368): "Bruckners Symphonien hingegen wirken wie neun von Stufe zu Stufe immer weiter ausgreifende, kraftvollere, überzeugendere, immer eindringlicher und packender werdende Lösungen eines einmal gestellten Problems."



## PART THREE

### THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE FINALE



## 3.0

### Prolegomena

Man soll den Handschriften immer das Menschliche zu entreißen verstehen, sie dürfen nicht stumm sein, sondern müssen dem Beschauer gleichsam zu redenden Zeugen der Vergangenheit werden.

— Leopold Nowak<sup>1</sup>

#### 3.0.1 Introduction to Part Three.

**I**N 1956, Antonín Sychra<sup>2</sup> noted that:

Skizzen, Entwürfe und verschiedene Fassungen ganzer Kompositionen oder ihrer Teile sind ohne Zweifel das wichtigste Material für die Erkenntnis des musikalischen Schaffensprozesses. Sie sind praktisch die einzigen Quellen, die uns einen direkten und unmittelbaren Einblick in die Werkstatt des Künstlers ermöglichen. Denn selbst das, was der Künstler über seine Arbeit sagt oder schreibt, kann man nicht immer ohne Reserve hinnehmen. Und doch widmet man—trotz aller verdienstvollen und fleißigen heuristischen Tätigkeit auf dem Gebiet des Studiums von Skizzen, Entwürfen und Fassungen—diesen Materialien nicht im entferntesten jene Aufmerksamkeit, die sie verdienen. Es ist bezeichnend, daß wir zwar zahlreiche mustergültige Ausgaben von Briefen, Erinnerungen und Tagebüchern haben, aber fast keine Skizzeneditionen, und die nur höchst selten und ganz unsystematisch, da sie meist nur zu gewissen Jubiläen, also nicht zu reinen Forschungszwecken, herausgegeben werden.

If today Sychra's objections still contain an element of truth—despite the accumulation since then of a far larger corpus of philological studies dealing with the sketches of composers<sup>3</sup>—the reasons can probably be sought, at least in part, in the difficulty of applying quasi-scientific terminology to the creative process, the interpretative and mechanical difficulties involved in the transcription of sketches, and the question of relevance that such studies raise in the light of modernist musicology's claim on the work as a *res facta*. Equally, a certain forced quality often applies to attempts to assimilate the 'Einblick in die Werkstatt' into a broader historical perspective. Like performers and audiences, musicologists since the last century—and our study of the reception of the Ninth has borne this out—have methodologically tended to take for granted the existence of a single finished, 'perfected'

---

<sup>1</sup> "Bruckners Werke in der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek", *ÖMz* 1 (1949), p. 271.

<sup>2</sup> "Die Bedeutung des Skizzenstudiums für die wissenschaftliche Analyse musikalischer Werke", *Kongreßbericht über den Internationalen Musikwissenschaftlichen Kongreß Wien, Mozartjahr 1956*, ed. Erich Schenk, Graz-Cologne 1958, p. 616.

<sup>3</sup> See for instance Tyson's Beethoven studies, Alan Tyson, ed., *Beethoven Studies*, New York 1973; *idem.*, ed., *Beethoven Studies 2*, London-Oxford 1977; *idem.*, ed., *Beethoven Studies 3*, Cambridge-London 1982.



score of a work, unsullied by the myriad variables created by issues of compositional genesis, multiple versions, external influences and editorial intervention—all problems germane to Bruckner scholarship.

All the more significant in this respect were the intentions of the Bruckner GA from its inception to publish the extant sketches for a specific work along with a critical report on the autograph score, innovations in editorial methodology which would later become standard for critical editions and yet which also, as one can see from the emergence of the GA in the 1920s (§1.3.5), represented important weapons against the wholesale disqualification of Bruckner's autographs by his first editors.<sup>4</sup> As Leopold Nowak wrote:<sup>5</sup>

Zum erstmalig beschränkte sich eine Ausgabe nicht nur auf die fertige Partitur, sondern bezog alle zu einem Werk erreichbaren früheren Fassungen und Skizzen ein. Das entsprang nicht einer Willkür, sondern war gerade bei Bruckner eine Notwendigkeit, weil sein Schaffensprozeß und die uns dadurch erhalten gebliebenen Handschriften solches nicht nur erlauben, sondern gebieterisch erfordern; auch Bruckners Schreibgewohnheiten verlangten eine eigene Methode kritischer Berichte, die in vorbildlicher Weise in die Tat umgesetzt wurde. [...] Die Ausgabe muß ihren vornehmsten Zweck darin sehen, die Handschriften Bruckners genau nach den Vorlagen wiederzugeben. Sie muß weiterhin trachten, jene Gestalt des Notentextes vorzulegen, die als die vermutlich letzte anzusehen ist, von der man daher sagen kann, daß sie von Bruckner nicht mehr verändert wurde.

We have already noted that Bruckner's final revision phase can be interpreted, as proposed by Grasberger (§1.1.1), as an attempt to bring Bruckner's entire 'canonical' output onto the same stylistic level as the last symphonies; conceivably, Bruckner's widespread destruction of sk. and other material in mid-1895 was an attempt to eliminate the traces not only of his own personal development as a composer, but also the compositional origins and emergence of his individual works—with the notable exception, it seems, of the preliminary materials for the Eighth and first three movements of the Ninth. If so, the ensuing remarks by von Dadelsen may also apply to Bruckner:

Nur am Rande sei bemerkt, daß uns in vielen Fällen die Tatsache einer abweichenden Fassung überhaupt verborgen bleibt; sei es, daß die Überlieferung lückenhaft ist, sei es auch, daß die Komponisten selbst aus handwerksmeisterlicher Haltung oder—in neuer Zeit—aus verständlicher Scheu vor dem Philologen-Eifer das Werkstattgeheimnis gehütet und die Vorstufen ihrer Werke vernichtet haben. Dies letzte ist der Grund, weshalb uns z. B. von den brieflich bezeugten Frühfassungen der Werke Johannes Brahms' so wenig erhalten ist.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Nowak, "Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe", *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 11; see also "Die Symphonien Anton Bruckners in der Gesamtausgabe", p. 142.

<sup>5</sup> "Bruckners Werk in dieser Zeit", *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup> "Die 'Fassung letzter Hand' in der Musik", p. 3.

As we have seen in ch. 1.2, by far the most substantial extant sources for any work of Bruckner's are those for the Eighth and Ninth; the extant materials of most of the foregoing works are almost negligible in comparison. What probably are largely complete sks. and drafts survive for at least four other late works—*Träumen und Wachen*, *Vexilla regis*, *Helgoland* and *Das Deutsche Lied*,<sup>7</sup> where we probably possess virtually all the significant pc. material. In the case of Psalm 150, on the other hand, not a single sk. or discarded score bifol. survives. It is probably worth pointing out that, although the materials for the Eighth appear equally extensive as those for the Ninth, they are ultimately less instructive as regards Bruckner's compositional technique, as the apparently greater number of ÖNB signatures for that work include numerous ASS and fragments involved with the reworking of the score in 1889–90.<sup>8</sup> Despite the catastrophic losses from the Finale, the sources for the Ninth appear to be the most completely preserved compositional sources of any Bruckner symphony, accordingly a valuable fund of information for its genesis.<sup>9</sup> Perhaps Bruckner, in apparently preserving the sources for this symphony while destroying so much material for earlier works, even intended this to be the case.

In the ensuing chapters, which detail the problems and possibilities presented by the extant sources, the correlation of the Finale fragments, and their compositional and textural supplementation, the attempt will be made to demonstrate the extent to which, given thorough familiarity with the material and with Bruckner's compositional technique, and an approach that may perhaps best be termed 'forensic musicology', a hypothetical reconstruction of the lost sections of the score is possible—a reconstruction which justifies both a sonic documentation of the surviving fragments as well as an attempt to flesh out their texture and instrumentation into a continuous, if in part speculative performing score. In view of the nature and extent of the surviving material this procedure may be looked upon as a justifiable intervention in the historical disaster represented by the posthumous dismemberment of what we will show to have been the Finale's emergent autograph score.

The multiple approach taken here—the preparation of separate reconstruction, documentation and performing versions—reflects what could be regarded as the three levels of philological and musical problems encountered in approaching this movement:

---

<sup>7</sup> See discussion of these sources in §3.1.3.

<sup>8</sup> Claudia C. Röthig (*Studien zur Systematik des Schaffens von Anton Bruckner*, = *Gottinger Musikwissenschaftliche Arbeit* 9, Kassel 1978, pp. 226f.) cites 18 separate 'Skizzenhefte' (i.e., signatures) for the Eighth Symphony, and 17 for the Ninth; she does not, however, include sources outside the ÖNB, nor count the extant fols. within these signatures themselves. *Pace* Röthig, the autograph sources for the Ninth are more numerous than those for the Eighth. While the latter are largely confined to the ÖNB, the present writer has recorded at least 23 signatures for the Ninth in the ÖNB which by Röthig's definition qualify as 'sketches', along with numerous further signatures held outside that library.

<sup>9</sup> *Pace* Röthig, who writes: "Die IX. Symphonie ist insofern unvollendet, als sie mit dem 3. Satz schließt. Nur ein großer Skizzenkomplex zum Finale ist erhalten, Daher gilt primär die VIII. Symphonie mit ihrer relativ günstigen Quellenlage als gültiges Fundament, Bruckners Schaffensweise zu erkennen und zu bestimmen" (p. 227).

- i. How far did Bruckner, assessed on the basis of the currently extant, incomplete sources, advance with the composition of the Finale?
- ii. Given that changes in musical opinion are brought about less by documentary publications, no matter how extensive or conclusive, than by confrontation with music in its arguably 'real' sonic form, how can what was obviously a well-advanced, emergent score, given its subsequent losses, most appropriately be presented in performance?; and
- iii. How can we best achieve not only a visual and analytical but also an aural impression of the intended Finale, and of until now rarely considered notion of a Ninth Symphony in four movements?

Reflecting these three problems, essentially the central issues of this study, careful separation has been observed between the Autograph-Partitur, Dokumentation and Aufführungsfassung—in other words, between a philologically based, thoroughly corroborated 'reconstruction', firstly on paper and secondly in sound, and thirdly the attempt to re-establish, if necessary more speculatively, what Bruckner apparently left—a continuous, partly orchestrated score—and to complete the necessary compositional parameters—instrumentation, dynamics etc.—that would allow its effective performance. Chapter 3.1 accordingly re-examines the surviving sources for the Finale, dealing with the Orel edition and Nowak's corrections, Bruckner's working methods, his handwriting, the paper types, rastrology and rulings used in the sources, the compositional evolution of the movement, and the reconstruction of Bruckner's Autograph-Partitur (reproduced in vol. II, section E, AP). Chapters 3.2 and 3.3 present critical reports on the Dokumentation des Fragments (vol. II, section F, DdF) and the Aufführungsfassung (vol. II, section G, AF) respectively, and have been structured in parallel so as to deal with complementary aspects of the reconstruction and completion procedure. The concluding chapter, 3.4, recounts the evolution and reception of the AF, AP and other publications since 1990.

Because of the comprehensive nature of this dissertation and for reasons of space, Part Three neither exhaustively transcribes and analyses every note of the original sources, nor provides an exhaustive commentary on the Aufführungsfassung. Of relevance for the ensuing discussion are Tables VI–XVI (A/23ff.), listing the extant MSS for the Ninth Symphony (VI), the Finale MSS as ordered by signature (VII), a concordance of the MSS with the Orel edition (VIII), the paper types (IX) and rulings (X) to be found in them, a diagrammatic representation of the genesis of the Finale (XI), the sources used in the Autograph-Partitur (XII), its written-out repetition signs (XIII), the sources used in the Dokumentation (XIV), and finally the sources used in the Aufführungsfassung (XV) and a formal overview thereof (XVI).

### 3.0.2 Literature.

In line with the observations of both Kirsch (quoted at the outset of Part One, §0.1.1) and Sychra (above), it is surprising to see how rarely any significant studies of Bruckner's

compositional technique have been undertaken until recently, symptomatic of deeply engrained problems in Bruckner research and reception, as Manfred Wagner recognised.<sup>10</sup> Nowak, though of all post-war musicologists surely in an optimal position to analyse Bruckner's working methods, contributed few articles of any size dealing with compositional process, rather than the specific exigencies of particular documents;<sup>11</sup> his successor Franz Grasberger likewise made only brief remarks on the topic.<sup>12</sup> The important contribution of Korte's *Brahms und Bruckner* to an understanding of Bruckner's compositional principles, has already been discussed. While not backing up his insights into Bruckner's compositional process from a study of any specific autograph MSS, the analytical perspectives opened up by Korte's discussions are of profound significance for the understanding of his compositional technique. Yet proceeding solely from study of the printed scores, even Korte completely overlooked the significance of the metrical numbers.

After Haas and Orel, one of the first to attempt any contribution to the study of Bruckner's MSS was German musicologist Wolfgang Boetticher, who in four articles<sup>13</sup> dealt with broad issues of Bruckner's late style, unfortunately without undertaking the sort of detailed research that might have provided his statements with an appropriate documentary weight. As Winfried Kirsch<sup>14</sup> observes:

Die Ausführungen Boettichers haben den Charakter von überwiegend positivistisch eingebrachten quellenkundlichen Marginalien, deren Nutzbarmachung in einer wirklich stringent systematisch durchgeführten, klaren Interpretation der Brucknerschen Schaffens-technik noch aussteht. Mit einem kurzen Überblick in das anscheinend noch unübersichtliche Skizzen-Arsenal und seiner Probleme ist es dabei nicht getan; und daraus bereits Schlußfolgerungen genereller Art zu ziehen, erscheint dem Leser solcher Texte doch etwas suspekt.

In 1977 Claudia Catharina Röthig, a student of Boetticher, presented her doctoral thesis on the sources for the Eighth Symphony, *Studien zur Systematik des Schaffens von Anton*

<sup>10</sup> Cf. the quotation in §2.0.2: "Denn bis heute unterblieben Detailuntersuchungen Brucknerscher Werkspezifika entweder gänzlich oder wurden in einer Sprache verschlüsselt, die mystisch-philosophisch dem zu erklärenden Phänomen beizukommen trachtete" (Manfred Wagner, "Zur Interpunktion in der Musik Anton Bruckners", *BrJb* 1981, p. 53).

<sup>11</sup> See among them *Ges. Aufs.*, "Die neue Gesamtausgabe der Werke Anton Bruckners", pp. 9–12, "'Urfassung' und 'Endfassung' bei Anton Bruckner", pp. 34–37, "Probleme bei der Veröffentlichung von Skizzen", pp. 54–60, "Die Arbeit an der 1. Fassung der III. Symphonie", pp. 195–197, "Die Notenschrift Anton Bruckners im 1. Satz seiner f-Moll Symphonie", pp. 227–229, "Die Motette 'Os justi' und ihre Handschriften", pp. 246–249, Die Kantate 'Vergißmeinnicht' von Anton Bruckner", pp. 249–253.

<sup>12</sup> Franz Grasberger, "Anton Bruckners Arbeitsweise", in: *Bruckner-Studien: Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz Grasberger, Vienna 1964, pp. 33–37.

<sup>13</sup> "Zur Kompositionstechnik des späten Bruckner", in: *Bruckner-Studien*, pp. 11–19; "Über einige Probleme der Kompositionstechnik in den Sinfonien Anton Bruckners", *BrJb* 1980, pp. 15–20; "Zum 'romantischen' Schaffensprozeß Anton Bruckners", in: *BrSympBer 1980*, pp. 85–90; and "Zum Problem eines 'Urtextes' bei Robert Schumann und Anton Bruckner", *Mf* 36 (1983), pp. 404–407.

<sup>14</sup> "Die Bruckner-Forschung... (III)", p. 210.

*Bruckner auf der Grundlage zeitgenössischer Berichte und autographischer Entwürfe*,<sup>15</sup> calling on much (unfortunately not all) of the extant sk. material for the Eighth as well as the documentation of Bruckner's reception history, but without giving much space to an analysis of the cultural and philosophical biases inherent in that history (as noted by Manfred Wagner<sup>16</sup>), nor attempting any sort of overview of the compositional history of the Eighth—an important task still outstanding. While much of Röthig's methodology in examining the MS sources is commendable, her analysis of them leaves important fundamental questions, such as the provenance of the materials, and the relation of what she calls "Partiturskizzen" to the autograph scores, unanswered; these sources, like those for the Ninth, still await a more comprehensive assessment. As noted by Kirsch: "Es ist verständlich, daß bei dieser, im Ansatz erfolgversprechenden, im Ganzen aber zu breitflächig gehandhabten Methode hinter den Schaffensprozeß eines Komponisten zu kommen, manches Ergebnis im philologischen Dickicht untergeht."<sup>17</sup>

Röthig was also, unfortunately, unable to include the sources for the Eighth which had again become available in Cracow around the same time. A decade later, the first major work to deal with the sources of the Ninth since Orel, likewise augmented by rediscovered materials from Löwe's estate, was a similar, more thorough, but also more positivist dissertation by Mariana E. Sonntag, *The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner: A study of the sketches and drafts for the first movement of the IX. symphony*.<sup>18</sup> In both Röthig's and Sonntag's studies, as evidenced to a lesser extent in Orel, the absence of analytical concepts appropriate to Bruckner's compositional procedure can be observed.<sup>19</sup> Both Röthig and Sonntag establish an elaborate terminology for Bruckner's various 'types' of sks., which often obscures rather than explicates the dynamic processes underlying their notation.<sup>20</sup> As we have seen, Sonntag encumbers her explanation of the genesis of IX/1 with the notion that the Repr. begins at m. 421 with the second subject, the Repr. of the first group, supposedly, constituting the coda.<sup>21</sup> The significance of the metrical numbers was overlooked, as we have noted. Moreover—although, as we have seen, the concepts involved were expounded by Korte in 1963—neither

<sup>15</sup> Diss., Göttingen 1977, publ. as *Göttinger Musikwissenschaftliche Arbeiten* 9, Kassel 1978.

<sup>16</sup> In Wagner's review of Röthig's dissertation, *Mf* 34 (1981), pp. 110–112.

<sup>17</sup> Kirsch, p. 211.

<sup>18</sup> University of Chicago, 1987, unpubl.; abstract in: *Dissertation Abstracts* 48, no. 7 (Jan. 1988), pp. 1580A–1581A. Mariana Sonntag's article "A New Perspective on Anton Bruckner's Composition of the Ninth Symphony", *BrJb* 1989/90, pp. 77–114, provides a summary of her dissertation.

<sup>19</sup> Sonntag's thesis bears evidence of several oversights, among them the omission of a folio in her foliation of the Cracow materials (as already noted, see §1.2.4), inaccurate transcriptions of Bruckner's MS dates (*The Compositional Process*, pp. 408ff.; cf. Table II, A/6, fn. 3), and incorrect paper measurements (*ibid.*, p. 22; cf. Table I, A/5, fn. 47). Conceivably Sonntag inadvertently based her measurements on reduced-size A4 copies).

<sup>20</sup> See §3.1.3 *infra*. As Nowak pointed out (*Ges. Aufs.* p. 19), the complexity of the situation is not aided by terminological confusion.

<sup>21</sup> *The Compositional Process...*, pp. 298ff., mentioned in §2.1.4.

Röthig's nor Sonntag's attempts to penetrate Bruckner's compositional methods made reference to the Mutationsverfahren, which provides such a useful tool for the analysis of the thematic-motivic process. Nor did Röthig, for instance, recognise the interrelationship between the creative and theoretical-speculative facets of Bruckner's compositional technique. Convinced of an alleged "größte Distanz zwischen Theorie und eigenen Komposition", she overlooked the significance of contrapuntal studies for the Eighth as compositionally unrelated "Lehrmittel".<sup>22</sup>

At the same time as Röthig was working on her thesis on the first movement of the Ninth, Samale and Mazzuca were re-assessing the MSS of the Finale for the first time since the 1930s. Their critical commentary on their *Ricostruzione* of the Finale, *Introduction to the Finale of Anton Bruckner's Ninth Symphony*,<sup>23</sup> while unknown to most Bruckner scholars,<sup>24</sup> remains an outstanding piece of philological detective work and an intelligent synthesis of analytical insight and compositional 'Feingefühl'. Also in 1987, Thomas Röder's dissertation on the sources for the Third Symphony, *Auf dem Weg zur Bruckner-Symphonie: Untersuchungen zu den beiden ersten Fassungen von Anton Bruckners Dritter Symphonie*,<sup>25</sup> was published.<sup>26</sup> The scope of Röder's thesis represented a laudable attempt to proceed in the direction of a comprehensive 'holistic' view that seeks to approach a major Bruckner work by correlating its sources, compositional genesis, transmission and reception history<sup>27</sup>—particularly perceptive, as we have seen (§2.1.4), in its recognition of the nature of Bruckner's metrical numbers. Röder's Kritischer Bericht on the Third Symphony appeared in the Bruckner GA in 1997. Other attempts to come to terms with the complex interplay of genesis, transmission and reception that makes the study of Bruckner's music so challenging can be found in studies appearing from the early 1980s onward, among them those of Hawkshaw,<sup>28</sup> Jackson,<sup>29</sup> Backes,<sup>30</sup> Grandjean,<sup>31</sup> Korstvedt,<sup>32</sup> while most recently the publication of

<sup>22</sup> *Studien zur Systematik*, pp. 339 and 346.

<sup>23</sup> English translation by Katherine Silberblatt Wolfthal, Milan 1987.

<sup>24</sup> With the exception, as noted (§§1.3.11 and 1.4.14) of Wolfram Steinbeck.

<sup>25</sup> University of Erlangen, 1984.

<sup>26</sup> As *AfMw* Beiheft 26 (Stuttgart 1987); subsequent publication Vienna 1994. See further "Das 'verstümmelte' Finale: Zum vierten Satz von Anton Bruckners Dritter Symphonie", *IBG-Mitt* no. 37 (Dec. 1991), pp. 11–20.

<sup>27</sup> The scope of Röder's publication was commented on disparagingly by Sonntag in her review in *JMusRes* 9 (1989), pp. 189–196 and subsequently in *Das Orchester*, May 1995, p. 57.

<sup>28</sup> See for instance his "The Date of Bruckner's 'Nullified' Symphony in D minor", *19th-Century Music* 6 (1983), pp. 252–263; "Weiteres über die Arbeitsweise Bruckners während seiner Linzer Jahre: Der Inhalt von Kremsmünster C 56.2", in: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*, Linz–Vienna 1995, pp. 143–152; "Das Kitzler Studienbuch: Ein unschätzbare Dokument zu Bruckners Arbeitsweise", in: *BrSympBer 1995: Zum Schaffensprozeß in den Künsten*, Linz, 1997, pp. 95–109; and "A Composer Learns His Craft: Anton Bruckner's Lessons in Form and Orchestration, 1861–63", *MQ* 82 (1998), pp. 336–361.

<sup>29</sup> "Bruckner's Metrical Numbers", *19th-Century Music* 14, no. 2 (Fall 1990), pp. 101–131.

<sup>30</sup> *Die Instrumentation und ihre Entwicklung in Anton Bruckners Symphonien*, Mainz 1993.

Doebel's comprehensive thesis on the first editions and their overthrow in the 1930s (Tutzing 2001) remains significant as a refreshingly open-ended positivistic approach to issues problematised by the polarisation of text-critical approaches with those arising from a renewed awareness of the political dimensions of music history. Apart from his publications on the Finale,<sup>33</sup> the present writer's attempts to come to terms with the issue of compositional process and Bruckner's use of the Mutationsverfahren<sup>34</sup> reflect his concern for a stylistically and compositionally appropriate analysis of motivic process, for which the large number of surviving sources for the Ninth Symphony provide such a valuable documentary resource, and which with more comprehensive analysis will permit 'harder' conclusions to be drawn about this unique aspect of Bruckner's compositional technique and the development of it within his musical style.

In the mid-1990s the GA committed itself to the publication, along with the earlier envisioned autograph score, facsimile edition and *Textband* on the Finale, of a new edition of the score, parts and Kritischer Bericht of the first three movements of the Ninth (edited by Cohrs, published 2000–2002), as well as separate *Studienbände* on the sources for each movement, that for the Scherzo (*Entwürfe zum zweiten Satz und Trio mit Viola-Solo/ Studienband*, edited by Cohrs), appearing in 1998. In May 2001 it was resolved to augment this suite of volumes by including a comprehensive 'Textband' dealing with the genesis and reception of the whole symphony, thus allowing the Studienband of each movement to deal only the compositional sources (cf. §3.4.13). While it was impossible to deal here with even the sources for the Finale in the sort of detail demanded by this form of inquiry, this comprehensive approach to the sources for the Ninth may eventually place us in a position to answer Kirsch's critique of Röthig's work on the Eighth.

Finally, the influence on this study of a 'classical' model for the philologically documented reconstruction and conjectural completion of a major orchestral score should be acknowledged: Deryck Cooke's performing version of Mahler's Tenth.<sup>35</sup> Although concerned with different editorial problems than those presented by the Bruckner Finale, the approach of this score, with its detailed critical commentary, underlaid partitello systems, and typographic

<sup>31</sup> See "Zur Aufführung der ergänzten Urfassung des Adagio und des ursprünglichen Scherzo der Ersten Symphonie von Anton Bruckner", *IBG-Mitt* 41 (Dec. 1993), p. 34–37; "Anton Bruckners 'Helgoland' und das Symphonische", *Mf* 48, no. 4 (1995), pp. 349–368; and *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner*, Tutzing 2001.

<sup>32</sup> *The First Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception*, University of Pennsylvania 1995; "The First Published Edition of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity", *19th-Century Music* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1997), pp. 3–26; and most recently his monograph *Bruckner: Symphony No. 8*, Cambridge 2000.

<sup>33</sup> Principally his "Neue Erkenntnisse...", *BrJb* 1989/90, pp. 115–203, and publications in the Bruckner GA.

<sup>34</sup> "Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren", in: *BrSympBer* 1992, pp. 153–178.

<sup>35</sup> *Gustav Mahler: A Performing Version of the Draft for the Tenth Symphony prepared by Deryck Cooke in collaboration with Berthold Goldschmidt, Colin Matthews, David Matthews*, first performed in 1966, published London 1976.

distinctions between autograph and added text, was an inspiration for the approach used in publishing the Finale. While Leopold Nowak<sup>36</sup> never realised the extent to which Bruckner completed the score of the Finale, if he believed that one “soll den Handschriften immer das Menschliche zu entreißen verstehen” he would surely also have ultimately commended an approach which attempts to extract not only “das Menschliche” but also ‘das Musikalische’ from manuscripts which—indeed—“dürfen nicht stumm sein...”.

---

<sup>36</sup> The Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur was dedicated to Nowak; cf. AP E/iv.



## 3.1

### The Sources Re-Assessed

[I]n no discipline can much be done of a serious nature and of lasting value without source material. [...] In musicology, publication of sources is the primary need, the first challenge to the intelligent musicologist and the compelling task before us under which all else should find its proper hierarchy.

—Armen Carapetyan<sup>1</sup>

Ich bin der Meinung, daß wir heute mit genauen biographischen und musikalischen Dokumentenforschungen weiter fortfahren müssen. Ausführliche Analysen der primären Quellen—Briefe, Taschenkalender, Archivadokumente, zeitgenössische Schriften, Anekdoten, Bilder, und eigenhändige Partitur und Abschriften, usw.—sollen unsere Hauptbeschäftigung sein. In diesem Kontext meine ich, daß unsere wichtigste gegenwärtige Verpflichtung die Vervollständigung der kritischen Berichte ist. Vom Standpunkt der Wissenschaft sowie der Praxis ist es eine dringende Arbeit.

—Paul Hawkshaw<sup>2</sup>

#### 3.1.1 The sources for the Finale.

**A**LTHOUGH facsimile editions of the MSS of the Mahler Tenth appeared as early as 1924 and again in 1967,<sup>3</sup> only a small percentage of the MSS for the unfinished last movement of the Bruckner Ninth appeared in facsimile until recently;<sup>4</sup> surprisingly perhaps, this was the first ever publication of a Bruckner movement in facsimile. The absence of such editions of Bruckner's scores is not in itself suspicious; like the delay in Nowak's intended republication of the Orel edition, reasons can readily be found in the chequered publication history of Bruckner's works, with its three phases of (a) an initial period of greater or lesser editorial intrusion, (b) the Haas GA, with its 'Mischfassungen' of some of the symphonies, and (c) the post-1945 period, with its recognition of the need to publish accurate representations of individual sources, rather than any kind of 'ideal' versions. With reliable performing scores of Bruckner's entire opus in urgent need of republication, Nowak, despite the best of intentions, never got around to the 'luxury' of publishing facsimile editions.

---

<sup>1</sup> From a 1954 editorial, quoted by Frank D'Accone in an obituary notice, "Armen Carapetyan (1908–92)", *AMS Newsletter* 23, no. 1 (1993), pp. 6f.

<sup>2</sup> "Wo steht die Bruckner-Forschung heute? Festvortrag bei der 20 Jahr-Feier des Anton Bruckner Institutes Linz 12. November 1998, Barocksaal des Musikhauses Doblinger", *IBGMitt* 51 (Dec. 1998), p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> The editions of Paul Zsolnay, Vienna 1924, and Walter Ricke, Munich 1967, respectively; see Bibliography §I.

<sup>4</sup> Edited by Phillips, Vienna 1996; see §3.4.9.

Only in more recent years, now that authoritative texts have in most cases been re-established, has there been much opportunity or inclination for Bruckner scholars to concern themselves with the composer's 'Vorarbeiten'. Sonntag's work on the Cracow materials for the first movement of the Ninth clearly shows the extent to which the first section of the Orel edition requires revision. As Orel had to work from only about half of the material now known to be extant, his findings are to be taken *cum grano salis*, as is also the case with his presentation of the genesis of the Adagio.<sup>5</sup> Even aside from the exclusion of major sources for the first and third movements, innumerable oversights and omissions occur in Orel's presentation.

Part of the problem lay simply in establishing accurate transcriptions of these MSS. While the idea of publishing exhaustively detailed studies of all available sources for a work was itself a laudable undertaking, the magnitude of the problem, as outlined by Nowak in his 1982 article on the history of the Bruckner GA cannot be overestimated:

In den *Entwürfen und Skizzen* verwirklichte sich auch zum ersten Mal die Absicht der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe, alle zu einem Werk vorhandenen Skizzen mitzuteilen. Dazu muß bemerkt werden, daß ein solches Vorhaben vor dem Bearbeiter nicht zu unterschätzende Schwierigkeiten aufwirft: sie sind gerade bei der Neunten Symphonie reichlich vorhanden. Die sich daraus ergebenden Probleme zeitlicher Reihung und der Lesbarmachung der nicht selten an einer Stelle zwei- oder dreimal übereinandergeschriebenen Einfälle gleichen Rätseln, deren Lösungen oft nicht so bald gefunden werden können.<sup>6</sup>

Orel similarly noted in the 1934 publication itself that:

Die Skizzen Bruckners gehören vielfach zu den am schwierigsten vollständig entzifferbaren, nicht so sehr wegen der schweren Lesbarkeit der Schrift als vielmehr deshalb, weil Bruckner oft mit der verbesserten Fassung die vorhandene gleich überschreibt, so daß ein System mehrere Fassungen enthalten kann. Es ist dann nicht leicht, die einzelnen Fassungen gleich chronologischen Schichten auseinanderzulösen.<sup>7</sup>

In cases such as the initial pc. sks. for the Ninth, particularly those for the Adagio and to a lesser extent those for the Finale, one finds this essentially 'private' handwriting,<sup>8</sup> in which versions are layered upon another not once but many times over, with added obstacles provided by wrong note values, pitches, etc. Further complications are imposed by Bruckner's

<sup>5</sup> Cf. for instance Haas (*Bruckner*, p. 155), who noted that the sketches for the Adagio, "wie in Beethovens Skizzen", emerge "aus unscheinbaren Anfängen [...], deren Profil mit dem Endergebnis kaum in Einzelzügen verwandt erscheint".

<sup>6</sup> See "Die Anton Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe...", *BrJb* 1982–83, p. 37.

<sup>7</sup> Orel D/6.

<sup>8</sup> A similar distinction between the 'public' handwriting of Beethoven's scores and the 'private' notation of his sketchbooks is noted by Alan Tyson in "Sketches and Autographs", in: *The Beethoven Companion*, ed. Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune, London 1971, 1973, p. 451.

myriad crossings-out and his system of reference symbols or 'Weiser' to which he often resorted in order to show the continuation of the musical line. The tortuous convolutions of some of these MSS would perhaps not have been fully construable to the composer himself had he been unable to recall from memory what he had worked out; they were not intended to represent any sort of definitive 'text', least of all do they allow exhaustive and definitive explication by another party. Much of the time one has the feeling—and this is particularly true in the case of the early sks. for both Adagio and Finale—that Bruckner was literally 'improvising on paper', exploring his ideas as he went, and that what ultimately remains on the written page is less any finished product than the record of its evolution, the results of which would be taken up in a subsequent sk., or carried over 'definitively' into the score.<sup>9</sup>

Accordingly, it is misleading to publish transcriptions of such sks. within a definitive edition as irreproachably accurate and impartial documentation. While one can speculate upon possible or likely compositional order, and in many cases plausible scenarios can be invented to explain what stands on the page, such activity remains in most cases open to conjecture; transcription becomes interpretation. A more defensible solution is to transcribe the sources less as coherent musical texts, as Orel and Nowak sought to do, than as graphic structures, assisting the reader by clarifying the exigencies of Bruckner's often untidy handwriting but maintaining blank staves, line breaks and margins, whereby the position of often essential marginalia (almost wholly ignored by Orel) and other elements extrinsic to the notated text can be preserved.<sup>10</sup> In this way, scholarly discussion can be fostered, rather than precluded, and alternative explanations encouraged, out of which a greater consensus of understanding may emerge.

In essence this explains the principles followed in the transcriptions here. For reasons of space these have essentially been limited to the 142-p. reconstruction of the AP, the editorial principles of which are outlined in §3.1.9 *infra*, together with the relevant pages of the Orel edition—itsself, as we have seen, an important key to understanding the movement's reception history. While a complete transcription of all MSS for the Finale lies outside the purview of the present study,<sup>11</sup> the extant sources have all been reproduced in facsimile, since even the most accurate and painstaking transcriptions cannot eliminate the need for facsimile

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Wolfgang Plath: "Beethovens Skizzen können als Protokolle seines Denkens verstanden werden, Mozarts Skizzen fixierten die Ergebnisse des Gedachten; die Prozesse, die sich davor abgespielt haben müssen, können wir nicht einmal ahnen" ("Bemerkungen zum Thema 'Skizze—Entwurf—Fragment'", p. 278).

<sup>10</sup> Nowak noted the difficulty of establishing compositional order in the written-over notations in "Bruckners Werk in dieser Zeit" (*Ges. Aufs.*, p. 20, quoted in §3.0.1 *supra*). The passage suggests that it was the Bruckner GA's decision to incorporate sks. and drafts for works into the GA (due to their assumed significance for his compositional technique, and therefore for the status of the autograph scores over the first-edition arrangements) that led to the philologically problematic decision to deal with the sks. along the same methodological lines as the autographs.

<sup>11</sup> These transcriptions will be included in the planned Studienband (formerly referred to as the Textband), on the Finale for the GA; see §3.4.13.

reproductions: one cannot arrive at an adequate understanding of these sources without an impression of the magnitude and nature of the extant material, with all its many visual cues as to degrees of definitiveness and completion, handwriting, mental lucidity and other factors which only facsimile reproductions make possible.<sup>12</sup>

In accordance with Bruckner's working methods, as described below (§3.1.3), the autograph material for the Finale has been reproduced in two main divisions, I: The Particello Sketches, and II: The Score Bifolios and 'SVE' (or continuity drafts).<sup>13</sup>

The particello sketches (Facs. C/3 onwards) comprise eight signatures:

- i. ÖNB 3194 (16 fols.), and
- ii. ÖNB 28.238 (1 fol.), a page probably originally belonging to the same group; both of which signatures, along with 28.229 (*infra*), are all written on oblong 16- or 20-stave music paper;
- iii. ÖNB 6007 (2 fols.) and
- iv. ÖNB 6086 (2 fols.), both using upright, 24-stave music paper;
- v. ÖNB 28.229 (1 fol.), as mentioned above;
- vi. the pc. sks. included within ÖNB 6085 (fols. 35f. and 39–48, 12 fols.),
- vii. the isolated pc. sk. from the Cracow material (fols. 59f. thereof, 2 fols.), and finally
- viii. a voice-leading sk. for the Finale known to be in private possession (fol. fragment), the last three groups all using upright 24-stave music papers.

These MSS have been reproduced according to the size and significance of the signatures and, as far as possible, in the likely order of their composition.<sup>14</sup>

The second division (C/51ff.) reproduces the score bifols. and SVE or continuity drafts for the movement, today distributed among nine different signatures or sources:

- i. ÖNB 6087 (all 36 bifols.),
- ii. the SVE grouped in 6085 (fols. 1–34 and 49–82, in total 34 bifols.); and a further three score bifols held by the ÖNB:
- iii. ÖNB 13.150,

---

<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, the failing of facsimile reproductions is their lack of differentiation between pencil and ink, often vital as a means of reconstructing compositional sequence. Bruckner's often faint pencil markings reproduce poorly, as many of the facsimiles in vol. II reveal. The typographical distinctions possible within transcription, although they already impose a degree of interpretation, are necessary in order to open up the musical contents to discussion and analysis.

<sup>13</sup> The ensuing text has been in part adapted from the Vorwort to the Faksimile-Ausgabe, Vienna 1996.

<sup>14</sup> See, however, below (§3.1.6). New findings made since the MSS were ordered for publication in the Faksimile-Ausgabe have rendered the ordering given there, which corresponds to that in vol. II, section C, less conclusive.

- iv. ÖNB 19.645, and
- v. ÖNB 24.264;
- vi. StB 3179 (four bifols.), and
- vii. StB 4189 (one bifol., fols. 27f.);
- viii. a score bifol., I.N. 36 555, held by the former Hochschule, now Universität für Darstellende Kunst, Vienna (one bifol.);
- ix. a score bifol. formerly held by the Historisches Museum der Stadt Wien on behalf of the Schubertbund, subsequently sold to the antiquarian Hassfurther; current location unknown.

This gives a total of 80 score bifols. and SVE. These have been ordered first by original bifol. number and classification, second by apparent compositional chronology; in other words, all versions of bifol. 1 have been grouped together in their apparent order, all versions of bifol. 2, 3, 4 etc.

Finally an Appendix (C/321ff.) presents related, principally non-autograph material deemed worthy of reproduction. Among this the following material is of immediate significance for the composition and reconstruction of the Finale:

- i. the autograph sk. (C/323) dated “27.12.93”, probably an early preliminary sketch for the chorale theme, known only from a copy found in the estate of Leopold Nowak;
- ii. the autograph fol. that allegedly—according to the explanation added by August Stradal—constitutes a “Berechnung des Verhältnisses der Takte im letzten Satze der IX. Symphonie” (C/324);
- iii. the model for the instrumental designations apparently used by Meißner in ruling up Bruckner's score paper (C/325ff.)—although apparently only the strike-through is autograph; and finally,
- iv. the 1st p. of Bruckner's cover bifol. or Umschlag (C/328), apparently used as a folder for bifols. 1 to 12, the Exp. of the movement

The index to the facsimiles (Facs. C/ii ff.) lists all MSS in order of their reproduction. Table VII (A/25ff.) orders the Finale-relevant MSS by library signature and classification; Table VIII (A/28ff.) presents the autograph material in order of its reproduction in section C, providing a concordance between the classifications used, location of the transcription in the Orel edition, the revised classifications of the present writer and location in both facsimile reproductions and, where applicable, the AP.

In order to conserve space in reproducing the less written-on pages, only those areas bearing notations by Bruckner have been reproduced; pages entirely without autograph notations have as a general rule been excluded. In the case of the SVE, where Bruckner often

noted merely a single line (e. g. the 1st vln.) of a bifol. already ruled up for scoring, the written-on staves have been reproduced in strip format.

The complete reproduction of all extant materials for the Finale inevitably involves much that is seemingly insignificant or appears to contribute little to the solution of the compositional problems which confronted Bruckner during the composition of the movement. Only with the greatest reservation can one attempt, for instance, an interpretation of many of the later SVE for bifols. 1, "13" or "14", which must unquestionably be ascribed to the same late period as the repeated renumberings written over many of the later bifols. of the score, but which, as already suggested (§1.1.12) are doubtless of later origin than the careful musical notation of these pages. Nonetheless, these MSS provide an unforgettable insight into the precision of Bruckner's working methods and his highly conscious and technically masterful approach. They also remain testament to a creative will which, even when completion of the movement no longer appeared possible, continued to struggle to make revisions and improvements.

### **3.1.2 The Orel edition and its revision; Nowak's corrections.**

Orel's transcription and exegesis of all available MSS of the Ninth was an impressive and commendable undertaking; without his contribution we would not today be in a position to arrive at an adequate assessment of the material, regardless of his mistakes. However, despite the excellence of his motives and the essential validity of his text and transcriptions, his representation of the Finale MSS in particular, with their grouping into apparently independent ' Fassungen', their publication in that order, and the related error of the classification of the final bifol. of the score, 31E/"32" as a "21D" (invalidating the formal structure of the movement), caused unnecessary confusion on the part of musicologists and critics. For the majority of readers, quite understandably, the edition represented an impenetrable philological labyrinth that did little to make the structure of the movement or Bruckner's compositional methods clear and resulted in attempts to invalidate performing versions of the movement or even Orel's own four-stave conflation (D/128ff.), as we have observed in chs. 1.3 and 1.4.

Moreover, while the material for the Finale was by no means complete, even larger gaps in the then-known sources for the other movements made the number of MSS for the Finale appear disproportionately great, suggesting that Bruckner had perhaps been unsure of his intentions. As we have seen, Orel omitted from his exegesis of First and Third movements of Ninth the 29 discarded fols. and sks. for each which had been sold by Löwe's widow to Berlin, as well as the further five fols. for the first movement which Bruckner may have given to Viktor Christ, apart from the omission of other scattered bifols. either unknown to Orel or omitted in transcription. The ramifications of this, along with the fact that Orel included, among so-called 'drafts' for the Finale, the surviving fragments of what was already the well-advanced, definitive score of the movement, meant that the material presented for the fourth

movement appeared greater than it was, leading Orel to refer to its “überreich erhaltene [...] Material und die sonst kaum irgendwo zu beobachtende fünffache Umarbeitung der Partitur, deren letzte erhaltene Fassung aber noch immer nicht den endgültigen Text darstellen dürfte” (D/4). In fact, as we shall see, Orel had fallen prisoner to his own philological methodology. As Sonntag wrote of the MSS for the first movement:

The addition of the materials in Krakow and the Library of Congress are particularly important because of the significant contribution they make to our knowledge of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony. These materials show that Bruckner made *extensive revisions, taking the work through several stages not known about before*, the kind and number of stages depending on the nature of the passage involved and the problems encountered at that point. Revisions range from alterations in the melodic line to additions or deletions of entire passages, demonstrating that perhaps the revisions in the other symphonies were not as atypical as we think. Bruckner's revisions in the first movement extend even into the autograph manuscript.<sup>15</sup>

Furthermore, Orel's explanatory text for the Finale—which, incidentally, invokes the notion of missing material at least nine times<sup>16</sup>—was overlooked by most readers, although it was often more important than the visual presentation of the fragments. Rarely, if at all, did Orel preserve the page breaks of the originals or, aside from metrical numbers, reproduce marginalia. A misplaced sense of economy occasioned him to omit ‘empty’ staves of the orchestral score, even those provided with whole-measure rests, although these often supply important clues as to how Bruckner conceived the instrumentation of a particular passage.<sup>17</sup>

Most often, however, one simply finds confirmation that ‘der Teufel liegt im Detail’. Many errors or oversights in the transcription occur, while apparent typographical errors do not help the reliability of the overall picture,<sup>18</sup> and are perhaps residues of the haste with which a final MS was expanded and re-typeset, from the proofs of the earlier version, to include the newly accessible Schalk material.<sup>19</sup> Many of the specific problems of the Orel edition were recognised, as already noted, by Jackson (§1.4.3), Samale and Mazzuca (§1.4.13) and Cohrs (§1.4.16) and commented on by Sonntag, who appears to have been the first

---

<sup>15</sup> P. 34; italics added.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. the texts in Orel, D/67, 70, 76, 77, 91, 102, 103, 110, 116.

<sup>17</sup> As was noted by Gunnar Cohrs (§1.4.15 supra). The same problem is mentioned by Susan M. Filler (p. 289) in reference to editions of Mahler's Tenth. Not even Orel's accurate reproduction, e.g., of Bruckner's whole measure rests in the woodwinds in the chorale hindered Ruzicka or Märzendorfer in their ‘padding out’ of sections expressly judged by Bruckner as “fertig”.

<sup>18</sup> For instance such text errors as D/3, “31.11.1894”, and where a footnote <sup>2</sup> is omitted; D/64, where several errors in the classifications of bifols. occur and the Vietinghoff bifol. listed in the Vorwort (D/6) is omitted (as previously noted, §1.2.6); D/91, “Umnummerierung” instead of “Ummumerierung”; and D/127, table, far-right column, third-to-last line, where “26 D” should read “26 F”. The errors in musical transcription and bifol. classification are discussed *infra*.

<sup>19</sup> As discussed in §1.2.6; see also §1.3.6.

scholar to pass on Nowak's verbal opinion of the publication.<sup>20</sup> While Nowak never published anything concerning the edition until 1984,<sup>21</sup> that he recognised the problems of the Orel edition and the manifold difficulties of the transcription of Bruckner's MSS is all too clear from the extent of the corrections undertaken fifty years before, in 1934–35.

While any comprehensive listing of the errors of the Orel edition as adumbrated by Nowak would go beyond the limits of space, a brief outline of the extent and nature of his work on the volume is appropriate.

One of Nowak's two working copies of the Orel edition, with innumerable corrections in red ink in his neat but often almost illegibly small *Korrentschrift*, was made available to the present writer by Herbert Vogg shortly before Nowak's death in May 1991.<sup>22</sup> The volume represents, in the apt words of Vogg, "einen Zug durchs rote Meer". The extent of Orel's errors, but also the microscopic detail and tireless patience with which Nowak attended to the task of correcting the elder scholar's work, can be gauged from the corrections on 3 pp. from the section on the Finale, 64, 83 and 101, reproduced on C/337ff.

Such corrections, written in the edition largely in red, sometimes blue-black ink, often over preliminary pencil, by no means represent the full extent of his revisions. Nowak also interleaved innumerable slips of paper, both plain as well as music paper, between pages where insufficient room was available for the corrections or where larger supplementations or complete re-transcriptions were required. These are written in pencil, blue-black or more rarely red ink, neatly glued in and independently numbered in brown pencil; it is due to the impracticality of reproducing them that Nowak's copy could not be used for the reproductions of the Orel text given in vol. II. Corrections to Orel's explanatory text as well as to the transcriptions are frequent; to a great extent, however, Nowak was simply concerned with a deeper level of detail than Orel: crossings-out, erasures, earlier readings, overlooked differentiations between pencil and pen, and scarcely legible pencillings are all recaptured as faithfully as possible, as are corrections to written-out simile signs, mislocations of notes, and oversights such as supplemented notes or rests in doubling parts. The broader picture was lost.

Of special documentary significance are Nowak's dates. On the title page of this copy, now held by the ÖNB as F60 BRGA 245/15b, he cites the date "15.VII. 34", presumably the date upon which he began work; a further date of "13.III.1935" is found two-thirds of the way

---

<sup>20</sup> *The Compositional Process...*, p. iii. Nowak expressed his misgivings about the Orel edition in no uncertain terms to the writer at a meeting shortly before his death in May 1991, roundly condemning it as "eine Schweinerei".

<sup>21</sup> See §1.3.5. Cf. Nowak, "Die Symphonien Anton Bruckners in der Gesamtausgabe" (originally publ. 1974), *Ges. Aufs.*, pp. 141f; in particular p. 142, where Nowak mentions the Orel edition, but does not detail its inadequacies.

<sup>22</sup> Thanks are due to Professor Herbert Vogg for his kind loan of the volume and permission to use Nowak's revisions. Two complete copies of the volume were made for the present writer and for Cohrs; the original, rebound in Adelaide in 1997, was given to the ÖNB, where it is now held under the signature F60 BRGA 245/15b.



down p. 63, the last p. of sks. for the Adagio; the last transcription there, of a discarded bifol. 10 for that movement, reveals no corrections. The material for the Finale reveals fairly consistently heavy corrections as far as p. 88 (= D/88); p. 89 bears none, as this bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C—which wandered into Orel's possession and only rejoined its fellows in 1970—was probably not accessible to Nowak. Corrections resume on p. 90, continue through the dated p. 101 (see Facs. C/339, lower r. h. margin, "1.V.35"), omit the D-ruling SVE for bifol. 1 (nos. 27 and 28) on p. 103, the E-ruling SVE for bifol. 1 (nos. 38 and 39) on pp. 117f., the bifol. 13 and 14 SVE (nos. 41 and 42) on pp. 121f., and conclude on p. 126, where in red ink in the lower r. h. margin can be found: "18.V. 1935/ 6.VII. 1935 mit/ dem Übertragen ins/ andere Exemplar fertig geworden.—", and below it in blue-black ink, "44 Seiten".<sup>23</sup> Nowak left uncorrected the late sketches reproduced on p. 127, as well as the Übersicht on the same page and the ensuing four-system conflation on pp. 128ff.<sup>24</sup>

Deleted: ).

Hence, of the Finale materials published by Orel, Nowak corrected all but bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C, the D- and E-ruling SVE for bifols. 1, 2, 13 and 14, and the late pc. sks.—with the exception of 1<sup>d</sup>C—exclusively the material of ÖNB 6085, most of which was presumably regarded as so fragmentary and unimportant as not to warrant attention. The distinction is perhaps significant, establishing, as mentioned (§1.2.6), that the material was probably already separated by extent of notation into two groups, which now 6085 and 6087, long before the official acquisition of the materials by the ÖNB in 1947.

Deleted: being

Just as Nowak ventured no correction of Orel's bifol. classifications, the biggest misfortune which befell Orel's presentation of the score material remained uncorrected by Nowak. Orel's misidentification of what was in fact the final extant bifol. of the score, 31E/"32" (see Facs. C/317ff.) as a "21. Bog. E" (D/125) implied that the continuity of the E version clashed with that of the preceding version D, placing the continuity of the entire movement in question.<sup>25</sup> From Facs. C/317 one can see the "21" on which Orel based his classification in the upper margin, but the position of the *original* numbering of the bifol., under the dozens of bizarre renumberings which cover the whole right side of the page, can be ascertained by comparison with preceding bifols.; it, rather than the innumerable overwritten figures, is significant. Moreover, given Bruckner's clear structural procedures, the chorale

<sup>23</sup> The reference to another copy of the text could be traced to a further copy of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* now held by the ÖNB as F60 BRGA 245/15a. ABIL's provisional catalogue of MSS for the Ninth compiled in the early 1990s cited this, as "Exemplar mit den Korrekturen von Nowak", its ÖNB location "Kassen in PhA/III 3/8".

Deleted: According to

Deleted: (c. 1994), this w

Deleted: an

<sup>24</sup> Along with the two copies of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* (so-titled) with Nowak's corrections (F60 BRGA 245/15 a and b), the ÖNB holds a further early version of the volume still entitled *Vorlagebericht*, F60 BRGA 245/16 which contains annotations from Nowak throughout the text of the first 2 pp. and occasional annotations (references to bifols.) throughout Orel's Übersicht on pp. 128ff. The copy also contains a piece of music paper glued inside the front cover in Nowak's handwriting (in ink), giving the chorale theme in 5 lines of 8 m. phrases followed by the equivalent passage from the Repr.—perhaps an attempt to reconstruct the continuity of the Repr.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. D/124, text, and following page, transcription, as well as Orel's four-system conflation, D/136f.

theme could scarcely have fallen in the Repr. of the Hauptth.<sup>26</sup> Ironically, Orel's mistaken classification was unwittingly 'corrected' by Nowak in his foliation of the signatures 6085 and 6087, probably made after their acquisition by the ÖNB in 1947,<sup>27</sup> in which 31E/"32" was ordered as ÖNB 6087/71–72, the final bifol. of that signature, immediately following the other surviving bifols. of the chorale Repr. (6087/67–70).

However, it is significant to note that no correction was made by Nowak in the Finale transcriptions or anywhere else of any aspect of Orel's philological conclusions. Nowak eschewed the broader picture in favour of meticulous observation. An impression of his thoroughness as well as the magnitude of the task can be gleaned from his "Versuche" (so styled by him) at deciphering the musical texts of such complex pages as the last three pages of bifol. 12C (cf. Facs. C/206ff.) or the last page of bifol. 15C (C/252) which were either omitted by Orel or glossed over with the remark (D/101): "verschiedene im Einzelnen nicht entzifferbare Entwürfe zur Streicherfigur" (Nowak's revision is reproduced on C/339). However, Nowak overlooked much significant marginalia, including Bruckner's annotations of "fertig",<sup>28</sup> and accepted Orel's often erroneous ordering of the materials without question.

Recent research on the ÖNB Fonds F60 BRGA 68, "Studien und Korrekturen zu *Anton Bruckner: Sämtliche Werke: Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie*" has revealed extensive notes and drafts made by Nowak for both the correction of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen* and the score of the first three movements, as well as many pages of material from the last years of his life (1986/87 and 1989).<sup>29</sup> A 4-p. typescript, "Anton Bruckner, Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie [...] Bemerkungen zu einzelnen Seiten" damningly listed Orel's shortcomings under such uncompromising rubrics as: "Ungenauigkeit in der Wiedergabe aus Nachlässig-

<sup>26</sup> Orel's classification of the alleged "21. Bog. E" was apparently based on the following four factors; see further the discussion of this bifol. in §3.1.10:

- i. Following Orel's own explanation, the notion that the bifol. was indeed numbered "21.", the most obvious of the many numbers appearing on the first page of the bifol. (Facs. C/317): this along with the innumerable other figures can best be described as 'apocryptic'; they cannot be rationally explained.
- ii. Again following Orel's own explanation, the measure numbers "35 36 37" etc. written above the top staff of the bifol., which he presumed indicated a link with the numbering-through of the fugue, as can be found on bifol. 20F/"21" (cf. Orel's transcription of "20. Bog. D", D/111, bottom of page; the numbers are not clearly legible in the reproduction in vol. II, C/285 but are on the corresponding page of the Faksimile-Ausgabe). However, the numbers do not match up with the beginning of the fugue—there is a discrepancy of 1 m. In fact, they relate to a numbering-through of mm. in the chorale Repr.
- iii. Again cited by Orel (*ibid.*), the occurrence of the horn motive in minims on both bifols. 22D and the alleged 21E (cf. AP E/98 and 135).
- iv. While not mentioned by Orel, his assumptions may have reflected hearsay of the time, confirmed in Auer's earlier biographies, that the chorale Repr. and combination of chorale and Te Deum motive (perhaps a reflection of Max Graf's assertions about a thematic overlay, mentioned in §1.3.3) marked the end of Bruckner's draft of the movement.

<sup>27</sup> This is visible in the lower l. h. corner of each recto page.

<sup>28</sup> See e.g. Facs. C/176, 180, 192, 196, 200.

<sup>29</sup> In total, 114 pp. This material was touched upon briefly in §1.3.5 and .6.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: , may well have been

Deleted: recognised b

Deleted: ,

Deleted: however, who

Deleted: , probably in

Deleted: , foliated the signatures 6085 and 6087

Deleted: the lower l. h. corner, ordering the alleged "21

Deleted: . Bog. E"

Deleted: after the bifols. comprising

Deleted:

Deleted: reprise

Deleted: ¶

.

Deleted: it is significant

Deleted: virtually

Deleted: to any

Deleted: :

Deleted: difficulty

Deleted: two

Deleted: cited

Deleted: supra)

keit", "Methodische Unrichtigkeiten", "Nachlässigkeiten in der Wiedergabe" etc., and underlines the personal politics existing between Orel and Haas at the time: Nowak was, of course, Haas' assistant, not Orel's. The later material of F60 BRGA 68 includes a rough transcription by Nowak of the earliest sk. for IX/1 (C/361) and a detailed and carefully annotated transcription of the Cracow sk. for the opening of IX/3, as well as attempts to approach the IX/4 material from analytical standpoints, including by comparing its structure with the proportions of Bruckner's other finale movements. Nowhere in any of this material does Nowak question any of Orel's many misclassifications or his allegation that the Finale existed in several versions, make reference to Bruckner's own bifol. numbers, to the renumbering, to lost bifols., to the collocation of score and pc. sks., to standard 16-m. bifol. lengths or metrical reconstructions.<sup>30</sup> All these matters, apparently, remained outside Nowak's purview.

Research since 1990, initially undertaken independent of Nowak's revisions, led to the alteration of many of Orel's bifol. classifications, and introduced others for material with which Orel was not familiar or which was not reproduced by him. Wherever possible, however, Orel's readings were maintained. For instance, no attempt was made to reverse the classifications of E- and F-ruling bifols., although F paper was in fact used between rulings D and E, namely for the later D and earlier E bifols. A comparison of all original and altered classifications can be found in Table VIII, A/28ff., which gives a concordance of the autograph material, its location in the new classifications, and the classifications of the Orel edition. The following omissions and classification errors deserve mention:

- i. Among numerous sketches or sketch pages not reproduced in Orel, the ÖNB signatures 6007 (Facs. C/27ff., apparently at that time still in possession of Max Auer) or 28.229 (C/39, which nonetheless apparently arrived in the ÖNB in 1927 from the estate of Ferdinand Löwe<sup>31</sup>) constitute autographs to which Orel appears not to have had access. In other cases (among them several pages of the signatures 3194, 6085 and 6086 of the ÖNB; see for instance C/19, 37, 40–44) transcriptions, for whatever reason, were omitted.
- ii. The damaged bifol. 1A (ÖNB 24.264; C/53ff.), probably the earliest notation of the beginning of the movement in score, was unknown to Orel; it only arrived in the ÖNB in 1966 from the family of Richard Strauss via the antiquarian firm of Hans Schneider.

<sup>30</sup> It should be noted that metrical numbers have been used elsewhere in the reconstruction of lost bifolios; see Wolfgang Grandjean, "Zur Aufführung der ergänzten Urfassung des Adagio und des ursprünglichen Scherzo der Ersten Symphonie von Anton Bruckner", *IBG-Mitt* 41 (Dec. 1993), p. 34–37.

<sup>31</sup> In the original MWV publications of both the Faksimile-Ausgabe (1996, pp. XI and XVII) and Autograph-Partitur (1994, pp. XVII and XXXI, corrected in the 1997 reprint) the provenance of this signature is given, like 28.238, as the estate of Bruckner's sister Rosalie Hueber. ÖNB 28.229, originally S. m. 3175, fol. 7 appears to have come from Löwe's estate, ÖNB 28.238, originally S. m. 3176, fols. 25 and 34, from the Hueber family.

- iii. Numerous SVE (in particular) to bifols. 1 and 2, both D- and E-rulings (see C/75–80, 103–106, 119–122, 125–130), were omitted; their transcriptions may have been regarded by Orel as unnecessary. This material is doubtless late and difficult to transcribe meaningfully, or to establish any chronological order for it. In one particularly strange case Orel transcribed as his 1<sup>c</sup>. Bogen D (D/103) two quite separate and apparently unrelated SVE, 1F (C/81) and 2<sup>c</sup>D (C/123).
- iv. Bifol. 2F (ÖNB 19.645, see C/131ff.), which, although initially listed by Orel (D/6) as “Aus dem Besitze von Baron Vietinghoff (Berlin)”, appears nowhere in transcription.
- v. A further classification error, which places the credibility of Orel’s entire thesis of distinct compositional versions in question: his “20. Bog. D” (D/111), is in fact not a D- but manifestly an F-paper ruling, originally a bifol. 20, subsequently renumbered “21.”, hence 20F/“21”. A similar case concerns 17F, which Orel (D/106) correctly recognised as an intermediate version between 17C and 17<sup>a</sup>D, without explaining how this was possible if “Fassung F” followed “Fassung E”.
- vi. The two bifols. 28E/“29” and 29E/“30” (C/309ff. and 313ff. respectively), erroneously transcribed by Orel as a single bifol., a “29.<sup>?</sup> Bg. E” (D/126).<sup>32</sup>
- vii. Bifol. 31E/“32” (C/317ff.), classified by Orel as a “21. Bogen E” (D/125), which placed the whole structure of the movement into question.

The most fundamental problem of the Orel edition remains, however, the classification, transcription and ordering of Bruckner’s orchestral score within five or even six “ Fassungen ” on the basis of the differing kinds of instrumental indications to be found in it (cf. Orel’s description, D/75). Although Orel recognised that most of the bifols. beyond those described by him as “Fassung A”, the instrumental designations and barlines of which reveal the aged Bruckner’s tremulous hand, were prepared by another hand,<sup>33</sup> he does not appear to have grasped the consequences of the fact.<sup>34</sup> Any attempt to reconstruct the genesis of the movement on this basis alone was doomed to failure, as it rested on the circular reasoning that a change of paper ruling coincided with the beginning of a new ‘version’ by Bruckner.

Had Bruckner prepared his own paper, such changes might have been significant. But that he simply used up stocks of prepared paper and asked Meißner to prepare more as

---

<sup>32</sup> Orel’s question mark perhaps indicates he was unsure as to when Bruckner undertook the renumbering of already drafted bifols. and allotted the revised numeration to subsequently composed bifols. In fact, both these bifols. reveal erasures of bifoliation, as does the subsequent 31E/“32”.

<sup>33</sup> Oddly termed by him “holograph”: see D/75; which was corrected in Nowak’s copy by the word “allograph”.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Orel’s listing of the five different kinds of prepared score bifols., D/75: “Bruckner hat [...] ein größeres Quantum partiturmäßig adaptierten Notenpapiers im Vorrat gehabt und nach dessen Verbrauch ein neues Konvolut verwendet.” As already mentioned (§0.3), Orel’s determination of the instrumental indications of Ruling C as “autograph” cannot be maintained: see §3.1.4 *infra*.

required by no means equates with distinct compositional phases. Hence, while the differences in paper preparation are significant for the reconstruction of the movement's composition, the conclusions often drawn—that the surviving material represents five or six divergent attempts to draft a movement, the structure of which was never conclusively established—are entirely unjustified.

Moreover—cf. Orel's "Übersicht über das erhaltene Material an Partiturentwürfen", D/127—the bifols. listed by him under "Fassung E" subsumed largely scored-out bifols. among incompletely scored versions from earlier stage—for example bifols. 5B and 6<sup>c</sup>B. Orel did so justifiably, to demonstrate the continuity of his *particello* reduction (D/128ff) in the face of material from later phases which he correctly recognised as missing, but the resulting inconsistencies between more and less elaborated versions produced a misrepresentation of Bruckner's compositional procedure that have no relation to reality or to Bruckner's customary practices, all of which have derailed the movement's reception.

The re-assessment of the score materials for the Finale begins with the realisation that Bruckner left a score on numbered bifols. which was, like any other late score of Bruckner's, reworked several times, and had manifestly reached a highly advanced stage of compositional emergence. Given this, publication of the last identifiable versions of each bifol. in correct compositional context rather than grouped into separate " Fassungen " was the only appropriate measure. Important points of reference for the re-ordering were provided by more detailed examination of the largely non-autograph instrumental designations, which exist in greater variation than the five *rulings* A to E and what is merely a further *paper type* (F—despite its designation by Orel as a separate "Fassung"). In fact, what Orel described as "Fassung F", "(nur einzelne Bogen) anderes Notenpapier [...]" (D/75) reveals the absurdity of basing rigid compositional distinctions solely on such factors, and then claiming that the existence of multiple compositional variants suggests anything other than a long and rigorous process of refinement and revision. While recognising the usefulness of paper types and rulings for the reconstruction of compositional sequence, it is more useful to subdivide the composer's compositional activity on the score of the Finale, with its gradual alterations of detail, into a series of 'work phases'. To understand this we must examine Bruckner's working methods more closely.

### 3.1.3 Working method and compositional process.<sup>35</sup>

Orel published the early material for the Finale, mainly the signatures Mus. Hss. 3194 and 6086 of the ÖNB, (Orel D/64–75) as *particello* 'Skizzen' as opposed to the 'Entwürfe' (drafts) in orchestral score, yet it is significant that even the earliest material scarcely represents the

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Sonntag's concise outline of Bruckner's "General Sketch Techniques", *The Compositional Process...*, pp. 34ff. See also Franz Grasberger, "Anton Bruckners Arbeitsweise", in: *Bruckner-Studien: Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, Franz Grasberger, ed., Vienna 1964, pp. 33–37, concerning working method, pp. 36f.

isolated jottings that perhaps spring to mind at the mention of the word ‘sketch’. From the outset Bruckner evidently wrote with a clear overall conception of the position of each element in the score and its connection with preceding and ensuing sections, even where symbols were required to show the continuity from one phrase or idea to another, particularly where deletions, revisions or insertions were made.<sup>36</sup> This is perhaps consistent with the postulate that Bruckner saw his forms largely as broad standard schemata, more or less independent of the material which filled them; Röthig wrote of the Eighth, of instance, that “Bruckner hatte nahezu in jedem Satz [...] eine präzise Vorstellung vom Inhalt und Verlauf, dessen Gestaltung für die Verwirklichung der Fortspinnung allein bestimmend war.”<sup>37</sup> Given this fact alone, that Bruckner could still have been unsure of the overall structure of the movement at a much later stage is highly unlikely.

The compositional process in Bruckner’s later works fell essentially into a two stage process involving first the process of establishing the essential continuity of the music by sketching it in pc. sk.-format, then transferring it to full score and eventually completing the orchestral texture, although this sequence may have recurred several times in the course of composing a longer movement, Bruckner returning to pc. format to lay out subsequent sections, or drafting further passages (particularly in the “2. Theil”) directly in score. The score phase itself can be subdivided into three further sub-phases:

- i. an initial laying out the music’s main elements, the strings and (where necessary) significant wind entries,
- ii. the completion of the instrumentation, and therewith the essential ‘Notentext’, and
- iii. the addition of phrasing (even sometimes ties), dynamics, articulations and other markings, along with final retouchings, revisions and inspections, apparently referred to by Bruckner as “Nuancierung”.<sup>38</sup>

Most of the Finale survives in at least the first stage; some surviving bifols. of the Exp. had progressed as far as the completion of the second. Although often forced to discard bifols. of the emerging orchestral score as he made revisions, or as the heavily worked paper simply became illegible, Bruckner did not usually compose a separate orchestral draft before proceeding to copy out a final *Reinschrift*—in fact, there are many instances of recopying of partially or largely complete bifols. in the Finale material, apparently solely for the purposes

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf. for instance the ÖNB 3194 pc. sks., Orel D/74f.

<sup>37</sup> P. 348.

<sup>38</sup> Paul Hawkshaw outlined the compositional process in Bruckner’s early MSS of the masses and symphonies in four stages, 2–4 of which are roughly congruent with these: 1., the sketch, 2., transfer to full score, 3., orchestration (in two or more stages, usually strings first and then winds), and 4., final corrections and addition of performance markings (“The Date of Bruckner’s ‘Nullified’ Symphony in D minor”, p. 255).

of neatness or legibility.<sup>39</sup> We have already noted (§1.3.6) Orel's statement that, "Es ist kein Fall bekannt, daß Bruckner selbst eine Gleichschrift eines seiner großen Werke angefertigt hätte"<sup>40</sup>—this he left to his copyists. Despite Orel's<sup>41</sup> and Sonntag's<sup>42</sup> perfectly appropriate phenomenological classification of the discarded early bifols. of the Ninth as separate "Erste Partiturniederschrift" or "Preliminary Manuscript" respectively, an ontologically distinct 'draft score' cannot be demonstrated in the case of any movement of the Ninth. For instance, the complete set of initial score bifols. for the Exp. of IX/1 extant today, although they appear to form a separate unit, still originally constituted 'the score'. They were simply material discarded in the course of subsequent composition of the emergent autograph. The same applies to the bifols. discarded from the emergent autograph score of the Finale.

Certain surviving sources from the late period appear to represent hybrids midway between draft and score. In the case of the first movement of the Eighth, an apparent "first draft" can perhaps be documented—ÖNB 6040.<sup>43</sup> Although more roughly written than one might expect of a definitive MS, this incomplete score of the Exp. of the movement is on the same oblong format, 20-stave paper as was mostly used for the scores of the foregoing symphonies. From the AP of the Eighth Symphony (with its expanded instrumentation) onwards Bruckner used an upright 24-stave format paper, as is found in most of the surviving scores of the late period. It is therefore difficult to assess whether Bruckner initially intended 6040 to be a definitive score, or wished to refine his ideas at an early stage in an orchestral draft; the question becomes all the more significant given that so few sources survive for the foregoing symphonies, so that it remains difficult to assess to what extent it represented Bruckner's practice in the earlier works.

Three later compositional sources survive where Bruckner appears to have set out to write a draft (or even a definitive) score, but in practice rapidly reverted to sk. techniques. The surviving pc. draft for the final Trio of the Ninth, ÖNB 28.226, although apparently notated in string-score format, is still in effect a pc. sk. The second page of the pc. sk. of *Helgoland* (StB 3792/1<sup>v</sup>, which contains the first entry of the chorus<sup>44</sup>), is laid out in what appears to be an 'abbreviated' score comprising the three upper strings, the four choral parts, vlc. and cb. (in all 10 staves), but is by no means actually 'scored'. Most of these staves, where used, serve

<sup>39</sup> See §§3.1.7 and 3.1.8.

<sup>40</sup> "Original und Bearbeitung...", p. 218.

<sup>41</sup> *Entwürfe und Skizzen*, p. 7.

<sup>42</sup> Cf, for example, "A New Perspective...", pp. 100ff.

<sup>43</sup> This is presumably referred to in Göll.-A. IV/2, p. 532. Like other sources for the Eighth, it has not been listed in Table I due to considerations of space.

<sup>44</sup> See the author's "Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren", *BrSympBer* 1992, pp. 160f., in particular the facsimiles of the sk. pages referred to here, pp. 172–175.

merely to accommodate corrections to the ‘active’ staves—1st vln., 1st tenor, 2nd bass and (string) bass. Bruckner soon reverts to four-stave, undesignated pc. on the ensuing pages.

An even more optimistic beginning can be found in the sks. for *Das Deutsche Lied* or “der deutsche Gesang” as Bruckner termed it on the first page of the sks.<sup>45</sup> The sks. use two bifols. numbered “24.” and “25.” and ruled up with 6 mm./p., but not otherwise written on, hence apparently discarded from the score of IX/1, and of the same “J. E. No. 8”, large trade-mark, 24-stave paper used for the majority of the bifols. of that movement.<sup>46</sup> Bruckner laid out the brass instruments and choral parts for the movement in the margin of the first page of “24.”, accommodating two sets of 12 staves on every 24-stave page, with one free stave separating the four choral and seven brass staves. These staves he also numbered in two sets of 1–12, repeating the numbers on the following page. But the only staves actually used were that of the 1st trumpet (in F), 1st tenor and 1st bass parts. As elsewhere, corrections to these staves were made on neighbouring staves, but the further composition progressed the more chaotic and less specific Bruckner’s use of staves became, rapidly reducing to the four choral staves (marked “1/ 2/ 1/ 2”) with occasional specifications of instruments, as on fol. 3<sup>r</sup>.

While it appears in the sks. for both *Helgoland* and *Das Deutsche Lied* that Bruckner first intended to write some form of ‘draft score’ for each piece, the compositional problems he encountered prevented him from achieving anything like this; the actual laying out in score, with the intention of subsequently orchestrating the musical continuity (phase i, above) only took place in what became the AP.<sup>47</sup> Accordingly, it is obviously more justifiable to classify such drafts as ‘particello sketches’ rather than ‘draft scores’; the distinctions between what Röthig,<sup>48</sup> in the drafts for the Eighth Symphony, categorised as “Primär-Skizze” and “Partiturskizze” (implying a more highly elaborated ‘orchestral’ pc. sk.) are essentially fluid. While some pc. sks. can be regarded as characteristic for particular types such as, according to Röthig,<sup>49</sup> “Primär-Skizze”, “Kompositions-Skizze”, “Verlaufsentwurf”, or using Sonntag’s

---

<sup>45</sup> A 177 of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde Archive in Vienna; documented in ÖNB PhA2253. The relation of *Das Deutsche Lied* to the Ninth is noted in §§1.1.2 and in 3.1.8 *infra*.

<sup>46</sup> Sincere thanks goes to Cohrs for his thorough evaluation of measure distribution and paper types in the AP of the first three movement of the Ninth (ÖNB 19.481), undertaken at the request of the present writer in November 1995; his research was incorporated into the Kritischer Bericht on the first three movements (in press). As the final bifol. of IX/1 is a “24.”, presumably Bruckner ruled up and numbered these bifols. before realising he would not need a bifol. 25; why “24.” was also regarded as supernumerary is unclear. The AP of IX/1 reveals, however, that fol. 2 of bifol. 24 was excised and replaced with a fol. of the same large trade-mark “J. E. No. 8” paper. Conceivably Bruckner, in altering the initial ending of the movement, numbered the extra bifols. 24 and 25 before realising he would need only to replace the second fol. of bifol. 24.

<sup>47</sup> Of great interest in this respect would be to compare the pc. sks. and discarded score bifols. for Psalm 150, all of which are lost.

<sup>48</sup> p. 229.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.* Her further term, “Partiturskizze”, is questionable for precisely the reasons given here; her description of compositional procedure (*infra*) can otherwise be largely endorsed.



differentiations,<sup>50</sup> “conceptualization sketches”, “continuity sketches”, “revision sketches” and “drafts”,<sup>51</sup> these terms possess little or no relevance as separate work phases. The only comprehensive distinction within Bruckner’s late compositional process remains that between *particello* and score. A more detailed description of Bruckner’s working methods within the confines of this essentially two-stage procedure follows.

The first and in many respects preliminary notation of the continuity of the music, including its accompanying grid of metrical numbers, was made in the form of a *particello* or short score—conceptually distinct, it should be emphasised, from a ‘piano score’. Bruckner usually bracketed together at least 2, at the most 10 or even 12,<sup>52</sup> but usually between 3 and 5 staves as a notational ‘canvas’ upon which to explore his ideas. Initial *sk.* for the Ninth use only 3 staves (cf. the Finale MSS, C/3ff.);<sup>53</sup> 4 staves, usually provided with two treble and two bass clefs, appears to represent the standard configuration for more fully elaborated *sk.* (C/6, 13, 21, 31ff.). Initial notations, which tend to be exploratory in nature, were usually undertaken in pencil, ink reserved for later, more definitive drafts, in which further pencil emendations can often be found. The pencil/ink distinction represented by the initial ÖNB 3194 vs. later 6086 *sk.* for the Finale can be found again in the *pc. sk.* for the first version of the Trio of the Ninth (in F major), ÖNB 28.225 (an initial pencil *sk.*) and 3165 (a later ‘clean’ copy in ink).

The actual nature of the initial stages of the compositional process revealed by the early *sk.* for a work is highly significant for Bruckner’s compositional technique generally. As we have seen (§1.1.2), Bruckner arrived at a general notion of the thematic material for all four movements of the Ninth at an early stage in its composition; he had probably conceived at least the general mood, key and character of the Ninth long before completing the Eighth. As work on the first version of the Eighth continued up until 10 August 1887,<sup>54</sup> while the first extant *sk.* for the Ninth (Cracow, IX, fol. 1<sup>r</sup>) is dated 12 August, Bruckner wasted little time waiting on inspiration, but pushed forward eagerly to explore the new sound world opening up for him. In this new conception, as we have seen,<sup>55</sup> the mystical aura of D minor, the intended dedication of the work (“dem lieben Gott”), its conception, in Kluger’s words, as a

---

<sup>50</sup> See for instance, “A New Perspective...”, p. 78.

<sup>51</sup> In Sonntag’s reading, however, this latter, in regard to the first theme group of the first movement, curiously incorporates both *pc. sk.* and preliminary MS stages. In *The Compositional Process...*, pp. 18f., Sonntag’s distinction between “conceptualization” and “continuity” sketches is useful in highlighting the fact that the majority of the former were used in the composition of the Exp. of the first movement, the latter mainly in the *Durchf.* and *Repr.*

<sup>52</sup> As can be observed in the two cases noted above, the *sk.* for *Helgoland* and *Das Deutsche Lied*; these represent exceptions to Bruckner’s standard practice.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Röthig, p. 258.

<sup>54</sup> As noted in §1.1.1.; see Table II.

<sup>55</sup> §§1.0.3, 1.1.1, 2.2.4.

“Huldigung vor der göttlichen Majestät” (§1.1.9), the connection with the *Te Deum* and the relationship of the work to the all-important model of Beethoven’s Ninth, all played key roles. One of the most striking aspects of the initial sk. of 12 August 1887, partly reproduced in a transcription by Nowak on C/361,<sup>56</sup> is that it appears to contain elements *in nuce* of not only the first movement but also the Finale: cf. the tied-over minims and ensuing descending arpeggiation in mm. 9–15, culminating in mm. 13–15, which strikingly anticipate the characteristic ‘zigzag’ double-dotted motive of the fourth movement, and perhaps even allude to the *Schreckensfanfare* of the finale of Beethoven’s Ninth (cf. Ex. 2d v, discussion §3.1.8 *infra*).

Although Bruckner had apparently arrived at a general conception of the themes of all four movements by early 1891, those themes were first given definitive notation, metrically organised, developed and reworked only as it came time to work on each movement or even section. A preliminary sketch stage similar to that found in Beethoven’s sketchbooks, in which apparently insignificant motives or melodic rhythmic fragments first attain musically significant form over many months or years alongside sks. and drafts for other compositions, is largely absent from the late Bruckner MSS.<sup>57</sup> Even when themes are extensively altered or the continuity of a section is radically recomposed, a definite thematic, not merely motivic, kernel, a kind of improvised continuity, appears to exist from the beginning.<sup>58</sup> In Bruckner’s compositional process, according to Röthig:

[...] besteht die Aufzeichnung der Skk [i.e., Skizzen] selten aus Bruchstücken oder Ansätzen, d. h. aus momentanen Inspirationen, die ihm eventuell während eines Spaziergangs gekommen sein könnten. Infolgedessen hätte sie Bruckner sicherlich verstreut auf diversen Bl [Blättern] oder Seiten festgehalten, um sie erst in einer weiteren Niederschrift zusammenzustellen. Seine Arbeitsweise dagegen dokumentiert eine fortlaufende Fixierung des primitiven Ganzen. Generell gesehen ging Bruckner bei Gestaltung der

<sup>56</sup> The sk. was originally notated by Bruckner in pc. format on 24-stave paper ruled up for the orchestral score of the Eighth; it must have been transcribed by Nowak, as his date (not Bruckner’s) in the r. h. margin indicates, on 4 May 1987 (F60 BRGA 68). Despite the numbering “1/2” (top centre), the C/361 transcription reproduces the first c. 17 mm. of the sk. on fol. 1<sup>1</sup>; the remainder was transcribed by Nowak on a second page marked “1/1”; it is not clear why Nowak reversed the reference numbers. Nowak’s transcription was used as the original is hard to decipher from the available copies; a new transcription of all the Cracow material is planned for the GA Studienband on IX/1. Cf. Sonntag’s description of this sketch and the emergence of the Exp. of IX/1, *The Compositional Process...*, pp. 44ff., and her transcription, p. 418.

<sup>57</sup> Röthig (p. 283), on the relationship Bruckner’s creative process bears to that of “intuitive” composers (e.g. Mozart) versus “konstruktive” (e.g. Beethoven), writes: “Bruckner [...] sollte weder definitiv der Gruppe der ‘intuitiven’ noch der ‘konstruktiven’ Komponisten zugeordnet werden. Sein Aufzeichnungen stehen vielmehr auf der Grenze beider Möglichkeiten.” Cf. the present writer’s “Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners...”, p. 164.

<sup>58</sup> For IX/1 this must be regarded as the irruption of Eb (mm. 19ff.) already found in the 12 August 1887 sk. In the case of the Adagio the thematic evolution of the first theme can be traced back to an original organ sk. of 20 May 1890, as discussed in §1.1.2. Orel’s earliest sources for both first movement and Adagio (cf. *Entwürfe und Skizzen*, pp. 8ff. and 52ff.) were already substantially later and in the case of the Adagio more fragmentary than the original material.

Themen von einem Komplex aus, der ihm klar vor Augen lag und nicht erst aus primitiven Anfängen entwickelt werden mußte.<sup>59</sup>

For this reason, few sks. for individual themes can be found in the preliminary materials for the late works.<sup>60</sup> Sonntag, who regarded the extant sources for IX/1 as virtually complete,<sup>61</sup> noted that Bruckner resorted to sks. for individual themes (what she calls “conceptualization sketches”) of only the Exp.,<sup>62</sup> but these also mark the beginning of the main sections of the “1. Theil” of the movement, which Bruckner already knew would have three theme groups. Whether these represent separate ‘thematic sks.’ or merely the compositional coalescence of each emergent theme group is hence a semantic question.

In summary, the emergence of the first, third and fourth movements of the Ninth Symphony appears to have been a relatively protracted process, with significant divergences and many interim phases between initial notation and finished score. On the other hand, the Scherzo<sup>63</sup> and all three versions of the Trio of the Ninth, and the choral works *Helgoland* and *Das Deutsche Lied*,<sup>64</sup> all appear to have emerged to varying degrees in more rapid, fluent compositional processes, in which definitive continuity could to a considerable extent be established within the initial sk. phase.

As the earliest sks. for the Finale reveal (ÖNB 3194, C/3ff.<sup>65</sup>), Bruckner’s primary aim in the initial stage was to establish the essential continuity of the music. Constant observations of metrical structure accompany the music’s emergence from the earliest sks. onwards (C/3ff.), which often consist of no more than two parts or even a single line, suggesting free explorations of the material, a kind of written improvisation. Bruckner usually has no need for all the staves he brackets together: the ‘free’ staves create space for metrical numbers and other annotations and allow for corrections to the one or two systems in ‘active’ use. As discussed in §2.1.1, we find countless indications of the theoretical underpinnings of the compositional process. There are frequent corrections to, or even initial indications of, notes or chords by means of letters placed above or below the staff (letter notation or ‘Tonbuchstaben’), designations of harmony by letter-name<sup>66</sup> or key,<sup>67</sup> of figured bass,<sup>68</sup> of

<sup>59</sup> p. 284.

<sup>60</sup> An exception may be the early sk. for a chorale-like passage dated 27 Dec. 1893 (C/323) and marked “H[au]p[t]th[ema]”; at an earlier stage (March 1893) before the movement had found its definitive form, Bruckner referred to the Adagio as having “sechs Hauptthemen”; cf. §1.1.2.

<sup>61</sup> *The Compositional Process...*, p. 300.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 18f.

<sup>63</sup> For which very few sks. are extant—cf. Table VI—only an apparently initial early sk. for the opening chord and rhythm of the movement (ÖNB 28.224) and the extended draft of the Exp. of the movement, ÖNB 3196.

<sup>64</sup> See J. A. Phillips, “Die Arbeitsweise...”, p. 140, fn. 41. Concerning *Helgoland* see also Wolfgang Grandjean, “Anton Bruckners ‘Helgoland’ und das Symphonische”, *Mf* 48, no. 4 (1995), pp. 349–368.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. C/3, top l. h. margin: “I. Anf.[ang]”.

<sup>66</sup> C/3, br. 4 “as d” [As dur].

musical processes (such as “Umkehr[ung]”<sup>69</sup>) and formal rubrics (such as “vor Choral” or “E d[ur] Choral”,<sup>70</sup> “2. Theil”<sup>71</sup> or “Gesangsp[erioden]”<sup>72</sup>). The numerous non-autograph annotations found in the Finale MSS appear to derive largely from Max Auer and probably date back, at least in the case of the Schalk MSS (6085–7), to his inspection of them in 1911;<sup>73</sup> there is no evidence that either of the Schalk brothers carried out the examination of the MSS with which Joseph Schalk was entrusted in 1896. Instrumental specifications and indications of tempo or dynamics are more frequently encountered in later, more advanced sks., such as the 6086 group.<sup>74</sup> Bruckner often dated his pc. sks., as he did his scores, but usually not sufficiently often to facilitate a chronological ordering of specific passages on this basis alone.<sup>75</sup> Chronology is further complicated by Bruckner’s reworking of material on top of earlier sks. and his use for later drafts of spare pp. or staves amidst older material.<sup>76</sup>

It appears that Bruckner wished to obtain at least a general overview over the movement in pc. form before proceeding to its elaboration and instrumentation in score: this may apply to the composition of *Helgoland*, *Das Deutsche Lied* and the Scherzo, Trio and (to a lesser extent) the Adagio of the Ninth.<sup>77</sup> The first and last movements of the Ninth appear to represent exceptions, and this may have to do with the fact that Bruckner was apparently less confident about the formal structure of either huge movement at an early stage, while the Scherzo and even the Adagio represented conceptually simpler structures. Bruckner appears to have begun scoring the Exp. of IX/1 even before the thematic material for the Schlußp. was definitively fixed,<sup>78</sup> while pc. sks. for the Durchf. and Repr. were only undertaken much later,

<sup>67</sup> C/5, br. 4 “Es d[ur]”.

<sup>68</sup> C/21, brackets 2 and 5.

<sup>69</sup> C/4, or “Umkehr[ung]”, C/22.

<sup>70</sup> C/10.

<sup>71</sup> C/16, 18, 19 and 20.

<sup>72</sup> C/24.

<sup>73</sup> These are usually in blue or red pencil, and often not limited to marginal observations, but underlinings of significant words of Bruckner or exclamations marks placed alongside them, or in the musical text, as on C/6, 1st br. “! !”, and (l. margin) “VItte!”, C/8, where the underlining and exclamation mark of “Choral” is from Auer, and C/9, top l. margin, “Datum 8. Juni!” Many of Auer’s annotations, such as those on C/21, have his name appended in brackets.

<sup>74</sup> See for instance Facs. C/31, 1st br. (= bracket): “Pauke”, “Violin”, “Br[atsche]”, “Kl[arinette]”; C/34, 4th br., l. margin: “pp”.

<sup>75</sup> The one date to be found in the initial pc. sks., “8. Juni” (1895), on C/9, has already been discussed in §1.1.10.

<sup>76</sup> This appears for instance to be the case with fols. 3<sup>r</sup> and 7<sup>r</sup> of the ÖNB 3194 sks. (C/6 and 13 respectively), where Bruckner appears to have given more significant form—note use of ink and ‘formal’ 4-stave *particello*—to an idea probably first developed on fol. 7<sup>v</sup> (C/14), possibly as the initial idea for the transition to the chorale theme. Cf. Orel’s explanations, D/71f.

<sup>77</sup> As yet, however, insufficient information is known; no such preliminary reintegration of the important Cracow sources with the Vienna sources for this movement has yet been undertaken, so that it is not yet clear how far into the movement Bruckner worked before beginning the score.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. the dates given in Table II, A/5.

in August 1891, following the notation of the entire Exp. in score.<sup>79</sup> In the case of the Finale, while sections of the early ÖNB 3194 and 6086 sks. already correspond closely to the eventual continuity of the Exp. chorale,<sup>80</sup> and to a lesser extent the opening<sup>81</sup> and Gesangsp.<sup>82</sup> of the movement, the initial continuity of the principal material and the course of the Durchf. and Repr. is radically different from that of its ultimate configuration.<sup>83</sup> As in the first movement, the overview provided by the initial sks. of 3194 and 6086 was sufficient to allow Bruckner to embark on the composition of the Exp. in score, although again, as in IX/1, he made many revisions to the Exp. and “2. Theil” both in score and in pc. sk. as composition proceeded.

In the next phase of the process, the continuity drafted in *particello* was transferred, with or without interim revisions, to bifols., each page of which was usually ruled up as orchestral score with instrumental indications and ruled barlines.<sup>84</sup> Each bifol. as it came to be used was numbered by the composer in the upper r. h. corner of the 1st p.; the bifols. were not interleaved in convolutes, but used consecutively, so that all 4 pp. of one bifol. were notated before Bruckner moved to the next. The notational sequence of the score followed the order typical for orchestral composition since the Viennese classical composers: first strings (usually the 1st vln. first, then the bass line, then middle parts) and wherever significant the leading wind parts; the remaining “Füllstimmen” were usually completed at a later stage. Hawkshaw's observations<sup>85</sup> on the datings of Bruckner's earlier D-minor symphony notes separate specifications by Bruckner for the conclusion of “Scitze”, “Streichinstr.[umente]” and “Streichmusik” prior to the dates given for the overall conclusion of the score. Nowak<sup>86</sup> notes a similar compositional order having been observed by Bruckner in the case of the Third Symphony, and it is not unreasonable to assume that this compositional order remained standard throughout Bruckner's compositional career.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Cf. A/7.

<sup>80</sup> See C/10f., 15.

<sup>81</sup> C/3f., 31f.

<sup>82</sup> C/33f.

<sup>83</sup> The 20 stave-bifols. 3194/13–16, and Durchf. sks. 28.238 and 28.229 were probably composed after 6086 and after Bruckner had laid out the Exp. and Durchf. in its initial score phase. This explains why the 6086 material and fols. 9–10 of the 3194 signature (cf. C/16–18, 35–36), map out initial continuities for the “2. Theil” of the movement in a similar fashion without making reference to the fugue—see §3.1.6 *infra*.

<sup>84</sup> The details of this procedure in the case of the Finale will be discussed separately in §3.1.4 *infra*.

<sup>85</sup> “The Date of Bruckner's ‘Nullified’ Symphony in D minor”, p. 254.

<sup>86</sup> “Vorwort” to *Anton Bruckner: Sämtliche Werke, Band III/1*.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Fritz Oeser (*Die Klangstruktur der Bruckner-Symphonie: Eine Studie zur Originalfassung*, Leipzig 1939, p. 59): “Wie die Skizzen zeigen, konzipiert Bruckner seine Werke anscheinend durchaus als ‘Streichmusik’, indem die eigentliche Skizze zwar nur das abstrakte Gerüst festhält, aber die Partituranlage tatsächlich die Streicherpartien zuerst ausgeführt zeigt.” Similarly Röthig (p. 349): “Erst nach Abschluß des abstrakten Streichergerüsts legte Bruckner die ‘endgültige’ Partitur an. Die frühesten Entwürfe, in denen immer wieder Synonymitäten, ja sogar klangliche Identität mit dem Streicherkorpus festzustellen ist, waren Basis für das anschließende formale Gefüge, das Bruckner oft nur mit mechanischem Mittel erreichte.”

It would appear from this that Bruckner habitually first turned to the systematic completion of the orchestration after the whole movement was completed at the initial score stage, although there are certainly many passages in both the material for the first movement as well as the Finale where Bruckner proceeded with the orchestration at an earlier stage.<sup>88</sup> Following completion of the orchestral texture (inclusive, for instance, of whole-m. rests), the compositional process concluded with the specification of tempi, articulation and dynamic markings.<sup>89</sup> Clear indices as to the entire compositional sequence can be found in the autograph datings of the AP of *Helgoland*, ÖNB 19.485, at the end of which (fol. 26<sup>v</sup>) can be found “Scitze<sup>90</sup> 27.4.893/ Chor<sup>91</sup> 24.5.893/ Streicher 18.6.893/ Holz 7.7.893/ Blech 23.7.893/ Wien 7. Aug. 1893”, the last date apparently marking the conclusion of final additions to tempo dynamics and articulation, along with final alterations, inspections and adjustments. Further confirmation can be found throughout the MSS and other documents of the period in question, for instance Bruckner’s letter to Levi of 10 February 1891: “Vom Besehl (1. Sinfonie) habe ich nur noch 3 Bogen Vortragszeichen zu machen, dann geht’s an die neunte (D-moll), wozu ich bereits die meisten Themen notiert habe”,<sup>92</sup> or the account of Bruckner’s last lecture of 5 November 1894: “Drei Sätze meiner IX. Symphonie sind schon fertig, die beiden ersten schon vollständig, nur im 3. Satze muß ich noch etwas nuancieren.”<sup>93</sup>

Of particular significance for the later compositional phase, the completion of the orchestration, is the tremendous number of examinations, and presumably from time to time alterations, of voice-leading undertaken by Bruckner. These are evidenced, as we have seen (§2.1.1) by (a) the innumerable ‘Kustoden’, or voice-leading directives, used by Bruckner (cf. for instance the r. margins of Facs. C/140, 191, 194, 285) and (b) the many examinations of voice-leading to be found concerning the elaborate contrapuntal texture of the last surviving bifol., C/317ff.—final testimony to the profound penetration of theoretical considerations into Bruckner’s compositional procedure.

An examination of the varying degrees of compositional completion found in the score bifols. of the Finale indicate that Bruckner entered material into score beginning most often with the 1st vln. line, usually in tandem with, or followed immediately by, the metrical

---

<sup>88</sup> Most of the C-ruling versions of bifols. 1 and 2, for instance, were completed in score at an early stage, although subsequently discarded and replaced. Cf. C/63ff., 107ff.

<sup>89</sup> Although a very few such indications, particularly significant alterations of tempo, can occasionally be found in the initial score phase Cf. C/259: “Sehr langs[am]”; C/261: “bedeu-/ tend langsamer”. Cf. Röthig (pp. 349f.): “Eine untergeordnete Stellung nahmen im frühesten Stadium Tempo, Dynamik und Ausdrucksgestaltung ein. Von wenigen Ausnahmen abgesehen setzte Bruckner diese Faktoren im Anschluß an Themenaufbau und Fortspinnung ein, so daß sie zu jenen Äußerlichkeiten zählen, die oft erst bei [der] Partiturfassung behandelt werden.”

<sup>90</sup> This implies pc. sk.

<sup>91</sup> The choral parts were usually completed before the strings in a choral work.

<sup>92</sup> Göll.- A. IV/3, pp. 137, 456.

<sup>93</sup> Schwanzara, p. 97.

numbers (e.g. C/185ff.<sup>94</sup>). Bruckner often used the wind staves for explorations of the strings or other parts in pencil, which would subsequently be erased as instrumentation proceeded (e.g. C/144, 206ff., 264 etc.<sup>95</sup>) or which conversely point in the direction of a subsequent version (C/249ff.—cf. 253ff.<sup>96</sup>). Wind parts were notated first when the strings were not playing (C/164, 172) or where musically more significant (C/217ff.). Exploratory pencil notation often preceded definitive entry of material in ink (C/189ff.); frequent erasures reveal the struggle with failing handwriting noted by Heller (§1.1.9), observable, for instance, where even insufficiently neat whole-measure rests had to be erased and rewritten (C/178f.).

Particularly characteristic of the later Finale MSS is the phenomenon of the 'Satzverlaufsentwürfe' or SVE: annotations, normally in ink, in only one or two lines of a bifol. already prepared in score format, which would prove unsatisfactory and have to be discarded. Their repeated use for passages which could readily have been revised in pc. format appears to represent rather extravagant use of Meißner's prepared material; perhaps, however, it was necessary to use this material for drafts if all the available music paper had already been ruled for score. Only three such bifols. can be found among the early rulings (6A, 8A and 1<sup>a</sup>C); a number of D-ruling SVE for the first two bifols. appear to re-examine the metrical structure of the movement's opening. The vast majority are late E-ruling versions of bifols. 1, 2, "13" and "14", i.e., the beginning of the movement and of the Durchf. They perhaps reflect the composer's remaining areas of concern with the movement's musical continuity at this stage; many are impossible to satisfactorily transcribe, however, and reveal no significant compositional advance over already scored material. While what appears to be a two-bifol. expansion "13a"E and (apparently) "13b"E (C/217ff.), dated "12. Aug. neu" (1896), probably does represent a compelling and lucid revision of a pre-existing (though lost) bifol. [12/"13"], most of the remaining late SVE can perhaps best be described as 'apocryptic' and ascribed to the final phase of Bruckner's mental decline.

Setting aside these testimonies to Bruckner's final struggle against declining powers, the Finale MSS reveal the same process of excision and replacement of individual bifols. as one finds in the materials for the other movements of the Ninth, particularly the first movement,<sup>97</sup> with the result that some bifols. remained the same from the earliest stages while others were

<sup>94</sup> This bifol., 8A was subsequently re-used by Bruckner for a continuity draft in pencil for bifol. 13—cf. Bruckner's correction of the original bifoliation, C/185.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Orel D/5f.; Sonntag, pp. 34ff.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. for instance the early 5A, C/159ff., with its initial notation in ink of the 1st vln. line, followed by many exploratory revisions in pencil of the sequence on p. 2, C/159. The revised version of the passage appears on bifol. 5B, C/163ff.

<sup>97</sup> As confirmed by Sonntag, p. 18 and *passim*. Sonntag is, however, incorrect in her assumption (p. 35) that because pasteovers and marginalia occur in the MSS of the first three movements of the Ninth, it must therefore have been intended to be recopied: virtually none of Bruckner's MSS constitute the sort of fair copy Sonntag implies.

replaced or had further bifols. or single fols. inserted between them. In the Finale virtually identical bifols. can be found: 4A and 4C for instance, the latter merely recopied for the sake of neatness, while those bifols. completed with full instrumentation, such as those containing the chorale in the Exp., have the word “fertig” written at the right foot of the last p.<sup>98</sup> Probably the entire Exp. and the first part of the Durchf. was completed in this fully worked out and already definitive form. The clear musical handwriting of even the last bifols. of the score (as Langevin observed<sup>99</sup>) also suggest that the continuity of the movement would appear to have been established well before the time of Bruckner’s death, and advanced into the coda, not merely as far as the end of the Repr.: the later revisions drafted by Bruckner in his final months, the alterations to the continuity of the opening of the movement or of the beginning of the Durchf., had negligible impact upon the movement’s formal conception, most, if not all of which was laid out in score by June 1896. To speak of the well advanced orchestral score of the Finale as merely ‘drafts’ or sketches’ is hence to misrepresent the nature of the surviving fragments, which to all intents and purposes constituted a highly developed and definitive structure—an ‘emergent autograph’. The following quotation is significant:

Das Autograph war von vornherein als Reinschrift-Partitur gedacht [...]. Es handelt sich hier [...] nicht um Entwürfe im Sinne provisorischer Niederschriften, sondern um die [...] Fixierung des endgültigen Textes in Form eines Particells sowie in einer musikalisch und strukturell ausgereiften Primärstufe, d. h. um den eigentlichen Vorgang des Komponierens. Die Sekundärstufe, also die Fertigstellung der Partitur, bestand demgegenüber in der Ausfüllung und Entfaltung, letztlich somit der Ergänzung des zuvor angelegten Materials.<sup>100</sup>

This description was made by Christoph Wolff of the AP of Mozart’s Requiem. It applies—with the exception of three elided passages referring to aspects of Mozart’s authorship and the vocal composition—with no less validity to the unfinished score of the Bruckner movement. The only differences are (a) the lost bifols. revealed by an examination of the Finale, and (b) the existence of more discarded bifols. for this than other movements, a fact which, far from connoting an insufficiently mature structural conception, underlines the high degree of compositional development the movement had achieved by the time of Bruckner’s death.

#### **3.1.4 The condition and legibility of the MSS.**

Concerning the modern-day condition of the MSS for the Ninth, their general state of preservation can only be described as fair. Unlike many older treasures of Vienna’s musical

<sup>98</sup> Cf. C/180, 192, 196, 200. Bifols. 4A and 6<sup>c</sup>B were also designated as “fertig” (cf. C/150 and 176), although the whole-m. rests were not completed on either. 4A was subsequently recopied as 4C/“5”; 6<sup>c</sup>B was probably also (a 6C/“7” does not survive). Like so much else, Bruckner’s significant marginalia here were not considered worthy of transcription by Orel or Nowak.

<sup>99</sup> See §1.4.10.

<sup>100</sup> Christoph Wolf, *Mozarts Requiem*, Munich–Kassel 1991, p. 89.



heritage, the paper used throughout Austria over this period was wood-pulp rather than cloth-pulp based and has not stood the test of time nearly as well as many older, more robust papers. It can also not be overlooked that the relative state of preservation of the signatures held in the ÖNB is noticeably better than that of identical paper types held by the StB. Günter Brosche, Direktor of the Musiksammlung of the ÖNB, has observed:

Sowohl das schlechte Papier, das Bruckner verwendete, als auch die Tinte und der Leim der zahlreichen Überklebungen erfordern fast andauernd restauratorische Maßnahmen. Das Holzschiffpapier bräunt auch bei nur geringer Lichteinwirkung, bricht und zerfällt im Extremfall in kleine Stücke. Das die Tinte in der Regel eine durchgreifende chemische Behandlung nicht verträgt, muß immer wieder durch mechanische Restauriermaßnahmen, wie Papierverfaserung im Bereich der Bruchstellen, der ärgste Verfall verhindert werden.<sup>101</sup>

While Bruckner's working methods, particularly in the initial *sks.*, make it difficult to arrive at clear and incontrovertible results in transcribing all but his 'official' MSS, the ink remains relatively clear, although the paper of many MSS has darkened considerably with age. The pencil *sks.* are the least legible; in particular those of ÖNB 3194/14, or ÖNB 28.229, as can be gauged from the facsimiles (C/23f., 39), have almost completely faded into the paper and can only be deciphered with difficulty. Of the score bifols., by far the most poorly preserved is the tattered ÖNB 24.264 (C/53ff.), presumably as a result of its adventurous transmission (as already noted, §1.2.6). The publication of the Faksimile-Ausgabe, in itself a measure aimed at conservation, at least now makes the contents of these MSS accessible to scholars, reducing the need to disturb the material itself.<sup>102</sup>

As can be gauged from a brief glance through the facsimiles, the initial *pc. sks.* (C/3ff.) were private documents not intended for eyes other than the composer's own. Their often chaotic appearance hints at the enormous effort and labour that Bruckner expended on the formulation of his ideas. The often exceptionally hard-worked paper of the later *pc. sks.* (C/31ff.) and the more substantially elaborated score bifols., on the other hand, with their innumerable erasures, written-over notes, rests and stave lines, and in several instances glued-on patches (cf. C/190–194, 204 and 255), provides dramatic evidence of the extent to which Bruckner altered and revised in the process of refining and elaborating his musical conception. An India-rubber eraser (at times dirty or greasy—cf. C/259) was used for large- and small-scale pencil erasures ('Radierung'), sometimes of whole pages, where Bruckner not

<sup>101</sup> "Die Österreichische Nationalbibliothek als Nachlaßverwalterin", in: *BrSympBer 1994. Bruckner-Freunde, Bruckner-Kenner*, Linz 1997, p. 109.

<sup>102</sup> In a paper given at the Bruckner-Tagung in Gmunden in October 2001, Günter Brosche referred to the problematic condition of the autograph scores, "die in absehbarer Zeit—es kann sich wohl nur noch um ein paar Jahrzehnte handeln—vom Zerfall bedroht sind. Die komplette Gesamtausgabe in Faksimile-Fassung wäre eine gute, aber eben auch sehr teure Lösung" (Rainer Boss, "Bruckner-Tagung Gmunden 4. bis 7. Oktober 2001", *IBG-Mitt* 57, Dec. 2001, p. 22).

infrequently used the wind systems to draft the details of the string score, and would have to erase these prior to completing the wind scoring. Unwanted notations in ink were scraped from the paper using a knife ('Rasierung'); on one occasion an erasure left a hole through the page (C/259, 2nd vln. stave, 1st m.; cf. corresponding position overleaf). As Nowak observes of the composer's handwriting and rigorous compositional procedure:

Die einfachen, manchmal derb zu nennenden Schriftzüge des heranreifenden Meisters wandeln sich in den Jahren zu einem schließlich immer noch genauen, in der zarten Linienführung aber durchaus vergeistigten Schriftbild. Die dem Lehrerstande eigene Gewissenhaftigkeit begleitet Bruckner sein ganzes Leben, veranlaßt ihn, jedes Manuskript zu datieren, es auf das sorgfältigste auszuschreiben, zu dem Zweck zu radieren oder zu überkleben, wo es notwendig ist, nur damit der Sinn vollkommen eindeutig feststehe.<sup>103</sup>

The effort expended by Bruckner on the 'finished' pages of the Finale score constitutes unambiguous evidence that it was not intended as a draft but as a definitive autograph.

Mention should also be made of the often extreme tremulousness evident in Bruckner's writing in the Finale—a striking aspect of his late handwriting certainly related to his health, which varies greatly in degree right up until the final bifolds of the score, but which on 'bad days' would seem to have been so extreme as to have demanded great effort in putting pen accurately to paper, and was the cause of frequent slips. It is scarcely possible to underestimate the impact this handicap had on the amount of physical labour required—and the dogged tenacity Bruckner possessed to have continued in spite of it. Equally, it need not be inferred from the untidy appearance of some pages that the composer was struggling to formulate his thoughts, a fact that becomes clear when one compares the remarkable accuracy in regard to *what* Bruckner notated with the obvious struggle over the accurate vertical placement of notes: there is for instance, scarcely a bar in all 400 pp. of sks. and score in which the double-dotted rhythm is not accurately represented by the four required symbols of crotchet, two dots and semiquaver with two tails. While slips in the values of notes or rests do occur (e.g. C/197, cb. stave 2nd m.), by and large the notation is remarkably accurate and consistent. Franz Zamazal, himself a robust octogenarian, noted in a letter to the author:

Nach Auskunft eines Arztes muß eine zitterige Handschrift nicht unbedingt ein Zeichen für geistigen Verfall sein, denn in der zittrigen Schrift äußern sich mehrere Krankheiten. Ich glaube, daß viele Brucknerforscher unkritisch aus den Äußerlichkeiten der Partituren auf einen geistigen Verfall geschlossen haben. Im Alter wird man eben etwas langsamer und vielleicht auch umständlicher.<sup>104</sup>

<sup>103</sup> "Bruckners Werke in der Österreichische Nationalbibliothek", *ÖMz* 1 (1949), p. 271. Elsewhere Nowak observes concerning the variant forms in the autograph of Bruckner's Third Symphony that "Die eine Form wird durch jene aus dem Anfang der siebziger Jahre bekannten klobigen, fast derb zu nennenden Schriftzüge dargestellt, die andere offenbart sich in den feinzügigen, spitzen Formen, zu denen sich des Meisters Schrift gegen 1880 entwickelt" ("Das Autograph von Anton Bruckners III. Symphonie", *Ges. Aufs.*, p. 16).

<sup>104</sup> Letter dated Linz, 1 July 1994.

We will now look more closely at the sources for the Finale. The following three sections analyse and to an extent reconstruct a chronology for the paper types (§3.1.5), *particello* sks. (3.1.6) and paper rulings (3.1.7). They provide the philological groundwork for the reconstruction the movement's composition (3.1.8), and of the score itself as it may have appeared by the end of Bruckner's life, as far as surviving sources permit (3.1.10), preceded by an explanation of its editorial principles (3.1.9). We turn firstly to the paper types.

### 3.1.5 The paper types.

As we have seen (§1.1.1), Bruckner began sketching the Ninth Symphony only two days after the last dated revisions to the first version of his Eighth in August 1887. During the more than nine years until his death on 11 October 1896, as the surviving sources show, the composer notated in excess of 490 fols. of music for the Ninth, ranging from fragmentary *pc.* sks. to completed score. 211 fols. survive for the fourth movement alone—in other words almost half the total material for the symphony—and there is clear evidence that many further bifols. for this movement have been lost.

Omitting a number of subgroups, five main brands or trademarks of music paper can be observed in the sources for the Finale, as summarised in the following overview:<sup>105</sup>

Brand	Format	Systems	Size (mm.)	Signatures
"B. & H. Nr. 15. A."	oblong	16	266–70 x 355	ÖNB: 3194/1–12. <sup>106</sup>
"B. & H. Nr. 16. A."	oblong	20	271 x 353–5	ÖNB: 3194/13–16; 28.229; 28.238. <sup>107</sup>
"B. & H. Nr. 14. A."	upright	24	351–4 x 269	ÖNB: 6086/1–2; 24.264.
"JE & Co./No. 8./24 linig." <sup>108</sup>	upright	24	338–43 x 261–8	ÖNB: 6007; 6085/1–2, /5–36, /39–40, /49–82; 6086/3–4; 6087/1–44, /47–64, /67–72; 13.150. StB: 3791. Hochschule. HMdSW. Cracow.
"JE & Co./No. 8./24 lienig"	upright	24	346–7 x 263–7	ÖNB: 6085/3–4, /37–38, /41–48; 6087/45–46, /65–66; 19.645. StB: 4189/27–28.

<sup>105</sup> An exhaustive listing of all paper types used during the composition of the Ninth Symphony was originally attempted by Orel and more recently confirmed, with a number of corrections, by B. G. Cohrs; see his *Kritischer Bericht* on the first three movements of the Ninth, Vorwort, p. IX (2001; in press). Cf. also Sonntag, pp. 19ff. In May 2001 the author made an even more comprehensive examination of paper types used in all extant Bruckner sources from 1887 onwards in the ÖNB and StB; this research which will be incorporated into the publications on the Ninth in the GA.

<sup>106</sup> The Faksimile-Ausgabe (pp. XII, XVIII) has erroneously "ÖNB: 3194/1–8, /11–12"; fols. 9–10 were inadvertently included in the ensuing group "B. & H. Nr. 16. A.".

<sup>107</sup> 3194/16 was not notated, and therefore omitted from the Faksimile-Ausgabe listing. The largely non-autograph ÖNB 28.240 also falls into this category (see below).

<sup>108</sup> Inclusive of further groups of slightly varying brands and sizes as well as a bifol. without brand, ÖNB 6087/27–28).

This is intended to provide only a general outline; a more detailed breakdown is given in Table IX (A/32f., *q.v.*) which specifies the compositional material represented by each signature.<sup>109</sup> As explained below, the ordering given here and in Table IX does not entirely reproduce the order in which each paper type was used; for the sake of simplicity it defers to the groupings given by Orel, who classified the papers used for *pc. sks.* separately from those used for the score. The actual order in which Bruckner used materials presents a more complex picture, as he must have reverted to *pc.-sk.* format during composition of the score more frequently than Orel recognised. Essentially, the two oblong Breitkopf und Härtel papers were used solely for *pc. sks.*, the upright format for both *sk.* and score. The ink *pc. sk.* ÖNB 6086, the first bifol. of which is Breitkopf, the second Eberle, marks the point at which Bruckner first used “JE & Co./No. 8” paper in the Finale. The “B. & H. Nr. 16. A.” *sk.* sources, however, were probably notated well after Bruckner had begun using the “JE & Co./No. 8./24 linig.” paper for the orchestral score. Apart from a few further exceptions—ÖNB 6007 (2 fols.), 6085/35–46 (12 fols.), as well as the isolated Cracow *sk.* (C/49)—the other extant bifols. of the “JE & Co.” paper types were all ruled up and used in the composition of the score.

The details given above and in Table IX therefore require some explanation in order to harmonise them with Orel’s comprehensive “Übersicht über sämtliche, in der gegenständlichen Zeit verwendeten Papiersorten” (*q.v.*, D/3). The first two categories correspond with what Orel designates as “Sigel” (elsewhere “Papier”) “c”—“12 Blatt Skizzen zum Finale” (see D/4)—but Orel appears to have overlooked the presence among them of several fols. of 20-stave oblong-format paper, a paper type to which he allots the designation “Sigel d” in his table. The same paper had been used in sources for the Ninth in early 1889 for the initial *pc. sks.* for the Scherzo movement and the F-major Trio drafts, and last re-emerged (unbeknownst to Orel) in the isolated chorale *sk.* of December 1893 (C/323). The few surviving fols. of this paper used in the Finale—ÖNB 3194/13–16, the related *sks.* 28.229 and 28.238 and the largely non-autograph 28.240<sup>110</sup>—were the last oblong-format paper Bruckner used. They probably constituted a small remnant of bifols. left over from an earlier purchase. Bruckner probably bought only upright-format paper in his last years.

The third paper type, (correctly) “B. & H. Nr. 14. A.”,<sup>111</sup> is referred to by Orel as “Sigel F”, and comprises a single *sk.* bifol. for the Finale, “1 Bogen Skizze zum Finale der IX. Symphonie” (D/4). This is the first bifol. of the ink *pc. sk.* ÖNB 6086/1–2; Orel was not familiar with bifol. 1A, ÖNB 24.264, which is of the same paper type. “Sigel F” paper was

<sup>109</sup> The sources are listed in numerical order only within each group. This applies also to the listings of bifols. given in Table X.

<sup>110</sup> This bifol. was apparently used as a template for the C-ruling score paper—see §3.1.7 *infra*.

<sup>111</sup> Orel’s table, D/3, has erroneously “Br. & N. Nr. 14 A”.

used for much of the autograph score of the Eighth, several initial discarded bifols. of the score of IX/1, and the score of Psalm 150, as well as several replacement bifols. of the AP of *Helgoland*. The two bifols. used for the Finale, used just as Bruckner was completing the initial pc. sks. on oblong paper and embarking on the movement's scoring on upright paper, were hence probably a small remnant of the earlier supply of upright paper used principally for the score of IX/3.

The fourth paper type in Table IX, "JE & Co./No. 8./24 linig.", which also includes a bifol. without brand (ÖNB 6087/27–28), corresponds to Orel's "Sigel E", which he explains as bearing the trademark "„J. E. & Co. Nr. 8, 24linig“, 19 mm hoch, außerhalb des Zeilenspiegels" (D/3) and used for "1 Bogen Skizze und fast alle Partiturentwürfe zum Finale der IX. Symphonie" (D/4). The Sigel E paper was also used for almost all the pc. sks., the entire orchestral score of IX/3 and virtually all of Meißner's AS of IX/1, as well as for a large number of the C- and D-ruling bifols. for the Finale; so presumably, like the remaining two F-Sigel bifols., this may have been left over from a larger stock of score paper which Bruckner already had on hand. Alternatively, the identical trademark may have remained commercially available throughout the period 1894–95.

Type 5, "JE & Co./No. 8./24 lienig", corresponds to Orel's final "Sigel J", which he identifies as "Einige Bogen der 6. Fassung des Finales der IX. Symphonie" (D/4)—i.e., ruling F of the Finale bifols. This in fact does not constitute a separate ruling, but was probably used with, or in part before, the acquisition of paper type 6. An apparent typographic slip in Orel's designation of the paper type on D/3 miscites the variant spelling—"lienig"—as "linig".<sup>112</sup>

Finally, paper type 6, again a "JE & Co./No. 8./24 linig." brand, but this time with the trademark differently placed, namely partly alongside the stave area and only on the 1st, not the 1st and 3rd p., of each bifol., corresponds to Orel's Sigel H, described by him as "„J. E. & Co. Nr. 8, 24linig“, 19 mm hoch, teilweise neben dem Zeilenspiegel". Sigel H designates "Einige Bogen der 5. Fassung des Finales der IX. Symphonie"—in fact, the entire body of ruling E bifols. for the Finale score.

While paper types 1–4 used in the Finale appear to have been music paper which Bruckner either had on hand or, if freshly acquired, were identical with stocks acquired previously (like type 4, Sigel E), paper types 5 (Sigel J) and 6 (Sigel H) do not occur in any earlier works, and seem to have been papers only acquired by Bruckner between the later part of 1895 and early 1896, probably when his remaining stock of type 4 ran out. The outline of paper use presented here may have been complicated by other factors, such as the possibility that bought stock may already have contained bifols. with varying trademarks—although parallels between apparent acquisitions and their use seems consistent enough to suggest that

---

<sup>112</sup> Orel's differentiation of this paper type from the manifold varieties of "JE & Co./No. 8./24 linig" listed above it became meaningless as a result.

this was not the case. As we will see in examining the Finale score itself (§3.1.7), more detailed criteria may be obtained by analysis of the manner in which Bruckner's score paper was prepared. In summary, however, the sequence of paper types used presents a largely consistent model which can in most cases be logically reconciled with the apparent compositional sequence. As such it can be called upon as corroborative evidence where other factors relating to compositional sequence become vague.

### 3.1.6 The *particello* sketches.

As an extensive re-examination of all *sks.* and discarded score materials for the Finale would exceed available space, discussion here is limited to an elucidation of the nature and likely compositional sequence of this material; following a similar discussion of the score materials, §3.1.8 will attempt to integrate all the surviving material into a comprehensive narrative reconstructing the genesis of movement. The reader is referred in the first instance to the facsimiles of the *sks.* given in vol. II section C (C/3ff.), as well as to Orel's analysis of them (D/64ff.), which constitutes a useful starting point. As already noted, Table VIII (A/28ff.) provides a detailed concordance of the original sources with the 1934 edition.

The extant known *pc. sks.* for the Finale comprise the signatures ÖNB 3194 (23 written pp.), 6007 (4 pp.), 6086 (7 pp.), 28.238 and 28.229 (1 p. each), 9 pp. of *pc.-format sks.* from 6085, plus a single-p. *sk.* from the Cracow MSS for the Ninth and an isolated page-fragment, a voice-leading study, known from a private collection—in all 48 pp., which have been reproduced in facsimile on C/3–50. In addition to these there are several further *sks.* in discarded bifols. in both 6085 and 6087 (C/209 or 252, for instance) as well as the many SVE bifols. which also in effect count as 'sketches'. However, only the first 12 fols. of 3194 and the surviving 4, originally 6, bifols. of 6086 were actually written prior to the composition of the score itself. As suggested by the overlap in paper type between 6086 and the first bifol. of the score, 24.264 (see Table IX), the notation of 6086 may have overlapped with the beginnings of the notation of the score. The remaining *pc. sks.*, including fols. 13–15 of 3194, all appear to derive from a later stage of composition during which Bruckner was already engaged with the score.<sup>113</sup>

As we have seen, that composition of 6086 followed that of at least the first 12 fols. of 3194 is suggested initially by the use of pencil in 3194 and ink in 6086. Like the two drafts for the first F-major version of the Trio, Bruckner undertook an initial roughing-out of ideas which he then further elaborated in a more formal and definitive draft. As comparison of the opening pp. of Orel (D/64ff.) with the facsimiles C/3ff. and C/31ff. shows, however, Orel

---

<sup>113</sup> The likely extent of this overlap was not recognised until recently, up to which time Orel's separate presentation of almost all the *pc. sks.* before the score fragments had been accepted as connoting chronological sequence; cf. the description of the movement's composition given in the *Faksimile-Ausgabe*, pp. XVf. and Table IX (A/31f.), which, while not incorrect, might otherwise have been differently conceived.

effectively conflated these two major sets of sks.; his nos. 1–2 and 4–7 (D/64ff.) transcribed the initial 3194/1–12 material, 3 and 8 the 6086 material. The 3194/13–15 sks. were transcribed by Orel as the various parts of no. 13 (D/73ff.). ÖNB 28.238, doubtless contemporaneous with the later 3194 fols., appeared in Orel's Nachtrag J (D/143); most of the coda sks., for which Orel offered no interpretation, were reproduced in his no. 46 (D/127), while as Table VIII shows, a significant number of sources were either not known to Orel or not transcribed by him. In summary, Orel faithfully transcribed virtually all the signatures 3194, 28.238 and all but the last written p. of 6086 (C/37); he revealed no knowledge of, or ignored, 6007, what is now 28.229,<sup>114</sup> several remaining 6085 sks., the Cracow sk. (C/49) and the voice-leading sk. (C/50). Strikingly, his methodology in dealing with the sks. was precisely the opposite of that followed by him for the orchestral score, where he attempted to meticulously separate what he thought to be compositional layers. Perhaps the fact that some of the 3194 sks. preceded, and others followed, the notation of 6086, and that the entire 2nd bifol. of 6086 was missing, led him to attempt to present the movement's composition in this way as a more effective narrative (cf. text, D/64, 65f., 70f.).

Fols. 1–12 of the 3194 material, which represent the earliest extant notation of the Finale, are unquestionably the hardest to decipher, let alone effectively transcribe. They represent purely 'private' notations, exploratory pencil sks. for what was at that stage a still dimly glimpsed conception. Unlike other early collative bindings of sks. such as 3165, 3175 and 3176, which Nowak separated into individual bifols. or fols. in 1951, ÖNB 3194 was never taken apart, and the nature of the binding, which uses strips of paper glued down the internal margins and extending beyond the top and bottom edges of the pages, makes it impossible to confirm which fols. originally belonged to which.<sup>115</sup> The foliation of 3194 (recto pp., upper middle r. h. margin) is not autograph,<sup>116</sup> so that the fols. may not have been notated in the same order in which they were foliated or bound. An alphabetic bifoliation, also non-autograph, but probably by a different hand, can be seen in the lower r. h. corner of the recto of each odd-numbered fol. up to 13, then on 14 (instead of 15). With the exception of fol 2<sup>r</sup> this is in each case the page which carries the Breitkopf trademark. However, the sequence of these letters—"C" (C/3), "H" (C6; scarcely legible), "G" (C/9), "F" (C/13), "E" (C/16), "C" (C/20), "A" (C/21) and "B" (C/23)—contradicts the likely compositional sequence and presents a further puzzle; its origin and purpose are unknown. Fols. 1–2, where the trademark falls on fol. 2<sup>r</sup>, may either constitute a single bifol. reverse-folded before use (fol. 1<sup>r</sup> was doubtless notated first), or may represent fols. detached from two original bifols., the complementary fols. of which are lost. That possibility is corroborated by the fact that the 'Weiser' "+

<sup>114</sup> Which at that stage was still fol. 7 of S. m. 3175.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. the reproduction, C/3ff. Only the pp. used for notation have been reproduced, however.

<sup>116</sup> Similar foliations can be seen in some of the other signatures originally belonging to these bifols.; they may have been made by an early curator of the Hofbibliothek.

de” written over a continuation of the Gesangsp. on fol. 3<sup>v</sup> (C/7; cf. C/33, third bracket) has no extant “vi-” appropriate to it (as noted by Orel, D/67), and no other early sks. for the opening of the Gesangsp. appear in the 3194 material. Fols. 3–4, 5–6, 7–8, 9–10 and 11–12 on the other hand all appear to have originally constituted bifol. units, as confirmed by the location of the trademarks, compositional contents and the fact that the last pp. of two (4<sup>v</sup>, 8<sup>v</sup>) were not notated. Of fols. 11–12 only the 1st p. was used, confirming that this bifol. was probably the last of a series. Following this, Bruckner most likely proceeded to the notation of the ink sk. 6086. At least at one point Bruckner returned to the 3194/1–12 material, however, filling in fol. 3<sup>r</sup> with a more definitive version in ink of a passage first notated in pencil on 7<sup>r</sup> (cf. C/6, 13, 14; Orel D/71f., nos. 9, 10 and 12). One can only surmise that he did so because the passage did not find its way into the conception of the movement as laid out in 6086, nor indeed any later stage of the extant material, yet Bruckner remained sufficiently interested in it to develop it independently, and in this apparently definitive form.<sup>117</sup> The remaining 4 fols. of 3194 (fols. 13–16; 16 was not notated) all use type 2, 20-stave oblong-format paper and were, as we will see, probably notated later.

The 6086 draft, on the other hand, as can be seen from C/31ff., charts a continuity for the movement in ink with often heavy reworkings in both ink and pencil, some of which may have been added subsequently.<sup>118</sup> As confirmed by the original bifol. numberings on C/31 and 35, the 2nd of what were originally 3 upright-format, 24-stave bifols. is lost. Bifol. 1 contains over 100 mm.; the second missing bifol., as Orel pointed out (D/70), would probably have contained some further 100 mm. and comprised the Exp. chorale and beginnings of the “2. Theil” in its earliest incarnation, initially drafted as an inversion of the introductory motive of the Exp. (C/16–20, 35; D/69f., nos. 6–8).<sup>119</sup> The first 2 pp. of 6085/3 (40 mm.) continue at a point well into the “2. Theil” of the movement before breaking off with the Hauptth. in D minor (cf. C/18, “wie im 1. Theil aber d moll”; C/36; C/32, “im 2. Th[eil] d moll”).

ÖNB 6007, not transcribed by Orel, uses the same paper type 3 (“JE & Co./No. 8./24 linig.”) used for rulings A–D of the Finale score, suggesting that its was probably used subsequent to composition of the 6086 sk. Fol. 6007/1<sup>r</sup> (C/27) starts with a draft of the fugue beginning from the 2nd entry, which probably followed on directly from the ending of 6086, as did the subsequent 3194/13<sup>r</sup> sk. for the passage (C/21). The scarcely legible sk. on the verso (C/28) relates to the progression of falling diminished-seventh intervals leading into the Exp. Hauptth. in a later conception than that given in 6086, and paralleled in the earliest surviving score bifol. 2<sup>a</sup>C (C/109, D/88; cf. the continuity given by 6086, where the same passage still

<sup>117</sup> This is one of the reasons why it was included among the sks. for the coda. Cf. §3.1.10 *infra*.

<sup>118</sup> For instance, the ‘lyrical counterpoint’ which was first added in pencil in an originally free system of bracket 4 on C/33.

<sup>119</sup> The inverted motives first emerge in drafts for the Steigerung to the chorale theme (C/9); later, perhaps after the composition of 6086, this idea was developed in the independent sk. in ink on the hitherto vacant 3194/3<sup>r</sup>.



leads to the Hauptth. beginning on  $c^2$ ). The sk. on 6007/2<sup>r</sup> and <sup>v</sup> (C/29f.) presents the opening tritone progression of the movement in a rhythmically undifferentiated form in whole notes, probably an analytical rumination on the underlying harmonic sequence of the opening. The pedal point of the movement's opening here appears altered from A to G, a situation not reflected by bifol 1A, where the pedal point is still the A of the sks., but found in both subsequent, scored-out C-ruling versions of the opening (cf. C/63, 67). Despite its ordering in the facsimiles therefore, the notation of 6007 most likely postdates 6086 but predates the 3194/13 sks. and C-ruling bifol. versions of the movement's opening.

The other surviving 20-stave sks. were probably all notated around the same time as the upright 24-stave bifols. 6007 and 6085/35–36; the use of the same 20-stave paper for the non-autograph instrumental template 28.240 probably confirms that these sks. followed the first phase of composition of the score (cf. Table XI), which saw the movement proceed at least as far as the end of the Exp. (bifol. 11). The remaining fols. 13–15 of the 3194 sks. (C/21ff.; D/74f.), the sks. 28.238 (C/26) and 6085/35–36 (C/41ff.; both the latter were not transcribed by Ore) present fragmented but nonetheless construable drafts for the fugue, fugal epilogue and Repr. of the Gesangsp. which extend as far as the “Schluss / D m” on fol. 15<sup>r</sup> (C/25; implying “Schlußperiode”), and were probably Bruckner's last sks. prior to those of May 1896 for the coda. As fols. 13<sup>r</sup> and 14<sup>r</sup> carry trademarks while 15 and 16<sup>r</sup> do not, 13 and 16 may constitute, or have constituted, a bifol. enclosing 14–15; the bifoliation “A” and “B” visible on 13<sup>r</sup> and 14<sup>r</sup> (C/21 and 23) may confirm this. The references to the bifols. on which the beginning of the fugue and Repr. of the Gesangsp. fall in the score (“zu 17” on C/21, upper r. margin, “23” on C/24, l. margin) are autograph. While “zu 17” is in pencil on an otherwise largely ink sk. and might have been added later,<sup>120</sup> “23” and the “Gesangsp.” below it appear to have been written at the same time as the sk. itself.<sup>121</sup> As Bruckner could not have known the location of the passage in advance, it was most likely written when he came to that particular score bifol. The same applies to the pc. sk. 6085/35–36 (C/41ff.), “Forts.[etzung] zum 21. Bogen”, an earlier draft for the continuation of that bifol. (from the 3rd m. of C/290 onward), which introduces (on C/42) a crochet-triplet motive, but in a different manner to that subsequently realised in the score (C/294ff. AP E/98). Like the later 3194 sks. with which it is doubtless contemporaneous, the isolated bifol. 28.238 (C/26<sup>122</sup>) is also a sk. for the Gesangsp. Repr. The single fol. ÖNB 28.229 (C/39) gives a subsequently discarded variant for the introduction of the Te Deum motive leading it downwards into the bass, and featuring the E-minor–A $\flat$   $\frac{6}{3}$  progression found on 12C (cf. C/207); whether it pre- or postdated composition

<sup>120</sup> Cf. §3.1.8 *infra*. The 6007 and later 3194/13 sks. appear to follow on from 6086; they may have been drafted well in advance of the first score version of the fugue on 17C.

<sup>121</sup> I.e., the sk. on brackets 2–4 of that p. Bracket 1 is crossed through, along with a “4” in the top l. h. corner; cf. previous p. (C/23), “Fuge Forts:[etzung] / 3.”

<sup>122</sup> Note the trademark; the verso p. and 2nd fol. were not used by Bruckner.

of that bifol. is unclear, as both the corresponding passage of the 6086 sk and bifols. [13] and [14] of the score are lost. 28.229 may have been notated subsequent to the 3194 and 28.238 material, perhaps using what was by then one of the last remaining sheets of 20-stave paper, an upside-down verso.

The remaining sks. (C/40ff.) probably date from a later phase of the movement's composition. 6085/39<sup>f</sup>, a sk. for the Durchf. of the Te Deum motive (C/40), was notated on an upside-down bifol. of paper type 4. Like 28.229, it leads the Te Deum motive into the bass register; however, as the handwriting of 6085/39 resembles many of the declining composer's later struggles with notation (cf. for instance SVE "14"<sup>d</sup>E, C/239) the similarity may not imply that the two were composed contemporaneously.

The remaining 5 pp. of sks. from the 6085 signature, fols. 41–48 (C/44–48) were all written on 4 bifols. of paper type 5 ("JE & Co./No. 8./24 lienig"). As confirmed by their various datings, all appear to have originated around May 1896 and seem to pertain to the coda. A further sk., apparently from this late phase (C/49), found among the Cracow sources is notated on the verso of what may have been a last remaining fol. of paper type 4. Already mentioned in §2.1.5, it may pertain both to the expansion of the beginning of the Durchf. (first 3 brackets) and to the coda, as comparison with the 6085 coda sks. (cf. C/45ff.) suggests. The final surviving sk. (C/50) is a page fragment containing a voice-leading study which pertains to the instrumentation of bifol. "2"<sup>e</sup>.

### 3.1.7 The paper rulings.

The fact that Bruckner composed the score of the Finale as an emergent continuity, rather than as a series of fragments, is amply demonstrated by his use of sequentially numbered bifols. no less than the fact that most of the surviving bifols. begin and end in the middle of a period, as demonstrated by Bruckner's metrical numbers. This is not reconcilable with the notion that the currently extant bifols. of the score represent, by and large, all that Bruckner composed of the Finale. Had Bruckner 'guessed' the length of bifols. as he composed, skipping some to work on others, he would at least have begun bifols. with the first m. of a period or musical passage; we would also expect to see numerous crossed-out or skipped measures in the sources.<sup>123</sup> Closer examination of the material confirms the reports of Heller and Auer concerning a "Geiersturz" on the composer's estate and the negligence of Bruckner's executor, demonstrated by the wide distribution of the currently known sources and their convoluted transmission paths (ch. 1.2). Some groups of sources may have been given away by Bruckner himself to students or colleagues, for instance the four StB 4189 bifols.,<sup>124</sup> which

<sup>123</sup> Such a notion contradicts every evidence we have as to Bruckner's compositional methods. It should be added that it has never been seriously put forward by the proponents of the 'sketch' theory, who, it seems, prefer not to debate details.

<sup>124</sup> Namely 1<sup>b</sup>C, 2<sup>b</sup>C, 5B, 17<sup>a</sup>D.

were perhaps given by Bruckner to Cyrill Hynais at a stage when they had already been replaced by later versions and were therefore no longer of any importance. Bruckner may also have simply thrown away rejected bifols. or sks. from time to time: no discarded bifols. survive, for instance, for the Scherzo of the Ninth, and neither pc. sks. or discarded bifols. have ever been located for Psalm 150. The vast majority of missing bifols. for the Finale, however, including several last-phase bifols.,<sup>125</sup> were essential components of what was intended to be the definitive score of the movement. All indications point to the likelihood that these materials were either stolen from Bruckner's apartment shortly after his death or subsequently lost through the negligence of his executor. Given these factors, for us today to be in possession of everything that Bruckner composed for the movement would be nothing short of a miracle.

In order to better understand the pattern of paper and ruling usage in the score of the Finale, it is necessary to reconstruct the procedure involved. Meißner would have taken bifols. from a pile of unused 24-stave music paper that was replenished at intervals by new acquisitions; the prepared material then formed a second pile, from the top of which Bruckner took each new score bifol. as he used it. In each case, earlier acquired or earlier prepared paper may have remained at the bottom of the pile as new material was placed on top; an example of this in relation to the unprepared paper is that of paper type 2 (Orel's Sigel d), used by Bruckner in 1889 for the Scherzo of the Ninth and again for the isolated chorale sk. of Dec. 1893, but which re-emerged, probably in late summer or autumn 1895, in the last oblong-format pc. sks. for the Finale (C/21–26, 39) and the 'instrumental template' (C/326f.). This model provides a useful tool by which to understand the pattern of paper usage presented by the surviving sources. While any number of factors—varying brands of paper sold together, a knocked-over or otherwise disrupted stack—may have complicated the picture in a random fashion at any point, apart from the apparently random occurrence of F<sup>IIa</sup>-ruling bifols. within the D<sup>I</sup>–D<sup>II</sup> sequence (*infra*), the listing given in Table X appears to correlate with compositional progress in a logical and consistent fashion.

As we have seen, and as summarised in Table IX, all surviving bifols. of the score, with the sole exception of bifol. 1A (ÖNB 24.264), were written on upright, 24-stave papers printed by Bruckner's publisher Josef Eberle.<sup>126</sup> Apart from their trademarks, these are all largely identical. The first-used were the "JE & Co./No. 8./24 linig" bifols., actually of two types, grouped together in the outline given at the beginning of §3.1.4, one with the trademark printed on both pp. 1 and 3, the other, used later, with the trademark on only the 1st p. Between the use of these papers lies that of the fractionally larger Eberle paper "JE & Co./No.

<sup>125</sup> E.g. "2"E, bequeathed by Max Graf to the Academy, 20F/"21" included in StB 3179, bequeathed by Löwe to the StB.

<sup>126</sup> The Eberle papers occasionally reveal watermarks of the company's crest, although these are not significant for an elucidation of the chronology of the Finale.

8./24 lienig.” Orel’s classification of the score bifols. into so-called “Fassungen” A to F was, as we have seen, an extrapolation from the observable styles of page ruling, corresponding to a number of batches in which Meißner (and, as it now appears, a further party) prepared Bruckner’s score paper. Meißner had previously assisted Bruckner by ruling up score paper for the other movements of the Ninth<sup>127</sup> and prepared the AS of IX/1, ÖNB 29.305. A page of the surviving Finale MSS also exhibits Meißner’s handwriting (C/114).<sup>128</sup> Setting aside ruling F for the moment, the following rough guide, based on Orel’s own table of “Fassungen” A–E (cf. D/75), provides an overview of the principal indices of the five main rulings based on the most obvious distinctions in handwriting and the designations of the strings:<sup>129</sup>

Ruling A	autograph	violins and viola indicated by “I / II / III”
Ruling B	not autograph (Meißner)	violins and viola indicated by “I / II / III”
Ruling C	not autograph (anonymous)	violins and viola indicated by “I. / II. / III.”
Ruling D	not autograph (Meißner)	violins and viola indicated by “I / II / III”
Ruling E	not autograph (Meißner)	violins and viola indicated by “VI. 1. / 2. / Br.”

Orel (cf. D/75) attributed rulings A and C to Bruckner; in fact, only ruling A can have been prepared by the composer.<sup>130</sup> Rulings B, C and D, plus one surviving F bifol., 1F,<sup>131</sup> were not prepared by him, although they follow the style of his orthography in varying degrees, i.e., “Ob.”, “Clar.”, “Fag.”, “C.”, “Tr.”, “Tb 1.2. in B Ten/ = 3.4. in F basso”, “Tymp.”, “Tromboni”, “CBT” (cf. facsimiles of any of these rulings). The remaining F and all E bifols. depart more significantly from Bruckner’s designations, using “VI. 1 / 2 / Br.” instead of Bruckner’s roman numerals for the upper string parts, “Hb.” instead of “Ob.”, “Cl.” instead of “Clar.”, “Hr.” instead of “C.” for the horns and “Pk.” instead of “Tymp.” for the timpani, and omitting Bruckner’s “=” for the staves of the 2nd and 3rd instruments (cf. E-bifol. facsimiles).

<sup>127</sup> See the Vorwort to the new edition of the first three movements of the Ninth, ed. Cohrs (2001), as well as the *Kritischer Bericht*.

<sup>128</sup> Bruckner must have asked Meißner to copy the contents of the 4th p. of 2<sup>a</sup>C (C/110) onto the 4th p. of 2<sup>b</sup>C (C/114). In doing so, Meißner curiously forgot to supply clefs and key signatures, which were for some reason missing from this page.

<sup>129</sup> While ruling A was always recognised as being autograph and E as being in Meißner’s hand, the attribution of paper rulings B, C and D has undergone alterations in the author’s publications since 1994. Both the 1994 edition of the AP (p. XXXVI) and 1996 Faksimile-Ausgabe (p. XIX) give B and C as “wohl nicht Meißner”, D as “wohl Meißner”; the 1999 edition of the AP (also p. XXXVI) lists B and C as “Meißner?”, and D again as “wohl Meißner”. The attribution given here appears the most suitable alternative until further information comes to hand. Concerning the authorship of the ruling C, see *infra*.

<sup>130</sup> Bruckner obviously did not have a stock of bifols. Prepared for use at this stage but ruled them as he went. Cf. for instance 5A, which gives the full instrumentation only on the 1st p. (C/159); on the remainder, as on 6A (C/167ff.) and 8A (C/185ff.), only barlines and the strings are indicated.

<sup>131</sup> See *infra*.

Whoever was responsible for preparing the ruling C paper, which must have been ruled up in the late summer of 1895, remains a mystery. While the B, D and E rulings are all doubtless in Meißner's hand and resemble in varying degrees his other rulings for other movements of the Ninth, the authorship of ruling C is problematic; it has therefore been marked here simply as 'anonymous'.<sup>132</sup> Orel's attribution of the instrumental indications of ruling C (D/75) to the composer is unquestionably erroneous; examination of the handwriting as much as the radically different clef forms confirms this. In both rulings B and D Meißner appears to have imitated Bruckner's orthography and to some extent his handwriting;<sup>133</sup> C does also, but, while at first glance resembling the tremulous and untidy handwriting of A, appears on closer examination rougher and more primitive. The loops are larger and more circular or spiral rather than ovoid, and there is a tendency not to cross loops on capital letters such as Cs or Fs; clef and key signature forms are also markedly different from either Bruckner's or Meißner's. A further conundrum is posed by the fact that in both C- and D-ruling designations Bruckner's capital Ts seem to have been confused with Fs ("Tromboni / A F", "C.B.F."; see Table X)—yet this is not the case with Meißner's previous ruling B or his subsequent E.

Light may be shed on this by the existence of a what appears to have been a 'template' for the instrumental indications, ÖNB 28.240, Facs. C/325ff., two separate fols. of "B. & H. Nr. 16. A." paper (probably originally a single bifol.), which reproduce the instrumental indications for the winds in the Finale in a not clearly verifiable hand, but which may have been hastily jotted by Meißner (cf. the clef forms, which resemble Meißner's in ruling E rather than in ruling B). According to Stradal, the designations on fol. 2<sup>v</sup> (C/326) were struck through by Bruckner (see pencil annotation and caption, C/326) and, presumably, subsequently rewritten correctly on the following page (C/327).<sup>134</sup> The bifol. was apparently given to Stradal by Meißner himself—what else may Meißner have given Stradal?—as it bears the inscription, in Stradal's hand: "Meißner behauptet, es sei die Instrumentation des 4ten Satzes der 9ten. Es fehlen aber die Streicher/ Das Blatt war schief abgeschnitten/

<sup>132</sup> See footnote to table of rulings, *supra*. Orel's curious use of the word "holograph" for "Fassungen" B, D and E on D/75, apparently implying the opposite of autograph, was altered by Nowak in his corrected copy to "allograph".

<sup>133</sup> Much of ruling D appears more different to B or E than it actually is due to the thicker nib used and also perhaps the greater porosity of the paper. Cf. 1F (C/81), which was probably prepared in the D-ruling style but at a later stage, perhaps shortly before or together with the later F<sup>IIa</sup> rulings.

<sup>134</sup> The Faksimile-Ausgabe and section C cite for C/326 incorrectly '1<sup>v</sup>', and the following page '2<sup>v</sup>'; the two pages reproduced on C/326 and 327 are correctly fols. 2<sup>v</sup> and 2<sup>f</sup>. Why Bruckner appears to have struck through one page and not the other is unknown; the designations appear the same, if anything neater and more legible on the crossed-out page.

Wahrscheinlich werden die Streicher abgeschnitten/ Stradal".<sup>135</sup> Perhaps the most likely explanation that can be ventured is the following:

Meißner, perhaps prior to his summer vacation<sup>136</sup>, having been given the task by Bruckner of ruling up more MS paper, copied the required instrumentation from an A- or B-ruling bifol. by rote onto one of the by then few remaining bifols. of Bruckner's oblong 20-stave MS paper. Perhaps unfamiliar with the instruments in question, the unknown copyist charged with this task in Meißner's absence confused Ts with Fs. On both pages of ÖNB 28.240, the contrabass tuba appears correctly designated "CBT", while the alto and tenor trombones were designated "A" and "F"—presumably a slip of Meißner's pen. The C-ruling bifols. perpetuated this lapsus in regard to the trombones, but added to it by citing "CBF" for the contrabass tuba as well. One of the C bifols. must then have provided Meißner with the template for ruling D, which perpetuate the aberrant Fs. While Meißner was a capable pianist, it is possible that he may have been sufficiently unfamiliar with orchestral instruments to have made such an error, which persisted through both subsets of D rulings and the F<sup>I</sup> ruling cognate with them, but is corrected in both the 29.305 AS and F<sup>II</sup> and E rulings. Other inconsistencies in Meißner's orthography in the D material, such as his variant capitalisations for the keys of the tubas ("B. Ten./f basso"—see *infra*) corroborate the likelihood that he too was working to some extent by rote. These apparently unimportant details take on 'forensic' significance as indices of subdivisions within D, F and E rulings.

Comparison of the standard number of measures per page (= 'mm./p.') in each ruling also reveals significant information for the reconstruction of the score. As bifol. 1A (C/53ff.) reveals, Bruckner began scoring the Finale by drawing up his score paper with 6 mm./p., hence, 24 per bifol., a division consistent with the score of the first movement of the Ninth and much of the Adagio; the Scherzo uses 8 mm./p. He promptly appears to have changed to the 4 m./p. layout found on bifol. 3A (C/143ff.) and most subsequent bifols. As bifol. [2A] is not extant, it is not possible to say whether this was subdivided by Bruckner into 24 mm. or not.<sup>137</sup> However, its subsequent replacement, the 24-m. bifol. 2<sup>A</sup>C (C/107ff.) was first ruled into 16 mm., but here as elsewhere a number of existing divisions were then halved by Bruckner's addition of further barlines; the difference between the copyist's and Bruckner's barline rulings is easily recognisable.

---

<sup>135</sup> This, as noted in ch. 1.2, is incorrect; the pages were standard 20-stave music paper; the strings were simply not included.

<sup>136</sup> Neither Meißner's "Erinnerungen" or Göllicher-Auer give much further information concerning Meißner's movements following his assistance in moving Bruckner to the Belvedere in early July 1895. It is certainly possible that Meißner may have spent some of the summer, perhaps later in July or in August, away from Vienna. July, or perhaps even August would certainly match the time-frame during which the C material is likely to have first been required by Bruckner.

<sup>137</sup> Cf. the substantial alteration of the passage on bifol. 1A (C/53ff.) vs. the preceding sk. version on 6086/1 (C/31f.).

As indicated by Table X, the vast majority of bifols. prepared by Meißner were ruled with 4 mm./p., the exception being 1F (C/81f.), which he ruled into 6 mm./p., presumably at Bruckner's specific request; a lost bifol. [27/"28"] may also have been prepared with 24 mm., as will be discussed (§3.1.10). Three F<sup>II</sup> bifols. were left by Meißner completely without barlines, presumably as a result of uncertainty as to whether Bruckner preferred 4 or 6 mm./p.: these are 20F/"21", 26F/"27", both of which were ruled into 16 mm. by Bruckner, and 6085/37–38, which was not used for the score itself but as a folder for the bifols. of the Exp. (cf. C/328). Normally speaking, Bruckner normally used the division of 4 mm./p. provided by Meißner; the resulting 16 mm. per bifol. was exceeded where Bruckner added mm. in revision, as he did in the course of revising bifol. 6 (cf. C/171 and 173), where a rejected bifol. was replaced with another on which the original mm. were divided into the requisite number of subdivisions. The most mm. per bifol. we find is 36 on 2<sup>c</sup>C and its successor 2F (C/115ff. and C/151ff.); the least, and by far the standard configuration, is 16. It is significant for this procedure, which could be referred to as Bruckner's *Bogen-Verfahren*, that we find no bifols. with fewer mm., either with spare mm. or, on any bifol. not rejected and replaced, any crossed-out mm.; this confirms that the score was intended as much as possible to be a 'fair copy', given the constraints imposed upon the composer by his handwriting.<sup>138</sup>

It has proven possible to tease out rulings D, F and E in greater detail than was achieved by Orel. The specifics of these subdivisions are given in the "Indices" column of Table X, and are predicated mainly on the basis of the variant designations Meißner allotted the tenor and bass tubas. As the column "Extant bifolios" shows, the distinctions can be correlated roughly with possible compositional order and, together with compositional considerations, confirm the loss of a number of bifols., listed hypothetically in the final column of the table.<sup>139</sup> As the table shows, the "lienig" bifols. (paper type 5; Orel's "Sigel J"), interpreted by Orel as constituting the basis of a separate "Fassung F" (cf. D/75,<sup>140</sup> or "Papier F", D/116<sup>141</sup>), were in fact prepared either as ruling D or E, so that bifol. 1F (sub-ruling F<sup>I</sup>) exhibits the hallmarks of the D-ruling designations, while sub-rulings F<sup>Ia</sup> and F<sup>Ib</sup> are roughly consistent with E<sup>I</sup> and E<sup>II</sup>. However, the F<sup>II</sup> ruling was prepared and used well in advance of E; at least one bifol. (17F) was used in advance of any D bifols.<sup>142</sup> In order to prevent the confusion of reversing the two,

<sup>138</sup> Many of the later SVEs used prepared 16-m. bifols. to resketch the contents of bifol. 1 or 2, however. These drafts appear either to trail off, as in the 2<sup>b-d</sup>D SVEs (C/119ff.) or to run onto a second bifol., as in the case of the late 1bE SVEs (C/99ff.).

<sup>139</sup> Wherever possible the bifols. have been listed in likely compositional order. Only where insufficient information is available on which to predicate compositional order has a purely numerical order been used, principally in relation to the D- and E-ruling SVE for bifols. 1, 2, "13" and "14".

<sup>140</sup> "Fassung F: (nur einzelne Bogen) anderes Notenpapier (mit '24 lienig' unterhalb der Marke)."

<sup>141</sup> This is particularly misleading as "Papier F" is used elsewhere by Orel in the 1934 edition to refer to Papier or Sigel F (cf. D/3f.), as we have seen.

<sup>142</sup> These are all conclusions based on a detailed study of the sub-rulings and their relation to compositional chronology—a complex issue which will be dealt with in more detail in the ensuing section.

Orel's designation of bifols. as E and F, where correct and consistent,<sup>143</sup> was retained.<sup>144</sup> Provided it is borne in mind that the use of F preceded E, this additional level of signification is useful: the late sks. for the coda (6085/41–48), for instance, use the same type-5 paper, which suggests possible inferences as to the chronological correlation between these sks. and the composition of the score—a correlation not possible on the basis of score-paper rulings alone. The effective order of use of the material was therefore ruling A, B, C, then D<sup>I&II</sup> with F<sup>I</sup> and F<sup>IIa</sup> used alongside them (largely in parallel with D<sup>I</sup>), then E<sup>I</sup>, with F<sup>IIb</sup> initially used alongside it, and finally a remnant of E<sup>I</sup> and the final sub-ruling E<sup>II</sup>.

While the B and C rulings cannot be differentiated in more detail, much information can be gleaned from the apparent order in which Meißner ruled up the D, F and E bifols., and which, as we will discover, suggests that the observable variations in these rulings were linked to compositional factors. As Bruckner left relatively few dates in the surviving material, the insights into compositional chronology provided by external considerations are particularly valuable.<sup>145</sup>

The similarity of not only the orthography but also the style of the handwriting and pen used for the F<sup>II</sup>- and E-ruling bifols. to that used for Meißner's transcription of IX/1 suggests that the preparation of this material must have been begun either while Meißner was at work on the AS or not long after. Meißner must have begun 29.305 sometime in late September 1895.<sup>146</sup> As we have seen, Joseph Schalk signed a receipt for the first ten bifols. (roughly a third of the movement) on 4 October but, given possible interruptions and the fact that the later part of IX/1 is considerably more complex and heavily scored, Meißner may not have finished it for several weeks after that. As the earliest used of the F<sup>IIa</sup> bifols., 17F, precedes the composition of 17<sup>a</sup>D, which Bruckner dated "16.12." (C/269), both F<sup>I</sup> and F<sup>IIa</sup> rulings must have been prepared by mid-December 1895. Given that the style of ruling used by Meißner in the AS is virtually identical to that of the F<sup>IIa</sup> ruling (and subsequent F<sup>IIb</sup> and E rulings), the AS probably explains why such a radical departure from the preceding ruling styles in the Finale occurred at all. That 29.305 used no "lienig" bifols. but included three replacement

<sup>143</sup> As noted, Orel misclassified 20F/"21" as a "20. Bogen D", for instance. Table VIII gives a complete listing.

<sup>144</sup> A key to the bifol. designations used is given in §0.3.1.

<sup>145</sup> It could be speculated that Bruckner left fewer dates in the Finale than other works—cf. Doebl's listing of the numerous dates in the scores of the Seventh and Eighth Symphonies, pp. 383, 326f. respectively—because he was at last able to work on a composition continuously, whereas he had previously juggled compositional activity with his teaching and Hofkapelle commitments. Many of his dates probably make sense as memoranda of what must have been a constantly interrupted work pattern. Dates were also used more in the final stages as work fragmented into scattered inspections and corrections of voice-leading; the Finale score never reached this stage. Bruckner would also surely have dated the last bifol. of the score that he composed, as we find in the case of the other movements of the Ninth and *Helgoland*.

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Cohrs' *Kritischer Bericht* on the Ninth, Anhang: "Die Abschrift des 1. Satzes ÖNB Mus. Hs. 29.305".



folios of an earlier paper used by Bruckner<sup>147</sup> may suggest that Bruckner's existing stock of paper was running out and that the type-5 paper was only acquired and prepared after the AS of IX/1 was concluded. However, the F<sup>I</sup> ruling still retains the erroneous "F." trombone and "C.B.F." tuba designations of the C and D rulings, which are corrected in the 29.305 AS, suggesting that F<sup>I</sup> was prepared before the AS was begun. Even if Meißner had intentionally copied the appearance of the D bifolia at a later stage, he surely would not have retained the erroneous tuba designations.

The distinction made between the subdivisions of ruling D is based, as we have seen, on Meißner's varying indications for 1st and 2nd tubas. While all the other instrumental designations remained strikingly consistent, he appears to have begun preparing the D bifolia by designating the tenor tubas with a 'random scatter' of abbreviation styles (= ruling D<sup>I</sup>), within which a further three subgroups can perhaps be posited—see Table X), but by the end had settled to a consistent "B Ten." (= ruling D<sup>II</sup>). As the list of extant bifolia given in these two categories in Table X shows, the D<sup>I</sup> subdivision must also have been used by Bruckner before D<sup>II</sup>.<sup>148</sup> The obvious area of overlap between the two is represented by the SVE for bifolia 1 and 2, in which the use of "B Ten" becomes standard.<sup>149</sup>

Apparently running in parallel with the use of ruling D is that of the F material, paper type 5, which comprised a fresh acquisition of at least the 10 bifolia extant;<sup>150</sup> a further 2–4 may be lost. The reason for the acquisition and preparation of this paper is all the more readily comprehensible if one considers that virtually all of Bruckner's existing stock had been ruled up by Meißner into 4 mm/p. by that time, with tubas indicated throughout rather than the horns required for the *Durchf.* and *fugue*. This accounts for the F<sup>IIa</sup> rulings interspersed throughout the largely D-ruling sequence of the *fugue* and *Gesangsp. Repr.*, and perhaps also explains why Bruckner used up prepared D-bifolia as SVE in order to draft revisions, as he did for the numerous fragmentary D-ruling SVE for bifolia 1 and 2, rather than use unruled bifolia and work in *pc.-sk.* format. Most of the F ruling was ruled without tubas being indicated, presumably to avoid Bruckner having to erase and replace the 1st–4th tuba with 5th–8th horn designations. While most of the F bifolia are consistent with the style of the 29.305 AS and later E-ruling material, the designations on a solitary surviving F<sup>I</sup> bifolium, the SVE 1F (C/81f.),

<sup>147</sup> According to Cohrs (further to the information given in his *Kritischer Bericht*, cf. fn. 143 *supra*), the 2nd half-bifolium of bifolium 1, 1st half-bifolium of bifolium 2 and 2nd half-bifolium of bifolium 5 of the AS appear to be later interpolations, although using the same paper.

<sup>148</sup> It is possible that the entire ruling (at least 20 bifolia) may have been ruled up by Meißner at a single sitting. He presumably laid the completed bifolia face down as he finished them, so that the bifolia prepared first would also have been used first.

<sup>149</sup> In the facsimile reproductions, the distinctions in the tuba designations for the SVE bifolia are largely not visible, as only page portions notated by Bruckner were reproduced. The analysis presented here was based on careful study of the originals and whole-page reproductions.

<sup>150</sup> 6 score plus 4 *sk.* bifolia.

were identical with those of the D<sup>II</sup> material, but presumably at Bruckner's request the bifol. was supplied with 6 mm./p. in order to accommodate a new 'fair-copy' version of the 24-m. bifol. 1. One or more such 24-m. bifols. were probably expressly requested by Bruckner, necessitating the acquisition of a fresh stock of paper because most available stock had already been largely used up for the 16-m. per bifol. D ruling. A more finished 24-m. [1F] may have existed, as suggested by the later 2F and "2"E (cf. §3.1.8 *infra*); the lost [27F/"28"] may also have been ruled up as a 24-m. F<sup>I</sup>, since a 16-m. bifol. could not have accommodated the continuity given for the passage in the pc. sks. (cf. §3.1.10).

The two F-subdivisions F<sup>IIa</sup> and F<sup>IIb</sup> and the two E-ruling subdivisions E<sup>I</sup> and E<sup>II</sup> are distinguished entirely by variations in Meißner's designations of the Wagner tubas and barline ruling. As we have seen, the manner in which these bifols. were prepared, with a finer pen, more elegant calligraphy and different orthography from that of the preceding rulings, reveals that they must have either overlapped with or post-dated Meißner's AS of IX/1, which by 10 October 1895 had advanced as far as the end of the movement's Exp. but which may not have been finished for some time thereafter. F<sup>IIa</sup> is, generally speaking, identical with the later E<sup>I</sup> and E<sup>II</sup> ruling, except that Meißner left the ruling of barlines to the composer and avoided reference to the tubas by name, citing only the four numerical designations "1. 2./ 3. 4."—presumably, as he may have thought, applicable to either horns or tubas.<sup>151</sup> Meißner probably responded to Bruckner's request for a further supply of paper 'with no tubas marked' by ruling up a number of bifols. in the same fashion as the AS of IX/1 he was working on by that time, specifying only "1. 2./ 3. 4." for the tuba/5th–8th horn staves<sup>152</sup> and perhaps omitting ruling barlines in consideration of Bruckner's previous request for 24-m. bifols.<sup>153</sup>

Bruckner had therewith supplied himself with three choices of paper: D (tubas marked, ruled into 4 mm./p.), F<sup>I</sup> (tubas marked, 6 mm./p.) and F<sup>IIa</sup> (no tubas marked, no barlines ruled). 17F, of the F<sup>IIa</sup> group, was probably the first used of all of these, although Bruckner reverted to D bifols. for the ensuing drafts of this bifol.; a phase 3 redraft of the Durchf. may well have used F<sup>IIa</sup> bifols. for the revisions of [13] and [14] (see *infra*). Ultimately, however, the irregular alternation of D and F bifols. in the surviving bifols. from 17 onwards suggests either that the F<sup>IIa</sup> bifols. became interleaved with the earlier-prepared D ruling, or that Bruckner was less than discriminate in their selection.

The perhaps surprising but simplest interpretation is that rulings D<sup>I</sup>, D<sup>II</sup> and F<sup>I</sup> were all prepared in advance of their use, namely before Meißner began the 29.305 AS—in other

<sup>151</sup> It is also possible that this had to do with Meißner's AS of the first movement of the Ninth, in which tubas do not play, and in which Meißner would not have ruled barlines in advance, as he varied the number of measures per page according to the rhythmic density of the music.

<sup>152</sup> Bruckner then had to alter these designations too as he proceeded with the scoring, for instance on 20F/"21", where "C/ in F/ C" is added in ink on the first page (C/285), and on the second (C/286) "C" in pencil.

<sup>153</sup> Clefs and key signatures were also omitted by Meißner on this ruling for reasons unknown.

words, by late September 1895. Given the “16.12.” date on 17<sup>a</sup>D, none of them were used much before mid-December 1895 (shortly before which the additional F<sup>IIa</sup> bifols. were prepared); in fact, they were used in advance of D<sup>I</sup> and perhaps even F<sup>I</sup>. The surviving D-, F<sup>I</sup>- and F<sup>IIa</sup>-ruling bifols., including revisions to the Exp. and Durchf., extend well into the “Zweiter Theil” of the movement, at least as far as 25D/“26”, so that, although we have no clear indices as to compositional progress during this period, it seems difficult to explain why Bruckner would have needed more prepared paper before at least early February 1896, given the roughly six-month period over which the A–C material was apparently composed (much of it scored out in full)—even allowing for the fact that compositional progress may have gathered momentum in the latter part of 1895.

The prepared D- and F-ruling stocks lasted Bruckner well into the Repr., but were obviously insufficient for the remainder of the score. A first stock of paper type 6 appears to have been acquired before the type-5 “lienig” paper had completely run out, perhaps in late winter or spring 1896, as one of the remaining “lienig” bifols., 2F (ruling F<sup>IIb</sup>), was ruled up together with E<sup>I</sup>. The unruled remainder, perhaps remaining on the bottom of the unruled paper pile, re-emerged in the late pc. sks. of May 1896.

The large number of type-6 bifols. which survive (26 bifols., in addition to which a number of further bifols. are lost) and the extended period over which this paper was used (most of 1896) suggests that it was probably acquired in more than one purchase. The single F<sup>IIb</sup> bifol. and twelve E<sup>I</sup> bifols. extant were prepared similarly to F<sup>IIa</sup>, but reinstated the 4 mm./p. barlines, clefs and key signatures and used a new system of tuba designations: “Ten. B 1. 2./ Tub./ Baß F 3. 4.”. Compositionally they appear to fall into three groups:

- a. 2F and the last three extant bifols. of the score, 28E/“29”, 29E/“30” and 31E/“32”;
- b. the three bifols. 13E/“14”,<sup>154</sup> “2”E, “3”E, all of which were written during the renumbering; and
- c. the six late SVE “13”<sup>b</sup>E and “14”<sup>a–c</sup>E.

Bifol. [30/“31”] and the remainder of the score of the Finale, namely bifols. [33/“34”] to approximately [39/“40”], presuming Bruckner reached the end of the movement, were probably all drafted on E<sup>I</sup> group a or b bifols. Bifols. 13E/“14”, “2”E and “3”E, and perhaps further lost bifols., represent ‘fair copy’ versions of bifols. previously largely scored out, which were copied out by Bruckner in June 1896 probably following initial completion of the continuity of the score (see §3.1.8 *infra*). The splitting up of 2F into “2”E, “3”E and probably part of a lost [“4”E] was necessitated by Bruckner’s late reconception of the passage on 2F, the finished instrumentation of which could no longer be comfortably accommodated on a single bifol. The interpolation of this additional bifol. resulted in the renumbering of the entire

---

<sup>154</sup> Meißner’s tuba designations were erased by Bruckner on the 1st p. of 13E/“14”; cf. C/225.

score by one. A shorter [1E] may have replaced a previous 24-m. [1F] (cf. Mus. Ex. 3a and 3b); losses of bifols. ["5a"] and ["5b"] can also be speculatively posited (*infra*) as likely offshoots of the renumbering process.

Finally, the last six E<sup>I</sup> bifols. (E<sup>I</sup> group c) form a late group together with the fourteen surviving E<sup>II</sup> bifols., all of which are SVE: 13<sup>a</sup>E, =“13b”E (an unnumbered bifol. apparently following “13a”), the probably related “15”E and finally the ten SVE 1<sup>a-c</sup>E and 1b<sup>a-c</sup>E. The transition between E<sup>I</sup> and E<sup>II</sup> was probably represented by “13a”E (the “a” is autograph; cf. C/217), on only p. 1 of which Meißner designated and provided clefs for the tubas;<sup>155</sup> the remaining pp. of “13a”E allot neither clefs nor designations for the tubas, nor does the rest of the E<sup>II</sup> ruling. Meißner probably left off indicating the tubas at Bruckner’s specific request, or after noticing that Bruckner again had to alter them on bifol. 13E/“14” (cf. C/225). This final stock of bifols. may have been intended for definitive ‘fair copy’ versions of the Durchf. and fugue, throughout which the tubas are replaced by 5th–8th horns, and which were largely laid out on D-ruling bifols. with tubas indicated. In fact, Bruckner’s worsened mental deterioration following the July 1896 crisis prevented further significant work on the score; the notation of the entire E<sup>I</sup> c and E<sup>II</sup> group probably reflected phases of greater and lesser lucidity. The most coherent drafts appear to be dated “11. August” which, as we have seen (§1.1.12), probably represented a particularly good day. While work on the Finale ostensibly continued up to the day of Bruckner’s death, the last two months, as evidenced by many of the late SVE and the frenzied renumbering of previously composed bifols., were indelibly marked by the advance of senility.

### 3.1.8 The composition of the Finale.

The preceding two sections have attempted to establish the philological basis upon which, in this section, a reconstruction of the compositional emergence of the score can be attempted, and hence how Bruckner’s emergent AP (transcribed in vol II, E, critical commentary in §3.1.10) may have appeared by the time of the last work phase. Given that apparently substantial parts of the original material, scattered at the time of Bruckner’s death, are lost or inaccessible today, the compositional genesis of the movement can only be understood by ‘forensic musicology’, integrating studies of paper use with compositional progress, MS datings and all external factors, such as correspondence or reports. What is presented here, while attempting to produce a ‘best fit’ of all available data, like any forensic study, inevitably becomes more speculative at points where evidence provides fewer clues. It is not presented as the only possible narrative, but crystallises many years of thinking about this material from varying standpoints. A ‘most likely scenario’ does not necessarily equate with ‘truth’: ‘less likely scenarios’ may have occurred; hypotheses implying apparent compositional intention

---

<sup>155</sup> The p. 1 designations are also unfinished—“1. 2./Tb. Ten B/3. 4.” (‘F basso’ was omitted).

must be qualified by the fact that Bruckner was mentally declining in the last months of his life and did not achieve everything suggested by the material. The logical assumption that one should attempt to reconstruct the movement's composition by positing a minimum number of lost bifols. seems reasonable, but does not alter the fact that a considerable number—the last bifols. of the score, or a selection of the better written examples—may in effect have been lost at a single grasp, or that Bruckner in his final infirmity may even have destroyed or irreparably disfigured them himself—we simply do not know. Moreover, many mysteries remain—the final form of bifol. 1, the reconstruction of the Durchf. and, obviously, the extent and musical continuity of the coda. Setting all these imponderables aside, we are left with the obligation of engaging at the most profound level with this material—firstly in order to reliably reconstruct a 'text' for the movement as it most likely stood by the end of Bruckner's life—both as a basis for analytical inquiry as well as for the purposes of performance, and secondly, by re-establishing its genesis, to learn about the composer's compositional procedures.

Table XI (A/36) presents a diagrammatic overview of the essentially continuous compositional process by which the Finale score emerged, and may be compared with Orel's Übersicht, D/127, on which it was based. While Orel's basic structure of five phases has been maintained, his " Fassungen " have been split into their partly independent components of 'ruling' and 'work phase'. Solid arrows reveal the adoption of an already drafted bifol. into later work phases; dotted arrows the recopying of a previous bifol. without significant alteration of its musical continuity or scoring. No less than Orel's dissection into " Fassungen ", these work phases represent an artificial articulation within what was essentially a seamless and interconnected process. While it can certainly be taken for granted that Bruckner worked forward in the score without leaving gaps at any point, the table does not show the order in which Bruckner revised bifols. within later phases. As we have seen, while rulings A, B and C were used essentially consecutively, the sequence in which the D, F and E rulings appear in the score is more complex. Table XI places the use of ruling A and B within phase 1, C within phase 2. The remainder of the initial composition of the score, on other words, the new material composed on D, F and E bifols., has been placed in phase 3; the beginning of the systematic instrumentation of the score, involving recopying on E bifols. and renumbering in phase 4, and number of subsequent revisions, likewise on E bifols. has been placed in phase 5. The compositional activity represented by these five phases may summarised as follows:

1. the use of ruling A and B (a number of replacement bifols.), which extended the score as far as the end of the Exp. (bifol. 11);
2. the use of C-ruling bifols. revising the Exp. and drafting the "2. Theil" of the movement as far as the exposition of the fugue (bifol. 17);
3. the composition of the remainder of the score using rulings D, F, and E, including D- and F-ruling revisions to the Exp. and Durchf.;

4. the renumbering of the score, apparently in June 1896, in which Bruckner began systematically completing the wind instrumentation which extended as far as the middle of the Durchf., recopying where necessary on E-ruling bifols., and as a result of a late revision to bifol. 2 renumbering all then-valid bifols. of the score by one, and
5. the late SVE, including those dated “11. August”, to the opening of the movement (bifol. 1) and Durchf. (renumbered bifols. “13”–“15”), again using the E ruling.

The complex issue of the reconstruction of the composition of the Durchf., which extends through phases 2–5, and for which two hypotheses are possible, has been dealt with separately between discussion of work phases 2 and 3.

We have already outlined the pc. sks. for the Finale in some detail (§3.1.6). As we have seen (ch. 2.2), Bruckner wove a reference to the characteristic tritone progression of the Finale into the coda of the Adagio at mm. 225ff.—a striking piece of motivic ‘Aufbereitung’ (cf. Mus. Ex. 2c, i). The Finale chorale was prefigured by the Adagio’s “Abschied vom Leben” theme and its later incarnations.<sup>156</sup> The ‘concept’ of the introduction (C/3) and Hauptth., the definitive musical continuity of the chorale (C/10) and the idea of introducing the Te Deum motive (C/10ff.; D/68) were all clear to Bruckner prior to composition of the Finale.<sup>157</sup> There are also some astonishing motivic parallels with the first movement of the Ninth in particular, due to the common use of double-dotted rhythm, rising or falling sixths and the prominent *c♭* which dominates the entire symphony. As Ex. 2d shows, the opening horn theme of IX/1 and the opening motive of IX/4 mirror each other, and are also found in the final phrase of the IX/1 Hauptth.; the significant pitches *d*, *e♭* and *c♭* recur repeatedly together with the intervals of the sixth and octave (*i*). The falling sixths of the IX/1 Gesangsp. anticipate in augmentation the chains of falling sixths of the Finale Hauptth. (the rhythm of which recalls that of IX/1), the ostinato-like Gesangsp., and the horn theme (the rising triplet crotchets of which recall, in inversion, the catabasic element of the IX/1 Hauptth.; cf. *ii*). The final horn entry of the Adagio, the last note of which, *b*<sup>1</sup>, becomes the opening *c♭*<sup>2</sup> of the Finale, prefigures in

<sup>156</sup> The chorale in the Ninth may have emerged in early draft form in the sk. of 27 December 1893 (C/323; cf. discussion §1.1.2), where it was initially considered as a principal theme: “Hpth” (Hauptthema); the topos ultimately appeared as the ‘supernumerary’ “Abschied vom Leben” theme (Adagio mm. 27ff., recurring at mm. 155ff. and 159ff. in forms more similar to its incarnation in the Finale). The connection between these and appearances of the same catabasis idea, for instance, in VIII/4, is laid out in full in Mus. Ex. 24 (as discussed in §2.2.3). As we have also seen (§1.1.2), *Das Deutsche Lied* of 1892 prefigured the Finale in several significant respects; *Vexilla regis* of the same year anticipates the harmonic realm of the chorale theme. There are also numerous thematic and motivic links, as Grandjean notes (“Anton Bruckners ‘Helgoland’ und das Symphonische”, pp. 355f.), between *Helgoland* and the falling-sixth/dotted-rhythm motivic vocabulary of the Finale, for instance the phrase “Die brünstige Bitte” (*Helgoland*, m. 73; cf. Grandjean’s musical examples 6 and 6A) and “die Feinde dort zerschmettert” (m. 131, Grandjean’s example 10), as well as the “non confundar” phrases identified by Grandjean, “zum Himmel, zum Himmel geschickt”, mm. 77ff., and “Der du in den Wolken thronest”, mm. 87ff.

<sup>157</sup> The beginning the Gesangsp. is not clear from the initial 3194 sks.; as noted, however, a bifol. or fol. may not have survived, as suggested by the Weiser “+ de” on C/7, which has no preceding “vi =”.

inversion the falling fourth-fifth intervals of the *Te Deum* motive (iii). It is perhaps not too far-fetched to recognise links to the opening of Beethoven's Ninth in both the introductory motive as well as the *Te Deum* motive (iv); an even more striking motivic similarity exists between the *Presto* of its last movement and the *Hauptth.* of IX/4 (v). As we have noted (§2.2.3), the stepwise descent of the chorale theme forms part of a much larger network of catabasis-type motives (Ex. 24). It appears no less than four times in the *Adagio* (Ex. 24k–m), and is again prefigured in chromatic form following the *Hauptth.* (Ex. 25n) prior to its final transcendent incarnation as the chorale itself (Ex. 25o).

Significant, finally, for the links between *Adagio* and *Finale* is the extent to which the radiant E major of the *Adagio* is carried over into the *Finale* as the key of the chorale and *Te Deum* motive, suggesting a dialectic of light and darkness; the *Finale* provides many further instances of the 'centrifugal' harmonic tendency of the music of the Ninth towards extreme sharp or flat keys, as announced at the opening of the first movement, discussed in §2.2.4. All of this argues for a compelling, highly integrated conception by Bruckner of the entire symphony—one in which the *Finale*, obviously, had a vital role to play.

It is therefore hardly surprising that Bruckner's first notations for the *Finale* (dated, according to Bruckner's calendar memorandum, 24 May 1895) begins with the familiar tritone progression and dotted motive on the 1st p. of the 3194 material (C/3, where the opening mm. are strikingly marked *8va*—an interesting idea which Bruckner later relinquished), and that the double-dotted chains of sixths, the chorale and *Te Deum*, all appear in the sks. in or close to their ultimate form. The date "8. Juni" (1895) on 3194/5<sup>f</sup> (C/9) probably lies roughly midway through this initial sketch process, so that is possible, assuming a relatively even pace of progress, that Bruckner had proceeded to the ink sk. 6086 by mid- to late June and began work on the score (bifol. 1A) shortly after the beginning of July, perhaps following his move to the *Belvedere*.<sup>158</sup>

#### *Work phase 1*

Of the autograph ruling A, nine bifols., 1A, 3–6A, 8A, and the subsequently renumbered 10A/"11" and 11A/"12" have survived; the latter bifols. were of course probably not scored out until at least phase 2. As 3A and 10A both begin in the middle of periods (cf. C/143, 197) and present a musical continuity which we already find altered in the B-ruling versions, the original existence of three intervening lost bifols., [2A], [7A] and [9A], can be predicated.<sup>159</sup> They would probably not have been significantly more elaborated than the extant bifols.

<sup>158</sup> Composition of 1A may even have overlapped with the notation of 6086, as suggested by the use of paper common to both sources; see Table IX.

<sup>159</sup> The fact that early A and B bifols. containing the chorale were fully scored out and ultimately renumbered while the remainder of the Exp. underwent numerous revisions is in line with the fact that the chorale theme had already attained apparently definitive continuity in the initial 3194 sks.

which adjoin them; while [2A] may have been somewhat more advanced in orchestration, [7A] and [9A] were probably only single-line SVE, with the 1st vln. part written in ink which, like extant bifols. 6A and 8A, were rejected when Bruckner altered the course of the *Steigerung* leading into the chorale (cf. 8A and 8B, C/185ff., with the continuity given in 3194/5<sup>f</sup>, C/9; cf. D/68).<sup>160</sup> Ruling B, the first ruling prepared by Meißner, apparently consisted only of seven revised bifols. within the A-ruling sequence: 5B, three versions of 6B, 7B, 8B/“9” and 9B/“10”. As it is unlikely that bifols. 1–4 were all rewritten on ruling-B bifols. and lost, B was probably used only for revisions of bifols. 5–9. If further B bifols. existed, there is no compelling evidence of them (cf. Orel D76ff.).

### *Work phase 2*

The second work phase saw the notation of the score advance from the end of the Exp. to the beginning of the fugue, as well as important revisions to, and probably the ostensible completion of, the Exp. in full score, a procedure which parallels Bruckner’s work on IX/1.<sup>161</sup> While the still valid A and B bifols. were probably first substantially scored out at this stage, the principal new material used was the ‘anonymous’ ruling C, of which 13 bifols. survive; internal evidence suggests the existence of a further 5 (see *infra*). The extant C bifols. include four versions of 1C (1<sup>a-d</sup>C), three of 2C (2<sup>a-c</sup>C), then 4C/“5”, 7C/“8”, 12C, 15C, 16C/“17” and the discarded 17C, all of which up to 12C were subsequently virtually completed in full score. The C-ruling versions of bifols. 1, 2, 4 and 7 replaced A or B versions but, in at least one case, that of 4C/“5”, this merely involved recopying the preceding version for the sake of neatness; the musical contents were not altered.<sup>162</sup> Considering the extensive nature of the C-ruling revisions of bifols. 1 and 2, most of which were fully scored out then discarded, it is unlikely that Bruckner would have left the undeveloped 3A, 5B or 6<sup>c</sup>B untouched while repeatedly recopying or revising other Exp. bifols. A bifol. [3C] must therefore have existed (cf. Orel, D/91); its continuity was probably not significantly different to that of 3A, considering that the last mm. of bifol. 2 remained unaltered throughout several revisions and that 4A was merely replaced by the unaltered fair copy 4C with the addition of whole-m. rests. Bifols. 5B and 6<sup>c</sup>B would also have been recopied in a similar fashion on C-bifols., further scored as necessary and, like most of the other extant bifols. of the Exp., probably regarded by him as “fertig”; 6<sup>c</sup>B

<sup>160</sup> 8A was later used by Bruckner as a SVE for bifol. “13” (cf. pencil renumbering and additional musical continuity in the wind staves, C/185).

<sup>161</sup> Cf. Orel, p. 7.

<sup>162</sup> A later sk. was added to the last page of 4C/“5”, however (C/154, timp. stave and top margin “1 2 3 4”), which Bruckner either drafted here, before its appearance on the 3rd p. of the discarded 15C (C/251), in which case the apparent later renumbering of this bifol. is only apparent—or Bruckner may have salvaged the phrase from the discarded 15C, perhaps with the intention of altering the continuity of the *Gesangsp.* in some way so as to include this phrase. In either case, the implication of 4C/“5” is the same: it was not a final text; see *infra*.



was already pronounced “fertig” by Bruckner (cf. l. lower margin, C/176<sup>163</sup>)—probably, like 4A, because only whole-m. rests were required to complete its instrumentation. Hence, there is good evidence that completed versions of [3C], [5C] and [6C] existed. While [3C] would later have been replaced in the process of redistributing the 36 mm. of 2F over three new bifols., and 4C/“5”, although renumbered, replaced in the process, [5C] and [6C] probably remained valid and would have been renumbered along with the ensuing extant bifols. of the score in June 1896 (work phase 4, see *infra*).

As no subdivisions within the C-ruling material can be ascertained, one can only speculate as to whether the use of this ruling began in the Durchf., from bifol. 12C onwards, or whether Bruckner returned to the beginning of the movement and revised the Exp. immediately after extending the score in phase 1 as far as bifol. 11. Some indication may be given by the order in which the three sks., for the fugue, the Hauptth. Steigerung and the opening sequence of the movement, appear in the pc. sk. 6007 (C/27ff.), perhaps suggesting that Bruckner conceived or revised these passages in that order. As we have already noted (§3.1.6), 6007 must have pre-dated the composition of the C-ruling bifols. 1, 2 and 17; whether the C-ruling layout of the Durchf. followed Bruckner's decision to recast the Hauptth. Repr. as a fugue or *vice versa* is difficult to ascertain as, aside from the 28.229 sk., the composer appears to have remodelled his conception of the Durchf. directly in score. That a [13C] and [14C] must be missing from this sequence is demonstrated by the existence of C-ruling bifols. 15–17 (C/249ff.) and the fact that 15C begins in the 7th m. of a period;<sup>164</sup> 15–17C also show that a substantial conceptual revision of the continuity of the Durchf. must have taken place since the notation of 6086 sk., and 17C, as its version of the fugal exposition shows, must obviously have postdated the composition of 6007/1<sup>f</sup> and 3194/13<sup>f</sup>. Furthermore, the logic and consistency of the motivic argument leading up to the fugue suggest that Bruckner consciously or unconsciously planned the whole later part of the Durchf. as an intentional Herankomponierung of the fugue and its countersubject, in which the development of submotives of the ‘lyrical counterpoint’ which emerges in the woodwind on bifol. 16C/“17” (C/258; E/74) plays a pivotal role, as shown in Ex. 5a (*q.v.*), in preparing each element of the fugal subject and countersubject (cf. the mutation cycle that the motivic elements a, b and c undergo); only the double-dotted rhythm itself makes a sudden resurgence at the beginning of the fugue. Even given that the final form of the subject and countersubject of the fugue are different in the initial phase-2 version, 17C, from that given on 17<sup>c</sup>D/“18” (which Ex. 5a uses as a basis), the most likely scenario is that Bruckner reconceived what was originally intended as the crowning point of the “2. Theil”—the climactic re-entry of the Hauptth. in D minor—as a fugue (C/21, 27; cf. Orel D/73ff.) before laying out at least the later

<sup>163</sup> This again is significantly clearer in the reproduction in the Faksimile-Ausgabe (*q.v.*) than in that in vol. II.

<sup>164</sup> Orel also recognised that C-ruling versions of 13 and 14 must have been lost; cf. D/102.

part of the Durchf. in score, redrafting the version of this passage given in the 6086 sk. so as to lead logically and seamlessly into the fugue.

The idea of introducing a fugue into the movement had other consequences. As 6086 reveals, the tonic statement of the Hauptth. seems initially to have been reserved for its Repr. in the “2. Theil”—a striking departure from Brucknerian precedent. Bruckner probably altered the Hauptth. in the Exp. to the more conventional tonic statement once he had determined to replace the Hauptth. in the “2. Theil” with a fugue on the theme. Hence, as a result of this reconception, Bruckner turned his attention to the opening of the movement, revising the C-ruling bifols. 1 and 2, then presumably recopied the further lost Exp. bifols., completing their scoring and that of the chorale, all of which appear to have remained essentially unaltered since phase 1. In confirmation of this, one notes that the initial pc. sks. for the fugue on 6007 and 3194 begin with the 2nd entry, which is more logical if they followed on from the last 4 mm. of the 6086 sk., even if only ‘conceptually’, rather than making a fresh start. ÖNB 3194/13<sup>f</sup>, as noted, cites “zu 17” as a reference to the bifol. on which the fugue begins (C/21) but this may well have been added later.<sup>165</sup> Alterations in the conception of the Exp. Hauptth. on the 2C bifols. confirm that the fugue and subsequent sks. on 6007 and 3194/13 post-dated composition of the 3194/1–12 and 6086 sks. and probably the composition of the entire Exp. as far as bifol. 11A, since in neither 3194 nor 6086 do the chains of falling sixths of the Hauptth. begin on the tonic, as they do in the 2C bifols. In the 3194 material they begin on  $b\flat^2$  (C/4; cf. D/64) and in 6086 on  $c^4$  (C/32; cf. D/65). The 2nd p. of 6007 (C/28) reveals the manner in which the Steigerung to the Hauptth. began to take on its C-ruling structure, leading into a D-minor statement of the Hauptth. Already by bifol. 2<sup>a</sup>C (C/109), the first extant score version of the Exp. Hauptth., we find that the opening entry of the Hauptth. has been altered so as to begin on what becomes its definitive pitch,  $d^3$ .

As two scenarios are possible for the layout and subsequent revision of the first part of the Durchf., potentially overlapping work phases 2 and 3, the composition of the passage has been discussed separately under the following heading.

### *The Durchführung*

The surviving bifols. include, from the C-ruling (phase 2), a 12C, 15C and 17C, all of which were not renumbered, and a renumbered 16C/“17”. The surviving D and F bifols. for the section (phase 3) include a renumbered 15D, 17F and three versions of 17D, the last of which was also renumbered (17<sup>c</sup>D/“18”). In what we may call the ‘D–F hypothesis’, both [13C] and [14C], which connected with 15–17C, have been lost, as well as later D- or F- versions of both, which connected with 15D. A ‘C2 hypothesis’ proposes that there were two versions of 12C and [13C], in other words, that Bruckner drafted the existing 12C (which was not

---

<sup>165</sup> As noted (§3.1.6), it is written in pencil whereas the main text of the 3194/13<sup>f</sup> is in ink

renumbered, and therefore must have been discarded) and perhaps part of an initial [13C], then discarded and rewrote both on lost C bifols. before proceeding with the composition of the remainder of the Durchf. ([14C], 15C, 16C, 17C).<sup>166</sup> The D–F hypothesis is probably the more likely given the surviving compositional material and is that which has been represented in Table XI, although it assumes the existence of more lost bifols. than the C2 theory, namely 5, as opposed to 3 or 4.<sup>167</sup> The AP, however, as well as both performing scores, use the last 6 mm. of 12C as the most likely clue to the contents of the lost bifol. [14], a notion possible given both theories, if perhaps more likely assuming C2.

Although both 3184 and 6086 sks. extend well into the “2. Theil”, the surviving work phase-2 bifols. 12C and 15–17C and the sk. 28.229 reveal that Bruckner’s concept of the Durchf. had radically altered by the time of their notation. The 3194 sks. (C/11, bracket 2; D/68 no. 5E) extended the chorale epilogue as far as the entry of the Te Deum motive on E, roughly the form taken by the passage on bifol. 11A/“12”, the first 6 mm. of 12C, and which seems never to have been altered. However, 3194 continues the descending bass line for several further measures (C/11; D/68 no. 5E) before leading into the “2. Theil”, initially envisioned as commencing on an E $\flat$  pedal (C/16; D/69 no. 6) and recalling the opening motive of the movement, subsequently used in inversion (C/20; D/70 no. 7; and again C/35; D/70 no. 8), for which Bruckner made innumerable deliberations on the spellings of the tritone progressions (C/19; D/69, and C/37—not in Orel). The opening of the Durchf. in the 6086 sk. is lost on the missing 2nd bifol. of that source, but given 28.229 its contents may have been largely overruled by the initial C-ruling sequence for the Durchf. in any case. While the inverted tritone progressions on 6086/3 (C/35) eventually found their way into the score (cf. 13E/“14”, 15C and 15D/“16”), 12C (C/203; E/53) reveals only a brief arrival point in E minor at the end of the choral epilogue, coinciding with the entry of the Te-Deum motive (C/205) in crotchets in the fl. (4 mm.), followed by a simultaneous augmentation and inverted augmentation of the motive in ob. and clar. (4 mm.), then a sudden tonal departure (last 6 mm. of the bifol.) using this motivic combination, modulating abruptly from the E minor (more accurately speaking, E Phrygian) of the close of the chorale to a progression beginning with an A $\flat$   $\frac{6}{3}$  chord, the last two mm. of which were crossed out at some stage, but which would probably have led on to [13C], [14C], and hence 15–17C.

According to the D–F theory, this whole continuity, from bifol. 12C through to 17C, with the exception of the renumbered 16C, would have been replaced by D or F bifols. which

<sup>166</sup> Closer examination of the surviving material, its degree of completion and metrical structure gives clarity to this statement, which radically condenses lengthy analysis of the material.

<sup>167</sup> The five lost bifols. of the D-F hypothesis would be [13C], [14C] and, replacing them. later D- or F-ruling versions of [12], [13] and [14]. Of course, a discarded [13C] and [14C] could both have been thrown away, given away or destroyed by Bruckner himself. The C2 scenario predicates the possible loss of an initial [13C] adjoining 12C, but the definite loss of later C-ruling versions of [12], [13] and [14].

were later either replaced ([13] by 13E/“14”) or renumbered. Alternately, Bruckner may have drafted only 12C and perhaps [13C],<sup>168</sup> then rewritten them immediately on subsequent versions before continuing on to [14] and the remainder of the Durchf. That the tuba markings on the 1st p. of 12C were altered to horns would suggest that Bruckner scored out the chorale before rejecting this bifol.—perhaps his rethinking of the passage was occasioned by revisiting the 3194 and perhaps 6086 sks. at this point—but the missing link between the continuity given for the passage in the initial pc. sks. and the score version is unquestionably the sk. 28.229 (C/39; not transcribed by Orel), which predates the continuity given by 12C and what would have been [13C], but already combines the E-minor–A $\flat$ -major shift found on 12C, moving the Te Deum motive, in minims, into the bass register, with the diminished seventh-chord transformations of the Te Deum motive descending by semitones which we later encounter on 13E/“14”. Due to the poor legibility of 28.229 in facsimile a single-line transcription of its continuity is given in Ex. 6a, with the principal elements found on 12C and perhaps on [13C] marked (a–d).

Given that no further sks. for the sequence have survived, [13C] and [14C], which joined up with the surviving 15C, probably alternated Bruckner’s initial idea of inverting the tritone sequences of the movement’s opening (cf. 3194/11, 6086/3) with passages using the Te Deum motive in minim augmentation. Assuming regular period structure and 16-m. bifol. length., using metrical numbers and taking the later 13E/“14” and the four main elements of 28.229 as substrate, a ‘conceptual reconstruction’ of the continuity of Durchf. as it may have stood in the C-ruling bifols. 12[–15] can be made:

12C:	end of chorale -7-8	Te Deum in fl. 1-4-	Te Deum in augm. in ob and clar. -5-8	A $\flat$ maj. 1-2-	A $\flat$ min. -3-4-	augm triad. -5-6-
28.229:	(a) (cf. Ex. 6a) -7-8	—	(b) 1-4-	(c) -5-6-	-7-8	—
[13C]:	[augm. triad?] -7-8	Te Deum motive over chrom. descending dimin. 7ths 1-8	1st inverted tritone sequence 1-6-			
28.229:	—	(d) 1-8	—			

Although no further pc. sks. give specific indications for the content of [14C], an impression of its instrumental texture and probable degree of completion can be gained from the first 2 mm. of bifol. 15C (C/249), which opens with 1st ob. (ink), 2nd–3rd bsn. and the sketched 1st vln. (both pencil). [14C] must therefore have concluded the 1st inverted tritone sequence, then begun a new progression ending in the arrival point on G $\flat$  major which we

<sup>168</sup> Cf. C/208: the extent of the sks. for the string figuration which Bruckner made for the progression with which 12C breaks off mid-period suggest that a similarly worked bifol. ensued. Orel left the notational sks. on the last p. of 12C untranscribed (cf. D/101); Nowak attempted their transcription in his corrections, reproduced on C/339.

find on 15C. As 8 mm. of G $\flat$  harmony would have been too long and 2 mm. too brief, the arrival point of the progression probably fell 2 mm. earlier, in the 5th m. of the period:

[14C]	End of 1st tritone sequence -7-8	2nd progression, ending in... 1-8	1-4-	G $\flat$ major -5-6
15C	G $\flat$ major, cont. -7-8	2nd inverted tritone sequence, etc. 1-8	1-6-	

Most of [13C] and [14C] given here would not, of course, have been elaborated much beyond the degree of completion revealed by 15C (cf. C/249ff.), in other words, much beyond the level of initial SVE.

However, Bruckner must have recognised not long after the drafting of this sequence the inherent problem with the passage: i.e., the abruptness of the E-minor–A $\flat$ -major modulation on 12C, which does not permit sufficient sense of the stasis normally found at this point in a Bruckner movement. For this reason he apparently reinstated his original concept for the passage roughly outlined in the 3194 (and perhaps 6086) sk., extending the descending bass line with which the chorale concludes—cf. Ex. 6b v.

Bruckner's chromatic descent topos—cf. discussion of the “Phrygian inflection” in §2.2.3—had a long history behind it prior to the composer's apparent recourse to it in the Finale. Bruckner's usage can perhaps be traced back to Beethoven's Ninth (Ex. 6b i) via Bruckner's *Nullte*, Second and Third Symphonies (ii–iv).<sup>169</sup> Here, although the loss of bifolds. 13 and 14 have left us without certain confirmation of the fact, the letter notation found in the top and r. margin of the final p. of 11A/“12” (“12 neu” C/204; not in Orel; transcription in AP E/52) and the later SVE “13”<sup>b</sup>E (C/213ff.; E/57) and “13a”E (C/217ff.; E/53) all suggest that a passacaglia-like repetition of this motive, derived from the epilogue of the chorale (Ex. 6b v), provided the essential musical momentum for the passage, which apparently becomes the chromatically descending series of  $\frac{6}{3}$  chords found at the beginning of 13E/“14”.<sup>170</sup> The contrapuntal concept behind its combination with the Te Deum motive, with which Bruckner appears to have struggled, is given in Ex. 6b vi, and required shifting the semibreve augmentation of the Te Deum motive by 2 mm.; cf. the later SVE “13”<sup>b</sup>E (E/58ff., underlaid), which was probably a first trial for the eventual expansion of this passage on “13a”E. An expansion of the chromatic descent motive can be seen (1st ob. system) against which two initial e<sup>6</sup> incipits of the Te Deum motive in semibreves are struck through. A further sk. for

<sup>169</sup> The connection between the ostinato in the first movement codas of the Bruckner Third and Beethoven Ninth was noted by Gölleirich in his *Konzert-Einführung* of the Third, Göll.-A. IV/2, pp. 647f.

<sup>170</sup> Cf. also first movement, letter J: it is probably not coincidental that the opening of the “2. Theil” of IX/1 uses an analogous musical structure as here: between three-octave F pedal points in brass and woodwind the strings intone first e $\flat^1$ -d $\flat^1$ -c<sup>1</sup>-b $\flat$ -a $\flat$ -b $\flat$ -c<sup>1</sup>, then from m. 235, e $\flat^1$ -d $\sharp^1$ -d $\flat^1$ -c<sup>1</sup>-d $\flat^1$ -d $\sharp^1$ . The d<sup>1</sup>-c $\sharp$ -c $\sharp$ -b $\sharp$  phrase apparently used by Bruckner in the Finale consists of the same first 4 notes.

the beginning of the Durchf. (ÖNB 6085/39<sup>f</sup>; C/40; likewise not in Orel) was notated on paper type 4 used for rulings A–D.<sup>171</sup> It contains a draft for the beginning of the Durchf. recalling the manner in which the probably earlier sk. 28.229 leads the Te Deum motive into the bass register, but adds the counterpoint (in letter notation) “e d c a”. Although a definitive ordering of this sk. into the surviving material is not possible—it may pre-or postdate 28.229 or 12C, or even represent a later ‘throwback’—the most plausible interpretation is that it represents an initial attempt to combine the Te Deum motive with the descending scalar motive first drafted for the passage in the 3194 sks. but which apparently only found its way into the score in a later version of bifol. 12.

Hence, it seems that Bruckner replaced 12C by a new version in which the chromatic descending line of the chorale epilogue was extended after the introduction of the Te Deum motive, but which combined with the Te Deum motive, probably in minims or semibreves, into what was originally envisioned in the 28.229 sk.: an arrival point on a diminished-seventh chord, with widely spread augmentations of the Te Deum motive descending by semitones. This can be found on the later 13E/“14” (C/225ff.; E/61) which, judging by its exceptionally clean appearance and lack of erasures, was probably largely a recopying of an otherwise definitive and fully scored [13] (the likewise definitive “2”E and “3”E are of the same ruling). The later SVE for the expansion of “13” (see work phase 5) indicate a combination of the two essential elements, the Te Deum motive and ongoing descending line. Mus. Ex. 6c gives an impression of the likely contents of the lost [12/“13”], which must have been at least as extensively scored as the earlier version of 13E/“14” which followed on from it, given that the latter, fully scored out and already provided with whole-m. rests, begins abruptly in the 7th m. of a period (cf. C/225). That this [12/“13”] must have existed is confirmed by a cut marked on the final p. of 15D/“16” (C/256), “de + v[om] 13. Bogen”, which must have corresponded with a location on a then valid, renumbered [12/“13”], as no harmonically appropriate site for the “vi–” can be found on 13E/“14” (see §3.1.11 *infra*); a plausible point in the reconstruction of this bifol. given in Ex. 6c is marked at m. 11, following the 8-m. introduction of the Te Deum motive with which the “2. Theil” began on 12C.

The reconstruction of [14/“15”] given (partially) in the AP (E/65f.) and DdF (G/37), and, with hypothetical continuation, in the AF (cf. Ex. 7, as discussed in §3.3.6), is based on the possibility that Bruckner retained the 28.229/12C progression rather than an unknown progression on [14C]. This is perhaps more in line with the C2 hypothesis, namely that 12C or an initial [13C] first represented the ‘endpoint’ of the score, and that Bruckner replaced 12C, or both 12C and [13C], with later C versions before progressing through the lost [14C] and the surviving 15–17C—this would be consistent with Bruckner’s repeated redrafting of bifols. which apparently troubled him on bifols. of the same ruling, e.g. 6<sup>a-c</sup>B, 1<sup>a-d</sup>C, or 17<sup>a-c</sup>D.

---

<sup>171</sup> As noted (§3.1.6), the bifol. was used upside down.

Although fewer bifols. must be posited as lost in this way, 15C, if first notated after the existing text of 12C was written, discarded and replaced, would surely have reflected Bruckner's revision of 12C's string writing, but which we only find on its successor, 15D.<sup>172</sup> As both 15C and its later counterpart 15D/"16" begin in  $G\flat$ , the ostensible reason why 15C was replaced appears to have been its subsequent continuity,<sup>173</sup> but if a lost 12 and 13D or F had been so radically restructured, harmonically and motivically, it is scarcely likely that the musical continuity of [14C] could have remained entirely unaltered and still led to  $G\flat$ . In fact, the final p. of 15C (C/252<sup>174</sup>) was used for sks. for the elaboration of the Te Deum motive counterpoint (similar to 12C and the beginning of 15C and 15D) which, although apparently marked "15 NB",<sup>175</sup> were doubtless redrafts of the continuity of [14]. Reconstructing a definitive continuity from them is by no means straightforward, however—cf. Bruckner's "10 Tacte", r. margin—so that it is not impossible that Bruckner may have returned to the original 12C progression at some point in any case. Given the similarity of the instrumental texture found at the beginning of 15D/"16" to that of the end of the original 12C, it remains possible that the progression found in the last 6 mm. of 12C (C/207f.; E/65) gives an impression of the contents of the later version of [14].

That the revised [13] and [14] may have been F-ruling bifols. has already been touched upon briefly (§3.1.7). The revision of these bifols., involving more substantial scoring and hence probable replacement of the tuba by horn designations shortly after Bruckner had used the remaining C-bifols. to extend the score as far as the fugue, may well explain why Bruckner recognised the need for the F bifols. as an alternative to the tuba-designated D ruling. This would, as we have suggested, provide a plausible explanation for Bruckner's intermittent recourse to the  $F^{IIa}$  ruling during the D-ruling sequence, which begins as early as 17F, the immediate successor to 17C. It does not, however, explain why 15D and subsequent versions of bifols. 17–18 and 20, which required horns in place of tubas, were rewritten on  $D^I$  ruling bifols.

In summary, while further explanation of the later expansion of the passage in work phase 4 and 5 is given in context below, the bifol. sequence of the Durchf. over work phases 2–5, following the more likely D–F hypothesis, may be reconstructed as follows:

<sup>172</sup> Cf. also the free system above the 1st vln. on both 12C and 15C, which contains identical figuration and doubtless predates Bruckner's arpeggio figuration in vlc. and 1st vln. on 12C in octaves, which we find in finished form at the beginning of 15D.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. 1st ob., the principal voice where the 1st vln. had figuration which would only be worked out in detail later: Bruckner obviously found the  $g\flat^1-d\flat^2-d\flat^2-e\flat^2$  progression on 15C unsatisfactory and changed it to  $g\flat^1-d\flat^2-d\flat^2-g\flat^2$ , altering the ensuing  $\frac{6}{5}$ -chord progression to begin from  $G\flat-C$  instead of  $E\flat-A$ .

<sup>174</sup> These sks. were not transcribed by OreI—cf. D/102: "In den freigebliebenen Partiturzeilen des 15. Bogens finden sich noch Bleistiftnotizen, deren Zusammenhang nicht zu erkennen ist".

<sup>175</sup> Cf. C/252; the "15" and "NB" may of course be independent of one another—cf. the "3" midway across the top margin.

- Work phase Bifolio sequence
- 2 12C → [13C] → [14C] → 15C → 16C
  - 3 [12D or F] (cf. reconstruction, Ex. 6c) Δ [13D or F] (largely identical to its replacement 13E/“14”) Δ [14D or F] (perhaps redrafted using the progression and scoring found on the discarded 12C; cf. Mus. Ex. 7) Δ 15D Δ 16C
  - 4 Renumbering: [12D/“13”] Δ 13E/“14”, dated 14 June 1896, replacing [13D or F], then Δ [14D or F/“15”] Δ 15D/“16” Δ 16C/“17”
  - 5 With the final versions of 12–16 all renumbered “13–17”, Bruckner on 11 August 1896 split [12/“13”] into two sep bifols., expanding the passage of stasis in E minor (= Phrygian) by a further 16 mm. (cf. Ex. 6d); “15”E was drafted as an alternative to 13E/“14” perhaps relating to the problem of concluding the Te Deum motive before the re-entry of the dotted motive. Further less conclusive SVE were drafted before or after this date for renumbered bifols. “13”–“15”.<sup>176</sup> Setting aside “15”E (see *infra*), the final sequence for the Durchf. would have been:  
 “13a”E Δ = “13b”E (or =“14”) Δ 13E/“14” (hence “44/ 2.”, top margin C/225) Δ [14D/“15”] Δ 15D/“16” (hence “NB 2. # 15.”, C/253?) Δ 16C/“17”

### Work phase 3

Aside from the question of the Durchf. revisions, reconstructing a coherent narrative for the genesis of the movement has so far been a relatively straightforward task. Phase 3, in which the ‘forward’ composition of the remainder of the score has been grouped, included revisions to the Exp. and Durchf. and involved the use of three rulings, D, F and E, the first two of which were used together, the E ruling later. The known date by which work had begun on this phase is, as we have seen, “16.12.”, given by Bruckner’s dating of 17<sup>a</sup>D. Despite the greater level of complication involved, further inferences as to likely compositional sequence can be made from the sub-rulings apparent within the three main groups.

That the acquisition of the F paper and preparation of the F<sup>I</sup> and F<sup>IIa</sup> rulings probably all took place in advance of the use of most of these bifols. by Bruckner is, as we have seen, revealed by the way in which ruling F bifols. are interspersed through the primarily D-ruling sequence of bifols. 17–26. The most likely reason for the preparation and use of the additional material is that the tubas revert to 5th–8th horns throughout the chorale, Durchf. and fugue. Despite the substantial number of prepared D-ruling bifols., Bruckner, anticipating the scoring out of this section, would scarcely have wished to go to the trouble of erasing and altering the tuba designations on so many bifols.; he had already had to do so on the A- B- and C-ruling

<sup>176</sup> The late SVE for bifols. “13”, “14” and “15” also include 8A (C/185ff.), which was reused as a SVE for bifol. “13”.



bifols. of the chorale (C/183f. and 189–205). While it is difficult to logically account for Bruckner's choice of D or F bifols. in every case, the 'spine' of the sequence was probably represented by the series of D<sup>I</sup> and D<sup>II</sup> rulings given in Table X, ordered by the manner in which their 1st and 2nd tuba designations gradually standardise. If the D ruling bifols. were not simply used at random, since Meißner's ruling sequence seems to have been maintained, the F<sup>IIa</sup> bifols. were either selected indiscriminately by Bruckner or at some point became intermingled with the D ruling.

As we have seen (§3.1.6), the numerous pc. sks. Bruckner made for the exposition of the fugue, 6007/1<sup>r</sup> and 3194/13, predate composition of 17C, where the progress of the movement again halted; the 1st p. of 17C was also subsequently used for sks. for the further course of the fugue. Bruckner gradually optimised the fugal exposition on bifols. 17F<sup>177</sup> and 17<sup>a-c</sup>D.<sup>178</sup> Having definitively established the continuity and counterpoint of the exposition in score and made pc. sks. for its continuation (3194/13<sup>v</sup>, 14<sup>r</sup>), composition of the fugue continued through 18D, [19], 20F and at least as far as the 6th m. of 21D. It may have been at this point that, as we have seen in the foregoing section, Bruckner replaced [13C], [14C] and 15C with D or F versions of [13] and [14], and with 15D,<sup>179</sup> drafted the SVE "#D, and apparently intended to accommodate an interpolation into the Exp. Gesangsp. (discussed under phase 4, *infra*) and a number of SVE for the movement's opening, 1<sup>a-c</sup>D, 2<sup>a-f</sup>D and 1F (not necessarily in the exact order given by the bifol. classifications). These are mostly very fragmentary, but largely appear to concern the irregular metrical scheme of the introduction.<sup>180</sup> As even the last fully scored C-version of bifol. 1, 1<sup>d</sup>C, is heavily written over with crossings-out, alterations and annotations, it is apparent that it would not have represented Bruckner's final intentions—considering the trouble to which Bruckner would later go to copy out 'clean' versions of the ensuing bifols.—but that he continued to work toward a more metrically regular and perhaps shorter and more incisive solution to the movement's beginning, as the later E-SVE attest.

The further course of the movement following the fugue was first drafted in pc. sks. (6085/35–36 sk., C/41ff.: "Forts[etzung] zum 21. Bogen"), which were discarded; the final continuity for the passage was apparently laid out directly in score (bifols. 21D–23D). The

<sup>177</sup> Although the use of the F<sup>IIa</sup> ruling for this bifol. might suggest that it postdated the D-ruling versions, its content (cf. the vla. entries on the last page of the bifol.) confirm that it was unquestionably used first. Orel (D/106) also placed it after 17C, although without venturing an explanation as to how this, for his model even more anomalous, sequence could have come about.

<sup>178</sup> The fugue could not have been extended further than its Exp. before its countersubject material had been established on bifol. 17. While the many corrections on 18D—erasures, pasteovers etc.—indicate how heavily it was reworked, the sum total of labour represented by the C, F and three D versions of bifol. 17 is considerably greater than that represented by 18D.

<sup>179</sup> [13] was, of course, later replaced by a 'clean version', 13E/"14".

<sup>180</sup> While it initially appears that these could constitute a single group together with the later phase-5 SVE for 1E and 1bE, the steadier handwriting of the D-ruling drafts and the fact that mostly ink rather than pencil is used confirms that the chronological separation suggested by the paper rulings is probably appropriate.

initial emergence of the ‘horn theme’ (E/98ff.; Ex. 9a) can be followed from the 6085/35–36 sk., in which Bruckner extends a double augmentation<sup>181</sup> of the ubiquitous falling-sixth–rising-fourth motive into a sequence featuring crotchet triplets (Ex. 9d). This is strikingly similar to a passage introduced into the first-movement Durchf. of the 1890 version of the Third Symphony (9b) and also recalls the coda of IX/1 (9c). However, the eventual realisation in the score reserved both triplet crotchets and falling sixth for a new theme which emerges in G $\flat$  major (see Bruckner’s comment on 6085/36<sup>r</sup>, C/43, top margin: “bis ges hinauf—halten”), which is approached via a sequence using string figuration, marked (a) in the following example, reminiscent of the Finale of the Sixth (b, cf. VI/4, letter B) or the “Aeterna fac” of the Te Deum (c):<sup>182</sup>

As shown by the motivic analysis in Ex. 9a, the later part of the horn theme forms a mutation cycle in which increasing motivic fragmentation prepares the return of the three-note accompaniment motive of the Gesangsp. (♩ | ♩ ♩) by gradually fragmenting a longer phrase.

The Repr. of the Gesangsp., first mapped out in pc. sk. on 3194/14–15 and 28.238, ensued, using a combination of D<sup>II</sup> and F<sup>IIa</sup> bifols., namely 23D, [24—probably D], 25D, 26F and [27—perhaps F]. The continuity of the pc. sks. is sufficiently complete and construable here that convincing and probably accurate reconstructions of the continuity of both [24] and [27] can be made from them (see Exx. 10 and 11a), but it also suggests that [27] must have been 24 rather than 16 mm. in length. Bruckner may either have ruled the barlines himself here if an F<sup>IIa</sup>-ruling bifol. was used, or chosen a further example of Meißner’s 24-m. F<sup>I</sup> ruling.

The remainder of the score was probably all laid out on E-ruling bifols. (paper type 6), probably acquired in late winter or early spring 1896. These, as we have seen, fall into two main groups, E<sup>I</sup>, used both before, during (phase 4), and after the renumbering (phase 5), and E<sup>II</sup>, used wholly after the renumbering. One remaining F bifol., 2F, was ruled up together with the E<sup>I</sup> bifols., which were used from 28E/“29” onwards; the lost [30/“31”] and several further bifols. from [33/“34”] to the end of the score, roughly as far, probably, as [39/“40”], were probably all drafted on E<sup>I</sup> bifols.

<sup>181</sup> That is, from double dotted crotchet + semiquaver to (in effect) double dotted semibreve + crotchet.

<sup>182</sup> This was itself a borrowing by Bruckner from the fugue subject of Bach’s Toccata and Fugue in D minor, BWV 565—



—one of the relatively few organ works which Bruckner is known to have played. The Toccata in the Griepenkerl edition is included among the scores listed in the inventory of Bruckner’s estate; cf. Göll.-A. II/1, pp. 336f.

The final phases of the composition of the score must have proceeded slowly but deliberately throughout the late winter and spring of 1896. While this involved the laying out of many pages of string score there are fewer indications of the instrumentation of the winds from the Gesangsp. Repr. onwards. The chorale Repr. would probably also have been just as straightforward to write as the corresponding passage in the Exp., so that it is scarcely surprising that the final bifols. of the score appear to have been laid out in a continuous sequence, and that no further pc. sks. have survived up until the coda sks. of May 1896. Bruckner's health declined further over this period, but not in any uniform fashion, as we have seen (§1.1.12). Heller noted the increase in mistakes and ink blots in the score over this period; a letter of 24 February 1896 to Nicodé dictated by Meißner began: "Da ich mich noch immer nicht ganz wo[h]l befinden u. mir das Schreiben etwas schwer fällt". On the other hand, Dvořák and Suk, at their visit in March 1896, finding Bruckner at his desk, "bekamen den Eindruck, daß hier ein Mensch haust, der ganz in seinem Geiste und seiner Arbeit aufgeht". On 27 March Bruckner wrote to Otto Kitzler on 27 March: "Bin noch immer krank", although his health appears to have improved again in April 1896. Franz Bayer's report in the *Steyrer Zeitung* of 10 May 1896 stated that Bruckner's health was poor but maintained, "den Schlußsatz seiner 9. Symphonie hat er wohl *vollständig skizziert* [i.e., largely concluded in draft score], doch [...] hofft er selber nicht mehr, diesen ganz fertig ausarbeiten zu können."<sup>183</sup>

Significantly, this report is very much in accord with the likelihood, based on the surviving material, that the composer had by this time extended the score into the coda of the movement ("wohl vollständig skizziert"), apparently as far as bifol. 34 or 35. A final surge of energy in late May and June 1896 may have permitted him to continue as far as the end of the movement and to begin completion of the instrumentation, which advanced as far as the Durchf. We possess no further surviving score bifols. past 31E/"32" but there is no suggestion that the score trails into incoherence at that point: Bruckner's handwriting and the elaborate counterpoint on 31E/"32", which was conceptually almost fully orchestrated, remains perfectly clear and consistent. There is also evidence from the late pc. sks. that Bruckner drafted the movement's coda in May 1896 in sks. which make reference to bifols. 35 and 36. Also decisive and musically compelling is the late, radical revision of the continuity of bifol. 2 on 2F (probably still during phase 3) and the subsequent recopying of earlier bifols. occasioned by it in June 1896 (phase 4).<sup>184</sup>

<sup>183</sup> Italics added. This was further discussed in §1.1.12.

<sup>184</sup> We can only speculate on the exact order of 2F within the compositional sequence. As explained, it was ruled up as a remnant of paper F, but whether before or after the E<sup>1</sup> ruling bifols. is difficult to establish. The final bifols. of the score look to have been composed in a smooth unbroken sequence, which probably continued at least as far as the coda (probably c. bifol. [33/"34"] or even later), and would probably have left Bruckner little time to review other parts of the score at least until he paused to draft the coda sks. of late May. Perhaps the grandeur of the coda he envisioned may have suggested to Bruckner the need to balance the movement's

Misleadingly reproduced by Orel (D/127), who attempted no opinion on their significance, *sk.*s. for the coda have survived. The most substantial of them, a *pc. sk.* of an extended 24-m. harmonic progression (ÖNB 6085/43; C/47; E/141), is curiously dated “am 21. Don[er]stag, 22. Freitag, 23. Samst.” (C/47) and below on the same page, continuing onto the verso, a perhaps earlier draft for the same progression marked “Nacht v.[on] Don[er]stag auf fr.[eitag]”. As confirmed by Auer<sup>185</sup> and Manfred Wagner,<sup>186</sup> the only possible coincidence of these dates and days is May 1896. 6085/45<sup>r</sup> and 47<sup>r</sup> (C/45f.), bear the figures “19.” and “21.” respectively, apparently not as references to bifols., as alongside a “19.” in the left margin of 6085/45<sup>r</sup> stands “Bogen 36”, doubtless indicating the location of the *sk.* within the orchestral score, similar to Bruckner’s annotation of “zu 17” and “23” in the 3194 *sk.*s. for the fugue and Gesangsp. Repr. The reference to a bifol. 36, the late dating as well as the nature of the music—a monumental, broadly outlined harmonic sequences centred on the persistent *c♭* which begins 6058/43<sup>r</sup>—all point toward the likelihood that these sketches were intended for the coda of the movement. A further brief, perhaps interrupted sketch, the interpretation of which remains uncertain, was dated “19. Mai” (ÖNB 6085/41<sup>r</sup>, C/44). The use of the “*lienig*” paper for all coda sketches (6085/43, 45, 47; Facs. C/4–49) as for the ruling F bifols. also suggests that these preceded composition of at least some of the E-ruling bifols.; these last surviving *pc. sk.*s. probably represent the final compositional hurdle before Bruckner arrived at the concluding “Lob- und Preislied” with which the movement was to conclude, and which, as Heller’s account suggests, was probably envisaged by him at a much earlier time.

There is also no need to assume that the May *sk.*s. marked the farthest point to which the score advanced. Shortly thereafter, perhaps towards the end of the month, Bruckner probably concluded the remaining *c.* four to five bifols. of the score, thereby bringing to an end the first stage of its notation—complete notation of the strings and of more important indications for the winds—and in accordance with his usual method of working began the systematic scoring-out of the instrumentation which, as we have noted, progressed some way into the development section, as indicated by the date “14.6.96” on 13E/“14” (C/225).

Further evidence of the conception of the coda as well as Bruckner’s later expansion of the opening of the *Durchf.* is provided by a single *sk.* for the Finale to be found in the Cracow material for the Ninth (C/49). This bifol., the same paper as that used for rulings A–D, was probably a last remnant of paper type 4 which reappeared along with the remaining, unruled

---

conclusion with this more massive and compelling *Steigerung* in the Exp. As we saw in §2.2.2, the 2F recomposition in many respects set the keystone to the great mutation cycle out of which the *Hauptth.* emerges; cf. Mus. Ex. 2c.

<sup>185</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 613. The annotation written by Auer on the MS itself, “[August 1896 Auer]”, is as erroneous as it was presumptuous.

<sup>186</sup> Manfred Wagner, *BrLWD*, p. 209.

bifols. of type 5 at this time. The numbers “13 / (18.)” and (below a horizontal line) “35 / (18)” appear in the top r. h. corner. The figures “13” and “35” most likely refer to bifols. 13 and 35: the first sk. comprises a 10-m. metrical structure with the *Te Deum* motive corresponding very roughly to Bruckner's subsequent introduction of the motive on bifol. “13a”E, the second a longer metrical structure featuring extended pedal points on F and b $\natural$ . The content of the expansion of the *Durchf.* and the b $\sharp$ /cb–f sequence around which Bruckner built the final progression of the coda is unmistakable—cf. the “f / ces / sehr lang” in the “Nacht v.[on] Don.[nerstag] auf fr.[eitag]” sk., C/47.<sup>187</sup> Considering that the other coda sks. all date from “19. May” onwards, the “(18)” may refer to the date of 18 May.

#### *Work phase 4*

Bruckner had doubtless continued the AP in initial string scoring well into the coda by May 1896, and there is every evidence that he could have extended the score as far as the final bifol. by early or even mid-June. Given the dating of the coda sks. (18–23 May 1896) and that Bruckner would still have had a number of bifols. to lay out in score thereafter, phase 4 probably began by early to mid-June. Some sections of the score, as both valid and discarded bifols., particularly from ruling C, reveal, were completed in score not long after being initially drafted—this applies particularly to passages such as the *Hauptth.* and *chorale*, in which the instrumental concept was clear to the composer from the beginning. Others, including the whole later part of the score, the *Repr.* of the *Gesangsp.* and *chorale*, and doubtless also the coda, were laid out in complete string score with varying degrees of scoring for the winds, ranging from none to virtually complete textures.

The surviving evidence for the completion of the instrumentation—Bruckner's second main compositional task, as we have seen (§3.1.3)—includes three late copyings and completed instrumentations of existing bifols. (“2”E, “3”E and 13E/“14”), as well as many undated additions to the scoring of existing bifols. A page fragment with a brief study for the voice-leading of the violas, made during the instrumentation of “2”E, also survives in a private collection (C/50<sup>188</sup>). Despite the late stage at which “2”E and “3”E were obviously written, they are clear and legible, as is 13E/“14”, which carries the date “14.6.96”.<sup>189</sup> If

<sup>187</sup> A further link is suggested by the roman numerals “I II IV IV [?] / V V VI” in the *Cracow* sk., which have not been deciphered, but probably represent scale degrees (*Stufen*), perhaps related to the “St. 2. / 3 St. / 1. St.” on 6085/43” (C/48).

<sup>188</sup> Cf. the vla., 2nd p. of bifol. 2F, C/132 and the final text of “2”E, AP E/6.

<sup>189</sup> Close examination of the originals themselves reveals that Bruckner renumbered more of the D and E bifols. than Orel supposed, including the last surviving bifol. 31E/“32”. The care with which the erasures of the bifoliations were carried out suggests the possibility that Bruckner might have left the technical labour of the erasures to Meißner, which could, perhaps, explain why bifol. 2<sup>c</sup>C (Facs. C/115ff.), finding its way into the wrong pile of music paper, appears to have been incorrectly renumbered “26”, for which reason it was placed by Nowak in corresponding, but nonsensical, order between bifol. 23D/“24” and 26F/“27” as fols. 63–64 of ÖNB

13E/“14” was the first bifol. to have been rewritten following the conclusion of the score, its dating may be consistent with Bruckner’s custom, which seems to have been to cite dates mainly at significant junctures.<sup>190</sup> In line with this assumption, Bruckner wrote the score of the Finale, carrying parts of it through multiple revisions, in an overall minimum of string score with the instrumentation of the Exp. and most the Durchf. complete, over a period of twelve months from late May 1895 to late May 1896—a credible achievement considering his physical condition, but also an impressive one.

The central problem of phase 4 was created by the composition of bifol. 2F (Facs. C/131ff.) containing the revised version of the Hauptth. Steigerung. As a result of its substantive musical revision over the previous versions of bifol. 2 (cf. 2<sup>c</sup>C, C/115), 2F could no longer be fully scored out legibly on a single bifol. Bruckner perhaps first considered dividing its contents over two 18-m. bifols. (c. C/134, lower l. h. margin, “18 / 2 / 36”), and as a result proceeded to renumber all following valid bifols. of the score,<sup>191</sup> but eventually settled upon dividing it over 3 bifols.—“2”E (18 mm.), “3”E (16 mm.), both of which are extant. The remaining 2 mm. must have been allotted, or intended to be allotted, to a [“4”E], which has not survived, but would also have subsumed the last 2 mm. of 2F (cf. C/134, top margin “4. [B]ogen”) and the first 14 mm. of [3C]. [3C] would in any case have had to be rescored due to Bruckner’s alteration of the brass scoring of the Hauptth. on 2F (C/134; cf. its forerunner, 2<sup>c</sup>C, C/118), and the whole process may have somehow related to the integration of an apparently earlier SVE, “#”D, which seems to draft an expansion to the Gesangsp., as will be explained shortly.

The final phase was, of course, intended to complete a definitive score, a public rather than a private document. May and June were evidently still relatively productive months for Bruckner and despite his comments to Bayer he may, even at this late stage, have intermittently retained the hope that he could complete the score. “2”E probably adjoined a correspondingly definitive bifol. [1E], which was probably as clear and neatly finished as “2”E and “3”E. The composer must either have adopted a pre-existing version of bifol. 1 (perhaps a lost [1F]) subsequent to the composition of 1<sup>d</sup>C, which was obviously replaced, or written a fresh copy (a lost [1E]). Indications of this can be found in marginal annotations of what appear to be numbers of mm.: the last p. of 1<sup>d</sup>C (C/70) cites “60” (a 24-m. bifol. 1 + 36-

---

6087. However, as Bruckner’s lower case ‘b’s are often indistinguishable from his ‘6’s, Bruckner may have renumbered the bifol. “2b” himself after an earlier composition of an intervening “2a”, which has not survived.

<sup>190</sup> See §3.1.8 *infra*. It is not absolutely clear from the original MS that bifol. 13E/“14” was renumbered, although the “4” appears in facsimile (C/225) to have been written over an erasure; examination of the original reveals the erasure to have been extremely faint. Conceivably 13E/“14” may have been copied from a 13C, D or F antecedent as Bruckner was proceeding through the score after splitting up 2F, and written as an already renumbered “14”. However, it is more likely that it too was renumbered.

<sup>191</sup> Cf. Orel D/91: “[...] in Fassung E [wurden] die ersten zwei Bogen auf drei erweitert [...], wodurch eine Ummummerierung [sic] aller folgenden, aus den Fassungen A bis D übernommenen Bogen notwendig wurde.”

m. bifol. 2), as does the last p. of 2<sup>c</sup>C (C/118); while the last p. of “2”E (C/138) has “50 / 18” and further below that “18” again. This may suggest that the total length of the lost bifol. [1] and subsequent split-up of 2F came to 50 mm. as opposed to the previous 60.<sup>192</sup> The surviving D-ruling SVE to bifol. 1, 1<sup>a-d</sup>D, reveal that Bruckner continued to deliberate over the metrical structure of the movement’s opening sequence. While it is impossible to know whether the result of these efforts, posited in Table XI as a lost [1E], was 24 mm. long or whether Bruckner continued to work toward a more concise version of the opening of the score (perhaps a 16-m. [1E]), it is clear that “2”E cannot have adjoined 1<sup>d</sup>C (AP E/1ff.). In place of the sustained brass chord which appears in all three extant C versions of bifol. 2 (cf. E/4, 5), we find at the beginning of “2”E whole-m. rests for all instruments apart from the strings and 1st ob. Wind doublings of the vlc. line marked in pencil in bsn. and horn in the first 2 mm. of 2F (C/131; cf. 1<sup>d</sup>C, C/70) also seem to have been dropped. Reconstructions of both 24- and 16-m. version of a final bifol. [1] have been given in Mus. Ex 3a and b; a possible 16-m. version suggested by SVE 1<sup>e</sup>E (C/95f. E/1ff., which may or may not have postdated such a solution, if ever realised in score) perhaps dropped the repetitions of the first two tritone sequences (thereby eliminating 4 mm.) and the 4-m. reference to the Adagio in horns and fl. at (originally) mm. 17–21 (cf. Mus. Exx. 3a and b). This hypothetical version has been used in the AF (G/1ff.); the DdF (F/1ff.) retains the text of the last fully scored 24-m. version (1<sup>d</sup>C).

Finally, the SVE classified by Orel as (5D)—in fact, only a “#” appears in pencil on its 1st p. (Facs. C/155<sup>193</sup>)—may constitute an important clue as to why Bruckner split 2F over three new bifols. instead of two 18-m. bifols. What can be found in the 6086 sk. as a counterpoint to the *Gesangsp.* motive (C/33, 4th bracket; note Bruckner’s “X” in the l. margin; cf. Orel D/66 and Mus. Ex. 4a), referred to for convenience as the ‘lyrical counterpoint’, curiously does not appear in the phase-1 bifols. for the passage (cf. bifols. 4A and 5A; Ex. 4b),<sup>194</sup> but first emerges as a new thematic idea in the *Durchf.* on 16C (C/258). Either Bruckner inadvertently omitted the phrase from the first score version of the *Exp. Gesangsp.*, or he only decided to reintroduce it into the *Exp.* later, on arriving at the *Repr.* of the *Gesangsp.* (bifol. 22D), as we have noted in discussion of phase 3.

“#”D was probably drafted as an expansion of the *Gesangsp.* in order to introduce the lyrical motive that first found its entry into the *Durchf.* at phase 2 (E/74) back into the *Exp.* The lyrical motive may have only later been added to the pc. sk. 6086 (Facs. C/33; cf. Orel

<sup>192</sup> The arithmetic ( $[16] + 18 + 16 = 50$ ) is only valid, of course, if the new third bifol. “3”E came to 16 m., not the 18 mm. that Bruckner initially intended.

<sup>193</sup> This, like much other marginalia, is not visible in the facsimile reproductions in vol. II; it is however clearly visible in the better-quality reproductions in the *Faksimile-Ausgabe*.

<sup>194</sup> Cf. the pencil additions of this and further counterpoints for the passage in the 6086 sk., C/33f.; transcription D/66; cf. also Mus. Ex. 4a and b.

D/66, 2nd bracket) after Bruckner had decided to introduce it in altered form in the Repr. of the Gesangsp. (E/103), as it does not occur in the 3194 sks. for that section. The interpolation into the Exp. may also have been made in order to maintain the proportions of the movement, as the Repr. Gesangsp. was now substantially longer than its counterpart in the Exp.; in retrospect Bruckner may have become convinced of the need to explain the ‘origin’ of the phrase which hitherto had suddenly emerged unprepared in the middle of the Durchf.

“#”D certainly appears to have been drafted, as its location in Tables X and IX suggests, within the D<sup>I</sup> ruling sequence. It is perfectly possible that Bruckner made this revision, the only known change to the Exp. Gesangsp. made in Phase 3, without at the time pursuing all the necessary rewrites of adjoining bifols. that it apparently necessitated. However, the anomaly between the lengths and musical content of the original Exp. Gesangsp. and later Repr. versions certainly suggest that Bruckner had something of this nature in mind. Apparently it was only integrated later, at the time of the renumbering, since it presumes the existence of a preceding bifol. on which the contents have been ‘shifted’ by 4 mm. The hypothetical reconstruction of the passage in the AP, E/12ff., makes this apparently complex procedure more clear. As suggested, this may have had to do with the redistribution of the 36 mm. of 2F onto “2”E (18 mm.), “3”E (16 mm.) and a lost [“4”] (2 mm. from 2F, plus the first 14 mm. of the original 16-m. bifol. 3); pencil annotations on 4C/“5” (cf. C/152, “Gesangsp. 5”, repeated) confirm this possibility. Presumably then, what may have been a lost [“5a”] contained the last 2 mm. of the former bifol. 3 and somehow expanded to 14 the first 12 mm. of 4C, thereby connecting with the continuity of the “#”D bifol., which may have been scored out as [“5b”E].<sup>195</sup> The cover bifol. 6085/37–8 (cf. C/325) with the autograph inscription “v[om] 1. bis inclusive 12.” and which belongs to the F<sup>IIa</sup> group may well have been a last remnant of that sub-ruling which remained on the prepared score paper pile when the newly prepared E<sup>I</sup> ruling was placed on top, and which then reappeared as Bruckner used up that ruling. It was most likely used by the composer following the renumbering to segregate the entire Exp. or “1. Theil”, the by then complete and fully orchestrated bifols. 1 to (renumbered) “12” (11A/“12”), from the “2. Theil” of the score, on which work was still in progress. It probably suggests that Bruckner regarded the Exp. as complete and definitive by the time of its use.

#### *Work Phase 5*

The rapid advance in Bruckner’s mental deterioration following the pneumonia of July 1896 (see §1.1.12) probably prevented further significant work on the instrumentation of the

---

<sup>195</sup> Bruckner would surely otherwise have integrated the additional number into the revised bifoliation of the score. The later “13a”E shows that Bruckner was prepared to number additional bifols. in this way (*infra*); see also fn. 186 *supra* concerning the numbering of bifol. 2<sup>c</sup>C and the ensuing fn. 193 concerning the numbering of the “1bE” bifols.



movement, which proceeded approximately as far as halfway through the Durchf. The appearances of several late additions to the instrumentation in pencil on 13E/"14" (C/225ff.; E/61ff.), 15D/"16" (C/253ff.; E/69) and 16C/"17" (C/257ff.; E/73ff.), the 1st p. of which is dated (in pencil) "Aug. 11.", confirm that Bruckner was attempting to score out this passage more fully in his last months. In view of the fact that the climax of the fugue on 20F/"21" survives in complete scoring, most of the pencilled instrumentation throughout the fugue was probably made earlier.

As we have seen, the remaining E<sup>I</sup> bifols., the SVE "13"<sup>b</sup>E and five versions of "14"<sup>a</sup>E, appear to form a late group together with the fourteen surviving E<sup>II</sup> bifols., all of which are likewise SVE: 13<sup>a</sup>E, the so-numbered "13a"<sup>a</sup>E, the unnumbered bifol. apparently following "13a", namely ="13b"<sup>a</sup>E, the probably related "15"<sup>a</sup>E, and the ten SVE 1<sup>a-c</sup>E and 1b<sup>a-c</sup>E. That these postdate Bruckner's renumbering of the score is demonstrated by the use of the altered bifol. classifications "13" and "14" for revisions of the continuity of what were originally bifols. 12 and 13.<sup>196</sup> The final stock of bifols. prepared by Meißner, E<sup>II</sup>, left the 1st–4th tuba/5th–8th horn staves completely unmarked, and was most likely intended for definitive 'fair copy' versions of the Durchf. and fugue, where the 5th–8th horn replace the tubas, but this never took place. Most of the surviving E<sup>II</sup> SVE, comprising 13<sup>a</sup>E, "15"<sup>a</sup>E, ="13b"<sup>a</sup>E and ten SVE for bifols. 1 and what appear in part to be extensions thereof, in part drafts for bifol. 2, classified here as '1b', must largely be regarded as apocryptic. As has already been suggested (§1.1.12), the SVE which Bruckner expressly numbered as "13a" and "15"<sup>a</sup>E, also dated "11. Aug.", can be logically construed and are probably significant. They suggest that Bruckner intended an expansion of the opening of the Durchf., the lost [12/"13"], onto two bifols, "13a"<sup>a</sup>E and what was left unnumbered but can only be equivalent to a "13b"<sup>a</sup>E or a new "14"<sup>a</sup>E—hence the numbering of "15"<sup>a</sup>E (cf. C/217–224; 245ff.; transcribed in the AP E/61ff.). The final p. of ="13b"<sup>a</sup>E was probably left blank because its continuity would still have matched that of the last 4 mm. of [12/"13"]—cf. Mus. Ex. 6c—however, Bruckner apparently copied into the tromb. staves on C/223 as a memorandum what must have been the ob. line of this following page, which uses the introductory motive of the movement, the concluding note of the line can be found in ink on 13E/"14". Ex. 6d presents a hypothetical reconstruction of the continuity of the expansion as it appears in the AF (G/29ff.) and in more skeletal form in the DdF (G/30ff.).

If anything, the fact that the late drafts, construable or not, concern only the opening of the movement and that of the Durchf. probably indicates that the remainder of the score had

---

<sup>196</sup> The classification and compositional sequence given to the 1 and 1b bifols. is more speculative, however, and open to interpretation. Orel, for instance, classified 1b<sup>a</sup>E (C/99f.; cf. D/118) as 2<sup>a</sup>. Bogen E, regarding it as a draft for "2"<sup>a</sup>E (his 2<sup>b</sup>. Bogen E). The autograph numbering resembles a "b" or "6", however, while the continuity outlined is roughly that of "2"<sup>a</sup>E. The SVE may well have been drafted subsequent to the composition of 2F as a guide to the layout of "2"<sup>a</sup>E.

attained definitive continuity. The repeated renumberings with which the 1st pp. of the later score bifols. are overwritten (from c. 20F/“21” onwards, cf. C/285, 289, 293, 297, 301, 305, 309, 313 and 317, but see also bifol. 4C/“5”, C/151 and the SVE “14”<sup>a</sup>E, C/243) obviously date from Bruckner’s last months of increasing mental confusion, as it is scarcely conceivable that they can have sprung from the same clear mentality as the musical contents of these bifols.<sup>197</sup> Judging by the amount of scribble on 31E/“32”, the 1st pp. of further lost bifols., [33/“34”] onwards, may have been almost completely overwritten.<sup>198</sup>

### *Conclusions*

The surviving materials for the score of the Finale reveal a composer working with great focus, critical acuity and inexhaustible patience in creating, revising and polishing an astonishingly original and dynamic musical conception. There is every reason to believe that the composer may have laid out the movement in score as far as its final double bar, despite the loss of several final bifols., apparently beginning a final systematic revision of the orchestration, which advanced as far as the middle of the Durchf., in June 1896. Hence, Bruckner was still capable of consistent and methodical work up to three or four months before his death. While there is unquestionably evidence of Bruckner’s mental decline in his final months, (a) the clear, consistent handwriting and musical conception maintained throughout the later bifols. of the score, not to mention the complex counterpoint of 31E/“32”; (b) the late, more complex reconception on 2F of the *Steigerung* to the *Hauptth.* in the *Exp.*; (c) the late recopying and completed orchestration of bifols. “2”E, “3”E and 13E/“14” in June 1896; and (d) the late expansion of bifol. “13”, dated 11th August (among many other SVE of the period which cannot be as rationally construed) show that Bruckner must have remained in full possession of his musical faculties at least up until his serious pneumonia of July 1896, and that he was still intermittently capable of varying degrees of meaningful compositional activity at least two months before his death.

While the continuity of the *Gesangsp.* and that of the beginning of the *Durchf.* can be reconstructed to some extent from surviving score bifols. or SVE, as we will examine in more detail, analysis has suggested that more score bifols. may have been lost than Orel thought, particularly from the later work phases. This also supports the assumption that the score originally extended considerably further than is now the case. Setting aside several obviously

---

<sup>197</sup> That these numbers increase as one moves through the score may have to do with the availability of the bifols. to the declining composer; presumably the later and more recently completed bifols. were simply more readily accessible in the composer’s final weeks, the earlier less so. As no other extant *Exp.* bifols. exhibit such repeated renumberings, the untidy, additional bifoliations on the apparently already renumbered 4C/“5” (C/151) may imply its subsequent exclusion and replacement, confirming, perhaps, that it was not among the bifols. 1–12 set aside by Bruckner in the cover bifol. 6085/37–38.

<sup>198</sup> This raises the possibility that a well-meaning person or persons could have destroyed the later bifols. as representing evidence of Bruckner’s mental decline, without recognising the logic of the underlying musical text.

superseded bifols. lost from earlier compositional phases (some of which may even have been regarded by the composer as not worth keeping), six gaps remain in the continuity of what survives of the emergent AP of the Finale in its final stages:

- i. Final versions of bifol. [1], [“4”], [“5a”], [“5b”], probably E rulings, and [5C/“6”], [6C/“7”], the continuity and even largely precise scoring of which can be reconstructed from preceding versions
- ii. [12/“13”] a C, D or F ruling, between 11A/“12” and 13E/“14”, which would have been fully scored out, although later supplanted by the SVE “13a”E and “13b”E
- iii. [14/“15”], a C, D or F ruling, between 13E/“14” and 15D/“16”
- iv. [19/“20”], a D or F ruling, between 18D/“19” and 20D/“21”, the continuity of which is partly recoverable from pc. sks.
- v. [24/“25”], a D or F ruling, between 23D/“24” and 25D/“26”, the continuity of which is recoverable from pc. sks.
- vi. [27/“28”], probably an F ruling, between 26F/“27” and 28E/“29”, the continuity of which is largely recoverable from pc. sks.
- vii. [30/“31”], probably an E ruling, between 29E/“30” and 31E/“32”
- viii. [32/“33”] to c. [39/“40”], probably E rulings—the approximately eight remaining bifols. of the score, for which only pc. sks. survive

In each of these 20 cases, the foregoing bifol. ends, and/or the ensuing bifols. begins—as Bruckner’s metrical numbering demonstrates—in the middle of a period. In confirmation may be cited: (a) in the case of the fugue ([19/“20”]) and the chorale Repr. ([30/“31”]) Bruckner’s numbering through of the mm. of whole musical sections, as well as (b) the apparent musical continuity and (c) often precisely matching degree of textural completion, of the bifols. surrounding the gap. And aside from the obvious issue of compositional continuity, no one could have orchestrated passages beginning in the middle of a period, as we find on 13E/“14” or 15D/“16”. Although the absence of so many bifols. of both preliminary and definitive stages of the score scarcely adds to an impression of compositional closure, it is clear that these absences are entirely random and in no way to be equated with the assumption of a fragmentary compositional conception on the part of the composer. There is every reason to believe that the above bifols. once existed and were subsequently lost from the main body of MSS which, as we have seen, were reported as lying around Bruckner’s apartment at the time of his death (§1.1.12). Some of them may yet survive in private collections.

### 3.1.9 The editorial principles of the Autograph-Partitur.

In the natural sciences, in archaeology, palaeontology etc., the attempt to reconstruct what once existed is regarded as not only a legitimate but a vital way of establishing how things actually function, as opposed to merely describing their appearance. Musicology’s reticence about the application of this concept to musical scores is perhaps linked to the twentieth

century's reification of the finished, untouchable musical text, the 'Fassung letzter Hand', as an axiomatic absolute. Orthodox musicology, which grew up in part in opposition to the editorial licences of nineteenth century musical practice, and since then has remained dominated by the search for the 'genuine' and 'authentic' over the 'inferior' and 'merely popular', accorded canonical status to the original work and relegated the arrangement to critical obloquy. Yet provided an editor's intentions are genuine and based on solid knowledge of the sources, he or she is answerable for the editorial interventions undertaken and their nature and extent is known to the audience or readership, nothing is to be lost in attempting to 'reconstruct', either on paper or in sound, a movement such as the Finale on which the composer laboured so hard and so long, and for which we are not in possession of all that was originally written. As Gülke pointed out,<sup>199</sup> the insight thereby gained into this music as well as into the composer's 'Werkstatt' is considerable and valuable.

Moreover, the amount of speculation involved in the case of the Finale is greatly reduced by the many theoretical and analytical checks and balances Bruckner employed in the compositional process—for instance, his tendency to compose continuous textures in extended sequences and over 8-m. periods, or his highly structured approach to scoring. The result cannot, of course, overcome the loss of original material, much less of a final score in which, had Bruckner completed the movement, any number of details may have been altered. However, despite the variable extent of the scoring and the presence of late SVE for the opening of the movement and that the Durchf., the Finale had by the time of Bruckner's death reached and to a large extent surpassed what Wolff, in speaking of Mozart's compositional practice, referred to as the "Fixierung des endgültigen Textes [...] in einer musikalisch und strukturell ausgereiften Primärstufe, [...] den eigentlichen Vorgang des Komponierens" (§3.1.5 *supra*). Despite Bruckner's greater tendency to revise his music, to simply dismiss the fragments that have come down to us as 'untouchable', since Bruckner would or could have altered them later is indefensible. That applies to any number of scores which he subsequently altered, just as it applies to the works of other composers which exist in more than one form. The attempt to reconstruct these sources is a valid and inevitable offshoot of the process of their musicological evaluation; not to do so would be to reinvoke the negative tendencies that have worked to exclude this movement from critical evaluation or useful inclusion in studies of Bruckner's music throughout its reception history.

Until the publication of the reconstructed score of the Finale in 1994, Alfred Orel's *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie* was the only substantial publication of the sketches for a Bruckner symphony.<sup>200</sup> As the widely scattered sources of the Ninth, although by no

---

<sup>199</sup> See §1.4.1.

<sup>200</sup> The text of the ensuing passage was adapted from the Foreword to the Bruckner GA publication of the AP (1994, 1999), pp. XXViff.

means complete, are probably the most substantial of any of the Bruckner symphonies, the new publication was a matter of particular interest for the Bruckner GA, in respect both to the incomplete final movement of the Ninth as well as the insights it provides into Bruckner's compositional technique. The researches and deliberations of Samale, Mazzuca, Cohrs and the author in the process of arriving at a philologically sound performing version were to prove useful and apposite in the preparation of the Finale for the Bruckner GA. In doing so, what one might regard as a 'synthetic', 'practical' or (indeed) 'recreative' approach was found to come closer to fathoming the peculiarities of Bruckner's compositional practice than a purely analytical one. The reconstruction is hence based on the philological groundwork of Orel, its scrutiny by Nowak and on insights gained in the attempt to produce a philologically tenable performing version of the movement.

The transcription of the AP of the Finale reproduced in volume II, section E, attempts to reconstruct the score as it may have appeared by the last months of Bruckner's life, as far as that is now possible, given the fragmentary nature of the sources. Specifications of sk. and bifol. sources, correlations with the reproductions of the facsimiles, information on bifol. correlation and text-critical detail are provided by the headings and footnotes. Unlike Orel, the publication acknowledges the fact that Bruckner was working on an emergent and unfinished orchestral score, one nonetheless intended as definitive, rather than a number of 'variants'; it therefore represents the surviving material of the last identifiable work phases in the order of its musical continuity, rather than split into 'versions'. Detailed analysis and transcription of most of the intermediate steps—the pc. sks. and rejected score bifols.—by which Bruckner arrived at this score have been relegated, correctly, to a more detailed examination of the movement's compositional genesis than could be given here, and are intended ultimately for publication in the planned Studienband on the movement.

As we have established, the score consisted, by the time of the last work phase, of a continuous notation of the strings (mostly drafted in pencil, then overwritten in ink), with indications of the involvement of the winds (in pencil and ink) which had in part advanced as far as fully elaborated instrumentation—doubtless throughout the Exp., extending into the Durchf., and also at the climax of the fugue. The present reconstruction attempts as faithful a reproduction of the originals as possible—inclusive, for instance, of significant marginalia, letter notation and annotations concerning harmonic progressions so characteristic of Bruckner's compositional method, much of which was omitted by Orel, although certain omissions have been made, as will be explained.

Bruckner's pc. sks., which preceded the notation of the score, in some cases provide the complete musical continuity of the missing bifols. This is confirmed by Bruckner's Bogen-Verfahren, his use of prepared bifols., ruled up in almost all cases into 16 mm. In addition to these come the numerous continuity drafts or Satzverlaufsentwürfe (SVE), bifols. initially drafted but whose further composition Bruckner never realised and which provide the actual continuity of apparent 'gaps' (e.g. bifol. "13a"E), or which constitute transitional forms that

permit us to glimpse the direction of Bruckner's revisions where final versions have not come down to us (e.g. bifol. "#D or the numerous SVE on Rulings D or E for the first bifol. of the score). Further factors significant for the reconstruction are: (a) Bruckner's careful numbering of virtually every measure of this sketches and scores;<sup>201</sup> (b) the numbering-through of the measures of whole sections (for instance the fugue and chorale Repr.; (c) indications provided by a comparison of parallel points in the score (e.g. between the Gesangsp. in the Exp. and that in the Repr.); (d) analysis of the context and structural characteristics surrounding the missing passages as well as (e) references to the three "vi-de" markings<sup>202</sup> which, although structurally deleterious and doubtless not intended for "spätere Zeiten",<sup>203</sup> underscore the definitive nature of the formal structure which Bruckner had established by c. June 1896.

The editorial principles underlying the transcription may be summarised as follows:

- i. The page division of the originals has been retained.
- ii. Non-extant bifols., the existence of which follows from (a) the configuration of the surviving bifols., (b) their original, apparently contiguous numeration, as well as (c) Bruckner's metrical numbers, characteristic of his compositional practice, have been printed as empty pages. In this way, the highly incomplete transmission of the sources becomes clearly apparent.
- iii. Metrical numbers have been supplemented in square brackets where their continuity, also with respect to the usual 16-m. lengths of the pre-ruled bifols., permits fairly certain reconstruction.
- iv. Where the continuity of non-extant bifols. can be traced using the pc. sks. which preceded the notation of the score, or by means of other partly worked out bifols. or SVE, this material has been printed under the empty staves of the score. In the case of the Exp. Gesangsp., earlier, rejected bifols. and SVE allow an approximate reconstruction of the outline of a later version. In this case, a reconstruction of the musical continuity, condensed onto two staves, has been underlaid in order to better illustrate philological conclusions (see E/13–24).
- v. The order of instruments follows that of the original manuscript (timpani above the trombones), while the instrumental abbreviations conform to the pattern of other volumes of the Complete Edition. The barlines, continuous in the original, have been split between the staves of the woodwind, brass and string families to

<sup>201</sup> It should be noted that Nowak himself used metrical number matching in reconstructing the 1876 Adagio of the Third Symphony (MWV 1980), Vorwort.

<sup>202</sup> Cf. Orel, D/110, 113, 115, 116, the second "vide" (p. 115) being cancelled. Cf. §3.1.11 *infra*.

<sup>203</sup> Reference is made here to Bruckner's oft-quoted letter of 27 Jan. 1891 to Felix Weingartner in which Bruckner recommends the cuts in the Finale of the Eighth, the whole movement being intended "nur für späteren Zeiten und zwar für einen Kreis von Freunden und Kennern" (*Ges. Briefe* (Auer), p. 237).

- allow easier reading. The stave left free in the originals above the 1st vln. has been printed only when Bruckner used it for notation. The instrumental indications (principally from Anton Meißner) have been reproduced in Roman, all alterations thereof by the composer (cf. for instance E/61), as well as all Bruckner's compositional annotations, in italic type.
- vi. Pencil and ink are reproduced by means of larger and smaller typefaces or note sizes respectively; barlines, strokes, slurs or ties written in pencil are reproduced with broken lines. Where pencil has been written over in ink, larger notes or type faces are used. The footnotes provide further information concerning the notation of clefs and special symbols such as pauses.
  - vii. For ease of reading, simile or repetition marks (so-called "Faulenzer"), as well as all instrumentational directives such as "col Primo", "col Basso", "a 2" etc. where they appear in completed notational text, have been written out in full. A complete listing of these annotations and the related issue of single and double stemming of notes is found in Table XIII, A/39ff.
  - viii. The musical orthography peculiar to Bruckner—in the Finale carried to its extreme—which, regardless of key signature (though not without numerous exceptions), places an accidental before every pitch of every measure, has been maintained, a principle in accordance with the practice of Alfred Orel and Leopold Nowak in their editions of the first three movements of the symphony (1934, 1951).
  - ix. Supplementations of the notational text made in the interests of easier legibility, for instance missing clefs or rests, always appear in square brackets. Obvious oversights by Bruckner have been corrected, with reference to the original appearing in the footnotes. A precise reproduction of the stem directions in the completed notational text has not been undertaken (see Table XIII); in principal, no alterations were made in the reproduction of the pencil sketches. The footnotes cite any exceptions to this rule.
  - x. Where possible, Bruckner's abbreviations have been supplemented using square brackets. Illegible places are indicated by [...], questionable interpretations (also on occasion in the musical notation) by [?].
  - xi. The position of some elements of the printed page, such as bifol. numeration or metrical numbers, has been standardised.
  - xii. Erasures have been referred to only where what has been erased can still be traced to an extent, or where it appears to be of special significance, especially in the case of the alterations to bifol. numbers made during the renumeration of the score.

- xiii. Additions by foreign hands, such as the entries of Max Auer, apparently made during his examination of the material in 1911 (usually top left or right; cf. for instance C/9, 21, 47), or the foliation made by the respective libraries, has been omitted without further remark.
- xiv. The references on the 1st p. of each bifol. give (a) its classification, (b) its library signature and (c) the page reference to the reproduction of the original in the Faksimile-Ausgabe, corresponding to vol. II, section C. In view of the breaks in the continuity of the surviving bifols., a continuous numeration of measures was inappropriate: references to particular measures therefore consist of both page and measure number.
- xv. Not every pen stroke permits of meaningful transcription. Most particularly, reference was made only in the footnotes to Bruckner's voice-leading *Kustoden* and annotations concerning voice-leading, which would otherwise have greatly reduced the clarity of the transcription. Furthermore, in working out the instrumentation, Bruckner often used empty staves to jot down pencil drafts for the 'active' systems. Where such drafts correspond to completed text, only references have been made. Also, the numerous glued-on patches have not been indicated; these are in any case easily recognisable in the facsimiles.

Concerning the problems of the transcription, it must be stressed firstly that, as Nowak pointed out, Bruckner's complex working processes and often illegible handwriting render irreproachable transcriptions of the late sketches a chimerical venture. Much of the Finale material, however, including much that was subsequently discarded, was undeniably intended as a 'public' rather than private document, from which we can assume that a finished text was intended, even when not achieved. Secondly, precise philological interpretations of his last creative efforts is hindered by the fact of his mental and physical decline, which apparently increased dramatically following the crisis of July 1896 and left its mark in the late continuity drafts and confused attempts, for instance, to repeatedly renumber score bifols. The reiterated and repeatedly written-over figures of these pages, which have not been transcribed (e.g. C/313 or 317), stand in stark contrast to the clear musical design and unambiguous, if tremulous, musical handwriting of the musical text, which must have originated earlier. The composer's frequently invoked mental deterioration does not justify dismissing everything we possess of the Finale. Special consideration is simply due in regard to the transcriptions of the later continuity drafts and in part also the sketches for the coda, the meaning of which can often be surmised only with great speculation and which resists definitive interpretation. However, as the facsimiles show, Bruckner's initial sks. for the Finale are often just as tangled. Here the reader can only be referred to the facsimile reproductions.



### 3.1.10 Critical commentary on the reconstruction of the Autograph-Partitur.

The ensuing critical commentary limits itself to an examination of the reconstruction of the musical continuity of the score as presented in vol. II, section E, and has been adapted from the English translation of the footnotes to the original publication of that score.<sup>204</sup> Like the rest of this chapter, it is by no means intended to exhaust the available knowledge concerning the movement: discussion of the reconstructed compositional continuity of those bifols. whose text cannot be fully reconstructed from the pc. sks., for instance the possible reference by Bruckner to the chorale “Christus ist erstanden” or the possible design of the coda, have been reserved for discussion of the AF in ch. 3.3, since such questions, although germane to the discussion of Bruckner’s efforts in composing the Finale, only arise (significantly) within the context of an attempted completion of the entire movement. Table XII (A/37f.) provides an overview of the most significant source materials for the reconstruction of the individual bifols. of the orchestral score, described in more detail here; it lists library signature, location in the facsimile reproductions, number of mm. and metrical figures, as well as the degree of instrumental completion in the case of the score bifols. A complete listing of simile signs and other instrumental directives, such as Bruckner’s frequently used “col Basso” in the vlc. system, which have been transcribed in full in the score, is provided by Table XIII (A/39ff.). However, most significant information can be gleaned from a perusal of the score itself, including the footnotes, which summarise the reconstruction of the text and collocation of the bifols. and sks. explained here, as well as supplying further critical information on textual details. As the reconstruction of most of the musical text has already been dealt with in some detail in the work-phase discussion in §3.1.8, reference to that section may be made where further explanation is required.

**E/1–4**            *Principal text:* Bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C, ÖNB 13.150; cf. Facs. C/67ff.

*Length:* 24 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1–8; 1–2; 1–2-

*Underlaid with:* SVE bifol. 1<sup>e</sup>E, ÖNB 6085/63–64; cf. Facs. C/95ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 21–24 [?]-5–6-[-...]; 1–3-[-...]

Bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C was fully scored out by Bruckner, but its numerous revisions, and crossings out (not transcribed here) reveal it to have been discarded and replaced, probably during work phase 3 or 4. Numerous later SVE as well as the link with bifol. “2”E—cf. the discrepancy in the wind scoring between the last 4 mm. of 1<sup>d</sup>C and 1st 2 of “2”E—suggest the loss of a later and

---

<sup>204</sup> 1994, 1997, Appendix III, pp. 146ff.

perhaps shorter version of bifol. 1 (see E/8, footnote 1). A transcription of one of these SVE, although not in itself conclusive as to the structure of the lost version, has been underlaid. Hypothetical reconstructions of the continuity of later 24-m. and 16-m. versions are given in Mus. Ex. 3; the DdF uses the text of 1<sup>d</sup>C, the AF a hypothetical 16-m variant. The diminution in the 1st clar. of the opening motive in the 1st vln. is also inconsistently notated at this stage; three variants occur, here marked a–c:



Bruckner still endorsed variant c in a parallel situation on the later 15D/“16” (cf. E/69ff., 1st fl.), but elsewhere throughout the movement’s orchestration consistently maintained b.

### E/5–8

*Text:* bifol. “2”E, Hochschule; cf. Facs. C/135ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–4; 1–8; 1–4; 1–4-

This and the following bifol. reveal a fully scored and neatly written texture, complete in every detail except dynamics, articulation and other performance directives. Bifols. “2”E and “3”E originated at the time of the renumbering of the score, when Bruckner copied the first 24 mm. of the 36-m. 2F onto these two bifols. and renumbered all ensuing then-valid bifols. by one. The beginning of “2”E reveals that it must have adjoined a differently scored-out version of the 1st bifol. than 1<sup>d</sup>C. The numbers in the lower r. margin on E/8 may give a clue as to the number of mm. of the 1st 3 bifols. in a later work phase (cf. E/4, lower r.; similar numbers can be found on E/37 and 38, r. margin).

### E/9–12

*Principal text:* bifol. “3”E, ÖNB 6087/5–6; cf. Facs. C/139ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–12; 1–8

*E/12 underlaid with:* bifol. 2F, last 6 mm., ÖNB 19.645/2<sup>v</sup>; cf. Facs. C/134

*Length:* 6 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–10 partly scored out.

See note to E/5–8. “3”E must have connected with a bifol. [“4”], which would have taken up and fully scored the last 2 mm. of bifol. 2F and at least the first 14 mm. of [3C] (the successor to 3A). The effective continuity is

demonstrated by the 2-stave underlay of the 1st vln. and bass of 2F on E/12 (of course, 2F (see C/134) was far more extensively scored than this suggests). The DdF (G/9f.) reconstructs the likely scoring of the bifol. in line with the instrumentation of “2”E and 2F (see also note to E/13–16). The added pencil sks. on E/9 and 10 in free wind systems were probably later apocryptic additions; that they are revisions to the continuity of bifol. 12, as suggested in the footnotes, is less likely.

**E/13–16**

*Principal text:* bifol. 3A, ÖNB 6087/3–4; cf. Facs. C/143ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

*Underlaid with:* reconstruction of a bifol. [“4”]

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -9–10-[12; 1–4]; 1–8;

Bifol. 3A (partly scored) was not renumbered and must have been discarded at an early stage; like bifol. 4A, it must have been replaced by a C-bifol., [3C], which has not survived. A still later version, [“4”], which would have linked up with “3”E and probably also ended 2 mm. earlier, is likewise not extant; a 2-stave reconstruction of its musical continuity has been underlaid. The ensuing 12 pp. feature these 2-stave reconstructions, intended to illustrate the continuity of non-extant bifols. from the later work phases, insofar as the surviving material permits. An explanation of the related expansion of the Gesangsp. is given on E/25 (note 1).

**E/17–20**

*Principal text:* bifol. 4C/“5”, ÖNB 6087/9–10; cf. Facs. C/151

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–2; 1–8<sup>205</sup>;

*Underlaid with:* reconstruction of a bifol. [“5a”]

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–2; [1–2]-3–6-

Bifol. 4C/“5”, although fully scored out, pronounced “fertig” by the composer and even renumbered, was apparently later discarded, as the entries in the timp. stave on its 4th p. (E/20) as well as its lack of correspondence with the continuity of the preceding (“3”E) and that of the

---

<sup>205</sup> Metrical numbers corrected according to bifol. 4A. Cf. E/19, fn. 2.

later bifol. (“#”D) suggest. The original page number is illegible, but was probably “4.” (ink; possibly erased, though even this is unclear), which was written over heavily with “5.” (ink), then “6.” (ink). The vertical stroke and repeated “5” in pencil on the 2nd p. (E/18) perhaps relate to the 2-m. alteration in the layout of the passage.<sup>206</sup> A hypothetical reconstruction of a later version, a bifol. [“5a”] probably written in connection with the expansion of the *Gesangsp.*, has been underlaid; concerning its continuity, see the note to the ensuing bifol.

Footnote 1 on E/20, which claims that the line marked “Alt” added by Bruckner in the timp. staff on the last p. of 4C (cf. C/154; cf. also the alternative metrical numbering, top margin) was a subsequent ‘Übertragung’ of the same line found on bifol. 15C (C/251) is surely in error—cf. Orel, D/91, 102, who did not note, let alone attempt to explain, any connection. The line on 4C is in pencil with many apparent reworkings; the line on 15C is in ink with not a single alteration of the staff notes themselves but with *Tonbuchstaben* (“cis”, “es”, “d”) which proceed beyond the text so laboriously established by Bruckner on 4C by carefully regulated, precise inversion of the intervals—note the final  $d\sharp^1-f\sharp$ , inverting the final rising sixth of the original 4C text, altered to  $d\sharp^1-b\flat$  on 15C. Bruckner could not have written the precise inversion on 15C, let alone in ink, without first having constructed it note by note from the Exp. progression; indeed, the only possible purpose of the extensive *Kustoden* used on 4C (omitted in transcription in the AP) would have been to ‘construct’ the line notated in the timp. staff as a precise inversion or mirror of this passage. The passage was conceived as a transition to the ensuing E-minor transformation of the *Gesangsp.* music in the *Durchf.*, just as the 4 mm. in the Exp. from which they were derived led (at that stage) into a G-major harmonisation of the *Gesangsp.* ostinato. The *Tonbuchstaben* written above the musical text on 15C thus represent ‘euphonic’ alterations to a more-or-less ‘mechanically’ derived inversion, demonstrating the systematic processes by which Bruckner worked as well as their regulation ‘durch das Ohr’.<sup>207</sup> Bruckner would ultimately have erased the added 4C text, of course, if the bifol. had

<sup>206</sup> No interpretation was offered in the AP itself concerning these pencil annotations (“*Gesangsp.* 5/ 5 [?]” (upper margin), then a diagonal line intersecting with “R n/ g d[ur] g”); they may well relate to the expansion of the passage, however. Cohrs recently suggested that the diagonal stroke may indicate the beginning of a passage to be repeated and that “R n/ G d g” probably implies “R[epetitio]n G d[ur]”.

<sup>207</sup> Cf. Bruckner’s annotation “Ohr” in the upper margin of p. 3 of 1<sup>b</sup>C (C/61), perhaps made in regard to the connection between the preceding tritone sequence ending in F major and the horn chord just below it.

been 'gültig'; doubtless, as we have already suggested, it was at a later stage replaced, or intended to be.

**E/21–24**

*Principal text:* SVE “#”D, ÖNB 6085/9–10; cf. Facs. C/155ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–10; [1–2; 1–4]-5–6; 1–4

*Underlaid with:* reconstruction of a bifol. [“5b”]

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–10; [1–2;] 1–6; 1–4-

*E/22–23 underlaid with:* pc. sk. ÖNB 6086/2<sup>r</sup>, br. 4; Facs. C/33

*Length:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4-

The SVE “#”D represents an intended expansion of the *Gesangsp.*, probably in order to accommodate the lyrical counterpoint envisioned in the initial pc. sk. (ÖNB 6086, fol. 2<sup>r</sup>, 4th bracket—see C/33), but which was apparently not included in the Exp. in phase 1 or 2, although it found its way into the *Durchf.* (E/74) and, in variant form, the *Repr.* (E/103f.). The counterpoint has been underlaid in the most likely position (E/22f.). As has been suggested, “#”D was probably only provisionally drafted in phase 3 and not ‘acted upon’ until the renumbering took place; hence the “#” (pencil), probably to be understood as ‘insertion’; Bruckner appears to have begun to write a number, but this was crossed out and the sign “#” added on the left. A final realisation of the passage in finished score, if notated, would almost surely have featured bifols. marked “5a” and “5b”, like the expansion of the *Durchf.*

Bruckner’s concern with regular metrical structures in the *Finale* provides clues as to the likely manner in which Bruckner intended to expand the passage and may relate, as suggested, to the split of the 36-m. bifol. 2F over bifols. “2”E and “3”E (18 and 16 mm. respectively). If, as a result, bifol. [“4”] began 2 mm. earlier (cf. E/12), a [“5a”] must have also, creating a 2-m. discrepancy with the beginning of “#”D, which begins with the last 4 mm. of 4C. The reconstruction of [“5a”] as a 16- rather than 14-m. bifol. proposes that Bruckner’s solution to this was an expansion of the irregular 6-m. period (2 + 4) with which the *Gesangsp.* began in phase 1 and 2 (cf. E/18f.) to 8 mm. (2 + 6), thereby ending the bifol. in what was the 12th m. of 4C/“5” (cf. metrical numbers, E/20) and permitting an exact link-up with the continuity given by “#”D.

Perhaps as a result of an oversight (cf. the corrected period structure on E/23–24), the composer did not continue with the working out of this continuity on “#”D itself. Whether Bruckner completed the expansion on another bifol. is unknown; the underlaid reconstruction of a [“5b”] can only give an impression of the manner in which he may have carried this out. The “G d[ur] NB/ NB” on E/23 presumably refers to the harmonic situation found in the 1st 4 mm. of bifol. 5B (E/25), in which the ‘suspended’ ostinato motive is finally ‘grounded’ in G-major harmony; this 4 mm. passage was probably intended to be expanded backwards onto “#”D, making 8 mm. (realised in AF and DdF as 4 mm. *f* + 4 mm. *p*). The expansion of the G-major passage had to begin 2 mm. later than Bruckner first marked, however (cf. the corrected metrical numbers below the score on E/25 and 26), which would have allowed for a further 2-m. iteration of the ‘lyrical counterpoint’; cf. the realisation of this passage in the DdF (F/12ff.) and AF (G/11ff.).

**E/25–28**

*Source:* bifol. 5B, StB 3791/5–6; cf. Facs. C/163ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [5–12]; 1–8;

*E/27–28 underlaid with:* pc. sk. ÖNB 6086/2<sup>r</sup>, br. 6; cf. Facs. C/33

*Length:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4-

Bifol. 5B, on which the strings are largely complete, and the scoring extended on E/26 to the winds, linked up with 4A, an earlier version of 4C/“5” (cf. C/147ff.). Like the following ruling B-bifol., 6<sup>c</sup>B, 5B was not renumbered and represented no part of the final score. As with the preceding bifols. of the exposition, 5B and 6<sup>c</sup>B were probably copied onto C-ruling bifols. and fully scored out, since it is unlikely that Bruckner would have repeatedly scored and altered bifols. 1 and 2, and completed the instrumentation of the chorale without establishing the continuity of the Exp. Gesangsp. However, the continuity of its successor may not have been significantly different. The underlaid pc. sk. on E/27–28 includes a counterpoint, probably intended for the 2nd vln. (cf. on E/27 the *colla parte* writing with the 1sts, which Bruckner interrupted, which is perhaps the reason why the bifol. was discarded). Two readings of the supplemented metrical numbers are given on E/25 and 26, the first referring to the linkage of this bifol. with 4A (C/147ff.), the second to a connection with Bruckner’s corrected numbering on “#”D. The textual supplementations on E/28 were made with reference to the Repr.; cf. E/109.

**E/29–32** *Source:* bifol. 6<sup>c</sup>B, ÖNB 6087/17–18; cf. Facs. C/173ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–4-

See commentary on E/25–28 *supra*. The instrumentation here was apparently complete: cf. Bruckner's note, E/32, lower right, "fertig"; presumably only the whole-m. rests were missing.<sup>208</sup> On E/32, the draft designated by Bruckner as "variando" (2nd vln.) is apparently an alteration of the 2nd vln. which continues as a sk. on the 1st p. of the bifol. following 6<sup>c</sup>B, namely 7B (C/177ff.); the apparent final form of this alteration has been underlaid. Bifol. 7C/"8" later replaced 7B; the alterations of the strings were retained while the triplets in the fl. (cf. the above strike-through and "Variande"), which do not match contrapuntally, were deleted.

The following 5 bifols. were fully orchestrated and later renumbered; they remained part of the final score.

**E/33–36** *Text:* bifol. 7C/"8", ÖNB 6087/23–24; cf. Facs. C/181ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–8; 1–6; 1–2; 1–6-

Although not expressly marked "fertig" like the following bifols., the texture of this bifol. is completely finished but for dynamics, etc., probably in phase 2 or 3, and was confirmed as valid by its renumbering in phase 4. It can be seen from the erasure in the top r. h. corner that the original number was probably "7.". The figuration in the 2nd vln. on E/33 continues on from the "variando" alteration on E/32—the reason why Bruckner discarded and rewrote 6<sup>c</sup>B. A clue to the reconstruction of the later version, [6—probably C—"7"], is the fact that the cb. is not marked *arco* on 7C/"8" (E/34): cf. Bruckner's "pizz." on E/32 and "arco" on the 1st p. of bifol. 7B, C/177. Presumably the cb. entry on ([6/"7"]) was no longer *pizzicato*.

From E/35 onwards (the Steigerung to the chorale), the text of 7C/"8" is largely the same as that of 7B (cf. C/179); significantly Bruckner eschewed a more elaborately scored version of the transition passage (C/178) for the ominous and almost brutally stark version adopted on 7C. Bruckner

<sup>208</sup> The texture here is strikingly similar to a passage in VIII(1890)/4, cf. letter Z to letter Aa.

prescribes an impracticably fast change from 1st–2nd tbas. to 5th–6th hrns. on E/35f.<sup>209</sup>

**E/37–40** *Text:* bifol. 8B/“9”, ÖNB 6087/27–28; cf. Facs. C/189ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

This bifol. was fully scored, pronounced “fertig” (E/40, lower r. h. corner) and renumbered. Here and on the following bifols., Bruckner had to erase his or Meißner’s tba. designations on deciding to use all 8 hrns. for the chorale.

**E/41–44** *Text:* bifol. 9B/“10”, ÖNB 6087/29–30; cf. Facs. C/193ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

Fully scored, pronounced “fertig” and renumbered. While Bruckner often added ties only at the last stage, and often overlooked them, it may be significant that no ties are marked for the trps. and 5th–8th hrns. on E/43, mm. 1–2, suggesting that m. 2 may have been intended as an upbeat m. to the 2nd chorale phrase, giving a phrase structure of 7 + 9 mm.; cf. E/126; cf. note to E/49–52.

**E/45–48** *Text:* bifol. 10A/“11”, ÖNB 6087/31–32; cf. Facs. C/197ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

This bifol. was again fully scored, pronounced “fertig” and renumbered. The 1st ob. and 1st bsn. staves on E/47ff. contain either a previous draft of these mm. or, more likely, a possible way in which Bruckner may have used the passage as a transition to the Te Deum by shifting the restatement of the chorale into C major. Cf. his annotation “Te Deum”, E/50, top.

**E/49–52** *Source:* bifol. 11A/“12”, ÖNB 6087/33–34; cf. Facs. C/201ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–12; 1–8; 1–2-

---

<sup>209</sup> This was solved in the DdF by placing the entry of 5th–6th horns on E/36 in cue notes in the 3rd–4th horn parts (cf. §3.2.6, mm. 141–158).



See note to previous bifol. The bifol. was again scored out, renumbered and pronounced "fertig". As in the first phrase of the chorale (E/43, mm. 1–2), the omission of ties from trombs. and cb. tba. from E/48, m. 3 may not be an oversight. The letter notation in the r. margin of the final page (E/52) is a sk. for a descending bass line on a later version of bifol. 12 with which bifol. 13E/"14" would have been linked. Cf. upper r. margin "12 neu", lower r. revision of the metrical numbering. Pencil drafts on E/9 and 10 referred to in E/52, fn. 1, more likely represent later accretions rather than having anything to do with this passage; cf. note to E/9–12.

**E/53–56**

*Principal text to E/53:* bifol. 12C, p. 1, ÖNB 6087/35<sup>f</sup>; cf. Facs. C/205.

*Length:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–4; 1–2-

*E/53 underlaid with:* SVE "13a"E, ÖNB 6085/75–76; cf. Facs. C/217ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–6-[7–8; 1–8; 1–2-]

*From E/54 SVE "13a"E is given as the principal text.*

Bifol. 12C was not renumbered and was probably discarded and replaced long before renumbering was carried out. However, a later, fully scored out version of bifol. 12, to which the largely completely scored 13E/"14" would have linked (see E/61), is not extant.

One of the last surviving revisions of the movement's continuity was an expansion of bifol. ["13"] dated "11. August" and distinguished from many barely decipherable revisions for this and the following bifol. from this late period by the clear text and the fact that ink rather than pencil is used. The two apparently related SVE bifols. "13a"E (so numbered by Bruckner) and ="13b"E (which was not numbered by Bruckner) have therefore been given here. The harmonic design of the original bifol. [12/"13"], which Bruckner was here expanding, would have involved the descending line drafted on the r. margin of E/52, the end of which sequence can found at the beginning of 13E/"14".

**E/57–60**

*Principal text:* SVE ="13b"E, ÖNB 6085/81–82; cf. Facs. C/221ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [-3–12; 1–6-]

*Underlaid with:* SVE “13”<sup>b</sup>E, ÖNB 6085/73–74; cf. Facs. C/209ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

See note to E/53–56. In order to clarify the harmonic design, the transcription of a somewhat earlier SVE, namely bifol. “13”<sup>b</sup>E, with which 13E/“14” could still have directly linked, has been underlaid under “13b”E. The double notes on E/221–222 presumably indicate 2nd–3rd rather than 1st ob. This phrase,  $e^2-e^2-b\sharp^1-b\sharp^1-a^1-a^1$  (cf. Ex. 11b, vii), follows a double augmentation of the Te Deum motive in the fl. (E/55–56), and can be understood either as an interpolation of that motive (assuming a final pitch was intended to follow, perhaps  $e^1$ ) or simply an intervallic variation in itself, but in any case functions as a distant *Aufbereitung* of the phrase appearing in the *Gesangsp. Repr.* (Ex. 11b, viii; as noted by Cohrs; cf. discussion of the *Christ ist erstanden* topos in §3.3.6). Bruckner probably did not notate the 4th p. of this bifol., as would only have involved recopying the last p. of its probably fully scored predecessor, [12/“13”] (cf. reconstruction, Ex. 6c). The entries in the tromb. staves on C/223 in effect probably continue the ob. line through the last p. (cf. obs. at the beginning of bifol. 13E/“14”, E/61), and can readily be harmonically reconciled with the chromatically descending  $\frac{6}{3}$ -chord sequence reconstructed at this point in 6c and 6d. What are apparently “Faulenzer” in the vln. staves of the first 3 pp. of the bifol. (cf. C/221ff.) presumably indicate continuation of the triplet *ostinato* (cf. E/53). The underlaid SVE “13”<sup>b</sup>E underwent multiple reworkings (cf. C/209ff.); only the last identifiable version has been reproduced here.

#### **E/61–64**

*Principal text:* SVE 13E/“14”, ÖNB 6087/37–38; cf. Facs. C/225ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

*Underlaid with:* SVE “15”E, ÖNB 6085/79–80; cf. Facs. C/245ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [...] 1–10; 1–4-.

The fully scored beginning of bifol. 13E/“14” reveals that it must have linked up with an equally scored-out [12]. The erasure and correction of the bifol. number is not as obvious in the original as it appears in facsimile, but it is probably safe to assume that this bifol. was written before the renumbering rather than after it. The pencil annotation “14 / 2.” to the left of

the bifoliation (cf. C/225) probably relates the preceding expansion of bifol. "13". The suggestion made on E/61, fn. 1, that the cut indicated on bifol. 15D/"16", "de + v[on] 13. Bogen" (E/72), refers to an earlier version of bifol. 13, is on balance less likely; the cut was probably indicated following the renumbering and thus referred to the lost renumbered [12/"13"] (see Ex. 6c, m. 11, where a hypothetical location for the "vi-" has been proposed). Equally, the date "14.6.96" (ink) may not indicate a later revision, as suggested in fn. 2; quite possibly the bifol. was either written or renumbered on this date. Judging by the lack of corrections, the main text notated in ink may well have been largely identical with a preceding C- or D-ruling version and only copied and perhaps more substantially scored out during phase 4. The instrumentation was in any case largely complete: the annotation "Pausen" on E/62 suggests that the whole-m. rests remained to be completed (in fact, hrns. and bsns. also required supplementation on E/62 and 63; cf. E/61).

Characteristic for the orchestral texture of the entire Durchf. and fugue is the use of the opening motive of the movement or its reduction to a rhythmic pattern ('red.')

combined with its simultaneous diminution, but substituting semiquavers for demisemiquavers:



The beginning of 13E/"14" reveals a fully elaborated texture featuring this combination in obs. and hrns., which must have continued on from an equally developed instrumentation on [12/"13"]. Conceivably the numbers "12 13" marked above the 1st 2 mm. of 13E/"14" refer to the number of mm. through which the combination had been used, in other words from the 6th m. of [12/"13"].<sup>210</sup> Added pencil entries in the wind staves (cf. fl. 2–3, E/61–62) are more difficult to interpret, and perhaps date from work phase 5. On E/63, m. 2, for instance, the Te Deum motive in the fl. has been continued in pencil, but conflicts with the 1st vln.—perhaps the reason for Bruckner's composition of an alternative ending to the Te Deum passage on "15"E (cf. underlay). In m. 4 of the same p., rests and notes appear to have been added between entries already notated in the bsns.

<sup>210</sup> The first iteration would have fallen in an even-numbered m.; cf. the hypothetical reconstruction in Ex. 6c, where the use of the motive has not been reconstructed; 6d shows the manner in which the motive has been introduced and developed in the expanded version of the passage reconstructed in the AF.

Among other late revisions to this area of the score, Bruckner on 11th August 1896 drafted a later version of bifol. "14" which he numbered "15.", apparently in reference to the expansion of the preceding bifol. 13. A transcription of this scarcely legible SVE, which features a 10-m. expansion of the 8-m. period featuring the Te Deum motive in minims in the fl., has been underlaid.

**E/65–68**

*Principal text (lost):* bifol. [14/"15"]

*Length:* 16 mm.(?)


*Metrical structure:* [-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-]

*E/65–66 underlaid with:* bifol. 12C, pp. 3–4, ÖNB 6087/36;

cf. Facs. C/207f.

*Length:* 8 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–6-

A bifol. [14/"15"] is not extant, but given the usual 16-m. length of the prepared bifols. its periodic structure can probably be reconstructed accurately. The bifol. must have begun with an F-major chord which concluded the tritone chord progression on 13E/"14" and continued with a passage using the triplet ostinato in octaves in vlns., sustained *tremolo* chords in the lower strings, the Te Deum motive in obs. and fl., and the  rhythm and its diminution in the lower woodwind. As discussed (§3.1.8), the final mm. of the discarded 12C and the sks. on the last p. of 15C (C/252) probably give some indication of the passage. The similarity of the motivic design at the beginning of 15D/"16" (E/69) to the last 6 mm. of 12C—triplets in the strings, parallel single and double augmentations and inversions of the Te Deum motive in the winds—suggests that Bruckner may have transferred the passage from the discarded 12C to [14] when he introduced the chromatic-descent sequence (see E/52, note 1) on later versions of bifols. [12] and [13]. The relevant mm. of 12C have been underlaid to give a general impression of this structure; they require an upward transposition from E to F to link up with the ending of 13E/"14". The lost passage obviously moved toward a cadence into G♭ major, which probably fell in the penultimate m. of [14/"15"]. The hypothetical reconstruction given in the AF (G/36ff.) is summarised in Ex. 7.

**E/69–72**

*Text:* bifol. 15D/"16", ÖNB 6087/41–42; cf. Facs. C/253ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–6; 1–4;

Renumbered versions of this and the following three bifols. all survive, indicating their validity through phase 4. The additions to the scoring in the winds on E/69 are most likely late additions; they must have continued on from the preceding bifol., which was probably as extensively orchestrated. The musical texture here was again, conceptually speaking, largely completed by Bruckner, and includes a complex transition on E/71 from the iambic motive of the introduction, ♪ ♩ ♩ ♩, to the trochaic ♩ ♩ ♩ ♩ of the Gesangsp. The annotation “NB 2. # 15.” may refer to the expansion of bifol. “13”; concerning the “-de” annotation on E/72, cf. note to E/61–64. The added scoring in the winds on E/69 is probably late; Bruckner appears to have erred here in the use of the clar. and bsn. staves.

**E/73–76**

*Text:* bifol. 16C/“17”, ÖNB 6087/43–44; cf. Facs. C/257ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [1–4]-5–8; 1–12;

The date of “Aug 11.” (1896) probably refers to a later revision; the bifol. was apparently not further orchestrated to a significant degree, however, although the precise placement of rests in ink on E/74 and E/76 (note the omission of 1st–4th hrn. rests on E/74) suggests that Bruckner already had largely determined on the principles for the orchestration, probably during the primary notation in ink. Substantial erasures in the winds on E/75 and 76 (not transcribed; cf. C/259f.) may not have been of preliminary drafts (*pace* E/75, fn. 1) but of intended doublings of the strings by these instruments which Bruckner erased prior to definitively rewriting them in ink (this interpretation is used in the AF); in apparent conflict with this interpretation, whole-m. rests in pencil can be seen between the wind staves on E/76. The surviving  $bb^2-d^2$  in the 1st fl., ob. and clar. staves on E/76 are most likely an earlier version of the  $bb^2-c\sharp^2$  in the vla. and vlc. (cf. the heavy erasures and patches in the lower strings).

**E/77–80**

*Text:* bifol. 17<sup>c</sup>D/“18”, ÖNB 6087/51–52; cf. Facs. C/277ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8;

At this point on bifol. 17C stands “Bedeutend langsamer” (C/261); bifol. 17F prescribes a change of time signature to **C** (C/265). Throughout the fugue, the conceptually largely complete orchestration pencilled in the winds was probably made at an earlier stage than much of the added pencil text of the Durchf., since it builds meaningfully into the fully scored out texture

found at the beginning of bifol. 20F/“21”, the first 6 mm. of which represent the last surviving complete orchestration in the movement. Significant throughout for this instrumentation remains the simultaneous iambic motive and its own diminution; the three-note accompaniment motive in the brass is derived from the trumpet fanfare. Ex. 5b (i–iv) shows the derivation of this fanfare as a rhythmic reduction from the lyrical counterpoint, (v) the motive itself, and (vi–vii) the subsequent mutations it undergoes in the course of the fugue.

**E/81–84**

*Text:* bifol. 18D/“19”, ÖNB 6087/53–54); cf. Facs. C/281ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3;

*Concerning underlay on E/84–85, see note to E/85–88.*

Although heavily worked, the strings are complete here with the principal non-*colla parte* indications of the winds; again, the instrumentation is conceptually speaking largely complete. Bruckner’s “C[orni]”, E/81, m. 4 suggests that, despite the use of ruling D, the 5th to 8th horn were intended to play throughout the fugue, and were probably maintained through bifol. 13E/“14” and the chorale. The annotation “acc.[ompaniment] aushalten” on E/82 probably refers to a continuation of the 3-note rhythmic accompaniment to the fugue (cf. Ex. 5b, vi). At this point, the Durchf. of the fugue, Bruckner resorts to a 3-m. period structure (for the first time since the fugal Finale of the Fifth symphony; cf. corrected metrical numbers, E/82).<sup>211</sup> Strikingly the lower strings unite at this point in a 3-octave deep, “1/2 später” p.a.e.t. imitation of the truncated subject in the 2nd vln. (cf. Bruckner’s annotation, E/82, top, “Bas[s]o 1/2 Tact später/ als II. Violin”). However, there is an independent vla. line (cf. alto clefs) notated in the 3rd–4th tba. staff which effectively represents a further p.a.e.t. imitation at the distance of only a crotchet (i.e., ‘1/4 später’) and was presumably added to intensify the contrapuntal texture, which otherwise becomes suddenly far more elaborate at E/84, m. 2, where Bruckner initiates a Spiegelbild structure between 1st vln. and bass (“gleichz.[eitig]/ 1/4 sp.[äter] II V.[ioline]”). The cut “vi (unis) im/ 21. Bogen” indicated just above this annotation ends on E/94 in the 7th m. of that bifol. Concerning the

<sup>211</sup> The sequence of two diminished chords (E/82, m. 4 to E/84, m. 1) is intentionally or unintentionally reminiscent of the coda to the first movement of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, mm. 431–438 thereof.

instrumental drafts on E/84 and underlay of the clar. line, see the following note.

**E/85–88** *Principal text (lost):* bifol. [19/“20”]

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [33–48]<sup>212</sup>

*E/87–88 underlaid with:* sk. ÖNB 3194/14<sup>f</sup>, br. 2–5; cf. Facs. C/23

*Length:* 7 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–7-[8]; 1–3;

*Underlay continued on E/89.*

The 16-m. length of a bifol. [19/“20”] is confirmed by the figures in the lower margin of the 1st p. of the following bifol. 20F/“21” (see E/89), which count the number of mm. from the beginning of the fugue (E/77), perhaps to ensure that the odd-even sequence of mm. was maintained despite the use of irregular 3-m. phrases. This numeration has been underlaid. The phrase notated in the 1st-trp. staff is most likely intended for the clar. in B $\flat$ , but only fits with the string counterpoint 2 mm. later; it has been underlaid in this position, and probably constitutes a guide to the harmonic layout of the first 2 mm. of [19/“20”].

An unbroken musical continuity for the development of the fugue was not achieved in the earlier pc. sks. (see C/21ff., 27; drafts for the passage can also be found on the 1st p. of the discarded bifol. 17C, C/261), but there is every indication that [19/“20”] would have consisted of a clear and to some extent probably reconstruable sequential structure (cf. the hypothetical reconstruction, AF, G/47ff.; Ex. 8a and b) which, as the last 3 mm. of 18D/“19” and 6 fully scored opening mm. of 20F/“21” suggest, was probably substantially scored, and which maintained the Spiegelbild technique with the truncated fugal subject in the highest and simultaneous inversion in the lowest voice of the texture, the remaining parts using various p.a.e.t. imitations. From the 10th m. of bifol. [19/“20”], it is possible to underlay a series of pc. drafts linked by Bruckner's characteristic ‘Weiser’, which lead directly into the first mm. of 20F/“21” (see E/87f.). The last 3 mm. of [19/“20”] must accordingly have been the 3 mm. of C $\sharp$  minor from the 3194/14<sup>f</sup>, 3rd bracket sk. All three bass inversions of the

<sup>212</sup> Cf. the numeration of measures from the beginning of the fugue, E/89, lower margin.

subject given in the sk. were initially to be carried over into the score, as “G moll” stands above the 4th m. of E/89; the later substitution of F# minor probably had to do with the subsequent Steigerung passage beginning on the dominant of C# minor on E/90, m. 3; this passage was not envisioned in the pc. sks. and apparently laid out directly in score. Ex. 8a presents an overview of the reconstruction of this bifol. given in the AF (G/47ff.; see discussion, §3.3.6).

**E/89–92**

*Text:* bifol. 20F/“21” StB 4189/27–28; cf. Facs. C/285ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–2-

See previous note. Concerning the transcription given on E/89, cf. the facsimile C/285: from this bifol. onwards begin the increasing numbers of cancelled and repeated bifoliations in the r. margin and stave area, in both pencil and ink, of what were doubtless much earlier notated texts. Here the scattered renumberings were written around Bruckner’s exhaustive examinations of voice-leading, with which they stand in stark contrast. The 1st 4 mm. of 20F/“21” were actually the remainder of the bifol. ‘conceptually’ fully orchestrated by Bruckner; the definitive nature of the counterpoint on E/89f. demonstrates that the missing bifol. of the fugue must have been substantially elaborated. The composer altered Meißner’s designation of the 1st–4th tba./5th–8th hrn. staves as “1. 2./ “3. 4.” on E/89 only; from m. 3, E/90, he wished to revert to tbas., although in practice the change is impracticably fast. The line written in the 2nd–3rd clar. stave, E/286, mm. 3–4, is notated for hrn. in F, as indicated by the letter notation.

**E/93–96**

*Text:* bifol. 21D/“22”, ÖNB 6087/57–58; cf. Facs. C/289ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

The orchestration of this and the following bifol. is again conceptually largely complete, Bruckner introducing striking dissonances, in effect an Undezimakkord or Sechsklang, at E/94 (cf. top “a m[it] As d[ur]”). The tumultuous passage of unison string writing 2 mm. later (the end of the “vide” marked on E/84) was apparently a later inspiration, Bruckner initially drafting a quite different passage in the ÖNB 6085/35–36 sk. (cf. C/41ff., Ex. 9d). Aside from the 1st trp. and the suggestion that the line is doubled in the 1st ob., there are few further textural clues at this point. However, the last 2 mm. of the bifol. quote the string writing of VI/4 and the “Aeterna



fac", as noted (§3.1.8), suggesting parallels with the instrumentation of those passages. An isolated note in the ten. tba. stave on E/96, m. 3 may suggest that the descending notes of the strings were to be doubled by the tbas. in crotchets from this point onwards (cf. instrumentation of VI/4 and Te Deum); this is confirmed by letter notation written between the tba. staves on E/97, m. 4.

**E/97–100**

*Text:* bifol. 22D/"23", ÖNB 6087/59–60; cf. Facs. C/293ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

Indications as to further instrumentation reappear at m. 3, from which point Bruckner begins preparing the introduction of the horn theme 4 mm. later, introducing sustained notes and quaver triplets in anticipation of the crotchet triplets of the horn theme.

**E/101–104**

*Principal text:* bifol. 23D/"24", ÖNB 6087/61–62; cf. Facs. C/297ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–12; 1–6-

*E/104 underlaid with:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, br. 2; cf. Facs. C/24

*Length:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–6-

The mutation cycle through which Bruckner takes the horn theme from this point was analysed in Ex. 9a. At E/102, m. 3 Bruckner gives two "1. vi =" indications, the first of which, crossed out, ended on E/111 at the 9th m. of bifol. 25D/"26"; the second probably ended at the 11th m. of bifol. [24/"25"] (see E/107). The strange progression with which the horn theme passage concludes (E/102–103) was conceptually largely scored out.

The continuity of the ensuing Repr. of the Gesangsp. was drafted in pc. sk., apparently not significantly in advance of the composition of the passage in score, since Bruckner wrote "23" on the pc. sk. (C/24); fortunately these pc. sks. allow reconstruction of the continuity of the following lost bifol. [24/"25"]; the last 4 mm. of 23D/"24" have been underlaid to demonstrate the overlap.<sup>213</sup>

<sup>213</sup> The ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, bracket 2 sk. in fact begins 2 mm. earlier; the first 2 mm. are marked by Bruckner to be repeated (cf. C/24); it is this repeat which in effect has been underlaid on E/104.

**E/105–108**

*Principal text (lost):* bifol. [24/“25”]

*Length:* probably 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-]

*E/105–106 underlaid with:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, br. 2; Facs. C/24

*Length:* 6 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1-[2]-3-[4]-

*E/106–107 underlaid with:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/15<sup>f</sup>, br. 3; cf, Facs. C/25

*Length:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–8;

*E/107–108 underlaid with:* bifol. 5B, from m. 9, StB 3791/6;

cf. Facs. C/165f.

*Length:* 8 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8;

The essential continuity of the lost [24—probably D—/“25”], but unfortunately not the details of its crucial 1st vln. line, can be reconstructed from the pc. sks. with a degree of certainty. The relevant passages from the sks. and bifol. 5B have been underlaid, together with the Weiser connecting them. Bruckner’s 2nd, undeleted “1. vi =” on E/102 must have ended at the F#-major “Trio” passage on E/107. Ex. 10 shows the reconstruction used in partial form in the DdF (F/61ff.) and more completely in the AF (G/60ff.).

**E/109–112**

*Text:* bifol. 25D/“26”, ÖNB 6087/55–56; cf. Facs. C/301ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–6; 1–8;

The completed, cleanly notated string texture of the first 8 mm. of 25D/“26” demonstrates that a completed versions of 5B and 6<sup>c</sup>B in the Exp. doubtless existed at the time of its notation. The deleted “vi–de” from E/102, which covered 8 pp., ended on E/111. The elided resolution (cb–[bb]) in the 1st vln. on E/112, m. 3 obviously caused Bruckner considerable thought.

**E/113–116**

*Text:* bifol. 26F/“27”, ÖNB 6087/65–66; cf. Facs. C/305ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1–8; 1–4;

The preceding 8 mm. and the variant of the chorale theme that begin this bifol. were again all notated first in pc.-sk. format (here ÖNB 28.238, C/26, brackets 2–3, “Anfang”, continuing onto 3194/15<sup>f</sup>, C/25, bracket 2.

Strikingly, this sk. ends in mid-flight. The last 4 mm. of the bifol. (E/116) do not survive in the pc. sks., and feature a motivically new progression which perhaps alludes to a Gregorian theme, that of “Christus ist erstanden” (cf. Ex. 11b); this is discussed at greater length in §3.3.6. The “2. vi =” indicated on E/116 must have ended on bifol. [27/“28”] (E/120); see notes to the following bifol.

**E/117–120**

*Principal text (lost):* bifol. [27/“28”]

*Length:*? mm. (here given as 16 mm., but see *infra*)

*Metrical structure:* [ ? ; 1–4]

*E/117–119 underlaid with:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, br. 3, mm. 5ff.;

cf. Facs. C/24

*Length:* 17 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8; [1–]

The non-extant bifol. [27/“28”] is only hypothetically given here as 16 mm.; more likely, given the substantial passage in the pc. sks. that was apparently allotted to this bifol., its length was 24 mm.; as discussed, Bruckner may either have ruled it with 24 mm. himself— he ruled the barlines himself on the foregoing bifol. 26F/“27”—or used a further example of the 24-m. ruling prepared by Meißner for bifol. 1F. In any case, the pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, bracket 3, mm. 5ff. reveals a striking and characteristically Brucknerian *Steigerung* apparently ending in D minor at the top of fol. 15<sup>r</sup>—cf. the annotation “Schluß D m[oll]”, perhaps also construable as “Schluß[periode] in D moll”, i.e., the *Schlußp.* was to begin here in D minor, instead of the E major of the Exp. Assuming Bruckner began the bifol., interrupting the Gregorian progression, with the 3194/14<sup>v</sup> sk., this progression would have accounted for the first 16.5 mm. of the bifol.

A further clue to the beginning of this period is given by the cut “2. vi =” in the 13th m. of bifol. 26F/“27” (see note to preceding bifol.), which must have ended on bifol. [27/“28”]. The most likely location for the “= de” is the beginning of the metrical period which continued on bifol. 28E/“29” (E/121) from the 5th m.; the most likely connecting note—cf. the g<sup>#2</sup> with which E/115 ends—would have been a<sup>2</sup>; this has been added on E/120. The triplet *ostinato* texture found at the beginning of the following bifol.—



—probably began with the beginning of the period 4 mm. earlier. The strong resemblance of this figuration to the accompaniment of the chorale (E/41)—



—suggests that its original form, beginning on the  $a^2$  4 mm. before, was probably:



This hypothetically accounts for the first 16.5 and the final 4 mm. of what was most likely a 24-m. bifol. The reconstruction of the remaining 3.5 mm. is dealt with in §3.3.6; an overview of the entire reconstructed continuity (AF G/66) is given by Ex. 11a.

#### E/121–124

*Text:* bifol. 28E/“29”, ÖNB 6087/67–68; cf. Facs C/309ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–6; 1–6; 1–6; 1–2-

The triplet figuration continues to the beginning of the chorale (E/124, expressly marked by Bruckner “Choral/ 2. Abtheilung”), at which point the string figuration suddenly changes to the original string figuration of the Te Deum itself—doubtless a symbolic combination long foreseen by Bruckner. The rests in both trp. staves on E/124 probably imply that the whole brass section was to be involved here, although only the 1st trp. is notated.

#### E/125–128

*Text:* bifol. 29E/“30”, ÖNB 6087/69–70; cf. Facs. C/313ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

The repeated bifoliations in the r. margin of the 1st p. (cf. C/313) have almost completely obscured the original number; a faint erasure visible under the lower of the two main groups of numbers in the top r. h. corner may indicate that this was the original bifoliation. The semibreve and “dim.” on E/126, m. 2 are significant, again implying, as in the Exp. (E/43), that the last two notes of the first 8-m. phrase of the chorale were not intended to be tied.

**E/129–132** *Principal text (lost):* bifol. [30/“31”]*Length:* 16 mm.*Metrical structure:* [-3–12; 1–6-]

The 16-m. length of a non-extant bifol. [30–probably E—/“31”] is confirmed by the figures at the top of the 1st p. of the following bifol. 31E/“32”, E/133, which represent a numbering-through of the mm. from the beginning of the chorale Repr. on E/124. (See E/133 as well as the supplemented numeration above.) The periodic structure of the non-extant [30/“31”] can most plausibly be reconstructed as -3–12; 1–6- or -11–14; 1–6; 1–6- (underlaid); the triplet motive design in the strings which continues on the 1st p. of the following bifol. (see E/133) probably began in the 11th m. of [30/“31”]; the voice-leading Kustoden in the l. lower margin of the 1st p. of 31E/“32” (cf. C/317) reveals that the previous group in the vlc. and cb. must have lain higher. While sks. for bifol. [30/“31”] are not extant, the last 2 mm. of the preceding bifol. and 1st 2 mm. of the ensuing bifol. suggest that Bruckner may have derived the passage, probably writing directly in score, by inverting the first 12 mm. of the chorale theme and its 8-m. middle section (cf. the exposition, E/41, m. 3 to E/44, m. 2, as well as E/45, m. 3 to E/47, m. 2). An exact inversion is possible, and corresponds with the rigorous nature of Bruckner's contrapuntal processes in the Finale generally. An overview of the passage, reconstructed in the AF (G/74ff.), is given in Ex. 12a; 12b outlines the derivation of the passage by inversion (more fully explained in ch. §3.3.6)

**E/133–136** *Text:* bifol. 31E/“32”, ÖNB 6087/71–72; cf. Facs. C/317ff.*Length:* 16 mm.*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

See note to the previous bifol. As discussed *infra* (§3.1.11), Bruckner probably intended the transition to the Te Deum to begin at some point after the end of 29E/“30”, the ostinato quavers of which could easily have led over into those of the choral work. That assumption may have nourished Orel's belief that 29E/“30”<sup>214</sup> was the last bifol. to have been written by Bruckner; that Orel thought no farther than this probably explains why he attempted no interpretation of the later sks. for the coda, and disregarded the marginal reference to “Bogen 36” on ÖNB 6085/45<sup>f</sup>. The facsimile C/317

<sup>214</sup> Or both 28E/“29” and 29E/“30”, as he transcribed the two as a single unit, “29<sup>2</sup>. E” (D/126).

reveals the huge number of repeated bifoliations on the 1st p. of this bifol., which increase in number from bifol. 20F/"21" onwards, almost complete covering the r. margin and r. stave area. However, like 29E/"30", careful study of the original 1st p. reveals two likely sites for the original bifoliation (cf. C/301, 305, 309, 313), a higher and a lower, within c. 5 mm. and 10 mm. of the vertical page edge respectively. Both of these here appear to begin with a "3". Like 29E/"30", the original second figure of the lower of the two locations, although illegibly overwritten, shows a faint erasure, suggesting that it too was originally renumbered.

The numbers written above the mm. of this bifol. in any case confirm that it followed a lost 16-m. bifol. [30/"31"]. In the upper margin of each p. of 31E/"32" is found a continuous numbering of mm. in pencil, beginning with a "35".<sup>215</sup> The chorale in the "2. Abtheilung" hence begins with the overlaying of chorale theme and Te Deum motive and in the course of the lost [30E/"31"] must have returned to the triplet figuration in the strings with which the Schlußp. Repr. began. The figures on the last p. of 31E/"32" (cf. E/136; cf. C/320) are apparently of later origin than those of the preceding pp. If not an oversight, they perhaps suggest an expansion of this bifol., perhaps an indication that the first 4 mm. of the horn theme were to be repeated (cf. E/98ff.; this was realised in the AF, cf. §3.3.6).

The elaborate texture of the string writing on this bifol. (among the most complex to be found in the entire score and which demanded numerous checks and inspections—see C/317ff.), the 1st and later 2nd ob. indicating the involvement of the woodwind, letter notation indicating what are most likely trp. fanfares, and even notes written for the timp., all suggest a highly advanced instrumental conception for the 1st 2 pp. and refute the notion that Bruckner's powers were significantly declining at the time of its composition. On E/319 the horn theme re-emerges, and the score breaks off at a point which cannot have been many measures before the beginning of the coda proper.

---

<sup>215</sup> Orel (D/124f.), in misclassifying 31E/"32" as 21. Bogen E (cf. the prominent "21" on C/31), related these numbers to the numbering-through of the mm. of the fugue from bifol. 18D/"19" onwards, although, as he himself noted, an exact correspondence is not possible: the numbering comes out 1 m. short. The numbering is correct from the beginning of the chorale Repr., i.e., from the penultimate m. of 28E/"29" and continuing through 29E/"30"; the predication of a missing 16-m. bifol. [30/"31"] between 29E/"30" and 31E/"32" brings the total number of mm. from the beginning of the chorale Repr. (2 + 16 + 16) to 34.

**E/137***Concerning the coda*<sup>216</sup>

Even the last of the score bifols. extant today must have been written long before the mental confusion of Bruckner's last months, as revealed by their coherent handwriting and musical design. It is quite possible that the composer, following his usual method of working, brought the notation of the strings in score as far as the end of the movement before proceeding to complete the instrumental elaboration, in the course of which he was led to renumber the valid bifols. of the score.

It would seem that Bruckner managed to complete a continuous instrumentation only as far as the early part of the development section. What he can have achieved after the crisis of July 1896 appears mainly to have been the late SVEs (principally for bifol. 1 as well as for the expansion of the development), and isolated and not always interpretable entries in previously composed bifols., as well as repeated attempts at their reenumeration.

That Bruckner had already brought the notation of the score well into the coda towards the end of May 1896 is evidenced by the annotation (probably to be understood as an indicator of its point of insertion in the score) "Bogen 36", found in the left margin of the sketch ÖNB 6085/45 (see E/139). Even though no further score bifols. after 31E/"32" survive, some extant sketches and written references from the primary literature permit us at least a hint of the character and extent of the last formal section of the movement.

The following come under consideration: a thrice-drafted crescendo passage from the early sketches (I); the suggestion by Auer concerning a contrapuntal combination of themes (II) and the sketches from May 1896 themselves (III). Most likely the coda was to arrive at its climax in the broadly conceived span of the cadence drafted on ÖNB 6085/43 (see E/141), which was to be followed by a "song of praise to the dear Lord", an "Allelujah of the second movement". Concerning this, only verbal references by the composer survive (IV).

**E/138, I**

Pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/3<sup>f</sup>; cf. Facs. C/6

*Length:* 36 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8; 1–8; [...]

---

<sup>216</sup> The following four paragraphs are a direct translation of the text on E/137, included here to maintain continuity; the subsequent discussion of the sources is more detailed than that included in the AP itself.

The sketch ÖNB 3194/3<sup>r</sup>, a *Steigerung* built on the inversion of the opening motive, was initially conceived as a transition to the Exp. chorale. ÖNB 3194, fols. 7<sup>r</sup> and 7<sup>v</sup> (C/13, 14) contain earlier versions. On fol. 3<sup>r</sup>, however, the passage was substantially elaborated in ink, perhaps with the intention of using it later; strikingly also, it was allotted a separate time signature, **C**. Only the continuation of the sk. after 24 mm. appears to have remained uncertain. The rhythmic form used for the motive here,



was later altered by Bruckner to match that of the opening motive of the movement (ending with a crotchet, instead of a semibreve) at some point between the composition of bifol. 7B (cf. C/179) and 7C/“8” (E/35); accordingly, 3194/3<sup>r</sup> must have been notated before 7C.

The sk. is also striking in that the descending chromatic motive (mm. 3–4), ultimately the same as the d–c#–c♭–b♭ of the *Durchf.*, appears here in a rhythmic form found nowhere else in the movement. As the non-autograph marginal annotation on 3194/3<sup>r</sup>, “VIIIte!” (probably by Auer) points out, this recalls the principal theme of the first movement of the Eighth (cf. m. 4 thereof); however, this allusion was probably less significant in the Finale of the Ninth. The four-note chromatic descent itself recalls the *Hauptth.* of IX/1 (cf. m. 65 thereof; Ex. 2d), and it is in this connection that Bruckner may have used the sk. here. The Finale codas of the Fourth to Eighth Symphonies all begin with a motive derived from that movement’s *Hauptth.*,<sup>217</sup> while three of these, the Fifth, Sixth and Eighth, invoke the *Hauptth.* of the first movement shortly before the coda and/or during it.<sup>218</sup> So the sk. may provide important information concerning the construction of the beginning of the coda. Given the motivic similarity of the horn theme to the *Hauptth.* of IX/1 (cf. Ex. 2d), Bruckner may have used the horn theme to lead into a climactic statement of the IX/1 *Hauptth.* in a similar way to his procedure in the Finale of the Eighth. If used after it, the 3194/3<sup>r</sup> sk., which mutates the chromatic descent motive further, may well have represented the actual beginning of the coda; and has been used in this way in the AF (F/82ff.; discussion §3.3.7). The use of 3194/3<sup>r</sup> in this way perhaps explains why no further sks. for the opening of the coda are extant.

<sup>217</sup> Cf. IV(1878–80)/4: letter V; V/4: letter W; VI/4: letter X; VII/4: letter W; VIII(1890)/4: letter Uu.

<sup>218</sup> Cf. V/4: letter V; VI/4: mm. 367ff. (allusion to accompaniment to VI/1 *Hauptth.*), mm. 407ff. *Hauptth.* itself; VIII(1890)/4: mm. 619ff., 1st invocation, letter Ww final cadence, letter Zz final peroration.



**E/138, II** *Source (lost) of a Themenüberlagerung*

Even though such a page, whether pc. sk. or score bifol., is no longer extant, Auer made two references to a Themenüberlagerung or contrapuntal combination of themes in the Finale in his single-volume biographies published in 1923 and 1934, as quoted here. The wording of both, however, suggests that his remarks were borrowed from an earlier source, namely Max Graf's review of the first performance of the Ninth, which we have already examined in §1.3.3; perhaps significantly, there is no further mention of a Themenüberlagerung in Auer's discussion of the Finale in the four-volume biography published after the appearance of Orel's *Entwürfe und Skizzen* in 1934. The relevant remarks are as follows:<sup>219</sup>

Mit Ergriffenheit haben wir diese Skizzen betrachtet, die mit zitteriger Schrift hingeworfen sind, da die kraftlose Hand den Bleistift kaum führen konnte. Die Themen lassen sich erkennen: ein Hauptthema, ein Fugenthema, ein Choral und das Quintenthema des Tedeums und einmal sogar werden alle vier Themen übereinandergestellt, eine vierfache Thürmung, wie sie schon in der achten Symphonie Bruckner's anzutreffen ist. An diese Symphonie erinnert Bruckner auch mit dem Adagio seiner 'Neunten', da er hier eine thematische Erinnerung eingeflochten hat.<sup>220</sup>

Graf's remarks would probably not be as significant were it not that we know him to have been in possession of a Finale bifol. ("2"E);<sup>221</sup> perhaps he saw, or was in possession of, fragments of the Finale other than that included in the material examined by Auer or subsequently transcribed by Orel. Perhaps Graf was making an informed guess, referring to the chorale Repr. (combining the chorale theme with the Te Deum motive; cf. E/124f.) or to the Finale of the Eighth (letter Zz thereof); perhaps he had more recourse to further information after all. His reference to a "vierfache Thürmung" seems quite specific, although exactly how the principal and fugal variants of the Finale Hauptth., the chorale and Te Deum motive can all have been combined simultaneously is itself problematic. The thematic overlay in the Finale of the Eighth invokes the themes of all four movements and, if the same concept was used by Bruckner at all in the Finale of the Ninth, it is far likelier, on internal evidence (the themes do permit of such a

<sup>219</sup> As quoted and discussed in §1.3.3. Graf's review appeared in the *Neues Wiener Journal*, 12 February 1903, p. 7; quoted in Manfred Wagner, *Die Geschichte der Österreichischen Musikkritik in Beispielen*, pp. 262ff.

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 263.

<sup>221</sup> See §1.2.6.

combination; cf. Ex. 16, AF/86f. discussion §3.3.7), that Bruckner would have invoked the other four movements at this point. If Graf's suggestion is thus only literary embellishment of the observed combination of chorale and Te Deum motive and perpetuated by Auer, it is nonetheless, like Wilhelm Zentner's comments concerning the likely appearance of the chorale in coda (§1.3.9), perceptive supposition.<sup>222</sup>

**E/139–142, III** The pc. sks. ÖNB 6085/45<sup>r</sup>, /47<sup>r</sup> and /43 (all paper F), apparently drafted between the 19 and 23 May 1896, all represent a lyrical crescendo and broad cadential passage, and were perhaps intended to follow a final entry of the chorale theme. As is the case with many of the earlier pc. sks., the drafts defy definitive transcription, but the sequence of the passage is independently confirmed by the dates:

- “18” (?) Cracow sk. for Durchf. expansion and outline of F–b $\sharp$  progression (apparent dating; C/49; cf. §3.1.8)
- “19. May” 6085/41 (C/44) ?—interrupted?
- “19”, “19.” 6085/45<sup>r</sup> (C/45; E/139) sk. ‘lyrical Steigerung’
- “21” 6085/47<sup>r</sup> (C/46; E/140) further sks. for Steigerung
- “am 21. Donnerstag, 22. Freitag, 23. Donnerst.” and  
“Nacht v.[on] Don.[nerstag] auf fr.[eitag]”  
6085/43<sup>r</sup> (C/47f.; E/141f.) sks. for final cadence

**E/139** Pc. sk. ÖNB 6085/45<sup>r</sup>; cf. Facs. C/45

*Length:*? mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4 [...] 1–8 [...] 4–8 [...]

A further undated pc. sk on the 1st p. of the discarded bifol. “13”<sup>a</sup>E (C/209, q.v.) may represent an earlier version of the passage drafted on 6085/45<sup>r</sup>. While the exact continuity of the Steigerung remains uncertain (cf. transcription, E/139f.), in particular the relation of the ideas drafted on 6085/45<sup>r</sup> and /47<sup>r</sup> respectively, the general direction of Bruckner's thinking is clear: the goal of these progressions was the *cb* with which the broad harmonic design on 6085/43 begins, and which probably represents the final cadence of the movement.

<sup>222</sup> Graf's reference to a “thematische Erinnerung” of the Eighth in the Adagio of the Ninth is also of interest, as the critic later in the same review mentioned having seen the composer's original score of the first three movements (then in the ÖNB). Pointing to erasures in the wind staves of the Adagio (probably Bruckner's normal working technique of first drafting the strings in the wind staves) he questioned, “ob Bruckner wohl nicht Manches dem Klange in diesem Satze zugefügt hätte, wenn ihm seine schwere Krankheit noch mehr Stunden der Arbeit gegönnt hätte” (quoted in Wagner, *Die Geschichte der Österreichischen Musikkritik...*, p. 264).

- E/140** Pc. sk. ÖNB 6085/47<sup>r</sup>; cf. Facs. C/46  
*Length:* 20 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8 [...]

See preceding notes. The remaining 3 pp. of the bifol. are without notation. Mm. 3–4 and 7–8 of the first period, which recall the falling 6ths or diminished 7ths characteristic of the movement, perhaps represent the bass line of a series of  $\frac{6}{3}$  chords.

- E/141–142** Pc. sk. ÖNB 6085/43; cf. Facs. C/47  
*Length:*? mm.  
*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8; 1–8; [...]

See preceding notes. The remaining 2 pp. of the bifol. are without notation. The upper 3 systems of fol. 43<sup>r</sup>, notated largely in pencil, appear to represent the most detailed draft of what can only have been the final, monumental cadence of the movement, a 24-m. sequence outlining the harmonic progression C $\flat$  major (4 mm.), F major (4 mm.), the dominant 7th on A, apparently with added 11th (7 mm.), what appears to be some sort of harmonic alteration in the 8th m., and finally D (8 mm.). The reading of fol. 43<sup>r</sup>, bracket 3, m. 1 as g $\sharp$ /b $\flat$  is that of Orel (D/127). The contents of a further 2 mm., begun in pencil in the 4th bracket (2nd to lowest stave on the page), were crossed out; they consisted of:



The lower part of the page, continuing onto fol. 43<sup>v</sup>, is notated in ink like the stave brackets, and probably represents an earlier, less differentiated draft for the progression laid out in more detail above; this is suggested by the apparent dating (in pencil) “Nacht v.[on] Don.[nerstag] auf fr.[eitag]”. This sk. probably begins from the a and D, “Moll/ D” notated in the lowest system within an added 2-stave bracket, continues through a crossed-out and overwritten c $\sharp$ <sup>1</sup>, “cis”, with “f” added above it, then “ces/ sehr lang” and “A/ Dom<sup>7</sup>”, apparently continuing over the page to conclude with the notes g<sup>3</sup>, g<sup>2</sup>, f $\sharp$ <sup>2</sup>, e<sup>2</sup>, d<sup>2</sup>. The interpretation of the 2nd bracket on fol. 43<sup>v</sup> is unclear.

This ink sk. again reverses the C $\flat$ –F sequence; the other sources also indicate that Bruckner vacillated over the order of the two chords (cf. E/139, 3rd–5th bracket, E/140, 2nd bracket). Contrary to E/141, fn. 1, the Cracow sk. (not transcribed, C/49), which also reverses the C $\flat$ –F progression, more

likely represents an earlier, less differentiated draft of the passage that Bruckner worked out in greater detail between 21 and 23 May.

**E/142, IV** We have already discussed (§1.1.8) the recollections of Bruckner's playing of, and intentions concerning the conclusion of, the Finale left in the account of Bruckner's last attending physician, Richard Heller. The insights it provides for the practical reconstruction of the passage are discussed in §3.3.7.

### 3.1.11 The 'vi-de' markings and the Te Deum transition.<sup>223</sup>

As we have seen (§1.1.10), there is no question that Bruckner, confronting the possibility that he might die before completing the Finale, considered and perhaps even experimented with salvaging the largely complete instrumental torso of the movement as a transition to the Te Deum. The three points in the score from which Bruckner may have conceived a transition occurring include firstly the end of the chorale in the Exp., where a 12-m. transposition in C major, of the melody and bass of the second statement of the chorale is overlaid in the vacant ob. and bsn. staves above the fully scored version in E major in the brass and strings (E/47ff.; cf. "Anfang", E/47, ending with the inscription "Te Deum" on E/50). Another possible transition may have been considered at a late stage from the middle of the Durchf., where the SVE "14"<sup>a</sup>E (Fac. C/229f.) modulates the Te Deum motive (augmented in minims, as on 13E/"14") into C major, the only time that key occurs in any of the drafts for this passage; the significance of this may be underlined by an apparent but questionable dating (see §1.1.10), which one can only speculate may have been a later reference to the performance of the Te Deum under Richard Perger attended by the composer in January 1896.

A third possibility, perhaps the most obvious, may have occurred to Bruckner from the chorale Repr., 28E/"29" and 29E/"30", where the Te Deum motive in its original form in quavers unites with the chorale. According to Stradal and Altwirth,<sup>224</sup> Bruckner improvised a transition to the Te Deum from this point for them at the piano which Stradal allegedly transcribed from memory, although no such sketch has come to light. A further passage from the Göllicherich-Auer biography not quoted in §1.1.11 deserves citation:

Des Meisters Schüler August Stradal und Altwirth versichern, daß er ihnen eine 'Überleitung zum Tedeum' vorgespielt habe, die Stradal aus dem Gedächtnis notierte. Diese Überleitungsmusik sollte von E-Dur nach C-Dur, der Tonart des Te Deum führen. Umrauscht von den Streichfiguren des Te Deum erklang ein Choral, der im Te Deum

<sup>223</sup> The text of this section is in part adapted from the author's article, "The Facts Behind a 'Legend': Bruckner's Ninth Symphony and the *Te Deum*", in: Howie, Crawford, Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, eds., *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner* (2001).

<sup>224</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 613.

nicht enthalten ist. Auch die Bemerkung Stradals, daß sich das Manuskript bei Schalk befinde, scheint darauf hinzuweisen, daß damit die letzten Takte der Finale-Partitur gemeint sind, die Bruckner mit "Choral 2. Abtheilung" überschrieben hat.<sup>225</sup>

Stradal's description, as related by Auer, corresponds to a continuation of the string figuration in quavers, which apparently modulated into the opening of the Te Deum.<sup>226</sup> The place described is the chorale Repr., apparently somewhere prior to the resumption of the triplet texture in the strings, which would have occurred in the last 6 mm. of bifol. [30/"31"].<sup>227</sup> This would have been a logical alternative, which would have left the bulk of the movement's formal structure intact, although it also, without cuts, would have produced a huge movement over 45 minutes in length; a purely conjectural realisation of how such a transition could have functioned has been attempted (G/99ff.; discussion §3.3.8). As we have seen (§1.3.13), the idea of ending the symphony in C major is far from as tonally unconscionable as has often been claimed, and as performance of the first three movements followed by the Te Deum reveal. The tonally rather curious alteration of the opening pedal of the Finale in the 6007 sk. (prior to the C-ruling versions of bifol. 1) from A to G—the original conception probably ameliorated because of its dissonance, rather than for any obvious musical or tonal reasons—would have worked in favour of signposting conclusion of the D-minor movement with the C-major Te Deum. The reconception of the instrumentation of the Hauptth. on 2F may also be significant. Cohrs has suggested that the late reconception of the Steigerung leading into the Hauptth. and the Hauptth. itself may be linked to an altered conception of the tempo of the movement, resulting from Bruckner's decision to use the torso of the movement as a transition to the Te Deum, which is marked **C** while the Finale is marked **♩**. The tempi of the two works are far from irreconcilable, however—both can be practically be regarded as *Allegro moderato* tempi taken in 2, minim = c. 60—and, if anything, the removal of the dotted rhythm from the trombones and tubas in 2F would suggest that Bruckner was rethinking the movement with a faster tempo in mind—perhaps too fast for these instruments to play dotted rhythms in leaps. But as noted in §3.1.10, Bruckner's final decision on the matter, according to Meißner,<sup>228</sup> was that "[...] keiner seiner musikalischen Entwürfe befriedigte ihn. Da schlug er vor mir unwillig den Klavierdeckel zu und sagte: 'Sie sollen halt das Tedeum einfach so an die Symphonie anhängen.'" <sup>229</sup>

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 613f.

<sup>226</sup> The chorale Repr. begins in D major, of course, begging the question as to whether the E-major starting point cited was not simply a misprint for D major. The only substantial passage in the Finale in E major is the Exp. chorale, which is not accompanied by the Te Deum figuration. There are many such misprints in the biography: for instance in Auer's formal outline of the Finale (Göll.-A. IV/3, p. 620), the second subject group is quoted as being in F, when in fact it is in G major.

<sup>227</sup> Cf. AP E/124–128; E/129, fn. 1.

<sup>228</sup> In: V. Keldorfer, "Aus den Auszeichnungen an Anton Meißners", *Die Furche: Jahrbuch 1947*, p. 84.

<sup>229</sup> Quoted by Wolfgang Partsch, "Anton Meißner," p. 59.

It remains to look more closely at the four “vi–de” markings indicated in the “Zweiter Teil”<sup>230</sup> of the score—see AP E/84, 94, 102, 107, 111, 116, 120—which may or may not have been related to the use of the previously composed torso of the movement as a transition to the *Te Deum*—a meaningful but untestable hypothesis proposed by Cohrs in 1996.<sup>231</sup> The cuts are distributed fairly evenly through the *Durchf.*, fugue, and *Gesangsp. Repr.*, and if anything emphasise the clear structural integrity which the score had achieved by this time. They are also significant in providing further evidence of the loss of both earlier, that is, discarded and replaced, bifols. of the score, as well as later, apparently definitive versions. The cuts, which we have mentioned in passing in §3.1.10, are summarised as follows:

- i. The annotation “de + v[on] 13. Bogen” on the p. 4 of bifol. 15D/“16” (E/72; cf. E/61, fn. 1). Since, as we have seen, no “vi–” survives on any extant version of bifol. 13, nor does 13E/“14” suggest a likely site for such an elision, this probably indicated the end of a cut beginning on a lost bifol. [12/“13”], and hence must have been made following the renumbering.<sup>232</sup> If the “vi–” was located at the position suggested in the hypothetical reconstruction of this bifol. given in Ex. 6c, the most harmonically and structurally appropriate point, the entire cut would have involved some 50 mm. and neatly excised the lengthy *Durchf.* of the *Te Deum* motive and the intervening passages inverting the introductory motive.
- ii. The annotation “vi (unis) im 21. Bogen” on p. 4 of bifol. 18D/“19” (AP, E/84), which ends at the beginning of the unison passage on the 2nd p. of bifol. 21D/“22” with the annotation “Unis[on] / de C m.[oll]” (E/84). As the “vi” annotation refers to bifolio 21, not 22, this cut must have been marked before the renumbering; its implementation in performance would have eliminated some 41 mm. from the score, including the development section and climax of the fugue, and the beginning of the ensuing *Steigerung*.
- iii. The annotations “~~1. vi =~~” (struck through), and immediately below it “1. vi =” again, on the 2nd p. of bifol. 23D/“24” (E/102). The first of these indications of a ‘1st cut’, which Bruckner apparently found unsatisfactory, ended eight pages later on p. 3 of bifol. 25D/“26” (E/111) with the marking “~~1. de (8 Seiten)~~”, likewise struck through. This cut, which would have deleted 34 mm. from the course of the second subject group, was apparently rejected in favour of a shorter cut which (assuming a harmonically analogous endpoint) would have ended at the F#-major

<sup>230</sup> See Glossary, §0.2.1; the meaning and use of Bruckner’s formal terms were discussed in §2.1.4.

<sup>231</sup> Bruckner, of course, marked cuts in several of his *Finales* (as well as other movements), for instance those of the Fifth and Eighth Symphonies, without this having anything to do with the use of these movements for any other purposes.

<sup>232</sup> This point was not made in detail in the author’s “The Facts behind a ‘Legend’”.

“Trio” section probably beginning on the 3rd p. of the lost bifol. [24/“25”] (E/107).

- iv. The annotation “2. vi =” on p. 4 of bifol. 26F/“27” (E/116) which, as we have seen, most likely would have ended with the resumption of D minor and of the triplet figuration of the chorale on the fourth to last measure of the lost bifolio [27/“28”], thereby probably cutting the last 24 measures from the Gesangsp. Repr.

Although, as we have seen, several of the final renumbered (and hence presumably definitive) bifolios of the Exp. have apparently been lost so that it is not possible to assess what, if any, corresponding cuts Bruckner might have indicated for the Exp. Gesangsp., it is possible to see that the cuts indicated here already involve over 120 measures of a score which, excluding the coda, would have been well over 600 measures in length.

In the Vorwort to the 1974 edition of the *Te Deum*, Nowak mentioned a cut indicated in the autograph of the *Te Deum* (ÖNB 19.486), namely from letter Q, the beginning of the “*Salvum fac*”, to letter V, the beginning of the double fugue on the words “*In Te, Domine, speravi*”. Nowak explained that the cut “must have been made at the instigation of Hellmesberger, whose enthusiasm for the *Te Deum* led him to consider performing it in the Hofkapelle on the occasion of the conferring of the biretta on Cardinal Ganglbauer on November 22 1884. In the event however Hellmesberger found the work too long”.<sup>233</sup> Cohrs, who examined the autograph in September 1996, speculated that the cut was indicated in the trembling hand characteristic of Bruckner’s old age,<sup>234</sup> but in fact the ink is identical to that used for the rest of the *Te Deum* score and the handwriting is quite firm; it can have had nothing to do with the Finale of the Ninth. The excision of 145 mm. from the 513 mm. score of the *Te Deum* is roughly analogous to the extent of the cuts marked in the Finale, but it goes against the grain to imagine Bruckner striking out such a substantial section of what was already a well-known work, and moreover deleting so much of a standard liturgical text, merely in order to accommodate a Finale which would also have been cut in a formally deleterious manner: one can imagine Bruckner willing to cut the *Te Deum* to accommodate a particular performance situation, but certainly not as a ‘definitive solution’.

Ultimately, while there is no question that rather than content himself with using the *Te Deum* or using the Finale as a transition to it, the composer continued doggedly, and in spite of failing mental and physical health, with the composition of the instrumental movement, which undoubtedly progressed well beyond the point from which the transition appears to have been envisaged. It may well be significant that the expansions he was willing to make to

---

<sup>233</sup> Foreword to vol. 19 of the GA (translation Richard Rickett).

<sup>234</sup> This possibility was aired in “The Facts behind a ‘Legend’”, but has since been discounted.

the score suggest that he was not at all concerned, by that point in time, about making the movement any shorter.

In summary, the underlying sequence of events in relation to Bruckner's thinking about a link between Ninth Symphony and Te Deum appears to have been:

- i. Dogged by ill-health and presumably also clear about dedicating the Ninth to God, Bruckner repeatedly and unequivocally specified the use of the Te Deum as an 'ersatz Finale', should he not live to complete a fourth movement. There is no evidence whatsoever that Bruckner ever expressed concerns about the fact that appending the Te Deum would effectively conclude a D-minor symphony in C major, despite the fact that this stumbling block for commentators ever since.
- ii. With composition on the movement well advanced, Bruckner appears to have returned to the idea of a transition to the Te Deum, perhaps around Easter of 1896, considering using the now well-advanced torso of the Finale itself as a vast instrumental introduction, and considering an adaptation of the chorale in the reprise so as to modulate into the Te Deum, although no musical documentation survives to substantiate this. It is conceivable that the cuts indicated in the extant fragments of the Finale score may have some connection with the practical considerations imposed by such a huge, compound formal conception, but neither musical nor literary sources yield further information.
- iii. Finally, Bruckner appears to have rejected this solution too, and proceeded with the composition of the instrumental Finale. However, there is no indication that Bruckner ever revoked his previous pronouncement that, should he not live to complete the Finale, the Te Deum should be used in its place; indeed, he appears to have reiterated it on several further occasions.



## 3.2

### The Dokumentation des Fragments

Die Musiker vor 100 Jahren, die Bruckners Werke sozusagen vom Blatt zum ersten Mal gespielt haben, haben die durchweg abgelehnt. Die haben gesagt, soetwas kann man nicht spielen. Und wir haben ein ganz ähnliches Gefühl gehabt, wie wir diesen Satz zum ersten Mal gespielt haben vor ein paar Tagen. Wir spielen da Musik von Bruckner vom Blatt, und unser Gefühl erstmal: Sowas kann man nicht spielen. Es hat sich noch nicht abgeschliffen, da ist noch keine Bekanntheit da, und die Geradlinigkeit und die absolute Strenge der Komposition—bei Bruckner gibt es nichts, wenn er in dieser Weise komponieren will, dann komponiert er in dieser Weise, und da hat jeder Ton seinen Platz. Diese Geradlinigkeit hat etwas Erschreckendes, und es ist ein sehr eigenartiges Gefühl, wenn man nach 100 Jahren soetwas erleben kann, wie es die Musiker vor 100 Jahren erleben konnten.

—Nicholas Harnoncourt<sup>1</sup>

#### 3.2.0 Introduction.

THE text of this chapter has been adapted from the foreword and commentary which accompany the score of the *Dokumentation des Fragments*, first published by MWV as loan material in 1999, and reproduced here in vol. II (section F, [DdF]). The score, a recent addition to the author's series of publications on the Finale undertaken in 1998 at the suggestion of Herbert Vogg, was premiered in Vienna in November 1999 by the Wiener Symphoniker under Nikolaus Harnoncourt; an account of its origin and reception is given in §3.4.12. In May 2001 Vogg resolved to commercially publish the score of the *Dokumentation*, previously available only as loan material, in A4 format; this score is currently in press. A number of minor revisions and improvements were made as a result, mainly to the accompanying text and critical commentary. These emendations have been incorporated here.

The foreword to the 1999/2002 score consists of three sections, the first two of which, The Transmission of the Sources and Concerning the Genesis of the Finale, are virtually identical to those of the *Faksimile-Ausgabe* (MWV, Vienna 1996), the subject matter of which is covered in greater detail in chapter 3.1. The third section of the foreword, Concerning This Edition, has been reproduced here in all essentials in §§3.2.1 & 3.2.2. The critical commentary following the score appeared in the 1999 edition in German; it has been translated here with minor emendations as §§3.2.3–7. §§3.2.3–5 are adapted from analogous

---

<sup>1</sup> From the transcription by Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs of Nicholas Harnoncourt's spoken text at the premiere of the *Dokumentation*, Vienna 13–14 November 2000; see Appendix III and further discussion in §3.4.10.

passages outlining the editorial principles followed in the AF.<sup>2</sup> Although a certain amount of overlap with foregoing, more detailed discussions of Bruckner's working methods and the reconstruction of the score in ch. 3.1 was inevitable, the original wording was maintained as far as possible, so as to preserve the integrity of the original conception of the score and its critical apparatus. While chs. 3.2 and 3.3 use an identical structure and are to some respects intended as separate 'modules' in order to minimise repetition the critical commentary on the DdF in §3.2.6 concentrates on the philological reconstruction of the score and realisation of existing instrumental directives, while §3.3.6 explains the additional compositional and textural supplementation required by the AF, but also the supplementation of dynamics and articulation which was carried over from that score into the DdF.<sup>3</sup>

### 3.2.1. Concerning the Dokumentation des Fragments.

The intention of this 'documentation' of the Finale is to present the surviving fragments of the score and, as far as can be established philologically, the reconstruction of its missing sections in a practical, performable version, which more than anything should make clear to us what has been lost through the composer's death and the scattering of parts of the manuscript. The following remarks on Bruckner's compositional method may serve to illustrate just how this was achievable; further details may be found in the critical commentary, §3.2.6 *infra*.

As we have already seen, Bruckner used for the composition of his orchestral scores bifols. which in the case of the Finale of the Ninth were usually prepared by another hand, each largely being ruled into 16 mm. (4 per p.). On being used, each was carefully numbered in the upper right-hand corner of the 1st p. Today several of these numbered bifols. are missing, and so the movement contains breaks in its continuity which led to the misconception that Bruckner composed only 'fragments'. However, the gaps occur suddenly and almost always within completely composed passages. Bruckner wrote his characteristic metrical numbers under virtually every bar; these order the measures into musical periods of largely 8 mm. each. That the majority of bifols. before and after such breaks end or begin abruptly in the middle of such periods confirms that the intervening bifols. have been lost.

Bruckner also left a number of pc. sks. written usually on between two and four systems which captured the essential continuity of the movement in its initial draft stage. By reference to these sks., to the metrical numbers as well as other factors, for instance, comparison with earlier versions of the same bifol. or with Exp. and Repr., it is possible to reconstruct the continuity of many of the bifols. missing today with a high degree of probability. As Bruckner demonstrably transferred almost all of the sks. directly into the string parts, it appeared quite

---

<sup>2</sup> Page references, abbreviations etc. have been altered throughout to conform with the style of the dissertation and facilitate reference.

<sup>3</sup> In moving between §§3.2.6 and 3.3.6 the reader is requested to refer to the relevant bifol.; the measure numbers of the two scores correspond only, by chance, between mm. 277 and 342.

justifiable to have these *sks.* played by the strings also. Most of the *pc. sks.* are either two-part (hence corresponding to the 1st *vln.* and bass) or conceived on more than two systems; from time to time Bruckner also refers to the intended instrumentation (see for instance AP E/22). The surviving fragments therefore make possible a performable 'documentation' of the movement which does not transgress the boundaries of that which can be strictly demonstrated from Bruckner's autograph text, and which also ends where further traces of the content of the lost bifols. as well as the instrumentation break off.

Consideration has also been given to the fact that Bruckner, even in the first work phase (in which form he left extensive parts of the score), left clear and in part realisable indications of how he intended to score this or that passage. From the transcription of the reconstructed score reproduced in the AP, it becomes clear that it would have made no sense in a practical edition to let such individual notes or measures as may be found in the AP E/80f. or E/90 stand as they are; it would have been even less defensible to omit such notes or verbal instructions completely. Numerous instrumental doublings indicated by Bruckner could be realised; even the virtually complete instrumentation of passages such as the carefully supplemented continuation of the *Hauptth.* (F/9f.) or—working backwards—the instrumentation of the 1st 3 *mm.* of the climax of the fugue (F/50f.) could be reconstructed with considerable certainty as sequential structures. For the lengthy *Steigerung* beginning on F/52 and continuing to letter P (F/60), so many clues as to the instrumentation were already written in the score that a virtually complete instrumentation of the passage could be realised, the only likely areas of uncertainty being the involvement of the *trombs.* and (at least from F/54 onward) *hrns.*

At two important places the musical texts of later SVE, intended as expansions, were considered and, as far as possible, carefully supplemented, namely the expansion of the *Gesangsp.* in the *Exp.* (see F/11–19) and the beginning of the *Durchf.* (see F/30ff.).<sup>4</sup> The integration of these two expansions certainly represent extreme applications of the methodology outlined, but the clear indications provided by them as to later revisions of the movement's continuity could also not be wholly set aside. The following explains these briefly; the highly complex philological problems involved can more readily be understood via a detailed examination of the appropriate pages of the autograph score.

Bruckner drafted in his initial *sks.* a short version of the *Gesangsp.* which added a 4-*m.* 'lyrical counterpoint' to the curious *ostinato* theme of this section (see *Facs.* C/33, bracket 4). This melodic line was apparently not used in the first full-score version of the *Exp.* (*bifols.* 4A, 4C/"5", 5B; *Facs.* C/147ff.; AP E/17ff.); it appears, however, without warning in the

---

<sup>4</sup> In the AF (*q.v.*, G/1) as well as in the AP (E/1ff., underlaid) a later SVE for the first bifol. of the score, shorter by 8 *mm.*, was taken into consideration, which here, in the absence of more precise clues as to its definitive form, could not be conclusively realised. See §3.2.6, *infra*; see also §3.3.6.

Durchf. (AP E/74) and again in the Repr. (AP E/103f.). Only as Bruckner renumbered all of the by-then valid bifols. of the score, a step apparently undertaken following completion of the score in its initial phase (as already explained in ch. 3.1, as well as AP E/5, note 1), does the absence of this counterpoint as well as the relative brevity of the Exp. Gesangsp. appear to have occurred to him. In order therefore to expand the Exp. and strengthen the compositional logic of the movement, Bruckner apparently decided to allow the motive to appear in the Exp. after all, and drafted as an ‘insertion’ the SVE “#”D which, while it does not contain the counterpoint itself, only permits of explanation as a metrical draft for its inclusion (see concerning this the footnotes, AP E/21 as well as ch. 3.1). Doubtless the 4-m. melodic fragment, probably intended for the 1st vlms. (as the 2nds probably take up the ostinato), would have been extended by 2 mm.; in the present edition the 1st vlms. have to rest for 2 mm. (F/14, mm. 101f.; cf. AP E/23); precise indications as to the phrase’s continuation are lacking.

In connection with the shift of the contents of 3A and 4A (AP E/12f., notes), SVE “#”D also reveals that Bruckner intended to “regulate” the irregular metrical structure of the beginning of the Gesangsp. (2 + 4 + 4 mm.) and to extend this section of the Gesangsp. by 2 mm. also (2 + 6 + 4; see F/12f.). Lastly, as a solution to the “G d[ur]” emphasised by Bruckner’s repeated “NB” on the 3rd p. of “#”D (AP E/23) a ‘backward expansion’ of the G-major harmonisation of the ostinato at the beginning of the adjoining 5B was proposed, which here, as in the AF (G/13) was realised as a sudden *fortissimo* (F/14).

The beginning of the Durchf. already had a protracted history as Bruckner in August 1896, long after the renumbering of the score bifols., decided to expand it. Although a final orchestrated version of the beginning of the Durchf. has not come down to us, realisable clues may be found on two SVE, “13a”E and the following unnumbered bifol., apparently to be regarded as “13b”E, which apparently would have expanded an originally 16-m. bifol. “13” to 32 mm. (see AP E/53ff.). Bifol. 13E/“14” begins suddenly with complete instrumentation, and reveals that a preceding bifol. [12/“13”] would probably have been just as extensively scored out. Precise study of the two SVE “13a”E and “13b”E as well as that of a further “13”<sup>b</sup>E (likewise AP E/57ff., underlaid) indicates that the augmentation of the Te Deum motive in semibreves was intended to take place above a continuation of the triplet ostinato as well as that of a four-note, repeated motive d–c#–c#–b (this latter motive presumably to be assigned to the vla.: cf. the last 2 mm. of the SVE “13a”E, AP E/56, as well as the SVE “13”<sup>b</sup>E, E/57ff.). One can see from the 3rd p. of bifol. “13b”E (AP E/59, in the tromb. systems, probably intended as a continuation of the musical line, as the 4th p. is blank), the manner in which Bruckner reintroduced the introductory motive from the beginning of the movement and apparently led the chromatic descending line into the chain of  $\frac{6}{3}$  chords which appears at the beginning of the scored-out 13E/“14”. While to some extent ‘speculative’ in regard to the only fragmentarily indicated continuation of the triplet and 4-note passacaglia motive in the strings, and the necessity of directing the triplets upward in order to lead into the  $\frac{6}{3}$  chords, the additions here, as in the case of the Exp. Gesangsp., make musical sense of what would

otherwise be for the listener the scarcely intelligible content of the two SVE involved. The principal aim has been here to give an impression of how Bruckner conceived this passage, despite the absence of surviving, scored-out versions.

The four unavoidable breaks in the continuity of the fragment, namely:

- a. the further course of bifol. [14/"15"] in the Durchf. (see F/38),
- b. the first c. 9 mm. of bifol. [19/"20"] (F/49),
- c. the last few mm. of [27/"28"] (F/70), and finally
- d. the 16 mm. of [30/"31"] (F/76),

have been left as lacunae in the movement's structure, even though their continuity, as the AF reveals, can be 'composed after the fact' with a high level of probability and stylistic persuasiveness, and without the introduction of foreign materials. At each interruption the conductor is requested to break off suddenly and without the least *rallentando*. The breaks leave room for comments which guide the listener through the movement and explain details of the reconstruction 'on the spot', independent of a printed programme. As an introduction to the presentation of the score fragments, the most important facts concerning the composition and form of the movement are outlined and the principal themes introduced.<sup>5</sup> The surviving clues concerning, and sketches for, the coda are explained in similar fashion. As these explanations are essential for an understanding of the Finale, the *Dokumentation* should never be either performed or recorded without spoken text.<sup>6</sup>

### 3.2.2 Editorial principles.

- i. The composer's musical text, whether completed ink, pencil or taken from sks. or other score bifols., inclusive of (written-out) simile signs, appears in this score in normal type. Supplementations prompted by Bruckner's text, such as the realisation of instrumental doublings indicated by the composer, as well as all added whole-m. rests, appear in small type. The musical text has been freed of the many unnecessary accidentals of the original and essentially made to conform with modern practice in regard to the use of single stems and where necessary 'a 2' in place of Bruckner's usual double stemming. All further details, particularly concerning editorial supplementations, can be found in the ensuing critical remarks and commentary, §§3.2.3ff.
- ii. Bruckner's metrical numbers have also been reproduced. Where alternative numberings exist, preference has been given to the numbering starting anew;

<sup>5</sup> This thematic overview can of course be omitted, particularly if the 'Dokumentation' is to be used as an introduction to a complete performance of the Ninth Symphony concluding with the AF of the Finale.

<sup>6</sup> For the sake of simplicity this text refers to the definitive, i.e., corrected numbering of the bifols. only. For instance bifol. [14/"15"] is given as "15", bifol. [19/"20"] als "20" etc.

supplemented measure numbers have been placed in square brackets. Information concerning sources used and page concordance with the autograph score of the Finale has likewise been included under the score.

- iii. Supplemented phrase marks and ties appear dotted.
- iv. Articulation has had to be added almost throughout; with the few exceptions of articulation already marked by the composer (additionally noted in the commentary), it appears in small type.
- v. The largely supplemented dynamic marks and performance directives (“cresc.,” “divisi”, “unisono”, “gestrichen” etc.) correspond to those of the AF and appear together with the few already notated by Bruckner (“pizz.,” “arco”, references to the use of hrns. or tbas. etc.) for the sake of legibility in uniform type throughout. All further information concerning this is provided in the commentary itself.
- vi. Tempo designations, likewise borrowed from those of the AF, have been placed in square brackets, with the exception of the few autograph indications by Bruckner (see F/7, 8, 17, 44); all further relevant information is given in the commentary.
- vii. For ease of reference, rehearsal letters, added throughout, correspond as far as possible with those of the AF of the movement. In order to better indicate the breaks in continuity, the letters L (F/39), O (F/50), T (F/71) und V (F/77) have been moved by a few measures forwards or backwards. Page divisions likewise correspond largely with those of the AF; the latter is, however, due to its reconstruction of a shorter bifol. [1E] in place of bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C, essentially a page ahead of the present score from F/3 onwards. Running measure numbers have also been added, which, due to the deviation of the continuity of this score from that of the AF, do not correspond.
- viii. In the parts all notes, rests and articulations appear in uniform size, phrase marks and ties are printed normally. Where each break in continuity occurs, the words “(wird gesprochen)” stand above the stave between double barlines, without either rest or fermata.

Table XIV, The Sources Used in the Dokumentation des Fragments (A/42f.), provides an overview of the source material as used in this score. Explanations of all abbreviations, library sigla and bifolio classifications used in the score and commentary are again to be found in section 0.2.

### 3.2.3 General critical remarks.

As explained above (§3.2.2), added notes, rests as well as the almost entirely supplementary articulation, appear in smaller typeface, added phrase marks and ties dotted. Added tempo markings have been placed in square brackets. Apart from this, the almost entirely supplemented dynamic markings (*p*, *f*, *cresc.*, *dim.* etc.), as well as all performance directives,

even where these were indicated by Bruckner, appear for reasons of legibility without brackets and in normal type; for further details see below (§3.2.6). Further information can also be obtained by a closer comparison with the Autograph-Partitur itself. In general, the musical text has been adapted to conform with modern orthographic principles, deleting Bruckner's customary cautionary accidentals throughout. The double stemming in the scored-out wind parts has been replaced by 'a 2' indications; the use of clefs in the high vlc. and cb. passages has been modernised. However, Bruckner's unique metrical numbers have been retained.

It is the intention of the present score to 'document' the surviving fragments of the Finale as accurately as possible within a performable concert version, i.e., to make possible its realisation in sound. Although it was here and there possible to carry out certain directives of the composer as to the further instrumentation of this or that passage, in contrast to the 'completed' AF the musical text has been limited to the fragments which have come down to us, and no compositional completion, however justifiable, has been undertaken. Those few additions not taken directly from the sources, but which were essential—principally performance directives—were largely taken from the AF. That version was, after all, based on the most detailed study of the sources as well as of Bruckner's compositional technique; such additions were hence already as well founded as they could be. In the AF details such as instrumentation, tempo, characteristic articulation and bowing were added with the aid of the Analogverfahren, which recognises as axiomatic the manner in which Bruckner used certain compositional and instrumental 'models'—as they recur in varying form in many of his works—and compared sections of the surviving Finale fragments with similar passages in his completed scores. Application of this principle yielded consistent as well as useful results, which in part could be utilised for the present score.

It appears that Bruckner saw the notation of performance directives as the final touches to a score which was already essentially "fertig" (complete) with the conclusion of the essential musical text. As only parts of the score of the Finale were left in such a highly elaborated form (admittedly probably the entire Exp. originally, from which today not all the final-phase bifols. are extant), it is understandable that Bruckner did not advance as far as determining details nonetheless indispensable for meaningful performance. Accordingly, some remarks on editorial practice in the supplementation of these parameters may be appropriate here.

### 3.2.4 The question of tempi.<sup>7</sup>

While Bruckner seems to have noted certain compositionally inherent tempo modifications from the outset (cf. mm. 47, 51, 126, 129, 289, 305, 311), on none of the surviving versions of the 1st bifol. does an overall tempo marking for the movement appear. By analogy with VIII/4

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. here the more substantial explanation of the movement's tempo structure in discussion of the AF, §3.3.4.

(*Feierlich, nicht schnell*), with IX/1 (*Feierlich; misterioso*) and *Das Deutsche Lied* (WAB 63; *Nicht schnell, feierlich*) the authors of the AF selected the marking *Misterioso, nicht schnell*. In addition, considering Bruckner's own marking at m. 289 for the Gesangsp. (at letter C) and its "Trio" (D), the markings *Langsamer* and *Noch langsamer* respectively were adopted, also by analogy with the corresponding sections in VIII/4 (*q.v.*, 1890 version, mm. 69, 99). The juxtaposition of chorale, Te Deum motive and introductory material at the end of the Exp. and beginning of the Durchf. also proves conclusively that these three elements are intended to share a common tempo. The autograph "Langs[amer]" at m. 289 apparently continues into the next section (mm. 291ff.) which, as earlier drafts for this passage reveal, is adapted from the material of the Gesangsp. (cf. mm. 129ff).

The remaining tempo markings, where not otherwise derived by comparison with the Exp., were added via the Analogverfahren. The so-called 'Gregorian theme' at letter S—apparently a connection with the third theme of the opening movement of the Third Symphony, apparently also an allusion to Bruckner's favourite Easter hymn *Christ ist erstanden*—was understood as representing a return to the principal tempo, confirmed by the return of the triplet figuration at T (cf. also letter G). With regard to the tempo of the so-called 'horn theme' (at P and again at m. 521) a discrepancy obtains which has been left unresolved here (a similar paradox can be found, for instance, in VI/1). It has been left to the interpreter whether to present this theme in two different tempi, to accelerate slightly before P, to slow at m. 521, or both. The fermatas at mm. 144, 290/1, 310/11 are all autograph and imply, just as in VI/4 (*q.v.*, mm. 370/1), short, but structurally significant *caesure*. The fermata at mm. 570/1 has been added for analogous reasons. The change from  $\text{♩}$  to  $\text{♩}$  at the beginning of the coda (W) is likewise autograph.

In view of Bruckner's own metronome markings in the somewhat faster Finale of the Eighth, one could suggest for the principal tempi of the movement: I: minim = c. 60 (Principal tempo, tempo of the chorale, "[Erstes Zeitmaß]"), and II: minim = c. 56 (the "[Langsamer]" of the *Gesangsperiode*, the "Bedeutend langsamer" of the fugue and "[Sehr feierlich]" in the coda). However these suggestions are not to be regarded as binding; for this reason they have not been included in the score. The remaining few markings: "[Noch langsamer]" (mm. 115, 424), "[Sehr langsam]" (mm. 305, 466) and "[Ruhig]" (mm. 527) are to be interpreted as a little slower than Tempo II. The "[a tempo]" marking at mm. 129, 438 and 450 all refer to a return to Tempo II.

### 3.2.5 Further supplementations.

Concerning dynamics, phrasing and articulation the surviving MSS provide even less information. Here one must largely fall back on the Analogverfahren, especially comparison with the first three movements of the Ninth; the commentary on the AF in ch. 3.3 provides more information on the supplementation of these parameters. Phrasing can be found only rarely in the autograph MSS, as for instance for the hrns. at m. 190 or for the Te Deum motive



at mm. 279–80. Even ties were frequently omitted by Bruckner (for example just before H), although it can also be maintained that the omission of ties in the hrns. and trps. at mm. 183–4 and again in the trps. at mm. 499–500 occurred intentionally, in order to create a phrasing for the first period of the chorale of 7 + 9 mm., as Bruckner's placing of a *dim.* in the Repr. at m. 500 would appear to confirm. The latter, together with the remarkable *dim.* in m. 47, the *dim.* at m. 121, the *p* at m. 152 and the *f* at m. 291 represent the only dynamic markings in the entire surviving material. On the other hand, all *pizzicato* and *arco* directives are autograph, likewise the downbows and wedges (^ accents) at mm. 51 and 55. Bowing and articulation of the introductory motive are based largely on a similar passage in the Finale of the Eighth Symphony (see letter Hh thereof); further clues are provided by the largely completely scored out but later discarded versions of bifol. 2 on paper ruling C. Like the wedges, all 'Drucke' (> accents) occurring both individually in the double-dotted rhythm as well as in sequence (for instance at P and after V) are to be understood as long emphases. Certain of these, which Bruckner used in the chorale (at H), were replaced there for the sake of consistency by ^s; here, as elsewhere in Bruckner, and especially in the chorale (G, U) these are to be understood more as breath accents and do not necessarily have to be tongued individually.

### 3.2.6 Critical commentary.

**F/mm. 1–24** *Source:* bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C, ÖNB 13.150; cf. AP E/1ff., Facs. C/67ff.

*Length:* 24 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1–8; 1–2; 1–2-

This bifol., which exhibits a musical text finished in all respects but for the provision of dynamics, articulation and tempo marking, but which is also heavily written over with revisions, annotations concerning voice-leading, etc., unquestionably did not constitute part of the definitive score. The many subsequent SVE for the first bifol. (Facs. C/71ff.) reveal the manner in which Bruckner continued to work at a further, probably shorter solution to the beginning; moreover, bifol. "2"E definitely connected with a later, differently scored version of bifol. 1, the approximate continuity of which can probably be glimpsed from SVE 1<sup>e</sup>E (AP E/1ff., underlaid). As a conclusive reconstruction of this no longer extant, subsequent version of the 1st bifol. (as undertaken in the AF) appeared less valid, the 24-m. bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>D was retained as a compromise solution. At mm. 5, 7, 9, 11 the 1st note of each of the 1st 4 clar. phrases are demisemiquavers in the autograph, at mm. 13 and 15 on the other hand, semiquavers (it appears as if Bruckner subsequently corrected them here; cf. C/67ff.). In deference to the later form taken by the diminution (as in the Durchf., 1st fl., from m. 281) the first notes of each phrase were altered to semiquavers. Certain apparently

exploratory annotations in pencil, for instance at mm. 21–23, have been omitted. Autograph accents can be found in the 1st ob. in mm. 22–24. Concerning the tempo marking, see §3.2.4 *supra*.

**F/mm. 25–42** *Source:* bifol. “2”E, Hochschule; cf. AP E/5ff., Facs. C/135ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–4; 1–8; 1–4; 1–4-

This bifol. likewise reveals a completed instrumentation inclusive of whole-m. rests in all unoccupied parts. It connected, as already mentioned, not with 1<sup>d</sup>C, but with another apparently non-extant version of the 1st bifol. In order to correspond with the instrumentation of the last mm. of 1<sup>d</sup>C, it was necessary to make additions to mm. 25–26 in the bsn., horn., tromb. and timp., as the B $\flat$ -major  $\frac{6}{3}$  chord on the non-extant [1E] must have been more lightly scored. Likewise in mm. 25–26 ties apparently overlooked by Bruckner as well as a *tremolo* marking in the cb. were added.

**F/mm. 43–58** *Source:* bifol. “3”E, ÖNB 6087/5–6; cf. AP E/9ff., Facs. C/139ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–12; 1–8-

Bifol. “3”E was likewise completely scored-out by Bruckner, and connected originally with a bifol. [“4”], which today is no longer extant. The version of the *Steigerung* leading into the *Hauptth.* that survives on bifols. “2”- and “3”E (a shorter, earlier version exists as well) was first drafted on the preceding version, bifol. 2F, which Bruckner copied onto two separate bifols. and completely scored out during the instrumentation phase. On bifol. 2F (Facs. C/133), 4 mm. before entry of the *Hauptth.*, at m. 47 of this score, stands “*accell. / dim.*”, which creates a radical and original transition into the *Hauptth.* at letter B. The “*a tempo*” at B is borrowed from an earlier version (bifol. 2<sup>a</sup>C, Facs. C/109); likewise autograph are the wedges and downbows at mm. 51 and 55 (bifol. “3”E, Facs. C/141). Certain pencil annotations in the brass systems from m. 45 onwards (cf. AP E/9f., E/10, fn. 4) were omitted here.

**F/mm. 59–74** *Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [“4”]; cf. AP E/13ff.*

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -9–10–[11–12; 1–4]; 1–8;

*Sources:* bifol. 3A, ÖNB 6087/3–4; AP E/13ff., Facs. C/143ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

*As well as:* last 6 mm. of bifol. 2F, ÖNB 19.645/2<sup>v</sup>; AP E/12, Facs. C/134

*Length:* 6 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–10

Apparently bifol. “3”E connected with a lost bifol. [“4”], which, however, could be largely reconstructed from the last 2 mm. of bifol. 2F as well as the partially scored-out preceding version, 3A. Bifol. 3A was completed in all significant details, and probably scored out on a lost [3C] in the course of the second work phase. The last 8 mm. of “3”E as well as the last 10 of 2F provide a sufficiently clear indication as to how the instrumentation from m. 59 onwards can be systematically filled out, however, so that the further course of the Hauptth. could be scored out with some degree of confidence. The trps. gradually leave the scene with truncations of their motive in mm. 63–66; fls., obs. and tbas. also probably have no further tasks to perform after m. 67. The only element in the supplementation from the cadence into B $\flat$  major onwards (mm. 66/67) not represented in the score sources is the chord in m. 66, “as / es / f”, which has been taken from the pc. sk. ÖNB 6086/1<sup>v</sup>, br. 4 (cf. Facs. C/32), apparently intended to be placed in the trombs., and which, with the participation of vlns. and hrns., leads via sequence directly into the chords notated for these instruments from m. 71 onwards. For reasons of balance the bsns. double the vlc. from m. 67 onwards, likewise the vla. provides appropriate supplementation to the clars. Precise indications as to the voice leading in the cb. from m. 67 onwards are lacking; octave leaps were chosen here which match the sixths of the vlc. At m. 75 the entire body of the strings makes way for the brass.

**F/mm. 75–90** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [“5a”]; cf. AP E/17ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–2; [1–2]-3–6-

*Sources:* bifol. 3A, the last 2 mm. (*see above*),

*As well as:* bifol. 4C/“5”, ÖNB 6087/9–10; cf. AP E/17ff., Facs. C/151ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–2; 1–8<sup>8</sup>

Bifol. 4C/“5”, which contains the curious ostinato beginning to the Gesangsp., exhibits a completed musical text, although with subsequent corrections, and together with several of the following bifols. of the Exp. was marked by Bruckner himself as “fertig” (finished).<sup>9</sup> The SVE bifol. “#”D, apparently planned as an interpolation and hence not additionally numbered (explanation below), proves, however, that here too later revisions were undertaken. These revisions, as already explained (ch. 3.1), were intended to introduce the ‘lyrical counterpoint’ found in the initial pc. version, and which had meanwhile had been used in the Durchf. and Repr., back into the Exp. In doing so, Bruckner also apparently ‘regulated’ the until now irregular metrical structure of the beginning of the Gesangsp. so that the text of 4C/“5”, now already beginning 2 mm. later, was probably intended to be expanded by 2 further mm. (mm. 89–90), from 2 + 4 to 2 + 6 mm.—cf. the metrical numbers on the last p. of 4C/“5” (“5–8”) with those at the beginning of “#”D (“7–10”), the 4 mm. being musically identical. The last p. (4 mm.) of 4C/“5” accordingly became the 1st p. of “#”D. The addition of the tempo marking at letter C, “Langsamer”, is explained above (§3.2.4).

**F/mm. 91–106** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [“5b”]; cf. AP E/21ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–10; [1–2;] 1–6; 1–4-

*Sources:* SVE bifol. “#”D, ÖNB 6085/9–10; cf. AP E/21ff., Facs. C/155ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–10; [1–2; 1–4]-5–6; 1–4

*As well as:* pc. sk. ÖNB 6086/2<sup>f</sup>, br. 4; AP E/22, Facs. C/33

*Length of section used:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4-

Bifol. “#”D, which contains a continuous annotation of metrical numbers, but only a partial, single melodic line, can probably be regarded as a pattern or template, intended to accommodate the ‘lyrical counterpoint’ originally

<sup>8</sup> The metrical figures of bifol. 4C/“5” were corrected to match those of bifol. 4A. Cf. AP E/19, fn. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Facs. C/150, 176, 180, 192, 196, 200, in the lower right margin in each case.

intended for the Exp., but omitted in the first version of the score; Bruckner perhaps discarded the bifol. due to an apparent mistake on the 3rd p. The AP, E/21–24, provides a more detailed explanation of the manner in which this counterpoint was apparently intended to be introduced. Allotted in the original sk. for the 2nd vln., it appears that Bruckner probably intended to place the motive in the 1sts here. From m. 95 the 2nd vln. therefore takes up the dotted ostinato motive; as in the Repr. (mm. 408ff.) the vla. and vlc. take the accompanying part which the 1st pair of hrns. should probably continue to double. Bruckner would surely have continued the counterpoint in mm. 101–2; due to the absence of further information the 1st vln. has been left to rest here for 2 mm. in the present version. From m. 103 the annotation “G-Dur NB / NB”, probably written by Bruckner 2 mm. too early—cf. his correction of the metrical numbers, AP E/23, notes 1 and 2—was interpreted as an indication of a sudden resumption of the G-major harmonisation of the ostinato figure, only implied until now, as can be found at the beginning of the following extant bifol. 5B. Hence, the last 4 mm. of [“5b”] were probably intended as a *f*- or *ff*-version of the 1st 4 mm. of 5B (to be interpreted as *p*), which the 1st vln. has been permitted to play an octave higher. If the presumed *ff* is correct, Bruckner would probably also have involved the winds and brass.

**F/mm. 107–122** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [5/“6”]; cf. AP E/25ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [-5–12]; 1–8

*Sources:* bifol. 5B, StB 3791/5–6; cf. AP E/25ff., Facs. C/163ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably [-5–12]; 1–8;

*As well as:* pc. sk. ÖNB 6086/2<sup>r</sup>, br. 6; AP E/27, Facs. C/33

*Length of section used:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4-

Like two further early extant sources for sections of the Exp. which lack extant subsequent versions (3A and 6<sup>c</sup>B), bifol. 5B was not renumbered; these bifols. could therefore not have constituted any part of the ‘definitive’ score. As no further material concerning any reworking of the passage is extant, it appears likely that Bruckner simply scored out the musical continuity surviving on 5B already during work phase 2. Comparison with the reprise of the passage (which was notated at a later point in time) reveals

that its continuity was probably not substantially altered in the process. In mm. 107–110 the 2nd vln. probably doubled the 1st; the vla. continues with the divided vlc. in mm. 109–110. In the passage termed “Trio” by Bruckner (mm. 115ff.), recourse to the corresponding section in the pc. sk. made it possible to include in the only partially notated 2nd vln. a counterpoint (AP E/27) which is missing in the score version. The  $c\sharp^1/e^1$  indicated on the last crotchet of m. 118 in the same pc. sk., which according to voice-leading moves to the  $d^1/f^1$  of the vlc. and vla., would probably have been placed in the wind; here, however, in the absence of further information as to instrumentation, it has been provisionally entrusted to the divided 2nd vln. The “dim.” in m. 122 was likewise found in the pc. sk. (cf. C/34, br. 1, m. 4). Concerning the added tempo marking “Noch langsamer” at D, see §3.2.4 *supra*.

**F/mm. 123–140** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [6/“7”]; cf. AP E/29ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–4–

*Source:* bifol. 6<sup>c</sup>B, ÖNB 6087/17–18; cf. AP E/29ff., Facs. C/173ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–4–

Bifol. 6<sup>c</sup>B, which, despite the absence of whole-m. rests was already scored out and noted by Bruckner as “fertig” (Facs. C/176, right lower margin), was not itself renumbered. Due to several revisions of its last p. (mm. 137ff.; cf. AP E/32) it is likely that it was probably written out in clean copy in the second work phase and that this subsequent version (probably a [6C]), now lost, was later renumbered. The additions made here are limited to the “[a tempo]” at ‘E’.

Concerning mm. 137–140 (cf. AP E/32), Bruckner initially drafted a texture which brought together the ostinato theme of the Gesangsp. with an *Aufbereitung* of the *Steigerung* preceding the chorale (*tremolo* and *pizzicato* in the lower strings with the triplet figuration of the chorale in the fls.). Subsequently he crossed out the triplets in the fl. and altered the 2nd vln. to a ‘wandering’ counterpoint in quavers, which Bruckner, as he so often did, drafted in the pencil in the wind systems. That this was indeed ‘valid’ and probably copied out into the subsequent version of this bifol. is confirmed by the beginning of the following bifol. 7C/“8”. Finally, it can be assumed that Bruckner altered the *pizzicato* of the cb. to a sustained note, since in comparison to 7B, no *arco* appears at m. 145 on bifol. 7C/“8”.

**F/mm. 141–158** *Source:* bifol. 7C/“8”, ÖNB 6087/23–24; cf. AP E/33ff., Facs. C/181ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–8; 1–6; 1–2; 1–6-

This and the following 4 bifols. of the ‘definitive’ autograph score are all extant. They exhibit a most carefully worked out and in all essential details completed musical text, as well the altered bifol. numeration, which shows that they were regarded as valid at the time. The change from 1st–4th tbas. to 5th–8th hrns. at m. 151 is autograph; experience with the AF has shown, however, that it is difficult for the ten.-tuba players to change to hrns. within only 5 mm. Mm. 156–160 should hence be played by 3rd–4th hrns. (indicated in the parts by cue notes). In the cb. a *p* appears at m. 153 together with the *pizz.* The “[*accel. sempre*]” at m. 149 has been added to facilitate transition into the “[*Erstes Zeitmaß*]” at E (as explained above, the chorale and Hauptth. must obviously share a common tempo).

**F/mm. 159–174** *Source:* bifol. 8B/“9”, ÖNB 6087/27–28; cf. AP E/37ff., Facs. C/189ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

As explained above, this bifol. was scored out and regarded as “fertig” by the composer himself.

**F/mm. 175–190** *Source:* bifol. 9B/“10”, ÖNB 6087/29–30; cf. AP E/41ff., Facs. C/193ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

Likewise scored out and considered “fertig”. Concerning the apparently ‘missing’ ties in trps. and hrns. at mm. 183–184, cf. above, §3.2.5.

**F/mm. 191–206** *Source:* bifol. 10A/“11”, ÖNB 6087/31–32; cf. AP E/45ff., Facs. C/197ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

Likewise scored out and considered “fertig”. As explained above (§3.2.5) Bruckner placed accents in m. 205 in 7th–8th hrns. and in trps., which here for reasons of consistency have been changed to wedges. At mm. 205–212 it may justifiably be assumed that Bruckner overlooked ties in the trombs. and cb. tba.

**F/mm. 207–222** *Source:* bifol. 11A/“12”, ÖNB 6087/33–34; cf. AP E/49ff., Facs. C/201ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–12; 1–8; 1–2-

11A/“12” can be regarded as the last surviving completely scored-out bifol. The wedges in the trps., alto and ten. trombs. at m. 213 are autograph. Concerning the added notes in the clars. in the last 2 mm., see below.

**F/mm. 223–238** *Reconstruction/supplementation of continuity of bifol. “13a”E; cf. AP E/53*

*Source:* bifol. “13a”E, ÖNB 6085/75–76; cf. AP E/53ff., Facs. C/217ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–6-[7–8; 1–8; 1–2-]

Supplementation according to the largely scored out bifol. 12C, p. 1,

ÖNB 6087/35<sup>r</sup>; cf. AP E/53, Facs. C/205

*Length of section used:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–4; 1–2-

An explanation of the expansion of the beginning of the Durchf., which according to Bruckner’s dating was undertaken in August 1896, hence long after the provisional conclusion of the score and renumbering (June 1896), has already been discussed (ch. 3.1). The two bifols. “13a”E and the apparently adjoining, although not itself numbered =“13b”E apparently replaced an earlier version, a lost [12/“13”], probably a valid subsequent version of the discarded 12C. Bruckner probably never got as far as completely scoring out “13a”E and =“13b”E; their significance, however, is apparent from the surviving material. The metrical structure of the lost, presumably 16-m. [12/“13”] was probably –7–8; 1–4-[5–8; 1–6-]. It must have been mostly scored out, as the adjoining 13E/“14” begins abruptly with completed instrumentation in the 7th m. of a period. Apparently Bruckner first ‘deferred’ the further harmonic continuity of his original bifol. 12C (mm. 9–16 thereof) and, following the entry of the Te Deum motive in the fl., extended the chromatic descending motive  $d^1-c\sharp^1-c\flat^1-b\flat$ , with which the chorale concludes, into a chain of  $\frac{6}{3}$  chords, the continuation of which can be found scored out at the beginning of 13E/“14”. Drafts for this, indicating a chromatic line descending from  $d^1$ , can be found in the right margin of the last p. of 11A/“12” (AP E/52).

Bruckner’s later deliberations over an expansion of [12/“13”] were apparently linked to the possibility of combining an augmentation of the Te Deum motive with the ostinato-like repeated, chromatic descending motive,



so as to create a broad passage of tense stillness corresponding to the usual 'run-out' area (*Auslaufzone*) at the end of the Exp. of many of his first and last movements. Drafts for the combination of the two motives can be found on "13"<sup>b</sup>E (AP E/57ff., underlaid). In order to better prepare the double augmentation of the *Te Deum* motive which begins at m. 231, Bruckner intended to weave this augmentation in at m. 221, that is, 4 mm. prior to the 'official' entry of the motive itself, as is indicated by the two notes *b*<sup>♯</sup>-*e* in the system of the 1st ob. at the beginning of "13a"<sup>b</sup>E (in view of the range the clars. are more likely intended here); the 1st two notes *e*<sup>1</sup>-*b*<sup>♯</sup> were correspondingly added in the last 2 mm. of 11A/"12". Probably the passacaglia-like *d*<sup>1</sup>-*c*<sup>♯1</sup>-*c*<sup>♯1</sup>-*b*<sup>♯</sup> motive was intended to begin at m. 229; the *d*<sup>1</sup>-*c*<sup>♯1</sup> notated in the 1st ob. system at mm. 237-8 indicate the continuation of this motive. The 'Faulenzer' in the vlms. at the beginning of the adjoining bifol. = "13b"<sup>b</sup>E (cf. AP E/57, Facs. C/221) again indicate a continuation of the triplet figuration, so that it may justifiably be maintained that the musical texture—triplet figuration in the vlms., *tremolo* (chromatic motive) in the vla., etc.—was intended to continue ostinato-like from the end of 11A/"12" to the beginning of 13E/"14". The beginning of bifol. 13E/"14" also makes it likely that cb. and vlc. (the latter also in triplet figuration) had to re-enter in the course of this passage, the most likely point being m. 237. The continuation of the timp. *tremolo* after m. 230 (cf. the beginning of = "13b"<sup>b</sup>E) was also added.

**F/mm. 239-254** Reconstruction/supplementation of the continuity of bifol. = "13b"<sup>b</sup>E;  
cf. AP E/57ff.

*Sources:* bifol. = "13b"<sup>b</sup>E, ÖNB 6085/81-82; cf. AP E/57ff., Facs. C/221ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably [-3-12; 1-6-]

*As well as:* bifol. "13"<sup>b</sup>E, ÖNB 6085/73-74; cf. AP E/57ff., Facs. C/213ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7-8; 1-8; 1-6-

See above, commentary to mm. 223-238. The ostinati in the vla., vlms. and vlc. are continued; from m. 245 the cb. also becomes involved. Probably from m. 249 onwards the chromatic descending motive in the vla. and cb. was intended to change from semibreves into minims; at the same time, the triplets must have been so altered that they could shift into the upper octave and move into the descending  $\frac{6}{3}$  chords from m. 251 onwards. At m. 251 the

2nd vln. also changes to *tremolo* minims. The double notes in the 1st ob. system from m. 239 probably indicate the involvement of the 2nd–3rd ob. (the concluding note  $b\sharp^1$  at mm. 245f. has been added); the dotted motive of the movement's introduction, probably already intended to begin at m. 248, has been allotted to the 1st ob. The quaver  $d^1$  at the beginning of the ensuing bifol. 13E/"14" makes it apparent that the introductory motive was accompanied by simultaneous diminutions in the 2nd–3rd obs. (cf. mm. 255ff., 5th–8th hrs., mm. 259ff., 2nd–3rd obs. etc.), which for reasons of sonority have been supplemented here after the model of the Performing Version (the motive would otherwise be inaudible). The remaining woodwinds, horns and trumpets would doubtless have been involved in the passage (cf. the AF, mm. 217ff.), as indicated by the beginning of 13E/"14", but have been omitted here. The timp. *tremolo* was concluded at m. 245.

**F/mm. 255–270** *Source:* bifol. 13E/"14", ÖNB 6087/37–38; cf. AP E/61ff., Facs. C/225ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

This bifol. was likewise renumbered by Bruckner and hence again formed part of the definitive score. Late SVE for bifol. "14." as well as "15.", that is, a subsequent version of 13E/"14" which connected with ="13b"E, are extant (Facs. C/229ff.), but do not permit of sufficiently conclusive interpretation. Bifol. 13E/"14" is largely scored out, the 1st p. (mm. 255–258) as far as the inclusion of whole-m. rests. On the 2nd p. (top left) Bruckner noted the word "Pausen", so that it is likely that the instrumentation is more or less complete from here on. Supplementations were confined to the 1st–4th hrs. and 1st–3rd bsns. from m. 259 and doubling of the 1st fl. by 2nd–3rd fls. from m. 261 onwards. The sense of the doubling of the Te Deum motive at the lower octave (pencil, from m. 261 in the 2nd–3rd fls., from m. 263 in the 2nd–3rd obs.) is not clearly construable and has been omitted. The last note of the Te Deum motive at m. 264, by analogy with the autograph truncation of the motive at m. 280, has been omitted (as it does not correlate with the F major of the strings), as have the curious pencil annotations in the 1st ob. system at m. 257 and pencil entries in the bsn. systems at mm. 267f.

**F/mm. 271–278** *Reconstruction* (of the 1st half) of a bifol. [14/"15"]; cf. AP E/65ff.

*Length:* probably 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably [-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-]

*Source:* bifol. 12C, pp. 3–4, ÖNB 6087/36; cf. AP E/65f., Facs. C/207f.

*Length of section used:* 8 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–6-

Bifol. 12C, which would have joined up with a lost [13C], was partly scored out, but at a relatively early stage discarded in favour of a subsequent version which, as discussed, contained the extended Durchf. of the chromatic descending line and  $\frac{6}{3}$  chords. In view of his single-minded, highly economical working methods, however, it is unlikely that Bruckner completely discarded the contents of the original 12C. The absence of any further sk. material for the second section of the Durchf. and textural similarity of the last c. 8 mm. of 12C with the first 2 mm. of bifol. 15D/“16” suggests that bifol. [14/“15”] was essentially a shift of the discarded section from 12C, extended so as to lead into the G $\flat$  major at the beginning of 15D/“16”. It is apparent that at the beginning of [14/“15”] the strings cadenced from C $\flat$  into F major, which in turn would imply that the passage drafted on pp. 3–4 of bifol. 12C would require transposition here by a semitone upwards (cf. also AP E/65, fn. 1). The triplet figuration in octaves in the vlms. found at the outset of 15D/“16” would have recommenced here; the remainder of the musical texture—simple and double augmentations of the Te Deum motive in the winds, *tremolo* in the (divided) vla. and in the vlc., sustained notes in the cb., which in part can already be found on 12C—would have begun with the new “1” of the following period 2 mm. later.

#### Gap

See the text, F/38. The remaining 8 mm. of [14/“15”], which in the AF lead directly on to the arrival point of the passage, the G $\flat$  major at the beginning of 15D/“16”, were omitted here due to the lack of hard philological evidence for their continuity.



**F/mm. 279–294** *Source:* bifol. 15D/“16”, ÖNB 6087/41–42; cf. AP E/69ff., Facs. C/253ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–6; 1–4;

While the Exp. was probably completely finished and the first bifols. of the Durchf. virtually completed orchestrated, Bruckner left the remainder of the score of the Finale from this point on in completed string texture, rendered permanent by the use of ink, with partly more, partly less, extensive indications of the involvement of the winds. A completely scored-out texture inclusive of all whole-m. rests occurs at only two further points—the beginning of the Durchf. of the ‘lyrical counterpoint’, mm. 299–300, and the

climax of the fugue, mm. 348ff. of the DdF. Nonetheless, it appears that the vast majority of elements essential to the composition of the movement and the completion of its texture were already set down on paper.

Bruckner appears here to have wrestled mightily with the transition to the Durchf. of the Gesangsp. (i.e., up to m. 291), of which mm. 287–290 in particular present a scarcely legible musical picture which is very difficult to interpret. The principal compositional problem here appears to have been to create as organic a transition as possible from the introductory motive  into its truncation  — the motive of the Gesangsp. In mm. 287–290 the two motives overlap. The transcription (AP E/70f.) reveals numerous pencil corrections to largely completely notated parts jotted down casually in the systems of unoccupied instruments, principally as follows: a correction, apparently intended for the cb., written above the ‘free’ system, as can be seen from the AP, E/70 (“pizz.”; cf. the current version, m. 285 onwards); the addition of further phrases in the 1st vln. (AP E/71, system of the 3rd–4th hrns.), as well as an apparent ‘preparation’ of the E minor of the ensuing p., probably notated in B♭ and intended for the clars. (in the ‘free’ system, AP E/71, here mm. 289–290). There is also the suggestion of a sustained hrn. note (AP E/71, 1st-trp. staff), which likewise could be assimilated into the present score, doubled at the lower octave. The remaining supplementations concern mainly the addition of motives indicated, for instance, the notes at m. 284 marked with “Alt”, and probably intended for the alto tromb., as well as the addition of a diminution of the introductory-motive rhythm in the bsns. at mm. 286/7, which the musical flow suggests is missing. Sonority dictates doubling the 1st ob. by the 2nd from m. 287; the same applies to the clars. from m. 289. Bruckner’s tempo marking “Langsamer” at m. 289 appears in pencil, if in part inadvertently erased; the barline fermata after m. 290 is likewise autograph, as is a group fermata over the phrase notated in the free staff at m. 290 and most probably intended for the clars., which here has been replaced in its function by an added “[rit.]”. In consequence, “[a tempo (langsamer)]” has been added at m. 291.

As already mentioned, the next section beginning at m. 291 is a Durchf. of elements of the Gesangsp. (from m. 299 the ‘lyrical counterpoint’), which ‘prepare’ the transformation of the desolate unison theme into the more elaborately conceived fugal subject. In view of the “*f*” notated at m. 291 (AP E/72, strings) one surely needs to imagine this passage as more richly scored. An *f*<sup>1</sup> in the 1st clar. staff indicates the participation of the clars. and probably also obs., as the crossed-out doubling at m. 297 indicates (AP

E/73); probably following the 1st crotchet of m. 297 the vlins. continue alone. The line in the staves designated here as 3rd–4th bass tbas. (AP E/72) was allotted to 7th–8th hrns<sup>10</sup> (the tuba designations in the AP here are of course not autograph); Bruckner appears to have decided by the last work phase to use hrns. from the third theme group of the Exp. until just after the fugue.

**F/mm. 295–310** *Source:* bifol. 16C/“17”, ÖNB 6087/43–44; cf. AP E/73ff., Facs. C/257ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [1–4]-5–8; 1–12;

See also the notes to the preceding bifols. The string texture was here left in a finished state by Bruckner, although intensively worked over several times; at m. 303, AP E/75, 1st m., erasure even created a hole in the paper. For mm. 299–300 a fully completed orchestration can again be established; the intended instrumentation by Bruckner in the following mm. is construable from the whole-m. rests which, unusually, were notated first (only the 1st–4th hrns. have no rests here). Also significant in establishing the orchestration intended by Bruckner in the AF were cues for the involvement of the winds from m. 307, which here, due to the absence of sufficiently precise information, could not be acted upon. Particularly curious is the fact that Bruckner in mm. 307f. erased a doubling of the vla. part marked in pencil in the woodwind, apparently in favour of whole-m. rests, which have been observed in the DdF. The falling sixth  $b\flat^2-d^2$  indicated in the woodwind at m. 309 perhaps represents an earlier version; it has been retained, but the collision with the diminished seventh  $b\flat^2-c\sharp^2$  in the vla. and vlc. avoided, in the AF. The diminished-seventh chord at m. 309 in 1st–8th hrns. has been added; in view of the annotation “b / g / e / d / cis” in the clar. systems as well as the missing whole-m. rests in the hrn. systems this was regarded as a necessary supplementation. The “Sehr langsam” at m. 305 is autograph, as is the barline fermata at mm. 310/311; the “[accel. sempre]” at m. 307 was added.

**F/mm. 311–326** *Source:* bifol. 17<sup>c</sup>D/“18”, ÖNB 6087/51–52; cf. AP E/77ff., Facs. C/277ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8;

<sup>10</sup> The autograph change to 7th–8th horn in  $B\flat$  basso observed in the AF was altered in the DdF, as between mm. 258 and 330 these instruments have few notes to play. The entries at mm. 291 and 309 thus remain in F.

Here begins the Repr. of the Hauptth., transformed into a fugue. Again the strings are completely finished in ink together with the main wind cues in pencil (largely hrn. and trp. entries). The interventions made are limited, in mm. 311–322, to the addition of what would appear to be missing notes; Bruckner would surely have orchestrated these measures far more richly. At mm. 319f., AP E/79, it appears as though Bruckner notated drafts for both trps. and hrns. on top of one another in the trp. systems; the dotted motive has been allotted to 5th–6th hrn. From m. 323 there are indications as to the participation of the woodwind, the realisation of which would, however, have required unduly speculative supplementation. Bruckner would surely have added the 2nd–3rd fls. from m. 323; similarly for reasons of sonority the clars. double the otherwise scarcely audible vla. entry at mm. 323–326; the addition in m. 325 of the first notes of phrases, the concluding notes of which are notated in m. 326 (Bruckner already had a clear conception of the manner in which the winds were to be involved), was adopted from the AF. A further necessary supplementation was a tie in the vlc., mm. 311f. The autograph tempo marking “Bedeutend langsamer” at m. 311 is taken from bifol. 17C, an earlier version of 17<sup>c</sup>D/“18”.

**F/mm. 327–342** *Source:* bifol. 18D/“19”, ÖNB 6087/53–54; cf. AP E/81ff., Facs. C/281ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3;

As regards the scoring of the winds in mm. 327–330, there are again sufficient notated as well as analytical clues that a largely complete texture can be constructed without indulging in undue speculation. Although not indicated in the autograph, Bruckner, at the fifth and final entry of the fugal theme in the tonic, would probably have added to the cb. the bsns., trombs. and cb. tba.; the timp. too would probably have been involved. The supplementation of all further winds can be justified by virtue of overall sonority: clars. double from m. 328 the vla., the obs. from m. 329 the 2nd vln. The crotchet rest in the fls. and obs. in the second half of m. 328 permits the  $b\flat^2$  in the 1st vln. to sound through better; probably for this reason Bruckner avoided the upper octave in the 1st trp. Again for reasons of sonority the 5th–6th hrns. double the 1st–2nd in mm. 327–329; in mm. 329–330 the reverse happens; in m. 329 the addition of a few notes was necessary (cf. also the additions in the obs. in m. 325).

The Durchf. of the fugue begins at m. 331 with a probably intentional allusion to the first movement of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony (cf. mm. 427ff. thereof). Here, for the first time since the Finale of his Fifth

Symphony, Bruckner made use of a 3-m. phrase structure and, presumably due to its irregularity, made an additional, continuous numbering of the mm. from the beginning of the fugue. This can be found at the beginning of the next extant bifol. 20F/"21" in the lower margin (AP E/89f.) and confirms the 16-m. length of the lost bifol. [19/"20"] which lay in between.

Bifol. 18D/"19" was again heavily worked over, particularly from the 2nd p. onwards (cf. Facs. C/282ff.): the completed string texture is accompanied by numerous pencil notations for the strings as well as for the involvement of the winds in the other systems. Consideration was made of a syncopated imitation of the principal motive in mm. 332–339 (cf. AP E/84ff.) written in alto clef, which Bruckner apparently drafted retrospectively in pencil in the b.-tba system and which would seem to suggest a revision of the vla. part. For the sake of sonority this was doubled by the 1st bsn. From among the clues as to the involvement of the winds (AP E/82), a doubling of the 1st vln. by the 1st–3rd obs. and of the 2nd vln. by the 1st–3rd clars. was chosen. A further element is constituted by the sustained chordal accompaniment in the 1st–4th hrn., in which, as m. 339 (AP E/84, m. 1) confirms, the 2nd–3rd trps. were probably also involved; partly erased traces thereof (not reproduced in AP) can be found from m. 331 onwards (see Facs. C/282). The rhythm of this accompaniment motive was probably the variant of the fanfare-like accompanying figure to the fugal theme which first appears at m. 327.

At m. 340 begins the 2nd episode of the fugal Durchf., only the first 3 mm. of which are extant. Probably the trps. no longer play from m. 339 (AP E/84), while on the other hand the hrns. are allotted in mm. 340f. a new, shortened variant of the same rhythm. From m. 340 onwards there are no further revisions to the strings; from the numerous drafts for the winds, that notated in treble clef in the timp. system was selected and allotted to the fls.; a further passage in the same rhythm as the 2nd vln. was allotted by the composer himself to the clars. For reasons of sonority the vla. and vlc. are doubled by 2nd–3rd bsns. A draft notated in treble clef in the trp. system (probably for a clar. part) fits precisely in with the harmonic structure, but oddly enough 2 mm. later (cf. AP E/84f. as well as E/84, note 3). It was made use of in the AF, where it assists in the reconstruction of the harmonic structure of bifol. [19/"20"], but omitted here as superfluous.

## Gap

Bifol. [19/"20"]; cf. AP E/85ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably [1–3; 1–3; 1–3]; 1–4; 1–3;

See the text, F/49. Bifol. [19/“20”] is not extant, and a continuous draft for the Durchf. of the fugue is not apparent in the earlier pc. sks. However, pc. drafts do survive for the final Steigerung and climax of the fugue (listed below), the validity of which can be confirmed from the next surviving bifol. of the score, 20F/“21”. As already mentioned, the length of bifol. [19/“20”] can be confirmed from the autograph numbering of the mm. from the beginning of the fugue; this numbering also appears on bifol. 20F/“21” (AP E/89, lower margin).

Although it cannot be categorically demonstrated from the extant sources, [19/“20”], like the first Durchf. episode of the fugue, probably consisted of a threefold sequence which began in the 3rd-to-last m. of 18D/“19” and wound its way in periods of 2 x (3 + 3), plus a further 4 mm., towards the climax of the fugue in the 3rd-to-last m. of [19/“20”]. An unbroken reconstruction of the continuity of this bifol. was undertaken in the AF which led to the C#-minor climax as it stands in the pc. sks. via three sequential steps—C, E and G# (so that, in effect, the supplementation of only 3 mm. was required). Pc. sks. for the last 7 mm. of this bifol. are extant, however, the 1st 4 mm. of which, as opposed to the alterations necessary in the continuous reconstruction of the AF, are reproduced true to their original notation here.

**F/mm. 343–349** Reconstruction of mm. 10–16 of a non-extant bifol. [19/“20”]; cf. AP E/85, 87f.

*Source:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/14<sup>1</sup>, brackets 2–5; cf. AP E/87f., Facs. C/23

*Length of section used:* 7 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5-7-[8]; 1-3

See above, last paragraph. The 1st 4 mm. of the sk. were allotted to the vla. and vlc. in unison (cf. mm. 340ff.). From m. 347 onwards, comparison of the 3 C#-minor mm. of the sk. with the ensuing extant and fully scored-out sequence steps of Bb- and F#-minor surviving on bifol. 20F/“21” made the idea of a complete reconstruction of the instrumentation of these mm., as in the AF, especially attractive. For reasons of voice-leading the beginning note of the truncated fugal theme in the vlns. and fls. must have been e<sup>3</sup>; the 1st–3rd trps. probably remained throughout the entire passage on the octave c#<sup>1</sup>–c#<sup>2</sup>, 1st–4th hrns. maintaining the fifth db<sup>1</sup>–ab<sup>1</sup>. Bass tromb. and cb. tuba double vlc. and cb.; alto and ten. trombs. fill out the harmony analogue to mm. 350ff. The 7th–8th hrns. were supplemented analogue to mm. 353ff.,



5th–6th hrns. analogue m. 352, vla. and clars. analogue to mm. 352ff., obs. analogue to mm. 353f.

**F/mm. 350–365** *Source:* bifol. 20F/“21”, StB 4189/27–28; cf. AP E/89ff., Facs. C/285ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–2-

The 1st 6 mm. of the bifol., for the last time in the extant fragments of the score, exhibit a completed instrumentation. From m. 356 onwards a complete string texture with numerous indications for the winds can be found, so that, as already mentioned (§3.2.1), a largely complete instrumentation of this as well as the following bifol. could be undertaken. Apparently Bruckner at m. 356 wanted to use the 1st–4th tbas. again in place of the 5th–8th hrns. (AP E/90, “Tb.”); the change within a measure is impossible, however, so that the notes drafted by Bruckner in these systems had to be re-allotted to the 5th–8th hrns. (the notes written by Bruckner in m. 356 are in any case notated in F). The ten. tbas. re-enter first at m. 380, bass tbas. at m. 385. The clars. (probably 1st–3rd) double the vla., the bsns. throughout obviously have to play the 1st–3rd and 5th–7th quavers of each m. of the vlc. part. In mm. 356–357, 2nd–3rd clar. system, one again finds drafts for an accompanying part in F (probably intended for the 1st–2nd hrns.) which, however, after m. 357 could not be extrapolated any further. After m. 362 1st–4th hrns. take over the function of 5th–8th.

**F/mm. 366–381** *Source:* bifol. 21D/“22”, ÖNB 6087/57–58; cf. AP E/93ff., Facs. C/ 289ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

See above, notes to the preceding bifol. Here again the strings are complete, with indications as to the wind scoring. From m. 368 the 1st–2nd trps. re-enter; in the same m. the notes in the 1st–4th hrn. are crossed out and further references to their involvement are absent, so that in the present version they continue to rest until the entry of the ‘horn theme’ at m. 388. From m. 368 the dotted motive is transferred to the obs.; for reasons of balance (cf. the dissonance with the trps. 2 mm. later) it appears likely that the fls. are to play with the obs. at the upper octave. At m. 369 the 5th–6th (or 7th–8th) hrns. have apparently to play with the vla. (cf. the letter notation, AP E/93; supplemented at m. 371). At the same time the vlc. line goes beyond the range of the bsns.; this probably has to do with the participation of the obs., so that it can be assumed that a change to the accompaniment pattern of the

bsns. as well as the beginning of an involvement by the 2nd–3rd, and later also 1st clar., was intended to take place here. From m. 372 the 1st trp. was doubled by the 2nd; from m. 380 all three play together.

All further comments to mm. 380–381 are implicated in the discussion of the ensuing bifol., and have therefore been given there.

**F/mm. 382–397** *Source:* bifol. 22D/“23”, ÖNB 6087/59–60; cf. AP E/97ff., Facs. C/293ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

See above, notes to the preceding bifol. From m. 380 the string figuration recalls almost literally two previous passages in Bruckner’s output, namely the Finale of the Sixth (cf. in particular mm. 385ff. thereof) as well as the “Aeterna fac” of the Te Deum, comparison with which provides insights into what here is a particularly crucial supplementation of the texture. Sustained notes have been added in the 1st–2nd fls. (cf. the 1st fl. from m. 384, AP E/97), 1st clar., 1st bsn. and 1st ten. tuba (the entry of which here is confirmed by a single note in the autograph, cf. AP E/96) as well as the doubling of the string figuration in crotchets in the 3rd fl., 2nd–3rd clars., 2nd–3rd bsns. and 2nd ten. tuba. The obs. from m. 380 were probably intended to accompany the trps.; from m. 384, however, these instruments have their own independent parts. At mm. 384f. (cf. AP E/97) the sustained  $f^{\#2}$  in semibreves in the 2nd–3rd trps. has been omitted in favour of doubling the 1st trp. part. In m. 385 the 1st–2nd fls. take up the triplets of the trps. at the higher octave. The entry of the bass tbas. at m. 385 is indicated in the autograph by letter notation. From m. 386 (cf. AP E/98) Bruckner goes so far as to write separate (admittedly scarcely audible) parts for the 1st and 2nd–3rd obs. A draft notated in the same mm. in the bass-tromb. system is probably written in  $B\flat$  and therefore intended for the clars.

With the entry of the horn theme at m. 388 (letter P) the autograph’s indications, sufficient up to this point for the largely complete supplementation of the texture, come to an end. Almost surely, however, Bruckner would have continued at least up until c. m. 395 to involve the entire orchestra in this massive climax. At m. 389 the notes of the 3rd–4th hrns. require supplementation (one of the composer’s very rare lapses). Apart from this, “sehr breit and gehalten” has been added to the hrn. parts at m. 388.

**F/mm. 398–413** *Source:* bifol. 23D/“24”, ÖNB 6087/61–62; cf. AP E/101ff., Facs. C/297ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–12; 1–6-

See also the notes for the previous bifol. At mm. 399/400 the trps. suddenly break off with a truncation of their motive; in the next 4 mm. the phrase is repeated, echo-like, whereby the  $f\sharp^3$  in the 1st fl. in mm. 402f. (AP E/102) is probably to be construed as the final note of a doubling of the 1st trp. at the higher octave (further woodwinds would probably have been involved here as well). In the ensuing mm., in brass and bsns. the motive is quasi-inverted; here, significantly, Bruckner again supplies precise information as to the scoring (AP E/102). The 2nd trp. plays an octave below the 1st, the last notes of the bass tbas. are probably indicated in m. 406 (AP E/103) in C, an octave higher, the ten. tbas. are also notated, likewise the bsns., which parts the hrns. are intended to double. At m. 406 the 1st–2nd hrns. repeat the truncated triplet motive. The addition of “sehr breit and gehalten” has been made to the trps. in m. 395 and hrns. in m. 388, as well as the “[riten.]” at m. 404.

Concerning the ensuing Repr. of the Gesangsp. (from m. 408), one has the impression that Bruckner wrote it out relatively rapidly, in a single draft, and indeed almost complete pc. drafts exist for this section of the score (see Facs. C/24ff.) which make possible a reconstruction of the two missing bifols. within this section. However, as essentially only the strings have been notated, it is scarcely possible to make any further instrumentation of the extant musical text. The tempo designation “Langsamer” has again been added here (cf. letter C in the Exp.).

**F/mm. 414–429** *Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [24/“25”]; cf. AP E/105ff.*

*Length:* probably 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably [-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-]

*Sources:* 2 pc. sks.:

1) ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, bracket 2; cf. AP E/104f., Facs. C/24

*Length of section used:* 6 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1-[2]–3–[4]-

2) ÖNB 3194/15<sup>f</sup>, bracket 3; cf. AP E/106f., Facs. C/25

*Length of section used:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–8;

*As well as:* bifol. 5B, from m. 9, StB 3791/6; cf. AP E/107f., Facs. C/165ff.

*Length of section used:* 6 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–6-

See AP E/104ff. (including footnote). Bruckner added from m. 400 onwards a variant of the ‘lyrical counterpoint’ (1st vln.) to a musical continuity allotted to 2nd vln., vla. and vlc. that was already established in the pc. sks. For mm. 414–423, however, this counterpoint could not be reconstructed with absolute certainty, so that the 1st vln. part here must remain silent (cf. the AF, from m. 423 thereof). From m. 420 the semibreve of the sk. has been allotted to the cb. and divided vlc.; a harmonic supplementation in the vla. at mm. 422f. also appears defensible (cf. again the AF, mm. 431f.). The remaining 6 mm., with the addition of a single note in the 2nd vln. (m. 424, 1st crotchet) could be taken note-for-note from the reconstructed bifol. [5/“6”] of the Exp. (see commentary to mm. 115ff. above). A further addition concerns the “[Noch langsamer]” added at m. 424 analogue to the Exp. (cf. letter D—see also §3.2.4, above).

**F/mm. 430–445** *Source:* bifol. 25D/“26”, ÖNB 6087/55–56; cf. AP E/109ff., Facs. C/301ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–6; 1–8;

Here again the strings are complete; apart from them Bruckner has pre-notated only a solitary fl. entry in mm. 438f. Analogue to m. 126 of the Exp., a “[rit.]” has been added at m. 435, correspondingly, an “[a tempo]” at R.

**F/mm. 446–461** *Source:* bifol. 26F/“27”, ÖNB 6087/65–66; cf. AP E/113ff., Facs. C/305ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1–8; 1–4-

The strings are complete. At m. 446 “[Sehr langsam]”, at m. 450 “[a tempo]”, at m. 454 “[accelerando]”, at m. 458 “[Erstes Zeitmaß]” have all been added; see above, §3.2.4.

**F/mm. 462–478** *Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [27/“28”]; cf. AP E/117ff.*

*Length:* probably at least 16, at the most 24 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [ ? ; 1–4-]

*Source:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, from br. 3, m. 5; cf. AP E/117ff., Facs. C/24

*Length of section used:* 17 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8; [1–]

*See AP E/117ff., in particular E/117, fn. 1.*

Within this bifol. Bruckner would have concluded the Repr. of the Gesangsp. and, following a grand cadence in D minor, resumed the triplet figuration of the chorale; cf. the following bifol., which according to the metrical numbers begins with the 5th m. of a period; the pedal point on D hence probably began 4 mm. before. The 17-m. pc. sk. used here corresponds precisely with this harmonic function, ending with a return to D minor and even the words “Schluß d m[oll]”, and which in its repetitions suggests a powerful *Steigerung*. Moreover, as noted in the A.-P., the “vi–” notated at the end of m. 457 would have to have connected with a “–de” at some point on [27/“28”]. Most likely this cut, from the g<sup>#2</sup> of m. 457, ended with an a<sup>2</sup> in the 4th-to-last m. of [27/“28”], where also most likely the triplet figuration of the vlins. resumed.

While it cannot be conclusively demonstrated, it also appears likely that Bruckner, at the end of the passage taken from the pc. sk. included within [27/“28”], i.e., at m. 478 of the present version, may have reintroduced, in D minor, the new so-called ‘Gregorian theme’ (see above, §3.2.4) that first appears at m. 458 in A minor. This would have brought the musical line precisely to the a<sup>2</sup> suggested by the vi–de, the transposition of mm. 458ff. into D minor being d<sup>2</sup>–a<sup>1</sup>–g<sup>1</sup>–a<sup>1</sup>–d<sup>2</sup>–c<sup>2</sup>–f<sup>2</sup>–g<sup>2</sup>–[a<sup>2</sup>]. The “vi–de”, if observed, would thus have neatly excluded both entries of the ‘Gregorian theme’ (which also nowhere appears in the original sks.). This convincing if speculative explanation was realised in the AF (see mm. 487ff. thereof), where it creates a grandiose, stylistically convincing climax. In the present score the connecting mm. between the sk. ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup> and the beginning of the next extant bifol. 28E/“29” had to be left as a gap; in other words, only 7-and-a-half mm., the continuity of which cannot be demonstrated with certainty, are missing here.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> An explanation of the unusual 24-m. total length thereby produced for the reconstruction of bifol. [27/“28”] gains in credibility when one considers that on the previous bifol. 26F/“27” Bruckner ruled the barlines himself (cf. Facs. C/305ff.); it is possible that for some reason on [27/“28”] he reckoned with accommodating more than the usual 16 mm. Furthermore, a bifol. is extant that was apparently ruled up by Meißner with 24 mm., namely 1F (Facs. C/81f.), moreover the same paper type as that of 26F/“27”.

The passage taken from the pc. sk. of ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup> could be transferred to the strings with few supplementations. The bass counterpoint suggested at m. 466 in the sk. (cf. AP E/117, bottom, last 2 mm., as well as E/118, bottom, 1st m.) was supplemented in mm. 467 and 469 according to the model provided by the AF; however, Bruckner would doubtless have extended this line up to the “Schluß d m[oll]”. Apart from this, the tempo designations “[Langsamer]” at m. 462 and “[stringendo poco a poco]” at m. 470 were added.

**Gap** See text, F/70, as well as above, 2nd-to-last paragraph.

**F/mm. 479–495** *Source:* bifol. 28E/“29”, ÖNB 6087/67–68; cf. AP E/121ff., Facs. C/309ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–6; 1–6; 1–6; 1–2-

See also above, concerning the previous bifol. [27/“28”]. Here, from the 5th m. of a period, we again find a complete string texture. At m. 479 “[Erstes Zeitmaß]” has been added, which of course should actually stand at the beginning of the period, i.e., 4 mm. earlier. Likewise at m. 479 two scarcely decipherable pencil notations in the fl. systems have had to be ignored (cf. AP E/121, Facs. C/309). The  $f\#^3$  in the 1st fl. at m. 493, on the other hand, was regarded as the endpoint of a long, sustained note (probably also an indication of the general involvement of the woodwind in the *Steigerung*; cf. the completed scoring of the *Exp.*, before letter G).

Probably the entire brass contingent was intended to take part in the chorale Repr. (from m. 493); the robust string texture as well as the two whole-m. rests in the previous mm. 491f., in the systems of the 1st as well as the 2nd–3rd trps. (cf. AP E/124), are indicative of this. Only the 2nd–3rd trps. have been added here.

**F/mm. 495–510** *Source:* bifol. 29E/“30”, ÖNB 6087/69–70; cf. AP E/125ff., Facs. C/313ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

See the preceding paragraph. Only the 2nd–3rd trps. have been added, as in the foregoing mm. The *dim.* above the 1st trp. system at m. 500 is autograph (see in connection with both this and the phrasing of the chorale theme, §3.2.5). The entry of the 1st ob. in the 2nd-to-last m. is again probably an indication as to the intended involvement of further woodwinds.

**Gap** A non-extant bifol. [30/“31”]; cf. AP E/129ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* probably [-3-12; 1-6-]

See text, F/76. Bifol. [30/“31”] was left in this score as a gap, as no extant sources definitively confirm its contents. Further information can be found in the AP E/129, note 1. In fact, however, we can establish its precise length, as Bruckner in the chorale Repr., as in the fugue, undertook a continuous numbering of the mm. of the section (see AP E/133ff., top margin of each p.), and hence deduce its metrical structure. Most likely—precisely as no further sks. are present—the passage was a relatively simple manipulation of the chorale material, probably an exact inversion of the 1st 12 mm. of the chorale theme and its 8-m. middle section. The superbly woven string texture found at the beginning of the following bifol. probably began in the 6th-to-last m. of [30/“31”].

**F/mm. 511–526** *Source:* bifol. 31E/“32”, ÖNB 6087/71–72; cf. AP E/133ff., Facs. C/317ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* -7-8; 1-8; 1-6-

The last extant bifol. of the score, which begins with the 7th m. of a period and breaks off just as abruptly with the 6th m. of a period, exhibits in its 1st 10 mm. a quite complex contrapuntal texture in the strings with what are in part easily construable entries and other indications as to the involvement of the obs., trps., timp. and hrns. The handwriting of this last bifol. is, although tremulous, perfectly clear, consistent and legible, so that it in no wise supports the supposition that at this point Bruckner ended his efforts on the score of the Finale not long before his death. Quite the opposite: it appears that Bruckner composed the chorale Repr., as well as that of the Gesangsp. “page after page” (according to Bruckner’s doctor Richard Heller)—in other words, relatively quickly and decisively, probably by Spring of 1896. We possess sks. for the final cadence of the coda from May of that year which, according to Bruckner’s step-by-step working methods, can only imply that he had by this time already advanced the score well into the coda. As far as the present bifol. is concerned the autograph reveals numerous annotations and inspections of voice-leading (cf. Facs. C/317ff.), which again prove with

what analytical reflection and rigorousness Bruckner continued to compose even in the final year of his life.<sup>12</sup>

Supplementations were made in the 2nd ob. from m. 513, which was placed in parallel sixths under the 1st ob. so as to close meaningfully in the autograph fifth at m. 519 (AP E/135). Between the brass systems from m. 514 onwards can be found repeated letter notation, apparently indicative of trp. fanfares (AP E/133f.) which were realised in the 2nd–3rd trps. (at m. 516 a missing note on the 3rd beat avoids a dissonance with the c<sup>#</sup><sup>3</sup> of the 1st vln.; an apparently missing phrase at m. 518 has been supplemented). Probably the crossed-out *eb* in the timp. at m. 518, oddly enough replaced by *A<sup>b</sup>*, is an indication that Bruckner perhaps wished to reserve his 3rd timpano for a subsequent entry. At the reappearance of the horn theme at m. 520, as at m. 388, “sehr breit and gehalten” has again been added.

### F/80

The extant fragments of the score break off suddenly here, and it is very possible that several further bifols. from this point onwards existed but have simply not survived. Within a few mm. Bruckner would have reached the beginning of the coda, which lies nonetheless not nearly so “ganz im Dunkeln” as Alfred Orel claimed in 1934.<sup>13</sup> Quite the opposite: pc. sks. for over 50 mm. of the coda are extant, while further clues may be gleaned from verbal statements of the composer which have come down to us. The annotation “Bogen / 36.” in the left margin of the sk. ÖNB 6085/45<sup>f</sup> (AP E/139) provides additional confirmation that Bruckner extended the score further than the last bifol. now extant; considering his working methods, it is perfectly possible that the copying out and elaboration of bifol. 2F onto “2”E and “3”E and the entire renumbering of all valid bifols. of the score at that point in time was first undertaken following the completion of the entire movement in its first work phase (the complete notation of the strings together with the most important wind entries), a score which may have extended roughly as far as a bifol. [39/“40”].

In order to better understand the likely direction of the music beyond bifol. 31E/“32” as well as in the coda, analytical considerations need to be drawn on. The reprise of the horn theme, by virtue of its motivic similarity

<sup>12</sup> The last extant bifols. of the score also reveal the later mental deterioration of the composer in repeated attempts to renumber already composed bifols., as already noted (ch. 3.1). According to Heller, “Bruckner’s mind did not remain untouched” following the serious pneumonia of July 1896 (Max Auer, “Anton Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, p. 33).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Orel D/139.



as well as the pattern of so many foregoing Bruckner Finales, probably ended in a monumental statement of the Hauptth. of IX/1, as was realised in the AF in stylistically convincing fashion (see mm. 573ff. thereof).

### 3.2.7 Concerning the coda.

**F/81** See the observations made in the AP, E/137ff. and in §3.1.10.

**F/mm. 527–550** *Sources:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/3<sup>r</sup>; cf. AP E/138, Facs. C/6

*Length of the section notated in ink and used here:* 24 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8; 1–8; [...]

See explanation, AP E/138. Only the first 24 mm. of the early sk. ÖNB 3194/3<sup>r</sup> were transcribed here for the strings; the interpretation of a pencilled continuation of the sk. from m. 25 onwards remains uncertain. For harmonic as well as voice-leading reasons from m. 528 onwards an apparently missing note in each chord was supplemented in the vla. (cf. AP E/138); as in the AF, the vla. and vlc. play *tremolo*, a variant first tried at the first performance of the coda sks. (April 2001, under B. G. Cohrs; cf. the sustained notes, AP E/138). The final note of the inverted opening motive used here (1st vln., m. 528, 560 etc.), which Bruckner first notated as a semibreve, then a minim, then a crotchet, was brought into line with the other appearances of the motive and given as a crotchet throughout. The AF (see mm. 603ff. thereof) leads the sk. further into D minor. Concerning the supplemented tempo marking “[Ruhig]” see §3.2.4.

**F/82** Concerning the reference to the contrapuntal combination of themes mentioned by Max Auer, see AP E/138. The AF provides a hypothetical overlay of all four themes of the symphony (different, admittedly, from the combination of the themes of the Finale noted by Auer); see mm. 607ff. thereof.

**F/mm. 551–554** *Source:* pc. sk. ÖNB 6085/45<sup>r</sup>; cf. AP E/139, Facs. C/45

*Length:* ?

*Metrical structure:* 1–4- [...]

Significant here are the extant sks. for the coda drafted by Bruckner between the 19th and 23rd of May and which appear to outline a final Steigerung and monumental cadence. Relatively definitive appear the 1st 4 mm. of the sk. ÖNB 6085/45<sup>r</sup> transcribed here for strings, the continuation of which remains unclear in the sk. A further draft, ÖNB 6085/47<sup>r</sup> (AP E/140),

apparently linked to it was omitted here due to insufficient harmonic information. Possibly this ascending sequence was intended to follow a final entry of the chorale; it can only be said with some surety that the *Steigerung* was intended to culminate in the  $c\flat^3$  at the beginning of the apparently ensuing sk. ÖNB 6085/43 (cf. the reconstruction and supplementation of this passage in the AF, mm. 627ff.).

**F/mm. 555–578** *Source:* pc. sk. ÖNB 6085/43; cf. AP E/141, Facs. C/47

*Length:* 24 mm. (?)

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8; 1–8; [...]

Finally, the sk. ÖNB 6085/43 outlines a broad area which appears to represent the final, monumental cadence of the symphony. The 24-m. harmonic progression notated in pencil appears mirrored in a further sk. in ink on the same p. below it (and continuing onto the next p.), which contains less precise information. Recognisable from the few notes is the tritone progression which has dominated the entire movement (see below, “f” then “ces / sehr lang”), as well as an *Undezimakkord* on the dominant, which at the beginning of the 3rd bracket ‘splits’ into the notes  $g\sharp/b\flat$ , a reading corresponding to the first harmonic step of the symphony, in which the opening pedal point on d splits into  $c\sharp/e\flat$  at m. 19 of IX/1. Thereafter follows in the sk. an 8-m. long pedal point on D/d, so that despite the further sk. below one is tempted to see here the beginning of the concluding D-major apotheosis of the Finale, which according to what has come down to us was conceived as a grand “Lob- and Preislied an den lieben Gott”.

The AF (mm. 635ff. thereof) constructs an elaborate *Klangfläche* here recalling the climax of the Adagio. In the present score the cadence has been given a purely harmonic arrangement in *f* in the strings which provides little more than a pale impression of the overwhelming and conclusive character of the passage Bruckner must have had in mind. Following a suggestion made by the conductor B. G. Cohrs, the passage has again been marked *tremolo*. Further supplementations concern the “[riten.]” at m. 570 and ensuing “[a tempo]”, as well as the barline fermata added between mm. 570 and 571, which provides a breath-pause characteristic of Bruckner, necessary here for reasons of voice leading.

**F/84**

Concerning the conclusion of the movement as well as the “Lob- and Preislied” intended by Bruckner, cf. the closing pages of the AF as well as the AP, E/83.

## 3.3

### The Aufführungsfassung

Die Erschließung Bruckners bedarf, mit Goethe, jener ‘zarten Empirie, die sich mit dem Gegenstande innigst identisch macht und dadurch zur eigentlichen Theorie wird’.

—Peter Gülke<sup>1</sup>

#### 3.3.0 Introduction.

**G**IVEN the extent of the surviving sources for the Finale, and that so much of the movement can be reconstructed without undue speculation from the surviving material, there are good reasons why attempts to arrive at an appropriate realisation of the Finale should go beyond a ‘Dokumentation des Fragments’. As noted in §1.4.1, “Musik ist darauf angewiesen, fertiggestellt zu sein”. Before it can exist for musicians, let alone a wider audience, music needs to be continuous and preferably reproducible in a manner appropriate to its content and style. The Finale is, moreover, not an isolated piece of music which we should have to give up as lost to the practical repertoire by virtue of its incompleteness, but a component of a larger structure which was never intended to exist without it; awareness of this has been lost during the symphony’s reception history by the fact that the Finale, although largely complete, was dismissed or suppressed as an object of musicological study—as shown in ch. 1.3, musicology has in this respect remained largely blinkered by performance tradition.

The first musicologists to recognise the extent and importance of connections between the Finale and the other movements of the Ninth were Samale and Mazzuca. As we have seen (§1.4.14), they pointed out in the commentary to their *Ricostruzione*:

The thematic and structural relationships with the first and other movements continue [in the Finale]; in fact they intensify in the course of [its] development and recapitulation. The cohesiveness of the Symphony’s compositional conception, and the organic nature of the four-movement complex are clear from even a first, summary analysis. We therefore cannot share the opinion of those who believe that the Ninth Symphony, as it is normally performed, that is with only the first three movements, is an ideally complete piece with an artistic unity of its own. Our attempt at reconstruction was not made with any presumption of being able to overcome such a serious loss, but simply in an effort to contribute, with the greatest possible commitment to philological rigour and stylistic pertinence, to enhancing our understanding of this Symphony as it was originally conceived: as a unitary four-movement complex.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “Der schwierige Jubilar”. Zu Anton Bruckners 150. Geburtstag,” *MuG* (1974) p. 550; also quoted by Mathias Hansen, p. 326.

<sup>2</sup> *Introduction...*, p. 4.

These words were written before what we now know about the composition of the movement had been established. The author's initial research on the sources in 1990–91 independently corroborated many of Samale's and Mazzuca's earlier claims, while the revision of Orel's philological conclusions and the discovery of the coda sks., among other things, culminated in a wholly new conception of the methodology required for a completion of the movement. Piecing together all the available MSS and information it could be seen that a 'reconstruction' of the movement, including the coda, became possible in a far more accurate and justifiable manner, instead of introducing materials not originating in the extant sks., as Samale and Mazzuca had found necessary. It introduced fresh ideas concerning the harmonic character of the work and the logic and contrapuntal rigour with which Bruckner composed his textures. As it could now be shown that the score of the Finale at the time of Bruckner's death constituted an 'emergent autograph', and that sufficient material survived to make a musicologically tenable reconstruction possible, publication of the extant fragments of Bruckner's autograph score could be included in the GA; this in turn gave new legitimacy to the AF, and subsequently led to the decision to publish a 'Dokumentation des Fragments' in which the more 'speculative' supplementations required by the AF were stripped away, reducing the performing score to only that which could be directly validated from the surviving sources.

The question—does sufficient material for the Finale and sufficient information about Bruckner's intentions exist to justify a continuous completion?—can be decisively answered in the affirmative. It was Paul-Gilbert Langevin who first suggested that musicology had a responsibility not to leave this movement in an unperformable state (cf. §1.3.10). As we have seen, Bruckner left most of the movement in apparently definitive form, much of it fully elaborated, and the bulk of the movement, despite the depredations of his admirers, is still extant. While details may have subsequently been altered, Bruckner had clearly completed the essential compositional phase, "den eigentlichen Vorgang des Komponierens", of most and perhaps all of the movement. Given his rigorous working methods and approach to instrumentation, reconstructing his textures, even at those relatively few points where all documentary evidence fails, is not nearly as difficult as it probably would be with any other composer. This is due to the innumerable checks and balances used by Bruckner in composing. His metrical numbers and regular period structure, his use of prepared 16-m. bifols., the existence of numerous versions of the same bifols. (often with only minor structural variations), the rigorousness of the compositional techniques, the use of extended sequences and long-sustained textural layers (in which instrumental lines maintain the same textural function and motivic structure throughout entire periods), and above all the extraordinarily unified thematic and motivic structure of this movement all combine to create a 'Berechenbarkeit' about the Finale that is probably unmatched by any other work or composer.

So while, as we have seen, a 'documentation' of the surviving fragments which makes no compositional supplementations and adds to the surviving scoring only as much as can be substantiated from the surviving sources is a worthwhile and responsible way in which to approach the problem of presenting these fragments to the public, it appears all the more senseless to interrupt the flow of the music at points where, for instance, the essential structure of only a few intervening measures is construable and where so much information as to the intended orchestration of the movement can be ascertained, or to break off at the last surviving score bifolio when sks. for the coda and references to a concluding "Allelujah des zweiten Satzes" have been identified and many further clues, both documentary and analytical, exist as to the structure of the coda.

The AF draws on this rich body of knowledge; the DdF does not. However, while the differing methodologies of DdF and AF in principle respect such a distinction, an absolute dividing line cannot be drawn between information supplied 'directly' by the sources and the further inferences that can be drawn from that information. Valuable insights about this music and about Bruckner's style in general can be gained by attempting to bridge the few remaining gaps in the movement's continuity, integrate the surviving sources for the coda into a conclusion of sufficient structural weight, and complete the overall instrumentation of the work in a manner sufficient to permit an overall impression of the composer's intentions. Such an impression is difficult if not impossible for any listener to gain using the discontinuous and essentially 'pedagogic' DdF, which was never intended to supply a suitable Finale to the first three movements, or to function as the Finale was intended to do in normal concert hall performance; so far the DdF has been used only as it was originally intended, namely as an interesting preliminary 'workshop' to performances of the first three movements or to performances of the symphony concluding with the Finale AF (see §3.4.11). Performed alone, as critical response showed (§3.4.12), the DdF falls short of providing audiences or critics with an aural experience from which any sort of overall impression of the symphony's thematic unity or intended 'shape' might emerge. Such impressions, which for the average listener and critic are of far greater importance than the precise degree of authenticity of this or that measure, are only perceptible when the Finale can be heard in its intended context—that is, following the first three movements. It is for this reason that a performing version of the Finale—as accurately and reliably founded on the sources as possible, of course—constitutes a legitimate musicological exercise and a significant contribution to the literature, and why it represents in many respects the apex of attempts to evaluate the surviving sources, and how best to solve the problem of their use.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Paradigmatic for the older perspective of some musicologists in this regard was Nowak's statement to the author, at his meeting with him in May 1991, that this music should not be brought to audiences in performance; audiences should learn to read music.

### 3.3.1 Concerning the Aufführungsfassung

The Performing Version of the Finale, or to use its full title, *Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen: Aufführungsfassung*, emerged as the result of a series of collaborations by Samale with Mazzuca, Cohrs and the author between 1983 and 1991, the final text the result of a close collaboration between Samale and the author throughout 1990 and 1991. It was premiered by the Bruckner Orchester Linz under Manfred Mayrhofer in Linz in December 1991 and published by the author with Cohrs' assistance in 1992 and again, with minor revisions, in 1996. The score is regarded by its authors as essentially definitive in terms of its continuity and its use of the available sources (unless, of course, any missing material were to re-emerge), although details continue to undergo refinement over time—a further revision is planned for 2002.

The AF comprises a total of 687 mm.; 164 mm. occur precisely as Bruckner scored them. The original material of a further c. 280 mm. ranges from virtually completed instrumental textures, through complete string scoring with varying degrees of indications for the winds (by far the greatest extent), down to the text of SVE bifols., where only one or two systems were notated. The reconstruction and supplementation of the remaining 243 mm. is based, in the first place, on the pc. sks. and on considerations such as bifol. length and apparent structure, comparison between the Exp. and the Repr. etc. Of these 243, no more than c. 82 mm. are not directly based on, or reconstructed from, autograph underlays of some kind, and even these measures, as will be seen, rely on relatively obvious extrapolations of the material, most often by *Reihung* or sequence, rather than any sort of 'free composition'; none make recourse to any kind of material not readily derived from the sources.<sup>4</sup> The 'Analogverfahren' already employed by Samale and Mazzuca in their *Ricostruzione* exploited the extent to which Bruckner used recurrent compositional and instrumental 'models' in many of his works, and compares incompletely scored passages in the score with the composer's realisation of analogous passages in other movements or works. Bruckner's works contain innumerable instances of recurrent melodic and textural topoi; the Ninth was proceeded by the similar structural schemes, but also the increasingly consistent orchestral

---

<sup>4</sup> The total of 82 mm. is far from definitive, since a question of degree is involved; nonetheless it is based on the following figures: 8 mm. (remainder of bifol. [14/"15"]); cf. E//67f., F/37f.) + 7 ([19/"20"]; cf. E/85ff., F/47ff.: the extent of sequence involved in the reconstruction reduces this figure to 3 or 4 mm., as the first 3 mm. of the 6-m. sequence exists on 18D/"19") + 4 (the last 4 mm. of bifol. [27/"28"], cf. E/120, F/69) + 14 (last mm. of [32/"33"]; cf. E/136, F/79ff.) + 4 (last 4 mm. preceding the *Themenüberlagerung*, cf. E/138) + 12 (the *Themenüberlagerung* itself, for which no surviving sources exist, although *Adagio* and first-movement themes are overlaid here in their entirety) + 4 (continuation of the lyrical *Steigerung*, cf. E/139, F/90) + 29 (concluding "Allelujah", cf. E/142, F/94) = 82. The reconstruction of the Exp. *Gesangsp.* (E/17ff., F/11ff.), although not included here, is to some extent speculative, but remains the best hypothesis available to us given the surviving material; the same applies to the reconstruction of [30/"31"] by precise inversion of the chorale (E/129ff.; F/74ff.). The continuity of [32/"33"] was also drawn directly from the sources in a sense, but was included in the figure of 82 mm. as not enough information is definitively known about the passage; the next textual underlay is represented by the 3194/3 sk. on the hypothetical [33/"34"]. See the ensuing critical commentary, §3.3.6.

models, of ten works of the same genre, a symphonic corpus perhaps more consistently written, unified and closely related than any other. As Grasberger acknowledged,<sup>5</sup> Bruckner appears to have understood his works as a highly integrated unity, interwoven by a network of thematic allusions and links, culminating in the Ninth and its Finale, which may be seen as the 'keystone' of this 'symphonic edifice'.<sup>6</sup> An awareness of this fact was combined in the preparation of the AF with a more rigorous understanding and application of the role played by the Mutationsverfahren in Bruckner's construction of texture, structural transition, motivic imitation, contrapuntal combination etc., which confirmed the painstaking motivic detail with which Bruckner was concerned. Use of both Analog- and Mutationsverfahren thus served to enhance the unity and 'stylistic purity' of the material used in the AF; it safeguarded against the introduction of foreign materials, for instance, in the form of added 'free' counterpoint. By penetrating more deeply into the nature of the musical material in this way, just as, it seems, the composer did, it became possible to build or to fill out textures in much the same way as the composer might have done. The editorial process in this respect became one of following the leadings of the material itself, aptly summed up by Gülke in Goethe's words as that "zarte Empirie, die sich mit dem Gegenstande innigst identisch macht".<sup>7</sup>

### 3.3.2 Editorial principles.<sup>8</sup>

The AF was initially envisioned for publication both as a study score of the performing version as well as an orthographically accurate transcription of the autograph, in which the provenance of the musical text was to be indicated by three differing sizes of musical text (as explained in §3.4.7, i. original score, ii. sk., iii. editorial addition). This plan was ultimately rejected as unworkable, but also unnecessary, given that the AP in effect provides the first two layers and does so in a far more detailed manner than would have been possible in a performing score. The DdF, as we have seen, does distinguish typographically between autograph (score and sketch) and editorial supplementation, and discreetly lists the sources used in small print underneath the text. Ideally, the text of the AF presented here, should have employed a similar differentiation,<sup>9</sup> but as it stands retains a certain legitimacy as representing

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. §1.1.1.

<sup>6</sup> Hans Pfitzner's disdainful remark, that Bruckner composed the same Symphony nine times, contains a grain of truth; more to the point, as Blume wrote, is that "Bruckners Symphonien [...] wirken wie neun von Stufe zu Stufe immer weiter ausgreifende, kraftvollere, überzeugendere, immer eindringlicher und packender werdende Lösungen eines einmal gestellten Problems" ("Anton Bruckner", *MGG*, col. 368).

<sup>7</sup> Used more generally by Gülke concerning the requisite approach to understanding Bruckner's music, it was applied specifically to the problem of completing the Finale in Gülke's introductory speech to the premiere of the Samale/Mazzuca reconstruction, Berliner Werkstattkonzert, 18 Feb. 1986 (see §1.4.14; broadcast tape courtesy of Gülke).

<sup>8</sup> As in ch. 3.2, the following §§3.3.2–3.3.5 have been expanded from the original Foreword to the score.

<sup>9</sup> The relevant musical examples, Exx. 3, 4, 6, 7 etc., do distinguish between original and supplemented text, however.

a more or less ‘ideal’ form of the movement, in which the very avoidance of typographical distinctions between original text and editorial supplementation or indications of sources within the musical text itself contributes to the impression of stylistic similitude this score was intended to achieve.<sup>10</sup> Despite the subsequent decision to publish the reconstruction of Bruckner’s autograph score separately from that of the AF, two significant features of the original concept were retained, in part for technical reasons. These include:

- i. Musical orthography: Bruckner’s distinctive and uniquely personal musical handwriting in the Finale—essentially, one accidental per pitch per measure, regardless of key signature (although many exceptions exist)—has been retained as an editorial principle for Bruckner’s surviving text as well as for the compositional and instrumental supplementations. This was in accord with the editorial practice of Orel’s publication of the first three movements of the Ninth Symphony in 1934, which was maintained by Nowak in his edition of 1951. In line with the orthography of the new edition of the first three movements and the DdF, the next edition of the AF, forthcoming in 2002, will return to standard modern orthographic practice.
- ii. Bruckner’s metrical numbers have likewise been retained, by virtue of the crucial role played by them in Bruckner’s compositional method, including those several points at which variant numberings of periods occur. Where missing numbering has been supplemented, or alternatives to Bruckner’s numbering been given, these additional figures have been enclosed in brackets [ ]; comparison with the AP and facsimiles provides further information. Bruckner’s numbering-through of measures within whole formal sections above or below the score, along with the numerous marginalia, indications of harmonic change, directives concerning voice-leading, etc., has been omitted. The rehearsal letters and measure numbers are entirely editorial additions.

The *Ricostruzione* (1989) of Samale and Mazzuca which preceded the AF was discussed in §1.4.14 and summarised in Table V, Significant Versions of the Finale, 1940–1988, part 3; the emergence of the AF from this earlier score is recounted in §3.4.1. Table XV, Sources Used in the Aufführungsfassung (A/44ff.), provides an overview of the main source materials used for the reconstruction of each bifol., a structure which has been followed in the critical commentary on the score, §3.3.6 *infra*; the table lists library signature, position in the Orel edition, number of mm., and metrical figures, as well as reference to the degree of instrumental completion in the case of the score bifolds. Table XVI, Formal Overview of the

---

<sup>10</sup> This is an important point, since any number of aspects of Bruckner’s scoring could be ‘improved’ from the standpoint of modern-day practice—as they were in Bruckner’s time.



Aufführungsfassung (A/47), provides a summary of the thematic and formal structure of the movement as realised in the AF. While, in principal, chs. 3.2 and 3.3 were intended as separate modules (this applies particularly to the sections dealing with editorial principles, §§3.3.3–3.3.5), an identical structure and layout was used to facilitate cross-reference. While the critical commentary on the AF, §3.3.6, refers back wherever possible to that on the DdF in §3.2.6, a certain amount of replication was inevitable, since the DdF was derived from the AF; in most cases, §3.3.6 supplies more information. Here, even more than in ch. 3.2, however, a critical report exhaustively justifying every single note, dynamic and articulation of the score together with every single factor considered by the authors in their choice would have constituted a thesis in itself; commentary accordingly has been limited to an explanation of the reconstruction of the more essential elements and editorial supplementations.

### 3.3.3 General critical remarks.

The intention of the score of the AF reproduced in section G of volume II is to present the surviving fragments of the Finale as faithfully as possible in a continuous, performable concert version, with the fewest editorial additions necessary for the realisation of that end. The guiding editorial principle of the authors was to present a score conforming as closely as possible to an 'ideal form' in which Bruckner might have left the autograph had he lived to see its completion, inclusive of such details as characteristic articulation and bowing.

First, in regard to the reconstruction of the surviving sources themselves, as we have seen, the pc. sks. which preceded the notation of the Finale score provide in many cases the complete musical continuity of missing bifols., confirmed by the nature of Bruckner's Bogenverfahren, his use of bifols. prepared in almost all cases with 16 mm. Several SVE, the working out of which Bruckner never realised, provide the actual continuity of apparent 'gaps', e.g. bifol. "13a"E, or represent transitional forms which permit us to glimpse the direction of his revisions where final versions of the mm. in question have not survived, e.g. bifol. "#D or the numerous ruling-D or -E SVE for bifol. 1. Because the emergent AP of the Finale was intended to be definitive, Bruckner often discarded bifols., sometimes apparently due only to factors of neatness and legibility. Further factors include Bruckner's metrical numbering (which extends to virtually every m. of his sks. and score), the numbering-through of mm. of whole sections (e.g. the fugue and chorale Repr.), information provided by comparison of parallel points in the score (e.g. between the Gesangsp. in the Exp. and that in the Repr.) and analysis of the context and structural characteristics surrounding the missing passages, as well as references to the 'vi-de' markings.

Second, the completion of appropriate orchestral textures was achieved primarily through application of the Analogverfahren, comparing surviving passages of the Finale with similar passages in completed scores, and yielded consistent and useful results in supplementing instrumental texture, the provision of suitable tempi, phrasing, dynamics and articulation. Further insights into the reconstruction and/or supplementation of missing

compositional textures were gleaned from an analysis of Bruckner's Mutationsverfahren. Along with the analytical insights produced by an exhaustive study of the Finale materials themselves, many clues, particularly concerning the coda, were supplied by other movements of the Ninth or other works of Bruckner's, as well as statements by the composer or his biographers. Such insights gain in importance when one considers the rigorous nature of Bruckner's compositional processes. Concerning the reconstruction of the period structure of missing bifols., it can be noted that the 8-m. period takes on an increasingly dominant role in Bruckner's late style; as we have seen (§2.1.5), there are remarkably few departures from it in the first movement, Scherzo or Adagio, and even fewer in the surviving material of the Finale. In many cases the metrical structure of a missing 16-m. section can be established from the metrical underlay of the previous and following bifol.; many features follow from this, particularly where, as in most cases, the beginnings and ending of periods do not coincide with the beginnings and endings of bifols.

Comparison of the finished passages of the score with the sks., for instance those for the Gesangsp., reveal that Bruckner had already achieved most of the 'creative details' of the score, much of which only required carefully considered application of the Mutationsverfahren in order to complete textures. This does not, of course, mean that Bruckner would have done this in precisely the same way; doubtless Bruckner's textural solutions would have been more inspired and daring, less careful and structured than those of the AF. However, given sufficient knowledge of Bruckner's instrumentation, harmony, voice-leading and counterpoint, and an understanding of their application in his late works, it is possible to achieve sufficiently convincing textural mimicry without introducing autonomous material; it is precisely the rigorous logic of Bruckner's contrapuntal textures that makes such textual completion possible. Bruckner's material in the Finale tends to enter increasingly into contrapuntal dialogue with itself as well as with other motives or themes, often introduced from other movements or works—a process of increasing thematic integration and self-quotation which would have culminated in the Themenüberlagerung and Allelujah of the coda. Comparison of related passages in the fully orchestrated parts of the Finale and the first three movements of the Ninth as well as other works of the late period, particularly *Helgoland* and the Psalm 150, prove instructive in this regard.

Concerning instrumentation and density of texture, the fully scored sections of the Finale reveal that Bruckner eschewed mere textural elaboration and depth of sound in favour of dynamic, dramatic contrasts ranging over a doubtless intentionally 'paranormal' spectrum, from the Herculean mass of the Hauptth. and chorale to the desolate asperity of the beginning of the Gesangsp. As opposed to their far more economical handling in the Adagio, Bruckner gives the four Wagner tubas a significant role from the outset, their first entry (marked by Bruckner "Gesang aus Thema", E/8), prefiguring the Hauptth. A change to 5th–8th hrns. (E/35) enhances the radiant sound character of the chorale and appears to have been intended to be maintained in the scored-out sections of the Durchf. (E/61) and fugue (cf. E/81,

C[orni]", E/89f.). A return to the darker colour of the tbas. was intended for the epilogue of the fugue (E/90, "Tb."). Although the movement most likely would have ended with the solemn weight that only these instruments can provide, the reappearance of the chorale in the Repr. (E/124), analogue to the Exp., would probably have called for a further change to 5th–8th hrns.

Bruckner appears to have seen, in the provision of tempi, dynamics, phrasing and articulation, the final touches to a score which for him was apparently already "fertig" with the completion of the essential musical text. Discussion of the editorial supplementation of these parameters follows.

### 3.3.4 The question of tempi.

While Bruckner clearly regarded such markings as finishing touches, the few but very significant tempo changes Bruckner left in the score and sks. indicate, like other late works of Bruckner, how soberly and rigorously Bruckner proceeded in their selection. As Halbreich observed,<sup>11</sup> one of the main principles behind Bruckner's tempo markings must have been that the same music, for instance a thematic quote from another movement or another section of the same movement, is intended to share the same tempo. Whether or not drafted by Bruckner, the Themenüberlagerung in the coda (AF/86f.; cf. Ex. 16; discussion *infra*) therefore functions as a kind of key to the principal tempi for the whole symphony. The combination of the principal theme of the Finale in its fugal form (marked by Bruckner *Bedeutend langsamer*) with that of the first movement would suggest that the opening (principal) tempo of the Finale was conceived as somewhat faster than that of the first movement, although the Finale returns to a slower tempo at some points, and was probably intended to conclude in this more 'feierlich' tempo. The minim of the first movement and that of the fugue of the Finale must therefore be roughly the same; both correspond to the dotted minim of the Scherzo which, as Cohrs has shown, was prepared by Bruckner in the crotchet triplets in the coda of the first movement.<sup>12</sup> The double augmentation of the Adagio theme in the Themenüberlagerung cannot be regarded as an absolute; a more appropriate correspondence would align the minim of the first movement with the crotchet, rather than the quaver, of the Adagio.<sup>13</sup> Compositionally integral modifications of tempo do appear to have been indicated from an early stage by Bruckner: the striking "acell./ dim." marked 4 mm.

<sup>11</sup> "Verlangt Bruckner ein einheitliches Tempo?", *BrJb* 1981, p. 202.

<sup>12</sup> *IX. Symphonie D-moll, Kritischer Bericht* (2001) p. 76. The triplet crotchets in cb. and vlc. from letter Y of the coda of IX/1 were originally resumed after the cadence at m. 551 and extended to the last m. of the movement. Followed by the insistent *pizzicato* of the 2nd vlms. at the outset of the Scherzo they would have created an unmistakable bridge between the two movements. Concerning the Trio, two mm. should equal to one of the Scherzo.

<sup>13</sup> Significant for this also is Cohrs' discovery of a faintly pencilled "bewegter" at m. 239 of the Adagio in the AP of the Ninth (*ibid.*, p. 199f.; Bruckner GA, Band IX, ed. Cohrs, note 111).

before the entry of the Hauptth. on bifol. 2F (C/133; cf. E/10, F/6<sup>14</sup>), “rit.” (E/29; cf. F/16), “langs[amer]” (E/71; cf. F/39) and “Sehr langs[am]” (E/75; cf. F/42). On the first score version of the Exp. of the fugue, bifol. 17C (C/261), can be found “Bedeutend langsamer” (cf. E/77, F/43), while on the 2nd version of the bifol., 17F, which attempts a considerably more complex counterpoint, is found **C** and “4/4” (C/265). This points up a second significant aspect of Bruckner’s approach to the designation of tempo, namely that Bruckner often slows the tempo when introducing smaller note values.

The sources for the other movements of the Ninth reveal that overall tempo markings first appear in the final AP; even principal tempi, apparently, were only added at a late stage. An overall tempo marking for the Finale does not appear on any of the surviving versions of bifol. 1; it may well have appeared on a lost source. *Das Deutsche Lied* begins with a similar motivic design to that of the Hauptth. of the Finale, suggesting its tempo marking *Nicht schnell, feierlich* (see score, C/345), but, considering the tempo marking of the first movement of the Ninth, *Feierlich; Misterioso* as well as the darker, more mysterious character of the Finale, the editors of the AF opted for a compromise between these two designations, namely *Misterioso, nicht schnell*. By virtue of the unbroken musical continuity between the passages in question, the same tempo must be maintained for the introduction, Hauptth. and chorale, as well as for the ‘horn theme’ which emerges following the fugue. The Gesangsp. here, as in the Finale of the Eighth, has been allotted a tempo modification, *Langsamer*; its middle section, termed “Trio” in the sks., again by analogy with the Eighth, *Noch langsamer*.<sup>15</sup> This is consistent with Bruckner’s marking “langs[amer]” in the Durchf. on bifol. 15D/“6” (E/71), just prior to material which first appears in the Exp. (E/72) as well as with the addition of the ‘lyrical counterpoint’ (E/74; cf. Exp., E/22f.). The subsequent “Trio” section from letter D uses smaller note values and even more elaborate counterpoint (cf. the 6086 sk., C/33f.), confirming the further relaxation of tempo here. The juxtaposition of chorale, Te Deum motive and introductory thematic material at the end of the Exp. and beginning of the Durchf. reveals that these three elements must also share the same tempo. The autograph “langs” (‘langsam’, or more likely ‘langsamer’) at m. 289 (E/71) must obviously continue into the next section from m. 291 which, as earlier drafts for this section reveal (C/251f.), is derived from the material of the Gesangsp.; the following likewise autograph marking, “Sehr langs[am]” at m. 305 (E/75) is only meaningful as a modification of a foregoing *langsamer*. Bruckner’s modification here may again be linked with the use of semiquavers in the following mm.; the abruptness of this Steigerung has been underlined by the addition of an *accel sempre*. As noted, the fugue at letter M has been marked *Bedeutend langsamer*.

<sup>14</sup> Previous to the composition of 2F, Bruckner had intended to slow before the Hauptth.: cf. bifol. 2<sup>a</sup>C, C/109, “langs[amer]” (top), “rit” (above 1st vln.), “a tempo” (top).

<sup>15</sup> As Halbreich (p. 192) suggested, such tempo modifications within the same movement should not exceed 15 percent of the principal tempo.

The remaining tempo markings, where not determined by comparison with the Exp., have similarly been supplemented by analogy. Letter Q is therefore “Langsamer”, as at C; the 4-m. quotation of the chorale theme in the Gesangsp. Repr. (mm. 455ff.) suggested a further temporary modification, *Sehr langsam*, returning to the Gesangsp. tempo at 459. What has been referred to as the ‘Gregorian theme’ (letter S), possibly a reference to the third theme of III/1 as well as to the Easter hymn *Christ ist erstanden* (cf., as mentioned, Ex. 11b; discussion in §3.3.6), was understood as representing a return to the principal tempo, justified by the recurrence of the triplets after letter T (cf. Exp., letter G) and which continues unaltered throughout the chorale Repr. A brief *accelerando* has thus been added prior to letter S, returning to the Gesangsp. tempo *Langsamer* 4 mm. later; at 475 a longer *stringendo poco a poco* prepares the conclusive return to the *Erstes Zeitmaß* at letter T; this is modelled on Bruckner’s use of the same marking in VIII(1890)/4, m. 527.

With regard to the tempo of the so-called horn theme at letters P and V, a discrepancy obtains which the authors have allowed to stand: letter P is, at least, nominally still in the tempo of the fugue (*Bedeutend langsamer*) while letter V is the principal tempo (a similar paradox can be found, for instance, in VI/1). The interpreter is hence at liberty either to let this theme appear in two different tempi or to hasten during the long *Steigerung* prior to letter P. The *fermate* at mm. 136, 290/1 and 310/11 are all original and represent, as in VI/4 (mm. 370–1), short but structurally decisive *caesure*. The *fermate* at mm. 578/9 and 650/1 have been added by analogy. The one departure from  $\text{♩}$  to  $\text{♩}$  which occurs at the beginning of the coda (letter W) is given in the pc. sk. (C/6); the ensuing *Themenüberlagerung* returns to  $\text{♩}$ .

The *Themenüberlagerung* (letter X), which may or may not have been drafted by Bruckner, is of particular significance in respect to the question of a specific tempo for the movement, since ideally each theme should retain its appropriate tempo. The combination of the principal theme of the Finale in its fugal form (*Bedeutend langsamer*) with the first movement and Scherzo (the double augmentation of the Adagio is admittedly not to be interpreted literally) tends to confirm that the opening or principal tempo of the Finale was conceived as somewhat faster than that of the first movement, and that it returns to the slower tempo in some passages.

By analogy with Bruckner’s own metronome markings in the somewhat faster Finale of the Eighth Symphony, the tempi can be given as: I: minim = c. 60 (principal tempo, tempo of the chorale, *Erstes Zeitmaß*), and II: minim = c. 56 (the *Langsamer* of the Gesangsp., the *Bedeutend langsamer* of the fugue, *Sehr feierlich* in the coda). The remaining tempi—*Noch langsamer* (mm. 107, 433), *Sehr langsam* (mm. 305, 455) and *Ruhig* (m. 579), are all to be interpreted as somewhat slower than *Tempo II*. The *a tempo* indications at mm. 121, 447 and 469 all signify a return to *Tempo II*.

### 3.3.5 Further supplementations

Concerning the formulation of appropriate dynamics, phrasing and articulation, even less information is provided by the MSS; these parameters have, again, been established largely by analogy with other works, principally the first three movements of the Ninth. Phrasing is only rarely indicated in the autographs, such as for the hrns. at m. 182 or for the Te Deum motive at mm. 279–80. Even ties were often overlooked by Bruckner during the initial compositional phase, e. g. just prior to letter H; at mm. 175–6 (cf. E/430 and again in the 1st trp. at mm. 515–6 (E/126), however, it was decided that the exclusion of ties in hrns. and trps. was intentional, suggesting a phrasing of 7 + 9 mm. for the first period of the chorale; this is perhaps confirmed by Bruckner's placement of a *dim.* at m. 516 (cf. C/314; E/126). The latter, together with the striking *accel.* and *dim.* at m. 39 (C/133; E/10), the (probable) *dim.* of m. 114 (sk., C/34, top), the *p* of m. 145 (C/183; E/35, m. 3, cb.) and the *f* of m. 291 (C/252; E/72, strings) constitute the only dynamic markings in the entire surviving material. However, in most cases dynamic supplementations constituted fairly obvious inferences from the existing extent or design of the scoring or the structural nature of the passage in question (Steigerung, climax, Abbau etc.). Characteristic of Bruckner's practice and a clue to the forceful nature of his style is his use of *cresc. sempre* to signify a powerful *cresc.*, often an intensification of a preceding *cresc.* or *cresc. poco a poco* (cf. IX/1, mm. 43ff., 58ff., 139, 203, 242), as well as his use of often sustained dynamic extremes, particularly *ff* and *fff*.

In contrast to these largely supplemented parameters, all indications of *pizzicato* and *arco* are original, likewise the downbows and heavy wedge accents (^) of the Hauptth., mm. 43 and 47 (E/11, 12). The articulation and bowing of the opening motive is based on an analogous passage in VIII/4 (*q.v.*, from letter Hh onwards); this is confirmed by three > accents written on a mutation of the phrase in the 1st ob. on bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C (E/4). All > accents, both in this motive and where occurring at phrase ends (as at letters P and V), are to be understood as long. Several > accents which Bruckner wrote in the chorale (as, for instance, at letter H; cf. E/48) have been altered into ^ for the sake of consistency. As elsewhere in Bruckner and here particularly in the chorale (letters G, U and Y), all ^ accents in the winds may be regarded as breath accents and need not be individually tongued; as passages such as the opening horn theme in IX/1, mm. 18ff, there can have been no essential differentiation in articulation between ^ and >; ^s tend simply to be reserved for longer notes (minims or semibreves), therefore carrying greater weight, >s for shorter. Final notes of phrases tend not to carry articulations. The *Strich für Strich* bowing given to the strings throughout the introductory and Hauptth. passages has been contrasted with legato bowing throughout the Gesangsp., a distinction observed generally in passages derived from either material.

Reference to the supplementation of phrasing and articulation has largely been omitted in the ensuing commentary for reasons of space; given the highly unified motivic structure of the movement it can be based on largely self-evident application of the above principles.

### 3.3.6 Critical commentary.

**G/mm. 1–16** Reconstruction of a non-extant, 16-m. bifol. [1E]

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1-[2–8]; 1–2; 1–2-

*Sources:*

1) Bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C, ÖNB 13.150; cf. AP E/1ff., Facs. C/67ff., DdF F/1ff.

*Length:* 24 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1–8; 1–8; 1–2; 1–2-

2) SVE 1<sup>e</sup>E, ÖNB 6085/63–64; cf. AP E/1ff., Facs. C/95

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–6-[7–8]; 1–3-[4; 1–2; 1–2-]

3) Pc. sks. ÖNB 3194/1<sup>r</sup>, Facs. C/3, and 6086/1<sup>r</sup>, Facs. C/31<sup>16</sup>

See §3.2.6.<sup>17</sup> Even if the numerous SVEs of Rulings D and E or the discrepancies between the scoring of 1<sup>d</sup>C and the beginning of 2E did not exist, bifol. 1<sup>d</sup>C could not be accepted into a definitive version of the score without reservations. How intensively Bruckner wrestled with the beginning of the movement is revealed by the fact that considerably more SVE for this portion of the score survive than for any other, while 1<sup>d</sup>C is almost completely covered with crossings-out, metrical corrections and annotations, although it is not possible to establish any apparent revised text from them. The beginnings of bifols. 2F and “2”E moreover show clearly—cf. the sustained chord in the brass on 1<sup>d</sup>C and its absence on “2”E—that both must have followed a differently scored version of bifol. 1.

The link with 2F and “2”E, as well as the many surviving D- and E-ruling SVE for bifol. 1, permit certain conclusions concerning the appearance of a later version, which has been reconstructed here as a hypothetical [1E]. The continual reworking of the metrical numbers on the D versions (see particularly C/71ff.) shows how important it was to Bruckner to arrive at a clear metrical structure for the beginning of the movement. The opening mm. of the C-ruling versions (C/57ff., cf. Orel D/81, 85, 89) are divided into 4 + 8 + 8, although the two 8-m. periods are more correctly grouped 12 + 4,

<sup>16</sup> Specifications of length and metrical structure have been omitted where not significant.

<sup>17</sup> When comparing the commentary on the DdF the reader is requested to refer to the relevant bifol., rather than the equivalent m. numbers; as explained above (§3.2.2), they correspond only between mm. 277 and 342 of the two scores.

as mm. 5–8 of the second period contain a quote-like allusion to the Adagio (cf. mm. 73f. thereof) not included in the original pc. sks. for the Finale nor on bifol. 1A; Bruckner first introduced it in work phase 2. In almost all the subsequent SVE these mm. are absent.<sup>18</sup> The deletion of the 4-m. Adagio quotation may have related to the reduction of the wind scoring in the last 4 mm. of the bifol.

Finally, as we have seen, the reduction of bifol. 1 from 24 to 16 mm. may be confirmed by figures found in the r. margin of the final p. of bifol. “2”E (C/138; E/8): “50”, “18” and further down “18” again.  $50 - 18 = 32$  ( $16 \times 2$ ), so that, if these figures can be construed as having to do with the lengths of the first bifol. of the score by this time,<sup>19</sup> given that the length of bifols. “2”E and “3”E are 18 and 16 mm. respectively, bifol. 1 may have been only 16 m. long. The reduction in length and regularisation of the metrical structure would have been readily achieved by omitting the 4-m. allusion to the Adagio and shortening the 12 mm. of the initial tritone sequence to 8 by elision of the repetitions of the 1st and 2nd phrases; this procedure seems closest to that suggested by bifol. 1<sup>e</sup>E (AP E/1ff.). The metrical structure of the [1E] reconstructed here is therefore: 4 mm. (timp. *trem.*) + 8 mm. (tritone sequence) + 2 + 2 mm. (sustained B $\flat$ -major  $\frac{6}{3}$  chord and beginning of the ensuing *Steigerung*).

The decision was also made to return in the AF to the original pitch of the timpani tremolo, A, as given in the early sks. (cf. C/3 and 31) and bifol. 1A (C/53). G is first found on 1<sup>c</sup>C (cf. C/63); the intervening bifols. 1<sup>a</sup>C and 1<sup>b</sup>C make no reference whatsoever to the timp. *tremolo*, as if Bruckner was at that stage unsure of the pitch. A question mark pencilled just above the timp. entry on the 1st p. of 1<sup>d</sup>C is just visible in the Faksimile-Ausgabe reproduction of this p. (cf. C/67), but what it referred to seems to have been lost; most likely it was a reference to the pitch of the timp. There appears to have been no compelling structural reason why Bruckner altered the pitch to G, although the G may have subsequently served to signpost conclusion of the movement with the C major *Te Deum*, as we have noted. It can only be assumed that Bruckner here ameliorated the startling dissonance and tonal ambiguity of his original conception as too harmonically advanced for audiences of his time—reasons which no longer exist today. The timp. was

<sup>18</sup> Only on SVE 1b<sup>d</sup>E (cf. C/104) can apparent reference to these mm. be found; the interpretation of the later E-ruling SVE is, however, highly debatable.

<sup>19</sup> Similar annotations recur at several points in the MSS; cf. for instance E/4, 37, 38, 43.



marked *pp*, the remaining instruments *p*; at m. 15 a *cresc.* was added. Concerning the note values in the 1st clar., mm. 5–12, see §3.2.6.

**G/mm. 17–34** *Source:* bifol. “2”E, Hochschule; cf. AP E/5ff., Facs. C/135ff., DdF F/3ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–4; 1–8; 1–4; 1–4-

Both “2”- and “3E reveal completed instrumentation inclusive of whole-m. rests. Unlike the DdF, no alterations were needed to the wind scoring of mm. 17–18 to bring them into line with that of 1<sup>d</sup>C, although, as in the DdF, ties apparently overlooked by Bruckner as well as a *tremolo* marking in the cb. were added here. Letter A would surely have been intended to be *f* with an ongoing *cresc. poco a poco*, reinforced by a *cresc. sempre* at m. 31. The dotted motive from m. 27 in the woodwind and hrns. was marked *marcato*, *gestrichen* in the vlms.; the tbas. alone are marked *ff marcato* at their entry at m. 31.

**G/mm. 35–50** *Source:* bifol. “3”E, ÖNB 6087/5–6; cf. AP E/9ff., Facs. C/139ff., DdF F/6ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–12; 1–8-

Concerning the supplementation of tempo and other markings at mm. 39 and 43, see the preceding paragraph as well as §3.2.6. As in the DdF, *fff* and *marcato sempre* or *gestrichen* was added at letter B, intensifying the articulation of the Hauptth.

**G/mm. 51–66** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [“4”]; cf. AP E/13ff., DdF F/9ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -9–10-[11–12; 1–4]; 1–8;

*Sources:* last 2 mm. of bifol. 2F, ÖNB 19.645/2<sup>v</sup>; AP E/12, Facs. C/134

*As well as:* 1st 14 mm. of bifol. 3A, ÖNB 6087/3–4; AP E/13ff., Facs. C/143ff.

See §3.2.6. As noted in regard to the DdF, the concluding 8 mm. of “3”E and last 10 mm. of 2F provide many clues as to how the instrumentation from m. 51 onwards may be systematically completed. The derivation of the trps. in mm. 55–59 from the foregoing fanfare is also a more stepwise

mutation in the later DdF (cf. F/9f.), than in the 1996 score reproduced here.<sup>20</sup> At m. 59 *f* was added (*mf* in the trombs.), subsequently *dim.* and *dim. sempre.*

**G/mm. 67–82** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [“5a”]; cf. AP E/17ff., DdF F/11f.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–2; [1–2]–6–

*Sources:* bifol. 3A, the last 2 mm. (*see above*),

*As well as:* bifol. 4C/“5”, ÖNB 6087/9–10; cf. AP E/17ff., Facs. C/151ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–2; 1–8<sup>21</sup>

We have already discussed (§3.2.6) the reconstruction of Bruckner’s apparent expansion and metrical regularisation of the structure of the Gesangsp., which takes into account the 2-m. discrepancy between the end of “3”E and that of 2F, and the likelihood that the alteration had to do with shifting and expanding the continuity of bifol. 4C so that it would have adjoined bifol. “#”D, and that the last 4 mm. of “#”D probably expanded backwards the first 4 mm. of 5B. The result would have been a longer and more regular metrical structure than the Gesangsp. had possessed up to that point (cf. AP E/21ff., Ex. 4):<sup>22</sup>

Mm.	Bifolio	Metrical nos.	Length	Section
67–82	[“5a”]	1–8	8 mm.	End of transition from the principal group, <i>pp</i>
		1–2	2 mm.+	Gesangsp. ostinato motive in the 1st vln. alone, <i>p</i>
		[1–2]-3–6–	6 mm.	Gesangsp. ostinato 3x, adding 2nd vln., vla.; last 2 mm. <i>pp</i>
83–98	[“5b”]	-7–10	4 mm.	Descending chromatic transition in strings, <i>pp, cresc. sempre</i>
		[1–2]	2 mm. +	Gesangsp. motive continues in 2nd vln. alone, <i>p</i>
		1–6	6 mm.	Gesangsp. motive 3x in 2nd vln.; adding vla., vlc., with lyrical counterpoint in 1sts., <i>p</i> , last 2 mm. <i>pp</i>

<sup>20</sup> This is one of a number of aspects of the 1996 score of the AF earmarked for reassessment in the 2002 edition. Also overlooked up till now is the significance of a *loco* marked in ink at the beginning of the Gesangsp. on both 4A and 4C (C/148, 152); cf. the pencilled *8va* indications above the 1st vlms. on 3A, C/143 and 144. As 3A must have been followed by a later, more fully scored version, and Bruckner was particularly scrupulous about such markings, the most reasonable inference is that, despite the further notations in their staves on C/145f., the vlms. remained silent throughout the entire Abbau passage following their descent to *b♭* at m. 59 of the AF.

<sup>21</sup> The metrical figures of bifol. 4C/“5” were corrected to match those of bifol. 4A. Cf. AP E/19, fn. 2.

<sup>22</sup> It would also have brought it to almost precisely the same length as the Gesangsp. in the Repr., namely 68 mm. (mm. 75–142), vs. 74 mm. (mm. 417–486; cf. Table XVI). See also the comparison made between Exp. and Repr. under the discussion of mm. 423–438, *infra*.

Mm.	Bifolio	Metrical nos.	Length	Section
		1–4–	4 mm.	Bruckner's annotation "G dur" suggesting an expansion backwards of the first 4 mm. of 5B, realised as <i>ff</i> and scored for <i>tutti</i> minus <i>tbas.</i> , 1st vln. <i>8va</i> ; thereafter <i>p</i> , <i>loco</i> for the first 4 mm. of [5/"6"] <sup>23</sup>
99–114	[5/"6"]	[-5–8– <sup>24</sup>	4 mm.	Original G major passage which prior to the expansion followed the descending chromatic transition (83–86) on 4C
		-9–12]	4 mm.	Ascending chromatic transition in woodwind, <i>pp</i> , <i>cresc.</i> <i>poco a poco</i>
		1–8	8 mm.	"Trio", continued on following bifol. [6/"7"]

As there is no indication from the sources that significant increases in musical density were intended to be made, Bruckner most likely used dynamic means to introduce contrast into the increased repetitions of the ostinato material that this expansion apparently entailed.<sup>25</sup> Little supplementation was required to make the passage musically convincing. The first 8 mm. of ["5a"] required virtually none, apart from obvious additions to the scoring indicated for the passage on 3A and the beginning of 4C/"5". Phrasing and *pp* were added at 67; letter C begins with legato bowing and phrasing, *p*, *gezogen* in the vlms., with the added 2 mm. 81f. marked *pp*.

**G/mm. 83–98** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. ["5b"]; cf. AP E/21ff., DdF F/13f.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–10; [1–2;] 1–6; 1–4–

*Sources:* SVE bifol. "#D, ÖNB 6085/9–10; cf. AP E/21ff., Facs. C/155ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–10; [1–2; 1–4]–5–6; 1–4

*As well as:* pc. sk. ÖNB 6086/2<sup>f</sup>, br. 4; AP E/22, Facs. C/33

*Length of section used:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4–

<sup>23</sup> Cf. the similar descent of the vlms. in the G major passage on 6<sup>c</sup>B, which thereby becomes a 4-m. reminiscence of the larger G major structure here. The identical structure can be found on the SVE 6A, C/168.

<sup>24</sup> Concerning the supplemented metrical figures from here on, see AP E/25, fn. 2.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. for example the static eleventh chords of the Adagio, mm. 17ff., vs. 21ff. thereof, which use a similar technique, likewise sliding chromatically down from F# to F<sup>b</sup> and subsequently to E, in a similar manner to the G major–F# major progression between mm. 95 and 107 of the AF. The ensuing progression from m. 121 reverses this sequence, ascending from F via G<sup>b</sup> back to G. It should be noted that Bruckner's approach in apparently creating a larger and more regular metrical structure here was fully in line with the late expansion of the Durchf. opening (see *infra*) as well as in accord with Bruckner's striking use of extended ostinato passages in the movement generally, and the vastly expanded conception of 'Leere' and 'Weite' already found in the Adagio.

See notes to preceding bifol. as well as §3.2.6. The musical text of the first 4 mm. is taken verbatim from 4C/“5”, adding only *pp*, phrasing and ties. *Cresc. sempre* has been added in m. 85, returning to *p* at the entry of the 2nd vln. at 87, whereupon the opening 8 mm. of the Gesangsp. are repeated with the addition of the lyrical counterpoint in the 1sts. (as from letter C, 6 mm. *p*, 2 mm. *pp*). Legato bowing and expressive dynamics were supplemented here in the 1sts; the third phrase added at mm. 93f. follows from the first two as the third iteration of a mutation sequence:



but is in fact borrowed from Bruckner’s own second phrase at the recurrence of the lyrical counterpoint in the Repr. (letter Q):



The realisation of Bruckner’s “G-Dur NB / NB”, apparently notated on “#”D 2 mm. too early, as we have seen, was probably to be construed as a *f* or *ff* version of the 1st 4 mm. of 5B. The kind of orchestral treatment required is suggested to an extent by the analogous *ff-pp* static chordal structures in the Adagio (mm. 17ff.), as well as by Bruckner’s scoring of the Exp. Hauptth. in IX/4. The full orchestra, apart from tbas. enters *ff*, 1st vln. and fls. taking the Gesangsp. ostinato at the octave, 2nd vlms., 1st trp. and 2nd–3rd obs. at pitch; 2nd–3rd trps. are allotted brief fanfares (cf. trps. at letter B). Held notes are added in 1st ob. and clars.; bsns., trombs. and cb. tba. double the lower strings. 1st–2nd hrns. continue their three-note accompaniment figure, 3rd–4th hrns. contribute a ‘1/2 später’ imitation of the Gesangsp. ostinato.

**G/mm. 99–114** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [5/“6”]; cf. AP E/25ff., DdF F/15ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [-5–12]; 1–8;

*Sources:* bifol. 5B, StB 3791/5–6; cf. AP E/25ff., Facs. C/163ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably [-5–12]; 1–8;

As well as: pc. sk. ÖNB 6086/2<sup>f</sup>, br. 6; AP E/27, Facs. C/33

Length of section used: 4 mm.

Metrical structure: 1–4–

See notes to the preceding bifol. and §3.2.6. The first 4 mm. of 5B apparently carried over onto [5C/“6”] became in effect, with the expansion of the Gesangsp., a *p* ‘echo’ of the preceding 4 mm.; the octave descent of the 1st vlms. parallels the later situation at mm. 129ff, where the ostinato in the 1st vlms. moves from  $g^3$  to  $g^2$  over 4 mm. The 1st ob. continues to double the 1st and 2nd vlms., the trombs. double the lower strings. The trp. fanfares are reduced to a brief remnant in the 2nd trp.; 1st hrn. alone continues the accompaniment motive but with an added tie. Mm. 103ff. are essentially as scored by Bruckner on 5B, with the addition of *pp cresc. poco a poco* and later *cresc. sempre*; a 3-note ‘lead-in’ has been added in the 1st ob., a stave perhaps left vacant on 5B for just such a purpose. This leads into the  $c\sharp^3$  indicated in the pc. sk. for the ensuing “Trio” passage (cf. E/27ff.). Concerning the tempo marking at letter D, cf. §3.2.4. The ensuing counterpoint in the 2nd vlms., doubled by 1st–2nd clar., is adapted from the 6086 sk. with the addition of an anticipatory crotchet in the 1st m. and quavers in the 4th m.:



The continuation in the 5th–6th mm. (taken by the 2nd–3rd clars.; the 2nd vln. changes function at m. 111) is borrowed from a counterpoint in an unused section of the 6086 sk. (C/34, 3rd bracket):



As noted in §3.2.6, the  $c\sharp^1/e^1$  on the last crotchet of m. 110 is also taken from 6086, here allotted to the 1st–2nd hrns. and bsns., where it allows the vlc. and vla. time to conclude the pedal-point function. Aside from this, the 2nd ob. doubles the 1st vln., the tbas. the lower strings (cf. the use of the tbas. at the structurally equivalent “noch langsamer” passage at letter F of VIII/4); the 1st hrn. imitates the added counterpoint a half-m. later. Legato phrasing and expressive dynamics have been used overall, mm. 107–110 *p*, with a *cresc.* to *f* at 111. Mm. 113f. have been realised as an echo, marked

*innig* with Bruckner's apparent *dim.* (cf. §3.2.5) at m. 114 providing a transition to a *pp*, *cresc. poco a poco* at m. 115.

**G/mm. 115–132** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [6/“7”]; cf. AP E/29ff., DdF F/17ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–6; 1–8; 1–4-

*Source:* bifol. 6<sup>c</sup>B, ÖNB 6087/17–18; cf. AP E/29ff., Facs. C/173ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–3; 1–3;<sup>26</sup> 1–8; 1–4-

See §3.2.6 and the preceding paragraph. A clue to the dynamic conception was provided by the austere but apparently finished scoring of bifol. 6<sup>c</sup>B, already regarded by Bruckner as “fertig”, though the last p. was subsequently altered. The “rit.” at 118 is original, requiring an ‘a tempo’ at 121. Otherwise only dynamics (*cresc. poco a poco* to *f* at m. 118, from 121 *pp*, *p*, *cresc. sempre*) together with articulation and phrasing were required up to m. 129, marked *pp*, with *zart gestrichen* in the 2nd vln. The alteration of texture and counterpoint on the last p. of 6<sup>c</sup>B and the fact that the *arco* directive on 7B is not repeated on 7C/“8” prompted altering the cb. to a sustained note (cf. §3.2.6).

**G/mm. 133–150** *Source:* bifol. 7C/“8”, ÖNB 6087/23–24; cf. AP E/33ff., Facs. C/181ff., DdF F/19ff.

*Length:* 18 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–8; 1–6; 1–2; 1–6-

As noted in §3.2.6, this and the following four bifols. are all extant and ostensibly complete. The necessary dynamic supplementation includes here *cresc. poco a poco* at m. 133, leading to *f* at 136, *p* at 137 and *cresc. sempre* at 139. An ‘accel. sempre’ added at 141 heightens the effect of the *cresc.* and leads smoothly into what must be a resumption of the principal tempo at letter F, marked ‘Erstes Zeitmaß’ (cf. §3.3.4), where Bruckner appears to recall his ‘Et surrexit topos (§2.2.3). As noted, the *p* at m. 145 appears in the AP; *cresc. poco a poco* has been added from 149. Concerning the use of 5th–6th hrn. in mm. 148–152, see §3.2.6.

<sup>26</sup> Bruckner underlaid an additional “1 2 3” under the last 3 mm. of this 6-m. period; the Repr. cites only 1–6, which has been used here and in Table XV for the sake of consistency.

**G/mm. 151–166** *Source:* bifol. 8B/“9”, ÖNB 6087/27–28; cf. AP E/37ff., Facs. C/189ff.,  
DdF F/22ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

Fully scored out and pronounced “fertig” by Bruckner; only essential dynamics and phrasing were required: *f cresc. poco a poco* at the entries in mm. 152f., *ff cresc.* at the entry of 7th–8th hrs. at 163, *cresc. sempre* in all instruments at 165.

**G/mm. 167–182** *Source:* bifol. 9B/“10”, ÖNB 6087/29–30; cf. AP E/41ff., Facs. C/193ff.,  
DdF F/24ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

Also scored out and regarded as “fertig”. The entry of the chorale at letter G is marked *fff*, vlns. *gestrichen*, ‘Choral’ marked in the trps. Apparently ‘missing’ ties in the trps. and 5th–8th hrs. at mm. 175–176 have not been supplemented, cf. §3.3.5; a tie in the 1st trp. between 182 and 183 has been omitted; cf. 2nd–3rd trps.

**G/mm. 183–198** *Source:* bifol. 10A/“11”, ÖNB 6087/31–32; cf. AP E/45ff., Facs. C/197ff.,  
DdF F/26ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

Likewise scored out and pronounced “fertig”. *fff* was added at 193. As explained (§3.3.5) Bruckner placed > accents in m. 197 in 7th–8th hrs. and trps., replaced here for reasons of consistency by ^s. From m. 197 it may justifiably be assumed that Bruckner overlooked ties in trombs. and cb. tba.

**G/mm. 199–214** *Source:* bifol. 11A/“12”, ÖNB 6087/33–34; cf. AP E/49ff., Facs. C/201ff.,  
DdF F/28ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* -7–12; 1–8; 1–2-

11A/“12” can be regarded as the last surviving completely scored-out bifol. Ties appear to have been overlooked in the trombs. and cb. tba. from 199–204. *fff* has been added at 205, *dim. poco a poco* at 209. The ^s in the trps., alto and ten. trombs. at m. 205 are autograph. The added notes in the clars.

at mm. 213f. are the first two notes of the Te Deum motive in semibreves indicated on “13a”E; cf. following paragraph.

**G/mm. 215–230** Reconstruction/supplementation of continuity of bifol. “13a”E; cf. AP E/53, DdF F/30ff.

*Source:* bifol. “13a”E, ÖNB 6085/75–76; cf. AP E/53ff., Facs. C/217ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3-6-[7-8; 1-8; 1-2-]

Supplementation according to the largely scored out bifol. 12C, p. 1,

ÖNB 6087/35<sup>r</sup>; cf. AP E/53, Facs. C/205

*Length of section used:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3-4; 1-2-

Cf. §3.2.6, which explains the most obvious reconstruction and supplementation based on the surviving material. Here 1st–2nd bsns. and later 2nd–3rd clars. were added from m. 217, sustaining the pedal point and reinforcing the chromatic descending motive in the vla. The 2nd fl. was added to the 1st at mm. 223ff. for reasons of sonority. From 229 the 1st–4th hrns. take over the function of the bsns., which from 230 begin the reintroduction of the dotted rhythm of the introduction. Entries at m. 217 are marked *mf*, all parts *dim. sempre*, from letter **J pp** throughout.

**G/mm. 231–246** Reconstruction/supplementation of the continuity of bifol. =“13b”E; cf. AP E/57ff., DdF F/32ff.

*Sources:* bifol. =“13b”E, ÖNB 6085/81–82; cf. AP E/57ff., Facs. C/221ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably [-3-12; 1-6-]

*As well as:* bifol. “13”<sup>b</sup>E, ÖNB 6085/73–74; cf. AP E/57ff., Facs. C/213ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7-8; 1-8; 1-6-

Cf. §3.2.6. As on “13a”E, most essential elements can be reconstructed from the sources to some degree; here it was necessary to add only instrumental doubling for reasons of sonority and balance: clars. and 1st–4th hrns. continue doubling the vla., and from 237, cb. line; also from 237 the 2nd–3rd fls. double the 1st. The one element not included in the DdF is the dotted motive of the introduction, first introduced as a rhythmic reduction from m. 230, which here begins alternating in dialogue between 2nd–3rd




bsns. and 5th–6th hrns., from m. 238 adding its own diminution in advance of the entry of the motive in melodic form, apparently in the 1st ob., which was indicated on “13b”E.<sup>27</sup> Dynamically the whole passage forms a powerful crescendo to *ff* at m. 249, beginning from *pp cresc. poco a poco* from 237, where the bass begins its ominous descent, intensified by *cresc. sempre* 4 mm. later. As noted, the last 4 mm. of “13b”E were probably identical with those of [12/“13”], which connected with the ensuing fully scored 13E/“14”; here a minimal amount of supplementation made it possible to logically reconstruct the continuity of each element which appears at the beginning of 13E/“14”. The clars. and 1st–4th hrns. follow the rising line of the passacaglia motive at 241, at 243 breaking into the descending  $\frac{6}{3}$ -chord sequence, the doubling of the clars. taken over at 245 by the trps. The dotted rhythm motive continues in the 5th–8th hrns. in alternation with the obs.

**G/mm. 247–262** *Source:* bifol. 13E/“14”, ÖNB 6087/37–38; cf. AP E/61ff., Facs. C/225ff.,

DdF F/34ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

Cf. §3.2.6. This bifol., largely scored out, again formed part of the definitive score; minimal supplementation was required beyond that undertaken in the DdF, mainly the interpolation of a p.a.e.t. diminution of the  motive in the 1st hrn. at mm. 260f. and 262f.,



as suggested by the falling-octave motive introduced by Bruckner at the recurrence of the passage at m. 287 (cf. 1st ob., E/71). *ff* has been added at 257, *p cresc. sempre* at 264f.

**G/mm. 263–278** Reconstruction of a bifol. [14/“15”]; cf. AP E/65ff., DdF F/37

*Length:* probably 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably [-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-]

<sup>27</sup> In the AF, the first two entries of the 1st ob. at 240ff. use  $f^2-b\sharp^1-d\sharp^1-d\sharp^1$ , enharmonically the exact notes of the opening motive, in place of the  $e^2-b\sharp^1-d\sharp^1-d\sharp^1$  indicated by Bruckner on “13b” and used in the DdF. The alteration was made principally for reasons of the audibility of the entry; it also enhances the motivic logic of the subsequent entries (*q.v.*).

*Source:* bifol. 12C, pp. 3–4, ÖNB 6087/36; cf. AP E/65f., Facs. C/207f.

*Length of section used:* 8 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7-8; 1-6-


Cf. 3.2.6. Presuming the assumption that the first 8 mm. of this bifol. were borrowed from 12C is correct, 8 mm. remained here for which no further information existed other than the adjoining mm. on either side of the gap. A progression was therefore constructed leading from the augmented triad with which 12C breaks off to the G $\flat$  major of the first mm. of 15D/“16”. Ex. 7 illustrates the continuity of this passage in its essentials. Although the sks. on the final p. of 15C suggest that Bruckner may have worked more with  $\frac{6}{3}$ -chord progressions here, a straightforward descent of the bass line via B $\flat$  (m. 27) to G $\flat$  (m. 277) seemed the simplest and stylistically most convincing solution. The strings obviously cadenced from C $\flat$  into F major at the beginning of [14/“15”]; extrapolating the texture backwards from that of the first mm. of 15D/“16”, the triplet figuration probably recommenced in the vlms. in octaves at this point, marked here *f dim.*; the remainder of the musical texture—the simple (minim) and double (semibreve) augmentations of the Te Deum motive in the winds, *tremolo* in the vla. (*divisi*) and vlc. and sustained notes in the cb., all of which can be found in part on 12C—would have begun with the new ‘1’ of the following period at m. 265. The 5th–8th hrs. (7th–8th changing to B $\flat$  basso for the passage up to m. 312, after which they revert to F tuning) double the lower strings throughout; at m. 273 the trombs and cb. tba. have been added. The 1st, subsequently 1st–2nd hrs., contribute an imitation of the double augmentation of the Te Deum motive; the 3rd–4th hrs. take over the double augmentation of the motive previously allotted to 1st–2nd obs. The woodwind change in function from 273, where the descending Te Deum augmentations found on 15D/“16” are introduced in the fls., and 1st–3rd obs. take over the minim augmentations of the inverted form of the motive previously allotted to 3rd ob. and clars. At the same time the clars. take up the rhythmic dialogue between the bsns. and (from 270) trps. (omitted in Ex. 7), leading smoothly into the complex alternation of motive and diminution found in the clars. and bsns. on 15D/“16”, which becomes more logical once the rhythmic motive in the trps. is included on alternate repetitions. Dynamically, the passage has been divided into 4 phases: *p* marked at 265, *cresc. poco a poco* at 269, *f cresc. sempre* at 273 and *ff* at 277.

**G/mm. 279–294** *Source:* bifol. 15D/“16”, ÖNB 6087/41–42; cf. AP E/69ff., Facs. C/253ff., DdF F/39ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7-8; 1-6; 1-4; 1-4-

Cf. §3.2.6, and concerning the tempo markings at mm. 289–291 §3.3.4. Concerning mm. 279–90, see preceding paragraph. As noted, the passage from L up to the *fermata* at mm. 290/291 was in essence almost fully scored by Bruckner, a good example of Herankomponierung via an elaborate process of motivic fragmentation in which, as explained, the iambic rhythm of the introduction motive is converted into the trochaic rhythm of the Gesangsp. Interpretation of the AP is complicated, however, by the fact that, while some notated elements were crossed out and obviously replaced, some were probably intended to replace others which were not crossed out. Beyond the DdF's instrumentation, which realised as faithfully as possible the clues given by the AP (cf. F/39f., explained in §3.2.6), a greater degree of logic in the motivic design could be achieved here in the AF. The falling-octave p.a.e.t. diminution of the 1st vln., which was allotted to 1st hrn. at mm. 260ff., was again used here from letter L, where it forms a new dialogue with the 1st. fl. It truncates at m. 285, where the 1st hrn. is replaced by corresponding phrases in the 1st–2nd obs., notated by Bruckner from 287 without the semiquaver upbeat. As at letter K, a natural *crescendo* underlies the passage from *p* at L to *f* at 287; here, at the climax of the passage, an unexpected disruption of the musical continuity occurs (underlined by interruption of the 8-m. period structure); this has been reinforced by the *fp* marking. As a result, the inverted motive in the 1st vln. 'jumps in' a measure early, losing its initial semiquaver in the process; this is faithfully imitated by the cb. Similarly, the p.a.e.t. diminution in the obs. loses its initial semiquaver, paving the way for a further p.a.e.t. shift of the surviving falling-octave element in the clars. This was begun in the AF a measure earlier than indicated in the AP, replacing a final statement of the complete diminution in the obs. (matching the 2nd–3rd bsns.); two last entries of the 1st vln. in mm. 288ff., included in the DdF, were also omitted to enable the clar. to assume more prominence.

The ensuing section, marked *f* by Bruckner, required somewhat more textural elaboration. Over and above the AP's textural clues, as realised in the DdF, the introductory motive  has been permitted to persist in the

form of p.a.e.t. imitations in 1st–6th hrns., reiterating the rising and falling minor 2nds of the melodic line.<sup>28</sup>

**G/mm. 295–310** *Source:* bifol. 16C/“17”, ÖNB 6087/43–44; cf. AP E/73ff., Facs. C/257ff., DdF F/41ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* -5–8; 1–12;

Cf. §3.2.6 and the preceding paragraph; concerning tempi, see also §3.3.4. The more straightforward doubling and accompaniment in hrns. and woodwind fragments from 295 under the impact of Bruckner’s emphatic underlining of the crotchet chords in 295f. by the trps., to which the trombs. have been added, continued in 297f. by offbeat chords in the trps. alone; these replace the winds, which Bruckner resolved to keep in reserve for the woodwind entry at 299 (see crossed-out doubling, E/73). A *cresc.* to *ff* highlights the drama of the sudden ‘Abbruch’ at 299. Here, as all whole m. rests were notated by Bruckner, only phrasing and expressive dynamics were required. Although Bruckner’s notation of whole-m. rests in the ensuing mm. (cf. E/74) might have suggested use of the hrns. at 301f., these 2 mm. have been reserved for strings alone; doubling of the essentially complete texture in the strings by the woodwind and hrns. begins from 303, leading in the following m. to a ‘signal’ entry of the 1st trp. doubling 2nd vln. and at 305 the bsns., trombs. and cb. tba. supporting the otherwise harmonically thin counterpoint of the strings (cf. the autograph whole-m. rests for trombs. and cb. tba. in the following mm. in the AP). The ♩ ♩♩ diminution at 304 is echoed by a rhythmic reduction in the 5th–8th hrns. in 305 and an added counterpoint, f<sup>1</sup>–g<sup>1</sup>–a<sup>b1</sup>–b<sup>b1</sup>–d<sup>b1</sup>, in the 3rd–4th hrns. in 306.

With the exceptions of harmonic additions in the 1st–4th hrns. leading into a realisation of the annotation “b/ g/ e/ d/ cis” by all hrns. at the climactic m. 309, the orchestration of mm. 307–310 essentially required only doubling, leading in the winds into the apparent doubling of the vla. and vlc. by the woodwind indicated in the AP at m. 309 (cf. explanation in §3.2.6).

---

<sup>28</sup> This is perhaps justified by the fact that Bruckner apparently continued the complete motive without truncation in the bsns. in mm. 288ff.; the isolated b<sup>b1</sup>–a in the vlc. in 289f., which prepares the melodically important minor 2nds in the ensuing passage (g<sup>#</sup>–a, f<sup>b1</sup>–f<sup>#</sup> etc.), also suggests a rhythmic continuation of the iambic rhythm in an subordinate part.

**G/mm. 311–326** *Source:* bifol. 17<sup>c</sup>D/“18”, ÖNB 6087/51–52; cf. AP E/77ff., Facs. C/277ff., DdF F/44ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8;

Cf. 3.2.6; concerning tempi §3.3.4. Here again the strings were completely finished together with the principal wind cues; supplementations beyond those made by the DdF required only the logical filling-out of what appear to have been the essential instrumental indications. These included reassertion of the ubiquitous rhythmic unit,



fragmented at its last appearance in the Durchf., in the 5th–8th horns at 311 prior to Bruckner's notation of it at 312f. in the bsns., partly doubling the fugal subject; the opposite situation occurs in 315ff., where Bruckner has indicated the rhythmic reduction in trps. and 2nd horn but not the doubling in mm. 316f. Here also the fanfare motive (• | • | ♯) indicated in the 1st horn at 315 would surely have been doubled by the woodwind. At 319 the fls. double the trp. fanfare at the octave, the partial doubling here allotted to the obs. At 322f. the 7th–8th horns re-enter with a partial doubling of the strings suggested by Bruckner's horn notation of 5th–6th horn at 329f.; a similar situation is suggested by Bruckner's  $d^2-c^{\#2}$  in the 2nd ob. at 326. As in the DdF, the doubling of the vla. entry by clars. from 323 and bsns. from 325, as indicated by the  $f^{\#}-e^{\#}$  notated in the 1st bsn. at 326, was adopted for reasons of sonority. The first four fugal entries are marked *ff marcato*; a brief *cresc.* in m. 326 precedes the fifth entry in the following bifol.

**G/mm. 327–342** *Source:* bifol. 18D/“19”, ÖNB 6087/53–54; cf. AP E/81ff., Facs. C/281ff., DdF F/46ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3;

Cf. 3.2.6 and the preceding paragraph. The instrumental doublings retained in the DdF in mm. 327–330 for reasons of sonority required only minimal supplementation here with iterations of the rhythmic unit and its diminution in the 3rd–4th and 7th–8th horns. *fff* was allotted to all instruments at 327; a brief *diminuendo* in 330 prepares the ensuing passage, marked *pp*, with legato phrasing for all instruments, contrasting with a return to *f gestrichen/marcato* for the second fugal episode at 340.

Autograph clues as to the overall scoring of mm. 331ff. were sufficient to enable a virtually complete textural picture to emerge, as outlined in §3.2.6. The single significant addition was the addition in the 1st ob. from m. 331 of an p.a.e.t. imitation with inverted intervals, which contributes to the motivic interest of the passage.<sup>29</sup>

What must obviously have been intended as the 2nd episode of the fugal Durchf. begins at m. 340, only the first 3 mm. of which are extant; as these form the central evidence for the reconstruction of the ensuing bifol., they have been discussed in that context below.

**G/mm. 343–358** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [19/“20”]; cf. AP E/85ff., DdF F/49ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably [1–3; 1–3; 1–3]; 1–4; 1–3;

*Source:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/14<sup>r</sup>, brackets 2–5; cf. AP E/87f., Facs. C/23

*Length of section used:* 7 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–7-[8]; 1–3

The last 3 mm. of 18D/“19” obviously represent the beginning of a new section, the second episode of the fugal Durchführung, featuring Spiegelbild technique (simultaneous subject and inversion, here in the 1st vln. and bass) accompanied by p.a.e.t imitations in the other voices. This essential structure obviously persisted, with truncation of the subject to 3 mm., into the climax of the fugue, with its the three sequential steps C# minor–Bb minor–F# minor (with added sixth). The first two of these steps can be identified from the 3-m. bass entries of the inverted, truncated subject in the 3194/14<sup>r</sup> sk.; the second and third are found fully scored on the ensuing bifol. 20F/“21”.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>29</sup> This line, carried over into the AF from the earlier Samale/Mazzuca score, represents one of the few surviving instances of an added, freely derived counterpoint. Although the texture suggests that a further element of some kind is probably required, it has been earmarked for reconsideration in the forthcoming revision.

<sup>30</sup> As pointed out in the AP (E/89, fn. 3), the third sequential step of the fugal climax was originally “G moll” (confirmed in the top margin of C/285), which would have produced a bass sequence of descending minor 3rds (C#–Bb–G) parallelling the ascending minor 3rds of the Exp. Hauptth. (D–F–Ab). Bruckner most likely altered the third step to F# minor after deciding on the ensuing Steigerung, which begins on Ab (m. 365), the dominant of C# minor; the entire passage through to c. m. 381 of the AF is effectively in Db minor. Notter’s prediction (*Schematismus und Evolution*, p. 53), that the climax of the fugue would have been D minor, followed by Bb minor and F# minor, thereby inverting the rising minor 3rds of the Exp. Hauptth. (d–f–ab) into descending major thirds—Carragan also made this assumption in his version—is less likely. Bruckner’s original conception of the fugal climax did possess such a symmetry, but the evidence of the pc. sks. shows that C# minor was chosen early on as the arrival point of the fugue; the whole 2nd episode of the fugal Durchführung must have been designed to lead into it, and Bruckner only changed the third step of the climax to F# minor after beginning the notation of bifol. 20F. Tonal and stylistic considerations confirm this: given the massive reiteration of D minor in the fugal exposition, the fugue itself could not have been as tonally circumscribed as a climax in D minor would dictate.

Most of bifol. [19/“20”] was probably as fully elaborated as the last 3 mm. of 18D/“19”; given that the continuation of the final sequence on 20F/“21” is fully scored, the orchestration of the last 3 mm. was probably also completed by Bruckner. As shown by the DdF (*q.v.*), a plausible reconstruction of the last 3 mm. of [19/“20”] can be made; given that the most likely first note for the subject in the vlms. would have been  $e^3$ , as explained in §3.2.6, the rest of the contrapuntal texture and instrumentation can be extrapolated backwards from the opening 6 mm. of 20F/“21”.

The ‘unknown’ section of [19/“20”] was therefore 13 mm. long; the entire second episode of the fugal *Durchführung*, beginning from the 3rd-to-last m. of 18D/“19”, comprised 16 mm. As we have seen, Bruckner did not achieve an obvious continuity for the passage in the pc. sks.; however, given:

- i. the clear structure of the 1st episode (three 3-m. sequential steps),
- ii. the contrapuntal and harmonic structure of the last 3 mm. of 18D/“19”,
- iii. the ensuing climax of the fugue (also three 3-m. sequential steps),
- iv. the continuity of the 3194/14<sup>f</sup> sk., which includes a 4-m. entry of the inverted subject prior to the C#-minor climax (E/87f.), and
- v. the construable metrical structure of the missing 13 mm.,

the passage is most likely to have consisted of three sequential steps, the inverted subject (probably in its entirety<sup>31</sup>) in vlc. and vla. mirrored by the rectus of the subject in the 1st vln. beginning on the ninth of what is in effect a dominant ninth chord. The first two steps must have been of equal length, namely 6 mm. each (either 3+3 mm., the underlay given in the AF, or simply 6 mm.), the third step 4 mm. long, corresponding structurally to the 4 mm. drafted on 3194/14<sup>f</sup>, which lead into the climax. Given the third-related harmonic structure of the fugal climax (bass descending through C#–B♭–F#), the most plausible harmonic sequence would have been an ascending series of thirds, C, E, G#, each ninth chords, and the third step, G#, constituting a powerful dominant preparation for the C#-minor climax. The structure of the entire fugue was therefore probably:

---

The climax must also have stood in some sort of tonal relationship to the ensuing *Steigerung*; the next arrival point (letter P) being G♭. Bruckner's change of the third step of the sequence from G minor to F# minor was probably made precisely with the intention of better preparing the tonality of the *Steigerung*; there is no reason to suggest that the fugal climax was anything other than the C# minor of the sk.

<sup>31</sup> I.e., including the two crotchets in the 4th m.

Section	Metrical structure	Contrapuntal procedure	Harmonic structure
Exposition:	8 + 8 + 4 mm.	Five entries of the subject	D min.; D $\flat$ maj.; D min.
1st episode:	3 + 3 + 3 mm.	3 entries of truncated subject, using p.a.e.t. imitations	B $\flat$ min. <sup>+6</sup> ; c dim.7th; d dim.7th <sup>32</sup>
2nd episode:	3[+3 + 3+3] + 4 mm.	3 entries of complete subject using Spiegelbild, p.a.e.t. imitations	C $^{\flat}$ ; [E $^{\flat}$ ; G $\sharp^{\flat}$ ]
Climax:	3 + 3 + 3 mm.	3 entries of truncated subject using Spiegelbild, p.a.e.t. imitations	C $\sharp$ min.; B $\flat$ min.; F $\sharp$ min. <sup>+6</sup>

This reduces the actual extent of compositional supplementation required in completing [19/“20”] to only 3–4 mm., since the first 3 mm. of each 6- or 4-m. step of the sequence survives as the last 3 mm. of 18D/“19”. A further clue to the continuity of the passage was provided by an entry of a p.a.e.t. variant of the fugal subject on the last p. of 18D/“19” (E/84), which was notated in pencil in the 1st trp. stave, apparently in B $\flat$ , and hence probably intended for the clar. This phrase only makes harmonic sense if beginning 2 mm. later,<sup>33</sup> and therefore provides another clue to the reconstruction of the passage. Ex. 8a summarises the reconstruction and supplementation of the essential contrapuntal lines, demonstrating the harmonic structure of the texture created via rectus and inversus p.a.e.t. versions of the theme; the contrapuntal structure is more clearly evident from the AF itself due to the numerous crossings of parts. Ex. 8b gives a harmonic reduction of mm. 340–348 with a Sechterian analysis of the passage, illustrating the “Kernspaltung” (c–c $\flat$ /d $\flat$ ; cf. §2.1.3) effect of Bruckner’s progression at m. 342 and the manner in which each 6-m. sequential step moves through an ascending sequence of roots (from 340–345, in F minor, V–VI–VII–I), before proceeding to the next sequential step (V in A minor).

The most significant addition to the textural elements included in the last 3 mm. of 18D/“19” was the semiquaver ‘tirata’ of the fugal countersubject (m. 317); this was used in the fls. at m. 342 etc. and in the 1st vln. at m. 345 etc.; it seemed too significant an element in the conception of the fugue not to have been intended for use at some later point. In the 1st vlins. this functions as a decisive upbeat to the next statement of the inverted subject.

<sup>32</sup> I.e., the diminished seventh chords c/e $\flat$ /g $\flat$ /a and d/f/a $\flat$ /b $\flat$ .

<sup>33</sup> The most likely reason for the apparently incorrect notation is that Bruckner first developed the counterpoint on [19/“20”] at a later step in the sequence; he may then have transferred it back correctly transposed but notated 2 mm. too early.



At m. 354 it is omitted from the fls. for reasons of range; its omission, however, is justified in light of the truncation of the sequence; at mm. 354f. the 1st bsn. and in effect the clars. also ‘jump in’ too early. In m. 355 the first two notes of the pc. sk. preceding the climatic C#-minor entry (AP E/88, m. 1),  $f\sharp^2-g\sharp^2$ , were retained in the vla. and vlc. The following upbeat crotchet of this sk.,  $g\sharp^2$ , was included in the DdF, where the whole 4-m. sk. was reproduced faithfully, but is omitted here, as it represents a non-motivic element conflicting with the otherwise rigorous logic of Bruckner’s contrapuntal procedures.<sup>34</sup> The scoring of elements maintained in common with either the first episode or with the climax, such as the fugal subject in the clars. (cf. mm. 331ff. etc. with 342ff. etc.), the brief p.a.e.t. imitation in the vla. and 1st bsn. (cf. 332f. etc. with 344f. etc.), or the similar “1/4 später” phrase in the clars. (cf. 340 etc. with 358 etc.), has also been kept consistent wherever possible.<sup>35</sup> Concerning the realisation of the instrumental texture of mm. 340–342 (and therewith mm. 346–348 and 352–354) from the evidence provided by the AP (E/84ff.), see §3.2.6.


Elements in the final texture of the score not summarised in Ex. 8a include the rhythmic truncation of the accompaniment fanfare in the 1st–4th hrns. from 340; even this subordinate ‘motive’ undergoes the following mutation cycle throughout the fugue from the straightforward motive at the beginning of the fugue, (a) in the following example, derived as a double augmentation of the preceding fanfare, through (b), the version presented by hrns. and trps. at m. 327 and the ensuing episode at 331 (the tie has been added), to (c), the truncation at 339, which presumably persisted throughout the 2nd episode:



The C#-minor climax at 356 reinstates (a) in the alto and ten. trombs.; 6 mm. later at m. 362 the motive ‘dies out’ entirely as even the trombs. revert to the rhythm of the fugue subject. The AF has introduced, in preparation for

<sup>34</sup> In the sk., the preceding entry of the inverted subject (E/87) beginning on  $f\sharp$  is an arpeggiated B-major  $\frac{6}{4}$  chord marked “H d[ur]/Ten[or]”; it would have required the final  $g\sharp^2$  in order to effect a cadence into C# minor. In the reconstruction, the third step of the sequence is already a G# dominant 9th from m. 352, amply preparing the C#-minor arrival point and obviating Bruckner’s departure from normal motivic procedures.

<sup>35</sup> A discrepancy obtains in regard to Bruckner’s notation of the final notes of the “1/4 später” phrases which has been allowed to stand in the AF: at m. 341 in the clars. the last note before the barline is notated as a quaver (cf. E/84); at mm. 333 etc. (E/82) and again on 20F/“21” (E/89f.) at mm. 358 etc. in the clars. and obs. as crotchets. Given the logic of Bruckner’s contrapuntal methods, these details would surely have been reconciled later.

the mass of static dotted rhythms in the 1st–4th hrns. and trps. at the climax, the persistent  rhythm and its diminution in the trps. and 5th–6th hrns. At m. 340, *f* and *gestrichen* (for the strings) or *marcato sempre* (for the winds) were added, the second and third steps of the sequence marked *cresc. poco a poco* and *ff cresc. sempre* respectively, with *fff* added at the climax at m. 356.

**G/mm. 359–374** *Source:* bifol. 20F/“21”, StB 4189/27–28; cf. AP E/89ff., Facs. C/285ff., DdF F/51ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* 1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–2-

As we have seen, the first 6 mm. of this bifol. exhibit completed instrumentation for the last time in the extant fragments of the score. While scoring was limited in the DdF to what could be ‘directly’ legitimised from the text of the AP, very few actual supplementations were required to complete a fully functional and stylistically convincing orchestral texture from letter O of the AF through to at least the entry of the horn theme at letter P. M. 365, as the abrupt dislocation of the scoring suggests, was understood as *p subito*, with *gestrichen* and staccato marked in the vlc. and its bsn. doubling. At the 9th m. (m. 373) *cresc. poco a poco* was added, leading with reinforcements every 8 mm. to the *fff* at letter P, 24 mm. later. Concerning the realisation of the existing scoring indications, see §3.2.6. The motivic fragments notated by Bruckner in F under the first 2 mm. of the clar. (which doubles the vla.) were allotted to the 2nd and 3rd hrns. alternately (thereby allowing the 1st hrn. some respite); these were continued, extending to the 5th–6th hrns. in m. 372 and 7th–8th in m. 373. Greater interest was given to the sustained accompaniment in the hrn. parts by the addition of what are in effect double augmentations of the double-dotted motive in the 5th and later (m. 371) 3rd–4th hrns.

**G/mm. 375–390** *Source:* bifol. 21D/“22”, ÖNB 6087/57–58; cf. AP E/93ff., Facs. C/289ff., DdF F/54ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

See notes to the preceding bifol. as well as §3.2.6. From 377 both the doubling of the vla. by the clars. and of the vlc. by the bsns. begins to lie outside the range of these instruments, leading to the introduction of obs. (indicated by Bruckner), fls. at the higher octave for reasons of sonority (cf.

Bruckner's addition of the trps.), while the doubling of mm. 378 and 380 is indicated for the 5th–6th hrs. The logical corollary of the introduction of obs. and fls. is to free at least the 2nd–3rd clars. to assist the bsns. in doubling the vlc. line. To the striking  $c\#^1/c\#^2$  octave in the 1st–2nd trps. was added an imitative  $a/g^1$  in the alto and ten. trombs.; the bass tromb. and cb. tba. join them, adding an  $A\flat$  ninth chord 2 mm. later, where the 'suspended' A-major harmony of mm. 377f. becomes a crushingly dissonant complete  $A\flat^{11}$ ; the chord functions as an augmented sixth to the C-minor  $\frac{6}{4}$  of the following m.

From m. 381 the massive string texture is supplemented by bsns., trombs. and cb. tba. in the lower register, clars. in the upper, while the 1st–2nd hrs. initiate a '1/4 später' p.a.e.t. rhythmic reduction of the dotted motive in trps., obs. and fls. which is melodically imitated '1/2 später' by the 3rd–4th hrs. At m. 387 the tbas. have been permitted to enter again, their notes,  $a\flat-a\sharp-b\flat-a$ , adding textural weight to the last 2 mm. before the *ff* of 389, an interpretation of Bruckner's curious annotation "Dom[inante] v[on] Des d[ur]/ B m[oll]"<sup>36</sup> written above these 2 mm. in the AP (E/96). The instrumentation of the remaining 2 mm. is included in the discussion of the next bifol.

**G/mm. 391–406** *Source:* bifol. 22D/"23", ÖNB 6087/59–60; cf. AP E/97ff., Facs. C/293ff., DdF F/56ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

See notes to the preceding bifol. As noted in §3.2.6, Bruckner's string figuration from m. 389 quotes the Finale of the Sixth and "Aeterna fac" of the Te Deum, comparison with these scores providing insights into the intended instrumentation. Sustained notes have been added in the 1st–2nd fls., 1st clar. and bsn., 1st and 3rd tbas. and alto tromb., the remainder of these instruments and cb. tba. doubling the descending quavers of the strings. The p.a.e.t. rhythm in octaves in 1st–2nd hrs. mutates into *a* 2 octave leaps (389, 391 etc.) and simple falling fifths (390, 392 etc.) in preparation for the entry of the horn theme with its falling sixths; the imitation of the trp. line in the 3rd–4th hrs. fragments, eventually (395) coalescing rhythmically with the 1st–2nd hrs. Bruckner prepares the crotchet triplets of the horn theme via quaver triplet fanfares in the 1st trp.

<sup>36</sup> Probably implying 'dominant of  $D\flat$  major changing to dominant of  $B\flat$  minor'.

and fls. (394) and clars. (395f.); a final semiquaver was added to m. 393 in the 1st trp. Contrary to the text of the DdF, the sustained semibreves from 393 in 2nd–3rd trps. and from 395 in 1st trp. were omitted in the AF for reasons of sonority in favour of the continued dotted rhythm notated by Bruckner in the obs.—details which are otherwise inaudible.<sup>37</sup>

From letter P, Bruckner notated essentially only the horns and strings, leaving few clues as to other textural elements. The broken texture of the horn theme itself suggested a rhythmically complementary imitation, which was allotted to the tbas.; the hrns. subsequently adopt this function as the melodic line moves to the trps. at 404; *sehr breit and gehalten* was added to the hrns. and tbas at P and to the trps. at 404 to underscore the melodic character of these phrases.<sup>38</sup> Comparison with VIII(1890)/4, mm. 469ff., proved instructive, constituting a close analogy to the musical structure from m. 405 of the AF onwards. Accordingly, the pencilled semibreve  $g\flat^3$  in the 1st fl. at 397 was used as the first note of a falling octave leap in dotted rhythm, a process preparing a subsequent diminution of this motive from 405 (cf. VIII/4) but also significant in connection with the horn theme's later Herankomponierung of the IX/1 Hauptth. after letter V. All instruments that do not continue to underline the string figuration participate in the dotted rhythm. From 405 the texture thins in line with Bruckner's elision of the lower strings. Heightening its sonority, the quaver figuration in the vlns. and vla. has been marked *a due battute* from 397.

**F/mm. 407–422** *Source:* bifol. 23D/"24", ÖNB 6087/61–62; cf. AP E/101ff., Facs. C/297ff., DdF F/59ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* -3–12; 1–6-

See also the preceding paragraph. At m. 408 the motive in the trps. suddenly truncates (cf. concerning the mutation cycle here Ex. 9a), suggesting that the ensuing double augmentation should be marked *p* in contrast; the pencilled  $f\sharp^3$  in the 1st fl. at 411f. has been interpreted as an indication of 8va doubling of the trps. by the upper woodwind; a triplet augmentation of the 3-

<sup>37</sup> It can be assumed that the existing notations in the trps. and obs. in the AP at this point represent variant versions of the same textural element. This was another situation in which the DdF was methodologically constrained by its obeisance to the existing text of the AP while the AF could explore more effective and interesting readings.

<sup>38</sup> However, it must be noted that this marking, adopted from III(90)/4, letter Z, probably derives from Franz Schalk.

note motive fragment has been added at 412 in the 1st ob., analogous to and in a sense justifying the crotchet triplet marked by Bruckner in the 1st–2nd hrs. 3 mm. later. The interpretation of Bruckner's instrumentation of mm. 413f. is explained in §3.2.6; the whole passage from 409 thus forms a striking and characteristically Brucknerian juxtaposition of extreme 'height' and 'depth'. Finally 'riten.' and *p cresc.* were added at 413, intensifying the grinding dissonance and abrupt Abbruch of the horns, additionally marked *sehr breit* thus underscoring the origin of the phrase in the triplets of the horn theme.

Concerning the Repr. Gesangsp., cf. again 3.2.6. The musical structure of mm. 417–423 was essentially complete, presumably requiring only doubling of the lower line by the hrs. by analogy with the Exp., adding holding notes in 1st–2nd and continuing the doubling of the vla. and vlc. by 3rd–4th hrs. for reasons of sonority from 421. Remaining supplementations include the tempo marking, *p*, expressive dynamics, legato bowing and phrasing, expressive dynamics in the 1st vln. and *gezogen* in the lower strings.

**G/mm. 423–438** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [24/"25"]; cf. AP E/105ff.,

DdF F/61ff.

*Length:* probably 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* probably -7–8; 1–8; 1–6-

*Sources:* 2 pc. sks.:

1) ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, bracket 2; cf. AP E/104f., Facs. C/24

*Length of section used:* 6 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1-[2]-3-[4]-

2) ÖNB 3194/15<sup>f</sup>, bracket 3; cf. AP E/106f., Facs. C/25

*Length of section used:* 4 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -5–8;

*As well as:* bifol. 5B, from m. 9, StB 3791/6; cf. AP E/107f., Facs. C/165ff.

*Length of section used:* 6 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–6-

The reconstruction of the essential compositional continuity of this lost bifol. has been detailed in §3.2.6. Beyond the text given in the DdF (cf. F/61ff.), a number of supplementations were necessary, however, foremost being the continuity of the 1st vln. up to m. 433 of the AF. The structure of mm. 423f. suggest the 1st vln. may have been derived from the preceding 2

mm.; mm. 425–428 structurally parallel 417–420, suggesting analogous counterpoint in the 1sts. The continuity of the 1st vln. at 429–432, (a) in the following example, has been derived by augmentation from Bruckner’s instrumental line in the “Trio” section (b); cf. Exp., m. 113, Repr. 439:



The textural realisation of the passage features use of the dotted motive in falling intervals in the winds, at first recalling the falling octave last heard at mm. 407f. (ob., hrn.), then forming falling–rising elements in the clars. inverting the rising sixths of the principal line in the 2nd vln. and 1st ob. The instrumentation of the ensuing Trio section is intentionally richer than that of the Exp. passage, including doubling the 2nd-vln. and 1st–2nd-clar. line (at 437 passing to the 2nd–3rd clars.) at the upper octave by the fls.

At 423 *cresc. sempre* has been added (cf. Exp. mm. 5f.); 425 returns to *p* and expressive dynamics (cf. Exp. m. 87) which are continued from 429 with *cresc. poco a poco*, *p* at 433 and *f* at 437. The ‘Noch langsamer’ at 433 likewise parallels the Exp.

In all, the structure of the opening of the Gesangsp. in the Repr. suggests parallels *in nuce* with the more expansive structure of the passage in the Exp.; these parallels can be summarised as follows:

Exp. passage	Description	Repr. passage	Description
75–82 (8 mm.)	Ostinato alone, <i>p, pp</i>	417–420 (4 mm.)	Ostinato + lyrical counterp., <i>p</i>
83–86 (4 mm.)	Chromatic transition, <i>cresc.</i>	421–424 (4 mm.)	Diatonic transition, <i>cresc.</i>
87–94 (8 mm.)	Ostinato + lyrical counterp., <i>p, pp</i>	425–428 (4 mm.)	Ostinato + lyrical counterp., <i>p</i>
95–102 (8 mm.)	G major, <i>ff / p</i>	— — —	— <sup>39</sup>
103–106 (4 mm.)	E $\flat$ major $\frac{6}{4}$ & transition, <i>cresc.</i>	429–432 (4 mm.)	D $\flat$ major $\frac{6}{4}$ & transition, <i>cresc.</i>
107–120 (14 mm.)	F $\sharp$ major, “Trio”, <i>p</i>	433–446 (14 mm.)	F $\sharp$ major, “Trio”, <i>p</i>

**G/mm. 439–454** Source: bifol. 25D/“26”, ÖNB 6087/55–56; cf. AP E/109ff., Facs. C/301ff.,

DdF F/64f.

Length: 16 mm.

Metrical structure: -7–8; 1–6; 1–8;

<sup>39</sup> However, the ensuing A $\flat$  pedal point in the bass from 429, not present in the corresponding transition in the Exp., functions in a manner similar to the G major passage in the Exp. by ‘grounding’ the music, in contrast with the preceding bass-less passages in the upper strings.

The instrumentation from 439 to 447 recalls that of the Exp. (cf. mm. 13ff.), but is enriched by doubling of the strings at the *p* in m. 439 by 1st ob., clar, bsn. and 1st–2nd hrns.; from 441 the 1st fl. and ob. partially double the 1st vln., the clars. double the lower strings in an expansion of Bruckner's own clar. line on bifol. 6<sup>c</sup>B. The dynamics, 'rit.' and 'a tempo' at 444 and 447 again parallel the Exp.

From 447 Bruckner creates what is in effect a skeletal echo of the preceding passage, omitting its contrapuntal lines. The strings (with the addition of ties) therefore probably constituted a more or less complete texture in themselves. In addition to the autograph 1st fl. line in 447ff., supplementations were confined to the use of imitative phrases (1st hrn. at 448f., 4th hrn. at 449f., 1st ob., hrn. and bsn. from 452) and textural doublings (3rd–4th hrn. from 449, trombs. from 451). M. 447 is marked *p*, m. 453 *dim*.

**G/mm. 455–470** *Source:* bifol. 26F/“27”, ÖNB 6087/65–66; cf. AP E/113ff., Facs. C/305ff., DdF F/66f.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–4; 1–8; 1–4–

The moving reminiscence of the chorale at 455 with its curious skeletal chordal spacing has been marked *pp lang gezogen*; the addition of the 1st trp. in 457f. (augmentation and reduction-to-rhythm of the dotted motive) distantly recalls the original instrumentation of the chorale. Concerning the tempo markings, see §§3.2.6 and 3.3.4. M. 459 returns to the tempo and instrumental style of the opening of the Gesangsp. (cf. addition of the hrns.), with inverted imitations in the 1st ob. and later 1st fl.; the sudden *Steigerung* from 463 clearly calls for an abrupt *cresc. sempre*, with further instrumental doubling in the 1st–2nd bsns. The return to 'Erstes Zeitmaß' and the powerful instrumentation of the passage at letter S (*f, gestrichen* in 1st vln.) hints at the weight that will later be given to this thematic allusion (see *infra*).

**G/mm. 471–494** *Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [27/“28”]; cf. AP E/117ff., DdF F/67ff.*

*Length:* 24 mm.<sup>40</sup>

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8; [1–4; 1–4-]<sup>41</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Cf. §3.1.8.

<sup>41</sup> See, however, the more detailed underlay of metrical numbers in the AF itself.

Sources: 2 pc. sks.:

1) ÖNB 3194/14<sup>v</sup>, from bracket 3, m. 5; cf. AP E/117ff., Facs. C/24

*Length of section used:* 17 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8; [1–]

2) ÖNB 28.238, bracket 1; cf. Facs. C/26

See concerning the reconstruction of this bifol., AP E/117ff., in particular E/117, fn. 1, as well as §3.2.6. Bruckner ended the *Gesangsp.* Repr. here and, according to the metrical numbering of the following bifol., probably resumed the triplet figuration of the chorale and D pedal point from the 4th-to-last m. of the bifol. The 17-m. pc. sk. used here corresponds precisely with this harmonic function, ending with a return to D minor in m. 17, where Bruckner noted “Schluß d m[oll]”. As we have seen, the “vi–” notated at the end of m. 457 must have connected with a “–de” at some point on [27/“28”]; the cut, from the  $g\sharp^2$  of m. 466 of the AF, most likely ended with an  $a^2$  in the 4th-to-last m. of [27/“28”]. This provides reasonable grounds for a reconstruction of the continuity of the first 16 and last 4 mm. As suggested in §3.2.6, the intervening 4 mm. were most likely a second statement, in D minor, of the ‘Gregorian’ theme introduced in A minor at the end of 26F/“27. This would, at m. 491, have arrived neatly at the  $a^2$  suggested by the “vi–” of m. 468, thus completing the continuity of a melodic line broken off at its first appearance. This reconstruction of the continuity of [27/“28”] is shown in Ex. 11a.

The texture of mm. 471–474 (cf. AP E/117) was realised by analogy with mm. 471–474, but differentiated from it; m. 473 was borrowed from a struck-through version of the phrase on 28.238 (br. 1, m. 6).<sup>42</sup> The scoring of the passage from 475 was realised in part by analogy with the massive textural build up of a very similar passage in VIII(1890)/4 (cf. mm. 527 thereof); the passage here, however, is effectively a ‘double unison’ (as found in many of Bruckner’s *Schlußp.* themes<sup>43</sup>) with a diminution of the

<sup>42</sup> Although not included in the AP, the first 8 mm. of ÖNB 28.238 contain *in nuce* the continuity of the subsequent 3194 version of the [27/“28”] *Steigerung*; compare bracket 2, m. 1, and the marginal annotation “Celli” with the bass line of the 3194/14<sup>v</sup> sk. (cf. C/24, bracket 4). The remainder of 28.238 makes a new beginning (“Anfang”) and proceeds to draft the continuity of the passage from letter R of the AF onwards (AP E/111); the ‘Weiser’ at the end of this line refers back to bracket 2 on 3194 (C/25), which drafts the continuity of p. 2 of 26F/“27” (E/114).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. for instance VII/1, letter E, and VIII/4, letter I. Bruckner often termed the third theme group “Unisono”, as in the AP of IX/1, letter F, which in the 2001 edition has been marked “Moderato (Unisono)”.



chorale in the upper line—cf. the incursion of the chorale at m. 453, which therefore functioned as an *Aufbereitung* of this passage—and the double diminution of the same line indicated in the sk. in crotchets. This line was continued here and allotted to tbas. and later to b. tromb. and cb. tba., while the recommencement of the triplet figuration at 491 was ‘herankomponiert’ using increasingly insistent triplet fanfares and later falling octaves in the trps. Concerning the resumption of the triplets at m. 491, see §3.1.10, discussion of AP E/117–120. The falling-octave accompaniment motive in the vla., here  $f^1$ – $f$ , doubled by 3rd–4th hrs., essentially continues the falling octave motive of the preceding passage in quasi-augmentation. This was suggested by Bruckner’s erasure of a dot following the minim in the vla. in the 1st. m. of 28E/“29” (C/309; cf. AF m. 495), where the vla. probably first read  $f^1$ – $e$ ; the addition of the crotchet  $f$  to this phrase avoided the overlap of a sustained  $f^1$  with the descending line of the vlms. The vlc. and cb.—cf. again the instrumentation of the chorale in the Exp., letter G—most likely maintained from the beginning of the period the *tremolo* on the open fifth D/A found at the beginning of 28/“29”. All other parts from 491 sustain the notes of the open fifth, which were presumably maintained as far as 495, the 1st m. of 28E/“29”, as perhaps suggested by illegible markings in the fl. staves in the AP (cf. E/121). The dynamic supplementations include the *pp cresc. poco a poco* at 475, *cresc. sempre* at 483, *fff* at T, then *dim.* at 494, with *p* at the beginning of the next bifol. The winds maintain legato phrasing throughout the sequence until 483; the strings begin with legato bowing, returning to *gestrichen* at T as at S. Concerning tempo, cf. Bruckner’s “stringendo poco a poco” marked in the analogous passage in VIII/4 as well as §3.3.4; letter T represents a definitive re-establishment of the ‘Erstes Zeitmaß’ after the complex modifications of the *Gesangsp.*

The use of the final 4 mm. of 26F/“27” at T calls for some discussion about the likely significance of this melodic construct for Bruckner and its use here.

*Excursus: “Christ ist erstanden”*

As discussed in §1.1.3, Bruckner apparently intended at least at some stage to realise the Finale of the Ninth Symphony as a chorale fantasy on his favourite hymn, *Christ ist erstanden*, also referred to as *Der Heiland ist erstanden*. Ex. 11b summarises the possible links between several incarnations of this originally Gregorian chant from its 11th-century origins (i) through later Catholic and Protestant versions of the tune (ii–iv). Characteristic for the melody are the Dorian-mode *Wendungen* (marked with brackets) d–c–d–f–g, d–a–g–a, or, even more strikingly, d–c–f–g–a, the rising fourth from 7th to 3rd scale degrees, in (ii). It is

significant that Hasse's 1774 version modifies these features into more obviously tonal ones; while we cannot be sure which version of the tune was known in St Florian or Vienna at the time,<sup>44</sup> Bruckner must have been familiar with the Salzburg–Tegernsee–Wittenberg version of the tune (ii) which, as Herz has noted, was well established in the German Easter liturgy by the 15th century; it maintains a place in the Austrian Catholic hymnal to this day.<sup>45</sup> Significantly, it is the most characteristic phrase of this version of the melody that we find in the Finale (viii). Although two similar Gregorian-inspired phrases appear elsewhere in Bruckner (First and Third Symphonies, v–vi), the fact that these melodic shapes do not prominently appear more often in Bruckner's music underscores the significance of their deployment here.

It can thus be seen that, while Bruckner had obviously abandoned the chorale-fantasy plan by the time he came to write the Finale, the emergence of the melodic sequence suggestive of *Christus ist erstanden* on 26F/"27" can have been no accident. It is also likely that the otherwise isolated appearance of the idea in the 'wrong' key of A minor may have been intended to be answered by a more definitive appearance of the phrase in its home tonality. Mention has already been made of Bruckner's curious mutation, a result either of interpolation or intervallic variation, of the augmented Te Deum motive into a similar melodic shape,  $e^2-b\sharp^1-a^1$  (vii), on the late expansion of the Durchf., SVE = "13b"E, thereby forming a distant precursor to the later appearance of the phrase in the Gesangsp. Repr.

It is furthermore significant that the *Christus ist erstanden* allusion was an afterthought, not apparent from anything in the original sks. Comparison of the surviving bifolds. 23D/"24", 25D/"26" and 26F/"27" with the contents of the relevant sks shows that the Gesangsp. Repr. had obviously arrived at its final shape in the pc. sks.; the only significant absence is that of the Gregorian theme itself. Erasures in the last 4 mm. of 26F/"27" suggest Bruckner first conceived the phrase as a–e–d–e | a–e–d–e (cf. the similar phrases in the Third, Ex. 11b vi); the a–g–c–d phrase, with the rising fourth from 7th to 3rd degrees so characteristic of *Christus ist erstanden* and of Gregorian chant in general, was the result of a subsequent alteration. As

---

<sup>44</sup> Information courtesy of Elisabeth Maier. Maier also notes references to "Osterl[ied]" and "Osterl[ied] Der Heiland [ist erstanden]" as prayer records in Bruckner's calendar entries of April 1892 and 1895 (*Anton Bruckner: Verborgene Persönlichkeit: Anton Bruckner in seinen privaten Aufzeichnungen*, Linz 2001, pp. 27f., 47f.).

<sup>45</sup> "The melody of *Christ lag in Todesbanden* is typically eclectic. Its first clause is identical with that of the 11th-century sequence *Victimae paschali laudes* and Gregorian Easter Alleluja *Christus resurgens ex mortuis*. The complete melody of 1524 resembles the 12th-century Easter song *Christ ist erstanden*, which by the 15th century had won a firm place in the German Easter liturgy" (Gerhard Herz, ed., *Cantata No. 4: Christ lag in Todesbanden: An Authoritative Score—Backgrounds—Analysis—Views and Comments* (Norton Critical Scores), New York 1967, p. 26). The 1974 edn. of the modern official *Graduale Romanum* (pp. 226f.) gives the Paschal alleluia *Christus resurgens*, in 1st mode, which indeed bears a resemblance to the melodic line of *Christ ist erstanden*, both in regard to the opening d–c–d as well as subsequent c–f–g phrases. See also *Gotteslob: Katholisches Gebet- und Gesangsbuch, Erzdiözese Wien*, ed. by the Bischöfen Deutschlands und Österreichs und der Bistümer Bozen–Brixen und Lüttich, Stuttgart 1975, pp. 276f. (source of Ex. 11b ii), 955 (11b iv).

in the foregoing allusions to the “Aeterna fac” and Sixth Symphony, or the tie-in between the horn theme in the Finale and the melodic line added to the 1890 version of III/1 (cf. Ex. 9), the passage again shows Bruckner deepening the web of allusion and cross-reference through the protean capacities of his mutation technique, linking the Finale with a theme he initially considered using as the basis for a choral Finale. The allusion to *Christus ist erstanden* also symbolises resurrection and ultimate victory over the forces of death precisely at the point in which the “Schluß d-Moll” of Bruckner’s sk. implies the victorious resurrection of the symphony’s home key.

Finally, it is significant that all the later revisions and additions to the structure of the Zweiter Theil and particularly the Gesangsp. Repr. involved quotations of some kind. The following summary of the complex metrical structure of the Repr. Gesangsp. as realised in the AF—not paralleled by that of the Exp.—shows how this process of ‘intercutting’, with its repeated interpolation of 4-m. subperiods, impacted upon the metrical structure—an aspect not always clear from Bruckner’s metrical numbering in the score:

M.	Metrical structure	Description
417	12 (i.e., 4+4+4) + 4 + 4	Opening of the Gesangsperiode with lyrical counterpoint throughout and new transition to:
433	8 + 6 (i.e., 4+4+6)	Trio (as in Exp.)
447	8 +	Trio reminiscence and vlc. passage derived from it, leading into:
455	4	Choral quotation
459	8 +	Brief Steigerung leading into:
467	4	1st Christ ist erstanden quotation
471	16 (i.e., 4+12) +	Quotation of vlc. passage from m. 451, then longer Steigerung leading into:
487	4	2nd Christ ist erstanden quotation

**G/mm. 497–510** Source: bifol. 28E/“29”, ÖNB 6087/67–68; cf. AP E/121ff., Facs. C/309ff., DdF F/71ff.

Length: 16 mm.

Metrical structure: -5–6; 1–6; 1–6; 1–2-

Cf. §3.2.6 as well as above, concerning the previous bifol. This passage in the DdF reflects the paucity of wind indications surviving in the AP; here, substantial wind supplementation was deemed necessary in order to match the instrumentation of the winds prior to letter G in the Exp., suggested in the AP by Bruckner’s  $f\sharp^3$  in the 1st fl. at letter U. Dynamically, the passage was understood as a *cresc. poco a poco* from 497, with a *pp subito* where the involvement of vlc. and cb. ends at 501, then a further *cresc. sempre* at 507. The bsns. in 495ff. provide a link with the ensuing chordal doubling of the lower strings in trombs. and cb. tba.; the clars. continue the falling

motive previously in the vla.; the partial doubling of the vla. by the 3rd hrn. is imitated ‘1 Takt später’ by the 1st ob. From 501 fls. and clars. augment the texture of the upper strings; the repeated notes in 2nd fl. and, from 503, falling fourths in the 1st ob. prepare the forthcoming re-entry of the Te Deum motive. The trps. provide short fanfares in counterpoint with the 1st ob. (suggested by the fanfares indicated by Bruckner on 31E/“32”); the whole m. rests in the trps. at 507f. are autograph; bsns. briefly double the ascending lines in vla. and clars. From 507 the 1st–4th hrns. assist the sustaining instruments and *cresc.* with an added bass line. Mm. 509f. are discussed under the following bifol.

**G/mm. 511–526** *Source:* bifol. 29E/“30”, ÖNB 6087/69–70; cf. AP E/125ff., Facs. C/313ff., DdF F/73ff.  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* -3–8; 1–8; 1–2-

See §3.2.6. The whole-m. rests in the trps. at 507f. suggest the involvement of 1st–3rd trps.; more than likely, however, all the brass would have been involved here as at letter G, *ff*, which at 517 thins to trps. and trombs., *p legato*, as suggested by the autograph *dim.* in the preceding m.; the shorter and more delicately scored *Steigerung* preceding U militates against the *fff* dynamic marked at G. The b. tbas. change briefly to 7th–8th hrns. in B $\flat$  basso for the first 8 mm.; the cadence is underscored from 521 by solemn ‘1/2 später’ rhythmic imitations in the 1st–4th hrns.; an added *dim.* makes a transition to the ensuing passage marked *pp*, doubtless intended to be scored for woodwind. The supplementation of mm. 525f. are dealt with below.

**G/mm. 527–544** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [30/“31”]; cf. AP E/129ff., DdF F/76  
*Length:* 16 mm.  
*Metrical structure:* [-3–12; 1–6-]

As noted in §3.2.6, a precise reconstruction of this bifol. is possible; that the passage from the last 2 mm. of 29E/“30” to the first 2 mm. of 31E/“32” was probably a simple manipulation of the chorale material is highly likely, given that no further sks. have come down to us. Ex. 12a gives the essential musical text (strings and woodwind) of this reconstruction, the derivation of which is shown in 12b, as an exact inversion of the 1st 12 mm. of the chorale theme and its 8-m. middle section. The 16-m. length of the bifol. is

confirmed, as we have seen, by the continuous bar numbering on 31E/"32", the period structure was most likely [-3-12; 1-6-],<sup>46</sup> implying that the elaborate string texture found at the beginning of the following bifol. must have begun in the 6th-to-last m. of [30/"31"].

The reconstruction of [30/"31"] may be summarised as follows. As Samale and Mazzuca recognised, the last two bars on "30"E—the entrance of the oboe—most likely represented the beginning of an episode inverting the chorale. While the first phrase of the chorale is 16-m. long, only 12 mm. are available here, but in attempting an inversion one discovers the futility (and, harmonically speaking, the difficulty) of an effective inversion of the last 4 mm. of the chorale—a single sustained  $c\sharp^2$ . On the other hand, a truncation of the phrase, ending in the 11th m. on  $e^2$ , the third of C major, forms a stylistically convincing progression and concludes with an appropriately 'churchly' plagal close. The first 16 mm. of the chorale are followed in the Exp. by a 'middle 8', a descending passage using, in mm. 1-2 and 5-6, the tritone sequences which characterise the entire Finale. From the C-major cadence of the previous phrase via the inversion of the  $F\sharp-B\flat$  junction at the parallel point in the exposition, a precise inversion of the tritone sequence beginning on  $A\flat$  major is possible; this sequence arrives 6 mm. later on a  $d^3$  at the D-major-G-major progression with which the next bifol. begins.<sup>47</sup> The string figuration of the first 10 mm. can be relatively easily established from the reconstructed progression, moving inwards in m. 536 towards the starting point of the ensuing triplet figuration, marked *ff*. The elaborate counterpoint of bifol. "32" can also be extrapolated seamlessly backwards; since the tritone progression consists of 2 4-m. sequential steps, mm. 3-4 were probably identical to the surviving mm. 7-8 of the period, leaving in effect only 2 mm. to reconstruct, since presumably mm. 1-2 and 5-6 were also identical. Further evidence was provided by Bruckner's Kustoden in the lower l. margin of 31/"32", which demonstrates that the preceding group in the bass on [30/"31"] lay higher. The gentle arch of the chorale inversion, marked *legato*, has been underscored by the addition of a *cresc.* at 529 and *dim. poco a poco* at 531, returning to *pp* at

<sup>46</sup> Cf. AP. Orel in his transcription (D/126) omitted the "1 2" under the "9 10" of the last 2 mm. of 29E/"30".

<sup>47</sup> Cf. the 1st vlins. The 1st ob. line must represent the alto rather than the soprano of a high woodwind texture. It may seem odd that Bruckner wrote in effect the alto rather than the soprano line of the progression here, although it is entirely in line with his initial scoring practice at other points throughout the score, for instance the initial bifols. of the Durchf., on which the 1st ob. was notated together with the strings. Bruckner may also have notated the fl. line above the 1st ob. in the previous mm. on [30/"31"], but simply omitted the  $d^3$  at the beginning of 31E/"32".

535, with dynamics enhanced by the addition from 529 of 3rd bsn. and sustained-note and falling octave motives in the 2nd–3rd trps. and 1st–6th hrns. From 537 *ff gestrichen* prevails in the strings, *marcato* in the upper woodwind and 1st–4th hrns., with brief fanfares in 2nd–3rd trps. marking the cadential progressions in mm. 539f. and 543f., in line with Bruckner’s own indications of the trps. from m. 546 onwards.

**G/mm. 542–562** *Source:* bifol. 31E/“32”, ÖNB 6087/71–72; cf. AP E/133ff., Facs. C/317ff., DdF F/77ff.

*Length:* originally 16 mm., perhaps intended to be expanded to 20 mm.

*Metrical structure:* -7–8; 1–8; 1–4-[5–10;]

Cf. §3.2.6, concerning the instrumentation of the first 2 mm., the preceding paragraph. The texture of at least the first 10 mm. of the last extant bifol. was essentially completed by Bruckner; although the passage has been marked *p*, additions to Bruckner’s indications of the obs. from 545 onwards, combining obs., clars. and bsns. with 1st trp. and trombs. in wide chordal spacing, were deemed appropriate, given that this represents the final appearance of the chorale in the Repr. At 549 Bruckner indicated an entry for the timp.; the curious alteration of *e♭* to *A♭* at m. 550 may have reflected the need to keep the 3rd timp. in reserve for a later point (perhaps, as here, the ensuing statement of the IX/1 Hauptth.) Another significant detail, the apparent omission of a first crotchet in the 2nd–3rd trps. at 548 (see Bruckner’s Tonbuchstaben, AP E/134), avoids a clash with the *c*<sup>#3</sup> of the 1st vln.; an apparently missing entry at m. 550 has been supplemented; in the following mm. a timpani tremolo has been added, underlining the *cresc. sempre* added in all instruments. The re-entry of the 1st–4th hrns. at V, again answered by the tbas. as at letter P, has been marked *ff sehr breit and gehalten*. As at letter P, textural supplementation was considered necessary on the downbeat, the trombs. and cb. tba. entering with the dotted rhythm figure as at P, highlighted by the trumpets.

The AF at this point also interpreted Bruckner’s repeated numbering in the top margin of the last p. of this bifol., “43 / 44 / 45 / 46” (cf. AP E/137, fn. 1, cf. previous p.) as an indication that the last 4 mm. were to be repeated, providing 4 entries of the horn-theme motive as at P, instead of the 2 apparently initially considered here; in effect, mm. 552–5 were repeated as

mm. 556–559<sup>48</sup> but with the addition of falling octaves in the trps. Following this, again structurally and melodically similar to the continuity following P, the trps. at m. 561 were allowed to take up the musical line (cf. trps. m. 404), this time with falling octaves instead of falling fourths, and answered at the closer interval of a half-m. by the trombs. Bruckner's string figuration from 551 is an augmentation of their previous figure. The overall design of the passage and reconstruction of the ensuing bifol. can be seen from the reduction in Ex. 13a.

**G/mm. 563–578** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [32/"33"];

cf. AP E/117ff., DdF F/67ff.

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [-11–12; 1–8;] 1–6;

See above, last paragraph, as well as Exx. 13a and b, which reduce the passage to its motivic design. As noted in §3.2.6, the motivic similarity of the horn theme to the IX/I Hauptth. suggests that Bruckner may have recalled the horn theme in the chorale epilogue so as to lead into a restatement of the first-movement Hauptth., as in the Finale of the Eighth. The next surviving relevant sk., as we have seen, appears to be the 3194/3<sup>F</sup> tritone sequence inverting the opening motive of the Finale. Strikingly, the 6th m. of the Hauptth. (cf. IX/1, mm. 68f.) forms a possible and appropriate link to the E $\flat$ -major  $\frac{6}{3}$  chord with which this sk. begins; such a truncation of the Hauptth. would also recall the first two iterations of the Hauptth. at letter N of the first movement. Three further factors determined the choice of this truncation: first, the entire Hauptth. is to be heard later in the coda where the whole first 8 mm. are used in the Themenüberlagerung, so that it becomes logical not to use the theme twice in the same form. Second, the truncation of the Hauptth. to 6 mm. forms a stylistically appropriate Abbruch, creating a metrical displacement and thereby imparting a sense of unrest to the entire ensuing passage. Third, although a speculative consideration, it cannot be overlooked that many of the principal sections of the Finale in the final version of the AP begin either with a fresh recto p. or with a fresh bifol.,<sup>49</sup> a

<sup>48</sup> This is perhaps anomalous, given that the repeat of the progression at letter V, B $\flat$ –G $\flat$ , becomes functionally meaningless on being repeated from G $\flat$  major at 556; the pencilled numbers may be apocryptic. The ensuing supplemented progression still works equally well; if anything, the omission of the added 4 mm. gives the passage a greater impetus. This is another passage in the score to be reconsidered in future editions.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. the Exp. Hauptth. (AP E/11), the Gesangsp. in the reconstruction of its assumed final version (E/19), the "Trio" (E/27), the Schlußp. (E/35), and the fugue (E/77).

final 6-m. period here would have concluded a 16-m. bifol. [32/“33”]; the coda would thereby have begun on a new bifol., [33/“34”]. The 3194/3<sup>f</sup> sk. also reveals a motivic link with the Hauptth.: the new chromatic descending motive in mm. 3ff. (cf. Ex. 14),  $a^1-g\sharp^1-g\flat^1-f\sharp^1$ , constitutes a further mutation of the  $c^3-b\flat^2-b\flat^2-a^2$  motive of the 4th m. of the Hauptth. Exx. 13a and b show the motivic procedures underlying the reconstruction of [32/“33”].

The 1st 2 mm. of [32/“33”] would almost doubtless have continued the repeated  $c\sharp/d\flat$ s; the next step in the AF was to reintroduce the horn theme in the hrns. in G major (note the tritone progression), heard twice in full, then in truncation, while the remaining brass prepare the dotted rhythm and falling octave of the Hauptth. (omitted in Ex. 13b). The strings at 565 return to their quaver triplet figuration,<sup>50</sup> from 569 adding canonic imitation. The coda of IX/1 (*q.v.*, mm. 541ff.) constituted an important model for this passage; concerning the treatment of 571, for instance, cf. IX/1, m. 548.

At 572, a final augmentation of the truncated horn motive in the brass leads into the Hauptth. itself, here harmonised in the major as at its final appearance in IX/1 (mm. 345ff. thereof). Similar to IX/1 (cf. 3rd–6th hrns., mm. 346ff.), the tbas. and later 3rd–4th hrns. supply a ‘1 Takt später’ imitation of the principal motive, while the strings, with the assistance of the bsns. and 3rd–4th hrns., augment the combined triplet figuration and falling octave of the preceding mm. Approached via a ‘rit.’ and *cresc.* in 572, and with the addition of timp. *tremolo*, the passage has been marked *fff*, ‘Sehr feierlich’, with a ‘riten.’ and barline fermata dramatising the Abbruch following m. 578. The metrical structure of the final two bifols. of the chorale Repr. is therefore as follows:

Mm.	Bifolio	Metrical nos.	Length	Section
543–562	31E/“32”	-7–8	+ 2 mm.	Conclusion of tritone progression ( <i>ff</i> )
		1–8;	8 mm.	Finale statement of chorale, <i>p</i>
		1–4-[5–8-	4[+4] mm.	Horn theme, <i>ff</i>
		[-9–10-]	2 mm. +	Continuation in trumpets in C# major
563–578	[31/“33”]	[-11–12]	2 mm.	Ditto
		[1–8;]	8 mm.	Horn theme continued in G major, leading to:
		[1–6;]	6 mm.	Restatement of Hauptthema of IX/1, <i>fff</i>

<sup>50</sup> The vlins. can now play the falling octave of the motive ( $g^1-g$ ); they were unable to accommodate the motive at letter V for reasons of range.



The entire chorale Repr. can therefore be summarised as follows:

Mm.	Metrical structure	Description
491–508	18 (6+6+6)	Resumption of triplet figuration (D minor; <i>fff</i> , <i>p cresc. poco a poco</i> , <i>pp</i> , <i>cresc. sempre</i> )
509–524	16 (8 + 8)	Chorale with Te Deum figuration (D major; <i>ff</i> , <i>dim.</i> , <i>p</i> , <i>dim.</i> )
525–536	12	Inversion of chorale (B major–C major; <i>pp</i> , <i>cresc.</i> , <i>dim. poco a poco</i> , <i>pp</i> )
537–544	8	Inversion of ‘middle 8’ of chorale (tritone progression, A $\flat$ major–D major; <i>ff</i> )
545–552	8	Concluding statement of chorale (E $\flat$ major–B $\flat$ major; <i>p</i> , <i>cresc. sempre</i> )
553–560	8 (4+4) +	Horn theme (G $\flat$ /F $\sharp$ major; <i>ff</i> )
561–564	4	Continuation of horn theme in trumpets (C $\sharp$ /D $\flat$ major)
565–572	8 (4+2+1+1)	Continuation in horns (G major, via B $\flat$ major, <i>cresc.</i> , to:)
573–578	6	Statement of IX/1 Hauptthema (truncated; D major, <i>fff</i> )

### 3.3.7 Concerning the coda.<sup>51</sup>

Setting aside the widely held belief that Bruckner never advanced the score of the Finale as far as the coda, it is unlikely, given the pressure under which his declining health placed him and the fact that he nonetheless lived to draft sks. for the coda, that he would at such a late stage have undertaken substantial alterations to the Exp. such as 2F, its recopying and the corollary renumbering of all bifols. without having established the continuity of the conclusion of the score. It is of course possible that Bruckner was already too ill by May 1896 to have undertaken more than these sks., and that perhaps bifol. 2F was written and the renumbering undertaken prior to their composition, but this leaves unexplained the fact that no further sks. for the coda survive from later months, from which we possess repeated attempts to refine the structure of bifols. 1 and 13. If the coda had still not crystallised by this time (and bearing in mind also that Bruckner had probably rejected the idea of a transition to the Te Deum by this time), establishing the compositional continuity of the coda would surely have remained his greatest priority, and we would expect to find many more later sks. or SVE for the coda. Yet not one survives.

Bruckner also appears to have only resorted to pc. sks. at points where the compositional direction required clarification, so it is significant in itself that no single comprehensive sk. for the coda of the Finale survives, as it does for instance in the case of the Finale of the Eighth.<sup>52</sup> Furthermore, the first references to bifols. in the May 1896 pc. sks. are to bifols. 35

<sup>51</sup> Cf. §3.1.10, from the commentary to E/137 onwards, and the discussion of the coda sks. in the DdF, §3.2.7.

<sup>52</sup> This is the 2-p. pc. sk. ÖNB 6070, ceremoniously dated “Steyr, Stadt-/ pfarrhof /16. August/ 1885./ A Bruckner mp/ Halleluja!” (incorrectly quoted as 1886 by Boetticher, “Über einige Probleme der Kompositionstechnik in den Sinfonien Anton Bruckners”, p. 17; a page is reproduced in Doernberg’s biography, following p. 68)—in

and 36, suggesting that Bruckner had probably composed at least as far as a bifol. 34 by that time. There are also the clues relayed via Heller concerning the conclusion of the Finale and even the thematic outline of the intended “Lob- und Preislied”. Heller’s attempted explanation, “wollte wahrscheinlich Tedeum sagen”, suggests, as we have seen, that Heller heard something like the Te Deum in the conclusion of the movement which Bruckner played to him; indeed, had he been sufficiently skilled in musical dictation, as he maintained, it might have been possible for him to sketch the symphony’s conclusion. Bruckner thus had a clear concept of the conclusion of the movement already in 1895; the May 1896 sks. probably represented no more than the final hurdle in the movement’s compositional design. Few significant creative contributions were apparently required in the composition of the coda beyond resolution of the crucial cadential area and the Steigerung preceding it (bifols. 35–37). Other elements of the coda were probably already established by the time Bruckner arrived at this point: these probably included the 3194/3<sup>f</sup> sk., some form of Themenüberlagerung and an entry of the chorale in the coda; like the inversion of the chorale in the Repr., they may have been sufficiently clear and straightforward as not to require independent pc. sks.

While we cannot be sure whether Bruckner completed significantly more of the composition of the Finale in score, it remains probable, even likely, that Bruckner would have attempted to lay out the coda in score before beginning what appears to have been the systematic completion of the movement’s orchestration. Whether he ultimately extended the score to the last measure, the final bifols. like so much else being lost, or whether he ceased ongoing composition at some earlier point in the coda is in a sense immaterial for the attempt to arrive at some conception of what was intended.

Even given all the clues we possess, it is inevitable that some elements of the design of the coda in the AF, let alone the ‘mere details’ of its orchestration, metrical or motivic structure, remain suppositional and speculative. However, they are by no means without foundation. Samale and Mazzuca as well as the present writer made detailed comparative studies of the structure and proportions of other final movements of Bruckner’s symphonies in an effort to better understand what the composer may have intended for the final coda of the Ninth;<sup>53</sup> in the end, however, comparative insights proved no more than a general guide. Bruckner’s own surviving material for the coda, his statements concerning it, and information

---

other words, composed two whole years before the completion of the AP of the first version of the Eighth (August 1887). Its 47 mm. summarise the continuity of what would become the last 71 mm. of the 1887 score, contrapuntally combining with the movement’s Hauptth. (i) the theme of the Adagio *in extenso*, (ii) the principal motive of the Scherzo, and finally (iii), at the final cadence into C major, the Hauptth. of the first movement—in other words, building up the concluding Themenüberlagerung in a more step-by-step fashion than is the case in the score. It of course remains possible that we have lost a further sk. or sks. from the early part of the coda of the Finale of the Ninth yet, by and large, there is less evidence of pc. sks. having been lost than bifols. The ‘Souvenirjäger’ perhaps considered neatly notated bifols. preferable booty.

<sup>53</sup> It has already been noted (§3.1.2) that Nowak made similar comparative studies of the proportions of other Finale movements in his attempts to come to terms with the Finale fragments in his last years.

derived from analysis of the materials, all proved more significant. Out of the earlier conception of the coda in the Samale-Mazzuca *Ricostruzione*, heavily indebted to the model provided by the coda of the Eighth and which can be retraced in §1.4.14 and Table V, the discovery and interpretation of the May 1896 sks. produced in the definitive version of the AF an independent, complex structure for the coda featuring six principal elements, all ratified in one form or another by the surviving musical materials of the Finale or by insights derived from them. These are as follows:

- i. The sk. 3194/3<sup>f</sup>, an ascending sequence of tritone-related chords, sketched three times over by Bruckner, finally notated by Bruckner in ink in apparently definitive form. It was first intended by Bruckner as a *Steigerung* to the first appearance of the chorale in the Exp., for which it would have proven too long, too grandiose and insufficiently dramatic; however its motivic elements, length and symmetrical structure would have suited it perfectly as the introduction to what would necessarily have been an expansive coda.
- ii. A *Themenüberlagerung* of the principal themes of each of the four movements of the symphony, a combination suggested by Auer's 1934 revision of his own and Max Graf's earlier comments concerning a *Themenüberlagerung* of the Finale's four themes. The idea that the coda of the Finale would have included some kind of *Themenüberlagerung* was endorsed by musicological opinion (cf. Langevin's remarks for instance, §1.3.10, or Moravcsik's remarks, *infra*) as well as the stylistic credibility of the solution itself. Apparent references to bifols. 35 and 36 on the Cracow and 6085/45 sks. also endorsed the need for a further structural element at this point.
- iii. A final statement of the chorale theme, realised in D major, in the harmonic form given to it by Bruckner in the Repr. der Gesangsp. The original goal of the 3194/3<sup>f</sup> progression was, of course, the chorale; independently, musicological opinion (again cf. Zentner, §1.3.9, Langevin) endorsed the likelihood that Bruckner would have triumphantly reintroduced the chorale, as in the coda of the Finale of the Fifth.
- iv. The sk. ÖNB 6085/45<sup>f</sup> for a lyrical ascending harmonic progression in minims (hence 'lyrical *Steigerung*'). The progression, beginning in C, would have had to follow on from an appropriate passage, which has not survived in sk., and apparently began, or led to, a "Bogen 36." The progression clearly had as its goal the *c♭* with which the ensuing sk. begins, and completed in the AF as an 8-m. period. Bruckner may have had a longer *Steigerung* in mind here; a further sk. for the passage, 6085/47<sup>f</sup>, was more difficult to construe and was omitted.
- v. The sk. ÖNB 6085/43<sup>f</sup> for a 24-m. harmonic progression ending with an 8-m. D pedal point, which must have represented the final cadence of the movement.

- vi. As discussed in §1.1.8, Heller's report, apparently from 1895, which quotes Bruckner as saying "Ich habe auch deshalb vor, das Allelujah (wollte wahrscheinlich Tedeum sagen) des zweiten Satzes mit aller Macht wieder im Finale zu bringen, damit die Symphonie mit einem Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott endet". The introduction of a theme extrinsic to the movement for the conclusion of the work itself indicates a significant shift in 'normal' symphonic thinking. The Fifth, for instance concluded with its victorious chorale, the Eighth with the symphonic apotheosis of its Themenüberlagerung. The Ninth, apparently, was to conclude with a gesture not logically derived from the exigencies of its musical material but from the 'programmatic' content of the symphony's conception as "Huldigung vor der göttlichen Majestät" and dedication to "dem lieben Gott".<sup>54</sup>

Setting all this information together, the attempt to arrive at a conception of the conclusion of the movement as intended by Bruckner becomes a worthwhile and profitable exercise rather an opportunity for unbridled speculation and what Gülke referred to as 'Drauflosbrucknern' (§1.4.3). The following six sections summarise the AF's conception of the overall design and reconstruction of the principal components of this structure; a summary of the textural and instrumental realisation of these elements, following the necessarily conjectural division of bifols. from here on., concludes this section,

*Length and metrical structure.*

Although substantial material—well over 50 mm.—for the coda survives, it is probably reasonable to assume that the final section of the score would not have exceeded c. 15 percent of the total movement length—a rough approximation based on the average length of the first- and last-movement codas of the nine symphonies.<sup>55</sup> This would imply that the coda may have been around 100 mm. long. Assuming, as seems likely, that the coda would have begun at or on a bifol. [33/"34"] and that Bruckner maintained the 16-m. barring of the prepared bifols.,

---

<sup>54</sup> The charge, made for instance by Simpson (*The Essence of Bruckner*, p. 182; cf. §1.3.9), that Bruckner's thematic material was insufficient to support a coda, was founded, first, on a massive misunderstanding about the nature of the Finale fragments. Such a view also overlooks the fact that retrospective, quotational elements represented significant aspects of the Bruckner's symphonic Schwanengesang from the outset, as we have seen (§2.2.3). In the Finale alone, Bruckner quotes or alludes to the Te Deum, the Finale of the Sixth and both first movement and Finale of the Third, as well as *Christ ist erstanden*, and in the "Lob- und Preislied" would have further deepened the network of allusion, presumably in an overriding, monumental fashion, by concluding with a conclusive form of his "Allelujah" or "non confundar" topos. Much has been written about the quotations and allusions in the Adagio; the dictates of symphonic unity likewise justified, if not demanded, the extraordinarily abbreviated motivic vocabulary to which Bruckner restricted himself in the Finale.

<sup>55</sup> By the present writer's own statistical analyses, not included here for reasons of space, and dependent in some cases, as to where one even locates the beginning of the coda, the percentages fall between a massive 22.5 per cent for the coda of V/4 (mm. 460–635) vs. 8.9 per cent for the coda of VIII(90)/4 (mm. 647–709). By virtue of the fact that both V/4 and IX/4 represent fusions of sonata form with fugal technique and both include chorales, the 109-m. coda of the AF, 15.4 per cent of the total movement length, could be regarded as a safe middle value.

the AP may therefore have concluded somewhere on bifol. [39/“40”].<sup>56</sup> That the ascending sequence or ‘lyrical Steigerung’ of 6085/45<sup>f</sup> or perhaps the “Ces” marking its climax were to fall on a “Bogen 36” provides a significant clue, as well as the apparent reference to a [Bogen] “35” in the Cracow Finale sk. (C/49), which, as we have seen (§2.1.5) perhaps marked out the metrical continuity from the foregoing bifol. onwards, and led into the extended tritone progression which must already have been envisaged as the climax of the coda (cf. in the Cracow sk. the extended F followed by b $\natural$ <sup>57</sup>).

Chief among other analytical perspectives were metrical considerations, to which we have also already referred. The 3194/3<sup>f</sup> sk., for instance, presents a highly regular metrical escalation pattern of ever more rapid harmonic change and decreasingly rapid ascent.<sup>58</sup> Leading back into D minor, as this sequence would surely have done had it been used here, a final 4 mm. were added (see further discussion *infra*). The 12-m. length of the Themenüberlagerung was determined by its largest unit, the double augmentation of the Adagio Hauptth. which forms its bass line, providing in effect a further escalation scheme. The 8-m. length of the final statement of the chorale was determined by its source, the 4-m. ‘quotation’ of the chorale in the Gesangsp. Repr. Most of the ensuing structure of the coda was determined by the sequence of the May 1896 sks.

Concerning the length of the concluding “Allelujah”, Cohrs in 1989 made the observation that each movement of the Ninth appears to feature a significant formal juncture of some kind 37 mm. before the end—37 being the Grundzahl of the Wiener Stephansdom, and believed by Cohrs to be a numerologically significant number in Bruckner’s construction of the Ninth (cf. §§1.4.16, 2.1.6). In IX/1, the 37th m. from the end falls at letter Y, where the brass enter for the first time in the coda (the coda itself begins 12 mm. earlier), with the first of three statements of the concluding phrase of the movement’s Hauptth. In the principal Scherzo movement, Bruckner deviates from the parallel structure of the ‘1. Teil’ of the movement with a *p subito* at m. 211. The most obvious case, the 37th-to-last m. of the Adagio, falls at letter R, the clearly marked beginning of the coda, following the Siebenklang with which the climax of the movement breaks off. Setting aside the extent to which these junctures may be simply ‘factitious’, it made good sense to structure the ‘Schlußbaustein’ of the Finale as 37, since this provided a final metrical escalation of 16 + 8 + 4 mm., followed by a concluding unit of 9 (4 + 5) mm., an eminently suitable structure for the intended Allelujah

<sup>56</sup> The use of original and renumbered classifications for the coda bifols. is of course entirely conjectural; it is ultimately unclear as to whether Bruckner may not have recopied 2F and renumbered the score sometime after composing the final extant bifol.

<sup>57</sup> It appears as if Bruckner may simply have taken the page already used for the Durchf. sk. and extended its numbering-through of the mm. so as to ‘pace out’, as it were, the compositional space required from, one assumes, bifol. 35, or perhaps even before, to the intended climax of the coda, initially conceived as an extended passage over the bass notes F–b $\natural$ .

<sup>58</sup> Cf. discussion, §2.1.5.

which matches the design of the 3194/3<sup>f</sup> Steigerung. The entire 109-m. coda therefore falls into a structure of two initial, propulsive metrical escalations, 16 + 8 + 4 and 8 + 4 mm., a central metrically stable ‘plateau’ of 8 + 8 + 8 + 8 mm., a final Steigerung of 16 + 8 + 4 mm. and a 9-m. conclusion:

No.	Length	Metrical structure	Description
i.	28	16 (8 + 8) + 12 (8 + 4)	3194/3 <sup>f</sup> sk., last 4 mm. added, in order to cadence into:
ii.	12	8 + 4	Themenüberlagerung
iii.	8	8	Chorale in D major, harmonisation from Gesangsp. Repr.
iv.	8	8	‘Lyrical Steigerung’: 1st 4 mm. of 6085/45 <sup>f</sup> , 4 mm. added, to join up with:
v.	16	8 + 8	Finale cadence, 6085/43 <sup>f</sup> : C $\flat$ major–F major–A <sup>11</sup> –g $\sharp$ /b $\flat$ , barline fermata, then:
vi.	37	16 (8 + 8) + 12 (8 + 4) + 9 (4 + 5)	D pedal point, beginning with last 8 mm. of 6085/43 <sup>f</sup> , then introducing the “Allelujah” in the trumpets

Finally, it should be mentioned, if only parenthetically, that due to the fact that the beginning of the coda coincides in the AF with the beginning of a new bifol. [33/“34”] and the two ‘metrically irregular’ passages, i and ii above, effectively cancel each other out, the structure of the coda accords largely with the hypothetical division of bifols. With the exception of the Themenüberlagerung (m. 607), each of the components of the coda would thus have begun either at the beginning of a bifol. (the 3194/3<sup>f</sup> progression at m. 579, lyrical Steigerung at m. 627, entry of the “Allelujah” in the trps. at m. 659) or on the 3rd p. of one (the chorale at m. 619, cadential zone at m. 635, D pedal point at m. 651).

#### *The 3194/3<sup>f</sup> sketch*<sup>59</sup>

As we have seen, only the first 24 mm. of 3194/3<sup>f</sup> were notated in ink by Bruckner; the remainder, in pencil, was disregarded as an attempt to extend the sk. but which has little relevance to the design of the preceding 24 mm., the first 16 of which ascend by minor thirds every 4 mm., the remaining 8 by major 2nds every 2 mm.

In order to lead the progression into the Themenüberlagerung this spiral formation was continued harmonically for a further 4 mm. (cf. Ex. 15) by analogy with the chorale Steigerung in the Exp. (cf. G/23). The added mm. further reduce the rate of ascent of the progression, climbing from B<sup>7</sup> via C<sup>7</sup> and A<sup>7</sup>, then flattening the fifth to e $\flat$  before cadencing into the D-minor (or more appropriately, D-Phrygian) Themenüberlagerung. The metrical structure thereby created forms an almost perfect sequence of metrical escalation:

16 +	4 + 4 + 4 + 4	Tritone progressions, ascending every 4 mm. by minor 3rds, from E $\flat$ major $\frac{6}{3}$
8 +	2 + 2 + 2 + 2	Tritone progressions, ascending every 2 mm. by major 2nds, from E $\flat$ major $\frac{6}{3}$
[4]	[2 + 1 + 1/2 + 1/2]	[Ascent by semitones to D minor from B $\sharp$ major $\frac{6}{5}$ ]

<sup>59</sup> AF G/mm. 579ff.; cf. Ex. 14, AP E/138 I.

*The Themenüberlagerung*<sup>60</sup>

We have already noted the lack of agreement in the sources concerning the exact nature of the themes combined, and the improbability that the overlay of chorale, Te Deum motive, Finale Hauptth. and the fugal theme of which Graf wrote, and which was adapted by Auer, was actually seen by either of them, or indeed, that such a combination is possible. The Finale Hauptth. is essentially the same as the fugal theme; neither permit harmonically of combination with the chorale.<sup>61</sup> Graf's and Auer's original text was not known to Samale and Mazzuca when they conceived the Themenüberlagerung in the coda of their *Ricostruzione* as a combination, not of the themes of the Finale, but of each of the four movements of the symphony, in accordance with the passage in the 1934 edition of Auer's biography, "Einmal treten in diesen Skizzen alle Themen gleichzeitig übereinandergebaut auf, wie im Finale der 'Achten'" (cf. AP E/138).

However, assuming Bruckner used the 3194/3 sk. for the beginning of the coda and at some point thereafter restated the chorale theme in some form, the "Bogen 36" reference on 6085/45<sup>f</sup> suggests that at least one further structural element would have been required in order to fill the intervening musical space. This assumes, of course, that the renumbering took place following the composition of the coda sks.; if the bifol.-35 and -36 annotations already referred to renumbered bifols., all other factors being equal, it is conceivable that the chorale may have followed directly on from the 3194/3<sup>f</sup> Steigerung.<sup>62</sup> However, there are many other possible variables, for instance, the length of the lyrical Steigerung 6085/45, unfinished in the sk., which Bruckner could perhaps have expanded considerably in the score. For this reason, the Samale–Mazzuca Themenüberlagerung, with minor alterations, retained its place in the definitive score of the AF. The combination (cf. Ex. 16) is stylistically credible and structurally convincing, forming a 12-m. quotation-like interpolation, which delays the expected arrival point of the preceding Steigerung, the chorale. We should also bear in mind that in the 1890s the Themenüberlagerung became an aspect of the Eighth Symphony most often approvingly (or even awe-fully) invoked in critical reception. Whether sighted by Graf or Auer or not, it is unlikely that Bruckner, if such a combination was at all possible, might not have seen fit to capitalise on the concept.<sup>63</sup> That the combination of more or less 'official' versions of the themes of at least three of the movements, with the addition of the rhythm of

<sup>60</sup> AF G/mm. 607ff.; cf. Ex. 16, AP E/138 II.

<sup>61</sup> It is of course, not necessary to infer from this that Graf was being purposefully deceitful; it remains possible, for instance, that, writing from memory of MSS perhaps only briefly viewed by him, he may have conflated more than one such passage, for instance the chorale Repr. on bifol. 28E/"29", as has been suggested in §3.1.10, E/138, II.

<sup>62</sup> This is possible with the AF as it stands, simply by making a cut from letter X to letter Z.

<sup>63</sup> For instance, Bruckner wrote 22 Dec. 1890 to Paul Heyse concerning a critique of the Fourth: "Daß der Herr Kritiker [...] das Finale soweit zurücksetzt, ja sogar als verfehlt bezeichnet, kränkt mich sehr [...]. Hier bezeichnet man allgemein das Finale als den besten und hervorragendsten Satz. Die Themen alle zusammen[zufassen], das beabsichtige ich gar nicht. Das kommt nur in der 8. Sinfonie im Finale vor."

the Scherzo is not only possible but effective with only a minimal modification of the fugal theme probably says more about the synergism of Bruckner's thematic procedures in the Ninth than it does about whether such a combination was consciously intended by him. Doubtless, had Bruckner intended an overlay of first movement, Adagio and Finale fugal themes, he would have had to have made such a sk. at an early point in the movement's evolution.<sup>64</sup> Michael Moravcsik, in an article on Bruckner's codas, wrote of the Themenüberlagerung in the Eighth,

It is tour-de-force but not for its own sake, since these themes are mere elements in the harmonies of this magnificent conclusion. [...] One feels quite certain that had Bruckner been able to complete the fourth movement of the Ninth Symphony, a similar fusion of thematic elements from all four movements would have appeared.<sup>65</sup>

However, one need also not assume that Bruckner would have done this the same way twice: in contrast with the triumphant thematic apotheosis represented by the Themenüberlagerung in the Eighth,<sup>66</sup> the 'catastrophic' overlay here brings together the 'Gothic', Phrygian-mode elements of D minor, from which point onwards the encyclopaedic twelve-tone progression of the chorale, ensuing Steigerung and extended tritone passage C $\flat$  major–F major effectively erases the listener's tonal orientation until D minor reasserts itself as the dominant 11th chord at m. 643. As shown in Ex. 16 (which adjoins Ex. 15), the Hauptth. of the first movement appears in the Themenüberlagerung in its original form underneath a typically Brucknerian violin figuration in quavers. The Finale Hauptth. appears in the form it takes as the subject of the fugue (with harmonic alteration); reference to the Scherzo is included as a rhythmic reduction of the timp. (the triplet rhythm persists in woodwind throughout the ensuing passage). Providing the musical continuity of the passage, the powerful arch of the Adagio Hauptth. appears in double augmentation in the bass, the

---

<sup>64</sup> Wolfgang Boetticher (Über einige Probleme...", pp. 16f.) refers to a 66-m. pc. sk. for the beginning of the Finale of the Fifth, ÖNB 6017, which corresponds roughly to the final text of the movement as far as letter B, but at mm. 31ff. superimposes the chorale theme above the first statement of the fugal subject—a combination that finally takes place 340 mm. later, at letter Q. The sk. is held at Kremsmünster; a page thereof is reproduced in Derek Watson's *Bruckner*, revised edition, Oxford 1996 (plate 6).

<sup>65</sup> "The Coda in the Symphonies of Anton Bruckner", p. 249; the statement is all the more significant in that it is clear from the context that Moravcsik was not informed about the degree of completion of the MSS; this was discussed §1.3.9. It is also significant that Warren Storey Smith ("The cyclic principle in musical design, and the use of it by Bruckner and Mahler", *Ch&D* 2, no. 9, 1960), who referred to a "never-composed" Finale of the Ninth Symphony (p. 10), nonetheless speculated that "[i]f Bruckner had lived long enough to write a Finale for his Ninth symphony, he probably would have introduced in it (preferably at the very end) the chief theme of the first movement, which had been his practice from No. 2 on" (p. 20).

<sup>66</sup> Carragan's attempt to combine the chorale in major diatonic form with the other themes, essentially a more faithful realisation of the combination which Graf, and Auer, in his 1923 biography, appear to have been alluding to, was described by a reviewer as a "*Salto mortale* in die Welt des Richard Strauss und am Ende gar der Filmmusik Hollywoods"; cf. §1.4.12.



original first 3 mm. of the statement (a) here expanded to 12 mm. (b); the  $c\sharp^1-d^1$  with which it concludes matches up with the  $d^2-c\sharp^2$  of the ensuing chorale (c):<sup>67</sup>



The first-movement Hauptth. and (harmonically slightly altered) fugue subject extend through the first 8 mm., the remaining 4 mm. being filled in by repetitions of the principal motives of these themes. Significant also is that the themes combine in such a way as to create at m. 3 (cf. Ex. 16) the same dissonance,  $d/eb/g/bb$ , which Bruckner himself employs in the coda of the first movement (mm. 553ff. thereof).

*The chorale and ascending sequence, or 'lyrical Steigerung'*<sup>68</sup>

The Themenüberlagerung therefore functions as a further metrical escalation to what was the original goal of the 3194/3 sk., the chorale, which the AF introduces here in D major in the curious and perhaps intentionally 'prophetic' form in which Bruckner introduced it in the Repr. Gesangsp. (cf. Ex. 17, which shows the derivation of the 8-m. harmonic progression in the coda from its 4-m. 'Aufbereitung' 164 mm. earlier). The progression was reduced to 'pure' triads, as it was felt that the Vierklänge used by Bruckner in the 2nd and 6th chords of the progression would in *ff* have detracted from the impression of effortless grace and power; the chorale is also followed by the apparently purely triadic progression of the 'lyrical Steigerung'. The catabasis topos undergoes a gradual extension of its melodic range throughout its mutation cycle in the Adagio and Finale, which perhaps vindicates the choice of the chorale in this particular incarnation in the coda. The "Abschied vom Leben" theme on its first appearance in IX/3 descends through a fourth, ( $b\flat^1-f$ ; cf. Ex. 24k); this is extended well beyond two octaves at the 'transfigured' appearances of the chorale later in the movement (letter L; Ex. 24l). At the first appearance of the chorale in the Exp., the melodic descent extends through a sixth ( $e^2-g\sharp^1$ ; Ex. 24o), ditto in the Repr. ( $d^2-f\sharp^1$ ; Ex. 24s), and at its last appearance in the surviving fragments of the AP, just before letter V, through a seventh ( $e\flat^2-f^1$ ; Ex. 24u). At the 'quotation' of the chorale in the Repr. Gesangsp. and hence also its final appearance in the coda of the AF, the chorale is reduced to a 'fictive' 8 note scale, which

<sup>67</sup> Further adding to the significance of the opening phrase of the Adagio here, the original arrival point of this line in the opening mm. of the Adagio is the D major entry of the trps. with an "Allelujah" topos (cf. Ex. 24k), which perhaps prefigures the entrance of the trps. later in the Finale coda—see *infra*.

<sup>68</sup> AF G/mm. 619ff.; cf. Exx. 17 and 18, AP E/139 III, E/113.

steps through the entire octave (in the Repr. Gesangsp.  $c\flat^3$ – $b\sharp^1$ , Ex. 24q, in the coda  $d^2$ – $d^1$ , Ex. 24v).

Ending on  $d^1$  in G major,<sup>69</sup> it is by no means far-fetched to imagine that these 8 mm. were specifically intended to precede the ascending triadic sequence of the 6085/45 sk. (Ex. 18; AF G/mm. 627ff.).<sup>70</sup> The beginning of this phrase, on  $e^1$ , on a C-major chord, rather than any note more obviously associated with D minor must surely have been significant. Parallels can be drawn with the conclusion of the chorale on its first appearance in the Exp. (cf. letter H). Both passages lead off in minims from a C-major chord following harmonic movement of the chorale in semibreves. At letter H the minims, located in the bass under a pedal point, lead downwards, in part chromatically; at 627 they lead upwards by whole tones in a freely modulating harmonic progression.<sup>71</sup> Even more strikingly, the pitches of the ascending phrase precisely complement those of the descending chorale, forming a complete twelve-tone series within as many measures:



While Bruckner did not complete the passage on 6085/45<sup>f</sup>, the  $c\flat^3$  at the beginning of the 2nd bracket, and the  $c\flat^1$  and  $f$  on the 3rd bracket suggest that the arrival point of the progression was probably not far off. A further sk. for this progression, 6085/47<sup>f</sup>, as discussed (§3.2.7) suggested a more gradual ascent, but cannot be readily linked with the  $c\flat^3$  with which 6085/43<sup>f</sup> begins. 6085/45 was thus supplemented in the AF (cf. Ex. 18) as an 8-m. period by adding only 4 mm., which ascend from a C major chord, which appears to follow the 4th m. of 6085/43, via  $G\flat$  major at m. 7, to the  $c\flat^3$  of 6085/43 (Ex. 19).

#### *The final cadence*<sup>72</sup>

While textural completion of the entire coda, and particularly the 6085/43 progression demanded a degree of ‘creative initiative’, the lack of motivic specification in the sk. was not in itself prohibitive; judging by the text of most of the “2. Theil” of the AP, had Bruckner laid this passage out in score, it would probably have consisted of no more than the complete string figuration and only general indications of prominent wind entries, in other words, essentially a ‘Klangfläche’.

<sup>69</sup> As the sk. on the verso of 6085/43 perhaps suggests.

<sup>70</sup> In their *Introduction* (p. 32), Samale and Mazzuca point to Bruckner’s use of several similar ascending chordal progressions: the *Kyrie* of the D-minor Mass, mm. 29ff., IV(78/80)/4, mm. 517ff., V/2, mm. 157ff., VII/2, mm. 170ff., VIII(90)/3, mm. 187ff., IX/3, mm. 191ff., and note that a common ancestor of the topos can be found in the *Lacrimosa* of the Mozart Requiem, mm. 5ff.

<sup>71</sup> *Vexilla regis* also closes with a ‘Phrygian’ cadence via C major onto E (cf. C/343, last 7 mm.)—strikingly similar to the harmonic situation between letters H and J of the Finale.

<sup>72</sup> AF G/mm. 635ff.; cf. Ex. 19, AP E/141.

The 6085/43 sk. appears to indicate, as already noted, a broad cadential progression: C♭ major  $\frac{6}{3}$  (4 mm.), F major (4 mm.), the dominant 11th of D minor (7 mm.), an apparent harmonic deviation g♯/b♭ in the bass (1 m.)<sup>73</sup> and finally the return to the tonic, D/d (8 mm.).<sup>74</sup> The progression was a logical choice for such a final summation, monumentalising as it does the tritone, the harmonic matrix which dominates the movement, and recalling the climax of the Hauptth. Repr. in IX/1, namely the progression B major<sup>9</sup>–F minor  $\frac{6}{3}$  (mm. 381ff. thereof), as well as the dissonant climax of the Schlußp. Repr., a similarly long-sustained Tredezim<sup>75</sup> (letter W). The realisation of the Undezimakkord in the AF intentionally recalls the sudden, dissonant entry of the trps. at m. 309, just prior to the fugue, in which d<sup>1</sup>/d<sup>2</sup> octaves in the trps. are pitted against the diminished 7th c♯/e/g/b♭;<sup>76</sup> the brief pre-fugue passage thereby becomes in the AF an Aufbereitung for the longer passage in the coda, the d<sup>3</sup> of the sk. realised as the same dissonant fanfare d<sup>1</sup>/d<sup>2</sup>,<sup>77</sup> while the dominant ninth progression underlying it ascends through a rising diminished 5th, from e to b♭. The passage also recalls, for the last time, the extraordinarily dominant role played by the initiatory harmonic progression of the symphony, with its ‘Kernspaltung’ d–db/eb, as Gülke described the progression at m. 19 of the first movement,<sup>78</sup> and the ensuing abrupt swing to the distant tonal centre of C♭ major (mm. 21f). The progression outlined on 6085/43 seems almost symbolically to reverse this, beginning with C♭ and ending with a repetition of the Kernspaltung on the dominant, a–g♯/b♭. The split of the bass into g♯ and b♭ was interpreted harmonically as an augmented-sixth chord, g♯/b♭/d/e, in which the e ‘blocks’ the centrifugal force which the ‘Kernspaltung’ progression possessed in the introduction to the first movement, where the db/eb functioned as a dominant seventh, leading away from the tonic towards the distant but powerful opposing tonal centre of C♭. By analogy with the barline fermata before the fugue of the Finale (mm. 310/311) as well as that at the similar harmonic situation at m. 290, it seemed only appropriate to precede the final arrival on the tonic by barline fermata, creating an Abbruch similar to the identical progression in the coda of III(90)/1, mm. 622 and echoing the Abbruch at m. 206 of IX/3 following the climactic Tredezim of that movement. An unbroken progression from this g♯ to the octave D-d of the next bar is in any case stylistically inappropriate.

<sup>73</sup> This reading, as we have seen (§3.1.10), was that given by Orel; cf. D/127.

<sup>74</sup> It is perhaps no coincidence that *Das Deutsche Lied*, completed in 1892 while Bruckner was still at work on IX/1, concludes with an extended cadence featuring a similar progression to the final cadence here, namely B major–E minor–A<sup>13</sup>–D major (cf. C/350, mm. 75ff).

<sup>75</sup> I.e., F<sup>13</sup>, with 3rd and 5th omitted (F/eb/g♭/b♭/db<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>76</sup> Mm. 379f. in the Steigerung following the fugue represent a similar harmonic spacing, where the c♯<sup>1</sup>/c♯<sup>2</sup> octave in the trps. is sustained against the Ab<sup>9</sup> harmony in the rest of the orchestra.

<sup>77</sup> The trumpet fanfares in *Helgoland* (q.v., mm. 31ff. and 139ff.) are almost identical with that prior to the fugue in the Finale.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. discussion, §2.1.3.

*The “Allelujah”*<sup>79</sup>

Bruckner’s use of the term “Allelujah” was thought to connote a combination of the anabasic arpeggiations with the 2nd added as passing note between the 1st and 3rd degrees, i.e., ascending arpeggio phrases including the stepwise-rising-third or *non confundar* topos frequently encountered in Bruckner’s music: Ex. 21 lists a number of variants of this topos from the Second (a), Seventh (b–d), Eighth (e–f) and Ninth (i–k) symphonies, Psalm 150 (g) and *Helgoland* (h).<sup>80</sup> Like the Hauptth. of the Finale, *catabasic* chorale and double augmentations of the Te Deum motive in the Durchf., the “Allelujah” would surely have appeared as a monumentalised hyper-dimensional image, as *reductio ad absolutum*; it therefore seemed most appropriate to introduce the theme in quasi-*choraliter* notation; this was furthermore felt to accord with the composer’s words, “Ich werde daher das Allelujah des zweiten Satzes *mit aller Macht* wieder im Finale bringen, damit die Symphonie mit einem Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott endet”. Ex. 20 shows the form in which the “Allelujah des zweiten Satzes” appears at m. 659 of the AF, derived as a threefold augmentation of the phrase at m. 25 of the Trio of the Eighth (Ex. 21e); the  $c\sharp^2$  and  $d\sharp^2$  passing notes of the original phrase (which in the Eighth produce consecutive fifths against the bass) were omitted from this ‘idealised’ version of the phrase as inessential.

The use of this particular source, of several versions of an “Allelujah” which could qualify for the role was suggested by Auer’s footnote “Trio der Achten Symphonie mit Anklängen an das Te Deum” appended to Heller’s citation of Bruckner’s cryptic “Allelujah des zweiten Satzes”, of which Heller himself attempted the explanation “wollte wahrscheinlich Tedeum sagen”—suggesting perhaps, as we have seen, that Heller heard something like the Te Deum in the conclusion of the movement which Bruckner played to him.<sup>81</sup> Noteworthy also that in the radicalised form of the topos employed here, the motive combines canonically with itself, producing the ancient voice-leading topos of so-called ‘horn-fifths’ (fifths approached or quitted by similar motion), as well as permitting numerous forms of contrapuntal combination with the Te Deum motive (cf. Ex. 20).

It of course remains possible that Bruckner did indeed imply the second movement of the Ninth, perhaps referring to the augmented-triad versions of similar melodic lines which arise in the principal Scherzo movement, cf. letter K thereof,  $e\flat^1-g^1-b\sharp^1-e\flat^2-f^2-g^2$  (Ex.

<sup>79</sup> AF G/mm. 651ff.; cf. Exx. 20, 22; AP E/142 IV.

<sup>80</sup> See Wolfgang Grandjean, “Anton Bruckners ‘Helgoland’ und das Symphonische”, pp. 355ff, where Grandjean discusses the use of anabasic motives and numerous instances in *Helgoland* and other late works (*Mf* 48, 1995, pp. 355ff.). Oskar Lang (“Das non-confundar-Motiv...”, pp. 1181ff.), also quotes numerous occurrences of the topos. See also ch. 2.2.

<sup>81</sup> The impression Heller received from Bruckner’s playing, it should be borne in mind, was sufficiently clear that, as Heller maintained, he could have sketched the symphony’s conclusion had he been adequately skilled in musical dictation.

21i);<sup>82</sup> it is also possible that Heller misunderstood, misheard or misquoted the phrase “Allelujah des zweiten Satzes” for “Allelujah des *dritten* Satzes” (of the Ninth), where an Allelujah-type phrase can be readily identified as the first entry of the trps. in the Adagio<sup>83</sup>—pointedly, in D major at the outset of a movement in E major (Ex. 21k). However, neither of these suggestions essentially contradict the form given the “Allelujah” in the AF; the precise origin of the melodic line as well as its realisation inevitably remain matters about which we can only speculate. All that could be achieved in the AF was to choose a suitable phrase which functions in an appropriate manner; in general terms, the fact that a number of what are motivically very similar phrases are suitable candidates for the role enhances rather than detracts from the logic of the AF’s solution.

**G/mm. 579–594** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [33/“34”]

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [ 11–12; 1–8]; 1–6;

*Sources:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/3<sup>r</sup>; cf. AP E/138, Facs. C/6, DdF F/81

*Length of the section used:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8;

Cf. ‘The 3194/3<sup>r</sup> sketch’, *supra*. The progression has here been laid out for the strings, the 1st and 2nd vlins. in unison (later in octaves), recalling Bruckner’s scoring of the Exp. chorale Steigerung, with answering phrases in the 1st clar. and 1st horn alternately; the descending chromatic motive has been allotted to the 1st ob. The final note of the inverted motive of the introduction (vlins., m. 578, 560 etc.), was notated in the 3194 sk. as a semibreve, then a minim, then a crotchet, was brought into line with other appearances of the motive. Vla. and vlc. are marked *tremolo*; the missing 5th in the chords at 581f., 583f. etc. (cf. AP) was supplemented in the vla. The whole passage was marked *ppp* (strings) and *pp* (winds), with expressive dynamics highlighting the role of the 1st ob. A gradual *cresc. poco a poco* was initiated at 587. The tempo specification “[Ruhig]” was added in line with the sketch’s change to **C** (see §3.3.4).

<sup>82</sup> The phrases at K can be understood motivically as approximate inversions of the descending arpeggiations in the 1st vln. with which the movement opens.

<sup>83</sup> As Herbert Vogt, for instance, suggested in a personal communication; Bruckner might also inadvertently referred to the Adagio as a second movement following the conventional movement pattern.

**G/mm. 595–610** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [34/“35”]*Length:* 16 mm.*Metrical structure:* 1–8-[–9–12; 1–4–]*Sources:* pc. sk. ÖNB 3194/3<sup>r</sup>; cf. AP E/138, Facs. C/6, DdF F/81*Length of the section used here:* 8 mm.*Metrical structure of the section used here:* 1–8

Cf. notes to preceding bifol. The second phase of the 3194/3<sup>r</sup> Steigerung is introduced by the 1st trp. in m. 594, similar to Bruckner’s use of the trp. at m. 152. The vlms. continue from here in octaves, the clars., and 1st, later 1–2nd bsns. double the vla. and vlc., to which the cb. is added. The truncated chromatic descent motive in the ob. is reinforced by the 1st–2nd, later 1st–3rd fls., 3rd–4th hrns. and 2nd, later 2nd–3rd trps. begin an alternating pattern motivically preparing the falling-octave and -sixth intervals of the first-movement Hauptth. and Finale fugue subject. The 1st–2nd hrns. from 598 contribute a p.a.e.t. imitation recalling the role of the 1st hrn. and subsequently 2nd–3rd clar. at letter F in the Exp.; M. 579 has been marked ‘*accel. poco a poco*’, the *cresc. poco a poco* reinforced; m. 603, which adds further to the wind scoring, adds ‘*accel. sempre*’ and *f cresc. sempre*.

Concerning letter X, cf. ‘The Themenüberlagerung’, *supra*. The passage was conceived as a final ‘catastrophic’ invocation of the D minor character of the symphony, scored for tutti minus the tbas., which are held in reserve for the ensuing chorale. The Adagio theme was allotted to cb., vlc., bsns., trombs. and cb. tba., the first-movement Hauptth. to the trps., fls. and obs., the fugal subject to the vla., clars. and hrns. and Scherzo rhythm to the timp.; the violin figuration in octaves assists the clarity of the overall harmonic design; the 1st, 4th, 5th and 8th quavers of the 1st m. pick out the notes of the Te Deum motive; otherwise characteristic of the figuration are falling sixths (mm. 608, 609, 610, 613ff.). The passage, which returns to  $\text{♩}$  time following the 3194/3<sup>r</sup> passage, was marked ‘*Sehr feierlich*’, *ff*, with *marcato sempre* in the clars. and hrns.; the *cresc. sempre* at 615 reinforces the escalative effect of the added 4 mm.

**G/mm. 611–626** Reconstruction/supplementation of a non-extant bifol. [35/“36”]*Length:* 16 mm.*Metrical structure:* [–5–12; 1–8;]

Source: bifol. 26F/“27”, 6087/65–66; cf. AP E/113ff., Facs. C/305ff.

Length of section used: 4 mm., augmented to 8 mm.

Metrical structure: 1–4

Concerning the first 8 mm. (611–618), cf. the preceding paragraph. Concerning letter Y onwards, cf. ‘lyrical Steigerung’, *supra*. The ensuing 32 mm., the chorale, Steigerung and cadence, were conceived in the AF as a continuous, rhythmically multi-layered texture recalling the “3. Theil” in the Adagio (*q.v.*, from letter M), intentionally surpassing in richness any previous texture in the Finale. The full orchestra is involved at Y, *fff*, for the first time since the quotation of the IX/1 Hauptth. at 573. The vlc. and cb. establish a crotchet figuration, *markig, breit*, beginning as an inversion of the Te Deum motive (cf. their quavers in the Adagio passage), the vlms. initiate a triplet-quaver figuration, initially *gestrichen*, suggested by the previous appearances of the chorale, the vla. takes on its typically Brucknerian role of mid-texture *tremolo*. The woodwind contribute a rhythmic pulsation in crotchet triplets (again cf. Adagio), the brass carry the full weight of the chorale harmonisation, with the tbas. at 619 and hrns. at 621 maintaining motivic links with the Finale Hauptth. At 623 these degenerate into falling octaves in the tbas., as the brief vision fades, *dim sempre*.

**G/mm. 627–642** Reconstruction/supplementation of a non-extant bifol. [36/“37”]

Length: 16 mm.

Metrical structure: 1–4-[5–8]; 1–8;

Sources: 2 pc. sks.:

1) ÖNB 6085/45<sup>f</sup>; cf. AP E/139, Facs. C/45, DdF F/82

Length of section used: 4 mm.

Metrical structure: 1–4- (incomplete)

2) ÖNB 6085/43<sup>f</sup>; cf. AP E/141, Facs. C/47, DdF F/83

Length of section used here: first 8 mm.

Metrical structure: 1–8;

Cf. the preceding paragraph. The ‘lyrical Steigerung’ was allotted initially to the darker coloration of hrns., tbas. and bsns., *p*, the clars. maintaining the triplet pulsation of the winds. The same texture continues in the strings, the vlms. *legato*. At 631 the melodic line is taken over by the trps., *cresc. poco a poco*, reinforced by *cresc. sempre* 2 mm. later. Here the tbas. reintroduce the dotted motive of the introduction in an intervallic mutation recalling the Te

Deum motive,  $g^{\flat^1}-d^{\flat^1}-d^{\flat^1}-g^{\flat}$ . This is joined in the upbeat to 635 by the trombs. and cb. tba. with the  $\downarrow | \underline{\quad}$  motive which has so often accompanied it (cf. for instance the hrns. at m. 5 or at letter A); both figures would appear to have been carefully kept in reserve by Bruckner since the Durchf.

Concerning mm. 635ff., cf. ‘The final cadence’, *supra*. The strings and woodwind maintain their overall texture, the fls. and obs. rejoining the clars., the vln. figuration marked *gestrichen immerfort*. The sustained chords in the trombs. and cb. tba. contrast texturally with the preceding passage and free up the horns and tbas. for motivic activity, which continues the review of the Finale’s main motives begun by the tbas. at 633. The fugal subject in inversion is re-introduced in the 3rd–4th and later 1st–2nd hrns., in alternation with the dotted fanfare motive.

**G/mm. 643–658** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [37/“38”]

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8;

*Source:* pc. sk. ÖNB 6085/43<sup>f</sup>; cf. AP E/141, Facs. C/47, DdF F/83

*Length of section used here:* last 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* 1–8; 1–8;

Cf. notes to the previous bifol. We have already discussed in passing the harmonic solution undertaken here (cf. ‘The final cadence’, *supra*); motivically all the elements of these 8 mm., with the exception of the trumpet fanfare recalled from the 2 mm. preceding the fugue, continue on directly from the elements of the preceding passage, intensified by the dissonance of Bruckner’s Undezimakkord, underscored by the *fff* marking and addition of the timp. The trombs., cb. tba. and bsns. maintain their harmonic and motivic role, assisted by the bass tbas., as do the ten. tbas., with their dotted motive. The hrns. unite in wide intervallic expansions of the falling-sixth motive. In all but the trps., which doggedly maintain their dissonant fanfare, the final 4 mm. of the passage in the brass constitute augmentations of the elements of the foregoing 2-m. phrases. A ‘riten.’ has been added at m. 649, at which the vlms. move to quavers, the figuration at 650 outlining an intervallic expansion of the Te Deum motive,  $b^{\flat^3}-d^{\flat^3}-d^{\flat^3}-b^{\flat^2}$ , with which the passage breaks off.

The change of key at letter Z underlines the structural and thematic caesura reached at this point. Over the last 8 mm. of 6085/43, marked ‘a tempo’, *ppp*—the D/d pedal point is maintained to the end—the AF establishes a broad, peaceful Klangfläche using the protean capacity of the



Te Deum motive to endlessly transform and combine with itself, again an element and compositional resource Bruckner may well have held in reserve for the final pages of the coda.<sup>84</sup> Underneath a variation of the Te Deum motive in crotchets in the vlms., *tremolando*, the 1st, then 1st–2nd ten. tba. intone rising inversion of the double-augmented Te Deum motive, answered by a single augmentation of the motive, uninverted, in 2nd–3rd clars.

**G/mm. 659–674** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [38/“39”]

*Length:* 16 mm.

*Metrical structure:* [1–8; 1–8-]

Cf. notes to the preceding bifol. as well as The “Allelujah”, *supra*. From here *cresc. poco a poco* is marked, reinforced by *cresc. sempre* at 665, the smooth ascent of the “Allelujah” in its ‘massive’ augmentation forming a natural crescendo into the powerful *ff* tutti at 667. The Klangfläche gradually increases in density from here on with the addition, first, of the bass tbas. to the underlying inversion of the motive in semibreves,<sup>85</sup> further entries of the woodwind in minims with both rectus and inversus forms of the motive, a p.a.e.t. entry of the double augmentation of the rectus in the hrns. at 663 and of the minim inversus in the 1st clar. at 665

At 667 the *ff* is reached. The trombs. and cb. tba. enter with sustained notes and repeated-note triplets recalling the conclusion of Psalm 150 (cf. Facs., C/344, and incidentally also the conclusion of Wagner’s *Götterdämmerung*<sup>86</sup>), the woodwind and tbas. maintain the Te Deum motive in crotchets and minims respectively as an ostinato while the vlms. begin a counterpoint in quavers most immediately reminiscent of the conclusion of VII/1 (letter Z) but characteristic of the conclusion of many of Bruckner’s Finale movements. All of this forms a sonorous background to the central motivic activity, which continues with the diminution into minims of the “Allelujah” theme, shared between trps. and hrns., continuing the ascending motive in stretto imitation.

<sup>84</sup> Consider Bruckner’s strikingly brief use of the motive as the string figuration of the chorale in the Repr. for no more than 28 mm. (mm. 509–536).

<sup>85</sup> The entire 16 mm. in the tbas. from letter Z forms a kind of ‘hyper-augmentation’ of the inverted Te Deum motive, each 4-m. phrase beginning successively on A, d, d, a.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Dover reprint of Schott score, Act III, pp. 608ff.; cf. also pp. 567ff., which reveals the figure’s link with the “Todesverkündigung” motive (*Die Walküre*, Act II; Dover reprint, p. 329). Auer reports that the score of *Götterdämmerung* constantly lay open on Bruckner’s piano (Göll.-A. IV/2, pp. 178f.).

**G/mm. 675–687** Reconstruction of a non-extant bifol. [39/“40”]*Length:* 13 mm.*Metrical structure:* [-9–12; 1–4; 1–5]

Cf. notes to the previous bifol. On the third ascent of the “Allelujah” in minims, the first note of the phrase truncates, permitting the phrase to mount to the  $a^2$  with which the first-movement coda concluded (cf. m. 563 thereof, 1st trp.). At this point, the climax of the passage, marked *fff*, a textural quotation of the Te Deum figuration was invoked (cf. in the Finale letter U), as perhaps suggested by Heller’s remark, “wollte wahrscheinlich Tedeum sagen”. Underneath the sustained fifth  $d/a$  in the woodwind, hrns. and 1st trp., the tbas. begin a final “allelujah” ascent echoing the preceding 4 mm. of the trps. and hrns.; the triplet fanfares in the trombs. and cb. tba. are echoed in the 2nd and 3rd trps. (recalling the fanfares of bifol. 31E/“32”), building at m. 682, under the final cadence of the 1st trp., into a sustained fanfare, again based on the “Allelujah”-topos.

These last 5 mm., summarised in Ex. 22, were based principally on the conclusion of *Helgoland*, of which Grandjean justly wrote “Er darf wohl zu den großartigsten Apotheosen im Schaffen Bruckners überhaupt gerechnet werden”.<sup>87</sup> Facs. C/351f. reproduce the final 2 pp. of *Helgoland*; the final p. of Psalm 150, C/344, also presents significant points of comparison. One finds as the principal elements in the *Helgoland* conclusion, (a) emphatic chords in the strings, (b) triplet fanfares in the trps. (cf. Psalm 150; cf. also IV(78/80)/4, mm. 507ff.) (c) the close of the monumentalised chorale theme “Der, du in den Wolken thronest” (cf. mm. 87ff.; cf. Ex. 21h) in the hrns. and 3rd trp., and (d) sustained harmony in the woodwind. The corresponding elements in the AF were (a) chords in the strings and lower brass, (b) triplet fanfares in the 2nd–3rd trps., closely resembling the fanfares in *Helgoland*, (c) a final monumental statement of the Te Deum motive in semibreves in the hrns., and (d) sustained harmony in the tbas. and woodwind.

**3.3.8 The conjectural Te Deum transition**

We have already seen<sup>88</sup> that Bruckner at some stage considered using the torso of the movement, probably implementing the several cuts marked in the score, as a massive introduction to the Te Deum; equally that, as Meißner reported, he at some point gave up such

---

<sup>87</sup> P. 352.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. §§1.1.11, 3.1.11.

attempts. This inevitably raises the question, what would such a transition have looked like; how might it have functioned tonally or motivically?

In line with the speculative completion of the Finale coda in the AF, a reconstruction of the passage Bruckner allegedly played to Stradal and Altwirth has been attempted and laid out in score; this is presented as an Appendix to the score of the AF in section G (G/99, *q.v.*), which forms a harmonically effective 14-m. transition to the choral work from m. 537, the point in the chorale Repr. on the lost bifol. [30/"31"] where Bruckner would have relinquished the quaver figuration of the chorale/Te Deum motive combination and returned to triplet figuration. Harmonically, the passage has been designed as a series of tritone progressions (the progression of the ensuing passage in the AF), initially recalling the melodic movement of the main chorale theme, with Aufbereitungen of the opening choral incipit of the Te Deum (trps. and trombs., mm. 538a–541a), then proceeding, from a *p subito*, in a series of three wave-like progressions, *cresc. poco a poco*, to a Tredezim on G at m. 547a, *ff*, with a further statement of the Te Deum incipit in the trps., at 549a answered by the hrns. The trps. then recall the fanfare which precedes the fugue, as the Tredezimakkord resolves conclusively into the open fifth c/g with which the Te Deum begins. A 'rit.' alleviates any disjunction between the tempi of the two works, which can be regarded as roughly equivalent, as we have seen (§1.3.11), while the sense of arrival and the greater weight of the opening of the choral work are assisted by the change to parallel-motion figuration in the strings (previously contrary) and the entry of the organ.<sup>89</sup>

The passage is of course entirely speculative; we know the composer also abandoned the idea ultimately; the intention of the conjectural passage given here is merely to show how such a transition could have functioned musically, and that the whole notion of using the Finale material as a preparation to the Te Deum, its D-minor tonality forming a kind of huge cadence into the C-major Te Deum, and thereby linking the chorale Repr. with the Te Deum is by no means as unfounded or impossible as critics have suggested. That the Te Deum gradually came to be understood as extrinsic to the musical character and 'programme' of the symphony was a corollary of subsequent developments in Bruckner reception. What for an earlier generation of Bruckner apologists was justified by the mystical, subjective manner in which Bruckner's music was received was repudiated in later, more sober, structuralist approaches. The fact that an E-major Adagio makes no better conclusion to a D-minor symphony than a C-major Te Deum, that Bruckner himself may have wanted the Te Deum performed 'as' or 'in place of' a fourth movement, or what he may have wished to say in making such a specification, has been unjustly ignored.

---

<sup>89</sup> The question remains, of course, how the difference in the scoring of the two works, triple woodwind and eight horns/tubas in the Finale, double woodwind and 4 horns in the Te Deum would be handled in practical terms; this could perhaps have been a consideration which led Bruckner to abandon the idea.

## 3.4

### History and Reception of the Finale since 1990

Die Vollendung ist nicht ein Ergebnis sondern ein Prinzip.

—Aristotle<sup>1</sup>

#### 3.4.1 Research developments since 1990.

THE present writer's concern with the Ninth began with an exhaustive harmonic and motivic analysis of the first three movements made in 1982. In early 1988 he embarked on the question of the Finale at the suggestion of Professor Andrew McCredie, who had heard the CD of the Carragan version, and suggested the question of attempts at completion of the Finale as a suitable topic for a thesis.<sup>2</sup> An initial letter from the present writer to Professor Peter Gülke in mid-1988 was handed on to Gunnar Cohrs, the ensuing correspondence laying the foundation for what became a long and fruitful association.

The first meeting between Samale, Cohrs and the present writer was planned by Cohrs to take place in Bremen in early 1990. On 25 January a lecture on the question of the Finale completion was given at the Musikhochschule in Bremen by Cohrs and the present writer, followed by a two-piano performance of the Finale by Samale and the writer, the version given being the 1989 “3., revidierte Fassung” of the score by Samale and Cohrs mentioned in §1.4.16, which incorporated a number of expansions based on numerological considerations which had been proposed by Cohrs. A discussion with Gülke on the question of a new version of the Finale followed on 27 January in Wuppertal. At this point Samale revealed his interest in rewriting the score with simpler, clearer orchestration and a more consistent methodology. The author then proceeded to Munich and Vienna (February–April 1990) where a thorough examination of the relevant literature (Munich) and the MSS (Vienna) was begun, financially assisted by a Deutsche Akademische Austauschdienst scholarship.

It was at this stage that the author made most of his philological discoveries concerning the score. Chief among them were:

- i. that the surviving score bifolios—some of them even marked “fertig”—did indeed constitute an integral score, not merely sketches, and that bifolios were

---

<sup>1</sup> Source unknown; quoted by Herbert Vogg in correspondence to the author, 9 Aug. 1993; quoted also by Vogg in Partsch, Erich Wolfgang, ed., “Round-table—*Finale der Neunten Symphonie*”, in: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen–Bearbeitungen–Vollendungen*, Linz 1998, pp. 192: “Ich habe auf meinem Schreibtisch einen kleinen Zettel liegen, auf dem ein Satz von Aristoteles steht: [...]”

<sup>2</sup> Initially a Masters dissertation, it was converted to a PhD thesis in 1989.

unquestionably missing from what was originally a contiguous numbered sequence,

- ii. the significance of Bruckner's use of prepared bifolios—mainly 16-mm.—for the composition of the score;
- iii. confirmation of the inadequacy of the Orel edition; and
- iv. identification of the pc. sks. for the coda, their dating and the marginal annotation “Bogen 36” (referring, apparently, to the location of that sk. within the score), on ÖNB 6085/45, which revealed the likelihood that Bruckner had extended the score considerably further than previously thought.

Among significant discoveries in the literature, Richard Heller's memoirs, published by Auer in his article “Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt”, with its remarks concerning the Finale and the “Allelujah” intended to conclude the movement, were found to be the single most important source for Bruckner's intentions concerning the coda of the Finale.

Collaboration with Samale on revision of the score, a fruitful and rewarding working relationship which was to extend over the next year and a half, began in Europe and continued by correspondence following the author's return to Adelaide, assisted by facsimiles of the original material made available by the ÖNB. Cohrs did not take part in these discussions but continued to follow proceedings with interest.

During 1990 and the first half of 1991, the Samale–Mazzuca–Cohrs performing score of the Finale re-emerged in a more philologically viable form, with greater attention paid to voice-leading as well as to the orchestral models provided by other works of Bruckner. The notion of an elaborate numerological construct underlying the movement and predetermining a total number of measures was methodologically rejected, although the figure proposed concerning the length of the coda's final component (37 mm.) was maintained in analogy to IX/1 and IX/3, as well as for musical reasons.

Work initially concentrated on solutions to Bruckner's apparent late revisions of the Exp. Gesangsp. and beginning of the Durchf., bifols. [14/“15”],<sup>3</sup> [19/“20”], [27/“28”],<sup>4</sup> and most significantly the coda, the majority of the changes being made during an initial follow-up period with Samale in Italy in spring 1990.<sup>5</sup> During this time the definitive conception of the coda emerged, the writer drafting the concluding cadence<sup>6</sup> and “Allelujah”,<sup>7</sup> the contrapuntal

<sup>3</sup> Which up to this point had consisted in Samale and Mazzuca's reading of 18 mm. in length.

<sup>4</sup> Which was expanded by 2 mm. and the conclusive statement of the *Christ ist erstanden* or ‘Gregorian’ allusion to a total length of 24 mm.

<sup>5</sup> Work directly with Samale was undertaken in Rome from 6–13 March, with a subsequent five days in Verona and Venice, 4–9 April.

<sup>6</sup> Using the C<sup>b</sup>–F–A<sup>11</sup>–D progression of ÖNB 6085/45. In an earlier version of the score (1985; see §1.4.14) Samale had attempted to use this sketch as the arrival point of the initial *Steigerung* of the coda, i.e., before the combination of themes (letter X of the present score). The ‘lyrical *Steigerung*’ (AF, mm. 627ff.) led via a

solution to bifol. 19/“20”,<sup>8</sup> and revising numerous areas of voice-leading and instrumentation. Revisions to the continuity of passages such as the *Gesangsp.* in the *Exp.* and the beginning of the *Durchf.* involved greater input from Samale.

The writer remained in Europe until 13 April, continuing work on the score by correspondence with Samale. The final solution to the *Exp. Gesangsp.*<sup>9</sup> and the reconstruction of bifol. 30/“31” by ‘pure’ inversion<sup>10</sup> were agreed to during correspondence between Adelaide and Rome later in 1990, as were the writer’s solutions to the orchestral textures of the *Steigerung* after the fugue and those at letters P and V of the score.

At this stage the AF was entitled “Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung nach den philologisch neugeordneten Autographen”. The new score was given a preliminary airing in a two-piano transcription at an introductory lecture held in Elder Hall, Adelaide, on the 13 August 1990 by Adelaide pianist Edward Kriek and the author, before an invited audience of the Musicological Society of Australia (South Australian Chapter) and the S. A. Richard Wagner Society. A national FM-radio broadcast of this transcription by the Australian Broadcasting Commission followed in December of the same year.<sup>11</sup> Initial publication of the author’s research was made in Adelaide in an article entitled “The Finale of Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony: new light on an old problem”.<sup>12</sup> Work was essentially completed in Rome by Samale and the present writer in April–May 1991, written almost entirely by Samale himself in ink (for Bruckner’s text) and pencil (supplementation) on large-format, 24-stave paper.<sup>13</sup> During this final phase re-examination of the MSS in Vienna by Samale and the writer suggested the possibility that a final revision by Bruckner of bifol. 1 might have existed,

---

continuation of Samale’s composition into the final tonic peroration via a cadence borrowed from VIII/4 (the mm. before letter Xx thereof), as in the subsequent *Ricordi* version (1986). On the basis of the sks. the present writer drafted a continuation of this progression which led into the 6085/45 cadence within 8 mm.

<sup>7</sup> The string figuration (AF, from letter Z) and use of the *Te Deum* motive was taken from Samale’s previous scores; the transformation of the “Allelujah”-phrase, taken from VIII/Trio, its scoring and the analogy to the conclusion of *Helgoland*, were the present writer’s contribution. As already mentioned (§1.4.16), a different “Allelujah” theme in minims had in fact been drafted by Cohrs in October 1989, who had had difficulty persuading Samale to move in the direction of a major-key, *laudatio* conclusion. As already mentioned (§1.4.14) the movement previously concluded with open fifths in analogy to IX/1.

<sup>8</sup> Samale had previously intentionally overlooked a tie in the 2nd violin of the last m. of 18D/“19” (AP, E/84; m. 342 of the present score of the AF) on the grounds that it made it impossible to supply a satisfactory continuation.

<sup>9</sup> Which, recognising the 2-m. discrepancy between bifols. 2F and “2”E / “3”E, shortened the score *vis-a-vis* the intermediate version by 2 mm.

<sup>10</sup> Versus the ‘partial’ inversion previously posited. The definitive solution was a suggestion of the present writer’s, initially discounted by him on aesthetic grounds but subsequently taken up at Samale’s urging.

<sup>11</sup> See article by the author, “The Finale of Bruckner’s Ninth: Reconstructing a symphonic masterpiece” [author’s title], published as “Cracking the Coda”, *24 Hours* (ABC FM Radio Journal), Dec. 1990, pp. 32–33.

<sup>12</sup> *Miscellanea Musicologica: Adelaide Studies in Musicology* 17 (1990), pp. 193–296.

<sup>13</sup> Samale entrusted the original to the writer as ‘Stichvorlage’ for the AF, which was typeset in Adelaide over the ensuing months.

containing only 16 mm., thereby shortening the AF by 8 mm.<sup>14</sup> Apart from this, almost all other alterations concerned only refinements of scoring, tempi and articulation.

### 3.4.2 The Linz premiere and ensuing reception.

During the sojourn in Rome Cohrs contacted Samale and the author with notification of the interest of Manfred Mayrhofer, then chief conductor of the Bruckner Orchester, Linz, in premiering the new score, with an intended performance date of early December 1991. On the author's return to Adelaide in late May 1990 the new version was typeset on computer; the 98-p. full score and 186-p. orchestral parts were sent to Linz in early November 1991.<sup>15</sup>

The first performance of the "Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung nach den neugeordneten Autographen" with the Bruckner Orchester under Manfred Mayrhofer took place in the Brucknerhaus Linz on 3 December 1991 as the 127th "Konzert für Alle" organised by the Kammer für Arbeiter und Angestellter für Oberösterreich. The performance was preceded by a press conference on Friday 27 November at which the author spoke on Maestro Samale's and his work and intentions, and the ABC recording of the two-piano version was played. Two articles appeared as a result, summarising the writer's press-conference address. Both presented the most salient points of the research and stressed that the version of the Finale to be presented in no wise assumed for itself the status of a 'completion'. Georgina Szeless noted:

Man kann zur immer wieder aufflammenden Fassungseuphorie bei den Bruckner-Symphonien stehen wie man will. Tatsache ist, daß durch sie eine Vertiefung und Verbreitung von Bruckners Werk dokumentiert wird und vor allem die geistige Beweglichkeit nicht abreißt, die man dem genius loci gegenüber schuldet. [...] Die Autoren maßen sich jedoch für ihre Arbeit keineswegs den Status der Vollendung an. Der 'neue' Bruckner soll mithelfen, Mißverständnisse und Fehldeutungen um den übrigens harmonisch unwahrscheinlich kühnen Satz zu beseitigen und den Einblick in die viersätzigige Gesamtkonzeption der 'Neunten' Anton Bruckners zu erleichtern.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> The return to the original timpani pedal point of A was made at Cohrs' instigation shortly after.

<sup>15</sup> Two brief articles appeared in Adelaide during this time, that of John Edge, "Reconstructing the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony", *Lumen* (Adelaide) 20, no. 10 (July 1991), p. 7, and Mark Douglas, "SA man completes 'lost' symphony", *The Advertiser* (Adelaide), 10 July 1991, p. 2. In Vienna the author's brief article "Neues zum Thema Finale der 9. Symphonie", appeared in *IBG-Mitt* no. 36 (June 1991), pp. 14–15.

<sup>16</sup> "Wieder ein neuer Bruckner: Vor Erstaufführung des Finalsatzes der 'Neunten' im 'Konzert für alle'", *Neues Volksblatt* (Linz), 29 Nov. 1991. See also Franz Zamazal, "Das 'kraftlose' Alterswerk: Bruckners unvollendeter Finalsatz der 9. Symphonie wurde rekonstruiert", *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* (Linz), 30 Nov. 1991. Zamazal similarly concluded: "Um keine falschen Vorstellungen über die notwendigen Ergänzungen aufkommen zu lassen: die jetzt vorliegenden Partitur ist mit einer im Entstehen steckengebliebenen Handschrift zu vergleichen. Der Feinschliff des Ansfeldner Meisters würde noch fehlen."

The performance itself was a success, lengthy applause greeting the orchestra and conductor in the capacity-audience Brucknerhaus.<sup>17</sup> A two-page programme text on the Finale was prepared for the performance by the author; due to some mix-up, however, both the intended text and the preliminary printed materials that had been sent to the orchestra's publicity office as information were distributed to the audience.<sup>18</sup> The ÖRF recorded the performance, which was broadcast, along with an interview with the author, on at least two occasions over the following months.<sup>19</sup>

Critical responses varied. Among the more positive reports on the performance were those by Rainer Lepuschitz and Franz Zamazal, both of whom, significantly, were present at the press conference and thus better informed concerning the intentions of the new score and the research behind it. Rainer Lepuschitz wrote a lengthy article<sup>20</sup> reviewing several aspects of the authors' researches (e.g.: "Der Satz ließ sich dank des vorhandenen und genau verglichenen Materials entgegen bisherige Annahme sehr wohl in eine klare übersichtliche musikalische Form und Struktur bringen"); even where the critic was of the opinion that Bruckner 'would have done it differently', understanding was shown for the intentions of the arrangers rather than merely criticising the sonic results themselves as inadequate:

Viele Stellen, vor allem Steigerungen—man spürt es—hätte Bruckner viel massiver und eindrucksvoller ausgestaltet. Oft kommt die Rekonstruktion fast zum Stillstand, bleibt in Einzelverläufen stehen—die Bearbeiter wollten ein klares Bild des Vorhandenen geben und keine eigene verdickte Fassung schaffen.

Franz Zamazal's critique<sup>21</sup> revealed the best understanding of the authors' standpoint. Citing their intentions to arrive at a better understanding of the Ninth through a sonic realisation of its unfinished last movement, he pointed out the authors' considerable research efforts and considered:

---

<sup>17</sup> Samale and Cohrs were present in Linz for the performance, as well as the writer's doctoral supervisor Andrew McCredie. Other Bruckner aficionados present included Cornelis van Zwol, Erwin Horn, Herbert Vogg and several members of the Bruckner Institute. Maestro Samale's satisfaction with the new version was enshrined in a handwritten comment on the title page of the writer's copy of the programme: "Questa è veramente la versione definitiva! (Endgültige Fassung)".

<sup>18</sup> This resulted, as Balduin Sulzer noted, in "sieben Seiten 'Kleingedrucktes'" (see Sulzer, *infra*). Concerning press conference and performance, see under "Kleine Mitteilungen", *IBG-Mitt* no. 37 (Dec. 1991), p. 39.

<sup>19</sup> The interview was recorded at the ÖRF's Landesstudio in Linz on 4 Dec.; broadcast dates for the Finale included 7 Jan. 1992, in the series "Musikland Österreich", where both the Carragan version and AF were played.

<sup>20</sup> "Doppeltes Gotteslob des symphonischen Parsifal: Denkwürdige Uraufführung in Linz: Finale von Bruckners 9. Symphonie neu rekonstruiert", *Tiroler Tageszeitung* (Innsbruck), 5 Dec. 1991, the author cited under the contraction 'lepu'.

<sup>21</sup> "Doch ein echter Bruckner: Eine Finale-Rekonstruktion beim 'Konzert für alle'", *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* (Linz), 5 Dec. 1991, p. 20, the author cited under the contraction 'sm'.



Das Ergebnis legt Zeugnis ab für die große Sachkenntnis und den Spürsinn der beiden Herausgeber und läßt sich ohne Einschränkungen voraussagen: Bruckner hat auch seine letzte Symphonie viersätzig angelegt. Der Tod verhinderte aber die Fertigstellung.

The performance revealed this clearly, he maintained, particularly in the Adagio:

Man hatte hier das Gefühl, daß die verströmenden Klangflächen eine Fortsetzung brauchen, Diese bringt das eigenwillig gestaltete Finale. Was hier an satztechnischer Kunst entwickelt wird, wirkt beim ersten Hören ungewohnt. Jedoch die Beharrlichkeit der Aussage erschüttert, macht betroffen; letztlich handelt es sich doch um einen echten Bruckner.

A longer and more detailed article was subsequently prepared by Zamazal for publication, initially in the IBG *Mitteilungen*,<sup>22</sup> which summarised the development of the score and the research perspectives it embodied.<sup>23</sup>

Other critics were more diffident. Fridolin Dallinger claimed that:

Die Uraufführung [...] bewies noch einmal, daß es nicht genügt, mit wissenschaftlicher Akribie zu arbeiten. Die Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung entbehrt des für Bruckner symptomatischen Flusses, wirkt wie Stückwerk. Es fehlt aber auch die meisterliche Detailarbeit, die Bruckner so auszeichnet. Die Coda in der die beiden Autoren motivisches Material aus "Helgoland" und dem "Te Deum" einbauten, wirkt aufgepfropft.

Wird sich auch dieses Finale vermutlich nicht durchsetzen, so war es doch interessant, in das letzte Schaffen Bruckners Einblick zu erhalten. Man entdeckte einen in der thematischen Erfindung fast asketischen, harmonisch jedoch zukunftsweisenden dissonanten Stil, der sich ja in den vorangegangenen Sätzen schon ankündigte.<sup>24</sup>

Balduin Sulzer dismissively compared the Finale to repaired masonry:

Das am Dienstag erstmals hörbare Ergebnis erinnerte an die frühgotischen Baurelikte im Kreuzgang des Stiftes Wilhering, die liebevoll mit Gips ergänzt sind. Der Gips ist überall deutlich erkennbar.<sup>25</sup>

Reinhard Kannonier wrote a more damning article for the *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* entitled "Bausteine ohne Mörtel",<sup>26</sup> expostulating:

<sup>22</sup> "Bruckners Neunte Symphonie samt Finale: Erste Begegnung mit der Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung des Finales von Nicola Samale und John A. Phillips", *IBG-Mitt* no. 38 (June 1992), pp. 16–18. This was subsequently slightly reworked and published as "Die letzte Arbeit Anton Bruckners: Zur Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung des vierten Satzes der 9. Symphonie", *Linz aktiv* 125 (Winter 1993), pp. 64–65.

<sup>23</sup> The author acknowledges the special interest taken in this project by Franz Zamazal, who took the opportunity during the author's stay in Linz to verify with him his notes for this article. Dr. Zamazal's correspondence and assistance with subsequent research has been invaluable. The article is quoted *infra*.

<sup>24</sup> "Problematische Rekonstruktion. Finale von Bruckners 9. Symphonie im Linzer Brucknerhaus uraufgeführt", *Neues Volksblatt* (Linz), 5 Dec. 1991, p. 9.

<sup>25</sup> "Liebevoller Ergänzung: Konzert für alle: Bruckners neues Finale", *Kronenzeitung* (Vienna), 5 Dec. 1991.

<sup>26</sup> *ÖMz* 47 (1992), p. 25; the critique followed the author's "Zum leidigen Thema 'Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners'" in the same volume, pp. 22–25.

Die Musikwissenschaft kann's nicht lassen: alles unvollendete ist ihr ein Dorn im Auge. [...] Zweifellos handelt es sich dabei um den bisher schlüssigsten, weil philologisch genauesten Versuch [...]. Dennoch: der musikalische Torso ist weit davon entfernt, ein harmonisch zusammengefügter Körper zu sein. In ungewohnten Klangfarben, und kurzatmig, fast hektisch erfolgte der Aufbau der ersten Takte; was dann in der nächsten ca. 25 Minuten folgt, sind trotz satztechnisch gekonnten Handwerks doch meist blasse Verbindungen von Fragmenten. Wie sollte es anders sein. Choral, kontrapunktische Verschachtelungen, Zitate aus den Sätzen eins bis drei und Beinahe-Zitate aus früheren Symphonien ("Siebenten"), Andeutungen von rhythmisch und harmonisch Wendungen ...<sup>27</sup> —all das läßt zwar eine äußerst vage Ahnung von einer Konzeption aufkeimen, aber das vorherrschende Gefühl bleibt das einer Unbefriedigtheit auch hinsichtlich der stilistisch-ästhetischen Annäherung an den Satzbau. Man kann die Prognose wagen: in der Aufführungspraxis wird auch dieser gewiß achtenswerte Versuch nicht Fuß fassen können.

As the writer wished to avoid being embroiled in polemics, Cohrs subsequently penned a spirited rebuttal, "Noch einmal zu Bruckners 'Neunter': Zu Reinhard Kannoniers Beitrag 'Bausteine ohne Mörtel' (*ÖMz* 1992/1)", published in a subsequent issue of the same journal.<sup>28</sup> It is quoted here in full:

Auch Herr Kannonier ist alles Unvollendete ein Dorn im Auge—ein so großer Dorn, daß er in seinem Kommentar zu John Phillips' Bericht [...], kritische Stellungnahme heuchelnd, eben jene von großer Intoleranz zeugende Blindheit an den Tag legt, die der Musikwissenschaft in puncto "Unvollendetes" bis heute zur Schande gereicht. Zunächst hat er offensichtlich den Gegenstand seiner Kritik gar nicht richtig gelesen. Wie könnte er sonst von "Zusammenstellungen", von "Fragmenten" reden, wo doch Phillips zeigt, daß es sich um "keine zusammenhanglose Anhäufung von Skizzen", sondern eine "stichhaltige, kontinuierlich geschriebene Orchester-Partitur" handelt.

Einerseits nennt er die Arbeit von Phillips und Samale den "bisher schlüssigsten, weil philologisch genauesten Versuch" einer Aufführungsfassung, spricht aber auch von "blassen Verbindungen von Fragmenten". Was ist nun blasser—die Restauration der Lücken nebst Einstellung einer "Arbeits-Coda" oder die ungewohnte Satzkonzeption, der sich Kannonier, behaftet mit dem Analogiezwang nähert, der Komponist müsse immer nach dem gleichen Muster vorangehender Finalsätze seine Ideen ausformen? Interessant wäre einmal die Probe aufs Exempel: Wäre Herr Kannonier in der Lage, allein durch Anhören des Satzes überhaupt Eingriff und Original zu unterscheiden?

Stilistisch erinnert Kannoniers Kannonade an die Schreibe längst begrabener Zeitgenossen Bruckners. Wenn er von "Fragmenten", "Zitaten", "Andeutungen von rhythmisch und harmonisch interessanten Wendungen" spricht, erinnern wir uns an den Hanslick, der über die Aufführung der umgearbeiteten dritten Symphonie schreibt: "Der erste Satz in welchem sich Nachklänge aus der Neunten Symphonie mit etlichen Venusberg-Motiven kreuzen, dann das lärmende Finale sind Stücke, die sich in lauter falschen Contrasten bewegen und zersplittern. Sie haben mir denselben unkünstlerischen Eindruck gemacht, wie die übrigen in Wien gehörten Compositionen von Bruckner, in welchen

<sup>27</sup> Ellipsis original.

<sup>28</sup> *ÖMz* 47/6 (June 1992), pp. 360–361.

leeren, trockenen, auch brutalen Stellen, oft ohne erkennbaren Zusammenhang wechseln. Wie helle Blitze leuchten hier vier, dort acht Takte in eigenartiger Schönheit auf; dazwischen liegt wieder verwirrendes Dunkel, müde Abspannung und fieberhafte Überreizung.”

Vom Finale der Achten sprach Heuberger als “unverfrorene Zusammenhanglosigkeit und unsägliche Einfallsdurftigkeit”, Kalbeck von der “endlosen, Episode an Episode anstückelnden Flickarbeit”, Kalbeck über die “Erste”: “wüster Trümmerhaufen”; über die “Siebente”: “musikalische Stegreifkomödie”.

Hier herrscht immer noch derselbe Ungeist, von dem man sich übrigens auch schon 1986 überzeugen konnte: Bereits mehrere Wochen vor der Berliner Uraufführung der Vorfassung des Finales von Samale/Mazzuca erschien eine Rezension des Konzertes mit dem Titel “Und wieder kein Bruckner! Wider die Vollendungswut von Musikern”. Kannonier bläst ins gleiche Horn. Die Fachwelt ist offensichtlich noch nicht reif für das Finale. Währenddessen war das Linzer Konzertpublikum nachhaltig begeistert. Bis zum Erscheinen der geplanten Faksimileausgabe der autographen Finalepartitur (sic!) und der ausführlich dokumentierten Partitur der “Ergänzung und Rekonstruktion”<sup>29</sup> des Fragmentes in der Gesamtausgabe sollte man allen sogenannten Musikologen schlichtweg verbieten, sich in Unkenntnis der Sache über dieses Werk zu äußern. Man kann Peter Gülkes Worten auf dem Symposium zum Finalefragment in Rom (Mai 1987) nur beipflichten: “In den 1934 von Alfred Orel veröffentlichten Skizzen findet sich (...)”<sup>30</sup> ein insgesamt 580 Takte umfassendes Material; dieses ausschließlich als ein durch das Faktum Brutum von Bruckners Tod tabuisiertes Trümmerfeld anzusehen und nicht als Aufforderung zu intensiver Beschäftigung, erfordert ein gehöriges Maß von orthodoxer Verstocktheit. (...) Schon der Erkenntnisgewinn, den Samale/Mazzucas Arbeit erbringt, ist so gewaltig, das prinzipieller Einspruch hiergegen sich desavouiert als Denkfaulheit im Gewande von Demut.”<sup>31</sup>

Dem wäre nichts hinzuzufügen.

### 3.4.3 Lectures and publications.

The author took the opportunity to speak on his work on the Finale on a number of occasions during his stay in Europe in late 1990 and early 1991, giving lectures in Vienna,<sup>32</sup> Bayreuth<sup>33</sup> and Würzburg.<sup>34</sup> Professor Dr. Walter Pass (Vienna) also kindly organised two opportunities

<sup>29</sup> Misprint for “Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung”, which at that stage was still intended for publication with MWV (see *infra*).

<sup>30</sup> Here and subsequently: ellipsis of Cohrs.

<sup>31</sup> Quoted from “Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987: Bruckner Symposium (Bericht)”, *Mf* 41 no. 3 (1988), p. 243; longer quotations appear at the outset of ch. 1.4 and in §1.4.14.

<sup>32</sup> At the Musikwissenschaftliches Institut, University of Vienna, 9 December 1990. Kind acknowledgement is due to ABIL for their organisation of the lecture. See (also concerning the following) under “Kleine Mitteilungen”, *IBG-Mitt* no. 37 (Dec. 1991), p. 39.

<sup>33</sup> At the Institut für Musikwissenschaft of Bayreuth University, 8 January 1992. Warm thanks to Professor Biehler (institute director) and Dieter Bayerlein (technical director of Bayreuth University) and his family for their organisational assistance and accommodation.

<sup>34</sup> At the Hochschule für Musik, 9 January 1992. The lecture was well attended by staff and students, and written up in the local paper: see Otto Schmitt-Rosenberger (appearing under the contraction ‘os’), “Eine sensationelle Rekonstruktion. John A. Phillips sprach über seine Arbeit an dem Finale von Bruckners 9. Symphonie”, *Volks-*

to speak on research topics.<sup>35</sup> Later in 1992 the author's lengthy article "Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners"<sup>36</sup> appeared, written at the suggestion of Elisabeth Maier of ABIL the previous year. This article, a translation and expansion of the earlier *Miscellanea Musicologica* essay, dealt with issues of the content of the Ninth Symphony with Finale, the genesis of Bruckner's score, earlier completion attempts, and the sources, methodology and analysis of the 'Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung', as the AF was then still called. Further research was undertaken in Vienna in September 1992 on the ÖNB and StB sources. At the Bruckner Symposium *Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk* held by ABIL in Linz the same month the author gave a paper entitled "Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren" dealing with the Mutationsverfahren and the sources for the Ninth and Finale.<sup>37</sup>

#### 3.4.4 Subsequent performance plans.

Initial planned performances had a chequered history. Shortly after the premiere in December 1991, Jesus Lopez Cobos of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra heard of the score, envisioning the possibility of a performance as part of his complete recording of the Bruckner symphonies, a plan which fell through, according to K. Michaelis of Peters Edition, New York, for reasons of insufficient rehearsal time and insufficient room on the CD.<sup>38</sup>

Cohrs now began to take a more active role, making significant suggestions and providing important points of discussion.<sup>39</sup> On the author's return to Adelaide in early February 1992, further minor revisions were undertaken with a view to achieving a more justifiable tempo scheme, and several superfluous modifications which had been retained from the earlier Samale/Mazzuca/Cohrs score were deleted. The orchestration of the final

---

*blatt/Volkszeitung* (Würzburg), 10 Jan. 1992, p. 6. Warm appreciation is given for the enthusiastic interest and kind hospitality of Erwin Horn, who graciously organised accommodation and the lecture in Würzburg.

<sup>35</sup> At a student seminar at Vienna University, 12 Dec. 1991, speaking on Bruckner's compositional technique, and in Radstadt, Land Salzburg (at the "Internationale Paul Hoffhaimer Tage 1992"), 20 Jan. 1992, on the Finale.

<sup>36</sup> *Bruckner-Jahrbuch* 1989–90, pp. 115–204.

<sup>37</sup> The paper was published in 1995 by ABIL in the report on symposium, *BrSympBer* 1992, pp. 153–178. Concerning ABIL's 1996 symposium, for which the author supplied a position statement, though unable to attend himself, see §3.4.10. Further research on the project was undertaken in Vienna in 1999 and again in 2001; a more complete listing of the author's papers and publications can be found in the Bibliography.

<sup>38</sup> In a fax dated 29 Jan. 1992. Michaelis was here representing MWV, which at this stage had undertaken to publish the score and parts. See publication history, §3.4.8 *infra*.

<sup>39</sup> Among these was the present writer's concluding trumpet fanfare, which created prolonged debate before a consensus was finally reached.

'Allelujah' was also altered.<sup>40</sup> The two-piano version was brought up to date and typeset on computer in May 1992.<sup>41</sup>

James de Preist of the Oregon Symphony Orchestra, Portland, Oregon, heard of the new version in mid-1992, and wished to perform the AF along with the first three movements in three performances in Portland on 9, 10 and 11 May 1993. The score and performing material were sent, programme notes written and printed; indeed, even a fourth performance was planned, and only a few days before the first performance a telephone interview given by the author with the music correspondent of *The Oregonian* newspaper. However, de Preist cancelled the performance of the Finale at the last minute, stating his reasons in a fax to the author dated 10 May, quoted here as an indication of the kind of reception difficulties, even with engaged and interested parties, which the Finale so often encountered:

It is with a mixture of regret, yet conviction, that I must inform you of my decision not to perform the Finale[...].

After carefully rehearsing and preparing to perform the four-movement version, I could not escape the overwhelming weakness (Bruckner's) of the Finale when actually played, especially following the monumentally sublime Adagio. I am fully aware that you strongly disagree with this view. [...] The decision not to go forward was the inevitable result of hearing the sequence of the third and fourth movements played by a well-rehearsed major orchestra.

My personal view is that Bruckner is not best served by completing his vision of a four movement work. In spite of all musicological eloquence to the contrary, the three movements constitute an artistic whole in need of nothing further. Divine intervention was, in the case of Bruckner's death I feel, truly divine.

The following response by the present writer to de Preist was made in the form of an open letter,<sup>42</sup> dated 27 May:

Your decision to remove the Finale from the programme was, as you wrote, the "inevitable result of hearing the sequence of the third and fourth movements played by a well-rehearsed major orchestra". I am quite happy to believe that reason, and can only sympathise with you that such drastic action must only have come as the result of much profound soul-searching. However, I would venture to suggest that your impression of the Finale as an inferior work, unworthy to stand alongside the "artistic whole" of the first three movements, was, at the heart of it, one based upon an aesthetic assumption which, as my colleague Gunnar Cohrs has pointed out, has a long and dubious tradition.

---

<sup>40</sup> Additions were made to the scoring of its initial crescendo, and the trombones and tubas were swapped in function from the *ff* onwards.

<sup>41</sup> 40 pp. This was printed out by the Apple Service Bureau with the financial assistance of Bruckner correspondent Dr. Burkhard Pünder (Düsseldorf), whose interest and kind support is acknowledged here. The two-piano version remains unpublished.

<sup>42</sup> Copies were sent to the present writer's Finale colleagues, the secretary and manager of the Oregon Symphony, *The Oregonian* (Portland), Herbert Vogg and Andrew McCredie. No further correspondence was received.

Aesthetic impressions are precarious foundations for determinations of ultimate musical worth. Please permit me one last act of what you have called ‘musicological eloquence’ and note the ‘inevitability’ of the following, written with—doubtless—great conviction in 1825:

The last movement, a chorus, is heterogenous, and though there is much vocal beauty in parts of it, yet it does not, and no habit will ever make it, mix up with the three first movements. [...] What relation it bears to the symphony we could not make out; and here, as well as in other parts, the want of intelligible design is all too apparent. [...] we must express our hope that this new work [...] may be put into a producible form [...].<sup>43</sup>

Or the following:

[I]f this were the production of an aspiring artist for fame [sic], it must be considered an extraordinary performance; but knowing it to proceed from the pencil of one, with whose former works I and the rest of the world have been delighted and astonished, I cannot but feel it falls infinitely short of them, and consequently fails to satisfy the minds of his true admirers. [...]

I have come to a decision in my own mind, that until any one [...] can persuade me that bad is good or that black is white, I must ever consider this new symphony as the least excellent [...], as an unequal work [...].<sup>44</sup>

Those pearls of wisdom [...] were written of the Ninth Symphony of Ludwig van Beethoven.

As for the presumed integrity of the first three movements of the Bruckner Ninth, I need only mention a parallel case: that of the Schubert ‘Unfinished’. The following was noted by a record reviewer (again, the excerpt is taken quite at random):

[Schubert’s] B minor Symphony, in particular, simply by virtue of having been left unfinished, has provoked any number of commentators into pious inanities to the effect that the composer left it so because he realised that the two completed movements formed an ideal, unimprovable unity on their own.<sup>45</sup>

We know of course that Schubert sketched a Scherzo and most likely a Finale also. The belief as it has grown up concerning the supposed perfection and ‘completeness’ of *any* work of the symphonic repertoire is just that, *merely a tradition*, and one that is radically challenged by any sort of departure from the acknowledged canon.

I am sorry to say that such clichés do not interest me much. What I, as a musicologist, and what the intelligent music lover of today remain most interested in, is what the composer himself thought, how he conceived his compositions, the challenges that he set an audience, the inconsistencies and even vagaries of his works. That, in a nutshell, is the difference between the music reception of the nineteenth, with its phoney concept of

<sup>43</sup> From a concert review published in the New York *Harmonicon* 3 (April 1825), p. 69; quoted in Elsie and Denis Arnold, “The View of Posterity: an Anthology”, in: *The Beethoven Companion*, Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune, eds. London 1973, pp. 496f.

<sup>44</sup> From a concert review published in *The Quarterly Musical Magazine and Review* 7 (1825), pp. 80ff., quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 497f.

<sup>45</sup> Bernhard Jacobson, in the programme text for a recording of Schubert’s String Quintet in C, D. 960 (EMI CDC 7 47018 2), 1983.

'sacred' genius, and that of the twentieth century, with its attempt to understand a little more than that given on the average record sleeve or, God forbid, determine musical values by the invocation of Divine intervention. Was the Divinity less or more divine in deigning to dismiss Mozart before the completion of his Requiem?

[...] [I]t is one thing to have nothing to do in principle with performing versions of unfinished works (provided one is consistent, and abjures even the Mozart Requiem...). However, having gone to the trouble of ordering it, finding out about it, programming and rehearsing it, your decision to cancel the Finale was, according to the reasons you gave, an act of what can only be called musical censorship. And an act of censorship always says as much about the censor as about the censored.

The first problem with the censorship of musical works for reasons of presumed inadequacy is, Where do we stop? The composer Robert Simpson, for example, has called attention to what he regards as serious flaws in the first three movements of the Bruckner Ninth; Beethoven is said to have confessed to Czerny and others that the provision of a choral finale to his Ninth had been a huge mistake. Should we remove the—even for its composer—inadequate Finale of Beethoven's Ninth too?

[...] One hundred years ago, Bruckner's closest disciples effectively censored his original scores and re-edited them so as to conform to the reigning ideals of taste and style, because, as they believed, they (the disciples or the works) would otherwise not be taken seriously by the concert goer. For the great Hermann Levi, the Finale of the Eighth was 'a book with seven seals'. Have we advanced any since then?

Bruckner's music, like the Bible, does not need to be believed in and defended as *verbum Dei*, nor does it need to be suppressed or censored, merely listened to, studied, discussed honestly and taken to heart by those drawn to it. Your supposed service to Bruckner and to your audience [...] was, unfortunately, no service to either party. Bruckner wanted his music, above all, to be played; your expectant audience was robbed of an opportunity to get to know this composer better, and a cliché was once again allowed to rule unchallenged. Bruckner would have been better served by letting his music speak for itself, 'warts and all'.

A Finale to the Ninth Symphony of Bruckner *exists*, good, bad or indifferent; it was conceived by its composer as an integral part of this symphony, and its autograph score—not draft!—was well advanced by the time of his death. Its continuity, where necessary, can be re-established with a high degree of accuracy; where necessary supplemented with adequate stylistic credibility. Whatever its real or imagined shortcomings, the Performing Version of the Finale gives us a better idea of Bruckner's overall conception of the Ninth than does the movement's wholesale suppression. It demands—and rewards—careful study and repeated listenings, not presumptuous dismissal in the name of pious cliché and aesthetic preconception.

As to whether the Ninth Symphony is better in four movements, in three, or whether one should perform the work at all because Bruckner didn't get the chance to revise it ten times over—that judgement has to be made by an intelligent and informed posterity, not by resort to [...] 'Divine intervention'.

It may be significant that, on return of the parts, Cohrs found that considerable liberties had been taken with them, passages having being considerably reorchestrated for no clearly apparent reason.<sup>46</sup>

A radio recording of the complete Ninth with the Südwest-Deutsche Rundfunk, Stuttgart, under the direction of Samale himself, was planned for May 1993, but also did not eventuate. At this stage it was thought that further performances might be counterproductive for critical reception, in any case—at least until the reconstructed autograph score, facsimile edition and text volume had been published by MWV and better-informed critical reassessment of Bruckner's achievement in the Finale could begin.

### 3.4.5 The Eichhorn recording.

In February 1993 the AF was recorded for the first time by the Bruckner Orchester of Linz under Kurt Eichhorn for release by Camerata Tokyo. Plans to include the movement in the orchestra's recording of the Ninth were laid in early 1992. The recording was undertaken as part of the complete Bruckner symphony series produced by the Bruckner-Orchester under Kurt Eichhorn with the financial assistance of the Brucknerbund für Oberösterreich; the first three movements of the Ninth had been recorded earlier, in April 1992.

The two-CD "World Premiere Recording" was released, initially in Japan and Austria, in August 1993. The substantial (37-page) explanatory text, complete with considerable philological details (3 tables, 4 facsimiles and 24 musical examples), was prepared in English by the author, translated into German by Cohrs, typeset by the author and provided by Camerata with a Japanese translation.<sup>47</sup> The English version of this text is reproduced in Appendix I (*q.v.*).

Kurt Eichhorn, who was 85 at the time of the recording and who died in June of the following year, had been engaged by the Bruckner Orchestra to record all of the Bruckner symphonies with them.<sup>48</sup> He had conducted the Austrian premiere of the Carragan Finale at St Florian on 15 June 1986. In the February 1993 recording of the "Aufführungsfassung" his choice of at times exceptionally slow tempi created a fresh set of problems for the continuity

---

<sup>46</sup> Cohrs considered that de Preist may have attempted to simplify some of the more difficult passages for the orchestra.

<sup>47</sup> See John A. Phillips, CD booklet to: *Anton Bruckner: Symphony No. 9 in D minor; with Finale, Reconstruction of the Autograph Score from the Surviving Manuscripts: Performing Version December 1992* by Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips and Giuseppe Mazzuca, with the assistance of Gunnar Cohrs. Bruckner-Orchester Linz, conducted by Kurt Eichhorn (World Premiere Recording). Tokyo: Camerata Tokyo 30CM-275-6, 1993.

<sup>48</sup> The project got as far as recordings of the Second (the earlier versions reconstructed by William Carragan), the Fifth, Sixth (recorded shortly before Eichhorn's death), Seventh, Eighth and Ninth. The remaining symphonies were recorded by the orchestra's subsequent chief conductor Martin Sieghart. The entire set of 12 CDs was released in September 1996.



of the movement<sup>49</sup> which, despite the structural clarity, pungent dissonance and hard-won conclusion of the new score, took on a 'pathetic' autumnal character reminiscent of parts of Carragan's completion.<sup>50</sup> Georgina Szeless' brief report on the CD release,<sup>51</sup> which made only token mention of the Finale, observed concerning Eichhorn's interpretation of the symphony: "Bruckner sei für ihn in der 'Neunten' ein Mystiker, er, Eichhorn, empfinde diese Symphonie als eine 'Anklage an Gott' (Bruckner wollte das Werk bekanntlich dem lieben Gott widmen), den Finalsatz als 'Eröffnung des Seligseins'."

Critiques of the recording were mixed. Franz Zamazal reacted positively, concluding in one report that:<sup>52</sup>

Im Finale, das allein 30 Minuten dauert, dominierten eine einfache rhythmische Floskel und ein Choralthema. Aus ihnen entsteht eine höchst kunstvolle und in ungewohntem Duktus gehaltenen Musik mit weihvoller Ruhe und knisternder Spannung.

In another,<sup>53</sup> he stressed the unusual character of the new score and the value of the recording:

Diese Aufnahme bildet einen wichtigen Schritt, die Musikwelt mit einem guten Stück Bruckner [...] vertraut zu machen. Dazu kommt noch, daß sich das Finale in seiner Konzeption nicht ganz mit dem aus den übrigen Bruckner-Partituren geläufigen Bild deckt. Gerade in einer solchen Situation ist die gutklingende und musikalisch inspirierte Gesamtwiedergabe [...] wertvoll.

However, the extensive and carefully prepared programme text appears to have been disregarded by some critics or even intentionally misconstrued and misrepresented. Wilhelm Sinkovicz averred:

Da liegen nämlich, von Souvenirjägern in aller Welt verstreut, in diversen Bibliotheken ausführliche Skizzen und sogar fertige Partiturseiten herum, die man sichten und ordnen kann, um festzustellen, was der Komponist im letzten Satz seiner Neunten vorgehabt hätte.

Der italienische Wissenschaftler Nicola Samale [sic—no mention of his colleagues] hat sich über dieses Vermächtnis hergemacht [...]. Das Linzer Brucknerorchester unter Kurt Eichhorn spielt recht holprig die bekannten Sätze und fügt auf ähnliche Weise den vierten hinzu. Es liegt, glaube ich, nicht allein an der Darstellungsweise, daß das, was

<sup>49</sup> The chorale in the Repr., in particular, was brought almost to a standstill in this reading.

<sup>50</sup> Apart from his choice of tempi, Eichhorn also altered scoring, including that of Bruckner, in the chorale for instance (letter G) doubling the violas on the 2nd violin part, producing negligible improvement in the audibility of the violin line but leaving a gaping hole in the resonance of the strings, particularly audible at the ends of the chorale phrases where the brass collectively take breath. At other points parts were omitted, whether inadvertently or by design; finally and strangest of all, the final statement of the Te Deum motive in the horns in the last five measures was altered to d'-a-a-a-d.

<sup>51</sup> "Finalsatz rekonstruiert", *Neues Volksblatt* (Linz), 18 Sept. 1993, p. 21.

<sup>52</sup> "Hier ist nichts geglättet: Brucknerorchester unter Kurt Eichhorn auf einer neuen CD", *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten*, 6 November 1993, p. 28.

<sup>53</sup> "A. Bruckner's 'Neunte' mit Finale", *Oberösterreichischen Kulturbericht* 47, no. 11 (Nov. 1993).

Samale uns da als Bruckner suggeriert, nicht wie Bruckner klingt, sondern wie unvollständig aneinandergereihte Versatzstücke von großen Gedanken und etliche Lücken, die man mit notdürftigen Stilübungen geschlossen hat.

Wer weiß, wie zögerlich der Komponist an seine Arbeit herangegangen ist, wie oft er einmal Gefaßtes wieder umarbeitete, ganz verwarf, durch neue Elemente ersetzte, Verworfenen wieder einfügte, kurz, wie er bis zum letzten Moment bereit war, Änderungen an seinen Werken anzubringen, der kann den Versuch Samales, aus provisorischen Partituranlagen und etlichen ungeordneten Skizzen einen Bruckner-Satz zu 'rekonstruieren', nur als Vermessenheit empfinden.

Selbst das, was in ausgeschriebener Partiturform vorliegt, hätte Bruckner garantiert noch mehrfachen Metamorphosen unterzogen und bis zur Unkenntlichkeit umgearbeitet. Es sei denn, er wäre in diesem Fall plötzlich ganz anders zugegangen. Wäre wahr, was Samale schreibt [sic—Samale wrote not a word of the CD text], daß nämlich aus den Skizzen der Verlauf des Gemeinten ziemlich einwandfrei zu ermitteln sei, dann bleibt doch die Frage, warum Bruckner, dem dazu wahrlich noch genügend Zeit geblieben wäre, diese für ihn doch relativ einfache Tätigkeit nicht selbst vorgenommen hat.

[...] Mehr als einige Ahnungen von dem vielleicht Gewollten wird man der CD nicht entnehmen.<sup>54</sup>

Typically of the usual approaches of such dedicated 'anti-Finaleists', Sinkovic's defence of Bruckner's alleged 'Unberechenbarkeit' assumes greater knowledge of his working methods than any 'Wissenschaftler' who has made the movement and Bruckner's compositional technique the subject of years of study. All of this was despite the comprehensive CD text provided which, as Appendix I shows, carefully explained both Bruckner's working methods, the degree to which Bruckner completed the compositional fragment and what the AF does and does not set out to achieve.<sup>55</sup>

On the other hand, Viennese musicologist Walter Dobner's review<sup>56</sup> of the Eichhorn recording made courteous obeisance to the 'informative' CD text, even if, apparently, he had not taken the time to read it:

Die Spekulation, wie Bruckner den vierten Satz seiner Neunten Symphonie vollendet haben könnte, hält weiter an. Zuletzt waren es der Musikwissenschaftler John A. Phillips, der Dirigent und Komponist Nicola Samale, der Komponist Giuseppe Mazzuca und der Dirigent Gunnar Cohrs, die in mühevoller, langjähriger Arbeit—selbstverständlich gestützt auf die Brucknerschen Skizzen und die bisher dazu bekannten Forschungsergebnisse—eine Aufführungsfassung dieses Satzes herstellten. [...] Aber bodenständig-solide, wie schon die ersten drei Sätze von Bruckners *Neunter* hier erklingen, wird schließlich auch dieses neue, insgesamt doch sehr konstruktiv wirkende *Finale* realisiert, womit sich

<sup>54</sup> "Was Bruckner wirklich wollte: Die Neunte auf CD: ehrlich und angeblich vollendet", *Die Presse* (Vienna), supplement *Schauenster*, 17 Feb. 1994, p. 9.

<sup>55</sup> Sinkovic's apparent ignorance of the commentary is also evident from the fact that, whether by reason of pure convenience or contempt, no mention of the name or degree of involvement of Mazzuca, Cohrs or the present writer was made in his review. Perhaps a single Italian made an easier target than an international team.

<sup>56</sup> Walter Dobner, "Weitere und Neue Anläufe: Zu neuen Bruckner Einspielungen", *IBG-Mitt* no. 41 (Dec. 1993), p. 50.

der eigentliche Wert dieser Einspielung auf das ausführliche Beibuch reduziert, in dem in höchst differenzierter Manier die *Finale*-Rekonstruktion informativst beschrieben wird.

No matter how much is done to establish the significance of the originals and the fact that the *Finale* existed as score, not sketch or even draft, critics' assumption of the unimpeachable validity of his or her aesthetic impressions—which may be founded on many factors, few of them probably objective—often reigned unchallenged.

### 3.4.6 The German and Italian premieres.

Manfred Mayrhofer renewed his contact with the *Finale* when he conducted the first performance of the AF on German soil at the Stadthalle in Braunschweig with the Staatsorchester of that city, as the eighth concert of their 1993/94 season on 17 and 18 April 1994. This time Cohrs supplied the programme notes, taking the opportunity to change, with the agreement of both Samale and Phillips, the 'rank' of the authors of the score, placing all four on an equal footing.<sup>57</sup> A review by Roland Comes, entitled "Mystische Wirkung", was strikingly laudatory in tone:

Der wie eine gigantische Zusammenfassung des Brucknerschen Schaffens angelegte Satz steigert nur die mystische Wirkung dieser fast einzigartig zu nennenden Tondichtung.

Diskussion um die Berechtigung der Arbeit von Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Giuseppe Mazzuca und Gunnar Cohrs dürften sehr schnell verstummen. [...].

Das *Finale* bietet nach dem Kampf zwischen Aufbegehren und Verzweiflung des ersten Satzes, dem dämonischen Scherzo und der Suche nach Ruhe des Adagios noch einmal die Summe Brucknerscher Satzkunst. Ein majestätischer Choral, Zitate aus dem *Te Deum* und dem Trio der 8. Symphonie, dazu die Parallelführung der Hauptthemen aller vier Sätze in der Coda lassen ein Klanggebirge entstehen, das sich nahtlos an die vorhergehenden Sätze anschließt. [...]

Noch eine Anmerkung zum rekonstruierten *Finale*: Schließlich akzeptieren wir ja auch Mozarts Requiem klaglos als *seine* Schöpfung, obwohl dieses Werk ebenfalls vom Komponisten nicht mehr zu Ende geführt werden konnte.

Uneingeschränkte Zustimmung beim Braunschweiger Publikum, das die Aufführung mit minutenlangem Beifall quittierte.<sup>58</sup>

In early 1995, the Haydn Orchestra of Bolzano contacted Cohrs concerning performance rights for the Ninth with *Finale* to open their 1995/96 orchestral season.<sup>59</sup> The conductor

<sup>57</sup> The wording of the title page of the programme was as follows: "Anton Bruckner. *Sinfonie Nr. 9 d-Moll mit Finale / Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen/ Aufführungsfassung von Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Giuseppe Mazzuca und Gunnar Cohrs (1985–1993)*." See Cohrs, *Programme notes...*, p. 1. Later (mid-1995) the order of authors was altered as well, reversing the order of Cohrs' and Mazzuca's names (see below). Apart from the extent of their respective editorial inputs, Cohrs had been highly active promoting the score since 1991, while Mazzuca had had nothing to do with the undertaking since the Ricordi publication of 1986.

<sup>58</sup> "Mystische Wirkung. Staatsorchester spielte Bruckners 'Neunte'", *Braunschweiger Zeitung*, 19 April 1994; italics of the original.

Johannes Wildner proved an enthusiastic proponent of the new score, and three performances of the complete Ninth by a much-augmented Haydn Orchestra, on 7, 9 and 10 October in Bressanone, Trento and Bolzano respectively, proved by all accounts highly successful.<sup>60</sup>

The 38-page programme booklet for the concerts included essays in German and Italian by Dietmar Holland and Giuseppe Pugliese. The former's "L'ultima Sinfonia di Bruckner: congedo e testamento/ Abschied und Vermächtnis: Zu Bruckners letzter Symphonie" accurately recounted the genesis of the Ninth and gave carefully considered, analytically specific information concerning the Finale and its links with both first movement and Adagio:<sup>61</sup>

Noch in seinen letzten Lebenstagen hat Bruckner an dem unvollendeten Finale gearbeitet, an einem Finale, von dem später für lange Zeit behauptet wurde, es läge nur in "Skizzen" vor und sei konventionell nicht nachvollziehbar. Der wahre Sachverhalt lautet indessen ganz anders: Außer zahlreichen Skizzen, Satzverlaufsentwürfen und Particell-Seiten ist auch das Entstehen der endgültigen Partitur, d.h. der Instrumentation in eigens dafür vorbereiteten Bögen überliefert, wenn auch lückenhaft (verlorengegangene Blätter?) und vor allem ohne—bei Bruckner stets, besonders in den Finalsätzen unentbehrliche—zusammenfassende und transzendierende Coda, in der sich—so auch in der Rekonstruktion (1985—1993) von Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Giuseppe Mazzuca und Gunnar Cohrs—die Hauptthemen aller vier Sätze hätten vereinigen sollen, da sie ohnehin durch gemeinsamen Materialbestand miteinander verbunden sind.

Aus dem erhaltenen Material zum Finale geht zweifelsfrei hervor, daß Bruckner niemals daran gedacht hat, als unfreiwilliges Finale das E-Dur-Adagio zu akzeptieren, dessen deutlich abschiednehmender Charakter [...] zwar unbestreitbar ist [...], niemals aber das Finale einer Symphonie in d-Moll bilden kann. [...]

[...] im Finale [tritt] der "Radikalismus eines Greises" (Peter Gülke) scheinbar gemildert [!] auf [...], indem die vorhergegangenen Katastrophen sich in breite, wenn auch innerlich gezackte, unruhige Flächen auflösen und somit eine Umkehrung des symphonischen Ablaufs (auch im thematischen Bereich) vollziehen: Der im dritten Satz noch periphere Choral ("Abschied vom Leben") erhebt sich im Finale [...] zum dritten, zentralen Themenkomplex, und das aufschießende, erste aktive Motiv des Kopfsatzes (noch vor dem ausbrechenden Ereignis des Hauptthemas) verwandelt sich in den absteigenden Gestus eines Motivs mit offenem, vorläufigem Grundcharakter auf harmonisch unsicherer

<sup>59</sup> The Bressanone (Brixen) performances were part of a "Musik und Kirche" festival.

<sup>60</sup> See note concerning the performances in *IBG-Mitt* no. 45 (Dec. 1995), p. 31. The programme itself correctly cites three performances, 7, 9 and 10 October; due to a misunderstanding, two performances were thought to have been staged in Bressanone, on 7 and 8 October in the Seminarikirche and cathedral respectively; this information is found in both the IBG report and the critique of Ferruccio delle Cave (*q.v. infra*). The Bressanone performance, on 7 October, was in fact held in the cathedral; there was no performance in the Seminarikirche, where the orchestra normally performs, as it proved too small a venue for the augmented orchestra.

A small but significant change to the AF was implemented in these performances for the first time, namely a simplification in the parts of horns 3–6 in mm. 265–276 (see AF, G/36f.) replacing an earlier, imitative counterpoint using the *Te Deum* motive in semibreves originally drafted in Rome in April 1991 by Samale during the last stage of combined work on the score. The change was agreed to in late October 1994.

<sup>61</sup> Pp. 14f.

Grundlage—Bruckners konkreter Ausblick in die musikalische Moderne unseres Jahrhunderts.

In the second essay of the programme, “L’‘incompiuta’ di Bruckner / Bruckners ‘Unvollendete’”, the writer concerned, although convinced of the propriety and musical value of the Finale, consulted the wrong score, as he apparently used the 1986 Ricordi score and *Commentary* for his confessedly hasty cogitations.<sup>62</sup> However, his views would otherwise surely have contributed to the successful outcome of the performances:

Ich glaube [...] nicht, daß man sich fragen sollte, ob es richtig wäre, das Finale zu rekonstruieren und aufzuführen, oder ob es besser gewesen wäre, die IX. Sinfonie mit den drei vom Komponisten beendeten Sätzen zu präsentieren. Ich kann nur meine Meinung darüber äußern. Nachdem ich das Finale gehört und studiert habe, glaube ich, daß es richtiger ist, dieses an Stelle des von Bruckner gewählten “Te Deum” aufzuführen. Man muß sich mit diesem Finale auseinandersetzen, man muß es in dieser Fassung anhören [...].<sup>63</sup>

Critiques were again varied. Wilhelm Sinkovicz<sup>64</sup> this time revealed a less polemic although still poorly informed approach:

Die Bruckner-Erstaufführung stellte eine neue Aufbereitung des Skizzenmaterials zur Neunten dar. Erst vor wenigen Wochen kam eine vom italienischen Wissenschaftler Nicola Samale [!] betreute Druck-Ausgabe von Bruckners Partitur-Skizzen im Rahmen der Gesamtausgabe beim Wiener Musikwissenschaftlichen Verlag in den Handel. Samale hat mit weiteren Wissenschaftlern und Komponisten auch eine Spielfassung des Finalsatzes hergestellt, die sich so weitgehend wie möglich auf des Komponisten Skizzen stützt.

One can assume from this that the GA publication had mitigated his concerns about the inauthenticity of the Finale and the temerity of attempting any completion—although he had still not taken the trouble of informing himself as to the identity of the volume’s editor.<sup>65</sup> Ferruccio Delle Cave’s comments<sup>66</sup> were kinder but not more accurate:

Vom Finale sind aus der Hand des Komponisten Skizzen und instrumentale Anweisungen erhalten geblieben. Die Brixner Aufführung endete mit der Rekonstruktion des 4. Satzes aus den Jahren 1985–1993.

“Musik und Kirche” kommt hier das Verdienst zu, dieses bisher nur den Bruckner-Spezialisten vorbehaltene Finale vielen Musikliebhabern zugänglich gemacht zu haben.

<sup>62</sup> This must have proven baffling for the audience when it came to his discussion of the coda, which was radically different in the earlier version.

<sup>63</sup> P. 36.

<sup>64</sup> “Brixen vollendete Bruckners Neunte”, *Die Presse* (Vienna), 12 Oct. 1995.

<sup>65</sup> See §3.4.5 *supra*.

<sup>66</sup> “Verklärte Visionen vom Lebensabschied. ‘Musik und Kirche’ in Brixen: Bachs ‘Kunst der Fuge’ mit Peter Waldner, Bruckners Neunte unter Johannes Wildner”, *Tiroler Tageszeitung* (Innsbruck), 10 Oct. 1995.

Two articles appeared in the Italian press. That of Giuliano Tonini, although positive in its assessment of the authors' activities, still seemed in doubt over the musical results:<sup>67</sup>

Anche la più recente ricostruzione di questo Finale ad opera di Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Giuseppe Mazzuca e Gunnar Cohrs e proposta in prima italiana dalla Haydn, nonostante le vadano lealmente riconosciuti pregi musicali, buona fattura orchestrale, e forse anche il merito fra tutte di essersi approssimata di più alle intenzioni bruckneriane perseguite con lodevole acribia critica, non è esente da riserve.

È un Finale virtuale: c'è molto di Bruckner ma c'è anche molta farina altrui benché macinata al mulino di Bruckner. All'ascolto però è un Finale convincente che riesce ad integrare in modo equilibrato l'originale con il rifacimento, e questo basti a legittimarlo.

—although he would doubtless have been in no position to accurately specify which passages qualified as 'Bruckner' and which as 'farina'. Annely Zeni gave a more enthusiastic account of the performance in Trento (9 October), summing up her impressions:<sup>68</sup>

Lasciando ad altri contesti il compito di individuare pregi e difetti di tale ricostruzione, rimane da descrivere l'impatto sicuramente positivo registrato nella serata trentina, dove, a confronto con il folto pubblico dell'Auditorium (per nulla sconcertato dalle impervie proporzioni del lavoro), questa versione della IX. sinfonia dava *la sensazione di una architettura infine completata*.

The reception history of the AF is continued in §3.4.11.

### 3.4.7 Publication of the Aufführungsfassung.<sup>69</sup>

As noted in §1.4.13, the score of the Samale/Mazzuca *Ricostruzione* was originally published by Ricordi as rental material in 1986. For each of the subsequent performances Samale had made more or less substantial alterations; no further performances had taken place since that conducted by Samale with the assistance of Cohrs in Katowice, Poland, in October 1988.

On the 23 and 25 May 1991, the author met with Herbert Vogg of Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna, concerning publication of his research and of the then so-called "Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung" of the Finale. Vogg informed the author of Nowak's lifelong wish to republish the Orel edition, and entrusted him with a copy of Nowak's corrections to the volume.<sup>70</sup> On 24 May, the author met Nowak, at this stage living in a sanatorium outside Vienna.<sup>71</sup> Nowak, who showed considerable interest in the research, confirmed the

<sup>67</sup> "Bruckner virtuale", *Il Mattino* 13 Oct. 1995.

<sup>68</sup> "Bruckner 'sublimato'", *Alto Adige* 11 Oct. 1995, italics added.

<sup>69</sup> The following is only a brief summary of a lengthy process, with many exchanges of correspondence.

<sup>70</sup> As discussed in chs. 1.4 and 3.1; see Facs. C/337ff. The volume was returned to the ÖNB in 1997, where it is now held with Bruckner-GA Fonds material, signature F60 BRGA 245/15b.

<sup>71</sup> The meeting was kindly organised by Elisabeth Maier of ABIL.

present writer's critique of the Orel edition and gave enthusiastic consent to Vogg's decision to proceed with a new publication of the Finale materials.<sup>72</sup>

A contract, later formalised,<sup>73</sup> was subsequently drawn up by Vogg between MWV, Samale and the present writer covering publication of the performing score of the work in a form in which the provenance of the musical material was to be notationally differentiated,<sup>74</sup> subject to Ricordi's agreement to relinquish its rights to the performing version. In addition to this, publication of the MSS in facsimile together with a comprehensive monograph was envisaged, to be prepared by the present writer.

However, in April 1992 publication of the performing version with MWV fell through due to the intransigence of Ricordi, who had previously acquired all rights to the Samale/Mazzuca score including those of subsequent revisions, and considered the present writer's research insufficient to warrant claims that the new score constituted a significantly distinct version.<sup>75</sup> Accordingly, any transfer of the rights for the performing score to MWV or any other publisher remained subject to agreement to Ricordi's conditions. Nor did a direct approach to Ricordi arouse interest in that firm's updating the—now clearly outdated and invalid—score and parts (from 1986) in their possession.<sup>76</sup> In addition to this came the realisation by MWV that the publication of any performing version under their aegis, even one employing such notational distinctions, would create only polemic and confusion as to its motives and intentions *vis-à-vis* the Bruckner GA.

In February 1993, Ricordi finally offered to take over the new version demanding, however, that agreements previously reached with Linz for the recording and with Portland, for the American premiere be retrospectively made over to Ricordi, conditions which could not be agreed to. The publication of a pocket score, which had been given as one of the conditions for release of the new score, was also declined, Ricordi considering itself unable to ensure an adequate distribution and admitting its ineffectiveness as a publisher of Bruckner's music. MWV, to whom Ricordi offered a license publication, also remained unwilling, for reasons given above. Continued delays and the clear lack of interest by Ricordi versus the

---

<sup>72</sup> It was the aged scholar's last meeting with any musicologist: he died in his sleep three days later, on 27 May 1991.

<sup>73</sup> Entitled *Aktennotiz über Gespräche zwischen Herrn John Philips und Herrn Dr. Herbert Vogg am 23. und 25. Mai betreffend Anton Bruckner, Finale der IX. Symphonie* (correspondence by MWV to the author, early June 1991), the first sentence of which is quoted in §1.4.2. The final signature to be added was that of Samale at a meeting in Linz, 3 Dec. 1991.

<sup>74</sup> As originally proposed, the publication was to use three different sizes of musical notation denoting, from largest to smallest, (a) original text of the score, (b) autograph material originating elsewhere, and (c) editorial supplementation. While logistically possible, the layout would have proven difficult to read.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. for instance a fax from Ricordi dated 16/12/1992: "As a matter of fact, our editorial committee examined thoroughly the Phillips edition and finally decided not to acquire it, as it seems it does not contain anything of so much interest."

<sup>76</sup> This in any case was only the original handwritten material prepared by Nicola Samale.

interest being shown by several parties in the score led inevitably, in early 1993, to the executive authors' (Phillips' and Cohrs') decision to undertake private publication and distribution of the AF in 'Selbstverlag', a legal 'loophole' in part facilitated by the present writer's republication of, and hence renewal of copyright on, the original material published within the GA.

For such publication a considerable sum of money was required, the undertaking ultimately financed by a subvention organised largely by Cohrs.<sup>77</sup> An initial request from the author for financial assistance by Brucknerphile Herr Erich Nowotny of Kronstorf was cordially granted, through whose graces the financial support of the Brucknerbund was secured. The original list of subscribers can be found in vol. II, G/iv.

An initial limited edition of 250 copies of the score was printed and bound by the firm of Waldemar H. Miemczyk, Bremen, in February 1993 from proofs produced by the author and printed by The Bureau in Adelaide. The volume consisted of the 98-p. score, as reproduced in vol. II, AF, preceded by 16 prefatory pages comprising a foreword, an outline of editorial procedure<sup>78</sup> and five tables<sup>79</sup> in English and German.<sup>80</sup> Almost all business concerning the AF, including responsibility for the publication of the score and management of the hire material, thereafter passed into the hands of Cohrs. The break was also expedient to avoid any apparent conflict of interests between the author's activities as contributing editor of the Complete Edition and his involvement with the AF.

Cohrs continued to work toward the adoption of the AF by a major publisher, with the intention of securing a wider distribution of the score. An offer was made to Universal Edition in Vienna concerning a possible collaboration between Ricordi Milan and UE, or indeed the complete takeover of all rights by UE—an alternative seen by the authors as the more satisfactory, in view of Ricordi's lack of interest in the project and the fact that it was not known as a publisher of Bruckner's music. However, the matter of the 'ownership' of the score, were it to be adopted by another publisher, remained. In late 1995, following the Italian performances of the Haydn orchestra, the order of authors was changed for a second time at Cohrs' request and with the agreement of the writer to "Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Gunnar Cohrs and Giuseppe Mazzuca", reversing the names of Mazzuca and Cohrs, a change

---

<sup>77</sup> In December 1992 Cohrs also produced and distributed an "Informationsbroschüre" with a reproduction of the aforementioned article by Zamazal, articles by the present writer and facsimile excerpts from both MSS and AF.

<sup>78</sup> See ch. 3.3.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Table VI, Currently Known Autograph Sources for the Ninth Symphony (A/23f.), Table XI, Genesis of the Finale Score (A/36), Orel, "Übersicht" (D/127), Table XV, Sources Used in the Aufführungsfassung (A/44ff.), and Table XVI, Formal Overview of the Aufführungsfassung (A/47).

<sup>80</sup> See announcement of the publication, *IBG-Mitt* 40 (June 1993), p. 46. The score appeared under the Australian copyright of the present writer, a copy being deposited with the National Library in Canberra. Copies, initially numbered on the verso of the title page, were distributed to the parties contributing to the subvention as well as subsequent buyers of the score by Cohrs from March 1993 onward.



justified in view of the major input made by the German conductor and musicologist to the revision of the score and its promotion. Among other unsuccessful advances to prospective publishers, that made by Cohrs to Schott, London, in early 1996 encountered the decision that, due to pre-existing long-term projects, neither the Mainz nor London bureaus of that firm could take on the publication.<sup>81</sup> 2001 saw renewed interest on the part of the editors in publication, or at least distribution through an official publisher, although as at time of writing no further developments concerning an 'official' release of the AF have eventuated.

In May–July 1996, in preparation for the anticipated performances later that year, the parts were re-edited and reformatted and the score republished in Adelaide in July 1996 in a larger, hard-bound format more suitable for use as a conducting score. This 'second impression' of score and parts incorporated alterations that, as already mentioned in ch. 3.3, were proposed during preparation of the AF for reproduction in vol. II, principal among which were changes to the scoring of mm. 53–59 (G/8f.)<sup>82</sup>—revisions symptomatic of the manner in which the AF will doubtless continue to evolve under the influence of repeated performances.<sup>83</sup> The writer's conjectural reconstruction of the Te Deum transition (G/99ff.) originated in early 1991; publication is not currently envisaged.

In September 2001 a variant version of the AF by Cohrs arising out of the repeated experience of the movement in rehearsal and performance was trialled during a tour of the Royal Flanders Orchestra in Japan. Score and parts were typeset by the writer in 2001.<sup>84</sup> In line with the new publication by MWV of the first three movements, the musical text was freed from the encumbering accidentals of the earlier editions. Apart from some small structural changes the main alterations vis-à-vis the previous, official version of 1991–96 concerned changes to the instrumentation and refinements of tempo and articulation. In particular the figuration of the violins in the coda was simplified.<sup>85</sup> A further 'official' version of the AF is planned for release in 2002, which will incorporate several of these changes.

---

<sup>81</sup> In a letter from Clifford Caesar, head of Schott's Editorial Department, 7 May 1996. The letter stressed that the decision "does not imply any criticism of the expert realization of the Finale".

<sup>82</sup> The mm. 53–59 changes were the following: (a) in mm. 53–54 a continuation of the descending lines in woodwind, horns, tubas, trombones and contrabass tuba, (b) at m. 55 deletion of the general *fff* marking, (c) in mm. 55–9 relocation of the high parts in tenor tubas, trombones and 1st violins an octave lower, (d) at m. 58 breaking the melodic line in the clarinets (previously continued without interruption into the new motive in the next measure), and (e) from m. 55 altering the trumpets, which had previously taken up the descending minims of the tubas and trombones at this point, permitting a more logical, 'mutation-oriented' continuation of Bruckner's own trumpet parts at letter B (cf. AP E/11f.). The remaining changes involved the already mentioned rescoring of the horns at mm. 265–276 (G/36f.), alterations creating a more chromatic bass line and other aspects of the scoring at mm. 615–618 (G/87) and the violin figuration of mm. 635–642 and 647 (G/90ff.).

<sup>83</sup> The writer recalls Samale's delight in such small improvements, often jocularly expressed in the remark: "Eine Ohrfeige weniger im Himmel!"

<sup>84</sup> See further details in §3.4.11, including Cohrs' statement concerning this version.

<sup>85</sup> The principal changes made by Cohrs were as follows:

### 3.4.8 Publication of the Autograph-Partitur.

According to MWV's original plan of May 1991, the three publications envisaged, as noted above (§3.4.1), an edition of the performing score in which the provenance of the musical text would be shown by notational distinctions, as well as a facsimile edition and monograph. However, when Ricordi refused to relinquish its rights to the revised performing score, Vogg<sup>86</sup> invited the author to prepare a score comprising only the 'pure' text of Bruckner's originals, a volume that could, and indeed should, be included in the GA.<sup>87</sup> In all respects this was a better solution than that originally envisaged. Not only could the unfinished Finale, like the unfinished or fragmentarily transmitted works of other composers, now take its rightful place within a complete edition as an unfinished score rather than as a collection of sketches, but the needs of a functional, easily legible performing score could be more appropriately addressed, distinct from the musicological documentation upon which it was founded. The technical difficulty of differentiating between three different sizes of notes was also obviated, along with any objection to publication of the Finale by MWV on the part of purists.

The computer files for the new publication were completed in late 1993. The 142 pages of transcription, reproduced here as E/1–142 of vol. II, including four pages dealing with the surviving materials for and literary references to the coda, were preceded by 37 prefatory pages in both German and English encompassing foreword,<sup>88</sup> editorial guidelines,<sup>89</sup> acknowledgements, three tables<sup>90</sup> and explanations of abbreviations and terminology, while two appendices listed the repeat signs and instrumental annotations of the originals which had

- 
- a. in the Exp. Gesangsperiode, the deletion of the 2 mm., 8lf., and interpolation of 4 mm. after m. 98, the latter taken from the pencilled addition to the last p. of bifol. 4C/"5", Facs. C/154, with substantial alterations to the scoring of mm. 95ff.;
  - b. recomposition of the missing bifolio [19/"20"] in the Durchf. of the fugue;
  - c. extension of the restatement of the principal theme before W by 2 mm. and correspondingly transposition of the beginning of the coda, letter W onwards, by a semitone upwards, with recomposition of mm. 603–6;
  - d. substantial rescoring/partial recomposition of the Themenüberlagerung at letter X;
  - e. major alteration to the figuration of the strings, and in particular the violins from letter Y onwards; and
  - f. the addition of 2 G. P. mm. just prior to Z.

Numerous alternations of C and  $\text{¢}$ , changes to tempo and the placement of rehearsal letters were also made in the interests of making tempo relationships clearer for conductor and players.

<sup>86</sup> In a letter dated 29 April 1992.

<sup>87</sup> The editorial solution to the problems of satisfactorily representing the original score evolved in correspondence and were finalised during discussion in Linz in September 1992 between Professor Vogg and the author.

<sup>88</sup> This text was 'extracted' with modifications by Vogg from that of the original Vorwort to the AF—perhaps not an ideal solution. The similarity was noted by R. Stephan in the critique quoted *infra*.

<sup>89</sup> See ch. 3.1.

<sup>90</sup> These correspond in vol. II to: Table VI, Currently Known Autograph Sources for the Ninth Symphony (A/23f.), Table XI, Genesis of the Finale Score (A/36), and Table XII, Sources Used in the Reconstruction of the Autograph Score (A/37f.).

been written-out in full in the transcription<sup>91</sup> and gave English translations of the footnotes. The volume was dedicated to Leopold Nowak in posthumous fulfilment of his lifelong wish to see a republication of the *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie*. The *Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen / Studienpartitur* appeared in July 1994. A slightly revised and corrected second impression appeared in August 1999.

Response to this, the first volume of the author's GA publications, was slow but cordial. Rudolf Stephan, in a review of the AP appearing in the May 1995 issue of *Das Orchester*,<sup>92</sup> outlined the envisaged three-volume series, observing:

Erst wenn alle diese Publikationen vorliegen, wird man sich ein Bild von der Überlieferung und den mit ihr verbundenen philologischen und musikalischen Problemen machen können. Immerhin ist schon jetzt erkennbar, daß hier eine gründlich vorbereitete Ausgabe vorliegt, die Respekt, Anerkennung und Dank verdient.

Franz Zamazal wrote in the *Oberösterreichischen Kulturbericht*:<sup>93</sup>

Die bewundernswerte Arbeit der Übertragung der oft nur schwer entzifferbaren Handschriften und der gewissenhaften Kommentierung leistete der junge australische Musikwissenschaftler John A. Philips mit ungeheurem Spürsinn. Er hat alles zugängliche Material berücksichtigt, das sich in die Gegenwart retten konnte, selbst wenn es in alle Welt zerstreut war. Damit wurde sichtbar, wie weit Bruckner das kühne Konzept dieses Satzes vollendet und instrumentale Details teils vollständig, teils mehr oder weniger ausführlich niedergeschrieben hat. Damit ist ein wichtiges Dokument aus der Zeit des alten Bruckners zugänglich.

### 3.4.9 Publication of the Faksimile-Ausgabe.

The planned facsimile edition of the Finale material, *Anton Bruckner: IX. Symphonie: Finale (unvollendet). Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten*, originally scheduled for publication in 1994,<sup>94</sup> appeared in March 1996.<sup>95</sup> The 339 pages of facsimiles it contains,

<sup>91</sup> Included here in as Table XIII, Repetition Signs and Instrumental Directives Written Out in the Autograph Score (A/39ff.)

<sup>92</sup> May 1995, p. 57.

<sup>93</sup> Vol. 49, no. 9 (Sept. 1995), p. 19.

<sup>94</sup> The original title, which still appears with that intended publication date on p. 1 of the AP (see E/1), was *Faksimile-Ausgabe aller dem Finale der IX. Symphonie zugehörigen Manuskripte*. This was altered to conform to the pattern of other MWV publications, in which the title of the symphony takes precedence.

<sup>95</sup> The rather chequered pre-history of the publication is as follows. The author had prepared a 'mock-up' of the volume while working on the AP in 1993 using photocopies of the MSS; this had been handed on in Vienna to a production editor who returned the task to MWV several months later untouched. Fortunately, MWV was soon to find another editor and despite the size of the undertaking and difficulty of satisfactorily reproducing many of the MSS, most of which were scanned in from microfilm, proceeded with the project. In early 1996 it became apparent that the quality of many of the scanned pages was inadequate, and substantial tracts of the volume had to be refilmed. Unfortunately, this is apparent in the facsimiles reproduced in vol. II, which were photocopied from the proofs prepared by Mayer and Co. in January 1996, cut out and pasted onto pages bearing the captions in

corresponding to pp. C/1–339 of vol. II of the current study, are grouped into three divisions, preceded in the MWV publication by 29 prefatory pages, including Foreword (German and English), in three sections: I. The transmission of the sources, II. Concerning the genesis of the Finale, and III. Concerning this edition, the last of which is included in ch. 3.1. These are followed by an explanation of terminology and abbreviations and three indices of the published material.<sup>96</sup>

One review of the Faksimile-Ausgabe appearing in 1996, from the redoubtable Sinkovicz,<sup>97</sup> appears to represent a further step along the path of that critic's *rapprochement* with the Finale. This time he was at least permitted himself the observation that: "Bruckner selbst hat den ersten Abschnitt der Komposition in Reinschrift [sic!] hinterlassen"; he again confused AF with AP,<sup>98</sup> while in his concluding summary the edition is claimed to represent "ein ergreifendes Dokument eines Scheiterns. Einem großen Mann war es nicht gegeben, sein letztes Wort in seiner Sprache zu formulieren".<sup>99</sup> The critic made no mention of the evidence that Bruckner concluded the drafting of the score months before his death or of the missing materials—information made abundantly clear in the Foreword. Predictably, Sinkovicz did his best to reinforce consensus beliefs.

#### 3.4.10 The 1996 Bruckner Symposium.

The centenary of Bruckner's death in 1996 understandably presented a suitable juncture from which to review the issues surrounding the Finale. The Bruckner Institute undertook the issue as a subtheme to its 1996 Symposium (Linz, 25–29 September) entitled " Fassungen—Bearbeitungen—Vollendungen", thus presenting the second symposium to deal with the theme since the 1980s.<sup>100</sup>

Significant for the ABIL's approach, the issues of versions, arrangements and completions as they apply to Bruckner scholarship were placed in valuable perspective by the

English; at this stage it was expected that the thesis would be submitted prior to the Faksimile-Ausgabe which, however, appeared in July of the same year.

<sup>96</sup> In vol. II of the present work these correspond to the Index to Section C [Facsimiles] (C/iii, as far as C/339), Table VII, The Finale MSS Ordered According to Library Signature (A/25ff.) and Table VIII, Concordance of the Autograph Finale MSS with the Orel Edition (A/28ff.).

<sup>97</sup> Wilhelm Sinkovicz, "Die Neunte Bruckner mit allen Notizen dazu", *Die Presse* (Vienna), 20 July 1996, p. 8.

<sup>98</sup> "Zu studieren ist damit, wie Philips [sic] und seine Mitarbeiter zu jener Version des Satzes gelangten, die vor Jahresfrist [actually in 1994] als Zusatzband zur Neunten Symphonie in Druck erschienen ist" (*ibid.*).

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.* Cf. also Crawford Howard's review of the Faksimile-Ausgabe and Cohrs' 1998 Studienband on the Scherzo, which erroneously refers to the score of the AF as appearing in the GA and concludes: "We are provided with a fascinating glimpse into the workshop of a composer whose striving for perfection and constant struggle with illness as he engaged with the Ninth Symphony in his final years bequeathed to us both a fascinating superfluity of trio material and a frustratingly incomplete finale" (*M&L* 80, no. 4, Nov. 1999, p. 668).

<sup>100</sup> See the conference proceedings, *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen–Bearbeitungen–Vollendungen*. Linz 1998. As we have seen (§1.4.15) and as van Zwol notes, a symposium on the theme was held in Rome in 1987 ("Der Finalsatz der Neunten...", p. 189) and another, as we have seen (§1.4.8), in Den Haag in 1998 ("Symposion 'De Onvoltooiden–Die Unvollendeten...'", *IBG-Mitt* 51, Dec. 1998, p. 22).

inclusion of papers on related or analogous topics from outside musicology, such as architecture, the visual arts, literature and archaeology,<sup>101</sup> while other musicologists made comparisons of these issues as they apply to other composers.<sup>102</sup> Three roundtables permitted lengthy discussions (also transcribed and published), with position statements from participants, on the issues of “ Fassungen bei Bruckner”,<sup>103</sup> “ Bearbeitungen”,<sup>104</sup> and in conclusion, “ Finale der Neunten Symphonie”.<sup>105</sup> The last named, moderated by Cornelis van Zwol, brought together Cohrs, Vogg and Zamazal among other participants; statements were read on behalf of William Carragan and the present writer, both of whom were unable to attend; that of the present writer, reproduced in Appendix V, was read by Cohrs.<sup>106</sup> This forum represented a major watershed in the reception of the movement; while Partsch's transcription should ideally be read as a whole, a number of significant excerpts deserve mention here.

Following a brief position statement by Carragan defending the notion of a performing version of the movement,<sup>107</sup> van Zwol gave an account of the known principal versions, concluding with an outline of the present writer's contributions.<sup>108</sup> Vogg continued, following his somewhat cryptic reference to the Aristotelian aphorism “ Die Vollendung ist nicht ein Ergebnis sondern ein Prinzip”, used as a motto for this chapter:

Zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie sind viel mehr Dinge vorhanden, als man bis vor kurzem angenommen hat. Und das ist das große Verdienst jener Leute, die sich mit der Vervollständigung dieses Satzes beschäftigt haben. Die Studienpartitur und der Faksimileband, die hier vorliegen, zeigen, wieviel vorhanden ist [...]. Daraus kann man dem Pub-

<sup>101</sup> See for instance the contributions from Manfred Koller (“ ‘Gefaßt’ oder ‘fassunglos’: Zur historischen und aktuellen Interpretation und Präsentation von Architektur und Bildkünsten”, *ibid.*, pp. 25–34); Johann Lachinger (“ Fragment, Fassung, Vollendung in der Literatur mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Adalbert Stifters”, pp. 35–40), Johann Hüttner (“ Bearbeitungen— Fassungen: Im Rahmen der Frage: Parodien am Beispiel Nestroys”, pp. 102–110), or Dieter Knibbe (“ Fragment und Ergänzung in Epigraphik und Archäologie”, pp. 143–156).

<sup>102</sup> For instance René Clemencic (“ Das Problem der Fassung und Bearbeitung bei Alter Musik”, *ibid.*, pp. 41–46) or Gernot Gruber (“ Die Position der Bearbeitungspraxis im 19. Jahrhundert am Beispiel der Musik Mozarts”, pp. 111–116).

<sup>103</sup> Erich Wolfgang Partsch, ed., “ Round-table— Fassungen bei Bruckner”, in: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen— Bearbeitungen— Vollendungen*, Linz 1998, pp. 85–102.

<sup>104</sup> Andrea Harrandt, ed., “ Round-table— Bearbeitungen”, in: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen— Bearbeitungen— Vollendungen*. Linz 1998, pp. 134–142.

<sup>105</sup> Partsch, Erich Wolfgang, ed. “ Round-table— Finale der Neunten Symphonie”, in: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen— Bearbeitungen— Vollendungen*. Linz 1998, pp. 189–210. An appendix follows the article with a chronology and list of relevant literature (pp. 208ff.).

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Appendix V, where the author's position statement is reprinted under its original title, “ Das Finale der Neunten Symphonie: Herausforderung an den musikalischen und musikwissenschaftlichen Kanon”. The Appendix V reprint omits a number of minor changes made by Cohrs in the read and published version.

<sup>107</sup> The essence of Carragan's statement was as follows: “ to me, the sketches reveal a new, bold, and imaginative turn in Bruckner's thinking, and I feel that the public has a right to hear these urgent rhythms, lovely melodies and mighty chords [...]” (*ibid.*, p. 189).

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 189ff.

likum eine Vorstellung davon geben, wie weit Bruckner mit diesem Finale gekommen bzw. in welchem Stadium er darüber gestorben ist.<sup>109</sup>

In his statement, Vogg outlined the policy of the Bruckner GA towards completions of the Finale, in particular with regard to the special problem of the coda, followed by the editorial principles behind the publication of the Studienband (AP). Cohrs pointed out in response the importance of recognising that the coda was very likely notated in the first draft phase in score: “Das ist das, was wir aus dem zwölf Jahre währenden Studium des erhaltenen Materials, auch der Skizzen zur Coda und der darin befindlichen Datierungen, glauben sagen zu können.” He concluded:

Es ist ein Unterschied, ob eine Partitur im Entstehen begriffen war, die wir dann versuchen zu restaurierten, oder ob es Fragmente gab, von denen wir nicht einmal die Reihung, d. h. die musikalische Faktur—wie im Falle von Schuberts oder Beethovens Zehnter—wissen. Das ist im Falle von Bruckner Finale eben nicht so.<sup>110</sup>

The author’s position statement ensued,<sup>111</sup> followed by a surprisingly protracted discussion as to how best to refer to the AF, given the unwieldiness of citing the four editors’ names.<sup>112</sup> Subsequent discussion returned to the issue of the coda and on the manner in which the Ninth should best be performed in the concert hall: in three movements, with Finale or with *Te Deum* (no one, it should be mentioned, spoke against inclusion of the Finale). Particularly insightful were the comments of Elisabeth Maier:

[...] ich bin sehr, sehr dankbar für alles, was mit der Vervollständigung der Neunten geschieht, mit dem Einblick in die Werkstatt, weil wir dadurch eine Vorstellung gewinnen, wie neu und großartig dieser Satz geworden wäre. Ich bin auch sehr dankbar für alles, was in der Gesamtausgabe vorliegt, und für eine Aufführungsfassung. Auch für mich wäre eine Aufführung mit einer kurzen Zäsur eine akzeptable Lösung. Aber ich finde, durch die Krankheit Bruckners und die Neuartigkeit des Satzes ist in der Coda, auch wenn Sie sie sehr getreu nachzuempfinden versucht haben, ein Nachlassen der schöpferischen Potenz zu bemerken. Nach dieser Symphonie hätte sich Bruckner bzw. sein ganzes Lebenswerk nochmals eine andere Coda verdient. Das ist mein persönliches Problem mit diesem Satz. Bruckner hat ja auch andere Möglichkeiten erwogen, z. B. *Der Heiland ist erstanden*. Ich glaube, für ihn selber war das letzte Wort auch noch nicht gesprochen.<sup>113</sup>

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 192ff.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 196.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 194–200; cf. Appendix V.

<sup>112</sup> The issue resurfaced some minutes later; *ibid.*, pp. 200, 202.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 201f. As has already been pointed out, no one would suggest that the coda can ever be anything like that Bruckner might have created, given the paucity of surviving sources for it, in contrast with those available for most of the torso of the movement.

The discussion was also significant in clearing up misapprehensions on the part of those present. Danish musicologist Bo Marschner confessed surprise that a Studienband on the Finale had been published;<sup>114</sup> Uwe Harten raised doubts as to the likely veracity of Heller's account concerning an "Allelujah des zweiten Satzes", which was answered by Cohrs.<sup>115</sup> Harten also questioned the reliability of the sources concerning Bruckner's specification of the Te Deum. Maier responded:

Der Plan mit dem Te Deum war eine Notlösung—da würde ich nicht so widersprechen wie Herr Harten—, und die Brücke ist die geistige Intuition. Man darf Bruckner nicht unterstellen, daß er den stilistischen Unterschied zwischen seiner Neunten und dem Te Deum nicht bemerkt hätte. Aber von der Widmung her war es das gleiche Konzept.<sup>116</sup>

In his concluding comments, Vogg pointed out the importance of major-name conductors taking up the cause of the Finale;<sup>117</sup> Cohrs pointed out the difficulties encountered in attempting to get such celebrities to consider performing the movement, and the difficulties of learning and programming such a difficult and substantial movement. All in all, however, the roundtable presented clear signs that a broadscale revision of thinking concerning the Finale, at least on the part of Bruckner researchers, was now firmly underway. Vogg's perspective on this discussion should perhaps have the last word:

Vor einigen Jahren war das Finale zur Neunten Symphonie ein Chaos von ungeordneten Skizzen eines geistig völlig verwirrten alten Mannes—und heute reden wir darüber, ob wir es mit oder ohne Coda aufführen sollen.<sup>118</sup>

#### 3.4.11 Reception of the Aufführungsfassung since 1996.

It was perhaps surprising that firm expressions of interest in performances of the AF in 'Brucknerjahr 1996' were late in arriving. Of those that proceeded as far as firm dates and plans, mention should be made of an undertaking by the Minnesota Orchestra to record and perform the Finale in October 1996 under Stanislaw Skrowaczewski. This fell through only in September, when that conductor, his mind incontrovertibly made up by Inbal's Teldec recording, refused to use any other score than this now defunct and superseded version—a musicologically untenable option.<sup>119</sup> Also in October, a workshop performance of the Finale was to be given by Peter Gülke in Wuppertal, and the BBC London Symphony under Andrew

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 202. Following the preceding discussion concerning how best to refer to the AF, Marschner observed: "Ich wäre auch mit 'Samale Fassung' einverstanden; aber ich habe gerade gesehen, daß ein Studienband erschienen ist, dessen Herausgeber John Phillips ist. Da wird man sofort wieder verwirrt."

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 203f.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 206.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 207.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 203.

<sup>119</sup> This was noted by Cohrs at the Linz roundtable, *ibid.*, p. 207.

Davis undertook to record the Finale for broadcast purposes. Owing to the conductor's ill-health this plan was subsequently realised by the BBC Northern Philharmonic under Vassily Sinaisky, who recorded the AF in Manchester on 27 November. Broadcast of the BBC radio production "A Grand Mysterious Harmony", which included all the symphonies as well as the Trios and Finale AF of the Ninth and a number of interviews with Bruckner scholars, was concluded with the broadcast on the Ninth on 31 December of that year.<sup>120</sup>

The next performances of the AF took place in April 1998 in Nordrhein-Westfalen, again under the direction of Johannes Wildner. Aside from the misconception (apparently originating with Wildner) that this represented the German premiere of the AF,<sup>121</sup> the preliminary reports and subsequent reviews of these performances suggested how convincing the AF could prove in performance, given an intelligent press campaign tackling preconceptions with factual information and a committed, intelligent interpretation of the symphony. The success of the performances merits close attention to the reviews which appeared before and after the performance. Wildner, at the press conference held before the performances, disarmed possible objections to the score by emphasising its musical value and links with twentieth-century developments in music history, as well as its 'authenticity'. Hans-Jörg Loskill<sup>122</sup> wrote that:

GMD Johannes Wildner führt erstmals in Gelsenkirchen den aus Fragmenten und Skizzen von Musikwissenschaftlern erst in den 80er Jahren zusammengefügt Finalsatz (25 Minuten) auf. Er erhofft sich dadurch eine Diskussion im Publikum zwischen denen, die interessiert und neugierig sind, und denen, die die Tradition gewahrt sehen wollen. Denn das kündigt Wildner, der diese Version vor zwei Jahren in Südtirol 'ausprobierte' und sich für sie ausspricht, an: 'Da klingt vieles neu, ja revolutionär. Mit diesem Satz schließt sich eine Lücke zwischen Bruckner, Mahler und Schönberg.' Anders gesagt: bis zum 3. Satz sei 'die heile Welt in Ordnung', im vierten aber kündige sich die Brüchigkeit der Welt um 1900 an. [...]

He concluded:

Bisher was es in der Regel so [?], daß die 9. Sinfonie mit Bruckners Te Deum als Finalsatz endete. Wildner erhofft sich von seinem Engagement für die neue Praxis u.a., daß 'diese sich weltweit durchsetzen wird'. Weil Bruckner dadurch 'noch spannender' klinge.

<sup>120</sup> The broadcast was subsequently nominated for a Sony Award.

<sup>121</sup> Which in fact was done by Manfred Mayrhofer in Braunschweig in 1994.

<sup>122</sup> "Neues Finale macht Sinfonie spannender. Im Sinfoniekonzert erklingt Bruckners '9.' komplett", *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* (Gelsenkirchen), 16 April 1998.



Another pre-performance article,<sup>123</sup> after referring to Wildner's assumption that the performance represented the German premiere, continued:

Lange nämlich galt die Sinfonie als unvollendet. Bruckner hatte damals das komplette musikalische Konzept für den vierten Satz erarbeitet, ein Drittel auch schon in Partitur angefertigt. Die Musikwissenschaftler Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca (Rom), John A. Philipps [sic] (Adelaide), Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs (Bremen) rekonstruierten den Satz nach den vorhandenen Quellen. Wildner: 'Was tatsächlich nicht von Bruckner ist, umfaßt bei dem 25minutigen Satz nur zwei Mal zwanzig Sekunden.'

Für Kenner und Fans des Bruckner-Klangs ein echter Leckerbissen: "Die Menschen hören zum ersten Mal Brucknersche Musik, die sie noch nicht kennen."

Als Bruckner an seiner Neunten arbeitete, nahm er, von schwerer Krankheit gezeichnet, bereits einen Wettlauf mit dem Tod auf. Als er am 4. Oktober 1896 starb, war der vierte Satz noch nicht vollendet. Die Musikwissenschaft versuchte sich an zahlreichen Rekonstruktionsversuchen. Die jetzt vorliegende gilt als einzig schlüssige und seriöse. [...]

Loskill's review of the performances, which took place in three towns—19 April in Recklinghausen, 20–21 April in Gelsenkirchen and 22 April in Kamen—was cautious but positive:<sup>124</sup>

Ich gebe zu: eine gewisse Skepsis bleibt gegenüber der 'Vaterschaft' des 25minutigen Finales einer weit gespannten, dem Bau eines Domes gleichenden Sinfonie. Aber glückliche Umstände und beharrliches Forschen hat zu diesem Ergebnis geführt. Nur Bruchteile (fünf vH) sollen an diesem Schluß gefehlt haben. Alles andere wurde in Bruckner-Material und -Quellen gesichtet und autorisiert.

Besser als die bisher gebräuchliche Lösung, die 'Neunte' am Ende mit Bruckners 'Te Deum' zu beenden, ist die Vervollständigung auf jeden Fall. Denn Brüche zu den vorausgegangen Sätzen gab es nicht—wohl aber hört man hier eine Brüchigkeit in den Akkorden, in der Klangopulenz, in den 'stehenden' Dissonanzen, in den sanften Chorälen. Mit diesem Satz erreicht der gottergebene Komponist, der sich nie stark gegen Einflüsse von außen wehrte [?], neue Ufer. Ist das Bindeglied zu Gustav Mahler und zum frühen, spätromantischen Arnold Schönberg hiermit gefunden?

Similar sentiments were echoed by the same writer in the *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* the following day,<sup>125</sup> a review which also incorrectly mentions the four researchers as working independent of one another. Again, Wildner's comments about the historic significance of the Finale were brought to the reader's attention:

<sup>123</sup> "ell", "Bruckners Neunte erstmals mit Finale. Philharmonie spielt unvollendeten 4. Satz", *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 17 April 1998.

<sup>124</sup> "Die heile Welt erhält hier den ersten Riß. A. Bruckners '9.' im Großen Haus", *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 22. April 1998.

<sup>125</sup> "Vollendet ist nun Bruckners Neunte. Erstaufführung unter Joh. Wildner", 23 April 1998.

[...] Diese Finale deutet auf eine neue Brüchigkeit Brucknerscher Gedanken: Während die ersten drei Sätze die 'heile' Welt im großen Klangdom der Sinfonik spiegeln, reißt der Komponist im Abschluß dissonante Schroffheit, kühne Wendungen und aufregende Spannung auf. Er schafft so eine Verbindungslinie zu Arnold Schönbergs Aufbruch.

Christoph Mrosek's review<sup>126</sup> was positive, with the following to say about the degree to which the Finale enhanced the symphony's sense of unity:

[...] dieser Bruckner bricht nicht nach dem Adagio ab, sondern endet, wie es dem Tonsetzer von Beginn an vorschwebte, mit einem fulminanten, ausladenden Finale. [...]

In seinem Vorwort spricht Dr. Johannes Wildner vom vierten Satz der 9. als dem 'missing link', dem fehlenden Glied in der Kompositionskette zwischen Bruckner und Mahler, ja bis hin zur Wiener Schule. Und er irrt wohl nicht, wenn er die wahrlich harschen Akkorde, die schroffen Abgründe, die wenig nur schönmalenden Passagen dieses Abschnitts als einen weiten Vorgriff in unser Jahrhundert bezeichnet. Aus diesem Blickwinkel heraus interpretierte Wildner [...] auch die anderen Sätze der Sinfonie. Er ließ sie nicht, wie jahrelang mangels Alternative üblich, so erscheinen, als bildeten sie ein vollständiges Stück, sondern kehrte alle Dissonanzen und verzwickten harmonischen Abläufe so hervor, daß sie im Spiegelbild des Finales eine logische Entwicklung nahmen.

After commenting positively on the performance and interpretation, Mrosek summarised:

So verwundert es nicht, daß am Ende Bravo-Rufe erklangen, der Applaus minutenlang anhält. Auch wenn Bruckner die Musikwelt eigentlich immer schon in zwei Lager gespalten hat.

Der Teil der Zuhörer, die ihn glühend verehren, erlebte den Komponisten am Sonntag in neuem Licht. Und der andere Teil hatte Gelegenheit, den Tonsetzer von einer völlig anderen, logischeren Seite aus zu betrachten.

The two most enthusiastic reviews derived from Elisabeth Höving and Karl Riebe. Höving, clearly impressed by the music she had heard, wrote:<sup>127</sup>

Bislang nämlich galt die letzte Sinfonie des Österreichers (1824–1896) als unvollendet. Nachfahren strickten entweder einen eigenen Finalsatz im Geiste Bruckners oder spielten am Ende auf Vorschlag des todkranken Komponisten sein 'Te Deum'. In den letzten Jahren aber sammelten renommierte Musikwissenschaftler Autograph-Fetzen in aller Welt und setzten so den von Bruckner durchkomponierten vierten Satz wieder zusammen.

So wurde es beim 7. Sinfoniekonzert dieser Saison erst nach einer Stunde so richtig spannend. Bis dahin kannte der wahre Bruckner-Fan jede Note, jede Melodie, dann kam die Premiere.

Und diese währte satte 25 Minuten lang. Herrschte sonst nach dem Adagio ungewollte Stille, brach jetzt ein Vulkan an massigen, gewaltigen Klängen hervor. Ein Finale deutlich im Brucknerschen Sinne, mit dem ihm ureigenen Kraftgestus, frisch, kühn und

<sup>126</sup> "Bruckner in einem völlig neuen Licht. Vormiete: NPhW stellt die 9. Sinfonie erstmals in der komplettierten Fassung vor", *Recklinghäuser Zeitung*, 21 April 1998.

<sup>127</sup> "Bruckners Neunte: Eine runde Sache: Sinfonie erklang erstmals mit Finalsatz", *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 22 April 1998.

ruhelos pulsierend, und doch wegweisend auf das, was nach ihm kommen sollte. Deutlich verletzte er hier bestehende Regeln der Tonkunst, komponierte mehrdeutig und aggressiv.

Riebe's review,<sup>128</sup> though briefer, was similarly enthusiastic. In his opinion: "Die grundsätzliche Auseinandersetzung über den von vier Musikwissenschaftlern aus Skizzen und bereits auskomponierten Teilen nachkomponierten vierten Satz scheint ein Ende zu haben. Bruckners Geist wurde in diese Aufführung jenseits aller philologischen Bemühtheit durchaus gegenwärtig."

A CD release of the Wildner performances followed in late 1998 on the Sonarte label. The programme notes for this, the second commercial release of the AF, as well as for the performances themselves, were written by Cohrs and provided with an English translation by the author; Cohrs' original text is reproduced in Appendix II, Notes for the Second CD Release of the Aufführungsfassung by Sonarte (*q.v.*). This text supplied the programme notes for later performances as well.

Sadly, the Sonarte release provided occasion for a particularly malicious and misinformed review by music critic Alfred Beaujean (*FAZ*, 29 Jan. 1999). Beaujean's article marked a return to the subjective and speculative-philosophic reception tropes before much had been promulgated about the reassessment of the Finale question, concerning which Beaujean was clearly ignorant. Rather than make any assessment of the merits of the recording or of the completed Finale, Beaujean indulged in lengthy polemic on the question of whether it is permissible to complete unfinished works, comparing the completion of the Finale—a "Verbrechen", according to Günter Wand, cited by Beaujean—with the long-accepted, canonical completions of the concert repertoire, the cases given by Beaujean being the Alfano conclusion of Puccini's *Turandot*, Süßmayr's completion of the Mozart Requiem, the work of Newbould on Schubert's E major Symphony, Cooke's on Mahler's Tenth and Cerha's on Berg's *Lulu*. In contrast to these, according to Beaujean:

Niemand wird heute mehr Mozart's Torso der c-Moll-Messe vervollständigen wollen [...]. Und niemand wird heute den Versuch ernst nehmen, Bachs am Schluß seiner 'Kunst der Fuge' stehende Tripelfuge zu Ende komponieren zu wollen. Der Abbruch-effekt bei Eintritt des 'B-A-C-H'-Themas, als 'Einbruch der Ewigkeit' gedeutet, ist mehr, als jede Rekonstruktion sein könnte, Signum des auf Erden Vollendbaren.

The case against the Finale is summarised in the following words:

Nicht weniger als vier Bearbeiter (Samale, Phillips, Mazzuca, Cohrs) wagten sich in Teamarbeit an die bis zum Beginn der Durchführung ausgearbeiteten Skizzen.

---

<sup>128</sup> "Monumentale Klangfluten: Sinfoniekonzert: Wildner dirigierte Bruckners 'Neunte'", *Buersche Zeitung* (Gelsenkirchen-Buer), 22 April 1998.

So imponierend ihre Bemühungen sind, drängt sich doch die Frage auf, ob das thematische Material Bruckners noch die grandiose Plastik besitzt, die seiner Symphonik im allgemeinen und den drei vollendeten Sätzen im besonderen eigen ist. Hat der 'liebe Gott', dem Bruckner seine Neunte widmen wollte, ihn nicht am Ende davor bewahrt, dem Gipfel seines Schaffens mit einem vergleichsweise schwächen Finale abschließen zu müssen? Auch die Frankfurter Aufnahme von Eliahu Inbal vermochte den Eindruck fehlender Erfindungskraft des todkranken Komponisten nicht aus der Welt zu schaffen.

Beaujean went on to claim that the contention of the "vier Finalerekonstrukteure" that Bruckner intended to use the *Te Deum* as a conclusion to the symphony "bleibt fragwürdig". Presumably, Beaujean never stopped to consider that the editors might have a better knowledge of the facts.

The now familiar mix of aesthetic preconception, mystical obfuscation and unqualified acceptance of traditional completions was again trotted out in support of a status quo which by now had been discarded in more informed circles. The mere possibility that new findings might call for a revision in thinking seems not to have entered consideration. In response, Cohrs drafted and published, but for professional reasons under the present writer's name, a lengthy article, which the *FAZ* significantly published in its entirety under the title "Was Bruckners Nachlaßverwalter versäumten" (18 February 1999). Two extracts suffice to reveal the extent of factual evidence brought by Cohrs against Beaujean's stance:

Seine Behauptung, es handele sich beim überlieferten Material zum Finale der Neunten Bruckners um 'bis zur Durchführung ausgearbeitete Skizzen' ist unrichtig. Vielmehr sind eine im Entstehen begriffene, von Bruckner selbst sorgsam nummerierte Partitur sowie ein reicher Bestand an Particellskizzen und Satzverläufen erhalten, inklusive 56 Takten Entwürfe zur Coda, die bis in das allerletzte D hineinreichen. Wer hier von 'Skizzen' spricht, verrät damit nur, daß er von Bruckners systematischer Arbeitsweise nicht das geringste verstand.

After going into some detail concerning Bruckner's working methods and noting Beaujean's dismissal of Bruckner's intention to complete the symphony with the *Te Deum*—as well as his omission of any mention of the achievements of conductor and orchestra—Cohrs came to the crux of the matter:

Im Falle von Bruckner wiegt die Kritik gegen Komplettierungen stets besonders schwer, denn Bruckner ist für einige ein regelrechter Hausgott. Seine Hohepriester glauben, ihren Götzen gegen jede Anfechtung ihres Dogmas verteidigen zu müssen. Daß man jeden Musiker, jeden Dirigenten dann besonders respektieren muß, wenn er von Musik, an die er nicht glaubt, die Finger läßt, steht außer Frage—viele sind übrigens leider nicht so weise. Dirigenten und Musikautoren jedoch, die Wörter wie 'Verbrechen' oder 'Sakrileg' gebrauchen, weigern sich zugleich, zunächst einmal die eruierten Fakten zur Kenntnis zu nehmen.

Further performances of the AF took place in Zagreb later in the same year under Ralph Weikert; the Netherlands premiere by the Het Gelders Orkest under Lawrence Renes took

place in August 1999. The year 2000 began with two performances in Bremen by the Philharmonisches Staatsorchester Bremen under Günter Neuhold (13–14 March).

These performances were well prepared and played, with an excellent summary of much of the relevant research supplied in the programme notes by Eva Pintér, reproduced here in Appendix IV.<sup>129</sup> Hartmut Lück's critique of these performances<sup>130</sup> can be seen as paradigmatic of informed critique, exhibiting responses which since 1998 were becoming increasingly standard. The reviewer laid myths and clichés aside, imparted a modicum of information concerning the sources, and focussed on the movement less as a self-contained curiosity than in terms of its significance for the unity of the whole symphony:

[...] leider konnte er die Reinschrift des krönenden Finalsatzes nicht beenden. Das verführte die Nachwelt zum Mystizismus um eine 'Neunte', die 'nach Gottes Wille' mit dem dritten Satz, dem 'Adagio', zu enden habe. Kompletter Unsinn, wie wir heute wissen, denn Bruckner hatte nicht nur seine 'Neunte' von Anfang an als viersätziges Werk konzipiert, sondern auch das Finale im Wesentlichen fertiggestellt: ein Teil in Partitur-Reinschrift, weitere Abschnitte im Particell skizziert, und dazu gibt es einen Verlaufsplan, der es erlaubt, die Skizzen zu ordnen.

Die nach dem Tode Bruckners verstreuten Manuskripte wurden in den letzten fünfzehn Jahren gründlich untersucht und 'aufgearbeitet', so daß die Musikwissenschaft in der Lage ist, eine Aufführungsversion des Finalsatzes anzubieten, die den Intentionen des Komponisten sehr nahe kommt. [...] Wenn man frühere Rekonstruktionsversuche aus den 1980er Jahren kennt, kann man ermessen, welch riesigen Schritt nach vorne die jetzige Version bedeutet, die im internationalen Teamwork von Nicola Samale, Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs, John A. Phillips und Giuseppe Mazzuca erarbeitet wurde. Das Finale klingt nicht nur ausgesprochen homogen, sondern offenbart auch eine logische Verbindung des eigene, sehr kühnen Themenmaterials dieses Satzes mit Reminiszenzen der vorangegangenen Sätze, woraus sich die umfassende Idee des Werkes erst richtig erschließt.

[...] Umso mehr überzeugte die klare Architektur des 'Adagio. Langsam, feierlich', die Ausgewogenheit der orchestralen Klangfarben, die diesen Satz glücklicherweise aller verklärenden (und falschen) Himmelstor-Ideologie entkleideten und perspektivisch bereits das Finale ahnen ließen.

Dieses wiederum wurde in seiner Logik, aber auch in der im wahrsten Sinne 'unerhörten' Neuartigkeit zum Höhepunkt der Darbietung, in der es Neuhold gelang, noch einmal alle Kräfte des an diesem Abend stark geforderten Orchesters zu einer rundum beeindruckenden Leistung zusammenzufassen. Diese nun viersätzig Sinfonie Bruckners überzeugte als Einheit—ein Gewinn für den Konzertsaal. [...] <sup>131</sup>

<sup>129</sup> Notes for the Bremen performances of the Aufführungsfassung, March 2000 (*q.v.*). Significantly, Pintér's text avoids mention of any missing bifolios.

<sup>130</sup> "Bläserchorale für den lieben Gott. Günter Neuhold dirigierte Werke von Wolfgang Rihm und Anton Bruckner", *Weser Kurier* (Bremen), 15 March 2000.

<sup>131</sup> The Bremen performances also led to the publication of an interesting letter to the editor, by Günter Menzel: "Was Benjamin G. Cohrs am 11. February 1998 zum Konzert in der Glocke [...] der 9. Sinfonie in der unvollendeten dreisätzigen Fassung [...] schrieb, nämlich: 'Dreisätzliche Aufführungen widersprechen seiner

Two months after the Bremen performances the complete Ninth was heard for the first time in the UK in a performance at the London Barbican on 17 May 2000 by the Royal Philharmonic under Robert Bachmann. While eyewitness accounts suggested that the performance was by no means a bad one—although the orchestra lacked energy and precision, and tended to drag—the reviews of this performance, after the considerable public and critical successes of the recent German performances, were disappointing, reflecting remarkable ignorance about the Finale and the activities of the editors<sup>132</sup>—not surprisingly, since it transpired that Cohrs’ detailed and carefully written explanatory notes had been massively abridged by the orchestra’s management, thereby depriving audience and critics of any possibility of educating themselves about the new research. Of the present writer’s English translation of Cohrs’ original notes used for the Wildner CD release, only that of the final section, “The Ninth as Four-Movement Whole”, actually found its way into the concert programme: comparison with Appendix II reveals the extent and nature of this omission.

Whatever the standards of the RPO’s performance, it was again demonstrated that the AF in this situation could only become an easy target for cheap journalistic attacks. The *Evening Standard* averred:<sup>133</sup>

Poor old Anton Bruckner had enough with well-meaning editors during his lifetime without having to put up with them 100 years after his death. Present-day Bruckner scholars, having denounced previous generations for tampering with the scores, now interfere just as much themselves. A team of four has presumed to finish the unfinished 9th Symphony by stitching together the 200 sketches [sic!] for the work’s finale which Bruckner was working on the day he died.

Last night the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra gave the British premiere of the four-movement work under the eminent Swiss conductor Robert Bachmann. It failed to ignite. A recording exists and broadcasts have been made, but the live, applauded performance is what christens a work of this scale. A segment of the audience resolutely clapped at the end of the funereal third movement, which marked the work’s conclusion at all previous renditions. Even if it were not Bruckner’s intention to end his last symphony there, time and custom have made it seem an appropriate exit to his extraordinary life.

What the new Finale lacks is any enlivening spark of genius or originality. It remains a dry, academic exercise. There is nothing in its bars to compare with the

---

[Bruckners] eigenen Intentionen aufs schärfste’, veranlaßte mich damals zu einem kritischen Leserbrief. Nach der am 14. März in der Glocke von Staatsorchester unter Günter Neuhold vorgetragene viersätzig Fassung der ‘Neunten’ von Anton Bruckner mit rekonstruiertem Finalsatz muß ich feststellen: meine damalige Kritik [...] war ‘unausgegoren’ und eben nur die eines Liebhabers Brucknerscher Symphonien gegenüber einem Kenner.

“Nie hätte ich nach der für mich tief beeindruckenden Darbietung unter Günter Neuholds Stabführung gedacht, daß es möglich sei, das ‘Adagio. Langsam, feierlich’ so ausklingen zu lassen, damit einem Finalsatz in der rekonstruierten Form die bei fast allen Bruckner-Symphonien ganz eigene Selbstständigkeit und zugleich überzeugende Abrundung der gesamten Symphonie gelingt. Für mich war das eine ‘ganz neue viersätzig Neunte’ und ganz Bruckner” (*Weser Kurier*, date unknown, published late March 2000; copy courtesy of Cohrs).

<sup>132</sup> Apparently a number of audience members pointedly left the hall prior to the performance of the Finale—something that did not happen even at the first performance of the AF in 1991.

<sup>133</sup> Rick Jones, “Endlessly satisfying”, *Evening Standard* (London), 18 May 2000 (*News Extra*).

protean mood-swings of the first movement, the demonic laughter of the scherzo or the haunting sound of the fibrous-toned Wagner tubas in the adagio. There are plenty of Wagnerian spells: whole minutes pass without a change of arpeggiated chord and there is more than one fiercely brassy climax. The leaping fifths between strings and wind is a return to the elemental and everyone's arrival on the tonic D is appropriately final, but there is nothing truly inspirational in these ideas. Beethoven's 9th was choral, Mahler's practically silent, Schostakovich's perversely jaunty. Bruckner's very endlessness seemed fitting. The finale adds nothing. Reseal the tomb.

Tim Ashley<sup>134</sup> was as diffident about the musical results, and no better informed:

Bruckner famously dedicated his Ninth Symphony to God; equally famously, he died before he finished it. The three-movement torso ranks among his greatest works, but the so-called problem of the missing finale has continued to nag in some quarters. In 1991, a performing version of the complete symphony—mind-bogglingly called the Samale–Phillips–Cohrs–Mazzuca edition—was produced by four musicologists. It has received neither the publicity nor the acclaim accorded to Deryck Cooke's completion of Mahler's Tenth and Anthony Payne's version of Elgar's Third. This, in fact, was its UK premiere. Whether it will ever take its place in the standard repertoire is debatable. Even though the symphony is technically unfinished, the three-movement version forms a complete statement in aesthetic, emotional, devotional and psychological terms. The ending of the adagio—with its magical transition from minor to major and flowing string phrases over the central choral—is music of such spiritual certainty that it seems logical that the work should end here.

The new finale jolts us into territory that contrasts doubt with glory. The divine has become terrifying as vast brass fanfares blare judgementally. The second subject quivers in abasement. It is impressive, but I remain unconvinced. Matters weren't helped by the performance: Swiss conductor and academic Robert Bachmann is a less than perfect interpreter of this edition.

Bruckner detractors, who see him as nothing more than solemn and grandiloquent, will have their views reinforced by Bachmann's approach. A pompous religiosity replaces spiritual fervour and genuine spirituality. God's majesty is equated with a high decibel count. The performance didn't find the RPO on its best form either. Only the Scherzo pulverised as it should and the finale seemed merely loud. There is, perhaps, a case for the completed version of Bruckner's Ninth—but it has yet to be made.

Bachmann followed up his efforts with the first Russian performance of the Finale by the Russian National Orchestra in Moscow on November 7, also using for the first time the new score and parts of the first three movements prepared by Cohrs with the assistance of the present writer, published early in 2001. Cohrs made his international debut as a conductor at this concert, performing the Mozart Piano Concerto K. 246 with pianist Alexander Ghindin prior to Bachmann's reading of the four-movement Ninth, and also gave a well-received lecture on the symphony and its Finale at the Moscow Conservatoire the previous day.

---

<sup>134</sup> "Unfinished business", *The Guardian* (London), 20 May 2000.

Whatever the English critics made of Bachmann's reading in London, the Russian premiere was clearly a considerable artistic success. While it has not proven possible to obtain and translate critiques of this event from the Moscow papers, two reports by visiting scholars and critics were located by Cohrs, extracts from which are given here. Duncan Hadfield<sup>135</sup> had the following to say:

To those readers of this piece already familiar with the background and pro- and contra-arguments for a completion of the mighty Ninth, whose final movement the ailing Bruckner left unfinished (and even to those who aren't), this is not the place further to rehearse the debate. Suffice to say that even in writing 'about' the project (let alone the accomplished scholarship and musicianship involved in bringing it to fruition), one of the quartet of the last movement's editors—Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs—has made out a more than eloquent case for the validity of the undertaking, the bare gist of which asserts that Bruckner himself certainly intended his Symphony to possess the customary complement of four movements; and that, moreover, almost a surfeit of sufficient material has survived to make a creditable performing version possible. And in my view, very laudable too are the results: the almost 30-minute Finale unfolding in dramatic and seamless fashion, its building blocks impressively hewn and set in place, before climaxing in a magnificent and shattering coda. Remember, Bruckner dedicated his opus summum to none other than the 'Dear Lord' himself. Surely something very akin to the monumental lines of this impressive completion is how we should consider him departing the world—his life's work well done—as opposed to the fading strains of the Adagio in the performed Symphony's usual three-movement torso, however elegiac such a valediction might seem.

Hadfield reviewed the Finale itself, and what was obviously a compelling and highly convincing performance of it, in the following terms:

Bruckner's sketches demonstrate that the mighty Finale was planned on an even more epic scale than that of the Eighth Symphony, or even the Fifth—a gigantic structure consisting of an exposition followed by a development combining a fugue with a recapitulation of the second subject group. What would an audience of no doubt almost exclusively new ears hear? Once again Bachmann admirably painted the scene with an opening nervous and mysterious, and fascinatingly ambivalent and proto-modern in its harmonies. Later on the more assertive chorale theme was posited on a grand scale, becoming tightly fused with the motif Bruckner takes from his *Te Deum*. Although the contents of this 'new' movement, as well as its complex argument, constructed from just a handful of simple threads, was of course entirely alien to the Russian National Orchestra, they coped manfully, with playing of great skill and energy, especially after more than an hour on the platform already. Bachmann had memorised and cogitated over this relatively alien territory with his customary fastidiousness too, as any number of finer points and pointings demonstrated, woven against the meticulous exposition, with its culminatory and argumentative force, of the whole. When the last great coda arrived it did so in a panoply of orchestral colour and force, and Robert Bachmann and his Russian

---

<sup>135</sup> "Bruckner's Ninth Symphony: Russian National Orchestra, Robert Bachmann" (publication forthcoming; copy courtesy of Cohrs.



players drove Bruckner's Symphony No. 9 home in mesmeric style and in a blaze of glory.

A lucid, meticulously prepared and finely executed performance then, commandingly supervised by Robert Bachmann both its in overall shaping and its acute attention to detail. Moreover the dedication, commitment and professionalism of the Russian National Orchestra was a joy to behold from first bar to last. Their ensemble is tight and cogent; and their sound distinctive, sonorous and homogenous. There were magnificent contributions from all sections: silken strings, perky and mellifluous woodwind, resplendent brass; and whilst it would be invidious to single anyone out for special treatment, the quartet of Wagner tubas played as if they knew their rare instruments inside out and the hard-worked timpanist rose to his arduous task with heroic zeal.

Utrecht musicologist Rob van der Hilst's review<sup>136</sup> was no less enthusiastic about the significance of the Finale for the symphonic whole. Discussing Bachmann's interpretation of the work, van der Hilst concluded:

The tempi were chosen in such a way that the connections between the themes became clearly audible. In this manner, the Finale movement, completed by foreign hand, not only integrated itself indiscernibly into the whole, but became the true climax of the symphony. In brisk tempo, and with a scarcely surpassable sense of the dramatic, the dotted rhythms of the first two themes and broadly flowing triplets of the moving chorale theme fought out the final battle between life and death. With the return of the principal theme of the first movement Bachmann found his way back to its initial feeling of peace. The coda, largely drafted by Bruckner himself, unfolded itself thereby in majestic breadth. In the final, radiant D-major measures, the conductor, summoning up all his forces, succeeded in achieving such a culmination in sound that the symphony appeared to conclude in an act of self-realisation. Robert Bachmann here revealed in an exemplary fashion what really goes to make a first-class Bruckner conductor—the control of the vast sonic and rhythmic energies which these symphonies release.

On 22 April 2001 the AF was again performed by Bachmann with the Philharmonia Hungarica in Dusseldorf; here again, Cohrs, who conducted the German premiere of the *Dokumentation des Fragments* (DdF) in the first half of the programme, ensured that audience and critics were supplied with copious and factual programme notes—cf. his text for the second CD release, Appendix II, all of which was reproduced in the PH's programme brochure with the exception of the final section, "Die Neunte als viersätziges Ganzes".

Here, the history of the AF, the DdF and the new edition of the first three movements by Cohrs (see §§3.4.12 and 13 *infra*), which were also premiered here, became intertwined with that of the ignominious demise of one of the twentieth century's great orchestras. As an indication of the astonishing background against which this concert took place, a relatively condensed version of the story by Stefan Pieper is given here in full, followed by excerpts of a further two reviews:

---

<sup>136</sup> Rob van der Hilst, "Bruckner's Completed IXth & Mozart, Piano Concerto No. 8"; text courtesy of B. G. Cohrs, published, in slightly abridged form, in *The Bruckner Journal* 5, no. 1 (March 2001), p. 4.

Nach 44 Jahren geht ein Kapitel Musikgeschichte unrühmlich zu Ende. Ironie des Schicksals: Im Oktober wird das Orchester, das es nicht mehr gibt, mit dem Europäischen Kulturpreis ausgezeichnet. Für ein Konzert, das wohl als das letzte der Philharmonia Hungarica in die Musikgeschichte eingehen wird, bot die Düsseldorfer Tonhalle mit ihrer transparenten Akustik ebenso würdige wie herausfordernde Bedingungen. Um so katastrophaler war es da, daß das Publikum schon im Vorfeld auf ein klägliches Häuflein von etwas 150 Zuhörer dezimiert wurde, weil es bis kurz zuvor fraglich war, ob das Konzert überhaupt stattfinden würde.

Der Grund der Nervenkrieg im Vorfeld: Die Musiker des Orchesters sind schon lange ihrer Rolle als Spielball unterschiedlichster politischer wie kommerzieller Interessen überdrüssig und empörten sich über einen nicht abgesprochenen und als kontraproduktiv aufgefaßten weiteren 'Rettungsversuch' durch einen neuen Sponsor. Ein weiterer Appell an die Bundesregierung für den Erhalt des Orchesters würde die ausgehandelten Modalitäten einer sozialverträglichen Abwicklung der Musiker gefährden. Der gravierendste Stein des Anstoßes war jedoch ein Presseinfo der Veranstalter, in dem der Schweizer Dirigent Robert Bachmann als neuer künstlerischer Leiter des Orchesters genannt wurde. Dabei war Bachmann lediglich für dieses Konzert festgebucht, und alles weitere war allenfalls Spekulation und Wunschenken des Sponsors.

Symbolträchtig, weil das Ende eines Lebens überhöhend, stand Bruckners 9. Sinfonie im Zentrum dieses heiklen Geflechts aus historischem Anspruch und psychologischen wie personellen Extrembedingungen für die Orchestermusiker. Damit widmeten sich die verbleibenden Musiker der PH und zahlreiche Mitglieder weiterer deutscher Sinfonieorchester einem Projekt, das alles, nur nicht die konsumorientierte Unterhaltung mit schönem Schein wollte und auch einen allzu sentimental Abgesang auf das arbeitslos gewordene Bundesorchester erfolgreich vermied.

In der Düsseldorfer Tonhalle brachten die PH-Musiker und ihre Verstärkung den restaurierten vierten Satz von Bruckners letzter Komposition zur deutschen Erstaufführung. Restauriert ist der Satz insofern, als er aus der musikologischen Erforschung einer Flut von Manuskriptfragmenten erwächst, die sich nach Bruckners Tod über halb Europa verstreuten. Zu verdanken ist die Aufarbeitung des Materials nicht zuletzt dem jungen Bremer Musikwissenschaftler Benjamin G. Cohrs, dessen Forschungsarbeit und Co-Autorenschaft am wieder entstandenen vierten Satz allein schon imponierend ist. Vor Ort moderierte Cohrs eine Einführung in den vierten Satz und gab Leitfaden zum hörenden Nachvollziehen seiner These: Das rekonstruierte Finale ist eine logische und zwingende Konsequenz dieses jahrzehntelang als 'unvollendet' geltenden Werks.<sup>137</sup>

In an *NMZ* article again devoted largely to the extraordinary plight of the insolvent Philharmonia Hungarica, Norbert Laufer gave the following account of the substance of the performance itself:

Der junge Dirigent und Musikwissenschaftler Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs hat in den vergangenen Jahren eine Neuauflage dieser Sinfonie erarbeitet und herausgegeben, über die er berichtete. Nein: er ließ sich eigentlich nicht in die Werkstatt schauen, sondern zeigte in seminarhaftem Vortragston die Quellenlage auf. Das Orchester steuerte alle von Bruckner überlieferten Noten bei. Den Zuhörern überließ Cohrs es, im Vergleich mit der

---

<sup>137</sup> Stefan Pieper, "150 Hörer nahmen Abschied. Philharmonia Hungarica gibt ihr letztes Konzert", *Neue Musikzeitung*, May 2001.

nach der Pause vollständig zu hörenden Sinfonie die Stellen seiner eigenen Arbeit heraushören.

Nun: er konnte mit seinen Argumenten überzeugen, daß man von nun an wirklich nicht mehr nur drei Sätze der Sinfonie oder diese drei Sätze kombiniert mit Bruckners 'Te Deum' (wie es des Komponisten Wunsch gewesen ist) spielen muß. Der vierte Satz, wie er hier präsentiert wurde, trägt und funktioniert als Finale für die vorangegangenen drei Sätze. Cohrs ließ jeden Originalton an seinem Platze, benutzte nur dezent Musik-Klebstoff, um das Material zusammenzubinden. Gleichzeitig zeigt diese Fassung Bruckners Schroffheit auf und läßt die Sinfonie schließlich 'mit einem Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott' (Bruckner) enden.<sup>138</sup>

*Westdeutsche Zeitung* critic Volker Ruschmann also appeared convinced. After explaining the orchestra's plight, he continued:

Man gab die 9. Sinfonie in d-Moll von Anton Bruckner. Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs erläuterte und dirigierte zunächst die Fragmente des unvollendeten Finales. Nach der Pause erklang unter Robert Bachmann die Deutsche Erstaufführung der Neuausgabe mit der Vervollständigung des Schluß-Satzes. Der Komponist hinterließ eine große Anzahl Partiturbogen, selbst von der lückenhaften Coda sind Skizzen von 56 Takten vorhanden; immerhin ist ein Drittel fertig instrumentiert. Bruckner hat seine Neunte immer als große, viersätzig-einheit gesehen, der Versuch einer Rekonstruktion des Finales lohnt also durchaus.

Die Fassung von Nicola Samale, John A. Philipps [sic], Giuseppe Mazzuca und Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs klingt wie ein echter Bruckner, voller packender Original-Passagen: etwa dem mächtigen Bläserchoral.<sup>139</sup>

The final reviews to be represented here are those of the first performances of the Finale in Munich, 25 and 29 April 2001, by the Münchener Symphoniker under Heiko Mathias Förster. The performance, which took place in the Herkulessaal, was prefaced by the Schubert "Unvollendete". Again the detailed program text (cf. Appendix II) was supplied by Cohrs. For Anton Sergl, writing in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, the performance represented a "Pioniertat":

Beim 7. Abokonzert im Herkulessaal stellten die Münchener Symphoniker unter Leitung von Heiko Mathias Förster Bruckners 9. Symphonie mit dem von Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Giuseppe Mazzuca und Benjamin Cohrs rekonstruierten Finalsatz vor. Hört man die in dieser integralen Version, wird jede herkömmliche Aufführung des dreisätzigen Fragments fragwürdig. Die Geschlossenheit der symphonischen Architektur wird erst durch das Finale evident, das die Hauptgedanken der vorausgehenden Sätze zum neuen Themenmaterial führt.

Die Neunte ist auf eine Finale-Dramaturgie hin konzipiert. Lange wurde behauptet, Bruckner sei für dieses Finale nicht über Skizzen hinausgekommen. Doch die nun vorgestellte Partitur bringt ausschließlich von Bruckner-Material in eine definitive Ordnung.

<sup>138</sup> Nobert Laufer, "Nur Blech glänzte. Ein Solidaritätskonzert unter dem Dirigenten Robert Bachmann für die Philharmonia Hungarica in der Tonhalle", *Rheinische Post* (Düsseldorf), 24 April 2001.

<sup>139</sup> Volker Ruschmann, "Versuch eines Finales, im doppelten Sinn. Die Philharmonia Hungarica gab ihr Abschiedskonzert—vor leeren Reihn—in der Tonhalle", *Westdeutsche Zeitung*, 24 April 2001.

Eben davor scheint der Komponist zurückgeschreckt zu sein, wurde er doch bei früheren ähnlich umfangreichen Werken gezwungen, bis zu einem Drittel zu streichen und die angelegte Form wieder umzuwerfen. Das scheint Bruckner bei einer Musik, die er ‘dem lieben Gott’ gewidmet hatte, nicht mehr ertragen zu haben. [...]

Diese vollständige Aufführung von Bruckners ganzer Neunter war eine Pioniertat. Andere kritisch verfolgte Deutungen sollten folgen.<sup>140</sup>

Peter Baier of the *Münchener Merkur* was less convinced, and seems also not to have particularly concerned himself with the programme notes, yet he was still by no means dismissive:<sup>141</sup>

Finale oder nicht Finale? An dieser Frage scheiden sich die Geister, wenn es um Anton Bruckners neunte und letzte Symphonie geht. Üblich ist es im derzeitigen Konzertbetrieb, das unvollendete Werk mit dem dritten Satz, dem Adagio, zu beschließen, der durchaus finalen Charakter hat. Andererseits ist es spannend, den oft als ‘Verfälschung’ bezeichneten, vielen Bearbeitungen ausgesetzten Schluß-Satz hören zu können. Die Münchener Symphoniker wagten sich nun an das vervollständigte Mammutwerk, addierten dazu die ‘Unvollendete’ von Franz Schubert zu einem ausgedehnten Konzertprogramm (Herkulesaal).

Baier’s impression of the movement remained dominated by the old habit of hearing the Adagio as a conclusion. For him it was

[d]eutlich hörbar, ja spürbar, warum viele Dirigenten die Symphonie mit diesem Satz [i.e., the Adagio] beenden. Das Finale, ebenso wie der erste Satz mit ‘misterioso’ bezeichnet, lebt vom massiven Hauptthema, Förster und die Symphoniker greifen die Kühnheit des Anfangs wieder auf.

Finale oder nicht Finale? Jede Fassung hat Vor- und Nachteile. Falls komplett, sollten Interpreten jedoch überlegen, das Werk einzeln aufzuführen. Denn sogar eine Komposition wie Schuberts ‘Unvollendete’ hat es schwer, gegen den Riesen Bruckner zu bestehen. [...]

Further performances followed in 2001 by the Royal Flanders Orchestra in Antwerp (at a “geschlossene Veranstaltung” of the orchestra on 6 July, conducted by Philippe Herreweghe) and during a concert tour by that orchestra in Japan in September and October, during which Cohrs conducted both the DdF and his own revision of the AF on 28 September in the Sumida Triphony Hall, Tokyo, while Herreweghe conducted the Ninth with the ‘official’ version of the AF on 30 September in Tokyo and 5 October in Osaka. Cohrs’ notes for this performance were translated by the present writer into English and into Japanese in their entirety by a Professor Yukosawa. Concerning his version of the AF, Cohrs released a statement which was appended to the official programme for the concert of the 28th; it read as follows:

<sup>140</sup> “Bruckners Neunte mit Finale. Eine Pioniertat”, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 27 April 2001.

<sup>141</sup> “Toben und Schwelgen. Bruckners vervollständigte Neunte”, *Münchener Merkur* 27 April 2001.

The completed Performing Version of the Finale by Samale, Phillips, Cohrs & Mazzuca is the result of many years of continuing optimisation. In any case, such a performance text remains a 'work in progress': many details of the working out of the score are, firstly, to be regarded as the compromises of teamwork, as the original manuscripts, which [have] not come down to us in complete form, permit different solutions at several points; furthermore, it is by no means impossible that further manuscripts for the Finale, thought lost, may yet come to light. Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs, as the editor of the new score and critical report on the first three movements in the Complete Edition, involved with the Performing Version as well as conductor, has been intensely involved with the Bruckner Ninth for many years. Over a period of time he developed his own conception of certain passages in the Performing Version of the Finale, which he finally set down in a newly written conducting score for his own use. The essential substance of the score remained almost completely untouched—with the exception of the position of two measures at the beginning, a rearrangement and extension of the second subject group by two measures and the insertion of two measures in the coda. The vast majority of the changes concern modifications of the instrumentation—particularly that of the second subject, the fugue and the coda—largely, however, technical details concerning dynamics, tempi, phrasing and articulation. The version performed here for the first time is regarded by its author as his 'own interpretation' of the movement and is not available to other conductors. Only under these conditions has the editorial team of Samale, Phillips, Cohrs & Mazzuca agreed to this experiment. Should the first performance of the Cohrs score reveal, however, that any of its variants prove useful for the official Performing Version of the score, those changes will be incorporated in a revision on which the editorial team is currently engaged. This revision was necessitated, in any case, in order to match the new layout and formatting of the Critical Edition of the first three movements; aside from that it will incorporate certain practical improvements gleaned over the last ten years of performances. This new 'official' version of the Samale et al Performing Version will appear in 2002.

No press releases are yet available for these performances, which appear to have been well received. In March 2002, the distribution rights to the Sonarte release of the AF by the Neue Philharmonie Westfalen were acquired by the major international firm of Naxos, making possible a far wider distribution than had so far been the case. Further performances of both AF and DdF are planned for the 2001/2 season.

In summary, as the preceding account shows, the reception of the AF presents clear documentary evidence of the extent to which the many preconceptions surrounding the Ninth and its Finale, as well as notions of 'authenticity' and thereby artistic 'value', are capable of determining aesthetic judgements of the Finale's 'success, regardless of its actual merits. That aesthetic judgements are subjective seems too obvious to mention until one considers the extent to which the 'success' of performances has risen or fallen on the basis of the amount of information available to (or absorbed by) critics. The validity of subjective responses, positive or negative, as any sort of arbiters of the 'success' or otherwise of the AF, must therefore constantly be held up to question. Equally, the importance of repeated performances and readily available recording of the AF and DdF in prompting critical and musicological re-evaluation of the Finale and the Ninth should not be underestimated. As we have seen, "Sehr wesentliches einer Musik begreift sich erst dann, wenn man sie in der Dimension erlebt, in die

sie hineingedacht war.”<sup>142</sup> Franz Zamazal, in a letter to the author of 13 May 1993, summed up developments since 1991 in the following words, still appropriate in 2002:

Wenn ich mich an Ihren ersten Besuch in Linz im Dezember 1991 anlässlich der Aufführung des Finalsatzes unter Manfred Mayrhofer zurückerinnere, so ist seither durch Ihre Initiative viel für diesen Satz geschehen. Sie können stolz sein, das ‘Bild’ Bruckners um wesentliche Züge bereichert zu haben, und zwar um ein Vielfaches mehr als die Musikwissenschaft durch ‘Deuteln’ und Aufstellen von Hypothesen, die man glauben kann oder nicht und die man oft schwer widerlegen kann.

Mein Standpunkt hinsichtlich von Rekonstruktionen oder Ergänzungen: Ein unvollendet gebliebenes Werk der bildenden Kunst, wie eine Plastik von Michelangelo, kann man ansehen und sich ein ‘Bild’ über Thema, Inhalt, Ausführung usw. machen. Wer kann sich aber schon in der Musik aus einem Berg von Notenblättern ein ‘klingendes Bild’ machen? Die paar Leute, welche Partiturlesen können, das ist zu wenig! Bruckner ist bereits ein kulturelles Allgemeingut und dazu gehört auch das Unvollendete in einer vertretbaren Fassung zum Aufführen. — Das ist Ihnen restlos gelungen.

#### 3.4.12 The Documentation des Fragments.

In mid-1998 Vogg proposed to the author the possibility of preparing some kind of performing score based solely on the AP, at that time approaching its second impression. The result of his proposal, originally discussed under the working title of ‘Vorführfassung’, was eventually termed ‘Dokumentation des (von Bruckner hinterlassenen) Fragments’ in order to avoid any confusion with the AF and any misunderstanding or negative publicity arising from the use of the word ‘Fassung’.<sup>143</sup> Convinced of the necessity of a clear explanation being provided along with the fragments (not merely the inclusion of an explanatory text in the programme), the author planned a score suited essentially to a ‘Werkstattkonzert’-type performance in which a speaker (or the conductor) could read or paraphrase a prepared explanatory text introducing and linking the surviving fragments.<sup>144</sup>

In September 1998, Nikolaus Harnoncourt, at Vogg’s urging, undertook to premiere this score with the Wiener Symphoniker in the 1999/2000 season. Performances taking place with the Symphoniker under Harnoncourt in the Großer Musikvereinssaal, Vienna, on 12, 13 and 14 November 1999, as the first half of a programme which concluded, following the interval, with the first three movements of the Ninth.<sup>145</sup> Strikingly, this was the first time the Finale had been played in the city in which it had been composed, 103 years after its composer’s

<sup>142</sup> Peter Gülke, as quoted at the outset of ch. 1.4.

<sup>143</sup> Noted by Herbert Vogg in fax to the author of 3 Feb. 1999.

<sup>144</sup> The musical text and wording of the spoken commentary were established by early 1999, the critical commentary and parts completed and typeset by mid-1999.

<sup>145</sup> The performance on the 12th was part of the 1999/2000 Wiener Jeunesse series, those on the 13th and 14th constituted the 2nd concert of the 1999/2000 concert season of the Wiener-Symphoniker-Zyklus.

death<sup>146</sup>—a remarkable situation in historical terms, and one which proved a remarkable experience for orchestra and conductor suddenly confronted with an unknown and very radical ‘new’ Bruckner score.<sup>147</sup>

As outlined in ch. 3.2, both the 1999 rental score and published version of 2002 consisted of an introduction explaining the Finale’s composition and transmission history and a thematic overview with eight musical examples, the latter being optional (cf. F/vi). Harnoncourt omitted the thematic excerpts and spoke in his own words ‘on’ rather than according to the text provided, but with a good grasp of most of the facts—namely, that Bruckner had written a movement, rather than merely sketches, and that bifolds are clearly missing. He also stressed the musical stature and power of the surviving fragments. A transcription of his spoken text appears in Appendix III. As can be seen from this, Harnoncourt paused following performance of the first fragment to draw attention to the dissonances in the trumpets at mm. 259ff. (F/35), explaining the logic of Bruckner’s voice-leading over what at first hearing might appear to be an error in the score, and played the passage in two variants before repeating the authentic version.<sup>148</sup> The remaining sections performed extended as far as the end of the last extant score bifold; the coda sketches were referred to by Harnoncourt but not played.<sup>149</sup>

Aware of the importance of pre-performance publicity, Vogg carefully prepared the performances, among other initiatives publishing a lengthy article in the Musikverein’s publicity magazine *Musikfreunde*.<sup>150</sup> The following passage, instructive in the emphasis it gives to the authenticity of the text, followed a brief outline of the present writer’s Bruckner

<sup>146</sup> Herbert Vogg wrote to the author 20 Feb. 1999: “Die Aufführung findet im Rahmen eines völlig normalen Konzert-Zyklus statt—da spielt man keine unzusammenhängenden Notenfetzchen, da muß schon ‘etwas’ da sein! Es ist aber auch kein sogenanntes ‘Gesprächskonzert’ oder ‘Werkstattkonzert’, sondern eben eine Aufführung der Neunten Symphonie von Anton Bruckner, bei der—als echte Sensation!—dem Publikum vor der Pause und vor den drei fertigen Sätzen gezeigt wird, wieviel—trotz Souvenirjägern etc.—von Bruckners Finale erhalten geblieben ist, und daß dieser Satz mithin eindeutig zumindest im Rohentwurf komplett (oder doch: fast komplett) vorhanden war (und auch ist).”

<sup>147</sup> As Harnoncourt noted in his remarks: “es ist ein sehr eigenartiges Gefühl, wenn man nach 100 Jahren soetwas erleben kann, wie es die Musiker vor 100 Jahren erleben konnten” (cf. Appendix III; the passage was quoted at greater length at the beginning of ch. 3.2).

<sup>148</sup> The repeat of the original version of the passage, as if in confirmation of Harnoncourt’s own opinion, was strikingly greeted by the audience on the 13th by a spontaneous burst of applause.

<sup>149</sup> This is significant in pointing up the impact made by actual performance over mere reference. Harnoncourt referred to the sketches for the coda in his address (cf. Appendix III), but concluded, before playing the final surviving score fragment, that “Was wir jetzt spielen, ist das letzte, was er in seinem Leben geschrieben hat.” Zamazal, for instance, in his review of the performance (“Die Uraufführung des Finale-Fragments der Neunten Symphonie Bruckners”, *IBG-Mitt* 54 (June 2000), p. 40), summarised inaccurately: “Die Coda sollte zu einem Abschluß mit fünf oder sechs Themen übereinander [...], führen; das blieb aber ungeschrieben.” This would surely not have been the impression received had the coda sks. been played.

<sup>150</sup> “Bruckners unvollendeter Lobgesang: Zur Dokumentation des Finale-Fragments der Neunten Symphonie,” *Musikfreunde—Zeitschrift der Musikfreunde in Wien* 12, no. 2 (Nov. 1999), pp. 10–13.

activities and a detailed account, taken from the Forewords to both AP and DdF, of Bruckner's compositional achievement on the Finale:

Wie aber entstand jene 'Dokumentationspartitur', die der Aufführung des Finale-Fragments im Konzert der Wiener Symphoniker zugrunde liegt? Es müßte doch, dachten wir, möglich sein, die erhalten gebliebenen Partitur-, Particell- und Satzverlaufseiten in der jetzt klar gewordenen sinnvollen und philologisch untermauerten Abfolge als ein Satz-ganzes zu edieren und im Wechsel von Partitur-, Particell- und Satzverlaufseiten Bruckners Konzept zumindest erahnen zu lassen. John Phillips sprang auf diese Idee an und legte 1994 in der Gesamtausgabe eine Studienpartitur des Finale-Fragments vor: Sämtliche Seiten folgen treulich Bruckners autographischer Hinterlassenschaft, nichts ist hinzugefügt, blanke Partiturseiten markieren in Verlust geratene Passagen. Die Publikation wurde zur Sensation.

Die Anfrage eines Konzertveranstalters, ob es zu diesem authentischen Finale auch ein Aufführungsmaterial gebe, löste den nächsten Schritt aus: Phillips erklärte sich bereit, die Partitur für den Konzertsaal einzurichten, behutsam und ohne jede Eigenmächtigkeit. Es wurde keine Note hinzugefügt, die nicht von Bruckners Hand legitimiert ist. Wo Bruckner uns nur den Streichersatz hinterlassen hat, ist der Hörer eingeladen, sich die von Bruckner vermutlich aufgetürmten Bläserklangmassen zu imaginieren. Wo das erhalten gebliebene Material lückenhaft ist, wo einer der von Bruckner durchnummerierten Bogen fehlt, wird der Satzablauf kurz unterbrochen.

The success of the premiere of the Dokumentation in conservative Vienna, where a performance of the Aufführungsfassung would surely have provoked howls of protest, again demonstrated that an adequately prepared audience, with the assistance of an informed and committed conductor and capable orchestra, can successfully take on the challenge of the Finale, even in its 'raw' state. The essential findings of the author's research were finally transmitted to an audience in an almost unmistakable manner, along with Harnoncourt's own passionate enthusiasm for the rediscovery of this remarkable music.<sup>151</sup> Heinz Rögl wrote informedly in the *Salzburger Nachrichten*:<sup>152</sup>

'Suchen Sie im Dachboden, ob Sie die fehlenden Abschnitte aus der Hand Bruckners finden!' Der das Publikum im Wiener Musikvereinsaal erheiternde Appell Nikolaus Harnoncourts hat einen realen Hintergrund. Denn kaum hatte Anton Bruckner 1896 endgültig die Augen geschlossen, stürzten sich Befugte wie Unbefugte wie die Geier auf seinen Nachlaß.

Von der 350 teils vollständig ausinstrumentierten und durchnummerierten Seiten des Finalsatzes der 9. Symphonie fehlen immer wieder einzelne Bögen. Irgendwo müssen die noch sein.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. in Appendix III, *passim*; for example "[W]ir laden Sie ein, mit unserer eigenen Neugier, mit der wir an diese Sache herangegangen sind, ein Werk von Bruckner zu sehen. Was kann er sich da vorgestellt haben? Wie könnte das geworden sein? Das hat uns Musiker wirklich brennend interessiert." Or: "Das geht einem echt unter die Haut, diese Musik, und dann soll ich Ihnen da was vorquatschen."

<sup>152</sup> "Keine Skizzen eines Altersschwachen. Nikolaus Harnoncourt präsentierte das Fragment des Finales von Bruckners Neunter", *Salzburger Nachrichten*, 15 Nov. 1999.



Die von dem australischen Musikwissenschaftler John A. Phillips angefertigte Studienpartitur enthält keine einzige Note, die nicht von Bruckner legitimiert wäre. Fehlt der Bläusersatz, muß man ihn sich zu den begleitenden Streicherfiguren dazudenken, reißt das Manuskript mitten in einer wilden Fuge ab, tritt eine Pause ein.

Ein Werkstattbericht, kein Konzert.

Nicht als Konzert sondern als spannenden Werkstattbericht legte Harnoncourt die von ihm moderierte Präsentation mit den Wiener Symphonikern an.

Er war ein beredter und überzeugender Anwalt dafür, daß Bruckner mit diesem gewaltigen Finalsatz sein gesamtes symphonisches Schaffen zu einem kühnen und krönenden Abschluß gebracht hätte, wären ihm ein paar Monate mehr Zeit dazu geblieben. Hauptthemen, Satzverlauf und den Plan zu einer riesenhaften Coda hatte Bruckner nachweislich als durchgehende Einheit fertig. [...]

In a similar vein Reinhard Kager wrote:<sup>153</sup>

Was Anton Bruckner wiederfuhr, könnte heute allenfalls einem Popkünstler passieren. Gleichsam unter dem Totenbett wurden einige Partiturbblätter seiner Neunten Symphonie von Verehrern vorgezogen und 'in Besitz genommen', wie Nikolaus Harnoncourt höflich die Leichenfledderei umschrieb. Zudem habe Bruckner ein halbes Jahr gefehlt, um den Finalsatz fertig zu stellen.

Dennoch war der Einblick in die Werkstatt des großen Komponisten, den Harnoncourt im ersten Teil dieses ungewöhnlichen Abends im Wiener Musikverein bot, faszinierend genug. Immerhin 600 fertig instrumentierte Takte dieses mit 'Misterioso' bezeichneten Satzes liegen nach der neuesten Ausgabe des Musikwissenschaftlers John A. Phillips vor.

Mit einem kaum hörbaren Paukenwirbel beginnt dieses Finale. Ein kärgliches, im punktierten Rhythmus absteigendes Streichermotiv folgt dem mysteriösen Beginn, um in beharrlichen Repetitionen allmählich anzuschwellen und in einem schneidenden Trompeteneinsatz zu gipfeln. Was beim ersten Anhören wirken mag wie ein—den brillanten Wiener Symphonikern an diesem Abend sonst nie unterlaufender—Fauxpas, ist trotz seiner harmonischen Kühnheit von Bruckner sehr bewußt gesetzt.

Die Unversöhnlichkeit, die diese Neunte birgt, ehe sie immer wieder in melodische Choräle mündet, hätte aber wohl auch das stets von neuem jäh abbrechende Finale weitergeführt. Sie auch den überlieferten drei Sätzen nach der Pause mit aller Härte unterstrichen zu haben geht auf Harnoncours kongeniale Interpretation zurück, die die Bläser klanglich ins Zentrum rückt. Ein grandioser Abend.

The Vienna *Kurier* issued the following:<sup>154</sup>

Eine Warnung des Dirigenten zu Beginn: Das Finale von Anton Bruckners 9. Symphonie sei eine—unvollendete—Werkstatt, die zur Uraufführung gebrachten Passagen forderten des Hörers Kreativität. Im Großen Musikvereinssaal aber verstand es Nikolaus Harnoncourt, diese geistige Kreativität mühelos, ja meisterhaft zu erwecken. Harnoncourt also stand am Podium, erläuterte theoretische Details, verglich einzelne Passagen in mehreren

<sup>153</sup> "Im Angesicht des Todes. Nikolaus Harnoncourt dirigierte eine halbe Bruckner-Uraufführung", *Der Standard* (Vienna), 15 Nov. 1999.

<sup>154</sup> P.J., "In der virtuososen Werkstatt", *Kurier* (Vienna), 15 Nov. 1999.

Spielweisen und ließ Bruckners Credo mehr als nur errahnen. Eine musikalische Einführung, die das Ohr schulte, ein oft prächtiges Fragment näher brachte und zudem das Können der Wiener Symphoniker eindrucksvoll unterstrich. [...]

Zamazal's review echoed Rögl's in highlighting the impact of the music itself:<sup>155</sup>

[...] Zum ersten jedoch befaßte er sich in einer Art 'Werkstattbesuch bei Bruckner' mit dem als Torso überlieferten Finalsatz. Hiefür wurde nicht etwa eine Fertigstellung, sondern die authentische Dokumentation des Finalfragmentes uraufgeführt, wie es sich aus Bruckners Hand erhalten hat. Diese behutsame Einrichtung für den Konzertgebrauch erstellte, wie schon vieles zu diesem Finalsatz, der Australier John Phillips.

Eine Ahnung vom vollständigem Bauplan dieses Satzes gaben die Erklärungen des Dirigenten. Zusammen mit der Wiedergabe der vier Blöcke reichten sie für die Einsicht: Bruckner hatte dabei eine große, auch wilde, bohrende Musik im Sinne, alles ohne jede Spur von Resignation, dafür von Explosivkraft erfüllt. [...]

The conservative *Presse* published the following more sober but nonetheless informed review:<sup>156</sup>

Wer sich eine Weihestunde mit Bruckners neunter Symphonie erwartet hatte, wurde eines Besseren belehrt. Belehrt im besten Sinne, denn es stand Nikolaus Harnoncourt am Pult der in blendender Form aufspielenden Symphoniker. Damit war ein Konzert zum Zurücklehnen nicht garantiert, und Bruckners Torso gebliebene letzte Symphonie hatte nicht einfach ihr Ende im Adagio, sondern begann mit dem, was vom Final-Satz erhalten ist.

Auch wenn es eine, natürlich spekulative, Rekonstruktionen des Finales gibt—Harnoncourt entschied sich für das Fragment des Fragments. Und bat, das Gebotene nicht als 'Konzert', sondern als Einblick in Bruckners Werkstatt zu betrachten. Die heute bekannten Teile des Finales befinden sich weltweit verstreut in Bibliotheken und in Privatbesitz. Als Bruckner 1896 in Wien starb, wurde versäumt, sein Sterbezimmer rechtzeitig zu versiegeln. Einige Seiten kamen so abhanden.

Reiner Bruckner erklang also, ohne Zutaten, und Harnoncourt kommentierte, erklärte, stellte an einer Stelle, wo der Autograph nicht eindeutig zu lesen ist, mehrere Möglichkeiten vor. Die drei vollendeten Sätze folgten nach der Pause. Ganz ohne Weihrauch, ohnes falsches Pathos, durchhörbar, konzentriert, aufregend, in durchaus zügigen Tempi.

On the other hand, Herbert Müller in the *Wiener Zeitung* revealed that he hadn't grasped the central issue:<sup>157</sup>

In den letzten Jahren erkannte man, daß eigentlich sehr vieles aus dem Fragment von Bruckners letzten Finale—dem seiner 'Neunten'—erhalten ist. Nikolaus Harnoncourt

<sup>155</sup> "Mit dem vierten Satz ein überwältigender Klangdom", *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten (Kulturnachrichten)* (Linz), 15 Nov. 1999.

<sup>156</sup> "mus", "In der Bruckner Werkstatt. Nikolaus Harnoncourt und die Wiener Symphoniker gaben im Wiener Musikverein eine außergewöhnliche Lektion", *Die Presse* (Vienna), 15 Nov. 1999, p. 22.

<sup>157</sup> Herbert Müller, "Erklärt und mißverstanden". *Wiener Zeitung* (Vienna), 15 Nov. 1999.

erklärte und ließ vom Orchester ungefähr insgesamt eine Viertelstunde Musik eines Werkstatteinblicks spielen, es war die Uraufführung der Dokumentationspartitur aus der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe: informativ und doch verwirrend, da kaum 'fertige' Abschnitte zu hören waren.

Predictably, Manfred Wagner also expressed reservations, revealing his limited engagement with research by now in print for the better part of a decade, and his unwillingness to recognise the Finale as having any significance for our understanding of Bruckner's conception of the symphony. For him the Finale represented an irrelevant appendage:

Hier wird deutlich, welche Verantwortung Konzertveranstalter und Verlage haben, wenn sie mit einem derart heiklen Thema vor die Öffentlichkeit treten. Mir scheint auch, als hätten die Textbeiträge im Programmheft noch eine Spur vorsichtiger sein müssen, weil unvollendet nun einmal unvollendet ist und keine Vorstellung der Welt sich für zuständig erklären kann, zu wissen, was hätte kommen müssen [...]. Im Großen und Ganzen exemplifizierte der Versuch der Brucknerschen Noten deutlich und machte keinen Unterschied zu jenen wenigen Ergänzungen, die vom Herausgeber John A. Phillips hinzugefügt wurden. Die Klugheit und Freude am Lehrbeispiel vermittelte jedenfalls Nikolaus Harnoncourt auch den Besuchern.

*Nach der Pause aber ging es um ein Werk, die 9. Symphonie in d-moll [...].*<sup>158</sup>

In other words, the Ninth Symphony, the real work, had nothing to do with the Finale. Following a lengthy critique of Harnoncourt's performance of the first three movements, Wagner concluded by revealing the true nature of his dismissal of the Finale: an accepted performance tradition, which clearly reflects a 'true' Ninth Symphony over any attempt to upgrade the status of an 'inferior' and irrelevant Finale, must apparently be upheld at all costs:

Daß diese Symphonie auch mit drei Sätzen ein vernünftiges Ende haben kann, ist aus dem E-Dur-Schluß abzulesen [...] Bleibt nur zu hoffen, daß der Fragmentbeginn des Konzerts auch als solcher verstanden wurde. Das Ende der Symphonie, soviel sei prophezeit, wird er wohl nie darstellen.<sup>159</sup>

German musicologist Eva Rieger in the *Neue Musikzeitung* also revealed herself less impressed by the authenticity and studious approach of the DdF and regarded the DdF as less effective than the AF in giving a meaningful impression of the Finale. After making reference to the missing bifolios and the current writer's research, she concluded:<sup>160</sup>

Unter der Leitung von Nikolaus Harnoncourt spielten die Wiener Symphoniker konzentriert und engagiert die einzelnen Teile, die durch Erläuterungen des Dirigenten ergänzt wurden. Der Satz besitzt mit drei Themengruppen eine klar gegliederte Sonatenform, wobei die dritte Themengruppe ein mit massivem Blech untermaltes Choralthema vorstellt.

<sup>158</sup> "Neues von Großen Komponisten: Bruckner-Uraufführung in Wiener Musikverein (13.11.)", *ÖMz* 55, no. 1/2 (2000), pp. 64–65; italics added.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>160</sup> "Lehrstunde: Bruckners Neunte-Fragmente", *NeueMZ*, February 2000, p. 34.

Dem Publikum wäre sicherlich mit dem ebenfalls von John A. Phillips komplett rekonstruierten vierten Satz mehr gedient gewesen. Dem insgesamt 25-minütigen Satz fügte er 40 Sekunden Musik hinzu. Aufführungen 1998 in Recklingshausen haben gezeigt, daß der Höreindruck stark war. [...] In Wien erhielten die Fragmente—noch dazu unterbrochen durch Apelle Harnoncourts, in den Wiener Dachstuben nach Manuskriptbogen zu suchen—einen didaktischen Anstrich. Zu unvermittelt standen die Einzelteile nebeneinander, rissen abrupt ab. Der Versuch, etwas von der ursprünglichen Einheit zu vermitteln, ging fehl, war vielleicht auch gar nicht intendiert.

In general, however, the reviews, as well as the strong audience reaction evident on both nights attended by the author, revealed that reception of the Finale had in many respects ‘come of age’ with these performances. Even if not accepted as a standard part of the concert repertoire, it was now patently clear to anyone that a movement had existed, and that it was too significant a compositional achievement to be simply dismissed. Vogg wrote to Cohrs following the performances:<sup>161</sup>

Die Aufführung der Finale-Dokumentation hat stattgefunden und war ein voller Erfolg. Herr Phillips wird Ihnen sicher berichtet haben. Ich bin sehr froh, daß ich Herrn Phillips seinerzeit dazu bewegen konnte, die Basis aller Fertigstellungen, nämlich die sinnvolle Aneinanderreihung der erhalten gebliebenen Elemente in ihrer jeweils letzten Ausarbeitung in Form einer ‘authentischen’ Studienpartitur des Finales vorzulegen; die Aufführungspartitur war die logische Folge. Jetzt ist also in Wien auch akkustisch demonstriert worden, daß Bruckner wesentlich mehr als nur ‘verworrene Skizzen’ hinterlassen hat, und Harnoncourt hat sehr deutlich darauf hingewiesen, daß vermutlich ein Satz-ganzes existiert hat. Sehr schön hat er auch das ‘Schroffe’ der Partitur herausgearbeitet. Er hat u.a. von der ersten Probe erzählt und wie da die Musiker zunächst einmal eingemaßen ratlos vor dieser Musik gesessen sind: ‘Jetzt haben wir eine Ahnung, wie den Orchestermusikern zu Bruckners Zeit zumute war.’

The second performance of the DdF took place under the direction of Cohrs as the first half of the concert in which Bachmann again performed the Ninth in four movements with the insolvent Philharmonica Hungarica in Düsseldorf in April 2001. Like Harnoncourt, Cohrs altered the author’s spoken text (though he read his own version rather than speaking freely), and omitted the thematic overview—justifiably, as the DdF was here acting as an introduction to the AF—but concluded by performing the coda sketches for the first time. The DdF was similarly performed by Cohrs in Japan with the Royal Flanders Orchestra in September 2001 with the inclusion of an explanation of the reconstruction of the Themenüberlagerung. Further performances are planned for the later part of concert year 2002/03 (see Table IV).

### 3.4.13 The Ninth Symphony in the Gesamtausgabe.

As noted above (§§3.4.8, 9) MWV’s original intention to publish three volumes on the finale was expanded in the mid-1990s to incorporate Studienbände on each of the other movements

<sup>161</sup> Letter dated 22 Nov. 1999 (copy sent by Herbert Vogg to the author).

of the Ninth, that on the Scherzo appearing under the editorship of Cohrs in 1998. MWV also decided to release a new score and parts for the first three movements of the Ninth (published in 2000) which were first used as performing material by the Philharmonia Hungarica in April of that year (§3.4.11). This, the third edition of the Ninth Symphony in the GA, was edited by Cohrs with typesetting and editorial direction by the present writer, and for the first time included a detailed Kritischer Bericht on the first three movements.<sup>162</sup> For the new edition the fourth movement was no longer disregarded as a later compositional accretion to the first three, with which its genesis was inextricably entwined, while Cohrs' research revealed that by 30 November 1894 Bruckner had by no means as conclusively finished the musical text of the first three movements as previously assumed, but probably continued revisions as late as October 1895 (§1.2.3). No longer would the first three movements be entitled "*IX. Symphonie D-Moll*" but rather "*IX. Symphonie D-Moll / 1. Satz – Scherzo und Trio – Adagio*"—in other words, the first three movements alone do not constitute the whole symphony.<sup>163</sup>

The AP of the Finale, first published 1994, had sold well enough by 1999 to require a second impression; this appeared in late 1999 with a number of minor errors corrected and reference made to the DdF and to Harnoncourt's premiere.<sup>164</sup> Interest shown in the DdF was sufficient to prompt Vogg in May 2001 to reverse his previous decision to issue the score as rental material only and publish it commercially. Proofs, which included a revised text and minor alterations in the scoring of the coda sketches, were dispatched to Vienna in June 2001; the volume is currently in press. The Studienband<sup>165</sup> on the sources of the Finale, the concluding volume of MWV's original Finale trilogy, is expected to be ready for publication by late 2002, followed by the remaining two Studienbände on the sources for the First movement and Adagio together with a comprehensive Textband on the entire Ninth, its history, documentary sources, biographical background, compositional genesis and reception. By including the Textband in the project, the Studienbände could be reconceived as focusing on the analysis of the extant compositional materials for each movement, providing an exhaustive documentary study of this unique body of sources and thereby Bruckner's late compositional technique. The forebear of the project, the AF, will also undergo a further revision in 2002, as mentioned. Sole rights to it remain at present the property of its four authors, although it is hoped that some form of distribution through a major publisher can be negotiated within the foreseeable future.

<sup>162</sup> Final proofs were completed in November 2001; currently in press (April 2002).

<sup>163</sup> A more complete outline of the entire publication plan as it now stands can be found in the author's *Bruckner Jahrbuch* article reprinted in Appendix V, "'Für die IX. ist gesorgt'...", in particular the sections entitled "Zur Neuausgabe der Sätze 1 bis 3" and "Zum *Finale* in der Gesamtausgabe".

<sup>164</sup> The note on the second impression (p. V) is dated August 1999.

<sup>165</sup> Formerly designated 'Textband' (cf. E/iii); it was decided in May 2001 to reserve the title Studienband for each of the separate volumes on the sources of the individual movements. 'Textband' will now be reserved for the comprehensive volume on the whole symphony (*infra*).

On completion, the entire set of publications on the Ninth in the Bruckner GA will comprise a total of ten volumes and two sets of orchestral parts. Six of these volumes are already in print,<sup>166</sup> four alone dedicated to the complex issue of the Finale.<sup>167</sup> The Bruckner GA will thereby include what may rank as the largest series of publications for any single work of the orchestral repertoire,<sup>168</sup> at last superseding the old 1934 edition of Alfred Orel, in a sense the standard-bearer of the original 1930s GA. The legacy of misinformation it brought about or perpetuated, like that initiated by Ferdinand Löwe's first edition, will not pass as quickly.

#### 3.4.14 Conclusions.

The multifaceted history of the Finale and its reception since 1990—the task of evolving a viable AF as well as adequate publication and promotion of the research which was to derive from it, and which has extended to republication of the scores and sources for the entire Ninth Symphony—has borne out the validity of the maxim quoted at the outset of this chapter: 'Vollendung' has indeed proven an ongoing process rather than a result.

There is no question that considerable 'Aufklärungsarbeit' remains to be done before the AF of the Finale can be established as even an occasional standard-repertoire item, and conductors and audiences are able to make informed choices as to which version of the Ninth they prefer. Of course, at least five choices are now available: (a) as a three-movement 'fragment', (b) with the Te Deum, as Bruckner intended; (c) by concluding with the AF; (d) by beginning (presumably) with the DdF (like Harnoncourt); or (e), as Cohrs and Bachmann demonstrated to good effect, by beginning with the DdF, both as an educational tool and in deference to authenticity, then performing the symphony concluding with the AF.<sup>169</sup>

Despite the likely preference of purists for performances of either the three-movement 'fragment' of the Ninth or for performances of the DdF preceding it, a strong plea can still be entered for performances using the AF. Despite its areas of speculation, given that such a small degree of actual compositional completion is involved, performance with this score still come closest, in terms of 'authenticity' as well as accessibility, to representing the original intentions of the composer. In performance following the Adagio it most readily allows an

---

<sup>166</sup> The AF FA and DdF on the Finale; the Studienband on the Scherzo and score and Kritischer Bericht of the first three movements.

<sup>167</sup> AF, FA, DdF and forthcoming Studienband.

<sup>168</sup> This does not include a further two performing versions of sources of the Ninth Symphony, Cohrs' editions of the rejected Trios of the Ninth Symphony for orchestra and for viola and organ published by Doblinger in 1998.

<sup>169</sup> A further solution is that planned for performances in Houston in November 2002, in which performance of the first three movements is to be followed, after the interval, by performance of the Documentation followed by the Te Deum.

uninterrupted and unmediated impression of the movement and of the whole symphony as Bruckner conceived it. The DdF, intended for a workshop concert situation, is by its nature unsuited to form an aesthetically convincing conclusion of a performance of the first three movements, and presumably will tend to continue to be performed before the 'work', as Manfred Wagner referred to the three movements. As more recent critiques of AF performances have shown (§3.4.11), critics have begun to call attention to the powerful manner in which the Finale provides a sense of closure for the foregoing movements—which was the composer's intention; it represents a considerable leap of faith to expect audiences to imagine the effect of the movement following the Adagio when the fragments of the Finale are played prior to the first movement. Objections to the use of the AF on the grounds of its 'inauthenticity' are specious: equally 'inauthentic', in their own way, are performances of the first three movements, an alternative with which the composer never reckoned and against which he specifically made the provision of the *Te Deum* conclusion.

A number of high-profile performances and CD releases of the AF by more than one first-rate conductor and major orchestra will probably be required before any major breakthrough in the acceptability of this score occurs, yet few major conductors appear willing to risk the venture or show much interest in assessing for themselves the philological complexities of the scholarship. The attempt by Stanislaw Skrowaczewski in 1996 (§3.4.11) to return to Samale's 1986 score was an indication of how much conductors' opinions can be swayed by the aesthetic impressions of what they have heard, how reticent they are about forging new directions and how little weight 'hard scholarship' carries with many of them.

Another problem is the perceived inadequacies of Bruckner's music itself, the unjustified legacy of decades of clichés about mental decline and fragmentary compositional attempts. For instance, Riccardo Chailly in a 1993 interview<sup>170</sup> opined that:

if I had to do an experiment with Bruckner I would like to play the Ninth and after an interval to try the Finale, which some musicologists have tried to prepare from the "Skizzen", although it is just hypothetical, as I have never planned to do it here [in Holland]. The reason why I have not planned it is that I am not confident as far as those "Skizzen" are concerned. But I cannot judge this as far as the complete Finale of Bruckner's Ninth is concerned. It certainly has not fascinated or convinced me as Deryck Cooke did with his Mahler's Tenth performing version. It is a big dilemma which nobody will ever be able to solve.

No one will ever 'solve' the problem, however, if aesthetic and factual preconceptions formed before any accurate evaluation of the sources was undertaken are not set aside.

The tacit assumption is also made by many critics of the AF that they are capable of differentiating 'true' Bruckner from 'counterfeit' supplementation. Just like the claim that

---

<sup>170</sup> "Bruckner and the Bruckner Tradition of the Royal Concertgebouw Orchestra. Riccardo Chailly im Gespräch mit Nico Steffen (26. August 1993)", *IBG-Mitt* no. 42 (June 1994), p. 30

nothing further could possibly follow the coda of the Adagio, or that Bruckner could not possibly have intended to conclude with the *Te Deum*, hearing alone is simply too subjective as a reliable determinant of authenticity. The AF's biggest 'problem' in terms of its credibility remains its unique stylistic characteristics, including the many passages scored out and regarded by Bruckner himself as 'fertig', rather than the stylistically plausible completions of texture or compositional continuity which have been made, since it is precisely the former that constitute the most striking and original parts of the score. No commensurately large movement exhibits such a striking motivic unity as the Finale; the pauses between sections or abrupt transitions decried as evidence of the patching-together of sketches are, of course, original and stylistically genuine.<sup>171</sup> The character of the *Gesangsp.*, despite what Bruckner clearly scored and obviously intended as a rarefied abstraction, also remains a stumbling block for those listening to the movement with no knowledge of the MSS: assuming they will hear an unfinished movement with obvious 'incomplete' sections in minimal scoring, such passages simply confirm their preconceptions. Precisely such qualities of abstraction and apparent 'roughness' constitute integral aspects of Bruckner's late musical style, yet somehow they are set aside on approaching the Finale. "Am Kriterium 'brucknerisch' hängt allemal viel subjektives Ermessen", wrote Gülke, "[d]as gesamte Trio der *Neunten* etwa klingt viel weniger im Normalverständnis 'brucknerisch' als lange Passagen der Rekonstruktion."<sup>172</sup>

Turning to the question of the scholarly reception of the Finale in recent years, the dilemma in which Bruckner scholarship currently finds itself in relation to this issue was borne out in a recent collection of essays on the Bruckner Symphonies, *Die Symphonien Bruckners: Entstehung, Deutung, Wirkung*.<sup>173</sup> While Egon Voss, in his chapter "Die Brucknersche Symphonie: Allgemeine Charakteristika" makes only the standard, now wholly inaccurate reference to 'sketches'—"Aus demselben Jahr [1894—!] datieren die letzten Aufzeichnungen zur IX. Symphonie, deren Finale nicht über das Skizzenstadium hinaus kam",<sup>174</sup> Wolfgang Stähr, in his "Werkbetrachtung" "IX. Symphonie in D-Moll" includes over a page of detailed information on the Finale—quoted here in full as an indication of the extent to which information is now filtering through—and of the extent to which this is still handicapped by myth and legend:

Die d-Moll-Symphonie—sie bedeutete auch für Bruckner den 'Abschluß seines Lebens'. Anders jedoch als Beethoven oder Mahler vermochte er seine IX. nicht zu vollenden. Zwar hatte Bruckner in dem Jahreszeitraum von Mai 1895 bis Mai 1896 das Finale bereits bis zum letzten Takt konzipiert und in einem Streicherparticell (mit Hinweisen

<sup>171</sup> One need only compare the Finale of the Eighth, which, assessed on the basis of the number of general rests of half-note duration or longer, has significantly more such breaks than the AF.

<sup>172</sup> "Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987: Bruckner-Symposion", *Mf* 41, no. 3 (July–Sept. 1988), p. 243.

<sup>173</sup> Edited by Renate Ulm, Kassel–Basel 1998. Thanks are due to Eva Rieger for making this text available.

<sup>174</sup> p. 27.



auf die Bläserstimmen) niedergeschrieben, für eine abschließende Ausarbeitung und vollständige Instrumentierung aber reichte seine Kraft nicht mehr aus. Und da die Manuskripte nach dem Tod des Komponisten alles andere als sorgfältig aufbewahrt wurden, sind sie heute nur noch lückenhaft überliefert. Immerhin blieben 172 von Bruckner komplett instrumentierte Takte erhalten; andererseits aber fehlt von der Coda fast jede Spur. Eine höchst aufschlußreiche, für das Verständnis des Finales, ja der ganzen IX. Symphonie wesentliche Äußerung Bruckners hat Richard Heller, der letzte behandelnde Arzt des Komponisten, mitgeteilt: "Sehen Sie, nun habe ich bereits zwei irdischen Majestäten Symphonien gewidmet, dem armen König Ludwig [die VII.] und unserem erlauchten Kaiser [die VIII.], als die höchste irdische Majestät, die ich erkenne, und nun widme ich der Majestät aller Majestäten, dem lieben Gott, mein letztes Werk und hoffe, daß er mir noch so viel Zeit gönnen wird, es zu vollenden, und meine Gabe gnädig aufnimmt. Ich habe auch (deshalb vor, das Allelujah des zweiten Satzes mit aller Macht wieder im Finale zu bringen, damit die Symphonie mit einem Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott endet." Wenngleich der Hinweis auf das 'Allelujah des zweiten Satzes' rätselhaft bleibt und zu allerlei Spekulationen Anlaß gegeben hat (das Scherzo der IX. kann damit jedenfalls nicht gemeint sein), so erscheinen Bruckners Absichten doch unmißverständlich: Mit einem triumphalen 'Lob- und Preislied' sollte diese 'dem lieben Gott' gewidmete Symphonie zu ihrem wahren Ende gelangen. Und für den befürchteten Fall, daß er selbst das Finale nicht mehr würde abschließen können, gab Bruckner die Weisung aus, an dessen Stelle sein Te Deum von 1881/83–84 aufzuführen: eine problematische Notlösung, die gleichwohl die dem Schlußsatz der IX. Symphonie zugrunde liegende Idee des überschwenglichen Gotteslobes bekräftigt. Bruckner gestaltete das Finale als Sonatensatz mit drei Themen und sah im Zentrum der Durchführung eine aufwendige Fuge über das Hauptthema vor. Die 'Gesangspartie' und den Hauptgedanken entwickelte er aus demselben scharfkantigen thematischen Material. Ein bewegender, befreiender, alle Last und Angst überwindender Choral beschließt die Exposition; in der Reprise wird er mit dem markanten Motiv der Streicherfiguration aus dem Te Deum kombiniert, das auch schon zuvor, zu Beginn der Durchführung, erklingt.

Choral, Te Deum und Allelujah ergänzen sich zu einem Finale, das als Loblied und Credo tatsächlich das einzig gültige symphonische Schlußwort Anton Bruckners gewesen wäre.

However, Stähr concludes fatalistically:

Obgleich es an Bemühungen nicht gefehlt hat, diesen Satz zu rekonstruieren und zu komplettieren, obgleich immer wieder ernstzunehmende Aufführungen und Aufnahmen einer viersätzigen Fassung der IX. gewagt werden, existiert Bruckners d-Moll-Symphonie im Bewußtsein der Musikwelt nur als ein Torso, als eine 'Unvollendete'. Der musikalisch wie dramaturgisch einleuchtende Gedanke, daß auf den 'Abschied vom Leben', das Adagio, kein Finale mehr folgen dürfe, korrespondiert in idealer Weise mit jenem Aberglauben, kein großer Symphoniker könne über die Neunte hinauskommen. Der Mythos der 'Neunten Symphonie' zeigt sich stärker als alle musikologischen Aufklärungs- und Rekonstruktionsversuche. "Es scheint, die Neunte ist eine Grenze", sagte Arnold Schönberg 1912. "Wer darüber hinaus will, muß fort. Es sieht aus, als ob uns in der Zehnten etwas gesagt werden könnte, was wir noch nicht wissen sollen, wofür wir noch nicht reif sind. Die eine Neunte geschrieben haben, standen dem Jenseits zu nahe.

Vielleicht wären die Rätsel dieser Welt gelöst, wenn einer von denen, die sie wissen, die Zehnte schriebe.”<sup>175</sup>

Myth is precisely what scholarly discourse is supposed to address, not defer to. Many factors combine to militate against engagement with the Finale by the scholarly establishment: engrained thought patterns, aesthetic preconceptions, cultural prestige and musicological territorialism, not to mention the continuing reinforcement of the status quo provided by the vast majority of performances of the Ninth which ‘correctly’ conclude with the Adagio. Then there is the existence of any number of scholarly texts dismissing the problem. Even when confronted by new information, the ‘myth of Bruckner’s Ninth’ is so deeply embedded in the thinking of many musicologists that they simply cannot conclude other than by dismissing the Finale or the issue of its replacement by the *Te Deum* as irrelevant—as they have been for most of the symphony’s reception. Far more is at stake here than the status or otherwise of a single movement: the possibility that current interpretative tropes, habits of thinking about the Ninth stretching back as far as 1903, may have overlooked a major aspect of what is a standard work of the symphonic canon is inimical to that entire construct, since the canon can only be defined heuristically as what is performed, not what could or should have been.<sup>176</sup>

Under these circumstances, the composer’s intentions, normally regarded as central and axomatic to our understanding of a work’s authenticity (as they were by the Bruckner GA from its inception) have come to be disregarded as being beside the point. The ‘real’ Ninth, as confirmed by almost one hundred years of performances, is only first three movements. ‘Anti-Finale-ism’ hence rests very largely on nothing more than the overwhelming weight of authority carried by those movements, and assumes an artistic veracity for concluding with the Adagio which never entered Bruckner’s thinking. It relegates a highly advanced, carefully revised score to the status of mere sketches and assumes an uncollegial superiority to the efforts of foolish, misguided or presumptuous ‘arrangers’. In light of the amount of information now published, the refusal of some writers to engage in any sort of meaningful debate with research findings make clear the extent to which such responses are emotional reactions rather than informed reappraisals. Such reactions are inevitable when deeply held beliefs—in this case, those lying at the heart of scholarship’s commitment to the symphonic canon—are drawn into question. Colin Matthews, a collaborator with Deryck Cooke on the best-known

---

<sup>175</sup> Pp. 222f. A similar situation is to be found in the *Bruckner-Handbuch*, published 1996 (see under “Symphonien”, pp. 430ff.), in which Wolfram Steinbeck provided an article on the first three movements of the Ninth, the author that on the Finale, with similar disparities in fact and interpretation apparent. A new scholarly consensus is clearly still ‘under construction’.

<sup>176</sup> See concerning the issue of canonicity, Appendix V, the author’s “Das Finale der Neunten Symphonie: Herausforderung an den musikalischen und musikwissenschaftlichen Kanon” as well as his “Bruckner, the ‘Musikant Gottes’ and the New Musicology”, paper given at the Fifth Conference of the International Society for the Study of European Ideas (ISSEI), Utrecht, August 1996; published on CD-ROM, Cambridge, MA, 1998.

version of Mahler's Tenth criticised scholarly reactions to that work in the following uncompromising terms:

It would be perfectly possible to go through the sketches almost bar by bar, explaining what is or might be missing, what Mahler might have done to improve the structure of instrumentation, where passages might have been expanded, revised or rejected. That is the prerogative of the musicologist where we know that a work has not reached its finished state. But what is not acceptable is for the musicologist to use this unfinishedness as an excuse for withholding the music, to say that, since Mahler did not complete it, and would not wanted it heard in its unfinished state, the work should, as Adorno wanted, be filed away and contemplated privately [...] In Deryck Cooke's words, 'Mahler's music, even in its unperfected state, is of such significance, strength and beauty, that it dwarfs into insignificance any uncertainties'.<sup>177</sup>

The same can be claimed even more justifiably of the Bruckner Finale. Here we possess not only short-score sketches, as in the case of most of the Mahler Tenth, but an unfinished full score, originally possibly complete, which, given the compositional emergence of the first three movements, is unlikely to have undergone more than minor structural alterations, if any, in the course of its further elaboration. We have the clear indications of the intended orchestral character from the passages that Bruckner did live to complete in score. Moreover, there is the vastly greater calculability of Bruckner's musical language—especially in the Finale, by virtue of its motivic unity and uncompromising use of the Mutationsverfahren.

Even if attitudes change in the foreseeable future—and this may well require at least a generation, so entrenched are current misbeliefs<sup>178</sup>—the current ossification of symphony concert programming, recording and marketing and the conservatism of Bruckner audiences and conductors all militate against the idea that the AF may ever become as widely accepted as the Cooke realisation of the Mahler Tenth, which was first released in the 1960s. Like the Eighth, the Ninth was probably intended by Bruckner to form a complete concert programme in itself; today, the first three movements are customarily preceded in performance by a short work such as a Mozart concerto, a programme with wider appeal than a single, dauntingly long, minor-key symphony in four movements.<sup>179</sup> The practical dilemmas involved in mounting performances of the Finale—the difficulty of some of the string writing and the problems of scheduling adequate rehearsal time for what is essentially 'new music'—are also not to be underestimated.<sup>180</sup> Even less likely is that a performance tradition of concluding

<sup>177</sup> "The Tenth Symphony and artistic morality", *Muziek & Wetenschap* 5 (1995/96), no. 3, p. 318.

<sup>178</sup> This was an observation made by Elisabeth Maier of ABIL in conversation with the author in May 1991.

<sup>179</sup> Bruckner is also a far less popular composer than Mahler, and the interest in his music may simply never be sufficient to overcome the inertia of a century of performance practice.

<sup>180</sup> A performance practice tradition and broader understanding by musicians and conductors of 'how the music is supposed to go' is also only just beginning to emerge. Some of the interpretational problems include the question of tempi, and its reflection on the 'nature' of the music—wistful valedictory or gripping final conflict?; orchestral balance (for instance that of the massed brass versus the strings in the chorale passages); the

with the *Te Deum* will ever be reinstated to any significant extent. Until now, the best intentions of scholarship have failed this work. The status allotted in twentieth-century musicology to ‘vollendete’ musical texts (the first three movements) over ‘unvollendete’ sketches (the *Finale*), or worse, ‘anecdotes’ (Bruckner’s nomination of the *Te Deum*—although independently passed down by dozens of Bruckner’s acquaintances) are all to blame for our having failed to better understand and defend the composer’s conception of this work.

With all that said, performances of the AF have increased rather than decreased over time, particularly since 1998 and, as we have seen, tend now to be warmly received, provided that audiences and critics can be persuaded to rethink long-held beliefs about the movement. Performances of both AF and DdF, notably those of Wildner, Bachmann and Harnoncourt, have begun to mine the enormous expressive potential of the *Finale*’s music. No longer seen as bestowing unimpeachable determinations of worth and value, the canon continues to decline in authority as musicologists become increasingly aware of its ideological underpinnings and dependence upon historical circumstance—as in this case. The first three movements of Bruckner’s Ninth, at least for many musicologists, no longer constitute the irreproachable and sacred work of a supreme musical genius and proof positive of the superiority of German culture. They are simply three movements of an unfinished symphony by a late-nineteenth century composer. The *Finale* belongs to that symphony, much of it is recoverable, and we owe it to our understanding of the composer to attempt to reintegrate it into our understanding of the work and of Bruckner’s stylistic development.

The longer-term impact upon scholarship, and to a lesser degree the concert world, of the Bruckner GA publications on the Ninth should also be borne in mind, which take for granted Bruckner’s conception of the Ninth as a four-movement symphony and impartially set the *Finale* side by side with the other movements. Both the DdF and the reconstruction of the AP on which it is based provide evidence of the tenability of the AF. Many articles by the author, Cohrs and others are now in print; a volume of the well-known series *Musik-Konzepte* scheduled for release in 2003 is to be devoted to the issue of the *Finale*, while the English-language sphere remains an important priority for the near future. While attempts to alter long-held perceptions will probably long continue to be dogged by what Gülke so aptly referred to as “Denkfaulheit im Gewande von Demut”,<sup>181</sup> it can be hoped that these publications will assist scholars, musicians and Brucknerphiles in providing a basis from which a more balanced and accurate consensus perception may in time emerge.

---

remorseless character of the double dotting, which must be maintained consistently, accurately and with unflagging intensity by all sections of the orchestra from start to finish. Among other interpretative details, the measure-line *fermate* following mm. 290, 310 and (supplemented) 578, 650, which have mostly yet to be interpreted as they were surely intended—as relatively brief, structurally decisive *caesure*.

<sup>181</sup> “Schon der Erkenntnisgewinn, den Samale/Mazzucas Arbeit erbringt, ist so gewaltig, das prinzipieller Einspruch hiergegen sich desavouiert als Denkfaulheit im Gewande von Demut, “Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987...”, quoted in §1.4.15.

## Epilogue

Die Gewalt der Subjektivität in den späten Kunstwerken ist die auffahrende Geste, mit welcher sie die Kunstwerke verläßt. Sie sprengt sie, nicht, um sich auszudrücken, sondern um ausdruckslos den Schein von Kunst abzuwerfen. Von den Werken läßt sie Trümmer zurück und teilt sich, wie mit Chiffren, nur vermöge der Hohlstellen mit, aus denen sie austritt. Vom Tode berührt, gibt die meisterliche Hand die Stoffmassen frei, die sie zuvor formte; die Risse und Sprünge darin, Zeugnis der endlichen Ohnmacht des Ichs vorm Seienden, sind ihr letztes Werk.

—Theodor W. Adorno<sup>1</sup>

**I**N an unpublished address given in 1987,<sup>2</sup> Peter Gülke pointed out that, in all of his earlier symphonies, Bruckner had naturally been concerned with securing performances of the works, and hence composed with the contingency of their possible rejection or revision in mind. In the Ninth, Gülke recognised a different underlying attitude: here Bruckner was writing with the sure conviction not only that this would be his last work, but also that he would no longer live to hear it; that he was writing a last word for posterity, a statement no longer to be altered by the interventions of those who might wish to introduce it more effectively into the world. He continued:

Für mich bleibt also die Frage, ob hier nicht auch der Altersradikalismus eines Mannes mitredet, der selbstverständlich oft ein schlechtes Gewissen haben mußte, wegen seiner Nachgiebigkeit, und der nun einmal seiner Mitwelt die Meinung sagen will.<sup>3</sup>

This Bruckner, honest, uncompromising, resentful, even angry with the world for its incomprehension of his work and for the compromises it forced upon him, remains, for our time, a more potent and more eloquent image than either the stereotype of the “Musikant Gottes” or the icon of German nationalism. It calls to mind an ineffably human side of the aged composer, one rarely shown to the world—perhaps most clearly revealed in that remarkable incident during Bruckner’s University lecture of 5 December 1892, where Schwanzara recorded the vehement outburst, “Ja, ich will noch unter den Lebenden sein, so lange als möglich noch!”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “Spätstil Beethovens”, in: *Moments Musicaux. Neuedruckte Aufsätze 1928-1962*, Frankfurt 1964, p. 16; quoted by Gülke, *Brahms–Bruckner*, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> Peter Gülke, “Vollendet-Unvollendet. Einige Anmerkungen zur IX. Sinfonie Anton Bruckners (Referat vom 12. Mai 1987 auf dem Symposium des Österreichischen Kulturinstituts, Rom: ‘Die Entwürfe und Skizzen der IX. Sinfonie Anton Bruckners’)”. Copy courtesy of the author; also quoted in §1.4.1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* Similarly, Gülke elsewhere describes the late Bruckner as “zorniger Prophet” (“Über die Zeitgenossenschaft Bruckners”, p. 21).

<sup>4</sup> Schwanzara, p. 90, quoted at length in §1.1.3.

---

The scene brings to mind the words of Dylan Thomas:<sup>5</sup>

Do not go gentle into that good night,  
Old age should burn and rage at close of day;  
Rage, rage against the dying of the light.

The compositional evidence for what Gülke described as Bruckner's "Altersradikalismus" can be found mostly clearly in the surviving manuscripts for the Finale of the Ninth—a movement which for nearly a hundred years has largely been denied existence. Even more than the first three movements, it reveals a composer at odds with the musical mores of his time, caring nothing for the preferences of audiences or the concessions hitherto extracted from him by the need to have his music performed. The Finale reveals a different conception of the Ninth than has been accepted until now, a new perspective on Bruckner's stylistic evolution. Its high degree of dissonance and uncompromising ostinati, its extremes of febrile asperity and overwhelming mass, are an extrapolation of Bruckner's late style—perhaps more than anything it represents the "kraftvolle Musik" Bruckner spoke of writing in 1874. But it too should be included in the referential frame of our image of the composer, analysed and evaluated. For this to happen, it needs to be performed—at best in its original intended location following the Adagio. The vast work that emerges from this is on the one hand a kind of *Bekennnismusik*, on the other a profoundly cogent musical structure, due to the overwhelming role played by the mutation process. The 'subjectivity' of the Ninth Symphony is thus in many respects an 'absent' subjectivity—a cipher, as Adorno wrote of the late Beethoven quartets. "Vom Tode berührt, gibt die meisterliche Hand die Stoffmassen frei".

The new perspectives presented here may also be regarded as a contribution to the reclamation of Bruckner's music from its past. They reveal the inadequacy and shortcomings of assumptions with which past reception has operated, and from which it must break free, and they encourage a reassessment of a reception tradition which read the emblemata of chorale and fugue, expanded brass contingent and bombastic orchestral unisons as tokens of pan-Germanic universalism. Bruckner's "Huldigung vor der göttlichen Majestät" undermines the nationalism with which such topoi have long been associated by permitting us to reapproach this unknown, century-old music with fresh insights. It thus remains a fitting symbol for both the former lapses of Bruckner scholarship and for the hope of a future re-assessment—a reassessment that will be essential for our continued engagement with it, and with other musics of the past.

---

<sup>5</sup> Dylan Thomas, *Collected Poems 1934–1952*, London 1952, p. 159.



# APPENDICES



- I. Notes for the First CD Release of the Aufführungsfassung by Camerata Tokyo (J. A. Phillips)
- II. Notes for the Second CD Release of the Aufführungsfassung by Sonarte (B. G. Cohrs)
- III. Text Spoken at the Premiere of the Dokumentation, November 1999 (Nikolaus Harnoncourt)
- IV. Notes for the Bremen Performances of the Aufführungsfassung, March 2000 (Eva Pintér)
- V. “Das Finale der Neunten Symphonie: Herausforderung an den musikalischen und musikwissenschaftlichen Kanon” (J. A. Phillips)
- VI. “‘Für die IX. ist gesorgt.’ Einige Erläuterungen zum Editionsprojekt Neunte Symphonie in der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe—und wie es dazu kam” (J. A. Phillips)

## I.

### Notes for the first CD Release of the Aufführungsfassung by Camerata Tokyo (J. A. Phillips)<sup>1</sup>

#### TOWARDS A REASSESSMENT OF BRUCKNER'S NINTH

##### The New Research Concerning the Finale: An Introduction

**T**RADITIONALLY, Bruckner's Ninth has usually been presented in three movement form, although the composer himself intended, should he not live to complete the fourth movement, that his *Te Deum*, composed some twelve years earlier, should conclude the symphony.

At the première of the Ninth Symphony in 1903, where the first three movements were presented in a massively reorchestrated version by Ferdinand Löwe, the existence of a fourth movement was tacitly denied; the myth, still in wide currency even today, that Bruckner left merely a few, scarcely construable sketches for a fourth movement can be traced back to this early period. Throughout the reception history of the Ninth the attempt was repeatedly made to construe the conclusion with the *Adagio* and the alleged absence of a finale as a symbolic gesture, an interpretation which contrasts starkly with Bruckner's actual intention to conclude his last symphony with a crowning instrumental movement or, should it prove necessary, his *Te Deum*.

That so much misinformation concerning the Finale existed is scarcely surprising. The major portion of the surviving fragments of the score—manuscripts which according to Bruckner's will should long before have been entrusted to the Vienna Court Library—remained until at least 1939 in the possession of the Schalk family. Other fragments slowly found their way out of private hands, by bequest or purchase, into official holdings.

Not until the late twenties, by commission of the International Bruckner Society, was the attempt made to publish the then known accessible sources of the Ninth Symphony; unfortunately the result, *Drafts and Sketches for the Ninth Symphony*, edited by Alfred Orel (Vienna 1934), conveyed a highly inaccurate and incomplete picture of the material, despite which it was to form the sole basis for all attempts at a performing version of the fourth movement until well into the 1980s. As the first

---

<sup>1</sup> *Anton Bruckner/ Symphony/ No. 9 in D minor/ (edited by Leopold Nowak)/ with/ Finale/ Performing Version December 1992/ by Nicholas Samale, John A. Phillips and/ Giuseppe Mazzuca,/ with the assistance of Gunnar Cohrs/ World premiere recording. Recorded Brucknerhaus, Linz, April 13–15 1992 (movts. 1–3) and February 16–17 1993 (Finale) by the Bruckner Orchester Linz, under Kurt Eichhorn; released 1993 by Camerata Tokyo, 2-CD set, 30CM-275~6; CD-booklet (80 pp.) enclosed, comprising Japanese translation (pp. 1–39); original text by J. A. Phillips (English) and German translation by B. G. Cohrs (in two columns), pp. 41–80. Text here reproduces the original English version; for discussion see §3.4.5.*

serious attempt at a musicologically tenable performing version must be cited the *Ricostruzione* of Samale and Mazzuca (Milan, 1986), who in 1983–4 corrected the Orel edition against many of the original manuscripts in Vienna. Not until 1990 however could an exhaustive analysis of the extant material as well as all primary literature be undertaken.

Accurate investigation of the manuscripts scarcely permits the impression that this is a sorry effort to be excused due to the composer's advanced age or the mental confusion of his last months. Bruckner had in fact advanced as far as the composition of a continuous, definitive orchestral score of well over 600 bars and probably completed the conception of the entire movement several months before his death. Of the surviving fragments from the last working phase, 172 measures are fully orchestrated, with all whole bar rests marked; the remainder reveals what must originally have been a continuous, completed notation of the strings in ink, with numerous indications for the winds, ranging from written indications or individual notes to apparently complete compositional texture. The double leaves or *Bogen* on which the score was written were carefully numbered by Bruckner throughout, and obviously represented originally an unbroken series, confirmed by the clear overall musical structure of the movement as well as by the fact that most of them begin and end in the middle of a musical period. The gaps evident in this sequence today arose during the dispersal of the composer's musical estate shortly after his death, when important manuscripts, including significant parts of the already substantially completed score of the *Finale*, were stolen by souvenir hunters, or scattered, due to the negligence of Bruckner's executor and some of his students. This unfortunate fact is well attested to by the broad dispersal of the surviving sources for the Ninth, which today are to be found under approximately 28 different signatures of widely disparate provenance, in six libraries in Vienna, Cracow and Washington D.C. (see Table D); further sources may yet lie undisclosed in private possession, though it is to be expected that over the last nearly one hundred years many of these must have been irretrievably lost.

Yet the surviving fragments have an even greater significance than hitherto believed, for they constitute the remains of a definitive score, not merely a sketch. Bruckner never composed a score with the intention of subsequently making a fair copy. Rather, following the preliminary draft in short score or *particello*, he proceeded directly to work on the full orchestral score and gradually, by the excision and replacement of individual *Bogen*, arrived at a notational form fully satisfactory to him. The first three movements of the Ninth came into being via demonstrably the same compositional process. The already well-advanced score of the *Finale* is hence neither sketch nor draft, and must rather, despite the fact that it has not come down to us intact, be regarded as an emergent *autograph score*.

**Facsimile I:** Mus. Hs. 6087, fol. 29<sup>r</sup>, of the Austrian National Library.

Entry of the chorale theme in the *Finale*

[cf. Facs. C/193]

This information makes imperative a radical rethinking of opinions concerning not just the *Finale* but the Symphony as a whole; moreover it invalidates the arrogant certitude with which all

attempts to present the surviving fragments of Bruckner's score in the concert hall or in recording have customarily been dismissed, an attitude described by the eminent musicologist and conductor Peter Gülke as "mental laziness in the guise of humility."

The work of the musicologists, conductors and composers Samale, Phillips, Mazzuca and Cohrs on the reconstruction and supplementation of the *Finale* has occupied some ten years and involved numerous preliminary versions. The final form of the score recorded here constitutes the only performing version in existence based on a complete and thorough evaluation of the over 400 surviving pages of original manuscripts. Contrary to previous opinion the surviving *Bogen* of the score (see Table II, pp. 30 ff) extend as far as the epilogue of the reprise; substantial drafts for the coda of the movement also survive. In most cases it has been found possible to reestablish the continuity of the missing *Bogen* from the preliminary drafts, to which, to a great extent, Bruckner's conception remained bound. Important clues were supplied by the composer's habit of ordering each measure via metrical numbers into musical periods; even the measures of longer formal sections were numbered through. Almost all the surviving *Bogen* of the later work phases reveal a standard division into 16 measures, as they were prepared in large batches by the composer's amanuensis Anton Meißner; moreover one should recall Bruckner's tendency to maintain, block-like, musical textures throughout lengthy passages. The analytical methods used here could probably only in Bruckner's case have been so fruitful, as the musical logic and stringency of his compositional practice permitted much to be re-established.

The results of the recent re-examination of the original manuscripts as well as of the primary biographical sources have radically improved the possibility of a reconstruction of the movement as Bruckner left it and led to the decision by the Anton Bruckner Complete Edition, Vienna, to publish the surviving fragments of Bruckner's autograph score in this form together with a detailed analytical study, as well as all the original manuscripts pertinent to the *Finale* (significantly, the first time ever that a Bruckner movement is to be published in facsimile).

But beyond that, this reconstruction could, by means of strict musicological methodology, not merely sensitive adaptation, be developed into a performable totality permitting us a stylistically adequate impression of Bruckner's conception in sounding form, without the necessity either of introducing foreign materials or of degenerating into untenable editorial speculation. The intention of the Performing Version of the *Finale* recorded here is hence to present, and as faithfully as possible, the reconstruction of the surviving fragments of the *Finale* with the least editorial additions necessary for the realization of that end, and moreover conforming as closely as possible to the "ideal form" in which Bruckner might have been expected to have left the autograph score had he lived to see its completion. The supplementation of the original manuscript required for this purpose was attempted primarily by means of the so-called *analogue method*, in which, taking as axiomatic the way Bruckner used certain compositional and instrumental "models" recurrent in variant forms in many of his works, comparison between sections of the surviving fragments of the *Finale* and similar passages in his completed scores was made. Further insights into the reconstruction and/or supplementation of missing compositional texture were gleaned from an analysis of Bruckner's technique of motivic

transformation, termed by Werner F. Korte “mutation process”, which also confirmed the painstaking detail in which Bruckner composed the *Finale*.

The Performing Version of the reconstructed *Finale* cannot, and never will, replace the score we might have known had Bruckner lived longer. But should we nowadays be unwilling to endorse the express wishes of the composer and to conclude the symphony with his *Te Deum*, all the more should we consider the possibility of rescuing at least something of the original conception of this monumental orchestral work from a suppression occasioned merely by historical circumstance. Despite the death of the composer, which thwarted the conclusive determination of all compositional details, as well as the loss of significant portions of the manuscript, we can still, from the surviving sources and the correct, careful application of musicological method, arrive at a considerably more precise idea of the intended totality of the Ninth Symphony than by continuing to act as if a fourth movement never existed.

*The intention of this recording was therefore not to present a musical curiosity, but rather a general impression, as true to the intentions of its composer as possible, of the four-movement conception of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony. This was attempted by the use of a performing version of its compositionally largely complete, if incompletely transmitted, Finale.*

Table I: Overview of the Currently Known Autograph Sources for the Ninth Symphony

[cf. Table VI, A/22f.]

### THE NINTH SYMPHONY AS A FOUR-MOVEMENT TOTALITY

THE RE-EVALUATION of the *Finale* has important ramifications for the interpretation of the whole symphony, for it becomes apparent that Bruckner's Ninth, like his Fifth, was orientated toward an overriding, broadly conceived final movement of compelling dynamic force, yet fully as long as the expansive *Adagio* which precedes it.

Expressly conceived as his last symphony and musical testament, the Ninth was dedicated by Bruckner, with characteristic simplicity, to “the dear Lord” and is accordingly both one of the greatest monumentalizations of the symphonic genre, a vast canvas of nearly 90 minutes in length, as well as a document of profoundly personal faith: like the late works of Bach, a fusion of mystical vision and introspective music-theoretical speculation. Bruckner himself characterized it as a “Homage to Divine Majesty.”

The Ninth appears to have been begun in August of 1887, shortly after the completion of what was to be the first version of the Eighth, but work was soon interrupted by the lengthy revisions of earlier symphonies which occupied Bruckner until February 1891, although further drafts for the first and second movements were made during this period. In March 1891 he is reported to have played passages “from all four movements” to the visiting composer Jean-Louis Nicodé; in 1892, while still at work on the first movement, Bruckner composed the brief *Das Deutsche Lied*, which prefigures many elements of the *Finale* of the Ninth. Hence it is clear that the Ninth, despite its protracted

genesis, was conceived as a close-knit entity and that Bruckner, although plagued from the beginning by the fear he might not live to complete it, saw the *Finale* as an intrinsic part of this original conception. In it, his intention of composing an instrumental work worthy of dedication to God was to culminate, according to the composer, in a “hymn of praise to the dear Lord” himself.

While Bruckner completed the scores of the first three movements in November 1894, serious illness prevented him from beginning work on the *Finale* until approximately May 1895, although, as we have seen, it appears that the movement had by this time already taken shape in his mind. Following his move to the Lodge of the Belvedere Palace in Vienna in July 1895 his health improved considerably, and within the space of about one year (from June 1895 to June 1896) Bruckner must have carried the composition of the movement, already partly scored out, partly in continuous string texture, well into the coda, if not to its actual conclusion. Thereafter the composer appears to have continued with the completion of the instrumentation, but at the beginning of July 1896 contracted a serious case of pneumonia and for the remaining months of his life was scarcely capable, physically or mentally, of sustaining further serious work on the score, although he attempted some further revisions of its continuity.

Replying to the obvious reproach of writing a ninth symphony in the same key as Beethoven’s, Bruckner is recorded to have explained pragmatically, “Beethoven would have nothing against it.”

Indeed, stylistically speaking, the Ninth represents a final marshalling up of all the ‘Gothic’ elements of D minor that Bruckner found prefigured in the first movement of Beethoven’s Ninth, but which the later composer raised to dizzying heights of terrifying spiritual power and beatific rapture. The scoring includes triple woodwind and eight horns; as in the Seventh and Eighth Symphonies, Bruckner again enriches his palette with four Wagner tubas, accorded important roles in the last two movements.

Tonally, the symphony’s structure hinges upon the conflict of D minor with the alien element of b natural or c flat. C flat major already emerges in the horn theme at the outset of the first movement; the *Trio* stands in the enharmonically related F sharp major, the *Adagio* in E major, while E major, E minor and G flat major all emerge as important tonal centres in the *Finale*. Such strikingly dissonant elements as the tonally ambiguous opening of the *Scherzo*, the famous climax of the *Adagio* (a complete seven note dominant thirteenth in C sharp minor), not to mention several strikingly dissonant passages in the *Finale*, foreshadow many of the harmonic developments of this century.

DESPITE its great expansion of musical form, the structures of Bruckner’s Ninth are clear and readily assimilated. In the **First Movement** (D minor; C; *Feierlich, Misterioso*), the exposition presents three contrasting theme groups; development and reprise are fused and constitute a much expanded “counterstatement” (Robert Simpson) to the “statement” of the material in the exposition. Significantly, Bruckner himself divided his sonata-form movements into “First” and “Second Sections”, terms which will be used in the ensuing discussion.

Ernst Kurth wrote of the character of this movement: “The principal key of D minor

particularly is kept curiously empty, for long stretches not stepping beyond the fundamental chord; as medieval tonality D minor is also the harmonic centre of the church modes, filled with the cold solemnity of the cathedral, and has remained up to the present day the key appropriate to mystery.”

The great opening paragraph brings firstly a darkly ruminatory theme in the horns,

[Mus. Ex.] 1<sup>2</sup> [cf. IX/1, mm. 1–11]

soon making the abrupt deviation into C flat major already mentioned:

[Mus. Ex.] 2 [cf. IX/1, mm. 11–26]

The ensuing crescendo, prefiguring the falling octave of the principal theme, finally erupts into the massive unison statement of that theme itself (cf. Facsimile II [...]), in all its overwhelming immediacy:

[Mus. Ex.] 3 [cf. IX/1, mm. 63–75]

The second group, customarily with Bruckner the *Gesangsperiode* (literally, song period), a singing web of consummate polyphony, brings a warmer note of human emotion into this preternatural music:

[Mus. Ex.] 4 [cf. IX/1, mm. 97–101]

The third or closing group, a tragically world-weary music returning to the austerity of D minor,

[Mus. Ex.] 5 [cf. IX/1, mm. 167–170]

after reaching a despairing climax, finally meanders into the broad, placid lake of F major that marks the end of the “First Section”.

The “Second Section” begins with a development of the opening horn theme ([Mus. Ex.] 1, 2) and diverts to variants of the second and third group materials before regaining force and plunging headlong into the principal theme (3), now accompanied by furious scales in the strings. A ghostly march-like passage, uncannily prefiguring Mahler, gradually builds into the climax of the whole movement, built around the progression B<sup>7</sup>–F minor, followed by an extended pedal point on A in which the strings gradually restore peace. (Bruckner was to return to this progression again in the coda of the *Finale*.)

The singing and weaving of the second group (cf. [Mus. Ex.] 4) returns, while the third group (cf. 5) is built this time into a crushingly dissonant climax. A solemn chorale (woodwind, brass) leads

---

<sup>2</sup> The numbering of the musical examples given here is that of the original CD text, and quite separate from that of Section B. Like the Tables and Facsimiles, the examples have not been reproduced here for reasons of space.

into a brief coda built on fragments of the principal material (2, 3) and ending with the cavernously empty sonority of the open fifth d–a.

THE DEMONICALLY supercharged **Scherzo** (D minor; 3/4; *Bewegt, lebhaft*) uses a kind of monothematic sonata form. The floatingly ambiguous harmony—an altered diminished seventh chord—with which it begins

[Mus. Ex.] 6 [cf. IX/Scherzo, mm. 2–8]

has fascinated theorists from the outset and recurs in the hellish stamping of the principal theme:

[Mus. Ex.] 7 [cf. IX/Scherzo, mm. 42–50]

The ensuing **Trio** (F sharp major; 3/8; *Schnell*) was the third to have been sketched by Bruckner (two earlier drafts featuring a viola solo survive). The final version is a weird, unearthly movement unlike anything else written by Bruckner, a sonata-rondo on the two themes:

[Mus. Ex.] 8 [cf. IX/Trio, mm. 1–15]

and:

[Mus. Ex.] 9 [cf. IX/Trio, mm. 53–68]

THE **ADAGIO** (E major; C; *Langsam, feierlich*), a vast, deeply meditative movement spun from two broad theme groups, is a profound retrospect, full of quotations and self-references, with established programmatic connotations.

The opening of the movement echoes, as Constantin Floros has noted, both the intense chromaticism of Wagner's *Tristan* as well as the transcendence of *Parsifal*:

[Mus. Ex.] 10 [cf. IX/3, mm. 1–7]

A long crescendo based on the opening motives builds towards the visionary climax of a blazing eleventh chord, shortly after which emerges a sorrowful theme in the tubas which Bruckner himself referred to as his “Farewell to Life.” and which we find again in monumental form in the massively scored chorale theme of the *Finale* (cf. [Mus. Ex.] 18):

[Mus. Ex.] 11 [cf. IX/3, mm. 29–36]

The second theme group follows, its two sections characterized by the thematic ideas:

[Mus. Ex.] 12 [cf. IX/3, mm. 45–48]



and:

[Mus. Ex.] 13 [cf. IX/3, mm. 57–59]

In the ensuing “Second Section”, a vast counterstatement, the principal group (10) and its motives are mainly dealt with; the material of (13) reappears, as does the “Farewell to Life” theme (11), which recurs twice in the form of a fervently impassioned chorale in the strings.

In the “Third Section” the remaining theme (12) is finally reintroduced in a broad augmentation in E major, but building into a massively dissonant climax at which the opening motive (10) reappears in the bass. This terrifying vision breaks off with the complete thirteenth chord mentioned above, for Bruckner probably the most strident dissonance possible.

The coda of the movement returns to the long crescendo of the opening of the movement, but this time leading to an ever more serene affirmation of E major, in which the motives of the movement gradually resolve into oneness. The inversion of (12) creates a quotation of the “miserere” motive from Bruckner’s D minor Mass (found also in the first movement of the Third Symphony). Falling tritone progressions herald the principal musical material of the *Finale*; tubas and horns quote the *Adagio* of the Eighth and in the very last bars the first movement of the Seventh.

**Facsimile III:** Mus. Hs. 6087, fol. 6<sup>r</sup>, of the Austrian National Library:

Entry of the principal theme in the *Finale*

[cf. Facs. C/141]

THE QUESTION of programmatic connotations becomes even more significant in the **Finale** (d minor, C, [*Misterioso, nicht schnell*]), in which elements such as the chorale theme and a four note motive borrowed from the *Te Deum* appear to have been intentionally ‘imposed’ upon the movement in order to impart a special spiritual significance to it. Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca, in the commentary to their *Ricostruzione*, spoke of the symphony as a résumé of life, a final confession, dedicated to ‘the good Lord,’ but noted that “its dominant theme is the problem of Man in his relation to God and to death. That theme is expressed in the weary resignation, but also in the rebellion and despair of the first movement; in the demonic nightmare of the *Scherzo*, in the labyrinth of the *Adagio* where the spirit finally appears lost on the threshold of Nothingness, in the *Finale*, where incorporeal forms at times materialize in harsh declamations and the spirit is calmed by the radiant appearance of the ‘Farewell to Life’ [in its incarnation as the chorale theme], and in the *Te Deum*, the symbol of final redemption.”

The *Finale* reveals a variant of sonata-form which, although unusual for Bruckner, is exceptionally well laid out, in its own way more a tribute to the final solution of compositional imperatives than a schematic repetition of his previous finales would have been (see Table III, p. 32 f). The exposition of the movement, with its stepwise transformation of the dotted motive and tritone progressions of the enigmatic opening

[Mus. Ex.] 14 [cf. AF, mm. 1–10]

into the herculean mass of the principal theme (cf. Facsimile III, p. 22)

[Mus. Ex.] 15 [cf. AF, mm. 43–54]

constitutes a masterful example of the “mutation process” already mentioned.

After a brief transition in the brass, prefiguring the chorale theme, the same dotted motive is further transformed into the bleak asperity of the second group,

[Mus. Ex.] 16 [cf. AF, mm. 75–78]

a unique use of such a process by Bruckner, subsequently softened by the gracious counterpoint:

[Mus. Ex.] 17 [cf. AF, mm. 89–92]

The closing group, reached after further transformations of the opening motive, is constituted by the great chorale theme (cf. Facsimile I [...]):

[Mus. Ex.] 18 [cf. AF, mm. 169–184]

The ensuing development section alternates variants of the four note motive borrowed from the string figuration of the *Te Deum* and first appearing in the flute

[Mus. Ex.] 19 [cf. AF, mm. 217–220]

with inversions of the opening material (cf. 14, mm. 4–5), before proceeding to variants of the second group material (cf. 16, 17).

Heralded by a strident trumpet fanfare, Bruckner fashions the reprise of the principal theme (cf. [Mus. Ex.] 15) into a remarkable fugue; the ensuing great crescendo, quoting the “Aeterna fac” of the *Te Deum* and the last movement of the Sixth, culminates in a new theme, introduced by the horns:

[Mus. Ex.] 20 [cf. AF, mm. 397–401]

The extended reprise of the second group (cf. [Mus. Ex.] 16, 17) follows, including a reference to the chorale and a plainsong-like theme harking back to the first movement of the Third Symphony:

[Mus. Ex.] 21 [cf. AF, mm. 467–470]

Contrary to previous opinion, the surviving *Bogen* of the score extend as far as the epilogue of the recapitulation, where, after the return of the chorale combined with the *Te Deum* motive (cf. 18, 19), Bruckner reintroduced the horn theme (20) that first emerged following the fugue. The motivic similarity of this theme with the principal theme of the first movement (3) strongly suggest Bruckner

was proceeding to reintroduce the latter, as in the finales of the Fifth and Eighth, to usher in the coda.

In the attempt to arrive at a tenable performing version of this last section of the movement also, several significant drafts of the composer could be drawn upon, determining substantial stretches of its continuity. In addition to these came a multitude of analytical considerations. An extended draft by Bruckner for a rising series of tritone progressions which connects with the seventh bar of (3) would appear to have begun the coda:

[Mus. Ex.] 22 [cf. AF, mm. 579–585]

From the Bruckner biographer Max Auer, who analysed the material of the *Finale* in 1911, we have the clue that the themes of the symphony appeared in the sketches “piled up, as in the *Finale* of the Eighth”; even though this page is no longer extant, it is significant that the four themes of the Ninth Symphony permit of just such a combination:

[Mus. Ex.] 23 [cf. AF, mm. 607–613]

The chorale, in the variant introduced in the course of the reprise of the second group, follows. Sketches survive from May 1896 for a final lyrical crescendo leading to a broadly conceived cadence C flat–F–A<sup>11</sup> and ensuing pedal point on the tonic (cf. Facsimile IV, p. 28). A marginal note on this page refers to a “Bogen 36”, suggesting that the score, which today extends only as far as *Bogen* 31, had by this time indeed advanced as far as this point.

**Facsimile IV:** Mus. Hs. 6085, fol. 43<sup>r</sup>, of the Austrian National Library:

Sketch, from May 1896, for the coda of the *Finale*

[cf. Facs. C/47]

Concerning the very end of the movement, verbal clues from the composer have come down to us. According to the memoirs of his last doctor Richard Heller, to whom Bruckner played passages from the *Finale*, including the conclusion of the movement, at the piano, the composer intended to bring “the Allelujah [...] of the second movement with great power into the *Finale*, in order that the symphony end with a hymn of praise to the dear Lord”. This “Allelujah” can most convincingly be identified with a phrase from the *Trio* (cf. letter C) of the Eighth; this was probably intended to be prefigured by the first entrance of the trumpets—in D major—in the *Adagio* (cf. 10, m. 5):

[Mus. Ex.] 24 [cf. AF, mm. 659–667]

Numerous compositional clues—among them the conclusion of Bruckner’s *Helgoland* and the many contrapuntal possibilities presented by combination with the *Te Deum* motive—suggest the manner in which Bruckner may have formed this theme into a culminating pinnacle, a purely instrumental “hymn of praise to the dear Lord”.

**Table II:** Overview of the Source Material of the Finale, as it has been used in the Performing Version

[cf. Table XIV, A/41f.]

**Table III:** Overview of the Performing Version of the Finale

[cf. Table XV, A/44]

### FURTHER READING

LISTENERS who wish to concern themselves in more depth with the problem of the *Finale*, its reconstruction, or with the supplementations necessary for the Performing Version are referred to the following publications:

- John A. Phillips, “Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners.” (German) In: *Bruckner Jahrbuch* 1989–90 (Linz, March 1993).
- Ditto, *Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony Revisited. Towards the re-evaluation of a four-movement symphony*. (English) Doctoral dissertation, University of Adelaide, 1993.
- *Anton Bruckner Gesamtausgabe: Zu Band IX: Finale: Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen. a): Studienpartitur; b): Textband*. Edited by John A. Phillips (German—English) Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna, 1993 (in preparation).
- *Anton Bruckner: Faksimile-Ausgabe aller dem Finale der IX. Symphonie zugehörigen Manuskripte*. Edited by John A. Phillips. (German—English) Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag Vienna (in preparation).

The first edition of the score and parts of the Performing Version of the reconstructed *Finale* as recorded here was supported by the Bruckner Association of Upper Austria and numerous eminent Bruckner specialists all over the world. The authors have published a limited special edition of this score. Interested parties are directed to write to:

Gunnar Cohrs,  
Hamburger Straße 250  
28 205 Bremen, Germany.

## II.

### Notes for the Second CD Release of the Aufführungsfassung by Sonarte (B. G. Cohrs)<sup>3</sup>

#### ANTON BRUCKNERS NEUNTE SYMPHONIE ALS VERVOLLSTÄNDIGTES GANZES

##### Zur besonderen Problematik von Musikfragmenten

Die Musikgeschichte überliefert Fragmente aller Art. Manche sind reine Ideen-Notate, von vornherein nicht zur Ausarbeitung vorgesehen; manche sind bloße Studien; wiederum andere konnten aus biographischen Gründen nicht fertiggestellt werden, sei es, daß ihre Schöpfer sich Neuem zuwandten oder über der Arbeit verstarben. Weitere Torsi sind Reste von Werken, die einmal fertiggestellt waren, jedoch unvollständig überliefert wurden. Darf man sie von fremder Hand aufführbar machen? Versucht man, diese Frage zu beantworten, sollte man sich zunächst über ein grundlegendes Problem im Klaren sein: Damit Musik überhaupt real erklingen, real vorhanden sein kann, muß sie in Partitur gebracht sein, muß der Kompositionsvorgang abgeschlossen sein. Dieser Zwang führt zum einen dazu, daß musikalische Fragmente in der Kunstästhetik ein viel geringeres Ansehen haben als Torsi aller anderen Künste. Zum anderen hat dieser von großen Musikern zuweilen stark als Last empfundene Zwang, daß Musik fertiggestellt sein muß, in vielen Fällen dazu geführt, daß Werke, die zwar fertiggestellt wurden, dennoch nicht vollendet sind; übrigens im Deutschen ein sehr unpretentiöser Begriff: Wir sprechen von der Unvollendeten; die Engländer sind sehr viel nüchterner und nennen sie die "unfinished", die *unbeendete* Sinfonie. Im deutschen Begriff Vollendung ist nicht nur impliziert, daß da etwas zum Abschluß gebracht worden ist, sondern auch, daß es auf jeweils vollendete Weise zum Abschluß gebracht worden ist. Die Folge ist fast eine Hypostasierung eines Gegenstandes, der in der Sprache und in unserem begrifflichen Denken grober und radikaler ausfällt als in der Wirklichkeit. So formulierte es anschaulich der Dirigent und Musikwissenschaftler Peter Gülke, selbst prominenter Bearbeiter von Schuberts Sinfonieskizzen. Ob es grundsätzlich angemessen ist, eine Aufführungsfassung eines Fragmentes herzustellen, müßte allerdings jedesmal erneut bedacht und entschieden werden. Versuchen wir nun im Folgenden, dies anhand einiger grundsätzlicher Fragen hinsichtlich Bruckners letzter, unvollendet gebliebener Sinfonie zu klären.

---

<sup>3</sup> Anton Bruckner/ Symphony/ Nr. 9 d-moll/ mit Finale/ Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur/ Samale, Phillips, Mazzuca, Cohrs/ Neue Philharmonie Westfalen/ Johannes Wildner/ Sonarte. Recorded Schillertheater, Gelsenkirchen, 20, 21 April, 12 May 1998 by the Neue Philharmonie Westfalen under Johannes Wildner; released late 1998 by Sonarte, 2-CD set, SP13; CD-booklet (40 pp.) enclosed, comprising German original by B. G. Cohrs (verso pp.) and English translation by J. A. Phillips (recto pp.). For discussion see §3.4.11.

**Hat Bruckner beabsichtigt, das Fragment fertigzustellen?**

Es kann kein Zweifel daran bestehen, daß Bruckner seine Neunte mit einem groß angelegten Finalsatz beenden wollte. Jede dreisätzigige Aufführung ist deshalb, ungeachtet vorgeschobener Rechtfertigungs-ideologien, eine krasse Mißachtung seiner Absichten und letztlich pure Besserwisseri der Nachwelt: Bruckner hatte sogar ausdrücklich verfügt, man solle das 1884 beendete Te Deum als besten Notschluß verwenden, falls er nicht mehr lang genug leben werde, den instrumentalen Finalsatz zu beenden, damit die Sinfonie [“]mit einem Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott, dem ich so viel verdanke, endet[“]. Andererseits war die Idee eines möglichen Chorfinales von Anfang an integraler Bestandteil von Bruckners konzeptionellen Überlegungen. Seine letzten Chorwerke (“Vexilla Regis”; “Das deutsche Lied”; “150. Psalm”; “Helgoland”) dürften aber auch als mögliche Vorstudien zum geplanten Finale verstanden werden. Anders wäre Bruckners freudige Annahme dieser zahlreichen Gelegenheitsarbeiten im vollen Bewußtsein seiner sich verschlechternden Gesundheit kaum zu erklären. Noch als er im Mai 1895 die Ausarbeitung des instrumentalen Finales begann, ließ er sich mit dem Te Deum eine Hintertür offen.

Die Manuskripte lassen erkennen, daß es ihm stets möglich blieb, in kürzester Zeit aus dem bis dahin Fertigen eine instrumentale Überleitung zum Te Deum zu gestalten. Erst als er selbst einsah, daß er die Instrumentation des Finales wohl nicht mehr fertigstellen würde, verfügte er schließlich, man solle das Te Deum einfach so an die Sinfonie anhängen. Daß die Mehrzahl von Aufführungen der Neunten bis heute freilich ohne Te Deum stattfindet, hat unterschiedliche Gründe: Zum einen ist es für Veranstalter ein erheblicher zusätzlicher Kostenfaktor, für nur zwanzig Minuten einen Chor und Solisten zu beteiligen. Außerdem verfügt nicht jeder Konzertsaal über eine Orgel. Eine wesentliche Rolle spielen auch die Umstände der Uraufführung am 11. Februar 1903 in Wien. Ihr Dirigent Ferdinand Löwe arbeitete während der Proben die ersten drei Sätze so stark um, daß Bruckners Originalklang völlig verfälscht wurde. Im Programmtext zur Aufführung stand, er habe das Te Deum allein aus Pietät mit aufgenommen und setzte anschließend die bis heute so verhängnisvolle Empfehlung in die Welt, auch die ersten drei Sätze könnten als Ganzes überzeugen. Löwe hatte jedoch nicht bedacht, daß der verwendete Erstdruck des Te Deum so gut wie nicht vom Original abweicht. Man stelle sich nun einmal die Wirkung von Löwes wagnerisierender Bearbeitung der drei Sinfoniesätze gegenüber dem strengen Farbklang des originalbelassenen Te Deum vor! Leider ignorierte später auch Alfred Orel, Herausgeber der ersten kritischen Ausgabe der Neunten (Leipzig 1934), Bruckners Wunsch.

Hätte er das Te Deum als vierten Satz in Partitur und Stimmen aufgenommen, so hätte sich diese Praxis wahrscheinlich eingebürgert. Beethovens Neunte wird heute schließlich auch nicht mehr ohne Chorfinale aufgeführt, wie es im 19. Jahrhundert lange Brauch war.

**Exkurs: Über Bruckners Arbeitsweise**

Der Arbeitsprozeß an der neunten Sinfonie gestaltete sich, abgesehen von der langen Entstehungsdauer von neun Jahren, nicht wesentlich anders als bei ihren Vorgängerinnen: Zunächst formte Bruckner das thematische Material in Particell-Entwürfen aus. Es gibt bei ihm freilich keine durchgängigen Skizzen der Sätze, wie wir sie zum Beispiel von Schuberts unvollendeter h-moll Sinfonie (D 759) oder Mahlers Zehnter kennen:

In den Sonatensätzen beschränkte sich Bruckner darauf, die drei Themen zu entwerfen, die er stets als Hauptthema, Gesangsperiode und Unisono bezeichnete. Die einzelnen Teile eines Sonatensatzes nannte er erste und zweite Abteilung und meinte damit Exposition, ein aus Durchführung und Reprise verschmolzenes Ganzes sowie die Coda. In den langsamen Sätzen nannte er die letzte große Steigerungswelle, die stets mit charakteristischen Streicher-Figurationen umrankt ist, auch dritte Abteilung. Nur die erste Abteilung wurde in der Regel vollständig skizziert. Weitere Entwürfe finden wir stets nur noch zu signifikanten oder problematischen Einzelteilen, wie etwa den Beginn von Abschnitten, Überleitungen, harmonischen Verläufen und Stimmführungen. Nachdem sich Bruckner derart das Material zusammengestellt hatte, verließ er sich in dessen Durchführung, ganz wie in seinen gerühmten Orgelimpromvisationen, auf seine schöpferische Fantasie und komponierte gleich in die Partitur. Man darf freilich nicht den Fehlschluß ziehen, er habe seine Klangvorstellung allein von der Orgel her entwickelt, denn sonst hätte er Orgelsinfonien und nicht für Orchester komponiert. Er war im Gegenteil an einer beständigen Erweiterung seiner Klangfarbenpalette interessiert, an der Ausdrucksvielfalt, die ihm nur das Sinfonieorchester bot. So sind schon die Skizzen oft deutlich an bestimmte Instrumentalfarben gebunden: Bruckner-Forschern ist immer wieder aufgefallen, daß man allein aus einer skizzierten Linie schon ableiten konnte, für welches Instrument sie gedacht war, so einfühlsam komponierte Bruckner für Orchester. Weite Teile schrieb er direkt in die Partitur. Dabei ging er grundsätzlich vom Streichquintett als Fundament der Instrumentierung aus. Zunächst schrieb er die Streicherpartitur und einzelne, wichtige Bläserstimmen mit Bleistift nieder. Dabei verwandte er für die vorgesehene weitere Ausführung eine eigens entwickelte Kurzschrift mit Elementen aus der Generalbaß-Notation, Tonbuchstaben, Weisern, Sprüngen ("vi-de") und weiteren Zeichen. Anschließend fixierte er die vornotierten Stimmen mit Tinte. Systematisch wurden Holz und Blech blockweise instrumentiert. Die einzelnen Partiturbogen wurden fortlaufend durchnummeriert und hintereinander gelegt. Bruckner konnte so seine Klangvorstellungen noch bei der Ausarbeitung stets verfeinern. Freilich mußte er, wenn er signifikante Veränderungen vornahm, oft ganze Partiturblätter aussondern und durch neu geschriebene ersetzen. In einem letzten Arbeitsgang schließlich, den Bruckner nuancieren nannte, sah er das Geschriebene noch einmal durch und fügte sämtliche spieltechnische Anweisungen hinzu.

### **Wie verlief die Arbeit an der Neunten bis zum Abbruch?**

Nur zwei Tage nach Vollendung der Achten stürzte sich Bruckner in das neue Werk: Am 12. August 1887 begann er mit den Entwürfen für die erste Abteilung des ersten Satzes, die er im Particell bis Ende September schon vorläufig fertigstellte. Die Neunte sollte sein opus ultimum werden, eine letzte Synthese all seiner Errungenschaften. Schon zwischen 1876 und 1878 hatte Bruckner, bevor er die Partitur der Fünften abschloß, seine ersten vier Sinfonien grundlegend überarbeitet und auf den neuesten Stand gebracht. Ähnliches passierte nun noch einmal: Im Sinne tätiger Werkschau arbeitete Bruckner zwischen Oktober 1887 und April 1891 die erste, dritte und vierte Sinfonie erneut gründlich um, revidierte die neue Achte und sah sogar die annullierte d-moll-Sinfonie sowie die Zweite noch einmal durch. Die erhaltenen Daten in den Manuskripten zeigen freilich auch, daß Bruckner an der Neunten arbeitete, wann immer er konnte. So entstand der vollständige Particellentwurf von Scherzo und Trio bereits am 4. Januar 1889, im Umfeld von kompositionstechnischen Problemen, die ihn vier

Wochen später auch im Scherzo der Dritten beschäftigen sollten. Als er im Februar 1891 schließlich die Partiturausarbeitung der Neunten in Angriff nahm, hatte er schon weitgehende Vorstellungen von der Sinfonie als Ganzes entwickelt. Der Komponist Jean Louis Nicodé berichtet, Bruckner habe ihm bei einem Besuch im März 1891 aus allen vier Sätzen vorgespielt. Von März bis Juni 1892 kamen noch der "150. Psalm" und "Das deutsche Lied" dazwischen, doch am 14. Oktober 1892 schloß Bruckner die Ausarbeitung des Kopfsatzes ab. Gleich anschließend dürfte er den Scherzo-Hauptsatz begonnen und bis Ende Dezember fertiggestellt haben. Hier fehlen gesicherte Daten, doch immerhin begann er bereits am 2. Januar 1893 mit neuen Entwürfen zum Adagio und beendete am 27. Februar ein später wiederum verworfenes, neues Trio mit obligatem Bratschen-Solo. Die Adagioentwürfe legte er dann im April wieder beiseite, um den symphonischen Chor "Helgoland" zu komponieren. Nach dessen Fertigstellung am 28. August 1893 entschloß sich Bruckner, zunächst die ersten beiden Sätze ganz fertigzustellen und beendete das Nuancieren des Kopfsatzes am 23. Dezember, das Scherzo mit dem neu komponierten, letztgültigen Trio am 15. Februar 1894. Mit den Particell-Entwürfen zum Adagio hat Bruckner zwischen Februar und Juli 1894 furchtbar gerungen, wie die ganz unterschiedlichen Ausformungen des Themas zeigen. Zwischen August und November 1894 komponierte Bruckner in einer gewaltigen Kraftanstrengung die Partitur des Adagio. Die Folge war eine schwere Rippenfellentzündung, die ihn für ein halbes Jahr ans Bett fesselte und dem Tode so nahe brachte, daß man ihm im April 1895 schon die Sterbesakramente besorgte. Doch danach erholte sich Bruckner auffallend schnell.

Am 24. Mai 1895 zeigt Bruckners Kalender den Vermerk: "1. mal, Finale neue Scitze". Der Komponist arbeitete nun mit seiner ganzen, ihm noch verbliebenen Kraft am Finalsatz. In nur knapp drei Wochen war die erste Abteilung skizziert, nur wenig später mehrfach durchgearbeitet und instrumentiert. Am 16. Dezember 1895 war mit dem Beginn der Hauptthemenfuge bereits die Mitte der Partitur erreicht. Vom 19. bis 22. Mai 1896 entwarf er schließlich die wesentlichen Teile der Coda (Daten in den Manuskripten). Etwa zur gleichen Zeit erschien in Zeitungen in Linz und Wien ein Bericht, demzufolge Bruckner den Schlußsatz seiner 9. Sinfonie vollständig skizziert habe. Bis Juni 1896 dürfte er im ersten Stadium (Streicher in Tinte, einzelne Bläserverweise) ans Ende der Finale-Partitur gelangt sein. Spätere Daten zeigen ihn schließlich noch bei einer Erweiterung des Durchführungsbeginns, ein Eingriff in die strukturelle Balance, der nur Sinn macht, wenn die Ausmaße des ganzen Satzes schon sichtbar waren. Die übergroße Kraftanstrengung der vorläufigen Fertigstellung dürfte, wie bereits schon einmal Ende 1894, auch der Grund für die schwere Lungenentzündung gewesen sein, an der Bruckner im Sommer 1896 überraschend erkrankte. Davon erholte er sich zwar noch einmal körperlich und versuchte im August weiterzuarbeiten (letzte Daten in der Partitur); seine geistigen Kräfte erlahmten jedoch, und als er am 11. Oktober 1896 starb, war er weder zur Beendigung der Instrumentation von Holz und Blech (mit Ausnahme der fertiggestellten Exposition) noch zum letzten Arbeitsgang, dem Nuancieren, gekommen.

### **Wie kam es zur Fragmentierung der Neunten?**

Unglücklicherweise starb Bruckner an einem Sonntag nachmittag. Seine Wohnung am Belvedere-Schloss war der Öffentlichkeit gut zugänglich, und unter den flanierenden Wienern verbreitete sich die Nachricht wie ein Lauffeuer. Bevor das Sterbezimmer viel zu spät versiegelt werden konnte, hat-



ten sich schon, wie Bruckners letzter Arzt, Dr. Richard Heller, berichtete. Befugte und Unbefugte wie die Geier auf seinen Nachlaß gestürzt und zahlreiche Manuskripte gestohlen, darunter viele der im ganzen Raum verstreuten Bogen zum Finale. Die Nachlaßverwalter begingen Versäumnisse:

Es wurde keine Inventarliste aufgenommen, und erst eine Woche nach Bruckners Tod wurden die Manuskripte gesichtet. Der Bruckner-Jünger Joseph Schalk wurde laut Protokoll vom 18. Oktober damit beauftragt, den Zusammenhang dieser Fragmente zu erforschen. Es verzeichnet insgesamt noch 75 erhaltene Partiturbogen, die zum Teil in mehrfacher Ausfertigung von "1" bis "36" durchnummeriert waren. Joseph Schalk kam seiner Aufgabe jedoch nicht nach, und als er am 7. November 1900 starb, übernahm stillschweigend sein Bruder Franz die Manuskripte zum Finale. Im Jahr 1911 lieh der Bruckner-Biograph Max Auer für seine Arbeiten die Finale-Manuskripte von Schalk aus und untersuchte sie gründlich, leider jedoch ohne seine Ergebnisse zu dokumentieren. Etwas später begannen auch einige Manuskripte, die offenbar ursprünglich entwendet worden waren, nach und nach wieder aufzutauchen: Die Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek kaufte 1914 vier Bogen zum Finale von der Witwe des späten Bruckner-Jüngers Cyrill Hinais; 1916 schenkte Max Graf einen wichtigen Partiturbogen der Akademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst. Nach dem Tod Löwes im Jahr 1925 verkaufte seine Witwe Amalie Manuskripte zur Neunten an die Preußische Staatsbibliothek Berlin und die Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek. 1931 starb auch Franz Schalk; seine Witwe Lili verkaufte 1939 einen größeren Teil der Finale-Manuskripte an die Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. Unterdessen hatte Alfred Orel in der neu gegründeten Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe 1934 die ihm bekannten Entwürfe und Skizzen zur Neunten herausgegeben. Freilich war ihm der Bestand in der Preußischen Staatsbibliothek entgangen, der erst 1933 inventarisiert worden war. Die Kriegswirren brachten die Manuskripte weiter durcheinander: Der Berliner Bestand wurde 1944 nach Grüssau in Schlesien ausgelagert und tauchte erst Mitte der Siebziger Jahre in der Krakauer Jagiellonska-Bibliothek wieder auf. Heute sind Manuskripte zur Neunten weltweit verstreut und liegen in sechs Bibliotheken unter mehr als dreißig Signaturen sowie in Privatbesitz. Solche Autographen werden heute auf dem Markt zu hohen Preisen gehandelt.

### **Ist für eine glaubhafte Aufführungsfassung ausreichend Material erhalten?**

Wir wissen dank der philologischen Studien von John A. Phillips ziemlich genau, wie Bruckners Partitur des Finales zum Zeitpunkt seines Todes ausgesehen haben muß: Ein erhaltener Kuvertbogen und zahlreiche andere Indizien beweisen, daß die Instrumentation der Exposition wohl im wesentlichen bereits abgeschlossen war. Die etwa 220 Takte verteilten sich auf 13 Partiturbogen, die (unter Einschluß zweier Bogen "5a" und "5b") von "1" bis "12" durchgehend nummeriert waren. Davon erhalten sind noch die Bogen "2", "3" und "8" bis "12"; sie weisen in der Regel am Ende Bruckners eigenhändigen Vermerk "fertig" auf. Zusätzlich sind von der ganzen ersten Abteilung Particellskizzen, Satzverlaufsentwürfe und ausgeschiedene Partiturbogen früherer Arbeitsstadien erhalten. Die zweite Abteilung bietet ein ähnliches Bild. Freilich sind hier keine erhaltenen Partiturbogen mehr vollständig instrumentiert; in der Regel ist der Streichersatz mit Tinte fixiert, sind wichtige führende Stimmen und zahlreiche Hinweise zur Instrumentation eingetragen. Den Beginn der Durchführung hat Bruckner später erweitert; hier sind zwei Bogen erhalten, ein "13a" und

offensichtlicher "13b". Verloren sind wenigstens die Bogen "15" mit 16 Takten der Durchführung, "20" mit 16 Takten der Fugendurchführung, "25" mit 16 Takten der Reprise der Gesangsperiode, "28" mit wohl 24 Takten eines Steigerungszugs, sowie "31" mit 16 Takten der Reprise des Choralthemas, die dann in "32" unvermittelt abbricht. Hinweise in den Skizzen auf einen Bogen "36" und ein entsprechender Vermerk im Protokoll der Materialsichtung deuten jedoch daraufhin, daß bei Bruckners Tod mindestens noch vier weitere Bogen vorhanden gewesen sein müssen, die insgesamt wenigstens 64 Takte Musik enthalten haben dürften und zur Zeit unzugänglich sind. Die noch erhaltenen Particellskizzen zur Coda enthalten ihren Beginn—eine zweimal skizzierte Steigerung über das Eingangsmotiv in 24 Takten, verschiedene Entwürfe eines choralartigen Akkordanstiegs von acht Takten mit dem Vermerk "36. Bogen" sowie der abschließenden Kadenz von 16 Takten, die in einen für acht Takte fixierten Orgelpunkt auf dem Grundton ausläuft. Insgesamt sind also 56 Takte zur Coda erhalten—wohl im wesentlichen alles, was der Komponist für ihre Ausarbeitung brauchte. Darüber hinaus haben wir einen Hinweis Max Auers auf eine Überlagerung der Themen wie in der Achten Sinfonie, die wohl auch Platz in der Coda finden sollte. Schließlich wissen wir sogar entgegen eines weit verbreiteten Irrglaubens, daß der Schluß des Finales tatsächlich existiert haben muß, da Bruckner ihn seinem Arzt am Klavier vorgespielt hat! Dr. Heller überliefert in seinen Memoiren zunächst folgende Worte Bruckners: "Nun widme ich der Majestät aller Majestäten, dem lieben Gott, mein letztes Werk und hoffe, daß er mir noch so viel Zeit gönnen wird, es zu vollenden und meine Gabe gnädig aufnimmt. Ich habe deshalb vor, das Allelujah des zweiten Satzes mit aller Macht wieder im Finale zu bringen, damit die Sinfonie mit einem Lob und Preislied an den lieben Gott endet." Dann berichtet Heller weiter: "Und dann setzte er sich ans Klavier und spielte mir mit zitternden Händen, aber richtig und mit voller Kraft, Partien daraus vor. Oftmals habe ich bedauert, musikalisch nicht soweit gebildet zu sein, um einmal Gehörtes wiederspielen oder niederschreiben zu können, denn dann wäre es mir möglich gewesen, vielleicht den Schluß der neunten Sinfonie zu skizzieren." Bruckner wußte also ganz genau und sicher schon sehr früh, wie die Sinfonie enden sollte, nämlich mit einem Lobgesang an den lieben Gott, "mit aller Macht". Dazu wollte er, wie die Skizzen zeigen, wohl auf einem Orgelpunkt ein extra eingeführtes "Allelujah"-Thema verwenden. Wenn also auch im heute erhaltenen Material ein Schlußstrich nirgends dokumentiert ist, haben wir doch eine recht gute Vorstellung von der Gesamtgestalt des Finalsatzes und dem Aussehen seines Schlusses. Die gesamte Partitur hätte bis zum Satzende angesichts der erhaltenen Teile wohl bis zu 700 Takte enthalten, verteilt auf ca. 40 Partiturbogen. Davon wären dann heute 18 verloren, 6 davon vollständig instrumentiert, 12 mit zumindest fixiertem Streichersatz.

### **Nach welcher Methode ließ sich das Finale-Fragment vervollständigen?**

Die hier vorgestellte Aufführungsfassung ist aus einem höchst komplizierten Arbeitsprozess hervorgegangen; Nicola Samale, John Alan Phillips, Giuseppe Mazzuca und Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs, ein multinationales Team aus Komponisten, Dirigenten und Musikwissenschaftlern, sind seit 1983 damit beschäftigt. Ihre Zusammenarbeit schloß eine gründliche Untersuchung aller zugänglichen Manuskripte zur neunten Sinfonie ein, denn die Verwendung der Orel-Ausgabe allein erwies sich aufgrund vieler Fehler und Auslassungen als unzulänglich. Zahlreiche Vorläuferversionen wurden

beständig weiterentwickelt und optimiert, bis 1992 die gedruckte Partitur im Selbstverlag erschien. Ziel dieses "work in progress" ist es, das erhaltene Material in eine geschlossene, aufführbare Form zu bringen. Sie soll einen ungefähren Klangeindruck von Bruckners viersätzig angelegter Sinfonie ermöglichen, ohne jedoch—wie Peter Gülke es so treffend nannte—"draufloszubrucknern". Die Vervollständigungen von Mozarts Requiem oder Elgars dritte Sinfonie, die jüngst sehr erfolgreich von Anthony Payne aus den erhaltenen Entwürfen zu Ende komponiert wurden, kamen nicht ohne erhebliche kompositorische Zutaten aus. Es war aber bei Bruckner gar nicht nötig, soweit zu gehen, denn nur an wenigen Stellen sind überhaupt keine Vorarbeiten mehr erhalten. Für die meisten fragwürdigen Passagen liegen hinreichend Entwürfe und ausgesonderte Partiturbogen vor, die helfen, die Faktur mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit wiederherzustellen. Zusätzlich waren natürlich Ergänzungen der Instrumentation sowie Dynamik, Tempi und spieltechnischen Anweisungen erforderlich. Die hierbei verwendeten Techniken lassen sich am ehesten mit der Arbeit eines Kunstrestaurators vergleichen, der verlorene Teile einer Plastik oder eines Freskos anhand des Erhaltenen rekonstruiert.

Grundvoraussetzung sind Kenntnisse des musiktheoretischen Hintergrundes sowie der stilistischen Eigenheiten in Bruckners systematischem Kompositions- und Instrumentationsprozeß. Ein wesentlicher Erkenntnisgewinn zur grundlegenden Taktstruktur resultiert aus Bruckners Durchnumerierung der Takte jeder Periode sowie aus seiner akribischen Vorbereitung der Partiturbogen, die in der Regel mit vier Takten pro Seite vorbezeichnet wurden. Der allergrößte Teil des erhaltenen Materials ist also auf Bogen notiert, die 16 Takte Musik enthielten und von Bruckner fortlaufend durchnummeriert wurden. Alle unumgänglichen Ergänzungen der musikalischen Faktur sind durch ein behutsames Syntheseverfahren zustande gekommen, daß Analogien im Spätwerk nachspürt beziehungsweise von Bruckner bereits vorgefertigte Teile wie Bausteine verwendet. Dieses Syntheseverfahren konnte vielleicht nur bei Bruckner angewendet werden, der sich in seinem letzten Finalsatz noch einmal selbst um regelrecht wissenschaftliche Akribie im Komponieren bemühte. Bei einer Brahms-Sinfonie etwa wäre ein solches Verfahren wohl sinnlos; hier ist es jedoch möglich, wie Peter Gülke einmal formulierte, "dem Material abzuhorchen, wohin es will". Allein die Coda stellt Bearbeiter vor größere, doch nicht unlösbare Probleme. Eine Instrumentierung ihrer skizzierten Einleitung von 24 Takten ist noch vergleichsweise einfach. Ziel dieser Steigerung dürfte jene von Auer erwähnte Themenüberlagerung gewesen sein:

Die Faktur der Hauptthemen läßt dies ohne Weiteres zu, jedoch nicht mehr in verherrlichender Weise wie im Finale der Achten, denn der eigentliche Schluß der Neunten war ja überdies dem Lobgesang vorbehalten. Offenbar sollte sich eine neue Steigerung anschließen, die in die von Bruckner selbst entworfene breite Kadenzzone führte. Auch im Schlußabschnitt wurden lediglich Bruckners eigene Elemente konsequent zu Ende geführt: Die Streicherfigurationen, das "non confundar/Allelujah" in Ganzen und Halben, die Trompetentriolen am Schluß, die kontrapunktischen Verschachtelungen der Te Deum-Figur im Holz (von Bruckner vorgefertigt im Durchführungsteil des Finales); all dies findet sich im Material des Finales vorbereitet. Die Länge von 37 Takten entspricht genau der Schlußbausteine aller vorausgehenden Sätze. Nachkomponiert wären im ganzen Satz lediglich 8 Takte der Durchführung, 6 Takte der Hauptthemenfuge, 8 Takte der Reprise der Gesangsperiode, 16 Takte der Reprise des Choralthemas und 43 Takte der Coda, also insgesamt 81 der 687 Takte. Angesichts der stringenten Vorgaben von Bruckner selbst sollte man derartige Arbeiten

jedoch nicht als nachkomponiert im Sinne von dazu erfunden, sondern besser als synthetisiert bezeichnen. Im übrigen ist das Finale von Bruckners Neunter in seiner Gesamtheit noch immer weitaus weniger spekulativ als vergleichsweise Mahlers Zehnte: Dort waren weite Strecken ganzer Sätze noch im ersten Particellentwurf stecken geblieben, während es sich hier um eine Partitur handelt, die, auch wenn sie nur fragmentarisch überliefert und nicht fertig instrumentiert wurde, das Endergebnis einer langwierigen, höchst kritischen Konzeptionsarbeit ist. Man muß also nachdrücklich davor warnen, Bruckners sich bereits im Endstadium der Instrumentierung befindliche, teilweise sogar fertig orchestrierte Partitur als die Skizzen zum Finale zu bezeichnen, wie man es bis heute immer wieder in Texten offenbar unvollständig informierter Autoren lesen kann! Warum Dirigenten, die Aufführungsfassungen von Mahlers Zehnter oder Mozarts Requiem dirigiert haben, das Finale von Bruckners Neunter ablehnen, ließe sich von daher rein faktisch nicht nachvollziehen. Wer sich mit einer Aufführungsfassung nicht anfreunden kann, sollte zumindest Bruckners letzten Willen respektieren, das *Te Deum* der Sinfonie anzufügen. Jede Aufführung des dreisätzigen Fragmentes reduziert es jedoch letztlich zur "Beute des Geschmacks" (Adorno) all derer, die meinen, es besser zu wissen, als der Komponist selbst.

### **Die Neunte als viersätziges Ganzes**

Die Neunte ist Bruckners sinfonische letzte Beichte, gewidmet dem lieben Gott und damit gleichzeitig dem ungeheuren Erfolgsdruck ausgesetzt, ihm auch würdig sein zu müssen. Sie entstand also in dem ganz deutlichen Bewußtsein der allerletzten Möglichkeit, sich der Nachwelt mitteilen zu können. Dieser Anspruch verbindet sich mit der musikalischen Auslotung der "letzten Dinge vor dem Tod", der Frage nach Erlösung oder Verdammung. Paradoxaerweise stand für Bruckner die Antwort schon fest—die Heimkehr in den Schoß der Kirche (der Komponist ließ sich wie ein Kirchenfürst im Stift St. Florian bestatten): "... damit die Sinfonie mit einem Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott endet." Dabei heraus kam ein Werk, das in seinen unglaublichen tonalen Freiheiten und harmonischen Kühnheiten die Brücke ins 20. Jahrhundert schlägt, über Mahler bis hin zu Schönberg, Ligeti und Varese. Kühnheiten, die Bruckner im Finale ganz bewußt noch auf die Spitze trieb. Alles in der Neunten ist letztes Wort: Zu Beginn erklingt noch einmal der berühmte Urgrund. Danach folgen, wie in einer letzten Tonsatzvorlesung, noch einmal die Darlegung der Bestandteile von Harmonie (Terz und Quinte) und Melodie: Der Einzelton "d" fährt in seine chromatischen Nachbartöne "es" und "des" auseinander, wie eine weiße Billardkugel, die beim Anstoß in das Dreieck hineingetrieben wird. Entsprechend sind die Konsequenzen: Eine letzte harmonische Aufgabe durchmißt den ganzen Tonraum bis hin zur von "d" am weitesten entfernten Tonart, As-Dur. Zum letzten Mal folgt eine große Steigerungswelle, in der sich einzelne Elemente zusammenballen, aus denen Bruckner ein in seinem Schaffen einmalig machtvolles, letztes Hauptthema eines ersten Satzes baut. Danach noch einmal eine jener lyrischen Gesangsperioden, in der viele Stimmen zu einem kunstvollen Ganzen verwoben werden. Peter Gülke unterschied einmal treffend diese Hauptthemen als Ausdruck einer "musica mundane" göttlicher Allmacht von den Gesangsperioden, als einer "musica humana" mit menschlicher Wärme. Zum letzten Mal dann auch jenes dritte, Distanz vermittelnde Thema, das Bruckner selbst als "Unisono" bezeichnete. Es zitiert im Holz müde das "Agnus Dei"-Motiv der d-moll-Messe. Dem großen dreifachen Schlußhöhepunkt (reflektiert im Finale am Ende der Haupt-

themenfuge) folgt eine Durchführung, die im klassischen Sinn gar keine mehr ist, weil sie die Hauptthemen auf Eis legt, welche deshalb in der Reprise um so unvermittelter losbrechen können. Schließlich, nach einem resignierenden Choral, noch eine unvergeßliche Coda, die nach einem Inferno gellender Trompetenschreie und Dissonanzen in einer leeren Quinte endet, wie zwei wichtige Vorbilder Bruckners: Mozarts Requiem und Liszts Inferno-Satz aus der Dante-Sinfonie. Kein Zweifel also: Dies ist der Kopfsatz aller Kopfsätze!

Ähnlichen Anspruch haben auch alle folgenden Teile. Erstaunlich ist freilich, wie Bruckner in ihnen stets das Gegenteil von dem tut, was es zuvor gab: Der sonst relativ leichte Scherzosatz schlägt um in einen dämonischen Totentanz von Mahlerscher Wucht; das früher so irdische Trio, indem es nicht selten ländlerte und jodelte, wird ein überirdischer, entkörperter Elfenreigen. Nicht mehr von dieser Welt ist auch das Adagio, das permanent an seiner eigenen Zerstörung arbeitet: Der Beginn ein unbegleiteter Aufschrei der Violinen, dann fallen die Begleitstimmen ein, türmen sich auf zu einem Gebilde, dessen Höhepunkt die Trompeten mit einer Fanfare markieren, die schon die spätere Erlösung in sich birgt: Es ist jene Himmelsleiter, die wohl auch am Ende des Finales stehen sollte. Ihr folgen das aus Wagners Parsifal und Mendelssohns Reformationssinfonie wohlbekannte "Dresdner Amen", und dann eine Steigerung, die im Nachhinein nur vorgefertigt scheint, denn Bruckner greift am Ende des Satzes darauf zurück. Immer wieder zieht er neue Karten aus dem Ärmel; eine aufgetürmte, rauschende Klangstruktur mit Trompetenfanfaren; danach ein langer Tubenchoral, den Bruckner als "Abschied vom Leben" bezeichnete. Im weiteren Verlauf des Adagios erscheinen etliche weitere Abschnitte, in denen sich Bruckner an das Finale regelrecht herankomponiert. Die große Schlußsteigerung des Adagios gewinnt Bruckner nicht wie in früheren langsamen Sätzen aus dem Hauptthema, sondern aus dem schwermütigen zweiten Thema, über feierlichen Tannhäuser-Triolen (wie in der Coda des ersten Satzes) schwingt sich diese Musik zu einer machtvollen Klangsäule auf, die aus sieben Tönen gebaut ist; ein Elementarereignis, das es in dieser Form in der Musikgeschichte bis dahin nicht gegeben hat und erst 20 Jahre später von Gustav Mahler in seiner unvollendeten Zehnten wieder aufgegriffen werden sollte. Auch diese Musik wollte Bruckner, wie die Entwürfe nahelegen, in der Coda des Finales wieder aufgreifen. Noch der Abgesang des Adagios ist gänzlich neu: Der Satz wiederholt zunächst die Musik vom Anfang, so, als ob gar nichts geschehen wäre. Doch dann löst sich die Musik immer mehr auf. Zitate aus anderen Werken treten in den Vordergrund: Das "miserere" der d-moll-Messe, die "Adagiothemen" der siebten und achten Sinfonie, letzteres freilich zugleich eine Erinnerung an den allerersten, längst verworfenen Ur-Entwurf des Adagiothemas der Neunten. Und darüber ein dahinfließendes Glockengeläut der Streicher, wie eine feierliche Segnung.

Wie ließe sich all dies in einem Finalsatz noch übertreffen? Bruckner findet den Ausweg aus diesem Dilemma in der letzten Befreiung vom selbst vorgegebenen Schema und gestaltet einen Satz, der alle vorausgegangenen negiert. Die Finalsätze der früheren Sinfonien waren stets daran gescheitert, im Grunde genommen nur ins Monumentale überhöhte Neuaufgüsse der Kopfsätze zu sein. Doch hier findet Bruckner zu einer Form, die zwar vom Sonatenmodell ausgeht, mit all ihren Freiheiten und Neuerungen jedoch eher einer Orgelfantasie entspricht, wie man sie von Bach, Buxtehude und viel später wieder von Max Reger her kennt. Kaum ein Symphoniesatz Bruckner ließe

sich besser für Orgel bearbeiten als dieses Finale. Das machtvoll daherschreitende Hauptthema im Tutti-Unisono entzieht sich durch seine Wiederholungen jeder Durchführbarkeit. Zugleich durchmißt es in fallenden Undezimakkord-Durchschreitungen das ganze Spektrum der chromatischen Töne und erhebt damit einen allumfassenden Anspruch, ganz wie etwa das durch alle damals bekannten Tonarten wandernde letzte "Amen" der Marienvesper von Monteverdi. Bruckner wollte, wie überliefert ist, an den Pforten der Ewigkeit rütteln. Die Gesangsperiode ist im tiefen Kontrast karger und leiser Streicher-Linien nurmehr ein Negativ-Image des Hauptthemas. Die sonst übliche Singseligkeit ist in resignierende Trostlosigkeit umgeschlagen, die an Schuberts Winterreise denken läßt. Alle erhaltenen reichen Vorarbeiten und Frühstadien dieser Passagen zeigen übrigens, daß Bruckner diese Kontraste ganz bewußt immer mehr verschärft hat: In insgesamt fünf in Partitur erhaltenen Anläufen zum Hauptthema wurde die motorische Entwicklung vom Beginn her immer drastischer gestrafft; zugleich wurde die anfangs verhältnismäßig üppige Instrumentierung so weit ausgedünnt, bis nur noch Essenz übrig blieb. Auch im Verlauf der Gesangsperiode wurden vormals aufgefütterte Texturen in Folgeversionen stark reduziert. Beide Themen haben den monoton wiederholten punktierten Rhythmus gemeinsam, der in seiner ostinaten Besessenheit wiederum an ein wesentliches Element der Orgeltoccata denken läßt.

Um so unvergeßlicher ist die Wirkung des dritten Themas: Nach einer hörbar aus dem Adagio abgeleiteten Steigerung feiert der "Abschied vom Leben" Auferstehung. Also ein drittes Thema, das diesmal im Gegensatz zur Gesangsperiode kein karges Doppelunisono wie etwa in der Achten Sinfonie mehr ist, sondern pure, harmonische Energie im strahlenden Blech, begleitet von lodernen Streicherfigurationen aus Vierteln und Achteltriolen. In seiner Lebensbejahung erinnert dieser monumentale Choral der Eingeweihte am Finale schon immer am meisten begeistert hat an die Hauptthemen aus Carl Nielsens "Unauslöschlicher" und Richard Strauß' Alpensinfonie. Am zunächst noch resignierenden Ende der Exposition erscheint in der Flöte leise das berühmte Quart-Quint-Motiv aus dem Te Deum. Daraus sind wesentliche Teile der Durchführung gebaut, ein formales Indiz dafür, daß dies Motiv wohl auch in der Coda eine zentrale Rolle spielen sollte. Dann folgt eine große Fuge, die aus Elementen des Hauptthemas gebaut ist. Zugleich spielen Zitate wiederum eine immer größere Rolle. In der Fugendurchführung klingt hörbar der erste Satz aus Beethovens Neunter an, und in dem machtvoll gesteigerten Epilog defiliert eine ganze Parade vorbei: Bachs Toccata d-moll (eins der wenigen Werke anderer, die Bruckner auf der Orgel spielte), das eigene "non confundar", Finale der Sechsten und "Te deum laudamus" verschmelzen mit dem Finale-Hauptthema zu einer ehernen Legierung. Ganz neu ist hier die Einführung eines Epilogthemas, das direkt aus der Triole des Hauptthemas der Sinfonie gewonnen ist. Die Gesangsperiode ist in der Reprise noch reichhaltiger gestaltet: Gegen Ende tritt sogar noch eine ausführliche Anspielung auf den Osterchoral "Christ ist erstanden" hinzu. Nach der Reprise des Choralthemas, verbunden nun mit der prägnanten Streicherfigur des Te Deum, greift Bruckner dieses Epilogthema wieder auf; es sollte wohl die Wiederkehr des Hauptthemas aus dem ersten Satz vorbereiten und so den Kreis schließen. Angekündigt wird es durch Triolen in den Trompeten, die sinnigerweise das "Lumen de lumine" der d-moll-Messe intonieren, ein Selbstzitat, das die letzte Apotheose schon erahnt.

Es ist bewundernswert, wie Bruckner bis hierher alle vorausgehenden Entwicklungen zu Ende führt. Noch die aus den Skizzen erkennbaren Konturen der Coda zeigen diese Stringenz: Ihre Einleitung greift das Anfangsmotiv in Umkehr auf; die Harmonik bildet ein verwickeltes Knäuel aus Tritonus-Sequenzen, die die Strebung von “d” nach “As” vom Beginn der Sinfonie noch einmal auf den Punkt bringen. Ein Kern wie die vermutete Themenüberlagerung wäre die logische Konsequenz einer solchen Steigerung, denn das chromatische Vierton-Abstiegsmotiv der Oboen greift sowohl auf eine Zelle des Kopfsatz-Hauptthemas zurück, wie auch auf die kurze *accelerando*-Überleitung zur Hauptthemenfuge im Finale. Auch aus diesem Grund verwendeten die Bearbeiter für die Themenüberlagerung diese Gestalt des Finales, das sich nun kontrapunktisch perfekt mit den anderen zusammenfügen läßt. Danach ließen sie letztmalig das Choralthema folgen, gewonnen aus Bruckners leisem, vorahnungsvollen Streicherchoral in der Reprise der Gesangsperiode.

Die allerletzte Kadenzzone korrespondiert in der hier vorgelegten Ausarbeitung der Skizze nicht nur mit dem Höhepunkt des Adagios und der Coda des ersten Satzes. Sie entspricht harmonisch auch genau der entsprechenden Passage des Finales in Beethovens Neunter, die dort zu den Worten “überm Sternenzelt muß ein lieber Vater wohnen” erklingt (s. dort, T. 749–762), eine rührende letzte Referenz, die zugleich viel über die außermusikalische Dimension von Bruckners Schwanengesang aussagt! Erst im letzten Moment fährt der dominante Baßton “a” wieder in seine Nebentöne “gis” und “b” auseinander; danach folgt unvermittelt der letzte skizzierte Orgelpunkt auf “d”, über den sich dann wohl nur noch der Lobgesang türmen sollte: Musikalische Entsprechung letzter Erkenntnis, daß göttliche Gnade einfach ist und nicht erst errungen oder verdient werden muß?

*Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs*

[Concluding the programme booklet:]

### **Quellenhinweise**

John A. Phillips:

Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Sinfonie Anton Bruckners. In: *Bruckner-Jahrbuch* 1989/90. S. 115–204 (Studie mit ausführlichen Notenbeispielen)

IX. Sinfonie d-moll: Finale (unvollendet), vorgelegt von John A. Phillips (Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe)

a) Rekonstruktion der Autographpartitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen

b) Faksimile-Ausgabe

c) Vorführungsfassung der Fragmente für Orchester und Sprecher (Partitur und Stimmen / vorr. 1999)  
[= Dokumentation]

d) Studienband zum 4. Satz (vorr. 1999)

Zu Band IX/2. Satz:

Scherzo und Trio: Entwürfe/älteres Trio mit Viola-Solo (1893): Autographpartitur [und] Studienband, vorgelegt von Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs (Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe, Wien 1998)

---

Zwei nachgelassene Trios zum Scherzo der IX. Sinfonie

Aufführungsfassung von Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs, Partitur und Stimmen (Doblinger, Wien 1998)

Bezug aller Bände:

Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Dorotheergasse 10, A-1010 Wien

Studienpartitur der Aufführungsfassung von Samale–Phillips–Cohrs–Mazzuca (1992) käuflich, Stimmen leihweise erhältlich. Bezug bei Benjamin G. Cohrs, der die Belange der Autorengemeinschaft vertritt. Seine aktuelle Adresse wird vom Musikwissenschaftlichen Verlag gern mitgeteilt.

### **AUFRUF**

Wem auch immer etwas über den Verbleib von bislang unbekanntem Bruckner-Manuskripten bekannt ist, wird um Mitteilung an die genannte Adresse gebeten. Alle Angaben werden selbstverständlich streng vertraulich behandelt. Wir appellieren eindringlich an Autographensammler, zumindest Kopien oder Fotografien zur wissenschaftlichen Auswertung zur Verfügung zu stellen.

---



### III.

#### **Text Spoken at the Premiere of the Dokumentation, November 2000**

**(Nikolaus Harnoncourt)<sup>4</sup>**

**M**EINE Damen und Herren!

Zum ersten Teil dieses Abends sollte ich Ihnen, glaube ich, einige Anmerkungen machen.

Es handelt sich um das Finale der Neunten Sinfonie von Bruckner. Von diesem Finale hat man bisher gedacht, gibt es nur einige unzusammenhängende, wirre Skizzen. Man hat sogar gemeint, Bruckner wäre schon so krank gewesen, daß er keinen vernünftigen musikalischen Gedanken mehr zustande gebracht hätte. Inzwischen hat sich's herausgestellt, daß aber doch sehr vieles da ist; daß überhaupt keine Rede davon ist, das Bruckner verwirrt gewesen sein soll. Die letzten Töne, die er geschrieben hat, noch als Schwerkranker, sind genauso geradlinig und sinnvoll wie die Töne, die er 20 Jahre vorher komponiert hat.

Erhalten sind viele Seiten kompletter Partitur. Dann sind viele Seiten von sogenannten Satzverlaufsentwürfen vorhanden, da gibt es ein oder zwei Stimmen, die durchgehen; die übrigen Zeilen sind leer. Und dann gibt es viele Seiten von Particellskizzen. Das sind zweizeilige, manchmal auch dreizeilige Entwürfe, die dazu dienen, sich das am Klavier vorzuspielen. Und aus diesen vorhandenen Quellen konnte man praktisch den ganzen Satz überblicken.

Was jetzt für diese Aufführung gemacht wurde, ist, an ganz wenigen Stellen, wo es überhaupt keinen Zweifel gibt, welche Töne welches Instrument spielt, diese Töne zu ergänzen. Das ist sehr, sehr wenig. Es ist praktisch nichts wirklich hinzugefügt worden. Kompositorisch ist kein Ton hinzugefügt worden. Das, was fehlt, das fehlt, und damit müssen wir uns abfinden. Es gibt auch viele Stellen, wo zum Beispiel das Streichorchester komplett ist, die Bläserstimmen aber nicht. Das spielen wir so, wie es dasteht. Das heißt: Wir spielen den Satz überhaupt nicht konzertmäßig. Sie dürfen sich jetzt kein Konzert erwarten—wahrscheinlich wäre Bruckner gar nicht einverstanden, daß wir das machen—, sondern wir laden Sie ein, mit unserer eigenen Neugier, mit der wir an diese Sache herangegangen sind, ein Werk von Bruckner zu sehen. Was kann er sich da vorgestellt haben? Wie könnte das geworden sein? Das hat uns Musiker wirklich brennend interessiert.

Vielleicht noch eine Bemerkung vom Standpunkt der Musiker: Die Musiker vor 100 Jahren, die Bruckners Werke sozusagen vom Blatt zum ersten Mal gespielt haben, haben die durchweg abgelehnt. Die haben gesagt, soetwas kann man nicht spielen. Und wir haben ein ganz ähnliches Gefühl gehabt,

---

<sup>4</sup> Commentary given (spoken freely, not read) by Nikolaus Harnoncourt at the premiere performances of the Dokumentation des Finale-Fragments (ed. Phillips), performed by Wiener Symphoniker under Harnoncourt, 13–14 November 1999, as first half of a concert, the second of which comprised the first three movements of the Ninth. Text transcribed from ÖRF tapes by B. G. Cohrs and used by his kind agreement; comments in square brackets by Cohrs and the present writer. . For discussion see §3.4.12.

wie wir diesen Satz zum ersten Mal gespielt haben vor ein paar Tagen. Wir spielen da Musik von Bruckner vom Blatt, und unser Gefühl erstmal: Sowas kann man nicht spielen. Es hat sich noch nicht abgeschliffen, da ist noch keine Bekanntheit da, und die Geradlinigkeit und die absolute Strenge der Komposition—bei Bruckner gibt es nichts, wenn er in dieser Weise komponieren will, dann komponiert er in dieser Weise, und da hat jeder Ton seinen Platz. Diese Geradlinigkeit hat etwas Erschreckendes, und es ist ein sehr eigenartiges Gefühl, wenn man nach 100 Jahren soetwas erleben kann, wie es die Musiker vor 100 Jahren erleben konnten. Sie werden jetzt eingeladen, das mitzumachen.

Es gibt von diesem Satz vier Fragmente. Zwischen diesen Fragmenten fehlen ein oder zwei Partiturseiten; das sind sogar zum Teil Seiten, die seinerzeit existiert haben. Weil Bruckner sie durchnummeriert hat, und weil er die Takte durchnummeriert hat, kann man ganz genau sehen, was fehlt. Die wurden damals von liebevollen Andenkenjägern an sich genommen, und ich würde Sie sehr einladen: Schauen Sie nach zu Haus! [*Gelächter*] Bei Schubert weiß man, daß man Sauerkraut in seine Manuskripte eingewickelt hat, aber bei diesen Manuskripten würde ich sagen, wurde nichts damit eingewickelt. Die liegen noch in Ihren Biedermaier-Kommoden, und vielleicht weiß man sogar, daß es von Bruckner ist und macht jeden Abend eine kleine Andacht davor! Aber ich würde Sie bitten: Schauen Sie nach! Die Stücke sind vorhanden. Es sind ein paar Seiten; es wäre sehr interessant, wenn wir die noch hätten. Also das war nur eine kleine Nebenbemerkung.

In diesem ersten Fragment hören Sie die Einleitung, ungefähr 50 Takte, dann das erste große Thema, voll ausinstrumentiert, dann die sogenannte Gesangsperiode, das zweite Thema, und das ist erstmal etwas befremdend, weil die normalerweise bei Bruckner harmonisch sehr reich ist. Die ist in diesem Fall außerordentlich spartanisch. Das ist aber so komponiert, und es sind in den Bläserstimmen überall Pausen notiert. Später, wenn sich das Ganze harmonisch auffächert, dort fehlen leider die Bläserstimmen, das werden Sie hören. Dann gibt es einen Übergang, und das dritte Thema ist ein großer Choral. Der Anfang der Durchführung ist auch noch vorhanden, und dann brechen wir ab, weil es einfach keine Noten mehr gibt. Ich werde Ihnen dann sagen, wie es weitergeht.

[folgt Fragment I: T. 1–278]

An dieser Stelle reißt es ab. Damit sie ein bisschen erkennen, was für Probleme man hat, wenn man so etwas studiert, möchte ich Ihnen eine Stelle von fünf Takten dreimal vorspielen, die wir gerade eben gespielt haben. Da sind die beiden Trompetenstimmen so, daß jeder erstmal sagt: Das muß falsch sein! Dann sehen wir uns die Quellen an und finden, es könnte falsch sein. Was könnte richtig sein? Es gibt eine Möglichkeit: Sie spielen in Nonen; sie spielen im Einklang—dann müßte man nur einen Ton als nicht ganz genau notiert sehen—; oder sie spielen an der einen Stelle in Nonen und an der anderen im Einklang. Wir spielen zuerst nochmal das vor, was wir jetzt gespielt haben. Dann spielen wir Ihnen die Einklang-Lösung, also die, die man damals wahrscheinlich gewählt hätte, um die Steine, die einem Bruckner in den Weg gelegt hat, auszuheben. Und dann spielen wir genau das, was eigentlich in den Noten steht, und was wir nicht gewagt haben zu spielen, was aber möglicherweise, je länger wir es spielen, umso eher, glaube ich, es doch richtig ist.

[folgt Musikbeispiel: T. 257–263 mit geänderten Stimmführung in den Trompeten]

Die Überlegungen, die dazu anzustellen wären, fallen für mich alle unter das Motto der absoluten künstlerischen Geradheit. Da gibt es keine Seitenwege, kein Sich-Beugen. Das ist gerade. Und das ist auch der Grund, weshalb die Kapellmeister zu Bruckners Zeit gesagt haben, so kann man die Stücke nicht aufführen. Und die wurden ja alle bearbeitet und verändert. Bruckner sagt: Macht's was ihr wollt, wenn es nur gespielt wird. Aber er hat keinen Ton in seinen Partituren verändert. In den Partituren der Kapellmeister sind diese Bearbeitungen zu sehen; die werden jetzt ja auch wieder gedruckt, aber in Bruckners Partituren gibt es keine Korrekturen. Er ist seinen Weg gegangen und hat gewußt: Das geht vorbei, und in 100 Jahren spielen die das wieder, was ich komponiert habe. [*Gelächter*]

Wir gehen jetzt weiter—diese acht Takte sind jetzt ein bisschen länger geworden—mitten in der Durchführung. Wie das gegangen wäre können wir nicht sagen, denn es beginnt der nächste Bogen, von dem wir jetzt spielen, in Ges-Dur. Und wie Bruckner da hingekommen wäre, kann man nur rätseln. Dann geht es unvermittelt in die Exposition einer Fuge. Und diese Fuge ist von einer Sperrigkeit und Wildheit geradezu, wie ich sie auch bei Fugen bei Bruckner nie gesehen habe. Und in der Exposition gibt es eine Stelle, eine Engführung, in der plötzlich das viertaktige Thema zu einem dreitaktigen Thema schrumpft und dadurch eine Explosivkraft entwickelt, die einen nur staunen lassen. Leider reißt auch die Fuge, die ziemlich komplett instrumentiert ist, plötzlich ab.

[folgt Fragment II: T. 279–342]

Der folgende Partiturbogen hat existiert. Das weiß man ganz sicher aufgrund dieser Numerierungen. Also, nach dieser kurzen Lücke von acht oder 16 Takten gehts weiter in der Fuge auf den original voll instrumentierten Höhepunkt der Fuge hin. Danach ist ein ungewöhnlicher Wehr-Abbruch, ein Riß quasi im Werk, der auch so komponiert ist, wie wir ihn spielen. Da fehlt nichts, das ist so komponiert, dieser jähe Riß, und danach die Reprise des zweiten Themas. Das ist so komponiert, wie Sie's hören werden. Danach in der Reprise der Gesangsperiode, des zweiten Themas, da fehlen wahrscheinlich große Partien der Bläser. Diesen Teil spielen wir jetzt im Zusammenhang, dann mache ich wieder eine kleine Erklärung.

[folgt Fragment III: T. 343–478]

Sie entschuldigen: Es ist nicht so einfach, bei so einem Stück zwischen dem Musikmachen zu sprechen. Das ist wirklich nicht einfach. Das geht einem echt unter die Haut, diese Musik, und dann soll ich Ihnen da was vorquatschen. Also, an dieser Stelle ist die Reprise des zweiten Themas zu Ende. Wieder fehlt ein Abschnitt. Jetzt gibt es einen Übergang, der zur Choralreprise führt, auch da fehlen 16 Takte. Diese 16 Takte werde ich nicht mich umdrehen, sondern machen wir einfach eine kleine Stille, und spielen weiter, bis zum Ende. Es ist klar, daß gegen Ende des Stückes es immer weniger gibt; das ist immer weniger ausgeführt. Zum Schluß gibt es das große Horn-Motiv, das wir

---

schon gehört haben, und das in die Coda hineingeführt hätte. Man spürt auch genau: Das führt irgendwo hin, und jetzt wäre die Coda—von der Coda weiß man, daß Bruckner davon gesprochen hat, und es gibt auch einige Skizzen, die wir aber nicht spielen wollen. Das war eine Kathedrale von einem Abschluß, mit dem er sein sinfonisches Werk nun beenden wollte, und in dem er fünf oder sechs Themen auch aus der Fünften, Siebten und Achten Sinfonie übereinanderschichten wollte zu einem wirklich unglaublichen Gebäude. Leider fehlt das wirklich. Was wir jetzt spielen, ist das letzte, was er in seinem Leben geschrieben hat.

[folgt Fragment IV: T. 479–510; dann nach kurzer Pause T. 511–526]

---

## IV.

### Notes for the Bremen Performances of the Aufführungsfassung, March 2000 (Eva Pintér)<sup>5</sup>

#### ANTON BRUCKNER—NEUNTE SYMPHONIE D-MOLL

“Sehen Sie, nun habe ich bereits zwei irdischen Majestäten Symphonien gewidmet, dem armen König Ludwig und unserem erlauchten Kaiser als die höchste irdische Majestät, die ich erkenne, und nun widme ich der Majestät aller Majestäten, dem lieben Gott mein letztes Werk und hoffe, daß er mir noch so viel Zeit gönnen wird, es zu vollenden und meine Gabe gnädig aufnimmt.”

**K**URZ nach der Vollendung seiner Achten Symphonie begann Anton Bruckner mit dem Komponieren seiner Neunten: die ersten Entwürfe stammen vom August 1887. Die Arbeit zog sich über lange Jahre hin, denn sie wurde immer wieder durch Bruckners Revisionsarbeiten an seinen früheren Symphonien sowie durch das Komponieren neuer Werke (“150. Psalm” und “Das deutsche Lied”, beide 1892, sowie “Helgoland”, 1893) unterbrochen. Ende 1893 war der 1. Satz fertig, im Februar des darauffolgenden Jahres auch das Scherzo—dessen Trio Bruckner dreimal (!) neu komponierte—, und im November 1894 war auch der langsame Satz vollendet. Für den 70jährigen Bruckner war dies eine enorme Anstrengung, die zu einer schweren Krankheit führte; doch am 24. Mai 1895 vermerkte er “neue Scitze” für das Finale der Symphonie und versuchte mit all seiner Kraft, den gewaltigen Satz fertig zu schreiben. Es gelang ihm nicht: am 11. Oktober 1896 verstarb er, ohne den letzten Satz seiner Neunten beenden zu können.

Die lange Entstehungszeit könnte—neben anderweitigen Arbeiten—auch mit einer gewissen “Scheu” Bruckners erklärt werden, ausgerechnet eine *Neunte* Symphonie zu schreiben: er soll einmal gesagt haben, “Ich mag die Neunte gar nicht anfangen, denn auch Beethoven machte mit der Neunten den Abschluß seines Lebens”. (Auch Gustav Mahler hatte übrigens ganz ähnliche Gedanken, deshalb komponierte er nach seiner Achten Symphonie—ein kleiner “Trick”—sein im Untertitel als Symphonie bezeichnetes “Lied von der Erde”.) Doch die Äußerung Bruckners sollte keineswegs als Aberglaube abgewertet werden; vielmehr zeugt sie von einem ganz besonderen Anspruch, gerade mit einer Neunten” die “Krönung” des eignen symphonischen Schaffens zu erreichen—in diesem Zusammenhang ist auch die oben zitierte Widmung seines Werkes “dem lieben Gott”, einer unübertrefflichen, endgültigen und letzten Instanz, zu sehen, indem die Widmung quasi als “Trägerin”

---

<sup>5</sup> Performance of Ninth Symphony with AF of Finale, preceded by Wolfgang Rihm, *Im Anfang*, by the Philharmonisches Staatsorchester Bremen under Günter Neuhold, 13–14 March 2000; copy of programme text supplied courtesy of B. G. Cohrs. . For discussion see §3.4.11.

der gedanklichen Konzeption der ganzen Symphonie erscheint. Der romantische Begriff "Programm" sollte dabei vermieden werden, denn es handelt sich keineswegs um eine literarische oder etwa durch ein Kunstwerk inspirierte, inhaltliche Vorlage eines Werkes (wie etwa bei den programmatischen Kompositionen eines Hector Berlioz, Franz Liszt oder später eines Richard Strauss), sondern im eine primär "spirituelle" Denkweise, die die vier Sätze der Symphonie gedanklich und musikalisch zwingend und voneinander untrennbar zusammenfaßt.

Deshalb bedarf es einer Erklärung, warum die Neunte von Bruckner erst—und nur—aufgrund ihrer viersätzigen Struktur zu betrachten ist, auch wenn das Finale unvollendet blieb. Verschiedene Äußerungen von Bruckner deuten unmißverständlich daraufhin, daß er seine Symphonie viersätzig konzipierte. Als er seinem behandelnden Arzt Dr. Richard Heller alle vier Sätze des Werkes am Klavier vorgespielt haben soll (das heißt, das Finale existierte schon damals in seiner Grundkonzeption!), sprach er nicht nur von der oben erwähnten Widmung seines Werkes, sondern er sagte, er beabsichtigte, "die Symphonie mit einem Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott" zu beenden. Am 12. November 1894, in seiner letzten Universitätsvorlesung sagte wiederum: "Sollte ich vor der Volendung der Symphonie sterben, so muß mein Te Deum dann als 4. Satz dieser Symphonie verwendet werden. Ich habe es schon so bestimmt und eingerichtet."

Aufgrund des vorhandenen Materials des Finalsatzes—der ja auf das "Te Deum" Bezug nimmt (s. unten)—ist dieser Vorschlag Bruckners nur allzu verständlich: sollte er das Finale nicht beenden können, so soll eben jenes Werk quasi als Finalsatz der Symphonie dienen, das eine ähnliche "Aussage", nämlich ein "Lob- und Preislied" zu vermitteln vermag. Paradoxerweise fingen hier jene Mißverständnisse und Legenden um die Neunte Symphonie an, die sich bis heute hartnäckig behaupten, Bruckners Vorschlag vom Hinzufügen des "Te Deum" wurde nämlich eben nicht als durchaus "praktische" Lösung für eine Aufführung betrachtet, sondern, im Gegenteil, als "Beweis" dafür, daß die drei vollendeten Sätze der Symphonie durch das "Te Deum" lediglich ein "Anhängsel" aufgrund des Zusammenfügens zweier "intakter" Werke erhalten.

Der unheilvolle Weg in der Rezeptionsgeschichte der Neunten von Bruckner begann schon am 11. Februar 1903 in Wien, als Ferdinand Löwe die Komposition zur "Uraufführung" brachte—mit vielen, befremdenden Retouchen in der Instrumentierung und mit der Bemerkung, daß er das "Te Deum" nur "aus Pietät für den Wunsch des Meisters" hinzugefügt habe. Und, was sich auf die Rezeptionsgeschichte der Neunten noch entscheidender, ja verheerender auswirkte, mit der weiteren Bemerkung, Aufführungen seien "ohne einen solchen Schluß durchaus berechtigt, und dies um so eher, als das Werk in der vorliegenden Form sehr wohl als ein Ganzes zu wirken vermag". So ist es kein Wunder, daß die Aufführung am 2. April 1932 in München unter der Leitung von Siegmund von Hausegger als "erste authentische Aufführung in die Bruckner-Rezeptionsgeschichte einging, obwohl sie lediglich die ersten drei Sätze zum Erklingen brachte. Ästhetisch-musikalische wie auch philologische "Interpretationen" trugen seither dazu bei, im dritten Satz der Neunten einen endgültigen "Abschluß" zu sehen, nach dem es keine "richtige" Fortsetzung geben könne. Vor der Erörterung des Finales sollen also zunächst die ersten drei Sätze beschrieben werden.

Die Angabe "Feierlich, misterioso" wie auch die gewaltigen Dimensionen sind bezeichnend für den Eröffnungssatz. Über einem 18 Takte langen Orgelpunkt auf "d" (dem Grundton des Werkes), einer düster-geheimnisvollen Aura, erklingt in den Hörnern eine motivische "Urzelle", die sowohl die Tonart d-moll beschreibt als auch die unbändige, ja explosive Energie des Hauptthemas antizipiert (bei solchen Themen wird es verständlich, warum bei Bruckner Musik das Attribut "gotisch" als Bezeichnung für eine schwindelerregend steil emporragende "Bauart" verwendet wurde).

Die Grundideen der Symphonie sind hier schon im Keime vorgestellt: die Entstehung der Motive aus "Ur-Segmenten", die Bevorzugung einer drängenden, mitunter unbarmherzig vorantreibenden punktierten Rhythmik wie auch eine enorm weitgespannte Gestik, die nicht nur im Hauptthema des I. Satzes einen großen Ambitus beschreitet. Das Seitenthema—mit Bruckners Worten die "Gesangsperiode"—erklingt in A-Dur und bringt eine entspannt-kantabile Melodie voller breiter, gefühlvoller Gesten; es wird von einem dritten, marschartigen Thema gefolgt. Bruckner nannte die Exposition seiner Sonatensätze "erste Abteilung"; der zweiten Abteilung gehörten Durchführung, Reprise und Coda an. Wie sehr letztere Formabschnitte miteinander "verschmolzen" sind, zeigt sich im Eröffnungssatz der Neunten, wo die Durchführung relativ knapp gehalten wird, während die Reprise die Themen in einer variiert-weiterentwickelten Gestalt bringt; danach folgt eine Coda, die ihre punktierte Rhythmik so hartnäckig und unaufhaltsam bis zu einer beinahe katastrophischen Stimmung vorwärtstreibt, daß das Ende des Satzes wie ein gequälter Aufschrei erklingt.

Das Scherzo steht in traditioneller Dacapo-Form (der Hauptteil wird nach dem Trio unverändert wiederholt) - doch nichts klingt in diesem Satz scherzhaft oder aufgelockert. Vielmehr wirkt der Hauptteil mal gespenstisch, mal bedrohend, und das Duolen-Thema des Trios (ein Thema, das inmitten des Dreiertaktes einen Zweiertakt-Rhythmus bringt) erscheint zwar wie ein idyllischer Abschnitt, wie ein "seliger Reigen"—aber auch das klingt nur wie eine Erinnerung.

Wenn man den im November 1894 beendeten langsamen Satz anhört, versieht man vielleicht, warum dieses "Adagio" für die Nachwelt als "krönender Abschluß" der Neunten Symphonie Bruckners gelten durfte: sowohl in der Intensität und Vielfalt der Klangfarben als auch in der Harmonik ist dieser Satz nicht nur "kühn" (wie man ihn gerne bezeichnete), sondern wahrhaftig zukunftsweisend. Die aufbäumende motivische Energie des Eröffnungssatzes findet hier eine vielleicht noch ausdrucksvollere Variante; scharf punktierte Rhythmik und leise Tremolo-Klänge bereiten jenes choralartige Motiv der Tuben vor, das Bruckner als "Abschied vom Leben" bezeichnete.

Die verschiedenen Zitate, die Bruckner aus seinen früheren Werken in dieses "Adagio" hineinbrachte—das "Miserere"-Motiv aus der d-moll-Messe sowie Motive aus der Siebenten und Achten Symphonie—deuten schon hier auf die Konzeption eines eben noch folgenden Finalsatzes hin, der so eine Zusammenfassung sowohl gedanklich als auch musikalisch vollenden sollte. Aufgrund der immanenten Entwicklung der ersten drei Sätze ist daher der Aspekt eines "unvollendeten Werkes" fragwürdig, denn diese Meinung basiert einerseits auf dem romantisch angehauchten Gedanken über die Faszination des "Fragmentarischen" und "Unvollendeten", andererseits auf der Deutung des Tuben-Chorals, den Bruckner als "Abschied vom Leben" bezeichnete.

Die Untersuchungen von Phillips—die sowohl auf den verwendeten Papierbögen bzw. deren Nummerierung [sic] als auch auf der spezifischen Arbeitsweise von Bruckner fußen—zeigen, daß das Finale der Neunten Symphonie keineswegs “skizzenhaft” überliefert worden ist, sondern daß die einzelnen Teile des Finales in verschiedenen “Arbeitsphasen” existieren. Da diese “Arbeits-Phasen” des “in Partitur schreiben” bei Bruckner stets in einem recht späten Stadium des Komponierens erscheinen, können die einzelnen Bögen bzw. ihre Ergänzungen” wohl die schlüssige Konzeption des Finales vermitteln. Den ersten Teil des gewaltigen Satzes (die “Exposition” eines großangelegten Sonatensatzes, die Bruckner die “erste Abteilung” nannte) hat der Komponist fertig geschrieben; aber auch die anderen Abschnitte liefern so entscheidende “Hinweise”, ja “Anordnungen” hinsichtlich motivischer Arbeit und Instrumentation, daß die heute zu hörende Rekonstruktion lediglich ca. 80 von insgesamt 687 Takten als “neue” Hinzufügung zu ergänzen brauchte.

Bei der Rekonstruktion des Finales wurden sowohl die aktuelle Quellenforschung und deren streng wissenschaftliche Auswertung wie auch die verbalen Äußerungen Bruckners (“Ich habe deshalb vor, das Allelujah des zweiten Satzes mit aller Macht wieder im Finale zu bringen” damit die Symphonie mit einem Lob und Preislied an den lieben Gott endet”) sowie ein “Analogverfahren” (d. h., die durch die früheren Werke erkennbare Kompositionsweise Bruckners) berücksichtigt. Der Aufbau des wahrhaft gewaltigen Satzes ließ sich als eine erweiterte Sonatenform verifizieren, für deren Themen—die aus einer einzigen motivischen “Urzelle” entstehen—die motivische Gestaltung der vorigen Sätze Pate steht: scharf punktierte Rhythmik, weit ausholende Gesten und überhaupt eine oft “karge” Klanglandschaft von breiten Dimensionen. Am Ende der dritten Themengruppe der Exposition erscheint das Motiv des “Te Deum” von Bruckner, das auch den Beginn der Durchführung beherrschen wird; die Reprise wird von einer meisterhaften Fuge eingeleitet und macht vom “Te Deum”-Motiv auch Gebrauch. Die Coda bringt jene “Überlagerung” der vier Hauptthemen der Symphonie, die Bruckner als musikalische wie auch ideologische Synthese wohl vorschwebte und die ins jubelnde Thema eines “Allelujah” mündet.”

---



## V.

### ‘Das Finale der Neunten Symphonie: Herausforderung and den musikalischen und musikwissenschaftlichen Kanon (John A. Phillips)<sup>6</sup>

IN vielerlei Hinsicht stellt das Finale der Neunten Symphonie (WAB 109) eines der letzten Tabufelder der Brucknerforschung dar. Die 1903 mit der Uraufführung der ersten drei Sätze begonnene Rezeptionsgeschichte der Symphonie zeigt eindeutig, wie die pure Idee eines vierten Satzes wegdiskutiert oder einfach ignoriert wurde, eine so fest etablierte Betrachtungsweise, daß auch die 1934er Ausgabe der *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur Neunten Symphonie* von Alfred Orel nichts daran zu rütteln vermochte. Gerne umgeht man auch bis heute diese angebliche Anhäufung von losen Skizzenblättern, die selbstverständlich nie den Status eines der großen ‘vollendeten’ Sätze der Neunten Symphonie je hätte erreichen können, angesichts des ‘wirklichen’ Finales—eines so herrlich und erhabenen Adagios—gar unwichtig und überflüssig seien, und schließlich Denjenigen zur unschuldigen Beute fielen, denen “*alles Unvollendete ein Dorn im Auge*” sei.<sup>7</sup> Das wäre alles schön und gut, stünden nicht ein paar lästige Details im Wege. Ich versuche sie hier so kurz wie möglich zusammenzufassen.

Das Finale ist, —und das zeigt die Forschung in eindeutiger Weise—nicht nur als bloße ‘Skizze’ überliefert, sondern war bereits weit über dies Stadium herausgekommen und als Satz in teils fertiger Partitur angelegt.<sup>8</sup> Selbst das, was heute von dieser Partitur übriggeblieben ist<sup>9</sup>, zeigt noch, daß ihre eindeutige Gliederung, klare Satzstruktur und komplexe, fertige kompositorische Faktur gar nichts mit ‘Skizze’ zu tun hat, sondern eher als ein ‘im Entstehen begriffenes Autograph’ zu bezeichnen ist, denn der reife Bruckner schrieb nie das, was wir eine Reinschrift nennen würden.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Article written mid-1996 as position statement for the round-table discussion on the Finale at the 1996 ABIL symposium; read in absentia by Cohrs. Published without title and with minor alterations by Cohrs (not included here) within the symposium report “Round-table—Finale der Neunten Symphonie”, in: *BrSymBer 1996: Fassungen—Bearbeitungen—Vollendungen*, Linz 1998, pp. 189–210, the house-style of which journal has been maintained. For discussion see §3.4.10; all subsequent footnotes are those of the original article.

<sup>7</sup> Siehe Reinhard Kannonier, *Bausteine ohne Mörtel*, in: *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 47, Nr. 1 (1992), S. 25, und die Replik von Gunnar Cohrs, *Noch einmal zu Bruckners ‘Neunte’*. Zu Reinhard Kannoniers *Bausteine ohne Mörtel*, in: *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 47, Nr. 6 (1992), S. 360f.

<sup>8</sup> Mindestens die Streicher, und damit die fortlaufende Kontinuität des Satzes, wohl auch bis in die Coda, waren in Tinte festgestellt.

<sup>9</sup> Es ist übrigens Unsinn, angesichts der katastrophalen Überlieferung und verstreuten heutigen Quellenlage davon auszugehen, wir hätten heute alle von Bruckner komponierten Bogen wieder in der Hand.

<sup>10</sup> Die späten Brucknerwerke sind in lediglich zwei Phasen entstanden: Particellskizze und Partitur: ‘Arbeitspartitur’ war bereits ‘Autograph’, wenn auch im Laufe der Arbeit viele Bogen ausgeschieden und wieder ersetzt wurden.

Die von Bruckner hinterlassenen Partitur des Finales ist auch nicht in mehreren von sich abweichenden Fassungen überliefert—dieser Irrtum ist lediglich Resultat einer lang tradierten Fehllesung der Orel-Ausgabe—, sondern zeigt einen klaren, hauptsächlich erweiternden Entwicklungsprozeß analog dem Entstehen früherer Werke, ein Prozeß, der (den Datierungen nach) mehrere Monate vor Bruckners Tod hauptsächlich abgeschlossen war.<sup>11</sup> Handschrift und musikalische Faktur auch der letzten erhaltenen Seiten zeigen eindeutig das klare Bewußtsein und die unverminderte schöpferische Akribie des Komponisten. Erst in den Revisionen und Zusätzen der letzten Monate seines Lebens wird ein zunehmender geistiger Verfall vernehmbar, der schließlich das Fertigstellen der Instrumentation vereitelte. Damit sind wir mit dem Zurechtrücken des Bildes bei weitem noch nicht fertig. Denn für den Fall, daß er den vierten Satz nicht fertigstellen sollte, verfügte Bruckner, man solle an dessen Stelle das *Te Deum* aufführen. Das ist eindeutig überliefert, und ein deutlicher Beweis dafür, wie wichtig ihm für die Konzeption der Symphonie zwei Begriffe waren: daß die Symphonie in einem "*Lob- und Preislied*" münden, und daß sie viersätzig angelegt sein muß.<sup>12</sup> Demgemäß sollten wir eigentlich die Symphonie niemals dreisätzig aufführen.

Das beabsichtigte symphonische Finale kann aber in seiner musikalischen Funktion nicht so leichtfertig durchs *Te Deum* ersetzt werden. Deutliche Beweise der eng miteinander verknüpfte Konzeption aller vier Sätze übermitteln Zeitgenossen, die berichten, Bruckner habe ihnen bereits 1891 Themen aller vier Sätze vorgespielt.<sup>13</sup> Das 1892 komponierte Auftragswerk *Das Deutsche Lied* (WAB 63) hält bereits mehrere Elemente des erst vier Jahre danach zu Papier gebrachten Finales im Keim fest. Das Choralthema des Finales, das erst im Adagio als 'Abschied vom Leben' auftaucht und dort als 'fremdes', zusätzliches Element im Satzgefüge steht<sup>14</sup>, kommt erst voll zur Geltung in seiner Inkarnation als Schlußgruppe des Finales.<sup>15</sup> Jene Tritonus-Fortschreitungen, mit denen das Finale beginnt<sup>16</sup>, erscheinen deutlich 'vorauskomponiert' in der Coda des Adagios,<sup>17</sup> eine motivische Mutation, die keinen Sinn hat, wenn das Finale nicht unmittelbar folgt. Dies und vieles andere bestätigt, daß das Finale durch und durch kein Anhängsel an die 'vollendeten' drei Sätze, kein bloßes Nachwort war. Wir haben als Musikwissenschaftlicher aus reiner Bequemlichkeit seine Bedeutung für unsere Auffassung der Neunten Symphonie, dieses Kernstück der Bruckneraufführungs- und Rezep-

---

<sup>11</sup> Selbst in Bruckners letzten Monaten wurde der Verlauf des Satzes an nur zwei Kanten in Frage gestellt: Der Anfang selbst, der wohl verkürzt wurde, und der Beginn der Durchführung, die eine Erweiterung erfuhr.

<sup>12</sup> Bruckner versuchte auch, den Torso des Satzes als Überleitung zum *Te Deum* hinüberzuretten. Siehe meine Dissertation, *Bruckners Ninth Symphony Revisited: towards the re-evaluation of a four-movement symphony* (University of Adelaide, 2001), Kap. 1.1, 3.3.

<sup>13</sup> Göll.-A. 4/3, S. 146; siehe auch ebenda S. 137.

<sup>14</sup> Siehe dort T. 29ff. sowie die späteren Umwandlungen bei T. 155ff.

<sup>15</sup> Siehe die rekonstruierte Autograph-Partitur des Finales der Neunten Symphonie (Wien: MWV 1995), S. 41ff.

<sup>16</sup> Ebenda, S. 1–3.

<sup>17</sup> Siehe dort, T. 225.

tionstradition, fast völlig übersehen. Diese Tatsachen sind auch in meinen bis daher erschienenen Bänden der Gesamtausgabe dokumentiert zu finden.<sup>18</sup>

Wozu aber beschäftigen wir uns damit? Soll dies zu keinem praktischen Ergebnis führen? Soll auch das Erscheinen des Satzes in der Gesamtausgabe in Faksimile, Transkription und Studie lediglich einer musikwissenschaftlichen Liebhaberei dienen? Ich glaube, ganz abgesehen vom pauschalen Ja und Nein zur Frage, ob man Unfertiges fertigstellen bzw. aufführen sollte (eine Frage, zu der man so oder so stehen kann), daß eine mit größter Vorsicht, Sorgfalt und Kompetenz ergänzte Aufführungsfassung des Finales<sup>19</sup> uns nicht nur als praktisches Hörbeispiel viel nutzt, sondern auch der Musikwissenschaft im Allgemeinen etwas zu sagen hat.

Erstens, es ist schon keineswegs so gewagt, einen Satz, der bereits feste Form und zum Teil fertige Instrumentation aufweist, aufführbar zu machen, als wenn man, wie noch immer als gängiges Klischee kolportiert wird, bloße Fragmente oder gar nur Skizzen zusammenbastelt. Die Partitur weist eine offensichtlich ursprünglich durchgehende Bogennumerierung auf. Mehrere Bogen sind ja soweit fertig, daß sie vom Komponisten ausdrücklich als "fertig" bezeichnet wurden!<sup>20</sup> Einige der durch mangelnde Überlieferung entstandenen Fehlstellen lassen sich durch die der Komposition der Partitur vorausgegangenen Particellskizzen, andere aus dem Vergleich mit bereits fertigen Teile ergänzen.<sup>21</sup> Skizzen zur Coda, die unter den erhaltenen Partiturfragmenten nicht vorhanden ist, existieren auch, sowie bedeutende Aussagen des Komponisten dazu.<sup>22</sup> Das alles hätten wir wohl nie gewußt, wenn nicht Samale und Mazzuca sich 1983 als die ersten seit Alfred Orel die Mühe gemacht hätten, diese vielfach tabuiserten Manuskripte einer ordentlichen Untersuchung zu unterziehen.

Zweitens stellt die Arbeit an der Aufführungsfassung, wie auch Peter Gülke erkannt hat, ein gewaltiges Erkenntnisgewinn dar.<sup>23</sup> Sie trägt zur Erhellung wichtiger Aspekte bei, darunter die Fragen, wie Bruckners Musik entstand, worum es ihm beim Komponieren ging, wie er seine

---

<sup>18</sup> *Anton Bruckner Gesamtausgabe: Zu Band IX: Finale: Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen. a): Studienpartitur; b): Textband;* Hrsg. von John A. Phillips (Wien, MWV 1994; Textband voraussichtlich 1998) sowie *Anton Bruckner: Zu Band IX. Finale: Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographischer Notenseiten*, hrsg. von John A. Phillips (Wien, MWV 1996). Siehe auch dazu John A. Phillips, *Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners*, in: *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1989–90*, S. 115–204.

<sup>19</sup> *Anton Bruckner: IX. Symphonie D-Moll: Finale: Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen: Aufführungsfassung von Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Gunnar Cohrs und Giuseppe Mazzuca*, hrsg. von John A. Phillips, Adelaide–Bremen 1992.

<sup>20</sup> Siehe etwa die Faksimile-Ausgabe des Finales, a. a. O. S. 150, 176, 180 usw.

<sup>21</sup> Vgl. dazu die Autograph-Partitur des Finales, a. a. O. S. 12–24, 27, 65f., 87f., 104–108, 117–120.

<sup>22</sup> Vgl. ebenda S. 137–142.

<sup>23</sup> Siehe Peter Gülke, *Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987: Bruckner-Symposion*, in: *Die Musikforschung* 41, Nr. 3 (1988), S. 243. Dazu ist zu bemerken, daß wichtige Aspekte einer Musik erst beim Versuch, sie nachzumachen, ihre wesentlichen Charaktermerkmale zu 'synthesieren', verständlich werden. Auch als Lernverfahren stellt dieses 'synthetische' einen willkommenen Ausgleich zum fast ausschließlich betriebenen 'analytischen' Vorgang unserer Zeit dar; es verschärft den Blick für das eigentlich Funktionierende, fast möchte man sagen, Physiologische von Musik, ein Blick, den wir heute mit unseren reduktiven analytischen Verfahren beinahe verloren haben.

Kompositionstechnik handhabte, wie er selbst darüber nachdachte.<sup>24</sup> Wichtig sind aber vor allem die allgemeinen Fragen, die dadurch aufgeworfen werden: Der Purismus verbietet jeglichen Ergänzungsversuch aus Gründen sogenannter Inauthenzität; manch ethisches Bedenken spricht auch dagegen: Eine von zweiter Hand erstellte Partitur soll keine Gültigkeit besitzen, denn sie sei vor allem nicht 'echt'. Dies sind ehrwürdige Einwendungen der Musikwissenschaft gegen 'Vollendungen' oder 'Bearbeitungen', die, wie ich hoffe, auch in den letzten Tagen noch einmal gründlich unter die Lupe gestellt worden sind.<sup>25</sup> Denn sie beruhen auf tief etablierte Denkmustern, die in der letzten Zeit zunehmend in Frage gestellt werden. Dazu ist ein kleiner Exkurs nötig.

Adorno schrieb 1961/62 ein sehr hartes Wort: "*Das wissenschaftliche Bewußtsein von Musik fällt auseinander in blinde Technologie und kindisch-unverbindliche, poetisierende Auslegungen wie die Scheringschen Beethovens; der Rest ist Beute des Geschmacks*".<sup>26</sup> Erst in den letzten Jahren haben wir begonnen, bezüglich dieser vor 35 Jahren umrissenen Problematik in der Musikwissenschaft etwas zu unternehmen. Langsam und nicht ohne Kampf wird die Disziplin erweiternden Perspektiven wie der Soziologie, dem Feminismus oder der postmodernen literaturwissenschaftlichen Theorie eröffnet.<sup>27</sup> Heute, am Ende des Jahrhunderts, stehen wir wohl vor einem klassischen Paradigmenwechsel in der historischen Musikwissenschaft. Dem neuen Denkmuster gemäß hat sich die Musikwissenschaft bis jetzt zu viel mit dem angeblich 'objektiven' res facta des kompositorischen Artefakts beschäftigt. Lange als fundamental behauptete und mit einer transzendenten Aura umgebene Kategorien wie die des Werkes, der Vollendung, des Kanons und—am Spitzenpunkt der musikalischen Hierarchie stehend—der Idee der absoluten Musik großer (und vor allem deutscher) Meister, beginnt die Musikwissenschaft in Zweifel zu stellen. Heute versuchen Wissenschaftler, solche Begriffe zu relativieren und wieder in das Netz von politischen, kulturellen und gesellschaftlichen Beziehungen zu integrieren.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Siehe etwa J. A. Phillips, *Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren*, in: *Bruckner-Symposion 1992. Bericht* (Linz 1995), S. 153–178.

<sup>25</sup> Siehe vor allem die Versuche Peter Gülkes, diese Begriffe zu relativieren, wie etwa im Aufsatz *Die mögliche und die unmögliche Vollendung, Bruckners Fassungen oder: kein Ende*, in: *Osterreichische Musikzeitschrift* 51, Nr. 5 (1996), S. 330–335.

<sup>26</sup> *Einleitung in die Musiksoziologie*, in: *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 14 (Frankfurt 1973, 3. Auflage 1990), S. 244; zitiert von Eva Rieger, 'Gender Studies' und Musikwissenschaft—ein Forschungsbericht, in *Die Musikforschung* 48, Nr. 3 (1995), S. 235.

<sup>27</sup> Siehe im Hinblick auf die deutsche Musikwissenschaft den Artikel von Eva Rieger, a. a. O.

<sup>28</sup> Siehe etwa Lawrence Kramer, *Haydn's Chaos, Schenker's Order; or, Hermeneutics and Musical Analysis: Can They Mix?*, in: *19th-Century Music* 16/1 (Sommer 1992), S. 3: "In the past decade, serious music criticism has begun to make use of hermeneutic techniques derived from postmodernist literary and cultural theories. These theories [...] agree in rejecting both a formalism that treats works of art as self-sufficient, trans-historical wholes, and a historicism that treats works of art as manifestations of a stable, determinate context. The aim of postmodernist criticism is to understand the work of art, or any other cultural product or practice, as an instance of social, political, discursive, and cultural action that traverses a larger field [...] of action." Siehe auch die Buchbesprechung Richard Taruskins, *Back To Whom? Neoclassicism as Ideology*, in: *19th-Century Music* 16 (1992), S. 286–302, insbesondere S. 299; Leon Botstein, *Aesthetics and Ideology in the Fin-de Siècle Mozart Revival*, in: *Current Musicology* Nr. 50 (1992), S. 5–25; Gary Tomlinson, *Musical Pasts and Postmodern Musicologies: A Response to Lawrence Kramer*, in: *Current Musicology* Nr. 50 (1992), S. 18–24, insbesondere S. 23; Sanna Pederson, *A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity*, in: *19th-Century Music*

Es gäbe viel zu tun, versuchten wir, die Musik Bruckners von solchen Gesichtspunkten aus neu zu betrachten und zu überdenken. Was, zum Beispiel, ist ein 'authentischer' Bruckner-Text, wenn Bruckner, vielmehr als manch andere Komponisten des 19. Jahrhunderts, die Mitwirkung, Einflüsse, Ratschläge und gar Kritik seiner Zeitgenossen nicht nur geduldet sondern aktiv genutzt und zu eigen gemacht hat? Vor allem ging es Bruckner darum, so scheint es mir, daß seine Musik *gehört werden sollte*; er war schließlich bereit, viele Kompromisse hinzunehmen, um dies zu erreichen. So galten seine 'eigenen' Partituren zwar für spätere Zeiten, zeigten jedoch bereits die Mitwirkung Anderer auf.<sup>29</sup> Hier hat auch die Geschichte des Finales uns wichtiges zu lehren, denn sie zeigt, wie sehr ihre heutige Einschätzung und ihr nicht-kanonischer Status vom reinen Zufall und geschichtlichen Umstand abhängen. Angesichts der Bearbeitungspraxis des 19. Jahrhunderts, hätten Schalk oder Löwe den Satz mit Sicherheit fertiggestellt und aufgeführt, wäre die Partitur des Finales intakt überliefert worden; ähnlich dem Requiem Mozarts hätte sich ihre Aufführung auch als Bearbeitung fest in die Konzertpraxis etabliert, auch wenn man später verschiedener Meinung über den Anteil Schalks oder Löwes gewesen wäre. Ich glaube nicht, daß man dann jemals so große Bedenken gegen die Finale-Konzeption Bruckners entwickelt hätte, wie man ihnen heute begegnet. Denn bedenken wir einmal: diese Partitur hätte Teil der Neunten Symphonie sein sollen. Sie hätte dann unsere Brucknerbild bestimmt, und nicht umgekehrt.

Denn stehen wir so oder so zu diesem Satz, müssen wir deutlich zwischen zwei ganz verschiedenen Dingen unterscheiden: auf der einen Seite die Aufführungsfassung, ihre Methodik und das Resultat, und auf der anderen die musikalische Konzeption Bruckners selbst. Zum ersten: Man kann natürlich nie eine solche Partitur wie unsere des Finales oder diejenige von Mahlers Zehnter erstellen, ohne auf allen Seiten angeschossen zu werden von denen, die selbstverständlich den Komponisten besser kennen und alles besser machen können. In den meisten Fällen kommen aber die Kritiker nicht einmal mit der Philologie zurecht; ihre Vorwürfe betreffen fast ausschließlich den subjektiven Höreindruck, ohne jemals die Frage zu stellen, was höre ich hier überhaupt, Bruckner oder Eingriff? Machen wir aber einmal aufrichtig die Probe, die Aufführungsfassung ohne Rückblick auf die Autograph-Partitur abzuhören. Was klingt uns nachgemacht (und daher 'unecht'), was überzeugt uns? Es ist aber oft genau die von Bruckner selbst beabsichtigten Aspekte, die uns fremd und daher 'unecht' erscheinen. Das Ungewöhnliche einzuführen war andererseits genau das, was wir uns als Herausgeber nicht anmaßen dürften. Hätte Bruckner lange genug gelebt, die Partitur fertigzustellen, wäre Passagen wie z. B. der karge, unisono-Beginn der Gesangsperiode—der offensichtlich vom Anfang an wesentlichen Bestandteil der Konzeption des Satzes war und auch in

---

18/2 (Herbst 1994), S. 87–107; und Pamela M. Potter, *Musicology under Hitler: New Sources in Context*, in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 49, no. 1 (Frühling 1996), S. 70–113, insbesondere S. 105f.

<sup>29</sup> Siehe dazu Ansätze der letzten Zeit wie die Dissertation Benjamin Korstvedts, *The First Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception* (Ball State University 1995), Thomas Röder, *Das 'verstümmelte' Finale. Zum vierten Satz von Anton Bruckners Dritter Symphonie*, in: *IBG-Mitteilungsheft* Nr. 37 (Dez. 1991), S. 11–20, sowie dessen Referat *The 1889 Version of the Third Symphony: a 'piece of butchery'?*, die Referate Morten Solviks, *The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P.*, und Thomas Leibnitz', *Anton Bruckner—'German Music'?* *Josef Schalk's Contemporary Portrayal of Bruckner as a National Composer*, alle drei im April 1996 beim Bruckner-Symposium, University of Manchester vorgelesen.

den frühesten Skizzen so steht—mit an Sicherheit grenzenden Wahrscheinlichkeit nicht viel anders geworden. Wir sollten es uns nicht in dem Gedanken bequem machen, Bruckner hätte diese in vieler Hinsicht so radikale Partitur genau so revidiert, wie es in unser aller Brucknerbild genau hineinpaßt.

Damit kommen wir zum zweiten Punkt. Die Kritik an die Partitur des Finales, wie Bruckner sie hinterlassen hat, beruht schließlich auf ästhetischen bzw. formalistischen Werturteilen (bedenken wir wieder die Worte Adornos); unsere Verständnis des Gegenstandes selbst fördert sie wenig. So interessiert mich schließlich nicht, ob Analytiker die musikalische Struktur des vierten Satzes 'gelungen' finden oder nicht. Damit sage ich übrigens nicht, das er nicht gelungen ist—ganz im Gegenteil: Er ist vielfach geschlossener, einheitlicher und deutlicher gegliedert, weniger diskursiv, als das Finale der Achten Symphonie. Musik ist aber nicht Maschinenbau, zu dem die positivische Betrachtungsweise der traditionellen Musikwissenschaft sie oft degradiert, sondern vor allem kultureller Ausdruck des Menschen. Ich erlaube mir daher, weniger für solche formale und ästhetische Vorlieben zu interessieren, die diese Musik erfüllen mag oder nicht (es sei denn, im Sinne der Rezeptionsgeschichte und ihrer Deutung), als für das, was *B r u c k n e r* selbst mit dieser Musik sagen wollte, welches Verhältnis das Finale zu den anderen Sätzen der Neunten für ihn hatte und wie er sich darin ausdrückte. Und das möchte ich nicht nur sehen und studieren, sondern—und sei es auch so 'unvollkommen'—*h ö r e n*. Die sogenannte 'Neue Musikwissenschaft' beschäftigt sich auch viel mit dem Moment des Hörens ('response'), etwas, das in der traditionellen Musikwissenschaft meistens zum zweitrangigen, subjektiven herabgesetzt wird. Eher ist dies im Gegenteil das bestimmende Moment der Musik überhaupt und sollte demgemäß eher etwas sein, das im Zentrum unserer wissenschaftlichen Betrachtung steht, als am Rande. Daran sollten wir uns ständig erinnern, denn wir haben uns als Musikwissenschaftlicher allzuoft die Gewohnheit angeeignet, Musik vorrangig zu lesen, anstatt sie zu hören. Demgemäß wird Musik nicht erst dann 'vollendet', wenn ein großer deutscher Meister genügende Noten auf das Papier gemalt hat, um sagen zu können, ich habe diese Partitur (also, dieses Schriftstück) 'vollendet', sondern erst im Erklären, in sinnvoller und einfühlsamer sonischen Realisierung und zwar vor, (wie Bruckner), "*einem Kreis von Freunden und Kennern*", also Hörern, die nicht erst eine Position kritischer Distanz aufnehmen müssen, um dann mit seinen Werken zurecht zu kommen.

Natürlich behaupte ich nicht, daß 'unser' Finale auch nur annähernd dem vergleichbar ist, was Bruckner selbst fertiggestellt—sagen wir einmal hier 'vollendet'—hätte (bei klarem Bewußtsein, versteht sich). 'Vollendung aus zweiter Hand' ist erstens ontologisch Unsinn, und sollte zweitens auch nie Zweck einer Aufführungsfassung sein. Ebensowenig können wir durch noch so viel philologischen Scharfsinn und musikalisches Einfühlungsvermögen die nicht erhaltenen Fragmente der überlieferten Partitur ersetzen. Die Fertigstellung der Partitur eines anderen, sei es auch noch so gut gemeint, ist eine riesige Verantwortung, die nicht auf die leichte Schulter zu nehmen ist, und verlangt das Äußerste an wissenschaftlicher Stringenz und handwerklich-kompositionstechnischem Können. Sie ist und bleibt ein Notbehelf, das mindere Übel zur anderen bestehenden Möglichkeit, nämlich, weiterhin so zu handeln, als ob ein vierter Satz nie existiert hätte, nie konzipiert würde. Ich frage mich, ob nicht manche Kritik daran eher die

---

Reaktion der Anhänger einer Denktradition ist, die sich durch eine Aufführungsfassung angefaßt fühlen, ohne genau zu wissen warum, und ohne einmal über die Gültigkeit ihrer Denkweise nachgedacht zu haben. Und schließlich, um wieder darauf zu kommen, bezweifele ich sehr, inwiefern wir uns von Konzepten wie 'Vollendung' und 'Authentizität' als bestimmende Kategorien musikwissenschaftlichen Denkens und von dem *sine qua non* der Gültigkeit von Musik überhaupt weiterhin leiten lassen sollen oder können. Es wird höchste Zeit, daß wir die Fragen einmal anders stellen.

---

## VI.

### “Für die IX. ist gesorgt.” Einige Erläuterungen zum Editionsprojekt *Neunte Symphonie* in der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe—und wie es dazu kam (John A. Phillips)<sup>30</sup>

„Für die IX. ist gesorgt.“ So soll sich der alte, schwerkranke Bruckner zu seinem geistlichen Freund Josef Kluger aus Klosterneuburg bei einem Besuch 1896 im Schloß Belvedere geäußert haben.<sup>31</sup> Leider wissen wir heute, wie seine diesbezüglichen Vorkehrungen restlos im Sande verlaufen sind. Denn wie Bruckner beabsichtigte, die Symphonie aufführen zu lassen, falls er das *Finale* nicht mehr beenden könnte – nämlich mit seinem *Te Deum* statt einem instrumentalen vierten Satz –, ist dank der durch Ferdinand Löwe 1903 angebahnten Aufführungspraxis nie Gebrauch geworden und wird bis heute nur selten respektiert, sondern vielmehr von Besserwissern entkräftet oder dementiert.<sup>32</sup> Stattdessen blicken wir heute auf eine beinahe hundert Jahre lange Rezeptionsgeschichte dieser Symphonie zurück, in der wiederholt versucht wurde (und wird), die reine Existenz eines unvollendeten, wenn auch weit gediehenen Finalsatzes zu verschweigen, die Symphonie in ihrer dreisätzigen Form ästhetisch zu rechtfertigen, und über Bruckners eindeutig überlieferte Aufforderung, das *Te Deum* anstelle des intendierten vierten Satzes zu nehmen, hinwegzusehen. Ihm war offensichtlich von enormer Wichtigkeit, daß die Symphonie erstens durch ihre viersätzliche Anlage eine gewisse „Quadratur“ bewahre, zweitens, daß sie mit einem „Lob- und Preislied an den lieben Gott“ ende. In der herkömmlichen, dreisätzigen Aufführungspraxis wird das *Adagio* zum eigentlichen *Finale* der Symphonie; so wird es auch für die Musikwissenschaft, die sich mit wenigen Ausnahmen kaum ernsthaft mit diesem für die Interpretation der Symphonie eigentlich grundlegenden Problem beschäftigt hat.

---

<sup>30</sup> Article written June-July 2001 for publication by ABIL in *BrucknerJahrbuch* 1997/98/99 (in press), the house-style of which journal has been maintained here. For discussion see §3.4.11; subsequent footnotes are those of the original article.

<sup>31</sup> Max Auer, *Bruckner*. Wien–Leipzig 1923, S. 328: „Hier sagte er seinem Liebling, dem jungen Chorherrn Josef Kluger aus Klosterneuburg, ganz unvermittelt: ‚Für die IX. ist gesorgt‘, ohne näheres darüber auszuführen.“

<sup>32</sup> Bruckners Aussage taucht jedoch in den Berichten und Memoiren beinahe Aller, die mit Bruckner in seinen letzten Jahren zu tun hatten und die *Neunte* erwähnen, immer wieder auf; sie muß als authentisch belegt angesehen werden. Ausführlicheres dazu siehe John Phillips, *The Facts Behind a „Legend“: Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony and the Te Deum*. In: Crawford Howie, Timothy L. Jackson und Paul Hawkshaw, Hrg., *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Aldershot, 2001 (im Druck). Siehe weiter etwa Manfred Wagner, Hrg., *Anton Bruckner: 9. Sinfonie. Wien 11.2.1903 (Uraufführung)*. In: ders., *Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik in Beispielen. Mit einem einleitenden Essay von Norbert Tschulik*. Tutzing 1979, S. 235–277: Fast sämtliche von Wagner angeführte Berichte über die Uraufführung der *Neunten* erwähnen, Bruckner habe ausdrücklich verfügt, sein *Te Deum* den ersten drei Sätzen anzuschließen. In den zwanziger Jahren sind in der Universal Edition auch Nachdrucke der Löwe-Ausgabe der *Neunten Symphonie* zusammengebunden mit dem *Te Deum* erschienen.



Der Titel dieses Beitrages steht daher ironisch für die Art und Weise, in der dieses Werk von der Nachwelt verkannt wurde, erinnert andererseits auch daran, daß die Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe erst jetzt im Jahre 2001 schließlich zu einem Punkt gekommen ist, für diese Symphonie und ihre heute vorliegenden Quellen eine angemessene Publikationsform zu finden und damit jener Aufgabe, für die Manuskripte Bruckners „Sorge tragen zu wollen“ nachgekommen ist, mit der der Komponist bekannterweise die damalige k. k. Hofbibliothek, die heutige Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB), Wien testamentarisch beauftragt hat. Die Lösung wird wohl eines der umfangreichsten Publikationsprojekte werden, die jemals für ein symphonisches Werk in Aussicht genommen wurde. Zweck des vorliegenden Aufsatzes ist es, die Vorgeschichte dieses Projektes ein wenig zu erläutern, und eine Übersicht über die heutige Publikationsserie zur *Neunten Symphonie* Anton Bruckners zu geben.

### Zur Überlieferung der Quellen zur *Neunten*

Bekanntlich fing Bruckner mit den ersten Skizzen zur *Neunten Symphonie* kurz nach Fertigstellung der ersten Fassung der *Achten* im August 1887 an; den vierten Satz hinterließ er mit seinem Tod am 11. Oktober 1896 unvollendet. Innerhalb dieser fast neun Jahre langen Entstehungsperiode sind zu dieser Symphonie allein – an dem heute zugänglichen, vorhandenen Material gemessen – über 490 Blatt Notenpapier, Vorarbeiten wie auch fertige Partitur, vom Komponisten beschriftet worden. Davon sind zum vierten Satz allein 211 Blatt erhalten – also beinahe die Hälfte.<sup>33</sup> Heute liegt dieser überaus reiche Bestand an Quellenmaterial – die enorme Zerstreung des künstlerischen Nachlasses dokumentierend – weit verteilt auf mehr als 30 Signaturen in mehreren Bibliotheken bzw. Museen in drei Ländern (Österreich, Polen, USA) vor. Weitere Fragmente befinden sich im Privatbesitz – sowohl bekannt sowie wohl unbekannt bzw. unzugänglich. Dagegen sind im Vergleich zu anderen Symphonien Bruckners zu seinen Lebzeiten oder kurz nach seinem Tod nur wenige Abschriften und Transkriptionen der *Neunten* entstanden. Die von Ferdinand Löwe besorgte Erstausgabe der Symphonie, die im Jahr der Uraufführung (1903) bei Doblinger erschien, entstand erst einige Jahre nach dem Tode Bruckners und auch, so viel man weiß, ohne jegliche Mitarbeit von ihm.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Das Material zum *Finale* wird allerdings statistisch dadurch vermehrt, daß Bruckner zahlreiche als Partitur eingerichtete Bogen lediglich für „Satzverlaufsentwürfe“ verwendete, in denen er hauptsächlich nur eine jeweilige leitende Stimme (meistens 1. Violine) eintrug und den Bogen wieder verwarf. Darüber hinaus wechselte er im *Finale* von seiner gewöhnlichen Takteinteilung von sechs Takten (wie im ersten Satz und im Scherzo) auf vier pro Partiturseite.

<sup>34</sup> Dazu ist allerdings zu bemerken, daß Bruckner sogar im Herbst 1895 noch bereit war, aus welchen Gründen wie auch immer, sein Werk von Anderen redigieren zu lassen. Ein von Joseph Schalk unterzeichneter und mit 4. Oktober 1895 datierter Vermerk in Bruckners Kalender bestätigt, er habe „*Die ersten 10 Bogen des ersten Satzes der neunten Symphonie zum Arrangement erhalten*“ (Göll.-A. IV/3, S. 546). Gemeint waren vermutlich die ersten 10 Bogen der von Meißner gefertigten Abschrift des ersten Satzes (ÖNB Mus. Hs. 29.305), die auch Hinweise auf Instrumentationsänderungen in der Handschrift Franz Schalks aufweist. Löwe fing etwa 1900 mit dem soeben begründeten Wiener Konzertvereins-Orchester mit Stimmen und Partitur zu proben an, die aus der Originalpartitur der *Neunten* abgeschrieben waren (Göll.-A. IV/4, S. 40f. Siehe auch dazu Max Auer, *Der Streit um den echten Bruckner im Licht biographischer Tatsachen (II)*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103, Nr. 10 (Oktober 1936), S. 1194). Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs berichtet: „*Ein auf Veranlassung Ferdinand Löwes wohl um 1900 nach der AP hergestellter Stimmensatz wurde bislang ebensowenig aufgefunden wie die bei der Uraufführung*

Im Vergleich dazu liegt zur *Achten Symphonie* ein wohl noch breiteres Trümmerfeld von Partituren, Vorarbeiten und vereinzelt Partiturbogen und -blättern vor; bei der *Achten* kommen auch zahlreiche Abschriften, mit und ohne autographe Eintragungen, sowie die Stichvorlage der Erstausgabe von 1892 in Betracht. Auch zu fast allen Chorwerken der letzten Zeit – mit Ausnahme des *150. Psalms* – sind die meisten Vorarbeiten erhalten; zu keinen anderen Werken Bruckners sonst liegen heute so weitgehend komplette Quellenbestände vor. Das Meiste der Vorarbeiten zu seinen früheren Werken – die den Berichten zufolge in seiner Wohnung in der Heßgasse haufenweise aufgestapelt lagen – vernichtete Bruckner mit Hilfe seines letzten „Sekretärs“ Anton Meißner bei seinem Umzug ins Kustodenstöckl des Wiener Belvederes Anfang Juli 1895 – also zu einer Zeit, zu der er alle seine Werke bis auf den vierten Satz der *Neunten* bereits fertiggestellt hatte. Bei den meisten früheren Werken seiner Reife kommen heute nurmehr vereinzelt Skizzenblätter und ausgeschiedene Bogen in Betracht. Wir können nur darüber spekulieren, was Bruckner dazu bewogen haben dürfte, die Vorarbeiten seiner Spätwerke anscheinend absichtlich dem großen Autodafé von 1895 entgehen zu lassen.

Den Hauptbestand zur *Neunten* bewahrt heute die Musiksammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB) unter etwa 25 Signaturen auf – einschließlich der Autograph-Partitur der ersten drei Sätze (Mus. Hs. 19.481) sowie der meisten erhaltenen Quellen zum *Finale*, dessen Hauptteil heute die drei Signaturen Mus. Hss. 6085–7 (166 Bl.) umfaßt. Laut eines am 17. Oktober 1896 von dem Testamentsvollstrecker Theodor Reisch und den Dirigenten Joseph Schalk und Ferdinand Löwe unterzeichneten Protokolls wurden die im Nachlaß vorgefundenen Manuskripten zum *Finale* durchgesehen, „*wonach sich ergab, daß 75 Partiturbogen vorhanden sind, welche die Paginierung 1.) bis 36.) aufweisen. Darunter beispielweise P. 1–10 und P. 2–8 etc. und übernimmt Joseph Schalk diese 75 Bogen, um den Zusammenhang dieser Fragmente zu erforschen*“<sup>35</sup> – der merkwürdige letzte Satz bezieht sich darauf, daß man zu einigen Bogen mehrere Versionen vorfand. Zu der ihm anvertrauten Aufgabe kam Joseph Schalk aber nicht. Nach seinem 1901 erfolgten Tode gingen die Manuskripte in die Obhut seines Bruders über. Sie wurden dem Biographen Max Auer 1911 für einige Zeit ausgeliehen und erst Oktober 1929 Alfred Orel für seinen schließlich 1934 erschienenen Sonderband zu Band 9 der Gesamtausgabe, *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie*, zugänglich gemacht.<sup>36</sup>

---

*1903 verwendeten Stimmen. Unauffindbar sind außerdem die von Löwe für den Erstdruck verwendete Stichvorlage sowie möglicherweise eine weitere Kopie, die Löwe als Arbeitsgrundlage gedient haben dürfte.*“ (Vorwort zum Kritischen Bericht zur Neuausgabe der *Neunten*, derzeit im Druck).

<sup>35</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, S. 608.

<sup>36</sup> Die Grünabzüge einer bereits etwa 1928–29 gestochenen Vorgänger-Version der *Entwürfe und Skizzen* existieren, die das von Schalk zur Verfügung gestellte Material noch nicht enthielt. Sie wurden von Orel als Vorlage für sein Manuskript der endgültigen Version verwendet; siehe Fonds F60 BRGA 34 sowie 35. Heute vorwiegend als *Sonderband zu Band 9: Entwürfe und Skizzen* bekannt, erschien die Publikation ursprünglich als *Vorlagebericht zur Neunten Symphonie* und wurde erst später „umgetauft“.

Erst im Mai/Juni 2001 konnten in dieser Beziehung mit freundlicher Hilfe von Dr. Angela Pachovsky genauere Daten aus dem voluminösen Fonds F60 BRGA ermittelt werden. Wie auch der Verfasser hatte etwa Cohrs geglaubt (vgl. Neuausgabe der ersten drei Sätze der *Neunten*, 2000, Vorwort, S. VIII), Orel sei erst nach dem Tode Franz Schalks (1931) durch Verhandlungen mit Lili Schalk an das Material zur *Neunten* gekommen;

Daß aber weitere Fragmente bereits v o r der Abfassung dieses Protokolls von Bruckners Nachlaß abhanden gekommen waren, belegt eindeutig die Tatsache, daß einige – darunter auch bereits fertige – Partiturbogen seit 1915, ja sogar noch bis 1985 nach und nach ans Licht gekommen sind und vereinzelt in die Bestände der ÖNB, der Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, der Bibliothek der Wiener Akademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst (heute Universität) und sogar der damaligen Preussischen Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, Eingang fanden.<sup>37</sup>

Heute noch kreisen Fragmente durch private Hände. Ein sprechendes Beispiel dafür wäre der Bogen 1<sup>c</sup><sup>38</sup> des *Finale*, ursprünglich aus dem Besitz einer Frau Dr. Thyll in Wien, der sich zur Zeit Orels im Besitz des Wiener Schubertbundes befand, für viele Jahre dann als Dauerleihgabe im Historischen Museum der Stadt Wien aufbewahrt, später an das Wiener Antiquariat Hassfurther verkauft und dort für den 14. Mai 2001 zur Versteigerung angeboten wurde.<sup>39</sup> Sein Nachfolger-Bogen, ein ebenfalls verworfener 1<sup>d</sup>C (allerdings schon die letzte ausinstrumentierte Version des Satzanfanges, die wir heute noch besitzen) kam erst 1971 aus dem Nachlaß Alfred Orels (!) in die ÖNB (Mus. Hs. 13.150). Orel verzeichnet 1934 auch einen Bogen 2F, der sich damals im Besitz des Baron Vietinghoffs (Berlin) befand (transkribierte ihn aber, aus welchen Gründen wie auch immer, nicht); dieser Bogen gelangte erst 1956 durch das Antiquariat Hans Schneider als Mus. Hs 19.645 in die ÖNB. Bogen „2“E, ein Teil der endgültigen Partitur des *Finale*, kam 1916 als Geschenk des

---

daraufhin sei eine Frühfassung der *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie*, die das Schalk-Material nicht enthielt, revidiert und erweitert worden. Ein bereits mit 28. Oktober 1929 datierter Brief Orels an Franz Schalk bestätigt jedoch den Erhalt des *Finale*-Materials, das von Schalk an Orel ausgeliehen wurde (F60 BRGA 1/3). Die Annahme Wolfgang Doebels (*Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen. Die Konzepte der Bruckner-Schüler und ihre Rezeption bis zu Robert Haas*. Tutzing 2001, S. 253f.), nämlich, daß Schalk der ihm von den Herausgebern der Gesamtausgabe bereits 1929 gestellten Bitte, alle in seinem Besitz befindlichen Manuskripten zur *Neunten* zu übergeben, immer wieder auswich, und daß Orel erst nach seinem Tode an das Material zur *Neunten* kam, muß also qualifiziert werden. Dennoch blieb das Material weiterhin bis 1939 wohl im Besitz der Witwe Schalks, auch wenn es etwa zur Korrektur des Bandes durch Leopold Nowak 1934–35 wiederum ausgeliehen werden mußte. Das Datum der endgültigen Übergabe der Schalk-Bestände, die bisher unklar blieb, konnte ebenfalls ermittelt werden. Alle seiner Bruckner-Manuskripte wurden zwar im November 1939 von seiner Witwe endlich freigegeben – man hatte bis dahin ihren Widerstand gegen Haas und die Herausgabe der Originalpartituren überwunden –; erst 1947 aber gingen sie zusammen mit anderen Bruckner-Manuskripten in den eigentlichen Besitz der ÖNB-Musiksammlung über. Anzunehmen ist, daß sie inzwischen bei Brandstetter bzw. dem MWV Leipzig liegengeblieben sind. Den Beleg dafür liefert ein *Protokoll über die Öffnung der Kiste mit der Bezeichnung Musiksammlung/ Dr Werner/ Aufgenommen am 23. September 1947 von Dr. Leopold Nowak im Beisein von Dr. Kasimir Kuzcewsky und Frl. Maria Razumovsky* (Fonds F60 BRGA 10/3).

<sup>37</sup> Diejenigen Skizzen zur *Achten* und *Neunten*, die in den frühen dreißiger Jahren von der Witwe Ferdinand Löwes an die Berliner Bibliothek verkauft wurden, blieben den Herausgebern der Gesamtausgabe in Wien bis zum Erscheinen des Bandes 1934 unbekannt. Sie wurden 1945 zusammen mit anderen wertvollen Autographen nach Grüßau in Schlesien ausgelagert und tauchten erst in den siebziger Jahren in der Jagiellonska-Bibliothek der Universität Krakau wieder auf.

<sup>38</sup> Zu den im Folgenden verwendeten Bezeichnungen der *Finale*-Bogen siehe zu Band 9 der Bruckner Gesamtausgabe, *Finale (unvollendet). Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen. Studienpartitur, vorgelegt von John A. Phillips*. Wien 1994, 1999, S. XXXVI; im Folgenden abgekürzt „AP“.

<sup>39</sup> Verzeichnet, mit Abbildung, im Katalog 31 der Galerie Hassfurther (o. J.), S. 110f. Zufälligerweise war der Autor im Mai 2001 in Wien, leider nur nicht am 14.; insofern der Kauf tatsächlich erfolgte, wurde der betreffende Käufer noch nicht ermittelt. Auch wenn dieser Bogen nicht die allerletzte Fassung des Satzanfanges darstellte, also später von Bruckner verworfen und ersetzt wurde, bildete er einstweilen einen Teil der *Finale*-Partitur. Der testamentarischen Verfügungen Bruckners gemäß gehörte er an sich rechtmäßig der Musiksammlung der ÖNB, wie bereits auch die Autograph-Partitur der ersten drei Sätze der *Neunten*.

Musikkritikers Max Graf in die Bibliothek der Wiener Akademie, heute Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst, während Bogen 1A, wohl die allererste Niederschrift des Satzanfangs, Alfred Orel unbekannt, irgendwie in den Besitz von Richard Strauß kam und 1966 wiederum durch Hans Schneider in die ÖNB gelangte. In keinem dieser vier Fälle kann erklärt werden, wie der jeweilige Erstbesitzer an das Material kam. Dieses Bild, das die Verstreuung des Materials wiedergibt, macht eindeutig: Es besteht kein Zweifel, daß mehrere solcher Fragmente zum vierten Satz – darunter Partiturbogen, die in Bruckners Sterbezimmer lose herumlagen – kurz nach seinem Tod abhanden kamen. Davon berichtet ausdrücklich Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt Richard Heller, der sogar von einem „Geiersturz“ schreibt.<sup>40</sup> Dazu Auer: „*Ein unverzeihliches Versehen war es, daß eine Inventur des Nachlasses nicht aufgenommen worden war und sich ein genaueres Verzeichnis nicht ermitteln läßt. Nach Dr. Hellers Mitteilung bemühten sich nach dem Tode des Meisters Berufene und Unberufene der umherliegenden Notenblätter. Es war daher auch nicht möglich, den Choral, den der Meister für Dr. Heller eigens komponiert hatte, aufzufinden. Ebenso waren die sechs Bände der Sechter-Studien, von denen Franz Schalk berichtet, daß er sie oft gesehen, nicht aufzufinden*“.<sup>41</sup>

### **Zur Neubewertung des *Finale***

Angesichts dieser Verstreuung ist es schlicht falsch, zu behaupten, wir wären heute wie durch ein Wunder doch in den Besitz sämtlichen Materials zum *Finale* gekommen, um dann daraus den absurden Rückschluß zu ziehen, Bruckner habe eben nur solche Fragmente oder Bruchstücke komponiert. Die früher weitverbreitete Annahme, Bruckner habe nur Skizzen zum *Finale* hinterlassen, ist ein Überbleibsel aus einer Zeit, zu der noch kaum jemand von der Existenz dieser zahlreichen Partiturbogen wußte. Die Legende wurde wohl bewußt von Ferdinand Löwe in die Welt gesetzt, um die Vertretbarkeit seiner dreisätzigen Auffassung der Symphonie zu untermauern. In seinem August 1903 datierten Vorwort zur Erstausgabe (Wien, Doblinger) heißt es etwa: „*Anton Bruckner's Neunte Symphonie [...] sollte (der ursprünglichen Absicht des Meisters nach) durch ein rein instrumentales Finale beschlossen werden. Durch schwere körperliche Leiden zu häufigen und oftmals andauernden Unterbrechungen der Arbeit gezwungen, musste aber Bruckner mehr und mehr befürchten, sein letztes Werk nicht mehr beenden zu können. Allmähig [sic] mochte so in ihm der Entschluss gereift sein, den vollendeten drei Sätzen als Finale sein TE DEUM anzufügen. Skizzen zu einer gross angelegten Ueberleitungsmusik sind uns erhalten; was ihnen zu entnehmen ist, läßt jedoch nur andeutungsweise die letzten Absichten des Meisters errathen.*“

<sup>40</sup> Eine der wichtigsten Quellen zu den letzten einhalb Jahren des Komponisten sowie zur Entstehung des *Finale* bleibt der Bericht Richard Hellers: Max Auer, Hrg., *Anton Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt*. In: *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner. Festschrift zum 100. Geburtstag Anton Bruckners*. Karl Kobald, Hrg. Zürich–Leipzig–Wien 1924, S. 21–35, insbesondere S. 35. Im Gegensatz zu den darauf basierenden Passagen im Band IV/3 der großen Göllerich-Auer Biographie ist in diesem Artikel das Wortlaut Hellers von Auer kaum redigiert worden. Richard Heller (1862–1934), praktischer Arzt und Sanitätsrat, der als ein zuverlässiger und unvoreingenommener Zeuge eingestuft werden kann, verfaßte auch eine ausführliche Krankengeschichte über Bruckner, die heute im Institut für Geschichte der Medizin an der Wiener Universität aufbewahrt wird; er muß also in der letzten Zeit viel mit Bruckner im Gespräch gewesen sein.

<sup>41</sup> Göll.-A. IV/3, S. 610; siehe auch S. 576.

Alfred Orel ging in seiner Ausgabe vernichtend mit der Idee um, das erhaltene Material stelle lediglich eine Überleitungsmusik zum *Te Deum* dar (obwohl Bruckner den Berichten mehrerer Zeugen zufolge auch diese Idee hatte<sup>42</sup>); Orels Text konstatiert jedoch öfters das Fehlen mehrerer in Verlust geratener Bogen – die erhaltenen Manuskripte lassen ja keine andere Auslegung zu.<sup>43</sup> Leider stiftete Orel Verwirrung durch seine Annahme, Bruckner habe den Satz in mehrfachen, angeblich voneinander abhängigen „ Fassungen“ hinterlassen (was durchaus nicht stimmt), und durch eine Fehlbezeichnung von Bogen 32 der Partitur als 21 stellte er sogar den gesamten zweiten Teil des Satzes in Frage! Neueste Forschungen belegen aber eindeutig, daß die heute vorhandenen, von Bruckner selbst nummerierten und Takt für Takt sorgfältigst mit metrischen Ziffern versehenen Bogen der Orchesterpartitur ursprünglich einen *d u r c h g e h e n d e n S a t z* bildeten, dessen Komposition bereits weit gediehen war, in allen wesentlichen Details feststand und eine klare musikalische Faktur sowie zum Teil komplex ausgearbeiteten Kontrapunkt aufweist. Der Satz kann keinesfalls als Entwurf, sondern muß vielmehr als eine im Entstehen begriffene *A u t o g r a p h – P a r t i t u r* bezeichnet werden. Einige bereits ausinstrumentierte Bogen hatte Bruckner selbst ausdrücklich als „fertig“ bezeichnet; ihnen fehlte nur der letzte Schliff – die „Nuancierung“, wie Bruckner die Hinzufügung von Artikulation und Dynamik nannte; von intensiver und langwieriger Entstehung zeugen die vielen ausgeschiedenen Bogen, vor allem zur Exposition des Satzes wie auch die Tatsache, daß Bruckner fertig komponierte Bogen, die ihm zu unsauber aussahen, sauber abschrieb – ein Bild übrigens, das mit der Entstehung des ersten Satzes durchaus vergleichbar ist. Bei einem „Entwurf“ würde sich ein Komponist wohl kaum solche Mühe machen. Alle Hauptelemente wie Anfangsmotivik, Hauptthema, Gesangsperiode, Choral und *Te-Deum*-Motiv sind bereits ab den frühesten Entwürfen in ihrer offensichtlich definitiven Form erhalten geblieben. Darüber hinaus ist es auch müßig, zu spekulieren, Bruckner hätte den Satz noch strukturell geändert, selbst wenn er hier oder da noch eine kleinere Erweiterung oder Verkürzung im Satzverlauf durchgeführt hätte. Auch wenn Bruckner im Laufe seiner Ausarbeitung weitere Details geändert hätte, stand für ihn doch der musikalische Verlauf des Satzes bereits einige Monate vor seinem Tode in allen wesentlichen Details eindeutig fest.

Was Bruckner hinterließ, war eine Partitur, die bereits weit über die erste Niederschriftphase (fertig komponierte Streicher, in Tinte eingetragen, zusammen mit den wichtigeren Bläserensätzen) gekommen und wohl schon bis zum Satzende einschließlich der Coda gediehen war, denn Bruckner pflegte immer zuerst diese eigentliche Phase der Komposition zu Ende zu führen, bevor er an die systematische Ausarbeitung der Instrumentation ging. Die Ausarbeitung, die auch den Einschub eines neuen Bogens 3 und daher die Umnúmerierung aller folgenden, zu diesem Zeitpunkt gültigen Bogen umfaßte – also eine Arbeit, die erst zweckmäßig war, wenn der Satz als fertiges Gebilde einmal

<sup>42</sup> Siehe dazu John A. Phillips, *The facts behind a „Legend“* ... a. O.

<sup>43</sup> Siehe etwa *Enwürfe und Skizzen* a. O. S. 110: „*Der Text des verlorenen Bogens 19* [...]“; S. 116: „*Der verlorene Bogen 24* enthielt offenbar 16 Takte“; S. 124: „*Auf diesen folgt ein nicht erhaltener* [...]“ usw.

dastand –, konnte Bruckner bis in die Durchführung des Satzes realisieren.<sup>44</sup> Die Annahme, ein Komponist könne einen Satz wie das *Finale* der *Neunten* in Bruchstücken konzipieren, widerspricht allem, was wir über die Kompositionspraxis Bruckners wissen; sie gehört viel eher in den Bereich der Spekulation als die schlichte Feststellung, daß wir heute infolge der weiten Zerstreung dieser Manuskripte lediglich nicht im Besitz aller von Bruckner komponierten Seiten sind.

„Erst Fakteln, dann Deuteln“: Es wird höchste Zeit, daß die Musikwissenschaft beginnt, sich mit diesem *Finale* ernsthaft zu beschäftigen, um das schiefe Bild der *Neunten* als dreisätzig Symphonie endlich zurechtzurücken.

### Zur Aufführungsfassung des *Finale*

Eine wichtige Lektion für die Musikwissenschaft ist auch, daß sich erst die Dirigenten und Komponisten Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca in den frühen achtziger Jahren ernsthaft mit den Quellen zum *Finale* beschäftigten. Seit einer 1940 uraufgeführten, von Fritz Oeser eingerichteten Fassung der Exposition des Satzes hatten zahlreiche Bearbeiter die Orel-Ausgabe in die Hand genommen und versucht, daraus einen Satz „im Brucknerstil“ zusammenzubasteln, meistens ohne das geringste Verständnis für die komplexe Philologie, die dahinter stand.<sup>45</sup> Die Tatsache, daß die Partitur eine ursprünglich durchgehende Serie von Partiturbogen bildete, auch daß die fehlenden Bogen fast immer jeweils 16 Takte umfaßt haben mußten, und daß man deren Verlauf anhand der der Komposition der Partitur vorangegangenen Particellskizzen weitgehend mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit rekonstruieren könne<sup>46</sup>, wurde Samale und Mazzuca klar.<sup>47</sup> Ihre *Ricostruzione* wurde im Dezember 1985 unter Eliahu Inbal erstmals für den Hessischen Rundfunk produziert und im Februar 1986 in Berlin unter der Leitung von Peter Gülke uraufgeführt.

Im gleichen Jahr traf der deutsche Musikforscher und Dirigent Gunnar (später Benjamin Gunnar) Cohrs mit Samale zusammen; Cohrs brachte wichtige weitere Perspektiven ins Spiel, wie etwa den aus dem Bericht Richard Hellers stammenden Hinweis, Bruckner wolle das *Finale* mit einem „Lob- und Preislied“ beenden. 1990 gesellte sich der Verfasser dazu; eingehende Studium der

<sup>44</sup> Uns fehlen heute mindestens Bogen mit den revidierten Nummern 1, 4, 5a, 5b, 6, 7, 13, 15, 20, 25, 28 und 31 sowie wohl einige weitere Bogen zum Satzende. In jedem Fall endet der vorhergehende bzw. beginnt der nachfolgende Bogen – wie Bruckners metrische Ziffern eindeutig beweisen – sogar manchmal fertig instrumentiert inmitten einer Periode. Siehe dazu in der AP des *Finale* a. O. S. XVIIIff., die Tabellen II und III sowie im Notentext selbst und in den Anmerkungen, etwa S. 65, 85, 105 usw. Wie die Rekonstruktion zeigt, stellte Bruckner aber vorläufig den Verlauf größerer Teile des Satzes in Particellskizzen fest, anhand derer man zum Teil diese Lücken mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit überbrücken kann.

<sup>45</sup> Siehe dazu etwa John A. Phillips, *Neue Erkenntnisse* a. O. S. 147ff. sowie Cornelis van Zwol, *Der Finalsatz der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners. Ein Referat in Utrecht (15. November 1986); ein Symposium in Rom (11. bis 12. Mai 1987)*, in: *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1987–88*, S. 31–38.

<sup>46</sup> Siehe dazu die AP des *Finale*, S. IX sowie im Notentext (passim).

<sup>47</sup> Damals konnte man auch nur schwer an die Quellen heran, da Leopold Nowak bis Ende der 1980er Jahre selbst an einer Neuausgabe der Entwürfe und Skizzen zur Neunten Symphonie arbeitete und sie daher anderen Forschern vorenthielt. Grundlegende Forschungsarbeit wurde erst 1990 möglich.

Quellen in Wien (1990/91) sowie weitere Erkenntnisse über die Rolle des „*Mutationsverfahrens*“<sup>48</sup> für die Kompositionstechnik Bruckners festigten die Autoren in der Annahme, eine mit größter Vorsicht und philologischer sowie kompositionstechnischer Akribie erstellte Aufführungsfassung des Satzes sei nicht nur machbar, sondern philologisch und ethisch auch vertretbar. Grundlegend war die Einsicht, daß Bruckner die Komposition des Satzes sehr weit gebracht hat, sowie auch, daß das *Finale* für den Komponisten keineswegs ein Unikum an sich, sondern von Anfang an einen unerläßlichen Bestandteil seiner Konzeption der gesamten Symphonie bildete – eine Konzeption, der man eigentlich erst gewahr wird, wenn man die Symphonie mit dem *Finale* aufführt. Bei allem Respekt für die Authentizität der Fragmente gehörten solche Erkenntnisse schon einem viel breiteren „Kreis von Freunden und Kennern“ an, als der Musikforschung allein.

Im Dezember 1991 in Linz unter der Leitung von Manfred Mayrhofer uraufgeführt, erschien die Partitur dieser Aufführungsfassung im folgenden Jahr mit Hilfe einer Subvention namhafter Musikwissenschaftler im Selbstverlag ihrer vier Autoren; sie wurde im Februar 1993 unter der Leitung von Kurt Eichhorn für Camerata zum ersten Mal eingespielt. Deutsche, italienische und britische Erstaufführungen bzw. Rundfunkproduktionen fanden in den Jahren 1994–96 statt. Seit 1998 sind immer bedeutendere Aufführungen und Aufnahmen zu verzeichnen, wie etwa die zweite CD-Produktion mit der Neuen Philharmonie Westfalen unter Johannes Wildner für Sonarte (April 1998), sowie Aufführungen in den Niederlanden (1999), Bremen, London, Moskau (alle 2000), München, Düsseldorf und Brüssel (2001). Zunehmend positiv wird auch die kritische Rezeption, die zeigt, daß Zuhörer und Kritiker, solange sie adäquat informiert sind, zu einer überaus positiven Beurteilung der Aufführungsfassung wie auch der Bedeutung des *Finale* für die Gesamtkonzeption der Symphonie gelangen.<sup>49</sup> Für die Saison 2001/02 steht eine Neuauflage der Partitur sowie die japanische Erstaufführung an.

---

<sup>48</sup> Siehe dazu Werner F. Korte, *Bruckner und Brahms. Die spätromantische Lösung der autonomen Konzeption*. Tutzing 1963; Matthias Hansen, *Bruckner*. Leipzig 1987, insbesondere S. 147f. sowie John A. Phillips, *Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren*. In: *Bruckner Symposium 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk. Bericht*. Linz–Wien 1995, S. 153–178. In letzter Zeit werden die Einsichten Kortés auch von Benjamin Korstvedt als wichtiger Schlüssel der Kompositionstechnik Bruckners bewertet; siehe dazu sein *Bruckner: Symphony No. 8 (Cambridge Music Handbooks, Julian Rushton, Hrg.)*. Cambridge 2000.

<sup>49</sup> Man vgl. z. B. Hartmut Lücks Rezension der Bremer Aufführungen: „*Das Finale klingt nicht nur ausgesprochen homogen, sondern offenbart auch eine logische Verbindung des eigenen, sehr kühnen Themenmaterials dieses Satzes mit Reminiszenzen der vorangegangenen Sätze, woraus sich die umfassende Idee des Werkes erst richtig erschließt. [...] Umso mehr überzeugte die klare Architektur des ‚Adagio. Langsam, feierlich‘, die Ausgewogenheit der orchestralen Klangfarben, die diesen Satz glücklicherweise aller verklärenden (und falschen) Himmelstor-Ideologie entkleideten und perspektivisch bereits das Finale ahnen ließen. Dieses wiederum wurde in seiner Logik, aber auch in der im wahrsten Sinne ‚unerhörten‘ Neuartigkeit zum Höhepunkt der Darbietung, in der es Neuhold gelang, noch einmal alle Kräfte des an diesem Abend stark geforderten Orchesters zu einer rundum beeindruckenden Leistung zusammenzufassen. Diese nun viersätzig Sinfonie Bruckners überzeugte als Einheit—ein Gewinn für den Konzertsaal.*“ (*Bläserchorale für den lieben Gott. Günter Neuhold dirigierte Werke von Wolfgang Rihm und Anton Bruckner*. In: *Weser Kurier*, Bremen, 15. März 2000).

### Zum *Finale* in der Gesamtausgabe

Es ist nur wenigen bekannt, in welcher besonderen Weise sich Leopold Nowak lebenslang mit den Entwürfen zur *Neunten Symphonie* und insbesondere mit denen des *Finale* beschäftigt hat. Bereits 1935 als junger Lektor an der Wiener Universität und Mitarbeiter der Gesamtausgabe las er Korrektur der *Entwürfe und Skizzen* Orels und stellte dabei buchstäblich Hunderte von Transkriptionsfehlern fest – ein Verdienst, der auch für die neue Edition herangezogen werden konnte.<sup>50</sup> Neuerlich aufgefundene Datierungen zeigen, daß Nowak noch 1986 bis Juli 1989 weiterhin versucht hat, etwa die Proportionen des *Finale* durch einen Vergleich mit den anderen Finalsätzen Bruckners zu eruieren, und auch angefangen hat, die „Krakauer“ Skizzen zu transkribieren.<sup>51</sup> Kurz vor seinem Tod im Mai 1991 stattete ihm der Verfasser einen Besuch ab, während dessen sich Nowak mit einer Neuausgabe des *Finale* in der Gesamtausgabe einverstanden erklärte. So sollte es auch sein, daß die *Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen* (Wien 1994; zweite revidierte Ausgabe 1999) dem Andenken des großen Brucknerforschers gewidmet wurde. Auf XXXVII + 155 Seiten wurde Bruckners Partitur des *Finale*, soweit die heute vorhandenen Partiturbogen und Particellskizzen dies überhaupt zulassen, vorgelegt und anhand von eingehenden Anmerkungen beschrieben und erläutert. Der Text dazu erschien auch in englischer Übersetzung.<sup>52</sup>

1996 wurde als nächstes die Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten publiziert, die alle erhaltenen Quellen zum *Finale* in Faksimile wiedergibt – ein stattlicher Band von XXIX + 339 Seiten. Ein ausführliches Vorwort und drei Verzeichnisse vermitteln Informationen über die Entstehung des Satzes und eine Konkordanz mit der in der Orel-Ausgabe erschienenen Quellen. Im Sommer 1998 machte Herbert Vogg dem Verfasser den Vorschlag, eine lediglich auf der „AP“ basierende Version der Rekonstruktion des Satzes für den praktischen Gebrauch herauszugeben – also ohne jegliche Ergänzung, weder des Satzverlaufs noch der Instrumentation. Die Lücken sollten als solche belassen werden, ergäben aber die Möglichkeit, einen erklärenden, gesprochenen Kommentar dazugeben. Vogg erklärte 1999<sup>53</sup>: „*Es müßte doch, dachten wir, möglich sein, die erhalten gebliebenen Partitur-, Particell- und Satzverlaufseiten in der jetzt klar gewordenen sinnvollen und philologisch untermauerten Abfolge als ein Satz Ganzes zu edieren und im Wechsel von Partitur-, Particell- und Satzverlaufseiten Bruckners Konzept zu mindest erahnen zu lassen. John Phillips sprang auf diese Idee an und legte 1994 in der Gesamtausgabe eine Studienpartitur des Finale-Fragments vor: Sämtliche Seiten folgen treulich Bruckners autographen Hinterlassenschaft, nichts ist*

<sup>50</sup> Die zwei Handexemplare, in denen er seine Korrekturen eintrug, gingen nach seinem Tod in den Besitz der ÖNB über; drei Seiten davon sind in der Faksimile-Ausgabe zum *Finale der Neunten* (S. 337ff.) wiedergegeben.

<sup>51</sup> Siehe im Fonds F60 BRGA 68.

<sup>52</sup> Rudolf Stephan schrieb in seiner Rezension der AP des *Finale* (*Das Orchester*, Mai 1995, S. 57), sich auf die vorgesehenen drei Bände zum *Finale* beziehend: „*Erst wenn alle diese Publikationen vorliegen, wird man sich ein Bild von der Überlieferung und den mit ihr verbundenen philologischen und musikalischen Problemen machen können. Immerhin ist schon jetzt erkennbar, daß hier eine gründlich vorbereitete Ausgabe vorliegt, die Respekt, Anerkennung und Dank verdient.*“

<sup>53</sup> *Bruckners unvollendeter Lobgesang. Zur Dokumentation des Finale-Fragments der Neunten Symphonie.* In: *Musikfreunde—Zeitschrift der Musikfreunde in Wien* 12, Nr. 2 (November 1999), S. 12f.



hinzugefügt, blanke Partiturseiten markieren in Verlust geratene Passagen. Die Publikation wurde zur Sensation. Die Anfrage eines Konzertveranstalters, ob es zu diesem authentischen Finale auch ein Aufführungsmaterial gebe, löste den nächsten Schritt aus: Phillips erklärte sich bereit, die Partitur für den Konzertsaal einzurichten, behutsam und ohne jede Eigenmächtigkeit. Es wurde keine Note hinzugefügt, die nicht von Bruckners Hand legitimiert ist. Wo Bruckner uns nur den Streichersatz hinterlassen hat, ist der Hörer eingeladen, sich die von Bruckner vermutlich aufgetürmten Bläserklangmassen zu imaginieren. Wo das erhalten gebliebene Material lückenhaft ist, wo einer der von Bruckner durchnummerierten Bogen fehlt, wird der Satzablauf kurz unterbrochen.“ Diese Dokumentation des Fragments des Finales, wie sie schließlich hieß, wurde im November 1999 im Großen Musikvereinssaal Wien von den Wiener Symphonikern unter der Leitung von Nikolaus Harnoncourt als Einleitung zu einer Aufführung der ersten drei Sätze der *Neunten* mit anhaltendem kritischem Erfolg uraufgeführt.<sup>54</sup> Der Präsentation der vier erhaltenen Partiturfragmente wurde eine Einleitung vorangestellt (mit der Möglichkeit, die Hauptthemen im voraus vorzustellen); die Dokumentation schließt mit einer Streicher-Bearbeitung der erhaltenen Skizzen zur Coda.<sup>55</sup> Die ursprünglich nur als Leihmaterial vorgesehene Partitur (XLII + 118 S.) bringt der Musikwissenschaftliche Verlag 2001 auch käuflich heraus. Wie in der „AP“ erscheint der ausführliche kritische Apparat (Vorwort, Tabellen und Kritischer Kommentar) zweisprachig.

Geplant wurde 1991 zum *Finale* auch ein Text- bzw. Studienband, der noch nicht erscheinen konnte. Etwa 1996 weitete man diesen Plan aus: Auch zu den anderen Sätzen der Symphonie sollten Studienbände erscheinen. Bereits 1998 gab Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs denjenigen zum zweiten Satz heraus (XXIII + 133 S.); im gleichen Jahr waren auch Cohrs' Bearbeitungen sowohl für Orchester wie auch für Orgel und Solo-Viola der zwei früheren Fassungen des *Trios* (F-Dur, Fis-Dur) beim Musikverlag Doblinger erschienen. Im Mai 2001 führten dann Gespräche zwischen Vogg, Cohrs und dem Verfasser dazu, die noch ausstehenden Bände zum ersten, dritten und vierten Satz als philologische Studien zu den jeweiligen Manuskript-Quellen umzukonzipieren. Ein zusätzlicher Textband zur *Neunten Symphonie* soll alle Dokumente und Forschungsergebnisse zu Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption der Symphonie enthalten, die sonst irgendwie wiederholt oder aufgeteilt in den Teilbänden hätten erscheinen müssen.

---

<sup>54</sup> Siehe z. B. die Rezension Heinz Rögls: „Er [Harnoncourt] war ein beredter und überzeugender Anwalt dafür, daß Bruckner mit diesem gewaltigen Finalsatz sein gesamtes symphonisches Schaffen zu einem kühnen und kronenden Abschluß gebracht hätte, wären ihm ein paar Monate mehr Zeit dazu geblieben. Hauptthemen, Satzverlauf und den Plan zu einer riesenhaften Coda hatte Bruckner nachweislich als durchgehende Einheit fertig.“ (Keine Skizzen eines Altersschwachen. Nikolaus Harnoncourt präsentierte das Fragment des Finales von Bruckners *Neunter*. In: *Salzburger Nachrichten*, 15. November 1999).

<sup>55</sup> Bei der Uraufführung sprach Harnoncourt frei, aber weitgehend nach dem Muster des vorgegebenen Textes. Er verzichtete dabei allerdings auf die Coda-Skizzen, die erst am 22. April 2001 in Düsseldorf von der Philharmonia Hungarica unter Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs erstmals mit aufgeführt wurden.

### Exkurs: Zur Erstausgabe der *Neunten Symphonie*

Auch wenn die Löwe-Ausgabe den Boden der Werktreue verließ, handelt es sich dabei um eine hervorragende Orchester-Bearbeitung. Wie Wolfgang Doebel gezeigt hat<sup>56</sup>, kann keineswegs davon die Rede sein, daß sie in den dreißiger Jahren erst aus ideologisch-politischen Gründen (wegen der Herkunft des Bearbeiters) beiseite geschoben wurde, denn selbst ein so nationalsozialistisch gestimmter Dirigent wie Siegmund von Hausegger konnte in Beantwortung einer Anfrage Max Auers noch 1930 ein blendendes Gutachten für die Löwe-Fassung schreiben. Dort heißt es etwa: „*Alles in allem ergibt ein Vergleich der beiden Partituren, daß L.[öwe]’s instrumentale Änderungen fast durchwegs eine wesentliche Verbesserung und klarere Herausarbeitung der musikalischen Idee bedeuten. Die Feinsinnigkeit, Sachkenntnis und Treue, mit der L.[öwe] vorging, sind bewundernswert.*“<sup>57</sup> Damals galten ja die Autograph-Fassungen als praktisch unaufführbar; auch wenn sie aus wissenschaftlichen Zwecken veröffentlicht werden sollten, wurde von einem Druck der Stimmen – also ihrer Nutzung für praktische Zwecke – abgesehen. Erst bei der Uraufführung von Bruckners Autograph-Partitur der *Neunten* am 2. April 1932 unter Hausegger bei einer geschlossenen Sitzung der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft wurde die Vertretbarkeit des Originals deutlich; daraufhin entschloß sich der Vorstand, auch die Stimmen erscheinen zu lassen.<sup>58</sup> Man gewöhnte sich an das viel schroffere, herbere Bild des Originals mit seinen in die Zukunft weisenden Dissonanzen, wie etwa den berühmten Siebenklang auf dem Höhepunkt im *Adagio*.

Auch wenn Bruckner noch Oktober 1895 bereit war, die Meißner-Abschrift des ersten Satzes Joseph Schalk „zum Arrangement“ zu übergeben<sup>59</sup>, und wenn auch zu Dokumentationszwecken ein kommentierter Nachdruck der Löwe-Ausgabe keinesfalls auszuschließen wäre, widerspräche es doch entschieden den Editionsprinzipien der Gesamtausgabe, die Bearbeitung Löwes dem Original gleichzusetzen, wofür im Falle des Erstdrucks der *Vierten Symphonie* immerhin durchaus zu argumentieren war: Denn wie Benjamin Korstvedt beweisen konnte<sup>60</sup>, handelt es sich bei dem 1889 erschienenen Erstdruck der *Vierten* um eine Kollaboration mit Ferdinand Löwe, genau wie auch in enger Zusammenarbeit mit Franz Schalk der Zweitdruck der *Dritten* (1891) entstand. Auch wenn Bruckner mit der Herausgabe seiner Werke in dieser vielfach „gemilderten“ (allerdings auch nicht „wagnerisierten“) Form einverstanden war, und auch wenn er daran revidiert und geändert hat, so bleiben deutliche Spuren der Eingriffe Löwes bzw. Schalks. Wie Thomas Leibnitz zeigte<sup>61</sup>, wurde das wahre Ausmaß der Bearbeitung beim Erstdruck der *Fünften* (1896) Bruckner absichtlich vorenthalten;

---

<sup>56</sup> a. O. S. 234ff.

<sup>57</sup> Ebenda S. 235.

<sup>58</sup> Ebenda S. 239.

<sup>59</sup> Spuren einiger Änderungsversuche in der Hand Franz Schalks sind darin enthalten; siehe in der Gesamtausgabe den *Kritischen Bericht zur Neunten*, B. G. Cohrs, Hrg. (Wien 2001; im Druck), Anhang, S. 203f.

<sup>60</sup> *The First Published Edition of Bruckner’s Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity*. In: *19th-Century Music* 20, Nr. 1 (Sommer 1997), S. 3–26.

<sup>61</sup> Siehe etwa sein *Francisce und der „Generalissimus“*. *Die Brüder Schalk als Interpreten und Bearbeiter der Werke Bruckners*. In: *Bruckner Symposium Bruckner Freunde—Bruckner Kenner. Bericht 1994*. Linz 1996, S. 87–94.

beim Erstdruck der *Achten* (1892) scheint Bruckner recht wenig mit den Druckvorlagen zu tun gehabt zu haben.<sup>62</sup> Wie Wolfgang Doebel neuerlich bestätigte<sup>63</sup>, hatte also Nowak durchaus recht, einen deutlichen Trennstrich zu ziehen zwischen dem, was Bruckner selbst geschrieben hat, und was er letzten Endes nur zugebilligt haben mag.

### Zur Neuausgabe der Sätze 1 bis 3

Eine Neuausgabe der ersten drei Sätze der *Neunten Symphonie* in der Gesamtausgabe wurde 1998 bei Benjamin G. Cohrs in Auftrag gegeben; Notentypographie und editorische Beratung leistete der Verfasser. Der Band ist 2000 erschienen. Schon Deckblatt und Titelseite zeigen, wie sich die Zeiten geändert haben, denn es heißt zum ersten Mal nicht mehr einfach „IX. *Symphonie D-Moll*“ sondern „IX. *Symphonie D-Moll / 1. Satz – Scherzo und Trio – Adagio*“. Es wurde also dem Umstand Rechnung getragen, daß diese drei Sätze allein nicht „die Neunte“ darstellen.<sup>64</sup> Für weitere Überraschung sorgt ein der Partitur vorangestellter Hinweis auf Bruckners Widmung der Symphonie „an den lieben Gott“.

Schon aus rein lesetechnischen Gründen war eine Neuausgabe der *Neunten* überfällig. Änderungen der Ausgabe von 1951 gegenüber jener von 1934 hatten sich aus drucktechnischen Gründen auf offensichtliche Druckfehler Orels beschränkt; vor allem sind bei Nowak die vielen unnötigen Vorzeichen Bruckners stehengeblieben. Erst bei der Ausgabe 2000 wurden diese entfernt, der Seitenumbruch der früheren Ausgaben wurde jedoch beibehalten. Auch wenn dies zur Folge hat, daß einige Seiten, bei denen viele Akzidentien entfernt werden mußten, zu „schwimmen“ scheinen, während andere fast zu eng gedruckt sind, war diese Lösung sicherlich vom Standpunkt des kritischen Lesers aus die angemessenste.

Zudem leistete der Herausgeber grundlegende und bemerkenswerte Forschungen zur Entstehung der Symphonie. Vor allem konnte klargestellt werden, daß die ersten drei Sätze der *Neunten* nicht so eindeutig fertiggestellt wurden, wie man bisher meinte, denn zu einer letzten, umfassenden Durchsicht ist Bruckner ja nie gekommen. Auch in seinem letzten Lebensjahr, in dem er am *Finale* bereits arbeitete, hat sich Bruckner wohl noch weiterhin mit der „Nuancierung“ der Partituren der ersten drei Sätze beschäftigt: Daraufhin deutet eine mit Bleistift vorgenommene Revision der Artikulation, die zwar in der Autograph-Partitur, nicht jedoch in der im Herbst 1895 von

---

<sup>62</sup> Dies bestätigt neuerdings ein von Cohrs und dem Verfasser durchgeführter Vergleich der im Archiv der Gesellschaft der Musifreunde in Wien aufbewahrten Stichvorlage der *Achten* mit einer in der Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek aufbewahrten Photokopie der Stichvorlage zur *Vierten*. In der Stichvorlage zur *Vierten* existieren zahlreiche autographe Änderungen der von Löwe hinzugefügten Tempobezeichnungen, in der Stichvorlage zur *Achten* hingegen keine. Dem Anschein nach wurden die vielen zusätzlichen Tempomodifikationen im Erstdruck der *Achten* erst eingeführt, nachdem Bruckner die Abschrift bereits durchgesehen hatte.

<sup>63</sup> a. O. S. 416.

<sup>64</sup> Bei der Neuausgabe wurde allerdings durchaus überlegt, ob man das *Finale* nicht besser mit den ersten drei Sätzen in einem Band hätte herausgegeben sollen. Lediglich auf Grund des umfangreichen kritischen Apparats, den die Rekonstruktion des vierten sowie die Neuausgabe der ersten drei Sätze benötigt, wurde davon abgesehen.

Meißner angefertigten Abschrift Mus. Hs. 29.305 erscheint.<sup>65</sup> Bruckner fügte auch im ersten Satz erst später ein langsames Tempo für die Gesangsperiode hinzu, das eigentlich die Ergänzung einiger weiterer Tempo-Modifikationen benötigen würde. Vor allem konnten offensichtliche Fehler des Komponisten berichtigt werden, jeweils unter Verweis auf eine der insgesamt 111 Anmerkungen zum Notentext, auf die am Ende des Bandes zweisprachig auf 20 Seiten ausführlich eingegangen wird. In einigen Zweifelsfällen wurden Alternativlesarten, vor allem bei der Artikulation, angegeben, die im Notentext typographisch als solche kenntlich gemacht wurden. Überdies ist ein neuer Stimmensatz erschienen, der auch dem Orchestermusiker erhebliche Leseerleichterungen verschafft.

Die „neue“ *Neunte* erklang erstmals bei einer kompletten Aufführung der Symphonie einschließlich der *Aufführungsfassung* des *Finale* am 22. April 2001 in Düsseldorf, gespielt von der Philharmonia Hungarica unter Robert Bachmann. Vorangestellt wurde die *Dokumentation des Fragments*, dirigiert und erläutert von Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs.

Noch im selben Jahr erscheint auch der *Kritische Bericht* zu den ersten drei Sätzen, der auf XVI + 220 Seiten die Autograph-Partitur der ersten drei Sätze, Mus. Hs. 19.480, genauestens beschreibt, zahlreiche Seiten in Faksimile wiedergibt, und im Anhang die Abweichungen der von Meißner besorgten Abschrift des ersten Satzes (Mus. Hs. 29.305) gegenüber der „AP“ verzeichnet. Den Dirigenten zur Information werden auch die unterschiedlichen Tempo-Angaben der früheren Ausgaben von Löwe (1903) bis Nowak (1951) in einer Konkordanz aufgelistet. Damit wird Cohrs im Rahmen der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe der erste Herausgeber der *Neunten* überhaupt, der gemeinsam mit seiner Edition der Partitur auch einen ausführlichen Revisionsbericht erscheinen läßt.

Zur Zeit liegt also von der gesamten vorgesehenen Publikationenserie zur *Neunten* etwa die Hälfte vor. Seit 1994 sind in der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe erschienen: die rekonstruierte *Autograph-Partitur* des *Finale* (1994, 1999) und *Faksimile-Ausgabe* (1996), der Studienband zum *Scherzo* (1998), wiederum zum *Finale* die *Dokumentation des Fragments* (1999; ab 2001 käuflich), die Neuausgabe der *Partitur der ersten drei Sätze* (2000) und deren *Kritischer Bericht* (2001). Die auf der Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur basierende *Aufführungsfassung* des *Finale* erschien 1992 und 1996 im Selbstverlag der Autoren (eine dritte Auflage wird vorbereitet). Im Musikverlag Doblinger sind 1998 die Bearbeitungen der nachgelassenen Trios für Orchester bzw. für Orgel und Viola erschienen. Insgesamt wurden also in der Gesamtausgabe sechs Bände zur *Neunten Symphonie* publiziert; dazu die drei weiteren *Aufführungsfassungen* des Trios und des *Finale*. Ausständig sind bis 2001 noch die drei Studienbände zu den Quellen zum ersten, dritten und vierten Satz der *Neunten* sowie der umfassende Textband zu Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption aller vier Sätze, die das gesamte erhaltene Material zur *Neunten* endlich in angemessener Weise erschließen werden. Für die *Neunte* ist jetzt also wirklich reichlich gesorgt...

---

<sup>65</sup> Erst 1999 von Cohrs identifiziert. Weder Orel noch Nowak haben diese Bleistifteintragungen in ihren Editionen berücksichtigt.

### LITERATUR ZUR NEUNTEN SYMPHONIE (Auswahl)

- Max Auer, *Anton Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt*, in: *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner. Festschrift zum 100. Geburtstag Anton Bruckners*. Hrsg. Karl Kobald. Zürich–Leipzig–Wien 1924, S. 21–35.
- Bearbeitungen. Round-table*, in: *Bruckner-Symposion „ Fassungen – Bearbeitungen – Vollendungen“ Linz 1996. Bericht*. Redaktion: Andrea Harrandt. Linz 1998, S. 133–142.
- Anton Bruckner, Kritische Gesamtausgabe. IX. Symphonie d-Moll. Band 9 (Originalfassung): Entwürfe und Skizzen*. Hrsg. Alfred Orel. Wien 1934.
- Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke. Zu Band 9: Finale (unvollendet): Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen. Studienpartitur*. Hrsg. John A. Phillips, Wien 1994, 1999.
- Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke. Zu Band 9: Finale (unvollendet): Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten*. Hrsg. John A. Phillips. Wien 1996.
- Anton Bruckner, Neunte Symphonie D-Moll: Finale. Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen: Aufführungsfassung von Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Gunnar Cohrs und Giuseppe Mazzuca*. Hrsg. John A. Phillips. Adelaide–Bremen 1992, 1996.
- Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke. Zu Band 9: Scherzo und Trio: Entwürfe; Älteres Trio mit Viola-Solo (1893). Autograph-Partitur; Studienband*. Vorgelegt von Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs. Wien 1998.
- Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke. Band 9: 1. Satz – Scherzo und Trio – Adagio*. Kritische Neuausgabe unter Berücksichtigung der Arbeiten von Alfred Orel und Leopold Nowak. Vorgelegt von Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs. Wien 2000.
- Anton Bruckner, Sämtliche Werke. Zu Band 9: 1. Satz – Scherzo und Trio – Adagio*. Kritische Neuausgabe unter Berücksichtigung der Arbeiten von Alfred Orel und Leopold Nowak. Kritischer Bericht. Vorgelegt von Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs. Wien 2001.
- Anton Bruckner: 9. Sinfonie. Wien 11. 2. 1903 (Uraufführung)*, in: Manfred Wagner, *Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik in Beispielen. Mit einem einleitenden Essay von Norbert Tschulik*. Tutzing 1979, S. 235–277.
- Wolfgang Doebel, *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen. Die Konzepte der Bruckner-Schüler und ihre Rezeption bis zu Robert Haas*. (Publikationen des Institutes für Österreichische Musikdokumentation 24). Hrsg. Günter Brosche. Tutzing 2001.
- Zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie. Round-table*, in: *Bruckner-Symposion „ Fassungen – Bearbeitungen – Vollendungen“ Linz 1996. Bericht*. Redaktion: Erich Wolfgang Partsch. Linz 1998, S. 189–210.
- Harmut Lück, *Bläserchoräle für den lieben Gott. Günter Neuhold dirigierte Werke von Wolfgang Rihm und Anton Bruckner*, in: *Weser Kurier* (Bremen), 15. März 2000.
- Leopold Nowak, *Die Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe. Ihre Geschichte und Schicksale*, in: *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1982/83*. Hrsg. Othmar Wessely. Linz 1984, S. 33–68.
- John A. Phillips, *Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners*, in: *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1989/90*. Hrsg. Othmar Wessely etc. Linz 1992, S. 115–204.
- , *Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren*, in: *Bruckner Symposion „Anton Bruckner – Persönlichkeit und Werk“ Linz 1992. Bericht*. Hrsg. Othmar Wessely etc. Linz 1995, S. 153–178.
- , *The Facts Behind a „Legend“: Bruckner's Ninth Symphony and the Te Deum*, in: *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Howie, Crawford, Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw. Aldershot: Ashgate (2001; im Druck).
- Heinz Rögl, *Keine Skizzen eines Altersschwachen. Nikolaus Harnoncourt präsentierte das Fragment des Finales von Bruckners Neunter*, in: *Salzburger Nachrichten* 15. November 1999.
- Herbert Vogt, *Bruckners unvollendeter Lobgesang. Zur Dokumentation des Finale-Fragments der Neunten Symphonie*, in: *Musikfreunde-Zeitschrift der Musikfreunde in Wien* 12 (November 1999) Nr. 2, S. 10–13.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE following listing, citing all scores and literature referred to in the text, is divided into five sections:

- I. Musical Scores and Critical Reports
  1. Bruckner, Anton. Complete Editions
  2. Bruckner, Anton. Individual Editions, Versions of the Finale
  3. Other
- II. Biography, Documentation, Reception
- III. Further Perspectives
- IV. The Ninth Symphony and Finale
- V. Bibliographic Studies, Work Listings

The titles of scores and critical reports are listed in §I as far as possible in their original form.

The majority of the monographs and journal articles have been listed according to their principal content. Unpublished materials such as unpublished conference papers or correspondence to the present writer have not been included; in the latter case correspondents are cited by name in the Acknowledgements (§0.4). MSS materials have been listed in Table I (vol. II, A/1). Where possible the articles of Leopold Nowak have been quoted from the substantial though not exhaustive collection of his essays *Über Anton Bruckner. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1936–1984* (= Nowak, *Ges. Aufs.*). Similarly, several of Manfred Wagner's writings are quoted from his *Bruckner: Leben—Werke—Dokumente* (q.v.; = Wagner, *BrLWD*). As some research material was collected via second or third hand, it was in some instances not possible to cite all publication details.

References to literature and scores within the text and footnotes have been shortened where possible; abbreviations, where other than the author's name or first words of the title, can be found following the appropriate entry. An index of all magazine and journal sigla (adopted in part from *The Music Index*), as well as of all other abbreviations used both in the footnotes and Bibliography can be found in the Guide to Terminology, §§0.2.2–2.2.4. For convenience of reference the list of bibliographic sigla is given again here.

<i>AcMus</i>	<i>Acta Musicologica</i>
<i>AfMw</i>	<i>Archiv für Musikwissenschaft</i>
<i>BrBlätter</i>	<i>Bruckner Blätter</i>
<i>BrJb</i>	<i>Bruckner Jahrbuch</i>
<i>BrSympBer</i>	<i>Bruckner Symposion Bericht</i>
<i>Ch&amp;D</i>	<i>Chord and Discord</i>
<i>DMK</i>	<i>Deutsche Musikkultur</i>
<i>IBG-Mitt</i>	<i>Mitteilungsblatt der Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft</i> (subsequently entitled <i>Studien und Berichte</i> )

<i>JMusRes</i>	<i>Journal of Music Research</i>
<i>KmJb</i>	<i>Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch</i>
<i>M&amp;L</i>	<i>Music and Letters</i>
<i>ME</i>	<i>Musik-Erziehung</i>
<i>Mens&amp;Mel</i>	<i>Mens und Melodie</i>
<i>Mf</i>	<i>Die Musikforschung</i>
<i>MGG</i>	<i>Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> (Basel–Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1954)
<i>MMR</i>	<i>Monthly Musical Record</i>
<i>MQ</i>	<i>The Musical Quarterly</i>
<i>MR</i>	<i>Music Review</i>
<i>MT</i>	<i>The Musical Times</i>
<i>MuG</i>	<i>Musik und Gesellschaft</i>
<i>MuK</i>	<i>Musik und Kirche</i>
<i>NMZ</i>	<i>Neue Musikzeitung</i>
<i>NG</i>	<i>The New Grove</i> (London: Macmillan, 1980)
<i>NZfM</i>	<i>Neue Zeitschrift für Musik</i>
<i>ÖGM-Mitt</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft</i>
<i>ÖMz</i>	<i>Österreichische Musikzeitschrift</i>
<i>ZfM</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Musik</i>

## I. MUSICAL SCORES AND CRITICAL REPORTS

### 1. Bruckner, Anton. Complete Editions.

*Sämtliche Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, im Auftrage der Generaldirektion der Nationalbibliothek und der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft, herausgegeben von Robert Haas und Alfred Orel. Große Partitur mit Revisionsbericht.* Vienna: MWV, published until 1938.

*IX. Symphonie d-Moll Band 9 (auch Skizzen). Hrg. von Alfred Orel. (Originalfassung):* 1934.

*Entwürfe und Skizzen* auch als Sonderdruck: 1934 (= Orel; pp. 1–4 and 68–143 are reproduced in [Orel], vol. II, D of this dissertation).

*Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, herausgegeben von der Generaldirektion der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek und der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft unter Leitung von Leopold Nowak.* Study scores with German and English Foreword. Vienna: MWV der IBG, from 1951. All volumes edited by Leopold Nowak, with the exception of those where the editors' names appear in brackets.

Messen:	b-Moll	Band XV, 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1975. Revisionsbericht, 1977.
	d-Moll	Band XVI, 1957.
	e-Moll	Band XVII/1 (Fassung 1866), 1977. Band XVII /2 (Fassung 1882), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1959.
	f-Moll	Band XVIII, 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1960.
Te Deum		Band XIX (Fassung 1884), 1962.
150. Psalm		Band XX/6 (Grasberger), 1964.
Kleine Kirchenmusikwerke		Band XXI (Bauernfeind/Nowak), 1984.
<i>Helgoland.</i>		Band XXII/2 (Burkhardt/Führer/Nowak), 1987.



- Streichquintett F-Dur Band XIII/2, 1963.
- Symphonien: f-Moll Band X (Fassung 1863), 1973.
- I c-Moll Band I (Linzer Fassung), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1953.
- I c-Moll Band I (Wiener Fassung), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1980.
- 'Nullte' d-Moll Band XI (Fassung 1869), 1968.
- Revisionsbericht: 1981.
- I c-Moll Band I (Linzer Fassung), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1953.
- I c-Moll Band I (Wiener Fassung), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1980
- II c-Moll Band II (Fassung 1877), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1965.
- III d-Moll Band III/1 (Fassung 1873), 1977.
- Band III/2 (Fassung 1877), 1981.
- Band III/3 (Fassung 1889), 1959.
- Revisionsbericht (Röder): 1997.
- IV Es-Dur Band IV/1 (Fassung 1874), 1975.
- Band IV/2 (Fassung 1878/80), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1953.
- Finale von 1878, 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1981.
- V B-Dur Band V (Originalfassung) (Haas), 1939.
- Band V (Originalfassung), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1951.
- Revisionsbericht (Haas/Nowak): 1985.
- VI A-Dur Band VI (Originalfassung), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1952.
- Revisionsbericht (Haas/Nowak): 1986.
- VII E-Dur Band VII (Originalfassung), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1954.
- VIII c-Moll Band VIII/1 (Fassung 1887), 1972.
- Band VIII/2 (Fassung 1890), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1955.
- IX d-Moll Band IX (Originalfassung), 2., rev. Ausgabe, 1951.
- Band IX: (*1. Satz—Scherzo und Trio—Adagio*). *Kritische Neuauflage unter Berücksichtigung der Arbeiten von Alfred Orel und Leopold Nowak/ Vorgelegt von Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs*, 2001.
- Kritischer Bericht (Cohrs): 2001.
- Zu Band IX: *Finale (unvollendet)/ Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen/ Studienpartitur/ Vorgelegt von John A. Phillips*, 1994 (pp. 1–153 reproduced in [AP], vol. II, E of this dissertation); 2., verbesserte Auflage, 1999.
- Zu Band IX: *Finale (unvollendet)/ Faksimile-Ausgabe/ sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten/ Vorgelegt und erläutert von John A. Phillips*, 1996 (pp. 1–339 reproduced in [Facs.], vol. II, C of this dissertation).
- Zu Band IX: *Finale (unvollendet)/ Dokumentation des Fragments/ Partitur/ Vorgelegt von John A. Phillips*, 1999, 2001 (pp. I–X; 1–84 reproduced in [DdF], vol. II, F of this study).
- Zu Band IX: *Scherzo und Trio: Entwürfe/ Älteres Trio mit Viola-Solo (1893):/ Autograph-Partitur/ Studienband/ Vorgelegt von Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs*, 1998.
- Zu Band IX: (*1. Satz—Scherzo und Trio—Adagio*). *Kritische Neuauflage unter Berücksichtigung der Arbeiten von Alfred Orel und Leopold Nowak/ Kritischer Bericht/ Vorgelegt von Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs*, 2001.
- Zu Band IX: *Textband zu allen vier Sätzen/ Vorgelegt von John A. Phillips* [provisional title], in preparation, 2003.
- Zu Band IX: *Finale (unvollendet)/ Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen/ Studienband/ Vorgelegt von John A. Phillips*, in preparation, 2002.
- Zu Band IX: *1. Satz/ Studienband/ Vorgelegt von John A. Phillips*, in preparation, 2003.
- Zu Band IX: *Adagio/ Studienband/ Vorgelegt von John A. Phillips*, in preparation, 2003.
- Briefe: Band XXIV/1: *Briefe/ Band 1 1852–1886/ Vorgelegt von Andrea Harrandt und Otto Schneider*, 1998.
- Band XXIV/2: *Briefe/ Band 2 1887–1896/ Vorgelegt von Andrea Harrandt und Otto Schneider* (in press; pre-press copy courtesy of ABIL).

## 2. Bruckner, Anton. Individual Editions, Versions of the Finale

Titles listed in chronological order, according to the wording of their title pages.

- Vexilla regis/ Anton Bruckner* [WAB 51]. In: *Album der Wiener Meister*. Vienna: Josef Weinberger, 1892, p. 8 (reproduced in [Facs.], vol. II, C/343).
- Anton Bruckner/ Helgoland* [*Symphonischer Chor*. WAB 71]. Gedicht von August Silberstein. Vienna: Ludwig Doblinger, 1899 (pp. 65–66 reproduced in [Facs.], vol. II, C/351–2).
- Neunte/ Symphonie/ für/ Grosses Orchester/ von/ Anton Bruckner/ herausgegeben von Ferdinand Löwe*. Vienna: Ludwig Doblinger, 1903 (title p. and pp. 4, 46, 63, 65, 136, 139 reproduced in [Facs.], vol. II, C/353–359).
- Anton Bruckner/ Das Deutsche Lied (Der Deutsche Gesang)* [WAB 63]. Gedicht von Erich Fels (*Chorwerke aus dem Nachlasse Anton Bruckners* 7). Viktor Keldorfer, ed. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1911 (pp. 5–10 reproduced in [Facs.], vol. II, C/345–50).
- Anton Bruckner/ Psalm 150* [WAB 38]. *Neurevision von Joseph V. Wöss*. Vienna: Universal Edition/ Philharmonia Partituren, n. d. (p. 46 reproduced in [Facs.], vol. II, C/344).
- Bruckner: Finalefragment der IX. Sinfonie*. Fritz Oeser, ed. Including typescript “Einrichtung für die Praxis” dated Leipzig, October 1940. Photocopy of largely handwritten score, including pages of the Orel edition. Kassel: Alkor Edition, 1940. Hire material.
- Anton Bruckner/ Sinfonia No. 9 in Re min./ Finale/ Ricostruzione a cura di G. Gastaldi & E. D. R. Neill*. Photocopy of handwritten score, with typescript preface by E. D. R. Neill (undated [1962]).
- Symphony No. 9/ D minor/ by/ Anton Bruckner [...] Edited from the autograph MS. by Hans-Hubert Schönzeler. Foreword by Hans F. Redlich* (includes brief bibliography). London–Mainz–New York: Edition Eulenburg, 1963.
- A. Bruckner./ Symphony IX./ Finale/ A D Walker*. Photocopy of unfinished handwritten score and further pages, n. d. (late 1960s).
- A. Bruckner./ Finale: 9e Sinfonie. D moll./ Orkest-Partitur* [Completion by] Hein ’s Gravesande. Dated from 2 April 1969 to 25 June 1969. Photocopy of hand-written score, including Preface and Overview of Form, in Dutch.
- [Carragan, William, ed.] *Anton Bruckner: Ninth Symphony: Finale. Notes and Essays*. Brochure, including Chronology, essay “The Enigma and Challenge of Bruckner’s Ninth” by Jack Diether and essay “The Fulfillment of Bruckner’s Ninth — the Finale” by William Carragan. © 1984, no publisher.
- Finale to Anton Bruckner’s/ Symphony No. 9/ in D minor./ Completed and orchestrated from the composer’s sketches by/ Marshall Fine./ Op. 13*, dated 1978–79. Photocopy of handwritten score, with 44-p. typescript “The completion of Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony.”
- Anton Bruckner/ IX. Symphonie D-Moll: Finale/ vollendet von William Carragan. Partitur. Troy, New York: © 1983*. Photocopy of handwritten score; includes Foreword by Carragan (German/English), dated May 1987. Published under the auspices of the Bruckner Archive, 1987.
- Anton Bruckner/Sinfonia n. 9/ Finale/ completato da Nicola Samale e Giuseppe Mazzuca (1985)*. Photocopy of handwritten score, with appended typescript *Introduzione al nostro completamento del Finale della IX Sinfonia di Bruckner*.
- Anton Bruckner. Finale della IX Sinfonia./ Ricostruzione di Nicola Samale e Giuseppe Mazzuca*. Milan: Ricordi, 1986. Handwritten hire material.
- Samale, Nicola, and Giuseppe Mazzuca. *Introduction to the Finale of Anton Bruckner’s Ninth Symphony*. English transl. by Katherine Silberblatt Wolfthal. Milan: Ricordi, 1987.
- Anton Bruckner/ IX. Sinfonie: Finale* (Samale/Mazzuca 1983–86, revised 1987–88 by Samale/Cohrs). Photocopy of handwritten score, with later versions of mm. 641–648 and 679–727.
- Samale, Nicola, und Giuseppe Mazzuca. *Anton Bruckner/ Finale der IX. Sinfonie. Kommentar zur vollständig ergänzten Aufführungsfassung. Ins Deutsche übertragen von Gunnar Cohrs*. Unpubl. photocopy, n. d. (mid-1987).
- Anton Bruckner/ Zwei Intermezzi für Orchester und Viola-Solo/ (Nachgelassene Trios zum Scherzo der IX. Symphonie)/ vollendet von William Carragan. Partitur. Troy, New York: © 1985*. Photocopy of handwritten score, with Foreword by William Carragan dated August 1987. Published under the auspices of the Bruckner Archive, 1987.

- Anton Bruckner/ *Zwei Trioentwürfe zum Scherzo der IX Symphonie: Trio in F & Trio in Fis (1892–3). Partitur und Kommentar. Vorgelegt von Gunnar Cohrs (1987–88).* Photocopy of handwritten score and commentary.
- Anton Bruckner/ *Symphony No. 9: Finale/ An orchestral reconstruction by/ Dr Nors Josephson.* Unpubl. Photocopy of score with Foreword (German and English) dated Spring 1992.
- Anton Bruckner: *IX. Symphonie D-Moll: Finale: Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen: Aufführungsfassung von Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Gunnar Cohrs und Giuseppe Mazzuca.* J. A. Phillips, ed. Adelaide–Bremen: publication by the authors, 1992, 2nd edn., 1996 (pp. 1–98 reproduced in [AF], vol. II, G of this dissertation).

### 3. Other.

- Abbatia Sancti Petri de Solesmis. *Graduale Sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae (Graduale Romanum).* Tournai, Belgium: Desclée & Co., 1974.
- Bach, Johann Sebastian. *Tocatta and Fugue in F major*, BWV 540. Organ Works, Book 9, Frederick Bridge and James Higgs, eds. Sevenoaks, Kent: Novello, 1890.
- . *Cantata No. 4/ Christ lag in Todesbanden. An Authoritative Score—Backgrounds—Analysis—Views and Comments.* Gerhard Herz, ed. Norton Critical Scores. New York: Norton, 1967.
- Beethoven, Ludwig van. *Symphonie IX, op. 125, D moll.* Philharmonia Partituren No. 30. Vienna–London: Universal Edition, n. d.
- Bischöfen Deutschlands und Österreichs und der Bistümer Bozen–Brixen und Lüttich, eds. *Gotteslob. Katholisches Gebet- und Gesangsbuch, Erzdiözese Wien.* Stuttgart, 1975.
- Einem, Gottfried von. *Bruckner Dialog/ für Orchester/ Op. 39.* London–Paris–Bonn: Boosey and Hawkes, 1974.
- Liszt, Franz. *Missa Solemnis ('Graner Festmesse').* Preface by Imre Sulyok. London–Mainz–New York: Edition Eulenburg, 1968.
- Mahler, Gustav. *Symphonie Nr. 10: Faksimile-Ausgabe.* Richard Specht, ed. Berlin–Vienna–Leipzig: Paul Zsolnay, 1924.
- . *Sämtliche Werke/ Kritische Gesamtausgabe/ Herausgegeben von der Internationalen Gustav Mahler Gesellschaft, Wien./ Band XI<sup>a</sup>/ Adagio/ aus der/ Symphonie Nr. 10/ für großes Orchester/ Partitur/ Erstausgabe der Originalfassung/ 3. Auflage.* Erwin Ratz, ed. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1964.
- . *Symphonie Nr. 10: Faksimile-Ausgabe.* Erwin Ratz, ed. Munich: Walter Ricke, 1967.
- . *A performing Version of the Draft for the Tenth Symphony prepared by Deryck Cooke in collaboration with Berthold Goldschmidt, Colin Matthews, David Matthews.* London: Associated Music Publishers Inc., Faber, 1976–66.
- Schubert, Franz. *Symphony in B minor ("Unfinished"). An Authoritative Score—Schubert's Sketches—Commentary—Essays in History and Analysis.* Revised; Martin Chusid, ed. Norton Critical Scores. New York: Norton, 1971, 1968.
- Wagner, Richard. *Eine Faust–Ouvertüre.* With Foreword by Ernst Praetorius. London–Mainz–New York: Edition Eulenburg, 1968.
- . *Die Walküre.* [Full score] New York: Dover reprint, 1978, of C. F. Peters edition of c. 1910.
- . *Götterdämmerung.* [Full score] New York: Dover reprint, 1982, of Schott edition of 1877.
- . *Parsifal.* [Full score] Milan: Ricordi, n. d.

## II. BIOGRAPHY, DOCUMENTATION, RECEPTION

- Abendroth, Walter. "Der große Anachronismus: Anton Bruckner." In: *Vier Meister der Musik: Bruckner, Mahler, Reger, Pfitzner.* Munich: Prestel, 1952, pp. 11–37.
- Agop, Rolf. "Siegmond von Hausegger (1872–1948). Erinnerungen eines 36 Jahre jüngeren Schülers." *BrJb* 1989–90 pp. 303–308.
- [Anonymous. Report concerning Bruckner's interest in St. Stephan's Cathedral in Vienna.] *NMZ* 13, no. 16 (1892), p. 187.
- [Anonymous.] "Verschiedenes" [concerning Bruckner's move to the Belvedere]. *Der Alpen-Bote* 41, no. 56 (14 July 1895), p. 4.

- [Anonymous. Report concerning Bruckner's last months, from the Hueber family (Vöcklabruck).]
- [Anonymous.] "Theater, Kunst, Musik und Literatur" [report concerning Bruckner's health and the Ninth Symphony]. *Neuigkeitsweltblatt* (Vienna) 13 Oct. 1895, p. 3.
- [Anonymous.] "Lokalnachrichten" [concerning Franz Bayer's visit with Bruckner, May 1896]. *Steyrer Zeitung*, no. 38 (10 May 1896), p. 3. Also in: *Linzer Volksblatt*, 12 May 1896.
- Antonicek, Theophil. "Anton Bruckner als akademischer Gutachter." *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 81–88.
- . "Ein neues Bruckner-Bild?" In: *Bruckner-Vorträge. Budapest 1983–84. Bericht*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1985, pp. 21–24.
- Auer, Max. *Anton Bruckner. Sein Leben und Werk*. Zurich–Leipzig–Vienna: Amalthea, 1923, Vienna: MWV, 1934, 1941, etc.; = Auer, *Bruckner* (1923), (1934), (1941).
- . "Anton Bruckners letzter behandelnder Arzt." In: *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner. Festschrift zum 100. Geburtstag Anton Bruckners*. Karl Kobald, ed. Zurich–Leipzig–Vienna: Amalthea, 1924, pp. 21–35.
- . "Der Streit um den 'echten' Bruckner im Licht biographischer Tatsachen." *ZfM* 103, no. 5 (May 1936), pp. 538–545, no. 10 (Oct. 1936), pp. 1191–1196.
- Backes, Dieter Michel. *Die Instrumentation und ihre Entwicklung in Anton Bruckners Symphonien*. Mainz: Studio Verlag, 1993.
- Barford, Philip. *Bruckner Symphonies*. BBC Music Guides. London: BBC, 1978.
- Bartlet, M. E. C. "Orel, Alfred." In: *NG* (1980) vol. 13, pp. 705–706.
- Blume, Friedrich. "Bruckner." In: *MGG* (1954) vol. 2, cols. 342–382.
- Boetticher, Wolfgang. "Zur Kompositionstechnik des späten Bruckner." In: *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*. Franz Grasberger, ed. Vienna: MWV, 1964, pp. 11–19.
- . "Über einige Probleme der Kompositionstechnik in den Sinfonien Anton Bruckners." *BrJb* 1980, pp. 15–20.
- . "Zum 'romantischen' Schaffensprozeß Anton Bruckners." In: *BrSympBer 1980: Die Fassungen*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1981, pp. 85–90.
- . "Zum Problem eines 'Urtextes' bei Robert Schumann und Anton Bruckner." *Mf* 36 (1983), pp. 404–407.
- Boss, Rainer. "Bruckner-Tagung Gmunden 4. bis 7. Oktober 2001", *IBG-Mitt* 57 (Dec. 2001), pp. 19–22.
- Botstein, Leon. "Music and Ideology: Thoughts on Bruckner." *MQ* 80 (1996), pp. 1–10.
- Brosche, Günter. "Anton Bruckners Traditionsbewußtsein." *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 430–436.
- . "Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf." In: *Bruckner-Studien. Festgabe der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum 150. Geburtstag von Anton Bruckner*. Othmar Wessely, ed. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975, pp. 171–185.
- . "Die Österreichische Nationalbibliothek als Nachlaßverwalterin." In: *BrSympBer 1994: Bruckner-Freunde, Bruckner-Kenner*. Linz: ABIL, 1997, pp. 107–112.
- Brown, Maurice J. E. "Sechter, Simon." In: *NG* (1980) vol. 17, pp. 98–99.
- Bruckner, Anton. *Gesammelte Briefe*, Franz Gräflinger, ed. Regensburg: Bosse, 1924; = *Ges. Briefe* (Gräflinger).
- . *Gesammelte Briefe, Neue Folge*. Max Auer, ed. Regensburg: Bosse, 1924; = *Ges. Briefe* (Auer).
- . *Vorlesungen über Harmonie und Kontrapunkt an der Universität Wien*. Ernst Schwanzara, ed. Vienna: Österreichische Bundesverlag, 1950 (= Schwanzara).
- Brüstle, Christa. "Musik für Verehrer. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der frühen Bruckner-Rezeption." *ÖMz* 51 (1996).
- . *Anton Bruckner und die Nachwelt. Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte des Komponisten in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin 1996; publication: Stuttgart 1998.
- . "Politisch-ideologische Implikationen der ersten Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe." In: Riethmüller, Albrecht, ed. *Bruckner-Probleme. Internationales Kolloquium 7.–9. Oktober 1996 in Berlin (AFMW Beihefte, vol. 45)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999, pp. 192–201.
- Budweg, Harald. "Keine dumme Musik! Überraschungen mit Bruckner-Erstfassungen beim Hessischen Rundfunk." *NZfM* 143 (Nov. 1982), pp. 54–56.
- Chailly, Riccardo, in conversation with Nico Steffen (26 Aug. 1993). "Bruckner and the Bruckner Tradition of the Royal Concertgebouw Orchestra." *IBG-Mitt* no. 42 (June 1994), pp. 28–34.

- Cohrs, [Benjamin] Gunnar. "Der musikalische Architekt. Zur Bedeutung der Zahlen in Bruckners 5. und 9. Sinfonie." *NZfM* 151 (July–Aug. 1990), pp. 19–26.
- . "Zahlenphänomene in Bruckners Symphonik. Neues zu den Strukturen der Fünften und Neunten Symphonie." *BrJb* 1989–90, pp. 35–76.
- . "Anton Bruckner als musikalischer Architekt." In: *Bruckner Klang Bau*. Stadt Bochum and Bochumer Symphoniker, eds. Bochum, 1992, pp. 106–117.
- . *Bruckner-Arbeit 1982–1992: Ein chronologischer Kurzbericht*. Unpubl., Feb. 1993.
- . "Der Mikofilm der Krakauer-Skizzen in der Musiksammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek." *BrJb* 1994/95.
- . "Anton Bruckners mißverständene 'musikalische Architektur': Marginalien zu Konzeption, Interpretation und Rezeption von Bruckners Sinfonien." Paper to be given at the Bruckner Symposium, Linz, September 2002.
- . "Marginalien zu Bruckners Finale." Article intended for publication in planned issue of *Musik-Konzepte* on the Finale of the Ninth Symphony (2003).
- Cooke, Deryck. "Anton Bruckner (1824–1896)." In: *The Symphony. Vol. 1: Haydn to Dvořák*. Robert Simpson, ed. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1966–75, pp. 283–306.
- . "Bruckner, (Joseph) Anton." With bibliography by Leopold Nowak. In: *NG* (1980) vol. 3, pp. 352–371.
- . "The Bruckner Problem Simplified." In: Cooke, Deryck. *Vindications: Essays on Romantic Music*. London: Faber and Faber, 1982, pp. 43–71.
- Dahlhaus, Carl. "Bruckner und der Barock." *NZfM* 124 (1963), pp. 335–336.
- . "Ist Bruckners Symphonik formbildend?" *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 19–26.
- . "Bruckner und die Programmmusik. Zum Finale der Achten Symphonie." In: *Anton Bruckner. Studien zu Werk und Wirkung. Walter Wiora zum 30. Dez. 1986*. C.-H. Mahling, ed. Tutzing: Schneider, 1988, pp. 7–32.
- Darcy, Warren. "Bruckner's Sonata Deformations." In: Jackson, Timothy L., and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Bruckner Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 256–277.
- Decsey, Ernst. "Anton Bruckner als Lehrer der Sechterschen Theorie. Erinnerungen und Beiträge." *Die Musik* 6, no. 4 (1906–07), pp. 191–204.
- . *Bruckner. Versuch eines Lebens*. Berlin: Schuster and Loeffler, 1919.
- Doebel, Wolfgang. *Zum Problem der Fremdbearbeitungen in den Symphonien Anton Bruckners. Untersuchungen zu den Bearbeitungskonzepten der Brüder Schalk, Ferdinand Löwes und Max von Oberleithners, dem Wandel der Bruckner Rezeption zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts und der Gesamtausgabe von Robert Haas*. Dissertation, Hamburg 2001.
- . *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen. Die Konzepte der Bruckner-Schüler und ihre Rezeption bis zu Robert Haas. (Publikationen des Institutes für Österreichische Musikdokumentation 24, ed. Günter Brosche)*. Tutzing: Schneider, 2001.
- Doernberg, Erwin. *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*. With foreword by Robert Simpson. London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1960.
- Dokalik, Alfred. "Auswahl und Darbietung der Sinfonien Bruckners an der AHS (III)." *Musikerziehung* 28, no. 5 (1975), pp. 206–212.
- Dümling, Albrecht. "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 Düsseldorf, 1988, pp. 9–18.
- . "Der deutsche Michel erwacht. Zur Bruckner-Rezeption im NS Staat." In: Riethmüller, Albrecht, ed. *Bruckner-Probleme. Internationales Kolloquium 7.–9. Oktober 1996 in Berlin (AFMW Beihefte, vol. 45)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999, pp. 202–209.
- Eckstein, Friedrich. *Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*. Vienna: Universal Edition, Wiener Philharmonischer Verlag, 1923 (= Eckstein).
- . "Die erste und die letzte Begegnung zwischen Hugo Wolf und Anton Bruckner." In: *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner. Festschrift zum 100. Geburtstage Anton Bruckners*. Karl Kobald, ed. Zurich–Leipzig–Vienna: Amalthea, 1924, pp. 44–59.
- Ehlers, Paul. "Das Regensburger Bruckner-Erlebnis." *ZfM* 104 (1937), pp. 745–748.

- Einem, Gottfried von. "Die Symphonie nach Anton Bruckner. Vom Standpunkt des Komponisten." In: *BrSympBer 1981: Die österreichische Symphonie nach Anton Bruckner*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1983, pp. 11–12.
- Engel, Gabriel. *The Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*. Iowa City, Iowa: The Bruckner Society of America, Inc., Athens Press, 1955.
- Eppstein, Hans. "Bruckner und das Triviale." *ÖMz* 30 (1975), pp. 632–640.
- Eybl, Martin. "Grandiose Isolierzellen und rasselnde Fugenmechanik—Zu Schenkers Kritik an seinem Lehrer Bruckner." *BrSympBer 1988: Anton Bruckner als Schüler und Lehrer*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1992, pp. 137–145.
- Federhofer, Hellmut. "Rafael Loidols Theorie-Kolleg bei Bruckner 1879/80." In: *Bruckner-Studien. Festgabe der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum 150. Geburtstag von Anton Bruckner*. Othmar Wessely, ed. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975.
- . "Heinrich Schenkers Bruckner-Verständnis." *AfMw* 39 (1982), pp. 198–217.
- . *Heinrich Schenker. Nach Tagebüchern und Briefen in der Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection, University of California, Riverside (Studien zur Musikwissenschaft 3)*. Hildesheim–Zurich–New York: Georg Olms, 1985.
- Flotzinger, Rudolf. "Bruckner als Theorielehrer an der Universität." In: *Anton Bruckner in Lehre und Forschung*. Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1976.
- Floros, Constantin. "Zur Antithese Brahms—Bruckner." *Brahms-Studien* 1 (1974), pp. 59–90.
- . *Brahms und Bruckner: Studien zur musikalischen Exegetik*. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1980.
- . "Die Fassungen der Achten Symphonie von Anton Bruckner." In: *BrSympBer 1980: Die Fassungen*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1981, pp. 53–64.
- . "Bruckner und Mahler. Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede." In: *BrSympBer 1981: Die österreichische Symphonie nach Anton Bruckner*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1983, pp. 21–29.
- . "Thesen über Bruckner." *Musik-Konzepte*, nos. 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 5–14.
- . "Historische Phasen der Bruckner-Interpretation." In: *BrSympBer 1982: Bruckner-Interpretation*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1983, pp. 93–102.
- . "Die Zitate in Bruckners Symphonik." *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 7–19.
- . "Zur Gegensätzlichkeit der Symphonik Brahms' und Bruckners." In: *BrSympBer 1983: Johannes Brahms und Anton Bruckner*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1985, pp. 145–154.
- . "Bruckners Symphonik und die Musik Richard Wagners." In: *BrSympBer 1984: Bruckner, Wagner und die Neudeutschen in Österreich*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1986, pp. 177–183.
- . "Bruckner—der Progressive." In: *Anton Bruckner: Leben—Werk—Interpretation—Rezeption. Kongreßbericht zum V. Internationalen Gewandhaus-Symposium anlässlich der Gewandhaus-Festtage 1987*. Leipzig: Edition Peters, 1988, pp. 144–149.
- . "Von Mahlers Affinität zu Bruckner." In: *BrSympBer 1986: Bruckner, Liszt, Mahler und die Moderne*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1989, pp. 109–117.
- . "Diskussionsbeitrag zum Thema Bruckner und Liszt." In: *BrSympBer 1986: Bruckner, Liszt, Mahler und die Moderne*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1989, pp. 181–188.
- Friedmann, Ernst. "Ein verschollenes Bruckner-Manuskript." *Neues Wiener Journal*, 22nd June 1926.
- Ingrid Fuchs. "'Künstlerische Väter' und 'Vormünder'. Bruckner und die zeitgenössischen Dirigenten seiner Symphonien." In: *BrSympBer 1994. Bruckner-Freunde—Bruckner-Kenner*. Linz: ABIL 1997, pp. 65–85.
- Gault, Dermot. "For Later Times." *MT* 137 (June 1996), pp. 12–19.
- Gerstenberg, Walter. "Bruckners Symphonie—damals und heute." *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 175–180.
- Gilliam, Bryan. "The Annexation of Anton Bruckner: Nazi Revisionism and the Politics of Appropriation." *MQ* 78, no. 3 (Fall 1994), pp. 584–609. Also in: Jackson, Timothy L., and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Bruckner Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 72–90.
- . "Bruckner's Annexation Revisited: A Response to Manfred Wagner." *MQ* 80, no. 1 (1996), pp. 124–131.
- Gülke, Peter. "Der schwierige Jubilar. Zu Anton Bruckners 150. Geburtstag." *MuG* 1974, pp. 547–550.
- Göhler, Georg. "Wichtige Aufgaben der Musikwissenschaft gegenüber Anton Bruckner." *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 1 (1919), pp. 293–5.

- Göllerich, August, and Max Auer. *Anton Bruckner. Ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild*. Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1922–37 [repr. 1974] (= Göll.-A).
- Gräflinger, Franz. *Anton Bruckner. Bausteine zu seiner Lebensgeschichte*. Munich: Piper & Co., 1911.
- . *Anton Bruckner. Sein Leben und seine Werke*. Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1921.
- . *Anton Bruckner. Leben und Schaffen*. Berlin: Hesse, 1927.
- Grandjean, Wolfgang. “Zur Aufführung der ergänzten Urfassung des Adagio und des ursprünglichen Scherzo der Ersten Symphonie von Anton Bruckner.” *IBG-Mitt* 41 (Dec. 1993), p. 34–37.
- . “Anton Bruckners ‘Helgoland’ und das Symphonische.” *Mf* 48 (1995), pp. 349–368.
- . *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner (Publikationen des Instituts für Musikforschung 25)*. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 2001.
- Grasberger, Franz. “Anton Bruckners Arbeitsweise.” In: *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*. Franz Grasberger, ed. Vienna: MWV, 1964, pp. 33–37.
- . “Die Bruckner Gesamtausgabe.” *ÖMz* 21 (1966), pp. 531–534.
- . “Neue Aspekte des Bruckner-Bildes.” *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 426–429.
- , ed. *Anton Bruckner in Wien. Eine kritische Studie zu seiner Persönlichkeit (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 2)*. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1980.
- . “Selbstkritik, Überzeugung und Beeinflussung. Zum Problem der Fassungen bei Anton Bruckner.” In: *BrSympBer 1980: Die Fassungen*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1981, pp. 33–38.
- Grasberger, Renate. *Bruckner-Ikonographie. Teil 1: Um 1854 bis 1924 (Anton Bruckner. Dokumente und Studien 7)*. Othmar Wessely, ed.). Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1990.
- Grasberger, Renate, and Erich Wolfgang Partsch. *Bruckner—skizziert. Ein Porträt in ausgewählten Erinnerungen und Anekdoten (Anton Bruckner. Dokumente und Studien 8)*. Othmar Wessely, ed.). Vienna: MWV, 1991.
- Grebe, Karl. “Bruckners Neun Sinfonien.” *NZfM* 118 (Oct. 1957), pp. 547–552.
- . *Anton Bruckner in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*. Rowohlt's Monographien. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1972.
- Gruber, Gernot. “Zum Verhältnis von Strukturanalyse, Inhaltsdeutung und musikalischer Rezeption. Exemplifiziert an Bruckners Achter Symphonie.” In: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1995, pp. 129–142.
- Gruber, Joseph. *Meine Erinnerungen an Dr. Anton Bruckner. Ernste und heitere Episoden aus seinem Leben*. Einsiedeln: M. Ochsner, 1928.
- Grüniger, Fritz. *Anton Bruckner. Der metaphysische Kern seiner Persönlichkeit und seiner Werke*. 1st edn. Stuttgart, 1922; 2nd edn. Augsburg: Johann Wilhelm Naumann, 1930, 1949.
- Grunsky, Karl; *inter alia*. *Bruckner's Symphonien. Erläutert mit Notenbeispielen; nebst einer Einleitung “Bruckner's Leben und Schaffen” von Dr. Karl Grunsky (Meisterführer 4)*. Berlin: Schlesinger'sche Buch- und Musikhandlung (Robert Lienau), 1907.
- . *Bruckners Symphonien*. Berlin, 1908.
- Grunsky, Karl. *Anton Bruckner*. Stuttgart, 1922.
- . *Das Formproblem in Anton Bruckners Symphonien*. Augsburg, 1929.
- . *Formenwelt und Sinngefüge in den Bruckner-Symphonien*. Augsburg, 1931.
- Gülke, Peter. “Der Schwierige Jubilar.” *MuG* 24 (1974), pp. 547–550.
- . “Über die Zeitgenossenschaft Bruckners.” In: *BrSympBer 1987: Die Fassungen*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1989, pp. 15–21.
- . “Die mögliche und unmögliche Vollendung: Bruckners Fassungen oder: kein Ende.” *ÖMz* 51 (1996), pp. 330–335.
- Haas, Robert. “Die Original-Partitur von Bruckners Messe in f-moll.” *Der Auftakt* 4 (1924), p. 106.
- . *Anton Bruckner (Die großen Meister der Musik 8)*, E. Bucken, ed.). Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1934.
- Halbreich, Harry. “Verlangt Bruckner ein einheitliches Tempo?” *BrJb* 1981, pp. 191–204.

- . “Bruckners Sechste: kein Stiefkind mehr.” In: *BrSympBer 1982: Bruckner-Interpretation*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1983, pp. 85–92.
- Halm, August. *Die Symphonien Anton Bruckners*. Munich: Georg Müller, 1914.
- Hansen, Mathias. “Über Nutzen und Nachteil von Metaphern. Anton Bruckner und das ‘Architektonische’.” *MuG* 36 (Oct. 1986), pp. 523–527.
- . *Anton Bruckner*. Leipzig: Philipp Reclam jun., 1987.
- Harrandt, Andrea V. “Harmonielehrunterricht bei Bruckner—Zu zwei neu aufgefundenen Vorlesungsmitschriften.” In: *BrSympBer 1988: Anton Bruckner als Schüler und Lehrer*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1992, pp. 71–83.
- . “Bruckner und das Erlebnis Wagner.” *IBG-Mitt* no. 38 (June 1992), pp. 5–15.
- . “Erstes Bruckner-Symposium in den USA.” *ÖGM-Mitt* 27 (Dec. 1994), p. 57–59; also in *ÖMz* 49, no. 6 (June 1994), pp. 384–385.
- . “Perspectives on Anton Bruckner II. [Bruckner conference,] University of Manchester, 1. bis 4. April 1996.” *IBG-Mitt* no. 46 (June 1996), pp. 16–17.
- , ed. “Round-table—Bearbeitungen.” In: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen—Bearbeitungen—Vollendungen*. Linz: MWV, 1998, pp. 134–142.
- Harrandt, Andrea V., and Erich W. Partsch. “Quellen—neu erfaßt, neu gedeutet.” *ÖMz* 46 (1991), pp. 698f.
- . “Bruckner auf ‘einen Blick’.” *ÖMz* 47 (1992), p. 627.
- . “Dokumentationsprojekt zu Anton Bruckner.” *ÖGM-Mitt* 25 (Dec. 1992), pp. 32–37.
- Hartmann, Karl Amadeus, and Waldemar Wahren. “Briefe über Bruckner.” *NZfM* 126 (1965), pp. 272–276; 334–338; 380–387.
- Hawkshaw, Paul. “The Date of Bruckner’s ‘Nullified’ Symphony in D minor.” *19th-Century Music* 6 (1983), pp. 252–263.
- . “Weiteres über die Arbeitsweise Bruckners während seiner Linzer Jahre: Der Inhalt von Kremsmünster C 56.2.” In: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1995, pp. 143–152.
- . “The Bruckner Problem Revisited.” *19th-Century Music* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1997), pp. 96–107.
- . “Das Kitzler Studienbuch: Ein unschätzbare Dokument zu Bruckners Arbeitsweise.” In: *BrSympBer 1995: Zum Schaffensprozeß in den Künsten*. Linz: ABIL, 1997, pp. 95–109.
- . “An Anatomy of Change: Anton Bruckner’s Revisions to the Mass in F Minor.” In: Jackson, Timothy L., and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Bruckner Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 1–31.
- . “A Composer Learns His Craft: Anton Bruckner’s Lessons in Form and Orchestration, 1861–63.” *MQ* 82 (1998), pp. 336–361.
- . “Wo steht die Bruckner-Forschung heute? Festvortrag bei der 20 Jahr-Feier des Anton Bruckner Institutes Linz 12. November 1998, Barocksaal des Musikhauses Doblinger.” *IBG-Mitt* 51 (Dec. 1998), p. 6.
- Helm, Theodor. “Anton Bruckner †.” *Neue Musikalische Presse* 5, no. 42 (18 Oct. 1896).
- Herzog, Friedrich W. “Was ist deutsche Musik? Erkenntnisse und Folgerungen.” *Die Musik* 26 (1934), p. 802.
- Hess, Willy. Review of: Wagner, Manfred. *Der Wandel des Konzepts. Zu den verschiedenen Fassungen von Bruckners Dritter, Vierter und Achter Sinfonie* (Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1980). *SchwMz* 121 (1980–81), pp. 194–196.
- Hilmar, Ernst. “‘Schade, aber es muß(te) sein’: Zu Gustav Mahlers Strichen und Retuschen insbesondere am Beispiel der V. Symphonie Anton Bruckners.” In: *Bruckner-Studien. Festgabe der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum 150. Geburtstag von Anton Bruckner*. Othmar Wessely, ed. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975, pp. 187–201.
- Honolka, Kurt. *Dvořák*. Hamburg: Rororo Bildmonographien, 1974.
- Horn, Erwin. “Evolution und Metamorphose in der Achte Symphonie von Anton Bruckner.” *BrJb* 1989/90, pp. 7–33.
- . “Metamorphose des Hauptthemas der Achten Symphonie im Scherzo-Thema.” In: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1995, pp. 123–128.
- Jackson, Timothy L. “The Enharmonics of Faith: Enharmonic Symbolism in Bruckner’s *Christus factus est* (1884).” *BrJb* 1987/88, pp. 7–20.



- . “Bruckner’s Metrical Numbers.” *19th-Century Music* 14, no. 2 (Fall 1990), pp. 101–131.
- . “Bruckner’s Rhythm: Syncopated Hyperrhythm and Diachronic Transformation in the Second Symphony.” In: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV 1995, pp. 93–106.
- . “Bruckner’s *Oktaven*: the problem of consecutives, doubling, and orchestral voice-leading.” In: Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson, eds. *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001, pp. 30–66.
- Jancik, Hans. “Anton Bruckner in seiner Kammermusik.” In: *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*. Franz Grasberger, ed. Vienna: MWV, 1964, pp. 45–73.
- Kantner, Leopold M. “Die Frömmigkeit Anton Bruckners.” In: *Anton Bruckner in Wien. Eine kritische Studie zu seiner Persönlichkeit (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 2)*. Franz Grasberger, ed.). Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1980, pp. 229–278. See also *ME* 40 (1986), pp. 61–73.
- Keldorfer, Viktor. “Erinnerungen an Bruckner.” *Die Furche*, supplement *Die Warte* 2, no. 2 (1946), pp. 1–9.
- . “Anton Meisners Bruckner-Erinnerungen. Aus den Aufzeichnungen Anton Meisners.” *Die Furche. Jahrbuch 1947*, pp. 78–87.
- Keller, Rolf. “Die letztwilligen Verfügungen Anton Bruckners.” *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 95–116.
- Kerner, Dieter. *Krankheiten großer Musiker*. Stuttgart: Friedrich-Karl Schattener, 1963–67.
- Kirsch, Winfried. “Religiöse und liturgische Aspekte bei Johannes Brahms und Anton Bruckner.” In: *Religiöse Musik in nicht-liturgischen Werken von Beethoven bis Reger*. Walter Wiora, ed. (*Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* 51). Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1978, pp. 143–156.
- . “Das Scherzo bei Brahms und Bruckner.” In: *BrSympBer 1983: Johannes Brahms und Anton Bruckner*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1985, pp. 155–172.
- Kitzler, Otto. *Musikalische Erinnerungen, mit Briefen von Wagner, Brahms, Bruckner und Richard Pohl*. Brünn, 1906.
- Klein, Rudolf. “Anton Bruckner und Gottfried von Einem.” *BrJb* 1981, pp. 103–106.
- Klose, Friedrich. *Meine Lehrjahre bei Anton Bruckner. Erinnerungen und Betrachtungen*. Regensburg: Bosse, 1927.
- . “Zum Thema ‘Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner.’” *DMK* 1 (1936–37), pp. 222–225.
- Kobald, Karl, ed. *In Memoriam Anton Bruckner. Festschrift zum 100. Geburtstage Anton Bruckners*. Zurich–Leipzig–Vienna: Amalthea, 1924.
- Korte, Werner F. *Bruckner und Brahms. Die spätromantische Lösung der autonomen Konzeption*. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1963.
- Korstvedt, Benjamin M. *The First Edition of Anton Bruckner’s Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1995.
- . “Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich and After: An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception”, *MQ* 80, no. 1 (1996) pp. 132–160.
- . “‘Return to the Pure Sources’: The Ideology and Text-Critical Legacy of the First Bruckner Gesamtausgabe.” In: Jackson, Timothy L., and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Bruckner Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 91–109.
- . “The First Published Edition of Bruckner’s Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity.” *19th-Century Music* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1997), pp. 3–26.
- . “The Bruckner Problem Revisited (A Reply).” *19th-Century Music* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1997), pp. 108–109.
- . *Bruckner: Symphony No. 8 (Cambridge Music Handbooks, ed. Julian Rushton)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Kosch, Franz. “‘Der Beter Anton Bruckner’ nach seinen persönlichen Aufzeichnungen.” In: *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*. Franz Grasberger, ed. Vienna: MWV, 1964, pp. 67–73.
- Kreczi, Hanns. *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.
- Kurth, Ernst. *Anton Bruckner* (2 vols.). Berlin: Max Hesse, 1925.
- Lang, Oskar. “Das ‘non confundar’ Motiv in Bruckners Werk.” *ZfM* 103, no. 10 (Oct. 1936), pp. 1180–83.

- . *Anton Bruckner: Wesen und Bedeutung*, 2nd edn. Munich: Biederstein, 1943.
- Langevin, Paul-Gilbert. "Wie Bruckners Symphonien vor das Publikum treten sollten, oder: Das Suchen nach der Idealfassung." In: *BrSympBer 1980: Die Fassungen*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1981, pp. 39–52.
- Leibnitz, Thomas. "Josef Schalk. Ein Wagnerianer zwischen Anton Bruckner und Hugo Wolf." *BrJb* 1980, pp. 119–128.
- . *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner (Publikationen des Institutes für Österreichische Musikdokumentation 14)*. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1988.
- . "Anton Bruckner and 'German Music': Josef Schalk and the establishment of Bruckner as a national composer." In: Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson, eds. *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001, pp. 328–340.
- . "'Francisce' und der 'Generalissimus'. Die Brüder Schalk als Interpreten und Bearbeiter der Werke Bruckners." In: *BrSympBer 1994. Bruckner-Freunde, Bruckner-Kenner*. Linz: ABIL, 1997, pp. 88–94.
- List, Rudolf. *Kleine Brucknervelle*. Oberösterreichischer Landesverlag Ried, 1932–53.
- Loerke, Oskar. *Anton Bruckner. Ein Charakterbild*. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1938, repr. 1976.
- Lorenz, Alfred. "Zur Instrumentation von Anton Bruckners Symphonien." *ZfM* 103, no. 11 (Nov. 1936), pp. 1318–1325.
- . "Klangmischung in Anton Bruckners Orchester." *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 63 (1936), pp. 717–720.
- Louis, Rudolf. *Bruckner*. Munich: Georg Müller, 1905.
- Maier, Elisabeth. "Anton Bruckners Arbeitswelt." In: *Anton Bruckner in Wien. Eine kritische Studie zu seiner Persönlichkeit (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 2)*. Franz Grasberger, ed.). Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1980, pp. 161–228.
- . "Neue Bruckneriana aus Privatbesitz." *IBG-Mitt* 36 (June 1991), pp. 6–13.
- . "Aus den Arbeiten des Anton Bruckner Institutes Linz (ABIL)." *ÖGM-Mitt* 27 (Dec. 1994), pp. 45–53.
- . "Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk. Einleitende Worte zum Symposium." In: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1995, pp. 7–9.
- . "Originalgenie oder Epigone? Zum Problem der künstlerischen Beeinflussung bei Bruckner." *BrJb* 1994/95/96, pp. 91–98.
- . "A hidden personality: access to an 'inner biography' of Anton Bruckner." In: Jackson, Timothy L., and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Bruckner Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 30–53.
- Maier, Elisabeth and Franz Zamazal. *Anton Bruckner und Leopold Zenetti (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 3)*, Franz Grasberger, ed.). Graz, 1980.
- Maier, Elisabeth, and Renate Grasberger, eds. *Anton Bruckner: Verborgene Persönlichkeit. Anton Bruckner in seinen privaten Aufzeichnungen*. Linz: ABIL 2001 (in press).
- Marschner, Bo. "Die chronologischen Probleme der 'Nullten' Symphonie Bruckners." *BrJb* 1987–88, pp. 53–62.
- Marx, Eva. "Bad Kreuzen—Spekulationen und kein Ende." In: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1995, pp. 31–39.
- Mayer, Johannes-Leopold. "Musik als gesellschaftliches Ärgernis—oder: Anton Bruckner, der Anti-Bürger. Das Phänomen Bruckner als historisches Problem." In: *Anton Bruckner in Wien. Eine kritische Studie zu seiner Persönlichkeit (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 2)*. Franz Grasberger, ed.). Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1980, pp. 75–160.
- . "Die Zwielfichtigkeit des Erfolges. Anton Bruckners 'Helgoland' im historischen Umfeld des Wiener Männerchorwesens." *BrJb* 1980, pp. 21–25.
- McClatchie, Stephen. "Bruckner and the Bayreuthians; or, *Das Geheimnis der Form bei Anton Bruckner*." In: Jackson, Timothy L., and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Bruckner Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 110–121.
- Moravcsik, Michael J. "The Coda in the Symphonies of Anton Bruckner." *MR* 34 (1973), pp. 241–258.
- Mörchen, Roland. "Mystiker der Monumentalität." *Lutherische Monatsheft* July 1993, pp. 36–37.
- Morold, Max. "Das Brucknersche Finale." *Die Musik* 6 (1906–07), pp. 28–35.
- . *Anton Bruckner*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1912.
- Murphy, Edward. "Bruckner's Use of Numbers to Indicate Phrase Lengths." *BrJb* 1987–88, pp. 39–52.

- Nagler, Norbert. "Bruckners gründerzeitliche Monumentalsymphonie. Reflexionen zur Heteronomie kompositorischer Praxis." *Musik-Konzepte*, nos. 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 86–118.
- Neumann, Friedrich. "Zum Verhältnis von Akkordik und Melodik bei Anton Bruckner." *BrJb* 1981, pp. 167–170.
- Neumayr, Anton. "Anton Bruckner." In: *Musik und Medizin*, vol. 2 (Vienna, 1989), pp. 261–361.
- Newlin, Dika. *Bruckner—Mahler—Schoenberg*. London: Marion Boyars, 1947, 1978.
- . "Bruckner the Teacher." *Ch&D* 2, no. 9 (1960), pp. 35–38.
- Notley, Margaret. "Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style and Politics in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna." *19th-Century Music* 17, no. 2 (Fall 1993), pp. 107–123.
- . "Volksconcerte in Vienna and late Nineteenth-Century Ideology of the Symphony." *JAMS* 50, nos. 2–3 (Summer–Fall 1997), pp. 421–453.
- . "Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism." In: Jackson, Timothy L., and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Bruckner Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 54–71.
- Notter, Werner. *Schematismus und Evolution in der Sinfonik Anton Bruckners (Freiburger Schriften zur Musikwissenschaft 14, Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht, ed.)*. Munich–Salzburg: Emil Katzbichler, 1983.
- Nowak, Adolf. "Zur Analyse Brucknerscher Symphonik." *NZfM* 135 (1974), pp. 674–676.
- . "Die Wiederkehr in Bruckners Adagio." In: *Anton Bruckner. Studien zu Werk und Wirkung. Walter Wiora zum 30. Dez. 1986*. C.-H. Mahling, ed. Tutzing: Schneider, 1988.
- Nowak, Leopold. "Bruckners Werke in der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek." *ÖMz* 4 (1949), pp. 269–271.
- . *Anton Bruckner: Musik und Leben*. Vienna—Munich: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1964.
- . *Über Anton Bruckner. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1936–1984*. Vienna: MWV, 1985 (= Nowak, *Ges. Aufs.*).
- . "Die Anton Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe. Ihre Geschichte und Schicksale." *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 33–68.
- Oberleithner, Max von. *Meine Erinnerungen an Anton Bruckner*. Regensburg: Bosse, 1933.
- Oeser, Fritz. *Die Klangstruktur der Bruckner-Symphonie. Eine Studie zur Frage der Originalfassungen*. Diss., Univ. Leipzig, 1938. Leipzig: MWV, 1939.
- Orel, Alfred. "Bruckner Ausgaben. Eine Erwiderung." *ZfM* 1 (1919) pp. 422–425.
- Orel, Alfred. *Anton Bruckner. Das Werk—Der Künstler—Die Zeit*. Vienna—Leipzig: Hartleben, 1925.
- . "Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner." *DMK* 1 (1936–37), pp. 193–222.
- . *Ein Harmonielehrkolleg bei Anton Bruckner*. Berlin–Vienna–Zurich: Verlag für Wissenschaft und Kultur, Payer und Co., 1940
- . "Anton Bruckners Nachlaß." *Oberösterreichische Heimatblätter* 3, no. 2 (1949), pp. 116–124.
- . "Ein Bruckner-Fund." *Die Pause* 5 (1940), pp. 41–44.
- . "Ein Bruckner-Fund (Die Endfassung der IV. Symphonie)." *Schweizerische Musikzeitung* 88 (1949), pp. 323–324.
- . "Ein Bruckner-Fund (Die Endfassung der IV. Symphonie)." *Die Pause* 5 (1940), pp. 41–44.
- . *Bruckner Brevier. Briefe, Dokumente, Berichte*. Vienna: Paul Kaltschmid, 1953.
- . "Bruckner und Bach" [posthumous publication]. *BrJb* 1981, pp. 39–49.
- Partsch, Erich Wolfgang. "Anton Meißner, der letzte 'Sekretär' Bruckners." *BrJb* 1984–86, pp. 57–62.
- . "Kritische Gedanken zur Bruckner-Rezeption." In: Renate Grasberger and Erich Wolfgang Partsch, *Bruckner—skizziert (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 8)*. Vienna: MWV, 1991, pp. 202–234.
- . "Der 'Musikant Gottes'—Zur Analyse eines Stereotyps." In: Renate Grasberger and Erich Wolfgang Partsch, *Bruckner—skizziert (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 8)*. Vienna: MWV, 1991, pp. 235–259.
- . "'Unser berühmter Landsmann'. Zur Bruckner-Berichterstattung in der Steyrer Presse bis 1896." *BrJb* 1994/95/96, pp. 289–294
- , ed. "Round-table— Fassungen bei Bruckner." In: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen—Bearbeitungen—Vollendungen*. Linz: MWV, 1998, pp. 85–102.
- Phipps, Graham H. "Bruckner's free application of strict Sechterian theory with stimulation from Wagnerian sources: an assessment of the first movement of the Seventh Symphony." In: Crawford Howie, Paul

- Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson, eds. *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001, pp. 228–258.
- Pflugbeil, Hans. “Omnia ad maiorem Dei gloriam. Anton Bruckner 1824–1896.” *MuK* 44 (Nov.–Dec. 1974), pp. 261–267.
- Pfohl, Ferdinand. *Gustav Mahler. Eindrücke und Erinnerungen aus den Hamburger Jahren*. Knud Martner, ed. Hamburg, 1973.
- Phillips, John A. “Die Arbeitsweise Bruckners in seinen letzten Jahren.” In: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1995, pp. 153–178.
- . “Bruckner, the ‘Musikant Gottes’ and the New Musicology.” Paper given at the Fifth Conference of the International Society for the Study of European Ideas (ISSEI), Utrecht, August 1996; published on CD-ROM: Frank Brinkhuis and Sascha Talmor, eds. *Memory, History and Critique: European Identity at the Millennium. Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the International Society for the Study of European Ideas (ISSEI), 19–24 August 1996, University for Humanist Studies, Utrecht, The Netherlands*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press Journals 1998.
- . Review of: Benjamin M. Korstvedt, *Bruckner: Eighth Symphony* (Cambridge University Press), *M&L* 82, no. 2 (May 2001), pp. 323–328.
- . “‘Für die IX. ist gesorgt.’ Einige Erläuterungen zum Editionsprojekt Neunte Symphonie in der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe—und wie es dazu kam.” Article written for publication by ABIL in *BrucknerJahrbuch 1997/98/99* (in press).
- Rauner, Reinhard. *Ferdinand Löwe. Leben und Wirken. I. Teil 1863–1900. Ein Wiener Musiker zwischen Anton Bruckner und Gustav Mahler. (Musikleben. Studien zur Musikgeschichte Österreichs. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Musikgeschichte an der Hochschule für Musik und darstellende Kunst in Wien, vol. 3, Friedrich Heller, ed.)*. Frankfurt am Main–Bern–New York–Paris–Vienna: Peter Lang, 1995.
- Redlich, Hans Ferdinand. *Bruckner and Mahler*. The Master Musicians Series. London: J. M. Dent, 1955, 1970.
- . “Das programmatische Element bei Bruckner.” In: *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*. Franz Grasberger, ed. Vienna: MWV, 1964, pp. 87–97.
- Reich, Willi. “Simon Sechter im eigenen Wort.” *NZfM* 132 (1971), pp. 539–541.
- Richter, Klaus P. “Posthum politisierter Bruckner” [review of the first American Bruckner conference of February 1994]. *Fonoforum*, July 1995.
- Ringel, Erwin. “Psychogramm für Anton Bruckner.” In: *BrSympBer 1977: Anton Bruckner zwischen Wagnis und Sicherheit*. Franz Grasberger, ed. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1978, pp. 19–26.
- Röder, Thomas. *Auf dem Weg zur Bruckner-Symphonie. Untersuchungen zu den beiden ersten Fassungen von Anton Bruckners Dritter Symphonie*. Diss. phil. Erlangen, 1984; publ. as *AfMw* Beiheft 26. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1987.
- . “Das ‘verstümmelte’ Finale. Zum vierten Satz von Anton Bruckners Dritter Symphonie.” *IBG-Mitt* no. 37 (Dec. 1991), pp. 11–20.
- . “Eigenes angewandtes Nachsinnen—Bruckners Selbststudium in Fragen der Metrik.” In: *BrSympBer 1992: Anton Bruckner—Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1995, pp. 107–122.
- Rösing, Helmut. “Gestalt und Wiederholung in Bruckners Sinfonien.” *BrJb* 1981, pp. 17–25.
- Röthig, Claudia Catharina. *Studien zur Systematik des Schaffens von Anton Bruckner auf der Grundlage zeitgenössischer Berichte und autographischer Entwürfe*. Diss., Göttingen 1977; publ. Kassel, 1978 (*Göttinger Musikwissenschaftliche Arbeiten* 9).
- Sachs, Jürgen. “Entstehungs- und Aufführungsdaten der Messen, des Te Deum und der Symphonien Anton Bruckners.” *BrJb* 1989–90, pp. 265–275.
- Salzer, Heinrich. “Erinnerungen an Anton Meißner. Nach den Erzählungen meines Vaters Josef Anton Salzer.” *BrJb* 1984–86, pp. 63–64.
- Schenker, Heinrich, ed. Oswald Jonas. “Über Anton Bruckner.” *Der Dreiklang* no. 7 (Oct. 1937), pp. 166–176.
- Schalk, Franz. *Briefe und Betrachtungen. Mit einem Lebensabriß von Viktor Junk*. Lili Schalk, ed. Vienna–Leipzig, 1935.
- Schalk, Josef. “Anton Bruckner.” *Jahresbericht des Akademischen Richard Wagner-Vereins* 24 (1896), pp. 14–19.
- Scheder, Franz. “Zur Datierung zweier Autographen Anton Bruckners: I. Skizzenblätter zur Neunten Symphonie; II. Bruckners Brief vom 31. Oktober 1894.” *BrJb* 1987–88, pp. 63–66.

- . *Anton Bruckner Chronologie* (2 vols.). Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1996.
- Schenk, Erich, and Gernot Gruber. “‘Die ganzen Studien’ zu Josef Vockners Theorieunterricht bei Anton Bruckner. In: *Bruckner-Studien. Festgabe der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum 150. Geburtstag von Anton Bruckner*. Othmar Wessely, ed. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975, pp. 349–377.
- Schollum, Robert. “Symphonie—Umkreisungen eines Themas mit Ausblicken auf unsere Zeit.” In: *BrSympBer 1981: Die österreichische Symphonie nach Anton Bruckner*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1983, pp. 75–92.
- Scholz, Horst-Günther. *Die Form der reifen Messen Anton Bruckners*. Diss. Marburg 1960. Berlin: Merseburg, 1961.
- Schönherr, Max. “Wer war Friedrich Eckstein?” *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 163–172.
- Schönzeler, Hans-Hubert. *Bruckner*. London: Calder and Boyars, 1970.
- Schwebsch, Erich. *Anton Bruckner. Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnis von Entwicklungen in der Musik*. Stuttgart: Der kommende Tag, 1921.
- Sharp, Geoffrey. “Anton Bruckner: Simpleton or Mystic?” *MR* 3 (1942), pp. 46–54.
- Simeone, Nigel. “Viennese Music Publishing at the End of the Nineteenth Century—Bruckner and the Small Businessman.” Paper given at the Bruckner Symposium *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner II*, University of Manchester, 1–4 April 1996.
- Simpson, Robert. “Bruckner and the Symphony.” *MR* 7 (1946), pp. 35–40.
- . “The Eighth Symphony of Bruckner. An Analysis.” *Ch&D* 2, no. 6 (1950), pp. 42–55.
- . “The Seventh Symphony of Bruckner. An Analysis.” *Ch&D* 2, no. 10 (1963), pp. 57–67.
- . *The Essence of Bruckner. An essay towards the understanding of his music*. New York: Crescendo Publishing, 1967. With revised chapters 4 [concerning the Third Symphony] and 11 [concerning the Ninth—see §IV], photocopy, unpubl., n. d. (c. 1987–88).
- . “Bruckner’s Unique Finale Problem” [Paper given at Bruckner Symposium, Rome, 11–12 May 1987]. Photocopy, n. d.
- Smith, Warren Storey. “The cyclic principle in musical design, and the use of it by Bruckner and Mahler.” *Ch&D* 2, no. 9 (1960), pp. 3–32.
- . “Bruckner’s Three Styles.” *Ch&D* 2, no. 10 (1963), pp. 28–39.
- Solvik, Morton. “The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P.” Paper given at the Bruckner Symposium *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner II*, University of Manchester, 1–4 April 1996.
- . “The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P.: A Case Study of Robert Haas and the Critical Edition.” *MQ* 82 (1998), pp. 362–382.
- Sonntag, Mariana. Review of: Thomas Röder. *Auf dem Weg zur Bruckner-Symphonie* (*AfMw*, Supplement 26, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1987). *JMusRes* 9 (1989), pp. 189–196.
- Sparrer, Walter-Wolfgang. Review of: Peter Gülke. *Brahms—Bruckner. Zwei Studien* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1989). *NZfM* 151, no. 9 (Sept. 1990), p. 52.
- Stefan, Paul. *Anton Dvořák*. Transl. by Y. W. Vance. New York: Greystone Press, 1941.
- Stephan, Rudolf. “Zu Anton Bruckners Dritter Symphonie.” In: *BrSympBer 1980: Die Fassungen*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1981, pp. 65–74.
- . “Über den Einfluß, den Anton Bruckner ausgeübt hat.” In: *BrSympBer 1981: Die österreichische Symphonie nach Anton Bruckner*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1983, pp. 41–48.
- . “Zum Thema ‘Bruckner und Mahler’.” *BrJb* 1981, pp. 137–143.
- . “Mahlers Bruckner-Interpretation.” In: *BrSympBer 1982: Bruckner-Interpretation*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1983, pp. 103–108.
- . “Bruckner und Wagner.” In: *BrSympBer 1984: Bruckner, Wagner und die Neudeutschen in Österreich*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1986, pp. 59–65.
- . “Bruckner und Liszt. Hat der Komponist Franz Liszt Bruckner beeinflusst?” In: *BrSympBer 1986: Bruckner, Liszt, Mahler und die Moderne*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1989, pp. 169–180.
- Stradal, August. “Eine Erinnerung an Anton Bruckner.” *ZfM* 93, no. 9 (Sept. 1926), pp. 505–506.
- . “Erinnerungen aus Bruckners letzter Zeit.” *ZfM* 99, no. 10 (Oct. 1932), pp. 853–860, continued no. 11 (Nov. 1932), pp. 971–978, and no. 12 (Dec. 1932), pp. 1071–1075.

- Suk, Josef. "Aus meiner Jugend." In: *Anton Dvořák in Briefen und Erinnerungen. Deutsch von Bedrich Eben*. Prague 1954.
- Suppan, Wolfgang. "Kienzl—Savenau (Anhang)." [critique of performance of Bruckner Ninth]. In: *BrSympBer 1984: Bruckner, Wagner und die Neudeutschen in Österreich*. Vienna: MWV 1986, pp. 189–200.
- Tauber, Reinhold (ReTa). "Welt-Zentrale für Bruckner." *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* (Linz), 2nd Sept. 1992.
- Thiele, Siegfried. "Bruckner und die Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts." *NZfM* 139 (1978), pp. 396–403.
- Tittel, Ernst. "Bruckners musikalischer Ausbildungsgang." In: *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*. Franz Grasberger, ed. Vienna: MWV, 1964, pp. 105–111.
- . "Simon Sechter. Zum 100. Todestag am 10. September 1967." *ÖMz* 22 (1967), pp. 550–551.
- Tschulik, Norbert. "Anton Bruckner in der Wiener Zeitung." *BrJb* 1981, pp. 171–179.
- . "Der Bruckner-Schüler Josef Vockner." *BrJb* 1989/90, pp. 289–299.
- Ulm, Renate, ed. *Die Symphonien Bruckners. Entstehung, Deutung, Wirkung*. Kassel–Basel: Bärenreiter, 1998.
- Unger, Klaus. Abstract of: *Studien zur Harmonik Anton Bruckners. Einwirkung und Umwandlung älterer Klangstrukturen*. Diss. phil. Heidelberg, 1969. *ÖMz* 25 (1970), pp. 87–88.
- Vetter, Walther. "Das Adagio bei Anton Bruckner." *DMK* 5 (1940–41), pp. 121–132.
- Vogg, Herbert. "Von der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe." *IBG-Mitt* no. 46 (June 1996), pp. 35–36.
- Voss, Egon. "Bruckners Sinfonien in ihrer Beziehung zur Messe." *Schallplatte und Kirche. Beihefte zu Musik und Kirche* 5 (1969), pp. 103–109.
- . "Die Brucknersche Symphonie. Allgemeine Charakteristika." In: Ulm, Renate, ed. *Die Symphonien Bruckners. Entstehung, Deutung, Wirkung*. Kassel–Basel: Bärenreiter, 1998. pp. 31–42.
- Waldstein, Wilhelm. "Zur Steigerungstechnik Wagners und Bruckners." *ÖMz* 3 (1948), pp. 11–14.
- Wagner, Karl. "Bruckners Themenbildung als Kriterium seiner Stilentwicklung." *ÖMz* 25 (1970), pp. 159–165.
- Wagner, Manfred. "Der Quint-Oktavschrift als 'Maiestas'-Symbol bei Anton Bruckner." *KmJb* 59 (1972), pp. 97–103.
- . "Zum Formalzwang im Leben Anton Bruckners." *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 418–425.
- . "Zur Diskrepanz zwischen Urfassung und späteren Fassungen bei Bruckner." *ÖMz* 33 (1978), pp. 348–357.
- . "Bruckner in Wien. Ein Beitrag zur Apperzeption und Rezeption des oberösterreichischen Komponisten in der Hauptstadt der k. k. Monarchie." In: *Anton Bruckner in Wien. Eine kritische Studie zu seiner Persönlichkeit (Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 2)*. Franz Grasberger, ed. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt 1980, pp. 9–74.
- . "Bruckner Sinfonie-Fassungen—grundsätzlich referiert." In: *BrSympBer 1980: Die Fassungen*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1981, pp. 15–24.
- . "Zur Interpunktion in der Musik Anton Bruckners." *BrJb* 1981, pp. 53–56.
- . Review of: Röthig, Claudia Catharina. *Studien zur Systematik des Schaffens von Anton Bruckner auf der Grundlage zeitgenössischer Berichte und autographischer Entwürfe (Göttinger Musikwissenschaftliche Arbeiten 1978)*. Kassel: Bärenreiter-Antiquariat, 1978). *Mf* 34 (1981), pp. 110–112.
- . "Musik von gestern—Provokation für heute. Zum Einfluß Bruckners auf die musikalische Gegenwart." *Musik-Konzepte*, nos. 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 71–85.
- . "Die Nekrologe von 1896: rezeptionsstiftend?—oder Wie Klischees von Anton Bruckner entstanden." *Musik-Konzepte*, nos. 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 119–147.
- . *Bruckner. Leben—Werke—Dokumente*. Mainz: Schott; Munich: Piper, 1983 (= Wagner, *BrLWD*).
- . *Anton Bruckner. Werk und Leben (Musikportraits 1)*. Vienna: Holzhausen, 1995.
- . "Response to Bryan Gilliam Regarding Bruckner and National Socialism." *MQ* 80, no. 1 (1996) pp. 118–123.
- Waldstein, William. "Bruckner als Lehrer." In: *Bruckner-Studien. Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*. Franz Grasberger, ed. Vienna: MWV, 1964, pp. 113–120
- Watson, Derek. *Bruckner* (The Master Musician Series). London: J. M. Dent, 1975.
- Wellesz, Egon. "Anton Bruckner and the Process of Musical Creation." *MQ* 24 (1938), pp. 265–290.

- Wessely, Othmar. "Vergangenheit und Zukunft in Bruckners Messe in d-Moll." *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 412–418.
- . "Anton Bruckner und Gustav Mahler." *ÖMz* 32 (1977), pp. 57–67.
- . "Anton Bruckner als Briefschreiber." In: *BrSympBer 1983: Johannes Brahms und Anton Bruckner*. Vienna: MWV, 1985, pp. 89–93.
- . "Bruckner und Liszt." In: *BrSympBer 1986: Bruckner, Liszt, Mahler und die Moderne*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1989, pp. 67–72.
- . "Bruckner—ein Mystiker?" *BrJb* 1989/90, pp. 213–218.
- Wiora, Walter. "Anton Bruckner 1824–1896." In: *Die großen Deutschen (Deutsche Biographie 4)*, Hermann Heimpel, Theodor Heuss, Benno Reifenberg, eds. Berlin, 1957, pp. 60–70.
- . "Über den religiösen Gehalt in Bruckners Symphonien." In: Wiora, Walter, ed. *Religiöse Musik in nicht-liturgischen Werken von Beethoven bis Reger (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 51)*. Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1978, pp. 157–184.
- Wohlfahrt, Frank. "Der Ur-Bruckner." *DMK* 2 (1937), pp. 144–151.
- Wolff, Werner. *Anton Bruckner, Rustic Genius*. Introduction by Walter Damrosch. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1942.
- Wöss, Margareta. "Brucknerpflege im Brucknerhaus." *BrJb* 1982–83, pp. 173–182.
- Zamazal, Franz. "Ein verschollenes Werk Bruckners: Die Rose." *IBG-Mitt* no. 35 (Dec. 1990), p. 11.
- . "Von der Antike bis zum Heute. Bruckner-Symposion zum 'Schaffensprozeß in den Künsten'." *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* (Linz), 26 Sept. 1995, p. 16.
- . "Göllerich—Auer—Gräflinger. Konturen zu ihrem Leben und Wirken. Ihre Bedeutung für Bruckner." In: *BrSympBer 1994. Bruckner-Freunde, Bruckner-Kenner*. Linz: ABIL, 1997, pp. 113–131.
- Zwol, Cornelis van. "Wie Original ist eine Originalfassung?" *BrJb* 1980, pp. 61–65.

### III. FURTHER PERSPECTIVES

- Abendroth, Walter. *Deutsche Musik der Zeitwende*. Hamburg, 1937.
- Adorno, Theodor W. "Spätstil Beethovens." *Moments Musicaux. Neuedruckte Aufsätze 1928–1962*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1964, pp. 13–17.
- [Anonymous.] "Ein offener Brief an Gustav Mahler." *Deutsche Zeitung* (Vienna), 18 Mar. 1900.
- Applegate, Celia. "How German Is It? Nationalism and the Idea of Serious Music in the Early Nineteenth Century." *19th-Century Music* 21, no. 3 (Spring 1998), pp. 274–296.
- Arnold, Elsie and Denis. "The View of Posterity: an Anthology." In: *The Beethoven Companion*. Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune, eds. London: Faber and Faber, 1973, 1971, pp. 493–529.
- Baden, Michael, with Judith Adler Hennessee. *Unnatural Death. Confessions of a Forensic Pathologist*. London: Sphere Books, 1989.
- Baumann, Thomas. "Requiem, but No Piece." *19th-Century Music* 15, no. 2 (Fall 1991), pp. 151–165.
- Beck, Hermann. *Methoden der Werkanalyse in Musikgeschichte und Gegenwart (Taschenbücher zur Musikwissenschaft, Richard Schaal, ed.)*. Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen, 1974.
- Bent, Ian. *Analysis*. With glossary by William Drabkin. The Norton/Grove Handbooks in Music. New York–London: Norton, 1980–1987.
- Bergquist, Peter. "The First Movement of Mahler's Tenth Symphony. An analysis and examination of the sketches." *The Music Forum* 5 (1980), pp. 335–394.
- Bloomfield, Theodore. "Die vier Versionen der Zehnten Symphonie von Mahler." *Das Orchester*, Nov. 1986, pp. 906–910.
- Bonds, Mark Evan. "Idealism and the Aesthetics of Instrumental Music at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century." *JAMS* 50, nos. 2–3 (Summer–Fall 1997), pp. 387–420.
- Botstein, Leon. "Aesthetics and Ideology in the Fin-de-Siècle Mozart Revival", *Current Musicology* no. 50 (1992), pp. 5–25.
- Burnham, Scott. *Beethoven Hero*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

- Capellen, Georg. *Ist das System S. Sechter's ein geeigneter Ausgangspunkt für die theoretische Wagnerforschung? Streitschrift (Sammlung Musikwissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen 2)*. Leipzig: C. F. Kahnt, 1902.
- Caplin, William Earl. "Harmony and Meter in the Theories of Simon Sechter." *Music Theory Spectrum* 2 (1980), pp. 74–89.
- Castle, Eduard. "Geheimnisvoller Stephansdom." *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 13 Nov. 1940.
- Cherubini, Luigi. *Cours de Contrepoint*. German transl. by F. Stölpel. Leipzig, 1835.
- Clemencic, René. "Das Problem der Fassung und Bearbeitung bei Alter Musik." In: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen–Bearbeitungen–Vollendungen*, Linz: MWV, 1998, pp. 41–46.
- Cohrs, Benjamin G. "Neues Licht auf ein altes Problem. Mozarts Requiem—Fragment und seine Komplettierungen." *Klassik heute* 4/2000, pp. 32–37.
- Cone, Edward T. *Musical Form and Musical Performance*. New York, 1968.
- Conrad, Klaus. "Das Problem der Vorgestaltung." In: *Das unvollendete als künstlerische Form. Ein Symposium*. J. A. Schmoll, G. Eisenwerth, eds. Bern: Francke, n. d., pp. 35–45.
- Cooke, Deryck. "The Facts Concerning Mahler's Tenth Symphony." *Ch&D* 2, no. 10 (1963), pp. 3–27.
- . "Mahler's Tenth Symphony. Artistic Morality and Musical Reality." *MT* 102, no. 1420 (June 1961), pp. 351–354.
- Csampa, Attila, and Dietmar Holland, eds. *Alban Berg: Lulu. Texte, Materialien, Kommentare*. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1985.
- Dadelsen, Georg von. "Die 'Fassung letzter Hand' in der Musik." *AcMus* 33, no. 1 (1961), pp. 1–14.
- de la Grange, Henri-Louis. *Gustav Mahler, Volume 3: Vienna: Triumph and Disillusion (1904–1907)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- DeNora, Tia. *Beethoven and the Construction of Genius: Musical Politics in Vienna 1792–1803*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.
- Dahlhaus, Carl. *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts (Neues Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft 6)*. Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion; Laaber: Laaber Verlag Müller-Büscher, 1980.
- Dürrenberger, Johann August. *Elementar-Lehrbuch der Harmonie- und Generalbaß-Lehre*. Linz, 1841.
- Eggebrecht, Hans Heinrich. *Musikalisches Denken. Aufsätze zur Theorie und Ästhetik der Musik (Taschenbücher zur Musikwissenschaft 46, Richard Schaal, ed.)*. Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen, 1977.
- . *Bachs Kunst der Fuge. Erscheinung und Deutung (Serie Piper, Band 367)*. Munich–Zurich: Piper, 1984.
- . *Heinrich Schütz: Musicus Poeticus (Taschenbücher zur Musikwissenschaft 92, Richard Schaal, ed.)*. Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen, 1985.
- Erauw, Willem. "Canon formation: some more reflections on Lydia Goehr's Imaginary Museum of Musical Works." *AcMus* 70, no. 2 (1998), pp. 109–115.
- Federhofer, Hellmut. "Die Funktionstheorie Hugo Riemanns und die Schichtenlehre Heinrich Schenkers." In: *Bericht über den Internationalen Musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress, Wien, Mozartjahr 1956*. Erich Schenk, ed. Graz–Cologne: Hermann Böhlau, 1958, pp. 183–190.
- . "Fux's *Gradus ad Parnassum* as Viewed by Heinrich Schenker." *Music Theory Spectrum* 4 (1982), pp. 66–75.
- Feuchtmüller, Rupert. *Der Wiener Stephansdom*. Vienna: Dom-Verlag, 1978.
- Filler, Susan M. "The Case for a Performing Version of Mahler's Tenth Symphony." *JMusRes* 3, nos. 3–4 (1981), pp. 275–293.
- Fischer, Kurt von. "Die Doppelschlagfigur in den zwei letzten Sätzen von Gustav Mahlers 9. Symphonie. Versuch einer Interpretation." *AfMw* 32 (1975), pp. 99–105.
- Franke, Knut. Record sleeve notes to recording of: Gustav Mahler: *Symphonie Nr. 10* (Vollständige Fassung nach Deryck Cooke). The Philadelphia Orchestra under Eugene Ormandy. CBS Germany, 1966.
- Goehr, Lydia. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Gruber, Gernot. *Mozart und die Nachwelt*. 2nd edn. Munich–Zurich: Piper, 1987.
- . "Die Position der Bearbeitungspraxis im 19. Jahrhundert am Beispiel der Musik Mozarts." In: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen–Bearbeitungen–Vollendungen*, Linz: MWV, 1998, pp. 111–116.



- Grundmann, Günther. *Dome, Kirchen und Klöster in Schlesien*. Frankfurt am Main: Wolfgang Weidlich, 1963.
- Harb, Karl. "Immer wieder eine Herausforderung. Jugendarbeit für das Musiktheater: Bergs 'Lulu' in Brüssel, eine Aufführung und ein Kongreß." *Salzburger Nachrichten* 26 Feb. 1988.
- Hecht, Konrad. *Maß und Zahl in der gotischen Kunst*. New York, 1979.
- Hepokoski, James. "The Dahlhaus Project and Its Extra-musicological Sources." *19th-Century Music* 16, no. 3 (Spring 1991), pp. 221–246.
- Hill, R. S. "The Former Prussian State Library." *Notes* 3 (1945–46), pp. 327–50.
- Hilse, Walter, ed. "The Treatises of Christoph Bernhard." *The Music Forum* 3 (1973), pp. 1–196
- Howat, Roy. "Schubert's unknown symphonies: a review article on the restorative work of Brian Newbould." *Musicology Australia* 18 (1995) pp. 52–59.
- Hoyt, R. J. Letter to the Editor concerning: William Kimmel. "The Phrygian Inflection..." [q.v. infra] *College Music Symposium* 22, no. 1 (1982), pp. 196–198.
- Hüttner, Johann. "Bearbeitungen—Fassungen: Im Rahmen der Frage: Parodien am Beispiel Nestroys." In: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen—Bearbeitungen—Vollendungen*, Linz: MWV, 1998, pp. 102–110.
- Hynais, Cyrill. "Die Harmonik Richard Wagner's in Bezug auf die Fundamentaltheorie Sechter's." *Neue Musikalische Presse* 10, nos. 4–7 (1901), pp. 50–52, 67–69, 81–82, 97–100.
- Imbrie, Andrew. "'Extra' Measures and Metrical Ambiguity in Beethoven." In: *Beethoven Studies*. Alan Tyson, ed. New York: Norton, 1973, pp. 45–66.
- Irmen, Hans-Josef. *Mozart—Mitglied geheimer Gesellschaften*. Mechernich: Prisca, 1988.
- Jacobson, Bernhard. CD booklet to recording of Schubert, String Quintet in C, D. 960., EMI CDC 7 47018 2, 1983.
- James, Jamie. *The Music of the Spheres*. London: Abacus, 1993.
- Jarman, Douglas. "Alban Berg, Wilhelm Fliess und das geheime Programm des Violinkonzerts." *ÖMz* 40 (1985), pp. 12–21.
- Kayser, Hans. *Akroasis. Die Lehre von der Harmonik der Welt*. Basel: Benno Schwabe, 1946.
- . *Lehrbuch der Harmonik*. Zurich: Occident, 1950.
- Kimmel, William. "The Phrygian Inflection and the Appearances of Death in Music." *College Music Symposium* 20, no. 2 (1980), pp. 42–76.
- Kinsky, Georg, ed. *Manuskripte—Briefe—Dokumente von Scarlatti bis Stravinsky. Katalog der Musikautographen-Sammlung Louis Koch*. Stuttgart: Hoffmansche Buchdruckerei Felix Kraus, 1953.
- Kirkendale, Warren. *Fugue and Fugato in Rococo and Classical Chamber Music*, rev. and expanded 2nd edn., transl. from the German edn. by Margaret Bent and the author. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1979.
- Knecht, Justin Heinrich. *Allgemeiner Katechismus. Oder kurzer Inbegriff der allgemeinen Musiklehre. Zum Behuf der Musiklehrer und ihrer Zöglinge*. Vienna: Haslinger, n. d.; Vienna: Steiner, n. d.
- . *Allgemeiner Katechismus.[...]. Neueste, verbesserte und vermehrte Ausgabe*. Vienna: Steiner & Comp., 1822.
- . *Theoretisch, praktische Generalbassschule*. Bozen 1838.
- Knibbe, Dieter. "Fragment und Ergänzung in Epigraphik und Archäologie." In: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen—Bearbeitungen—Vollendungen*, Linz: MWV, 1998, pp. 143–156.
- Koch, Heinrich Christoph. *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition* (3 vols.). Rudolstadt 1782, 1787, 1793.
- Koller, Manfred. "'Gefaßt' oder 'fassungslos': Zur historischen und aktuellen Interpretation und Präsentation von Architektur und Bildkünsten." In: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen—Bearbeitungen—Vollendungen*, Linz: MWV, 1998, pp. 25–34.
- Kolneder, Walter. *Die Kunst der Fuge: Mythen des 20. Jahrhunderts (Taschenbücher zur Musikwissenschaft 42, Richard Schaal, ed.)*. Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen's Verlag, 1977–83.
- Kramer, Lawrence. "Haydn's Chaos, Schenker's Order; or, Hermeneutics and Musical Analysis: Can They Mix?" *19th-Century Music* 16, no. 1 (Summer 1992), pp. 3–17.
- Kramer, Richard. "The Hedgehog: Of Fragments Finished and Unfinished." *19th-Century Music* 20 (Fall 1997), pp. 134–148.

- Kramolisch, Walter. "Kalliwoda, Johann Wenzel." In: *MGG* (1954), vol. 7, cols. 454–458.
- Kris, Ernst and Otto Kurz, *Die Legende vom Künstler*. Frankfurt/Main, 1980.
- Kurth, Ernst. *Romantische Harmonik und ihre Krise in Wagners 'Tristan'*. Hildesheim–New York: Georg Olms, 1968 [repr. of original edn., Berlin, 1923].
- Lachinger, Johann. "Fragment, Fassung, Vollendung in der Literatur mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Adalbert Stifters." In: *BrSympBer 1996: Fassungen–Bearbeitungen–Vollendungen*, Linz: MWV, 1998, pp. 35–40
- Lenneberg, Hans. "The Myth of the Unappreciated (Musical) Genius", *MQ* 66 (1980), p. 220.
- Leppert, Richard, and Susan McClary, eds. *Music and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Levi, Erik. *Music in the Third Reich*. Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press, 1994.
- Lobe, Johann C. *Lehrbuch der musikalischen Komposition*. Leipzig, 1850.
- Mahler, Alma, ed. *Gustav Mahler: Erinnerungen und Briefe*. Amsterdam: Allert de Lange, 1940; 2nd edn. 1949.
- Marpurg, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Abhandlung von der Fuge*. Berlin: A. Haude and J. C. Spener, 1753 [photographic reprint of the original, n. d.].
- . *Abhandlung von der Fuge*. Simon Sechter, ed. Vienna: Anton Diabelli and Co., n. d. (1843).
- Marx, Adolf Bernhard. *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition* (4 vols.), 5th edn. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1858.
- Matthews, Colin. "The Tenth Symphony and artistic morality." *Muziek & Wetenschap* 5 (1995/96), no. 3, pp. 309–319.
- Mayrberger, Karl. *Lehrbuch der musikalischen Harmonik*. Preßburg–Leipzig: Gustav Heckenast, 1878.
- . "Die Harmonik Richard Wagner's an den Leitmotiven aus 'Tristan und Isolde' erläutert." Bayreuth, 1882.
- McClary, Susan. "The blasphemy of talking politics during Bach Year." In: Richard Leppert and Susan McClary, eds., *Music and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . "Narrative Agendas in 'Absolute' Music': Identity and Difference in Brahms's Third Symphony." In: Ruth Solie, ed. *Music and Difference. Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press, 1993, pp. 326–344.
- . "Constructions of Subjectivity in Schubert's Music." In: Brett, Philip, Elizabeth Wood, Gary C. Thomas, eds. *Queering the Pitch. The New Gay and Lesbian Musicology*. New York: Routledge 1994, pp. 205–233.
- Moessel, Ernst. *Die Proportion in Antike und Mittelalter*. Munich, 1926.
- Müller-Blattau, Joseph. "Schuberts 'Unvollendete' und das Problem des Fragmentarischen in der Musik." In: *Das unvollendete als künstlerische Form. Ein Symposium*. J. A. Schmoll, G. Eisenwerth, eds. Bern: Francke, n. d., pp. 141–153.
- Müller-Blattau, Joseph, ed. *Die Kompositionslehre Heinrich Schützens in der Fassung seines Schülers Christoph Bernhard*. Kassel–Basel: Bärenreiter, 1963.
- Némcová, Alena, "Kalliwoda, Johann Wenzel." In: *NG* (1980), vol. 9, pp. 779f.
- Niemöller, Klaus Wolfgang. "Zur religiösen Tonsprache im Instrumentalschaffen von Franz Liszt." In: Wiora, Walter, ed. *Religiöse Musik in nicht-liturgischen Werken von Beethoven bis Reger (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 51)*. Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1978, pp. 119–142.
- Notley, Margaret. "Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style and Politics in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna." *19th-Century Music* 17, no. 2 (Fall 1993), pp. 107ff.
- . "Volksconcerte in Vienna and late Nineteenth-Century Ideology of the Symphony." *JAMS* 50, nos. 2–3 (Summer–Fall 1997), pp. 421–453.
- Nowak, Adolf. "Religiöse Begriffe in der Musikästhetik des 19. Jahrhunderts." In: *Religiöse Musik in nicht-liturgischen Werken von Beethoven bis Reger*. Walter Wiora, ed. (*Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 51*). Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1978, pp. 47–58.
- Otto, Rudolf. *Das Heilige. Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*. Gotha: Leopold Klotz, 1926.
- Pederson, Sanna. "A. B. Marx, Berlin Concert Life, and German National Identity." *19th-Century Music* 18, no. 2 (Fall 1994), pp. 87–107.
- Plath, Wolfgang. "Bemerkungen zum Thema 'Skizze—Entwurf—Fragment'." *Mf* 45 (1992), pp. 275–278.

- Potter, Pamela M. "Musicology under Hitler: New Sources in Context." *JAMS* 49, no. 1 (Spring 1996), pp. 70–113.
- . *Most German of the Arts. Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the end of Hitler's Reich*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Ratner, Leonard G. *Classic Music. Expression, Form and Style*. New York: Schirmer, n. d.
- Reicha, Anton. *Vollständigen Lehrbuch der musikalischen Composition*. Transl. Carl Czerny, Vienna: Diabelli, 1832. First published as *Traité de mélodie*. Paris 1814.
- Renner, Gerhard. *Die Nachlässe in den Bibliotheken und Museen der Republik Österreich. Ausgenommen die ÖNB und das Österreichische Theatermuseum (Verzeichnis der schriftlichen Nachlässe in den Bibliotheken und Museen der Republik Österreich 1)*. Vienna–Cologne–Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 1993.
- Richter, Ernst Friedrich. *Die Grundzüge der musikalischen Form und ihre Analyse*. Leipzig: George Wiegand, 1852.
- Riemschneider, Margarete. *Das Geheimnis der Numinosen Zahl*. Munich, 1966.
- Reti, Rudolph. *The Thematic Process in Music*. New York: Macmillan, 1951.
- Schenker, Heinrich. *Harmony*. Edited and annotated by Oswald Jonas. Transl. by Elizabeth Mann Borgese. Chicago—London: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Schleuning, Peter. *Johann Sebastian Bachs 'Kunst der Fuge'. Ideologien—Entstehung—Analyse*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch; Kassel–Basel: Bärenreiter, 1993.
- Schoenberg, Arnold. *Harmonielehre*, 3rd edn. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1922.
- Sechter, Simon. *Die Grundsätze der musikalischen Komposition* (3 vols.). Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1853–54.
- Solomon, Maynard. "Schubert's 'Unfinished' Symphony." *19th-Century Music* 20 (Fall 1997), pp. 111–133.
- Shepherd, John. *Music as Social Text*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
- Slonimsky, Nicolas. *Lexicon of Musical Invective. Critical assaults on composers since Beethoven's time*, 2nd edn. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1953, 1965.
- Subotnik, Rose. "On Grounding Chopin." In: Richard Leppert and Susan McClary, eds., *Music and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, pp. 105–131.
- Sychra, Antonin. "Die Bedeutung des Skizzenstudiums für die wissenschaftliche Analyse musikalischer Werke." *Kongreßbericht über den Internationalen Musikwissenschaftlichen Kongreß Wien, Mozartjahr 1956*. Erich Schenk, ed. Graz–Cologne: Hermann Böhlaus, 1958, pp. 616–622.
- Thomas, Dylan. *Collected Poems 1934–1952*. London: Dent, 1952.
- Tittel, Ernst. "Wiener Musiktheorie von Fux bis Schönberg." In: *Beiträge zur Musiktheorie des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Martin Vogel, ed. (*Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* 4). Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1966; pp. 163–201.
- . "Simon Sechter. Zum 100. Todestag am 10. September 1967." *ÖMz* 22 (1967), pp. 550–551.
- Trapp, Klaus. *Die Fuge in der Deutschen Romantik von Schubert bis Reger. Diss. Frankfurt am Main: 1958*. Photocopy, unpubl.
- Treitler, Leo. "History, Criticism and Beethoven's Ninth Symphony." *19th-Century Music* 4 (1980), pp. 193–210.
- . "What Kind of Story is History?" *19th-Century Music* 7, no. 3 (1984), pp. 363–373.
- . *Music and the Historical Imagination*. Cambridge etc.: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Truscott, Harold. "The Ninth in Perspective." *MMR* 88, no. 990 (Nov.–Dec. 1958), pp. 223–228.
- Türk, Daniel Gottlob. *Anweisung zum Generalbaßspielen*, 5th edn. *Mit zeitgemäßen Verbesserungen und Zusätzen von Fr. Naue*. Halle, 1841.
- Tyson, Alan. "Sketches and Autographs." in: *The Beethoven Companion*. Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune, eds. London: Faber and Faber, 1971, 1973, pp. 443–458.
- Tyson, Alan, ed. *Beethoven Studies*. New York: Norton, 1973.
- , ed. *Beethoven Studies* 2. London–Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- , ed. *Beethoven Studies* 3. Cambridge–London: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Voss, Egon. *Richard Wagner und die Instrumentalmusik: Wagners symphonischer Ehrgeiz (Taschenbücher zur Musikwissenschaft 12, Richard, Schaal, ed.)*. Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen 1977.

- Wagner, Manfred. *Die Harmonielehre der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 38)*. Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1974.
- Warren, Charles W. "Brunelleschi's Dome and Dufay's Motet." *MQ* 59, no. 1 (1973), pp. 92–105.
- Wason, Robert. "Schenker's Notion of Scale-Step in Historical Perspective: Non-Essential Harmonies in Viennese Fundamental Bass Theory." *Journal of Music Theory* 27, no. 1 (1983), pp. 49–73.
- . *Viennese Harmonic Theory from Albrechtsberger to Schenker and Schoenberg (Studies in Musicology 80)*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1985 (= Wason).
- . "Josef Schalk and the Theory of Harmony at the End of the Nineteenth Century." In: Jackson, Timothy L., and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Bruckner Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 122–139.
- Weber, William. *The Rise of Musical Classics in Eighteenth Century England: A Study in Canon, Ritual, and Ideology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1992.
- Wessling, Berndt W. *Gustav Mahler. Prophet der neuen Musik*. Munich: Wilhelm Heyne, 1985.
- Whitehead, P. J. P. "The Lost Berlin Manuscripts." *Notes* 33 (1976), pp. 7–15.
- Wiora, Walter. "Zwischen absoluter und Programmusik." In: *Festschrift Friedrich Blume*. Anna Amalie Abert and William Pfannkuch, eds. Kassel–Basel: Bärenreiter, 1963, pp. 381–388.
- . "Einleitung." In: *Religiöse Musik in nicht-liturgischen Werken von Beethoven bis Reger*. Walter Wiora, ed. (*Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 51*). Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1978, pp. 7–17.
- Wolff, Christoph. *Mozarts Requiem. Geschichte—Musik—Dokumente—Partitur des Fragments*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch; Kassel–Basel: Bärenreiter, 1991.
- Wörner, Karl H. *Das Zeitalter der thematischen Prozesse in der Geschichte der Musik (Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 18)*. Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1969.
- Wright, Craig. "Dufay's *Nuper rosarum flores*, King Solomon's Temple, and the Veneration of the Virgin." *JAMS* 47, no. 3 (1994), pp. 395–441.
- Wulf, Josef. *Musik im Dritten Reich. Eine Dokumentation*. Frankfurt—Berlin—Vienna: Ullstein, 1983.
- Zeleny, Walter. *Die Historischen Grundlagen des Theoriesystems von Simon Sechter (Wiener Veröffentlichungen zur Musikwissenschaft 10)*. Othmar Wessely, ed.). Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1979.

#### IV. THE NINTH SYMPHONY AND FINALE

- Adensamer, Michael. "Bruckners Einfluß auf die Moderne (mit Beispielen aus dem Adagio der 9. Symphonie)." *BrJb* 1980, pp. 27–31.
- Apel, Hans. "Ein musikalisches Geheimnis wurde am Dienstag gelüftet. Uraufführung eines Bruckner-Fragments." *Die Wahrheit* (Berlin), 20 Feb. 1986.
- [Anonymous.] "Mittheilungen und Notizen" [report concerning planned performance of the Ninth Symphony in 1901]. *Österreichische Musik- und Theaterzeitung* 12, nos. 17–18 (1901), p. 13.
- [Anonymous.] "Bruckners 'Neunte' erstmals mit Original-Finale in der Vervollständigung durch Märzendorfer." *Kurier* (Vienna), 25 Nov. 1969.
- [Anonymous.] "Pressecommuniqué [concerning] Internationales Symposium über das Thema 'Das Problem des Finales in den Symphonien Anton Bruckners. Vorführung des Finales der IX. Symphonie nach der Rekonstruktion von Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca. 11. und 12. Mai 1987 am Österreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rom." Photocopy; dated Padua, 13 March 1987.
- Ashley, Tim. "Unfinished business" [Review of UK premiere of Finale by the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra under Robert Bachmann]. *The Guardian* (London), 20 May 2000.
- Auer, Max. "Anton Bruckners IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung. Zur ersten Aufführung durch die Wiener Philharmoniker unter Clemens Krauß am 23. Oktober 1932 in Wien." *ZfM* 99, no. 10 (Oct. 1932), pp. 861–870; English transl.: "Bruckner's Ninth: The Original Version." *Ch&D* 1, no. 4 (Oct. 1933), pp. 7–11.
- . "Die IX. Symphonie in der Originalfassung." *BrBlätter* 1934, no. 3, pp. 40–42.
- Baier, Peter. "Toben und Schwelgen. Bruckners vervollständigte Neunte." *Münchener Merkur*, 27 April 2001.
- Beaujean, Alfred. "Weiterkomponieren: Einbruch in die Ewigkeit." *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 29 Jan. 1999.

- Birtel, Wolfgang, Review of: *Anton Bruckner: Symphonie Nr. 5 B-dur; Finale der 9. Symphonie d-Moll, Rekonstruktion von Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca*. Radio-Sinfonie-Orchester Frankfurt, conducted by Eliahu Inbal (Teldec 8.35785 ZA, 1987), *NZfM* 149 (July–Aug. 1988), pp. 83f.
- Blumauer, Manfred. "Bruckner: Finalsatz der 9. Symphonie" [Program notes to premiere of Märzendorfer Finale version, Graz, 24–26 Nov. 1969].
- . "Weitreichende Wirkungen. Zur Grazer Bruckner-Aufführung." *Südost Tagespost* (Graz), 22 Nov. 1969.
- . "Bruckner-Uraufführung und mehr. Die Musikvereinskonzerte unter Ernst Märzendorfer/ Finalsatz zur 'Neunten', Beethoven, Mahler." *Südost Tagespost* (Graz), 26 Nov. 1969.
- . "Bruckner-Uraufführung in Graz. Die erste Präsentation des von Ernst Märzendorfer kompilierten Schlußsatzes der 'Neunten'." *Salzburger Nachrichten*, 26 Nov. 1969.
- Boschi, Carlo. "Bruckners negende nog weer eens anders voltooid (gesprek mit N. Samale en G. Mazzuca)." *Mens&Mel* 41 (June 1986), pp. 252–260.
- Bouquet, Fritz. "Der Tod trat in die Werkstätte. Bruckner Entwürfe zum Klingen gebracht." *Mainzer Anzeiger* 18, Oct. 1940.
- Brandt, Maarten. "Carragans voltooiing van Bruckners Negende. Europese première van het Utrechts Orkest." *Mens&Mel* 40 (May 1985), pp. 224–230.
- Cantrell, Scott. "Unfinished Business: Completing the Orchestral Classics." *Symphony Magazine* 35, no. 6 (1984), pp. 14–18.
- Cohrs, Gunnar. "Komplettierungsversuche eines Torsos. Zu den verschiedenen Fassungen von Bruckners Neunter Sinfonie." *FonoForum* Aug. 1988, pp. 18–19.
- . "Noch einmal zu Bruckners 'Neunter'. Zu Reinhard Kannoniers Beitrag 'Bausteine ohne Mörtel' (*ÖMz* 1992/1)." *ÖMz* 47 (1992), pp. 360–361.
- . Program notes to performance of: Anton Bruckner. *Sinfonie Nr. 9 d-Moll mit Finale/ Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen/ Aufführungsfassung von Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips, Giuseppe Mazzuca und Gunnar Cohrs (1985–1993)*. First performance in Germany, Stadthalle Braunschweig, 17–18 April 1993. Staatsorchester Braunschweig; conducted by Manfred Mayrhofer.
- Comes, Roland. "Mystische Wirkung. Staatsorchester spielte Bruckners 'Neunte'." *Braunschweiger Zeitung*, 19 April 1994.
- Cwienk, Ewald. "Für Bruckner nach-gedacht. Ernst Märzendorfer stellte ein Finale zur 'Neunten' her und vor." *Kurier* (Vienna), 26 Nov. 1969.
- Dallinger, Fridolin. "Problematische Rekonstruktion. Finale von Bruckners 9. Symphonie im Linzer Brucknerhaus uraufgeführt." *Neues Volksblatt* (Linz), 5 Dec. 1991, p. 9.
- Delle Cave, Ferruccio. "Verklärte Visionen vom Lebensabschied. 'Musik und Kirche' in Brixen: Bachs 'Kunst der Fuge' mit Peter Waldner, Bruckners Neunte unter Johannes Wildner." *Tiroler Tageszeitung* (Innsbruck), 10 Oct. 1995.
- Dobner, Walter. "Weitere und Neue Anläufe: Zu neuen Bruckner Einspielungen." *IBG-Mitt* no. 41 (Dec. 1993), pp. 46–50.
- Douglas, Mark. "SA man completes 'lost' symphony." *The Advertiser* (Adelaide), 10 July 1991, p. 2.
- Eckert, Thor, Jr. "Mostly Mahler" [concerning performances of Mahler Tenth and Bruckner Ninth]. *Ovation* 5 (Apr. 1984), pp. 29.
- Edge, John. "Reconstructing the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony." *Lumen* (Adelaide) 20, no. 10 (July 1991), p. 7.
- ell. "Bruckners Neunte erstmals mit Finale. Philharmonie spielt unvollendeten 4. Satz. *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 17 April 1998.
- Floros, Constantin. "Zur Deutung der Symphonik Bruckners. Das Adagio der Neunten Symphonie." *BrJb* 1981, pp. 89–96.
- Goodwin, Noel. *Bruckner Symphony No. 9 in D minor; with Finale, completed by William Carragan (World Premiere Recording) plus Original Sketches of 4th Movement* [CD booklet]. London: Chandos Records, 1986. CHAN 8468/9.
- Grunsky, Hans A. "Der erste Satz von Bruckners Neunter. Ein Bild höchster Formvollendung." *Die Musik* 18 (1925–26), pp. 21–34, 104–112.

- Gülke, Peter. "Vollendet-Unvollendet. Einige Anmerkungen zur IX. Sinfonie Anton Bruckners. (Referat vom 12. Mai 1987 auf dem Symposium des Österr. Kulturinstituts, Rom: 'Die Entwürfe und Skizzen der IX. Sinfonie Anton Bruckners')." Photocopy, unpubl.
- . "Rom, 11. und 12. Mai 1987. Bruckner-Symposium.' Bericht." *Mf* 41 (1988), p. 243.
- . "Bruckner. Von seiner Neunten Sinfonie aus gesehen." In: *idem, Brahms–Bruckner. Zwei Studien*. Kassel–Basel: Bärenreiter, 1989.
- Günzel, Paul. "Von Bruckners 'Neunter Symphonie'." *ZfM* 99, no. 5 (May 1932), p. 427.
- Haidmayer, Karl. "Anton Bruckner wurde uraufgeführt. Ernst Märzendorfer im Musikverein." *Kleine Zeitung* (Graz), 26 Nov. 1969.
- Hadfield, Duncan. "Bruckner's Ninth Symphony. Russian National Orchestra, Robert Bachmann" [Review of Russian premiere of Finale under Robert Bachmann]. (Publication forthcoming; copy courtesy of B. G. Cohrs.)
- Halbreich, Harry. "Un Essai de Synthèse." In: *Bruckner: Apogée De La Symphonie*. Paul-Gilbert Langevin, ed. Lausanne: Editions de l'Age d'Homme, 1977, pp. 265–270.
- Hirschfeld, Robert. Program booklet: *Anton Bruckner/ Neunte Symphonie/ Uraufführung in Wien am 11. Februar 1903. Dirigent: Ferdinand Löwe*. Vienna: no publisher, n. d.
- Holland, Dietmar. "Bruckner-Raritäten" [review of recording by Oslo Philharmonic Orchestra of Carragan Finale]. *NMZ* 36 (June–July 1987), p. 29.
- . "L'ultima Sinfonia di Bruckner: congedo e testamento/ Abschied und Vermächtnis: Zu Bruckners letzter Symphonie." In: Programme booklet to performances of Ninth with Finale in Bressanone, Trento and Bolzano by Orchestra Haydn-Orchester under Johannes Wildner, October 1995.
- Höving, Elisabeth. "Bruckners Neunte: Eine runde Sache. Sinfonie erklang erstmals mit Finalsatz." *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 22 April 1998.
- Howard, Crawford. Review of: Bruckner, Anton. *Symphonie D-Moll, Scherzo und Trio: Entwürfe. Älteres Trio mit Viola-Solo (1893): Autograph-Partitur*, ed. Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs (Vienna 1998) and Bruckner, Anton. *Symphonie D-Moll, Finale (unvollendet): Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten*, ed. John A. Phillips (Vienna 1996). *M&L* 80, no. 4 (Nov. 1999), pp. 667–668.
- Jones, Rick. "Endlessly satisfying" [Review of UK premiere of Finale by Royal Philharmonic Orchestra under Robert Bachmann]. *Evening Standard (News Extra)* (London), 18th May 2000.
- Kannonier, Reinhard. "Bausteine ohne Mörtel" [concerning premiere of Aufführungsfassung, Linz, 3 Dec. 1991]. *ÖMz* 47 (1992), p. 25.
- Kager, Reinhard. Im Angesicht des Todes. Nikolaus Harnoncourt dirigierte eine halbe Bruckner-Uraufführung." *Der Standard* (Vienna), 15 Nov. 1999.
- Kaufmann, Harald. "Das Ereignis einer Bruckner-Uraufführung 1969. Märzendorfer rekonstruierte das Finale der Neunten—Orchesterkonzert im Grazer Stephaniesaal." *Neue Zeit* (Graz), 26 Nov. 1969.
- Krones, Hartmut. "Symposium zur 'Fertigstellung' von Bruckners IX. Symphonie im Österreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rom (Bericht)." *ÖMz* 42 (1987), pp. 521–522.
- Kropfreiter, Augustinus Franz. "Das Kyrie der f-Moll-Messe im Adagio der Neunten Sinfonie." *ÖMz* 29 (1974), pp. 439–440.
- Lade, Ludwig. "Bruckners Entwürfe zum Finale der Neunten (Münchener Urvorführung)." *BrBlätter* 6, no. 4 (1934), p. 8.
- Lang, Oskar. "Die Entwürfe zum Finale der 9. Symphonie Anton Bruckners." *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* 61 (1934), pp. 445–447.
- . "Zwei frühere Fassungen des Trios der IX. Symphony von Anton Bruckner." *ZfM* 105, no. 12 (Dec. 1938), pp. 1328–1330.
- Langevin, Paul-Gilbert. "Neuvième Symphonie, en ré mineur" In: *Bruckner: Apogée De La Symphonie*. Paul-Gilbert Langevin, ed. Lausanne: Editions de l'Age d'Homme, 1977, pp. 195–216.
- Laufer, Norbert. "Nur Blech glänzte. Ein Solidaritätskonzert unter dem Dirigenten Robert Bachmann für die Philharmonia Hungarica in der Tonhalle." *Rheinische Post* (Düsseldorf), 24 April 2001.
- Lepuschitz, Rainer (lepu). "Doppeltes Gotteslob des symphonischen Parsifal. Denkwürdige Uraufführung in Linz: Finale von Bruckners 9. Symphonie neu rekonstruiert." *Tiroler Tageszeitung* (Innsbruck), 5 Dec. 1991.

- Loskill, Hans-Jörg (HJL). "Neues Finale macht Sinfonie spannender. Im Sinfoniekonzert erklingt Bruckners '9.' komplett." *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* (Gelsenkirchen), 16 April 1998.
- . "Die heile Welt erhält hier den ersten Riß. A. Bruckners '9.' im Großen Haus." *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 22. April 1998.
- . "Vollendet ist nun Bruckners Neunte. Erstaufführung unter Joh. Wildner." *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 23 April 1998.
- Lück, Hartmut. "Bläserchorale für den lieben Gott. Günter Neuhold dirigierte Werke von Wolfgang Rihm und Anton Bruckner." [Review of performance of Aufführungsfassung under Günter Neuhold, Bremen, 13, 14 March 2000]. *Weser Kurier* (Bremen), 15 March 2000.
- Mrosek, Christoph. "Bruckner in einem völlig neuen Licht. Vormiete: NPhW stellt die 9. Sinfonie erstmals in der komplettierten Fassung vor." *Recklinghäuser Zeitung*, 21 April 1998.
- Müller, Herbert. "Erklärt und mißverstanden." [Premiere of Finale Dokumentation under Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Vienna, Nov. 1999]. *Wiener Zeitung* (Vienna), 15 Nov. 1999.
- mus. "In der Bruckner Werkstatt. Nikolaus Harnoncourt und die Wiener Symphoniker gaben im Wiener Musikverein eine außergewöhnliche Lektion." *Die Presse* (Vienna), 15 Nov. 1999, p. 22.
- Neill, Edward D. R. "Notre Realisation du Finale de la 9e Symphonie." In: *Bruckner: Apogée De La Symphonie*. Paul-Gilbert Langevin, ed. Lausanne: Editions de l'Age d'Homme, 1977, pp. 261–264.
- Neißer, Arthur. "Anton Bruckner's neunte Symphonie (Uraufführung in Wien)." *Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musik-Gesellschaft* 4 (1902–03), pp. 313–317.
- Neuberg, A. "Das Scherzo der Neunten. Ein Vergleich beider Fassungen." *Dresdener Bruckner-Blätter* no. 3, pp. 9–14.
- Orel, Alfred. "Skizzen zum Vierten Satz von Bruckners Neunter Symphonie." *Der Merker* 12, no. 19 (1921–22), pp. 411–419.
- . "Zur Entstehung von Bruckners IX. Symphonie." *BrBlätter* 1934, nos. 1–2, pp. 2–7.
- Partsch, Erich Wolfgang, ed. "Round-table—*Finale der Neunten Symphonie*." In: *BrSompBer 1996: Fassungen—Bearbeitungen—Vollendungen*. Linz: MWV, 1998, pp. 189–210. Includes position statement by John A. Phillips, reprinted in Appendix V.
- Phillips, John A. "The Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony: new light on an old problem." *Miscellanea Musicologica. Adelaide Studies in Musicology* 17 (1990), pp. 193–296.
- . "The Finale of Bruckner's Ninth: Reconstructing a symphonic masterpiece" [tit. fict.], published as "Cracking the Coda." *24 Hours* (ABC FM Radio Journal), Dec. 1990, pp. 32–33.
- . "Neues zum Thema Finale der 9. Symphonie." *IBG-Mitt* no. 36 (June 1991), pp. 14–15.
- . "Zum leidigen Thema 'Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners'." *ÖMz* 47 (1992), pp. 22–25.
- . "Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners." *BrJb* 1989–90, pp. 115–204.
- . CD booklet to: *Anton Bruckner: Symphony No. 9 in D minor; with Finale, Reconstruction of the Autograph Score from the Surviving Manuscripts: Performing Version December 1992 by Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips and Giuseppe Mazzuca, with the assistance of Gunnar Cohrs*. Brucknerorchester Linz, conducted by Kurt Eichhorn (World Premiere Recording). Tokyo: Camerata Tokyo 30CM–275–6, 1993. Reprinted in Appendix I.
- . "Was Bruckners Nachlaßverwalter versäumten." *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 18 Feb. 1999.
- . "Ferdinand Löwe's Version of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony (1903), or: How to Earn a Place in the Canon." Paper delivered at the 23rd National Conference of the Musicological Society of Australia, University of Sydney, April 2000.
- . "Ideology and Authenticity: Ferdinand Löwe's Version of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony (1903)." Paper delivered at the 19th-Century Music Conference, Royal Holloway, University of London, June 2000.
- . "The Facts Behind a 'Legend': Bruckner's Ninth Symphony and the *Te Deum*." In: Crawford Howie, Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw, eds. *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Aldershot: Ashgate 2001, pp. 270–281.
- . "'Für die IX. ist gesorgt.' Einige Erläuterungen zum Editionsprojekt Neunte Symphonie in der Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe—und wie es dazu kam." *BrJb* 1996–97–98 (forthcoming, 2002); reprinted in Appendix VI.
- Pieper, Stefan. "150 Hörer nahmen Abschied. Philharmonia Hungarica gibt ihr letztes Konzert." *NMZ*, May 2001.

- P.J. "In der virtuosen Werkstatt" [Premiere of Finale Dokumentation under Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Vienna, Nov. 1999]. *Kurier* (Vienna), 15 Nov. 1999.
- Pugliese, Giuseppe. "L' 'incompiuta' di Bruckner/ Bruckners 'Unvollendete'." In: Programme booklet to performances of Ninth with Finale in Bressanone, Trento and Bolzano by Orchestra Haydn-Orchester under Johannes Wildner, October 1995.
- Redlich, Hans F. "The Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony." *MMR* 79 (July–Aug. 1949), pp. 143–149.
- Reich, Willi. "Bruckner's Ninth (the Original Version)." *Ch&D* 1, no. 6 (1935), pp. 15–16.
- Ritschel, Gerhard. "Bruckners Neunte viersätzig (Kurzkritik)." *ÖMz* 41 (1986), p. 593.
- Riebe, Karl. "Monumentale Klangfluten. Sinfoniekonzert: Wildner dirigierte Bruckners 'Neunte'." *Buersche Zeitung* (Gelsenkirchen–Buer), 22 April 1998.
- Rieger, Eva. "Lehrstunde. Bruckners Neunte-Fragmente." *NMZ*, February 2000, p. 34.
- Rögl, Heinz. "Keine Skizzen eines Altersschwachen. Nikolaus Harnoncourt präsentierte das Fragment des Finales von Bruckners Neunter" [Premiere of Finale Dokumentation under Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Vienna, Nov. 1999]. *Salzburger Nachrichten*, 15 Nov. 1999.
- Rohde, Gerhard. "Auch Bruckner entgeht den Vollendern nicht. Die neunte Sinfonie mit dem vierten Satz unter Elisha Inbal aufgeführt." *NMZ* 35 (Dec. 1986), p. 44.
- Ruschmann, Volker. "Versuch eines Finales, im doppelten Sinn. Die Philharmonia Hungarica gab ihr Abschiedskonzert—vor leeren Reihen—in der Tonhalle." *Westdeutsche Zeitung*, 24 April 2001.
- Ruzicka, Peter. "Annäherung an einen Torso." *Hi-Fi Stereophonie* 18 (Feb. 1979), pp. 40–41; repr. in: *idem*, ed. Thomas Schäfer, *Erfundene und gefundene Musik: Analysen, Portraits und Reflexionen. Festschrift zum 50. Geburtstag von Peter Ruzicka*. Hofheim: Wolke Verlag, pp. 109–114.
- Samale, Nicola, and Giuseppe Mazzuca. *Anmerkungen zur Rekonstruktion des Finales der 9. Symphonie Anton Bruckners* [paper delivered at Rome Symposium, May 1987. Photocopy, unpubl.].
- Schmitt-Rosenberger, Otto ('os'). "Eine sensationelle Rekonstruktion. John A. Phillips sprach über seine Arbeit an dem Finale von Bruckners 9. Symphonie." *Volksblatt/Volkszeitung* (Würzburg), 10 Jan. 1992, p. 6.
- Schönzeler, Hans-Hubert. *Zu Bruckners IX. Symphonie: Die Krakauer Skizzen*. Vienna: MWV, 1987.
- Sergl, Anton. "Bruckners Neunte mit Finale. Eine Pioniertat." *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 27 April 2001.
- Simpson, Robert. "The Ninth Symphony of Anton Bruckner." *Ch&D* 2, no. 6 (1950), pp. 115–117.
- . Revision of Chapter 11 (originally 10) of *The Essence of Bruckner*. (New York: Crescendo Publishing, 1967). Photocopy, unpubl., n. d. (c. 1987–88).
- Sinkovicz, Wilhelm. "Und wieder kein Bruckner. Anmerkungen zur 'Vollendungswut' von Musikern." *Die Presse* (Vienna), 10 Jan. 1986.
- . "Was Bruckner wirklich wollte. Die Neunte auf CD: ehrlich und angeblich vollendet." *Die Presse* (Vienna), supplement *Schaufenster*, 17 Feb. 1994, p. 9.
- . "Brixen vollendete Bruckners Neunte." *Die Presse* (Vienna), 12 Oct. 1995.
- . "Die Neunte Bruckner mit allen Notizen dazu." *Die Presse* (Vienna), 20 July 1996, p. 8.
- Sonntag, Mariana Elsa. *The compositional process of Anton Bruckner: A study of the sketches and drafts for the first movement of the Ninth Symphony*. Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1987.
- . Abstract of: *The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner: A study of the sketches and drafts for the first movement of the Ninth Symphony*. Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1987. *Dissertation Abstracts* 48, no. 7 (Jan. 1988), pp. 1580A–1581A.
- . "A New Perspective on Anton Bruckner's Composition of the Ninth Symphony." *BrJb* 1989–90, pp. 77–114.
- Spies, Hansjörg. "Graz: Ernst Märzendorfer bearbeitete Bruckner-Finale." *Kärntner Tageszeitung* (Klagenfurt), 2nd Dec. 1969.
- Stähr, Wolfgang. "IX. Symphonie in D-Moll / Ein unzerstörbares Credo. Werkbetrachtung und Essay." In: Ulm, Renate, ed. *Die Symphonien Bruckners. Entstehung, Deutung, Wirkung*. Kassel–Basel: Bärenreiter, 1998. pp. 216–225; 226–231.
- Steinbeck, Wolfram. *Anton Bruckner, Neunte Symphonie d-Moll (Meisterwerke der Musik 60)*. Munich: Fink, 1993.
- Stephan, Rudolf. "Eine wichtige Bruckner-Aufführung in Berlin." *ÖMz* 41 (1986), pp. 176–177.



- . Review of: *Anton Bruckner: IX. Symphonie d-Moll. Finale (unvollendet), Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen...* (Vienna: MWV 1994). *Das Orchester*, May 1995, p. 57.
- Strauss, J. "Anton Bruckner's neunte Symphonie. Uraufführung am 11. Februar 1903. Dirigiert von Ferdinand Löwe." *Wochenschrift für Kunst und Musik* (Vienna) 1, no. 11 (22 Feb. 1903), pp. 101–102.
- Sulzer, Balduin. "Liebevolle Ergänzung. Konzert für alle: Bruckners neues Finale." *Kronenzeitung* (Vienna), 5 Dec. 1991.
- Suppan, Wolfgang. "Kienzl—Savenau." Appendix: "Bruckner-Rezensionen von Wilhelm Kienzl" [concerning performance of Ninth Symphony, Graz 1904]. In: *BrSympBer 1984: Bruckner, Wagner und die Neudeutschen in Österreich*. Linz–Vienna: ABIL–MWV, 1986, pp. 197–198.
- Szeless, Georgina. "Wieder ein neuer Bruckner. Vor Erstaufführung des Finalsatzes der 'Neunten' im 'Konzert für alle'." *Neues Volksblatt* (Linz), 29 Nov. 1991.
- . "Finalsatz rekonstruiert." *Neues Volksblatt* (Linz), 18 Sept. 1993, p. 21.
- Tonini, Giuliano. "Bruckner virtuale." [Concerning performances of Ninth with Finale in Bressanone, Trento and Bolzano, October 1995.] *Il Mattino*, 13 Oct. 1995.
- Truscott, Harold. "The Ninth in Perspective." *MMR* 88, no. 990 (Nov.–Dec. 1958), pp. 223–228.
- van der Hilst, Rob. "Bruckner's Completed IXth & Mozart, Piano Concerto No. 8" [Review of Russian premiere of Finale under Robert Bachmann]. *The Bruckner Journal* 5, no. 1 (March 2001), p. 4 (slightly abridged).
- Vogg, Herbert. "Bruckners unvollendeter Lobgesang. Zur Dokumentation des Finale-Fragments der Neunten Symphonie." *Musikfreunde—Zeitschrift der Musikfreunde in Wien* 12, no. 2 (Nov. 1999), pp. 10–13.
- Wagner, Manfred. "Anton Bruckner: 9. Sinfonie. Wien 11.2.1903 (Uraufführung)." In: *idem*, ed. *Geschichte der österreichischen Musikkritik in Beispielen. Mit einem einleitenden Essay von Norbert Tschulik*. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1979, pp. 235–277.
- . CD booklet to: *Anton Bruckner: Symphonie Nr. 5 B-dur; Finale der 9. Symphonie d-Moll, Rekonstruktion von Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca*. Radio-Sinfonie-Orchester Frankfurt, conducted by Eliahu Inbal. Frankfurt: Teldec 8.35785 ZA, 1987.
- . "Bemerkungen zu den Ergänzungsversuchen von Nicola Samale und Giuseppe Mazzuca." *IBG-Mitt* 3 (1987), pp. 5–7.
- . Review of: Chandos recording by Oslo Philharmonic under Yoav Talmi of Bruckner Ninth with Finale completed by Carragan. *NZfM* 149 (July–Aug. 1988), p. 84.
- . "Neues von Großen Komponisten. Bruckner-Uraufführung in Wiener Musikverein (13.11.)." *ÖMz* 55, No. 1/2 (2000), pp. 64–65.
- W., Dr. L. "Anton Bruckners Neunte vollendet? Uraufführung unter Ernst Märzendorfer in Graz." *Linzer Volksblatt*, 29 Nov. 1969, p. 8.
- Zamazal, Franz. "Das 'kraftlose' Alterswerk. Bruckners unvollendeter Finalsatz der 9. Symphonie wurde rekonstruiert." *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* (Linz), 30 Nov. 1991.
- (sm). "Doch ein echter Bruckner. Eine Finale-Rekonstruktion beim 'Konzert für alle'." *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* (Linz), 5 Dec. 1991, p. 20.
- . "Bruckners Neunte Symphonie samt Finale. Erste Begegnung mit der Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung des Finales von Nicola Samale und John A. Phillips." *IBG-Mitt* no. 38 (June 1992), pp. 16–18.
- . "A. Bruckner's 'Neunte' mit Finale." *Oberösterreichischen Kulturbericht* 47, no. 11 (Nov. 1993).
- . "Die letzte Arbeit Anton Bruckners. Zur Rekonstruktion und Ergänzung des vierten Satzes der 9. Symphonie." *Linz aktiv* 125 (Winter 1993), pp. 64–65.
- . "Hier ist nichts geglättet. Brucknerorchester unter Kurt Eichhorn auf einer neuen CD." *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* (Linz), 6 November 1993, p. 28.
- . Review of: Anton Bruckner. *Zu Band 9 der Gesamtausgabe (IX. Symphonie d-Moll): Finale (unvollendet). Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen/ Studienpartitur*. J. A. Phillips, ed. (Vienna, 1994). *Oberösterreichischen Kulturbericht* 49, no. 9 (Sept. 1995), p. 19.
- . "Mit dem vierten Satz ein überwältigender Klangdom" [Premiere of Finale fragment under Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Vienna, Nov. 1999]. *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten (Kulturnachrichten)* (Linz), 15 Nov. 1999.
- . "Die Uraufführung des Finale-Fragments der Neunten Symphonie Bruckners." *IBG-Mitt* 54 (June 2000), pp. 39–43.

- Zeni, Annely. "Bruckner 'sublimato'." [Concerning performances of Ninth with Finale in Bressanone, Trento and Bolzano, October 1995.] *Alto Adige*, 11 Oct. 1995.
- Zentner, Wilhelm. [Concert programme from the 9th concert of 1946–47 Bruckner Zyklus of the Münchener Philharmoniker (27, 29, 30 May, 1 June 1947) under Hans Rosbaud featuring the Schubert *Unvollendete* and Bruckner Ninth.]
- Ziehn, Bernhard. "Ueber den ersten Akkord im Scherzo der neunten Sinfonie von Bruckner." *Allgemeine Musikzeitung* no. 28–29 (10–17 July 1903), p. 467.
- Zwol, Cornelis van. "Der Finalsatz der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners. Ein Referat in Utrecht (15. November 1986); ein Symposion in Rom (11. bis 12. Mai 1987)." *BrJb* 1987–88, pp. 31–38.
- . "Symposion 'De Onvoltooiden—Die Unvollendeten.' Eine 'Bruckner'-Premiere in Den Haag." *IBG-Mitt* 51 (Dec. 1998), pp. 22–23.

## V. BIBLIOGRAPHIC STUDIES, WORK LISTINGS

- Grasberger, Renate. *Werkverzeichnis Anton Bruckner (WAB) (Publikationen des Instituts für Österreichische Musikdokumentation 7*. Franz Grasberger, ed.). Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1977.
- Kirsch, Winfried. "Die Bruckner-Forschung seit 1945. Eine kommentierte Bibliographie." *AcMus* 53, no. 2 (1981), pp. 157–170; 54, nos. 1–2 (1982), pp. 208–261; 55, no. 1 (1983), pp. 201–244; 56, no. 1 (1984), pp. 1–29.
- Riehn, Rainer. "Werkverzeichnis." *Musik-Konzepte* 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 148–155.
- Wagner, Manfred. "Vorwort zu einer Bibliographie; dargestellt an jener über Anton Bruckner." *Mf* 26 (1973), pp. 225–235.
- Zuber, Barbara; Rainer Riehn. "Auswahlbibliographie." *Musik-Konzepte* 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 156–163.

The following biographies listed in §II above also contain catalogues of works and bibliographies:

- Blume, Friedrich. "Bruckner." In: *MGG* (1954) vol. 2, cols. 342–382.
- Cooke, Deryck. "Bruckner, (Josef) Anton." Bibliography by Leopold Nowak. In: *NG* (1980) vol. 3, pp. 352–371.
- Grasberger, Renate. *Bruckner-Bibliographie (bis 1974) (Anton Bruckner. Dokumente und Studien 4*. Othmar Wessely, ed.). Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1985.
- Grebe, Karl. *Anton Bruckner* (1972).
- Redlich, Hans F. *Bruckner and Mahler* (1955–70).
- Riehn, Rainer. "Werkverzeichnis." *Musik-Konzepte* 23–24 (Jan. 1982), pp. 148–155.
- Schönzeler, Hans-Hubert. *Bruckner* (1970).
- Wagner, Manfred. *Bruckner. Leben—Werke—Dokumente* (1983, 1989).
- Watson, Derek. *Bruckner* (1975–77).
- Zuber, Barbara, and Rainer Riehn. "Auswahlbibliographie." *Musik-Konzepte* 23–24, pp. 156–163.