

A VERY SHORT PREFACE

This article about Robert Haas was first written as a short appendix to my Manuscript (4th movement) Score. The 2005 published Study Score offers the article – in an intermediate form – at the end of the score.

But when I decided to write something about Haas, the difficulties were great. The first serious information about Haas that I received came from Michael Nowotny, who told me that the MGG Lexicon (*Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*) has a short synopsis of Haas' work and life. This article is the fundamental basis of my work.

Many years later Prof. Dr. Vogg (Vienna) wrote in some letters that Haas and Nowak respected each other very much and there never had been any animosity between them. But they had of course different scientific opinions.

The information about Haas' Civil Defence Duties during the World War I was found by Internet research. And finally Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs (Bremen) told me about Haas' opposite position against the workshop-performance of Oeser's arrangement of the Finale-Fragment (1940/Symphony no.9). This fact shows clearly that Haas was no 'perfect angel'. He was more or less a child of his time.

Wolfgang Doebel's book 'Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen' (2001) I regard as some kind of an 'Unofficial 8th Symphony Editor's Notes'. Here I found – quoted – Haas' letter to Max Auer, begging him in 1946 for help, after his forced pension.

The first version of this article therefore is more or less fragmentary; and I regard this, now present version only as the very beginning of a fair discussion about Haas, his work, his time and his personality.

Therefore I beg all readers who know something hitherto unknown – or less known – about Haas and even his former assistants Nowak, to tell me these facts. An open-minded discussion 'sine ira et studio' is more than necessary.

Haas' principles of editing were more pragmatic, seen from the point of view of a Kapellmeister – but always respecting Bruckner's spirit. And he made possible what nobody in 1920 had thought as possible: the first Critical Complete Edition of Bruckner's music.

Wiesbaden, November 2008

Joseph Kanz

AD PERSONAM ROBERT HAAS.



Robert Haas

(* 1886 Prague · † 1960 Vienna)

Bruckner's music, as we know, is connected together with Haas' name. Robert Maria Haas was born August 15th 1886 in Prague, as member of a German-Bohemian aristocratic family, coming from Teplitz-Schönau (Teplice). After his school years, the studies in Prague, Berlin and Vienna and his promotion (dissertation) at Prague, he became an assistant at Vienna's 'Musikhistorisches Institut der Universität Wien'. His solid craftsmanship allowed him to work occasionally as Kapellmeister at the German Opera Houses in Münster/Westphalia, Constance and Dresden. In Dresden, he assisted the famous conductor Ernst von Schuch. During World War I he was a lieutenant in the Austrian Army attached to the 24th Rifle Regiment.

In 1918 Haas began working at the Vienna National Library and by 1920 he became its director. His Habilitation as 'Privatdozent' was made in 1923, and in 1929 he became Extraordinary Professor of the Vienna University. Many publications, highly recommended for reading, bear his name.

Bruckner's complete estate was given to the Imperial & Royal Court Library in Vienna (K.K. Hofbibliothek), which became after the end of the monarchy, The Austrian State National Library. Therefore it was logical that Haas would become the editor of the Complete Edition. The uneasiness with the well-known first prints had increased and the musical community wanted to know the backgrounds of these contradictory and faulty scores. Haas was first

assisted in this difficult project by Alfred Orel and later by Leopold Nowak and Fritz Oeser. By 1929 the publication began, and one notable event was the memorable first performance of the original 9th Symphony under Siegmund von Hausegger's baton in 1932.

Originally Franz Schalk was to conduct this performance. In 1930, he had already conducted the 6th Symphony's original version in Munich. In his later years he had a completely different opinion than he had as the arranger of Bruckner's First Prints, but unfortunately Schalk died early in 1931 and couldn't realize his plans. It was only after this concert that many musicians finally recognized that Bruckner's music up until that time had been played in a seriously manipulated form.

With great drive and enthusiasm, other Bruckner scores were published as 'Original Editions', and Haas as a practitioner always strove for the correct orchestral material. Significantly, one of his most popular publications was a book entitled, 'Music and Practice of Performance'. The sequence of the publication depended in great part on how much of the so-called 'First Print' was doctored. The 1st Symphony followed the 9th, then the 5th, 4th, 6th, 2nd and the 2nd version of the 8th Symphony (1939). The D-minor Requiem, a lovely work, and the lesser known Missa Solemnis in B-flat minor were also edited carefully by Haas.

The 7th Symphony, as Haas wrote in his 1944 Preface, was printed during the heavily depressing times of war. Even here Haas could find a lot of tampering errors and got some clarity about the ominous 'cymbal crash'. During the war years Haas edited, together with Leopold Nowak, the E-minor Mass and in 1944 the F-minor Mass. Even the first version (Ur-Version) of the 3rd Symphony (1873) was engraved, but only a few proof prints survived the war. It was a great task considering that all prints were 'first prints' after the original manuscripts. For his own Œuvre as a composer, there was less time and he composed, as only a few know, lieder and chamber music.

The Musikwissenschaftliche Verlag / Vienna, which had become entrusted with the publication, worked undisturbed until 1938. In Germany however, politics was influencing the entire musical life of the country. After Austria's 'Anschluss' with the German Reich (March 1938) Haas found himself increasingly 'under the dogs' of great politics. The enthusiasm, around since the middle of the 19th Century that desired a 'connection' with Germany was a true one. The foreword to Bruckner's 8th Symphony (Haas' Edition) often criticised, simply reflects that public opinion. The German-Bohemians, and Haas was one of them, had suffered greatly at the end of the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy, and many expected 'new and better times' after 1938/39.

The price for supporting the official musical politics of the Third Reich was a high one. At first, the job for Haas became increasingly difficult. The waves of emigration – mostly Jewish musicians – the increasing problems with paper production and engraving and army duties for many musicians during the Second World War combined to hinder the editing of the scores.¹ The case of the 3rd Symphony was a very tragic one, for many manuscripts sources had become inaccessible. Bruckner had given a score as a present to his Jewish pupil Gustav Mahler whose widow had emigrated with the manuscript. Alma Mahler wanted to sell the score, for Hitler was a Bruckner maniac, but this never happened. (Ironically, the emigrants – the most important were William Steinberg, George Szell and Bruno Walter –

¹ Fritz Oeser had to sign in his publication 'Die Klangstruktur der Bruckner-Symphonie [MWV 1939] Jewish [non Arian] authors by an * (As there were for instance G. Adler, Fr. Eckstein, E. M. v. Hornbostel, E. Kurth, M. Graf, H. Leichtentritt and others). But Oeser was encouraged enough to quote them.

became ‘Bruckner’s ambassadors’ in America. They used more and more the ‘Originalfassungen’. They obviously had little problem separating Haas, the excellent editor from Haas, the Nazi-Party Member.)

Even the ‘Vorlagenberichte’ (Editor’s Notes), that Haas had added as a serious musicologist to all scores, could no longer be printed. The 2nd Symphony (ed. 1938) is the last edition with an Editors Note. The ‘Special Issued Scores’ (Partitur Sonderausgaben) were the only thing that Haas still could do.²

At the end of the war, the criticism that came from many once very enthusiastic followers hit Haas very hard. He lost the director’s job of the Austrian State Library (Musical Department), and became accused as a Nazi-collaborator. In 1946, he was forced into retirement and even Max Auer, the famous Bruckner biographer – to whom Haas begged for intervention – couldn’t help. In the highly charged atmosphere of Post War Austria, Haas had no fair chance for rehabilitation. Fortunately he still could publish some books and articles which he did until he died on October 4, 1960.

The loss of this leading scholar in Bruckner’s work shortly before the Complete Edition came to an end and the trouble that followed until today proved to be a burden for editing Bruckner’s works. The splitting up of Europe and Germany and the reinstallation of the Austrian State plus the problems about selling and publishing rights, all did their part to add to the confusion. The **Brucknerverlag Leipzig** (as the **Musikwissenschaftliche Verlag** had become named in 1939) became nationalized in 1947 in the Soviet Zone and moved to Wiesbaden. Here Fritz Oeser, Haas’ former assistant, energetically worked to save whatever was possible. In 1955 the **Brucknerverlag** became incorporated into the **Alkor Edition** (now a part of the Bärenreiter Verlag Group). **Breitkopf & Härtel (VEB) Leipzig**, nationalized during the time of Germany’s division, sold until 1990 the already published volumes of the ‘Old’ Complete Edition. In 1951 the **Musikwissenschaftliche Verlag** in Vienna finally got back its publishing rights. (To further the confusion, reprints in the U.S.A. were made without the approval of the original publishers. These reprints are mostly banned in Germany and Austria, but are of course available. It is a very ‘grey area’.) It was, and still is, a confusing situation. The earlier enthusiasm was gone and work on the Complete Edition now continued at a slower and slower pace.

Haas was very distressed about the fact that Nowak, his successor as Director of the Musical Library (Austrian National Library) misrepresented the work that Haas had done, by proposing completely different principles and ideas about editing. Haas, who had a hard battle in Vienna after 1945, could do nothing. (*But the truth need be told: Nowak valued Haas’ work very highly, a fact quite unknown to many. But the political circumstances were something that Nowak could not change. See below*) The musical world would have needed a long time to accept the slogan ‘Original Version’, now it was very confused and people asked which ‘Original’ score is ‘original’?

In critical cases, often found in Bruckner’s music, Haas followed his principles of editing; always opting for the musically most convincing version. Some scores, even written by the composer himself, have to be regarded as a ‘muddy source’. These decisions of an editor

² It is a quite unknown fact that Haas as a man of nearly 60 years age, had to do his duties for the Civil Defence Services [Luftschutz]. No prominent Nazi helped, only the famous conductor W. Furtwängler, tried to intervene. (Letter with date April 21st 1944, to Paul HEIGL (Director General Austrian National Library) ‘As member of the German Bruckner Society, I please you to dispense Robert Haas (Director of the Musical Library) from Civil Defence Night Services; the Bruckner Complete Edition has to go on.’

became regarded suddenly as ‘unscientific’, though the scores had become proofed by practice. Haas was a skilful and experienced musician who composed and conducted and felt, in some special cases, what should be done. Very prominent musicians called the editions ‘excellent’. Significant is Hans Hubert Schönzeler’s opinion: *“Haas tackled the question from an artistic point of view, attempting to present the works under discussion in the purest spirit of Bruckner, and musically speaking his solutions are perhaps the more satisfying.”* (When regarding the very situation of Haas reputation in Austria after 1945 this publication of the MWV Vienna (1974) – first written in English by Schönzeler – is a great exception)

Both editors may be criticized in some cases, but since both have since died and cannot defend themselves one needs to be tactful. Surely, Haas sometimes had his own will in mixing versions, but he also had a keen musical sense, only found in great personalities. He intuitively found, in that muddle left by Bruckner, the most convincing version. His Russian companion at that time, Pavel Lamm edited Mussorgsky’s music in a very similar manner; for musicologists in those days regarded themselves as the ‘connecting link’ between theory and practice, and tried to offer the great composer’s music in good editions, respecting the ‘Urtext’, without forgetting the necessities of musical life and performing.³ The 19th Century liked to offer spurious ‘adaptations for practical use.’ The years after 1945 had a very significant gap between musicology and musical practice, musicology became more and more sophisticated and theoretical. Followers of the pretended ‘pure science’ gradually lost contact to practical music making.⁴ This ugly mutual neglect between practitioners and theoreticians is becoming less noticeable in recent years as they come from similar backgrounds.

The issue of Haas vs. Nowak is a chapter all its own, touching a delicate theme of post war times and politics. Austria still has great problems accepting some of these issues today. The years between 1938 and 1945 are wanted to be ‘forgotten’ and **nobody** seemed to be ‘somebody in the party’. There was a very unlucky mix of many circumstances and until today we have no objective and correct solution to this problem. Many eye-witnesses are long dead and it has become increasingly difficult to get real clarity. The ‘great politics’ had too much influence and covered differences in scientific interpretation. Greater circles don’t know who decided to fire Haas: did ‘re-educated’ overly-involved Austrians offer Haas as a ‘pawn’ to make forgetting their own ‘Great German Past’? Or did the Allied Occupational Forces decide? Some very clever and resourceful opportunists of these hard times, involved in the worst crimes and massacres, still got the best administrative jobs within the bureaucracy after 1945; Haas got no pardon.

Nowak had to take on a difficult task in hard times and we cannot imagine that he forced himself into this eventual ungrateful job. First he had to rebuild the completely destroyed publishing house, together with the necessary organisation for distribution. Herbert Vogg reported to the author several times that **Nowak always respected and admired Haas**, in spite of his rivalry. This respect of Haas goes along with a strange criticism about Haas’ principles in editing. Nowak had been Haas’ assistant and it is hard to understand what happened. (Probably you might interpret the relationship of Haas and Nowak as some kind of a ‘father-son conflict’?)

³ Even the Soldan Editions, published by Edition Peters (f.i. Handel’s ‘Messiah’) are all made in that manner.

⁴ Postscript 2005: There has been a recent change in attitude. Haas’ work has increasingly become more respected. In the case of the F-minor mass his reading; his version is now regarded with high musical quality. The puzzled Bruckner sources seem to justify ‘posthumously’ his principles of editing

Nowak's own editions are of the highest quality and made in the finest manner. He kept most of Haas' principles of editing – as there are Bruckner's 'French use of accidentals' or the 'old up-bow'. The scores that made no further problems were revised by him and are now accepted by musical experts without any discussions. The single blame you can make is the fact that Nowak didn't realize the strong 'Normative Power of Facts' and therefore his own editions were not accepted everywhere. Also many could not believe that Haas' work should become worthless so suddenly. New orchestral parts, bought since 1932 by many orchestras are, of course, Haas' Bruckner-version. And many important conductors still use them, especially in the case of Bruckner's 8th symphony. (Ironically, the reprints, made in Leipzig (GDR) and the U.S.A., where a completely different Copyright allowed reprinting, are now regarded as 'public domain' [*Domaine publique*]).

The fact that Nowak believed to add changes in his edition of the F-minor Mass (1960), the 8th (1955) and 2nd Symphony (1965), many years after the Original Version already had been published, damaged Bruckner's works more than it helped. **But technically, a combined print would have been easily possible and might have taken some of the edge off of the discussion.** But Nowak was open-minded and later accepted that clear solutions sometimes are quite impossible and he offered an option in his edition of the 2nd symphony, the ending of the second movement also in the better-done 1st version. Perhaps strong criticism made compromise possible.

Unfortunately many documents still are unpublished or publications are long since completely out of print. No one really can prove if Haas went too far from sources half a century after his editions were printed and his notes are accessible only to a few. It's a great pity that the Editor's Notes, in spite of many announcements over the years, have not appeared – this is astonishing from a publisher calling itself 'musicological' – and having caused many ugly discussions. The old notes of the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 9th symphony only are to be found in good libraries with many old books or photocopied for private use. Finally, in 1985 and 1986 Haas' notes of the 5th and 6th symphony were revised and printed. (*The Notes of the 7th symphony were finally made by Rüdiger Bernhöft in 2003.*) Haas documented his work as long as possible with detailed notes. So we know by his edition of the 2nd symphony, the cancelled parts and the 'Ur-Version' can become reconstructed. Because of the war we have no notes of the 8th Symphony and from the Masses in E-minor and F-Minor. (*Fortunately, an excellent 'Vorlagenbericht' of the F Minor Mass was published in 2006 by Paul Hawkshaw.*) Complete facsimile editions of the manuscripts don't exist. It is a great loss; only the 9th symphony drafts were published.

The pioneers around Haas regarded Bruckner as a German composer and many 'Reichs-German' ['Reichsdeutsch'] musicians collaborated. Engraving and printing was made in Germany, at Leipzig. After 1945 one tried to forget the great common German-Austrian history and emphasized the Austrian elements in Bruckner's music.

Unfortunately, excellent Bruckner-experts, like Hans Ferdinand Redlich and Fritz Oeser, could not work together with the Complete Edition after WW II. Oeser, who already had been Haas' assistant, later edited great operas such as 'Carmen and The Tales of Hoffmann' and was no longer engaged with Bruckner's music, so his son Christian Oeser reported to the author. And Redlich, besides his occupation as a musical professor in England, newly edited some works (the F-Minor Mass and symphonies 3, 4, 7, and 9). But he had to be content with freely accessible sources, therefore some music couldn't be published. A new engraving would have been excessively expensive. Even Hans Hubert Schönzeler only edited the 5th symphony in a new revised original version.

For over one hundred years the works of Bruckner have been a purely Austrian / Viennese thing and it took many years before non-Austrian experts could collaborate. Those musicians, often coming from the Anglo-Saxon cultural circle, and even Germans – after many years of some kind of ‘Splendid Austrian Isolation’ – finally brought some life into the stagnating Complete Edition. But the new ‘fresh wind’ shows the very different opinions about Bruckner: some musicologists accept some of the First Prints (No. 3/4/8) as fully approved for printing by Bruckner; others cannot fully agree.

What should happen now, how should it go on?

We have to thank Professor Dr. Herbert V o g g that now some Editor’s Notes are ready, or (2008) soon to be printed. (7th symphony, F-Mass, 9th symphony (ed. Cohrs) with the unfinished finale (ed. Phillips), and the complete, excellent Notes of Thomas Röder; written for all versions of the 3rd symphony. Haas edited all the symphonies, except the 3rd symphony, whose editing proved impossible because of the war. Also the heavily altered choral works. Many works fortunately became edited in good editions. (For instance: Te Deum, 0th Symphony, D-Minor Mass and nearly all a-cappella choral works.) Works from Bruckner’s youth, early versions and alternative versions of some movements, for musical practice are less important than sometimes suggested. The Ur-Versions of the symphonies 3/4/8, and the newly reconstructed Ur-Versions from symphony 2nd and 1st, are hardly convincing.

When looking through publications from the Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, it’s a pity to say that the name Haas is rarely mentioned. One gets the impression that all the work has been done by Nowak.⁵ Without neglecting Nowak’s and his companions’ labour, the basic work for three quarters of the edition was done by Haas and Orel - before Nowak took over the Complete Edition. An Editor has to make decisions, that’s part of his job; no manuscript, no copy and no first print is without mistakes and inconsequence. If the editors of the 19th Century’s great complete editions (Bach, Beethoven, Mozart and others.) hadn’t made some clear decisions, there would be many problems. Even here we had problems with many copies and first prints. The ‘status quo’ of the **Breitkopf Editions** saved us from much trouble. The new complete editions still have to be compared with the old editions, and often aren’t the better ones.

Haas was criticised heavily during his lifetime and criticisms can still be heard. Unfortunately too often his less happy partisanship for the doubtful ideas of the ‘Great German Times’ became mixed with scientific critiques. His accomplishments still have to fight for acceptance by many musicologists. Something always becomes criticised. But on the other hand, even Nowak made some decisions, disagreeing with many. For instance: Is his Version III/3 of the Complete Edition authentic in all details? Why does he prefer the New York Copy of the 4th Symphony instead of the Vienna Manuscript? Or, why he didn’t he study the Muck Adaptation – authorised by Bruckner – of the 7th Symphony at all? (And this version contains some authentic alterations of the composer). But there is a significant reservedness against Nowak. Polemic articles found in some semi-professional newspapers do not always gain our respect, but basic criticisms do not come from German speaking authors.

But recently (2008) Dr. Christoph S c h l ü r e n wrote something about the difficulties with the three different ‘Complete Editions’. He wrote: “After WW II the great names of the authentic

⁵ Herbert Vogg reported to the author that he had no chance to mention the fundamental work of Haas; even during the 90’s, when Vogg followed as ‘kommissarischer Leiter’ of the Complete Edition – after Nowak had have become seriously ill).

Bruckner movement - Siegmund von Hausegger and Robert Haas - became swallowed by the defunct Third Reich, as if they fell into a Black Hole. Now, in Vienna they hired for the newly established Complete Edition a new editor, Leopold Nowak, who did everything more true and less true to prove his work with the pioneer Robert Haas. So we end up with editions largely preferring less typical and less good solutions – simply for the reason ‘to be somewhat different’. Thus – after Nowak’s retirement – they began unwillingly with a third Edition of the Complete Edition – half a hundred years after Haas’ epochal Editions, basing on newfound sources and many new results of research.”⁶

Nearly all manuscripts are to be found at the Austrian National Library in Vienna and without contacting the Austrian Institution or Viennese Professors; you cannot get into the precious riches of this collection. A National library has to give researching free access to manuscripts of great poets and composers. But the important musicologist Hans Ferdinand Redlich, who did much for Bruckner’s music in Anglo-Saxon countries, had the unfortunate experience in 1967 of having Nowak refuse his request to look at the manuscript, or at least a microfilm of the F-minor Mass. He argued that his own edition, made in 1960 (!) was not completely ready at that time. Redlich was very angry about Nowak’s behaviour and wrote about it in his editor’s notes.⁷ Nowak, as assistant editor of the Complete Edition under Haas, was in personal contact with the Director of the Musical Collection of the National Library. So we must question this unusual refusal.

Robert Haas’ political past hardly became regarded for instance in the U.S.A. His scientific work is accepted and there is no narrow judgement. Even in other foreign countries things became regarded with wisdom, Anna Amalie Abert wrote in ‘New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians’: “A prolific researcher and editor, he has won much praise for his versions of Bruckner’s original texts. His (book) *Aufführungspraxis der Musik* (1931) reflects both his scholarship and his sensitivity as a practising musician.” This may depend on the well-know articles of Deryck Cooke: ‘The Bruckner Problem Simplified’. These articles – in German speaking counties less, or even unknown – clearly show the high estimation of Haas’ work by Cooke. But in the very recent past, more and more criticism is heard about Haas, beginning with his membership in the Nazi-Party and ending with a description of his ‘mixed scores’ as unscientific.

The principles of editing, as shown by the New Bruckner Complete Edition, are gradually slipping. The fear of clear decisions, though a pretended philologically correct process is clearly recognised, is symptomatic for our time. The 2nd symphony easy shows: Besides the Haas Edition, we have two further ‘Original Versions’ and the First Print (1892) now seems to become accepted as authentic and was partially published by the complete edition (II/2.).⁸

⁶ The German original is found in Dr. Schlären’s notes to Ivor Bolton’s recording of Bruckner 9 [B. Cohrs’ revised Edition]. **Oehmsclassic OC 717 Mozarteum Orchester Salzburg / Ivor Bolton Anton Bruckner: Sinfonie Nr. 9 (CD) Translation by the author with kindly permission of Dr. Schlären.**

⁷ Redlich as musicologist had a very pragmatic, open mind and might have been closer to Haas than to Nowak. In contrast to Haas, he accepted the first prints of the 3rd and 4th Symphony as ‘by Bruckner tolerated, alternative Version’ and found many well-done details in these scores. The Haas editions he accepted always as authentically. Therefore he hinted the production of ‘practical, final scores’. His edition of Bruckner’s F-minor Mass is one of the best ones. Unfortunately he died rather early in 1968.

⁸ Haas Edition of the 2nd Symphony is much closer to the 1st version than Nowak’s. He opened most of the cuts, restored the dynamics, but he kept some parts of the Andante and the Finale in its later, mature, and better version. The 2nd Symphony seems to be an everlasting ‘Work in Progress’ like many opera scores – adapted from time to time to the circumstances of an actual performance. Therefore editors have so much trouble with this work.

Therefore one of the greatest problems we have is the case of the **4th Symphony**. Bruckner arranged the score – together with Löwe – for printing. He was an old man, sick, tired and at the end of his life. At that time (1888) only a few scores were already printed and he agreed even to a ‘doctored’ version; only for the reason to make his music more accessible.

The score of the **8th Symphony** is, for the most part, ‘quite good’; when we accept the cuts that Bruckner had made. The Lienau-Score (1891) sounds much like the Nowak-Score; the alterations are practical improvements by keen conductors. And the **3rd (III/3.)** printed Score (1890) is a well-done practical version, but the **Finale** remains problematic even when one accepts the cuts. The rescoring – here done by Franz Schalk – is absolutely non-Brucknerian.

Haas avoided these irritating things, by making decisions for conductors whenever possible and necessary. He was walking on a narrow path between science and practical music making. Therefore he can always be attacked, for seen formally, his decisions are a breach of the musical text. **But what is really authentically Brucknerian?** The more we go into the history of composing of the single works, the more **contradictory** the sources become.

For Haas was speaking through the high musical quality of his work, embraced by many, and often preferred in performance. While his editions have been debated, it is clear that many musicians accept them and continue to perform them. The testimony of many conductors, confessing to Haas, though becoming attacked, should be regarded.

It would be highly desirable if the Complete Edition could find a way, to ‘**finally make peace with Haas**’ and to accept his musically convincing editions as an alternative, **equally worthy** version. A ‘King’s way’ cannot be found, Haas’ way was abandoned by Nowak and his pupils. But it seems to be problematic.

The here offered ‘Performing Version’ of Bruckner’s 3rd Symfonie; is dedicated to the memory of this musicologist, worthy to be embraced; whose tragedy was, getting between the ‘millstone’ of contemporary politics. Therefore he couldn’t finish editing this symphony, one that is so important for Bruckner’s entire music.

Wiesbaden, Fall 2008.

Joseph K a n z .

Thanks to John F. Berky for proofreading and improving my English version. The photo of Haas is from John’s library.

Postscript 2008. The first version of this essay was written as a draft already in 1999. New information made it necessary to completely re-write some parts.

I prepare an essay: Robert Haas, misunderstandings about a great scientist. (German: Robert Haas, Missverständnisse um einen bedeutenden Wissenschaftler)

Here I try to show, why musicians prefer the Haas-Versions and I write about the very important political circumstances in Old Austria, the 1st Austrian Republic and Germany at Haas’ lifetime.