10 Bruckner editions: the revolution revisited

BENJAMIN M. KORSTVEDT

Textual matters loom large with Bruckner. Not only have they been considered and reconsidered by generations of Bruckner scholars, but anyone, professional, student, or amateur, approaching this repertory soon runs into the 'Bruckner problem'.[1] Put simply, many of Bruckner's works exist in multiple versions and editions, some of which are clearly authentic, some of which are now known to be not authentic, and some of which are of unclear or disputed authenticity. The existence of multiple versions of Bruckner's symphonies goes back to the composer's time; as is well known, he prepared more than one version of several of his works and the published texts of most of his works deviate in some way or another from his manuscript scores.

Currently the study and performance of Bruckner's works are ordinarily based on a fairly well-defined canon of versions drawn from the Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe*, the now nearly complete critical edition of Bruckner's works primarily edited by Leopold Nowak. For several symphonies, notably the Second, Fourth, Seventh, and Eighth, some conductors and critics prefer the somewhat different scores edited by Robert Haas, who directed the first collected edition in the 1930s and 1940s. Nowak's and Haas' scores alike are based principally on Bruckner's autograph manuscript scores and, with a few exceptions – most importantly, Haas' editions of the Second and Eighth Symphonies – are examples of sound editorial methodology.[2]

Alongside this group of regularly used versions stand a number of other versions, which we tend to see as variants of the now usual versions. These are encountered among the volumes of the *Gesamtausgabe* itself, in old scores found in libraries and antiquarians, on pioneering recordings of recently published scores of early versions (by Eliahu Inbal and Georg Tintner, among others), on some historical recordings that preserve older practices (most famously those by Hans Knappertsbusch), and occasionally in the concert hall. These variant texts fall into two distinct categories: early versions that were precursors of the familiar later versions and revised versions published during the composer's lifetime or shortly thereafter. The First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Eighth Symphonies were revised by Bruckner before publication and often even before performance, and the early versions of these works have been published in modern editions. Bruckner's

revisions were concentrated in two periods of time: the late 1870s when the First through Fourth Symphonies were revised, and the years between 1887 through 1891 when the First, Third, and Fourth were all revised again and the newly composed Eighth Symphony was reworked. The motivations for these revisions were several. The Third, Fourth, and Eighth Symphonies were all first revised before they were performed, partly because of changing compositional conceptions and partly to ameliorate anticipated problems in performance; in withdrawing the first version of the Fourth Symphony Bruckner referred to 'difficult, unplayable violin figures in the Adagio' and instrumentation 'that was too unsettled and overladen' in some places.[3] Many revisions made in the 1870s also reflect Bruckner's desire to 'regulate' rhythmically the periodic structures of his music, and those of the late 1880s contain alterations of voice-leading to expunge hidden parallel octaves and fifths.[4]

The editing, publication, and elucidation of these early versions are among the most salient accomplishments of modern Bruckner scholarship. In the 1930s Haas prepared versions of previously unpublished, and effectively unknown, versions of the First, Fourth, and Fifth Symphonies, as did Alfred Orel with the Ninth Symphony. In the 1970s Leopold Nowak produced editions of early versions of the Third, Fourth, and Eighth Symphonies; more recently John Phillips published a critical edition of the extant sources of the incomplete score of the Finale of the Ninth Symphony and soon William Carragan will publish an edition of the earliest version of the Second Symphony.[5] Furthermore, the early versions have generated a substantial body of criticism that addresses their import in relation to Bruckner's compositional methods and his evolving approach to symphonic form.[6]

The second major category of variant versions consists of the texts of the symphonies that were published during the composer's lifetime or shortly after. Seven of the symphonies were published before Bruckner's death in 1896; the Sixth was not published until 1899 and the unfinished Ninth appeared in 1903 in an edition prepared by Ferdinand Löwe (see Table 10.1). The texts of these so-called 'Erstdruckfassungen' or 'first published versions' (literally 'first printed versions') in varying degree incorporate orchestral retouching, alterations in phrasing, articulation, and dynamics, and added tempo and expression markings.[7] The score of the Eighth has a cut of six bars and a two-bar insertion in the Finale and, like several other symphonies, it contains suggestions for optional cuts (marked 'Vi-de'). In the first published versions of the Fourth and Fifth Symphonies the da capo restatement of the Scherzo movement is shortened. The first published scores of the First, Second, Third (both the 1879 publication and the 1890), Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Symphonies do not comprise full-fledged versions in their own right, but are variants of versions transmitted by manuscript scores and now published in the *Gesamtausgabe*. The first published version of the

Table 10.1 *Early publications of Bruckner's major works*

Date	Work[a]	Publisher	Location
1864	*Germanenzug*	Josef Kränzl	Ried
1879	Third Symphony (1877 version)	Theodor Rättig	Vienna
1884	String Quintet	Albert J. Gutmann	Vienna
1885	Seventh Symphony	Albert J. Gutmann	Vienna
1885	Te Deum	Theodor Rättig	Vienna
1889/90	Fourth Symphony (1888 version)	Albert J. Gutmann	Vienna
1890	Third Symphony (1889 version)	Theodor Rättig	Vienna
1892	Second Symphony	Ludwig Doblinger	Vienna
1892	Psalm 150	Ludwig Doblinger	Vienna
1892	D minor Mass	Johann Gross	Innsbruck
1892	Eighth Symphony	Schlesinger/Haslinger	Berlin and Vienna
1893	First Symphony (Vienna version)	Ludwig Doblinger	Vienna
1893	*Helgoland*[b]	Ludwig Doblinger	Vienna
1894	F minor Mass (ed. Schalk)	Ludwig Doblinger	Vienna
1896	Fifth Symphony (ed. Schalk)	Ludwig Doblinger	Vienna
1896	E minor Mass	Ludwig Doblinger	Vienna
1899	Sixth Symphony	Ludwig Doblinger	Vienna
1903	Ninth Symphony (ed. Löwe)	Ludwig Doblinger	Vienna

[a] Smaller choral works are not included.
[b] Vocal score published in 1893. The full score first published in 1899.

Sources
Uwe Harten (ed.), *Anton Bruckner: ein Handbuch* (Salzburg, 1996).
Paul Hawkshaw, 'Bruckner, (Joseph) Anton', Works List in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd edn, ed. Stanley Sadie and John Tyrrell, 29 vols. (London and New York, 2001), vol. IV, pp. 476–84.
Nigel Simeone, 'Bruckner's Publishers, 1865–1938', *Brio* 36 (1999), 19–38.
Alexander Weinman, 'Anton Bruckner und seine Verleger', in *Bruckner-Studien: Leopold Nowak zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz Grasberger (Vienna, 1965), 121–38.

Fourth Symphony, with its modest but significant formal modifications in the last two movements, constitutes a distinct version, which is now generally accepted as authentic (an edition of which will soon be published in the *Gesamtausgabe*).[8] The most extreme changes are found in the posthumous edition of the Ninth Symphony, in which the orchestral textures were thoroughly revamped by Löwe (the score was not cut), and in the Fifth Symphony, which in addition to reworked orchestration includes two large cuts in the Finale and a recasting of the final coda. Although the Fifth was performed and published in 1894–5, it is now clear that that publication was revised by Franz and Joseph Schalk largely without Bruckner's participation or awareness of what was being done. (Bruckner did make some revisions between the finalization of the first version in 1878 and Schalk's reworking, but their extent and significance have not been fully clarified.)

In contrast to the straightforward ways in which scholars have handled the early versions, the reception of the first published versions has been complex, contentious, and difficult. It has become traditional to regard these scores as essentially inauthentic, if not outright corruptions of Bruckner's intended texts. By the middle of the twentieth century this judgement had become a basic premise shared by scholars, performers, and enthusiasts alike.

and the first published versions fell into disrepute and out of use, replaced by modern scores transmitting what are commonly, if imprecisely, described as Bruckner's 'original versions', a term used to identify texts derived from Bruckner's manuscript scores, which are claimed as the only authentic expressions of his artistic vision.[9] These matters are ordinarily explained quite simply in terms of authenticity and inauthenticity. For example, Deryck Cooke, whose writings on the 'Bruckner problem' were tremendously influential for English-speaking Brucknerians, wrote that with the Second Symphony, we are faced with a simple 'choice between the original version and the revised version; and only one decision seems possible'.[10] Despite their long familiarity, such formulations are misjudged if not actually mistaken, and their prevalence has constrained the emergence of a more critical and historically complete view of the texts of Bruckner's symphonies. Above all, the idea that the main issue is one of simple authenticity is too limiting to encompass the real textual complexities of Bruckner's music.

The seeds of the Bruckner problem lie in Bruckner's own processes of composition and revision, the ways in which his scores were brought to publication, and the nature of the extant sources of his works. Bruckner revised many of his works extensively and often over relatively long periods of time. On various occasions he sought advice about revisions, which he heeded or not as he saw fit. Many manuscript scores of his works are preserved, and these often present a complicated picture to modern-day scholars. The processes by which his works were published in his lifetime were often rather involved and not always straightforward. In addition, the particular directions in which Bruckner scholarship developed in the twentieth century decisively shaped modern perceptions of the issues at stake and the ways in which the discourse about them is framed. The most influential, and in many ways the most radical, work in this area was done in the 1930s and 1940s by Robert Haas in conjunction with the preparation of the first collected edition of Bruckner's works. Haas and his colleagues, including Max Auer, Alfred Orel, and Fritz Oeser, set out to publish '*for the first time the texts determined by Bruckner*'.[11] How successfully and appropriately they accomplished this task may be questioned, but it cannot be doubted that their work effectively reshaped the canon of Bruckner's symphonies and revolutionized understanding of the textual issues attending them.

The revolution in Bruckner editing

Serious concern with editorial problems in Bruckner's symphonies arose in the decade following the First World War. In 1919 the German conductor Georg Göhler decried the poor quality of the then-available editions of

Table 10.2 *Publication of the Bruckner* Gesamtausgabe, *1930–44*

Volume	Title	Editor	Date of publication
15	Requiem d-Moll, Missa Solemnis b-Moll	Haas	1934[a]
9	IX. Symphonie d-Moll	Orel	1934
11	Vier Orchesterstücke	Orel	1934[b]
1	I. Symphonie c-Moll, Wiener (1890/91) Fassung und Linzer (1865/66) Fassung	Haas	1935[c]
6	VI. Symphonie A-Dur	Haas	1935
5	V. Symphonie B-Dur	Haas	1935
4	IV. Symphonie Es-Dur, Fassung von 1878 mit dem Finale von 1880. Finale von 1878	Haas	1936[d]
2	II. Symphonie c-Moll	Haas	1938
8	VIII. Symphonie c-Moll	Haas	1939[e]
12	Messe in e-Moll	Haas/Nowak	1940[e]
12	Messe in f-Moll	Haas	1944[e]
6	VII. Symphonie E-Dur	Haas	1944[e]

[a] Unless otherwise noted, all scores were published in large-format conductor's score, study score, and orchestral parts. All of the volumes that appeared before 1939 were also published in a 'scholarly edition', a folio including the full score and critical apparatus. Source reports for the later volumes were never completed.
[b] This volume was labelled 'Band 11, Sonderdruck daraus' because it contained the partial contents of a larger volume planned to contain Bruckner's early orchestral works, String Quintet, and small instrumental pieces.
[c] The Vienna version was not made available in study score, conductor's score or orchestral parts.
[d] This volume was labelled '4. Band, 1. Teil'. A second part containing the score of the first version of the Fourth Symphony (1874) was planned but not completed.
[e] No 'scholarly edition' of this score was produced. It was published only as a study score and as a conductor's score without critical apparatus.

Bruckner's music in a polemical article.[12] Göhler did not work from a direct knowledge of Bruckner's manuscripts, but was alarmed by prevalent errors and discrepancies in the published orchestral score, piano score, and orchestral parts of the Sixth Symphony. What was needed, Göhler argued, was a 'definitive, rigorous scholarly edition of Bruckner's scores' that reflected 'what Bruckner himself had originally written'. The Austrian musicologist Alfred Orel promptly confirmed that it was well-known in 'musicological circles' that significant differences existed between printed versions and autograph manuscripts of Bruckner's symphonies, and agreed that a 'stringent critical edition of the works of Anton Bruckner that contains authentic texts based on the master's manuscripts is urgently needed'.[13] Despite these calls by Orel and Göhler, it was not until 1927, with the founding of the Internationale Bruckner Gesellschaft, that concrete steps were taken towards a new Bruckner edition. The Bruckner Gesellschaft included among its main goals the publication of a critical edition of Bruckner's complete works, and over the course of the next decade and a half twelve volumes were published, most of them edited by Robert Haas (see Table 10.2).

The initial impetus behind the *Gesamtausgabe* may have been the desire to replace the error-ridden editions of Bruckner's symphonies then in circulation with 'error-free practical editions', yet in the end it came to have a scope undoubtedly greater than could have been foreseen in 1927,

let alone 1919. Ultimately it led to the determination that only Bruckner's unpublished manuscript scores, not the first published versions, could be accepted as authentic. This conclusion emerged incrementally. The series began with works that presented relatively straightforward editorial choices before moving on to knottier cases, and as the text-critical problems faced by the editors of the *Gesamtausgabe* grew increasingly difficult, their solutions grew increasingly radical.

The first five volumes of the *Gesamtausgabe* contain works that had not been published in Bruckner's lifetime, with the sole exception of the Vienna version of the First Symphony. With these works, including the posthumously published Sixth and Ninth Symphonies, there was no question about the primacy of autograph manuscript sources. Orel's edition of the Ninth Symphony was of pivotal significance. In this case, a previously unknown original version, which differed markedly from the then-familiar score edited after Bruckner's death by Löwe, did exist, and its publication must have been a revelation. The rather sensational way in which this score was introduced – at a special concert that juxtaposed Löwe's edition and the original version before an invited audience – and the often overeager promotion, which occasionally verged on sloganeering, of the original version as the unveiling of the 'true Bruckner' after long obscurity, proved to be symptomatic of future developments.

The next two volumes of the *Gesamtausgabe*, those containing the Fifth and the Fourth Symphonies, raised different and more difficult questions, and the ways in which these problems were handled were to prove lastingly significant. Both symphonies had been published during Bruckner's lifetime and were important repertory pieces; Haas' new editions, particularly that of the Fifth, presented these works in a form that differed dramatically from the guise in which they had been known and admired for some four decades. The publication of the Fifth Symphony in 1935 was supported by a vigorous and occasionally extravagant critical campaign, waged largely by Haas and Auer, president of the Internationale Bruckner Gesellschaft. This campaign sought to discredit the published version of the symphony as an 'inauthentic' version prepared behind Bruckner's back, and urged its replacement by Haas' new 'authentic' score. Similar critical support had been offered for the new editions of the Sixth and Ninth Symphonies, but these cases had been much less contentious because the questions of authenticity they posed were much clearer. The new edition of the Fifth Symphony, however, sparked a heated dispute in the musical community about the relative merits of the two competing versions of the symphony. Ultimately, Haas' claim that the first published version was not authentic carried the day. Postwar scholarship supports this view, but in the 1930s its acceptance was due at least as much to support by the National Socialist cultural establishment and the emotional

appeal of the resurrection of a suppressed text of a great German master as to its scholarly or musical merits. The legitimization of the new edition of the Fifth Symphony as the only indisputably authentic text seems to have strengthened Haas' resolve to replace all of the first published versions, most of which were far less clearly 'inauthentic' than was that of the Fifth Symphony, with editions of the 'original versions'. Haas' consolidation of power and the increasing rigidity of his editorial position led Orel to break with him. Orel objected to Haas' methodology and his approach to the first published versions; he specifically contested Haas' rejection of the 1888 version of the Fourth Symphony. In 1936 Orel published a lengthy article arguing for a less categorical approach and shortly thereafter was removed from the editorial board of the *Gesamtausgabe*.[14]

The third and, as it transpired, final phase of the *Gesamtausgabe* consisted of five volumes: the Second, Eighth, and Seventh Symphonies and the Masses in E minor and F minor. All of these volumes, like the two preceding volumes, contained works that had been published in Bruckner's lifetime. Again, Haas rejected the versions published in the 1880s and 1890s in favour of texts derived from earlier manuscript sources. Now the *Gesamtausgabe* went forward virtually without opposition; the climate in the Third Reich was hardly favourable for open, critical discussion of the Bruckner problem, particularly after Goebbels' infamous pronouncement at the ceremony installing a bust of Bruckner in Walhalla (a shrine to German culture built by Ludwig I in the 1840s later appropriated by the Nazis) in June 1937 that 'the Führer and his government consider it their honourable duty' to promote and disseminate Bruckner's 'precious legacy' and therefore they 'have decided to make a substantial annual contribution to the Internationale Bruckner Gesellschaft for the editing of the original versions of his symphonies'.[15]

The final volumes of Haas' *Gesamtausgabe* witnessed a decline in the quality and integrity of his editing; as Leopold Nowak wrote, 'with the Second Symphony... Haas set out on a path that proved to be disastrous for the subsequent works he edited'.[16] In his editions of the Seventh and, especially, the Second and Eighth Symphonies Haas went beyond the limits of scholarly responsibility in his pursuit of new texts that differed from the first published versions. He attempted to recover an early version of the Seventh Symphony, largely by deciphering earlier readings of passages that Bruckner had revised in the manuscript and by omitting the famous entrance of cymbal, triangle, and timpani in the Adagio that he implausibly deemed to have been later cancelled by Bruckner.[17] In his editions of the Second and Eighth Symphonies, Haas conflated discrete texts and actually reworked details of some brief passages himself without signalling this fact to users of the edition.[18] The Second Symphony was the last for which

Haas prepared a critical report, and the lack of documentation for the four volumes published in 1939–44 long obscured the sometimes extreme nature of Haas' editorial choices. Following the German defeat, Haas, who had been a member of the Nazi party, was removed as editor of the *Gesamtausgabe* and replaced by Leopold Nowak, who then held the position until his death in 1991.

Haas' editorial work has been subject to some revision, most importantly by Nowak, who rectified Haas' dubious editorial decisions in the Second, Seventh, and Eighth Symphonies in producing new editions that more accurately represented the texts of Bruckner's manuscript scores. He also supplemented Haas' work by preparing editions of early versions of the Third, Fourth, and Eighth Symphonies. Although Haas' editions are no longer universally accepted, his basic premise that Bruckner's autograph manuscripts alone represent the 'real Bruckner' is still an article of faith for many Brucknerians, as is the belief that the composer's works were generally subjected to unwanted, ill-advised, clandestine, and even coercive editing before publication and that therefore the first published versions cannot be accepted as authentic.[19]

Reassessing Haas' project and its ramifications

Although substantial objections to central aspects of Haas' position have been raised periodically since the 1930s, beginning with Orel, they have remained largely on the margins until quite recently.[20] Only in the last decade or so has new scholarship modifying and even contesting the traditional wisdom begun to emerge and gain credence.[21] In particular, several scholars have seriously re-evaluated the broad dismissive judgement of the first published versions, including its genealogy, its historical justification, and its continued validity in an era in which the theory and practice of textual criticism have evolved substantially.[22] This reassessment has several aspects.

First, our knowledge of the manuscript and printed sources of Bruckner's works has advanced greatly in the past half century. Numerous manuscript sources, primarily copy scores with or without emendations in Bruckner's hand, have emerged since the 1930s, and some of these are crucial in understanding some of the first published versions. To take one prominent case, the score used to prepare the first edition of the Fourth Symphony emerged after Haas' edition of this symphony was finished.[23] This score, which was copied by Löwe and the Schalk brothers and contains extensive revision in Bruckner's hand, makes it clear that Bruckner was fully involved in the composition of the printed text. In addition, general understanding of the

sources of Bruckner's works has been greatly aided by the appearance of new and revised critical reports detailing autograph manuscripts, copy scores, printed scores, variant readings, and other pertinent information about several of the *Gesamtausgabe* editions. These include updated reports prepared in the 1980s by Nowak for the Fifth and Sixth Symphonies, and new reports on the Third and Ninth Symphonies. Those on the First, Second, Fourth, and Seventh Symphonies as well as the F minor Mass are underway, but the Eighth Symphony, in many ways the most complicated case of all, is still awaited.[24]

The biographical explanations that have been offered in defence of the rejection of the published versions seem less persuasive today than they did a generation or two ago. Not only is there far less acceptance of legendary characterizations of Bruckner as an insecure, easily manipulated figure, but some of the specific claims made in support of Haas' contentions are now known to be false. It is not true, as Haas claimed, that at the time the Fifth Symphony was published Bruckner was under the sway of 'sanctions' threatened by the Schalks and Löwe.[25] We know now that Hermann Levi's rejection of the first version of the Eighth Symphony in 1887 came too late to motivate Bruckner's decision to revise the Fourth Symphony. Nor is it true, as Hans Redlich and Cooke asserted, that Bruckner made a fresh copy of the 1880 version of the Fourth Symphony in 1890 as a 'silent protest' against the first published version.[26] Systematic study of the correspondence of Bruckner, the Schalk brothers, and others has, however, lent clear support to the idea that several works published in 1893 and after were subject to covert, unauthorized revision. Paul Hawkshaw wrote of 'Bruckner's loss of control over the publication process' of the Fifth Symphony and the F minor Mass.[27] The circumstances surrounding the publication of several other works – notably the First, Second, and Eighth Symphonies – are widely considered suspicious, but much remains unclear about the circumstances of these editions.

Bruckner's famous bequest, stipulated in his will and testament dated 10 November 1893, of the 'original manuscripts' of his major works to the Hofbibliothek in Vienna (now the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek) may well have been prompted by the unauthorized revision of the F minor Mass. The will states that the firm of Joseph Eberle 'shall be authorized to borrow from the Imperial and Royal Hofbibliothek for a reasonable period of time the manuscripts of the compositions it publishes', notably the First, Second, Fifth, and Sixth Symphonies, Psalm 150, and the Masses in E minor and F minor. This stipulation often has been claimed as an indication that Bruckner did not accept the first published versions of these works, thereby giving future editors licence, or even the imperative, to replace these texts with editions derived from the bequeathed scores.[28] The will clearly does

instruct that the Fifth and Sixth Symphonies and the E minor Mass, which were the works in question still unpublished in November 1893, should be published from the bequeathed manuscripts (which did not happen); broader readings of the will that extend similar coverage to other works, even to those published by other firms, are open to question.

It has long been recognized that Haas' work and its reception in the Third Reich were deeply politicized; however, many Bruckner scholars and critics, especially English-speaking ones, long remained rather oblivious to the ideological aspects of Haas' project. Mid-century Anglo-American ideals of scholarly objectivity, which tended to see textual criticism as an essentially 'positivistic' pursuit not much implicated in ideology, may paradoxically have made it hard to see how ideological Haas' work actually was. It was not until the 1990s, after poststructuralism and critical theory had focused attention on the ideological dimensions of all sorts of scholarship and cultural work, that several scholars returned to question how ideology and politics affected the substance of Haas' text-critical work.

Deciphering the ways in which the relatively abstract and largely apolitical work of a musical editor ramifies the influence of ideology is a complex task and certainly not one amenable to easy answers, yet it is clear that ideological and political forces impinged in several ways on the development and reception of the first Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe*. Over time external forces seem to have conspired to overdetermine the rejection of the first published versions and fuel the pursuit of new 'original versions'. For example, Christa Brüstle has documented previously unrecognized ways in which concerns about copyright impinged on Haas' editorial determinations. From quite early in the publication of the *Gesamtausgabe*, Universal-Edition, which held copyrights on all previously published scores of Bruckner's symphonies, contested the legitimacy of copyrighting Haas' 'original versions' as new, independent texts. Following a series of legal actions in 1936–8, Haas was left having to 'manoeuvre his editions through various legal opinions'. In the end, he was not permitted to claim copyright on versions that Bruckner had published or performed or those that had been published posthumously and was 'compelled therefore', as Brüstle explained, 'to edit "versions" that concurred with neither the Universal-Edition scores nor Bruckner's own'.[29] This stricture must have greatly inhibited Haas. His editions of the Second, Seventh, and Eighth Symphonies – in which he pursued questionable editorial decisions to produce new textual readings – may in part be products of these constraints.

Ideology worked in more abstract ways to influence the course of the edition as well. The belief that the *Gesamtausgabe* represented 'a liberation of the true symphonic will of the master' and thus helped the regeneration of the works of an unfairly beset German master must have resonated with

the Nazi ethos.[30] Likewise, the express interest in recovering and restoring the pure, 'original versions' of Bruckner symphonies, freed from the foreign elements and textual contaminants, echoes other, far more sinister, Nazi practices. Anti-Semitism emerged palpably in the eagerness of Haas and other commentators to implicate Jews and Jewish firms (Levi, Löwe, Dessoff, Universal-Edition, the 'Jewish press') as culprits. Haas himself described his work in terms of cultural politics; he reported that he had personally told Goebbels immediately after the *Anschluss* that 'the spirit of this *Gesamtausgabe* with its plan, determined by me from the beginning, has differentiated itself so profoundly from the usual liberalistic habits of musical philology that it inevitably aroused the strongest Jewish objections and opposition'.[31] Politics also played an important role in the legitimization of Haas' work as well; not only was open debate of the Bruckner problem largely stifled in the Third Reich from the late 1930s, but Haas was very willing to employ political advantage in this and other matters, ranging from obtaining manuscripts to disenfranchising opponents.[32] In the end, careful and thorough study of these aspects of Haas' project can only undermine confidence in its commitment to reasonable standards of scholarly rigour.[33]

The purposes of critiquing Haas' project in these ways should not be misunderstood. Surely the point is not, as has been suggested, to oppose the *Gesamtausgabe*, or to suggest that Haas' work must be jettisoned wholesale.[34] Nor is it a matter of exposing, let alone sensationalizing, the political past of Haas or other Bruckner scholars; the Nazi affiliations of Haas, Orel, and several others are well known and the political slant of much writing about the *Gesamtausgabe*, and much else about Bruckner, during that era is painfully evident. Nor is it a matter, as Günter Brosche explained, of 'de-Nazifying' Bruckner, who was dead long before the Nazi movement began its rise to power and who, moreover, was a man who had nothing to do with any 'murderous ideology'.[35] The productive purposes of the critical analysis of the ideology of the first Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe* are twofold. First, it documents an important chapter in the history of musical scholarship in Nazi Germany, a topic of considerable import in its own right. Secondly, since the standard accounts of the text-critical problems of Bruckner's works remain deeply indebted to Haas, the realization of how his work and the acceptance of it were affected by the ideological and political circumstances of his times has direct relevance for current and future developments in this field. It should encourage an acute analysis of his text-critical judgements, especially in areas where the external impingements were most intense and compromising, notably those relating to the judgement of the first published versions. The ramifications of this are important. The belief in the inauthenticity of the first published versions of Bruckner's works, and the imperative instead to use, value, and believe in authentic, 'original versions',

has come to function as a mythology. The term mythology here does not necessarily imply untruth; quite the opposite, for, as Garry Wills wrote, 'a myth does not take hold without expressing many truths – misleading truths, usually, but important ones', including 'truth to the demand for some control over complex realities'.[36] Functional myths tend to elude our awareness; as Stephen H. Daniel suggested, 'myths become effective, then, for the same reason that they fail to remain myths: Insofar as they provide the basis for organizing experience, they become incorporated into the discursive practices of a community and thus are no longer viewed as source expressions of meaning...'[37] As the contingencies that shaped the origins of the received view of the 'Bruckner problem' come clearly into view, it begins to lose its transparency and the ability of interpretative paradigms derived from it begin to lose their ability to provide effective 'control over complex realities'.

The first published versions: towards a new paradigm

The possibility of readmitting the first published versions of the Bruckner symphonies to serious consideration poses some difficult and perhaps not finally soluble problems. The most basic problem is this: it seems quite clear that most if not all of the first published versions contain some emendations, revisions, and additions that were made by others, with or without Bruckner's approval and authorization; yet a historically and critically grounded comprehension of Bruckner's music and its significance can hardly afford to dismiss these editions out of hand, even if they contain some elements that did not originate directly from the composer. Most of them were performed and published with the composer's evident approval, and some are based on revised texts that the composer intended to supersede earlier versions.

First, some important distinctions need to be drawn. The first published versions of the Fifth and Ninth symphonies as well as the F minor Mass certainly contain extensive modifications and additions made without Bruckner's approval, participation, or knowledge. The text of the Sixth Symphony as published in 1899 does too, but here the changes are less profound. These texts are not then 'authentic' *per se*, but may hold interest as reflections of turn-of-the-twentieth-century conceptions of Bruckner's music and its performance. The published versions of the Third (both the 1879 and 1890 versions), Fourth, and Seventh Symphonies (and possibly the Quintet) are at the other end of the spectrum; these are authentic versions prepared, supervised, and authorized by Bruckner. They do contain some elements that did not originate from the composer, but especially

in the light of his publication of them, this is not enough reason to reject them. The remaining symphonies, the First, Second, and Eighth, fall into something of a grey area: they differ in certain ways from the readings of Bruckner's last manuscript scores and certainly contain some external editorial emendations (in the tempo and performance markings and occasional instrumental retouching) yet they were published with Bruckner's apparent approval. (More study is needed here; one of the negative effects of the vigorous rejection of the first published versions has been to discourage serious research into these texts.) In the absence of any extraordinary mitigating circumstances, such as those of the Fifth Symphony, it is hard to justify simple rejection of texts published during Bruckner's lifetime. To do so in the name of honouring the composer's 'real intentions' runs the risk of contradicting his own actions and defeating his own meticulous pre-publication decisions.

A crucial issue in developing a coherent critical interpretation of these texts is making sense of their authorship, especially its collaborative dimensions. It is helpful to gauge how unusual they are in this regard. Seen against the ways in which contemporary composers handled the final revisions and editing of published musical texts, the editorial alterations found in the first published versions of Bruckner's works appear unusually pronounced; yet they do not stand out as essentially aberrant. Published musical texts ordinarily contain changes not found in a composer's raw manuscript score, whether these derive from the proving and refining of the musical text in performance or from the processes of editing, copying, and engraving. For example, as Robert Pascall has shown, Brahms often made revisions and emendation to his works in the engraver's score, in proof, or even in his personal copies of published scores; Brahms himself stated that with the Haydn Variations (Op. 56a), 'it is not the manuscript that is definitive but rather the engraved score, which I myself have corrected'.[38] Not all of such changes, even those that are ordinarily considered authentic, necessarily originate directly from the author's written script or even were made at his express direction. A remarkable case is the score of Verdi's *Falstaff* (1893). James Hepokoski argued that 'we grossly misunderstand the multi-layered reality' of this text if we approach it with a narrow 'concern for Verdi's intentions alone'.[39] The published text, for example, contains bowing markings and, very possibly, substantial revision of the string writing that was the work of the leader of La Scala's orchestra; although these changes are not found in Verdi's autograph scores, he knew about this work and 'all the available evidence suggests that he welcomed it'.[40] For these and related reasons, Hepokoski concluded that 'the autograph score was not produced to serve as the final court of appeal in editorial questions'; rather it was a step – the single most important one, to be sure – in a process that

aimed ultimately to produce a final, edited, published text, and therefore the autograph manuscript could not properly be the 'preferred principal source' for a modern critical edition of the opera.[41] It is not appropriate to draw easy parallels between the published texts of Bruckner's symphonies and the text-critical problems stemming from their production and those of Brahms, let alone with a work as heterogeneous as a Verdi opera; yet these examples offer pause for thought about the propriety of a notion of textual authenticity that regards the composer's autograph, especially one superseded by a published edition, as the pre-eminent or even exclusive source.

Reconceptualizing authorship and authenticity – matters at the heart of the Bruckner problem – have been vibrant issues in the fields of literary scholarship and textual criticism for some two decades. The notion of authorship as an ideally isolated, essentially inner process, which has been called the 'Romantic ideology of authorship', has been subject to important critique.[42] In particular, textual critics have argued that authorship inevitably includes collaborative elements; this is doubly true of works written and produced in modern print-based cultures. In the age of print, it is argued, authorial intention ordinarily includes the intention to publish, and this entails an expectation that certain types of textual changes – notably typographic standardization and notational completion – would take place in the publishing process.[43] Indeed published texts often stand as the first fully completed notation of a work; as Donald Reimann wrote, 'unlike earlier scribal manuscripts (which were themselves the published works), modern holographs or transcriptions by amanuenses ... were intended merely as way-stations to the printed texts'.[44] This applies to musical works as well. Writing about Brahms' works, Pascall made the point that it is in the nature of an engraved score to differ from a composer's manuscript notation in certain ways, since it was part of an engraver's task not simply to reproduce the manuscript text but also to 'regulate and amplify signs according to the then current compositional practice'.[45]

Many critics see the social dimensions of publication as important sources of meaning. Jerome McGann argued famously that textual authority does not derive from 'authorial intention' narrowly defined; but rather 'the concept of authorial intention only comes into force for criticism when (paradoxically) the artist's work begins to engage with social structures and functions'.[46] Thus, although published texts may commonly be considered less authoritative than manuscript sources, published texts carry levels of meaning absent from unpublished manuscripts; the decision by Bruckner, or any author, to publish a particular version of one of his works endows that text with a certain authority, as do the ways in which a published text

enters into the meaningful discourses of audiences, critics, and performers. A text-critical approach responsive to social, collaborative models of authorship and textual meaning, as James Grier wrote, 'transforms the process of editing from a psychological endeavor (in which the editor attempts to determine the author's intention) into a historical undertaking' in which 'the editor assesses the value of [the] evidence against the background of the larger historical context in which the piece was created'.[47] This can be particularly helpful with Bruckner because claims about his true, inner wishes have often been used to deny the authority of the first published versions and to trump, legitimately or not, the development of more complex answers that are more strongly historical and contextual.

One of the most important contexts for music is of course performance, and it is in conjunction with issues of performance that the first published versions have clear pertinence. As a rule, these scores, which formed the sole basis for Bruckner performance traditions for several decades, contain more extensive and more detailed marking of tempo, dynamics, and expression than do Bruckner's manuscript scores (and the modern editions based on them). Connections between these new markings and the experience of performance are manifest. With only a few exceptions (the Ninth Symphony and the outer movements of the Sixth were not performed during Bruckner's lifetime, and the Eighth was published before its first performance), Bruckner's symphonies were performed before publication and these performances, not surprisingly, provided the opportunity to emend, correct, and even complete the notation of performance markings. In 1884 in anticipation of the premiere of the Seventh Symphony in Leipzig, Bruckner twice wrote to the conductor Arthur Nikisch regarding the notation of tempi. On 5 July he wrote: 'Schalk and Löwe have just played the Finale of the Seventh Symphony for me on two pianos, and I see that I may have selected too quick a tempo. I am convinced that the tempo must be very moderate and that tempo changes are often required.'[48] In a letter dated 5 November, Bruckner reiterated that 'many important things as well as frequent tempo modifications are not marked in the score'.[49] The score of the symphony was emended before publication, not in Bruckner's hand, to contain several notated tempo changes, which seem designed to spell out some of these tempo modifications. It is possible to trace in other symphonies a similar process of emendation and clarification of tempo and other markings during rehearsal and after first performances.[50] Often these markings are not present in the 'original versions', i.e. the autograph manuscripts.

The value and meaning of these performance indications is naturally open to interpretation. No one can claim that these scores (or indeed any other scores) preserve Bruckner's interpretation of a symphony in all of its

details; yet, they are a potentially very rich resource for the interpretation of Bruckner's music. The scores of some of the 'original versions' do not clearly delineate large-scale tempo schemes and often the first published versions contain markings that can help clarify things. To take one instructive example, the outer movements of the original version of the Sixth Symphony, which were never brought to performance in Bruckner's lifetime, contain an incomplete, ambiguous series of tempo markings, and the 'obstinate adherence' to them, as Peter Gülke put it, 'leads to a dead end'.[51] The first published version indicates defined tempi for each of the three theme groups in the first movement of the Sixth; but in the original version the markings are ambiguous: either the third theme group of the first movement should be taken at different tempi in the exposition and the recapitulation (as Nowak's text seems to imply); or, following Haas or Nowak to the letter, the slower tempo marked for the second theme group should be held through the development section and for most of the coda.[52] Several musicians and scholars have turned to the first published versions in considering these and similar interpretative problems and found that the tempo markings of these scores can facilitate the sensible organization of Bruckner's symphonic structures and their component parts in performance.[53]

The first published versions are also intriguing because of the ways in which their tempo and performance markings, and even their orchestral modifications, contrast and conflict with the ways Bruckner symphonies are now typically performed. The confluence of modern, relatively literal approaches to musical notation and to the realization of tempi in particular, and the sparse tempo indications characteristic of the critical editions of Bruckner's symphonies (reflecting those in Bruckner's autograph manuscripts), have encouraged performances that attain a degree of sonic monumentality and marmoreal grandeur that seems quite incompatible with the much more mercurial, dramatically labile picture presented by the first printed versions and supported by what we know generally about performance styles from around 1900.[54] The aims of historically and contextually informed approaches to musical performance are not just the achievement of historical authenticity or the recreation of a composer's original conception, but also the stimulation of new, musically compelling performances. Here the first printed versions should have something to say. Precisely because of the fascinating difference (even strangeness) of their flow of accelerandos and ritenutos, the Wagnerian vocabulary of their tempo markings, and their detailed dynamic shadings, the critical reading and performance of these texts may productively challenge our traditions of performance and our assumptions of how Bruckner should and could sound.[55]

The pursuit of the original texts of Bruckner's works has unquestionably underwritten, and continues to underwrite, a great deal of important research that greatly enriches our understanding of this music. We would be incomparably poorer without the critical editions of the early versions that are now available, and it would be impossible to understand Bruckner's art and career adequately without a clear picture of the complex patterns of his revisions and a sense of how they interlocked with his efforts to bring his scores successfully to performance and publication. Yet, concern about textual authenticity, especially if framed too facilely, becomes counter-productive when it unduly inhibits or even forecloses other critical and interpretative approaches. Myths, if not outright misconceptions, growing from the discourse about the inauthenticity of the first published versions have, for example, sedimented themselves widely across many areas of Bruckner reception, from biography to style criticism to performance practices. Narrow, dogmatic approaches to the 'Bruckner problem' have long obstructed serious, reasonable engagement with the texts of the first published versions. It can only be beneficial that this is gradually beginning to change. To do full justice to the 'Bruckner problem' surely means testing our understanding of these texts, their authorship, their authenticity, and their musical meanings against the fullness of the existing documentary and contextual evidence, and simultaneously to judge this evidence (and our reading of it) against our conceptualizations of authorship and authenticity. Some preliminary steps in this direction have already been taken and while it is still unclear exactly where this process will lead, it may well become an important avenue for the continued renewal of the study, performance, and understanding of Bruckner's music.