

The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity

BENJAMIN MARCUS KORSTVEDT

For more than fifty years the third and final version of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony has been lost to sight, obscured by a tradition of critical rejection. Although Bruckner himself had this version of the symphony published in 1889, it has been dismissed from the canon of Bruckner's works and excluded from modern collected editions.¹ This rejection derives from the contention that the text published in 1889 is not authentic, that it is a "completely spurious score" "drawn up" by two younger associates, Ferdinand Löwe and Franz Schalk, which "should be rejected altogether as a falsification of Bruckner's inten-

tions."² Thus the second version, which dates from 1880–81, is generally considered the definitive text of the symphony. In keeping with this logic, the third version has been supplanted by modern critical editions based on the second version.³

The conviction that the third version is not authoritative arose long after Bruckner's death. Bruckner himself never evinced any doubt about the authority of this text; to the contrary, he authorized its publication, took part in preparing the premiere, and attended at least two later performances.⁴ Moreover, this edition of the symphony was quite successful in Bruck-

19th-Century Music XX/1 (Summer 1996). © by The Regents of the University of California.

I would like to thank William Carragan, Paul Hawkshaw, and Jeffrey Kallberg for their valuable assistance with various aspects of this article.

¹Two collected editions of Bruckner's works have been undertaken. The first, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Vienna, 1930–44) directed by Robert Haas, was left unfinished with the German surrender in 1945. In the late 1940s, a new collected edition was begun under the direction of Leopold Nowak, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (2nd rev. edn. Vienna, 1951–). See Leopold Nowak, "Die Anton Bruckner Gesamtausgabe: Ihre Geschichte und Schicksale," in *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1982/83*, ed. Othmar Wessely (Linz, 1984), pp. 33–67.

²See Deryck Cooke, "Anton Bruckner," *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie (London, 1980), vol. 3, pp. 360–61, rpt. in *The New Grove Late Romantic Masters* (London, 1985), p. 32, and idem, "The Bruckner Problem Simplified," in *Vindications: Essays on Romantic Music* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 59, 62.

³These modern editions are *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, 4. Band: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur (Originalfassung)*, ed. Robert Haas (Vienna, 1936; rpt. Leipzig, 1944), and *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, Band 4/2: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur (Fassung von 1878/80)*, Studienpartitur, ed. Leopold Nowak (2nd rev. edn. Vienna, 1953).

⁴The premiere was given by the Vienna Philharmonic under Hans Richter on 22 January 1888. The two later performances were 15 June 1892 in Vienna at the Musik- und Theater-Ausstellung, conducted by Joseph Schalk, and 5 January 1896 with the Vienna Philharmonic, again conducted by Hans Richter.

ner's day: it was reprinted in 1892 and performed thirteen times before the composer's death in 1896. The current rejection of the third version is a product of the peculiar trajectory of Bruckner reception in this century. It originated with the text-critical revolution that swept through Bruckner studies in the 1930s, the centerpiece of which was Robert Haas's *Gesamtausgabe*, the first critical edition of Bruckner's works. This edition was never completed, but it did institutionalize the claim that the editions of Bruckner's music published during the composer's lifetime are not authoritative. Following Haas's lead, modern scholars have consistently agreed that the first printed editions of Bruckner's works are not authentic, that they are products of unwelcome collaboration and compromises, and that they do not reflect Bruckner's "real" wishes. Haas's main text-critical conclusions have been accepted for more than half a century, and the textual province of Bruckner reception is still defined by Haas's totalizing assertion that only manuscripts—and not early printed editions—represent the "real Bruckner." As a result, the scores that Bruckner himself had published have been neglected and their significance has remained unexplored.

The third version of the Fourth Symphony is a case in point. The extant evidence concerning its authorship is fragmentary and raises text-critical and historiographic questions that are not amenable to unequivocal answers. Moreover, the textual history of the third version has been subject to so much dismissive criticism that it has become, as Cornelis van Zwol put it, "dangerous territory."⁵ By bringing together the available evidence this article seeks to map this territory. Although a seamless account of the genealogy of this text lies beyond our grasp, it is possible to arrive at important conclusions—above all, that the third version of the Fourth Symphony is indeed a fully legitimate, authorial text.

⁵Cornelis van Zwol, "Bruckners Vierte Symphonie: Nicht nur eine 'Romantische'," in *Bruckner Symposion: "Die Fassungen,"* ed. Franz Grasberger (Linz, 1981), p. 28.

The Fourth Symphony exists in three versions; Table 1 lists them. In November 1874, Bruckner completed the first version of the symphony. Two years later, after his initial attempts to have the symphony performed met with no success, Bruckner enlisted the aid of Wilhelm Tappert in his pursuit of a performance. Tappert, a progressive music critic from Berlin whom Bruckner had met at Villa Wahnfried during the Bayreuth Festival of 1876, successfully prompted the German conductor Benjamin Bilse to perform the symphony. Bilse made plans to perform it in Berlin, and it seems that in 1876 Bruckner sent him a score and a set of orchestral parts.⁶

In October 1877, however, Bruckner changed his mind about the desirability of a performance and wrote to Tappert requesting the return of the parts and the score: "I have become convinced that my Fourth Romantic Symphony urgently needs a thorough revision."⁷ In the course of the following year, Bruckner revamped the symphony by tightening up the first two movements and writing a new, shorter finale, entitled "Volksfest," based on his original thematic material. The composer also replaced the original scherzo with an entirely new movement, which he labeled "Jagd-Scherzo." (This version is labeled Version IIa in Table 1.) In November 1879 Bruckner removed the "Volksfest" finale and replaced it with a new, substantially different movement, which was finished in June 1880. In this form—the first three movements from 1878 and the finale composed in 1880—the symphony was given its first performance, on 20 February 1881 by the Vienna Philharmonic under the direction of Hans Richter. Over half a century later, Haas identified this text (Version IIb in Table 1) as Bruckner's "Endfassung," his definitive version,

⁶See Bruckner's letters to Tappert dated 19 September 1876, 1 October 1876, and 6 December 1876 in Anton Bruckner, *Gesammelte Briefe, neue Folge*, ed. Max Auer (Regensburg, 1924), pp. 136–41. See also August Göllerich and Max Auer, *Anton Bruckner: Eine Lebens- und Schaffens-bild* (Regensburg, 1936), 4/1, pp. 417–22.

⁷"Ich bin zur vollen Überzeugung gelangt, daß meine 4. romant. Sinfonie einer gründlichen Umarbeitung dringend bedarf" (letter to Wilhelm Tappert, 12 October 1877, in Bruckner, *Gesammelte Briefe, neue Folge*, p. 144).

Table 1

The three versions of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony

BENJAMIN
MARCUS
KORSTVEDT
Bruckner's
Fourth

	FIRST MOVEMENT	SECOND MOVEMENT	THIRD MOVEMENT	FOURTH MOVEMENT
Version I November 1874	Allegro 630 measures	Andante quasi Allegretto 246 measures	Sehr Schnell- Trio. Im gleichen Tempo- [Scherzo D.C.]-Coda 336 + 132 + 336 + 26 measures	(Allegro Moderato) 616 Measures
Version IIa December 1878	Bewegt, nicht zu Schnell 573 measures	Andante quasi Allegretto 247 measures	Scherzo. Bewegt- Trio. Nicht zu schnell- [Scherzo D.C.] "Jagd-Scherzo" 259 + 54 + 259 measures	Allegro Moderato "Volksfest" 477 measures
Version IIb June 1880	ditto	ditto	ditto	Finale. Bewegt, doch nicht zu Schnell 541 measures
Version III February 1888	Ruhig bewegt (Allegro molto moderato) 573 measures	Andante 247 measures	Scherzo. Bewegt- Trio. Gemächlich- [Scherzo] 1. Zeitmaß 255 + 54 + 191 measures	Finale. Mäßig Bewegt 507 measures

and both he and Nowak used it as the basis for their editions.⁸ Almost without exception, this version is the one performed today.

Bruckner's initial attempts to have this version of the symphony published were unsuccessful. In 1885 and 1886 Bruckner submitted the score to two German publishers—Bote and Bock of Berlin and Schott of Mainz—but both declined it. Following the performance of the first and third movements at the Sondershausen Musikfest on 4 June 1886, Bruckner apparently made one last attempt to have this version of the symphony performed and, perhaps, published. In the summer of 1886, he gave a copy of the score to the conductor Anton Seidl, who took it to New York and performed it there on

4 April 1888.⁹ Whether Seidl "offered to find a publisher over there," as Auer and Gräflinger reported, is not clear; in any event, the symphony was not published in America.¹⁰

With this gesture of giving away a copy of the score and sending it across the Atlantic,

⁹This copyist's score, which was rediscovered in the early 1950s, is now in the collection of Columbia University. For a description, see my *First Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Authorship, Production and Reception* (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995), pp. 257–66.

¹⁰The two collections of Bruckner's letters, *Gesammelte Briefe*, ed. Franz Gräflinger (Regensburg, 1924) and *Gesammelte Briefe, neue Folge*, ed. Auer, contain the text of an apparently undated letter to Levi that states: "Darauf verlangte Herr Seidl selbe Partitur und meinte, er würde drüben einen Verleger finden." The letter appears on pp. 67–68 of Gräflinger's collection and pp. 221–22 of Auer's collection. Both date the letter to 1888.

In his biography of Bruckner, which contains a collection of "unpublished letters," Gräflinger wrote that this letter, along with thirty others, was discovered only in 1927 in the *Nachlaß* of Michael Balling. Here Gräflinger dates the letter 16 November 1886. [This date is surely correct.] Oddly, this latter source does not include any reference to Seidl; the source of the earlier reading, presumably a draft, is obscure. See Gräflinger, *Anton Bruckner: Leben und Schaffen (Umgearbeitete Bausteine)* (Berlin, 1927), pp. 319–20.

⁸Nowak also published editions of the first version of the symphony, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, Band 4/1: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur (Fassung von 1874)*, Studienpartitur (2nd improved edn. Vienna, 1975), and the "Volksfest" finale, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, zu Band 4/2: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur (Finale von 1878)*, Studienpartitur (2nd rev. edn. Vienna, 1981).

undoubtedly never to be seen again, Bruckner closed the door on the second version of the Fourth Symphony and soon set to revising the score again. In the meantime, he had succeeded in finding a publisher, the Viennese music publisher and impresario Albert Gutmann.¹¹ In October 1886 Bruckner's ally Hermann Levi approached Gutmann, who had already published the Seventh Symphony and the String Quintet, to inquire whether he would be interested in publishing another Bruckner symphony.¹² Gutmann evidently responded positively and proposed to publish the Fourth Symphony on the condition that he receive a fee of one thousand marks.¹³ At first Bruckner was not happy with the idea of paying Gutmann's requested fee. On 16 November 1886, he wrote to Levi, "Herr Gutmann wants to take [the Fourth Symphony] on himself, but means for me to request one thousand florins from the Court, which he imagines I will then offer to him as a fee. I cannot do that! I am incapable of it! Herr Gutmann shall accept this romantic Fourth Symphony only without a fee."¹⁴ But by the beginning of the new year Bruckner accepted Gutmann's terms, perhaps after he realized that Levi would in fact raise the necessary money. On 3 January 1887, Bruckner appended this postscript to a letter to Levi: "NB: I gladly gave Herr Gutmann the one thousand marks for printing (Fourth Romantic Symphony in E♭)."¹⁵ Although an agreement was reached with Gutmann by January 1887, actual publication followed only slowly: Bruckner did not sign the

contract with Gutmann until 15 May 1888, and the score did not appear in print until September 1889.¹⁶

THE TEXT OF THE THIRD VERSION

The differences between the second and third versions are less extensive and less fundamental than those between the first and second versions. The large-scale formal outlines of the first and second movements remained unchanged (see Table 1). Indeed, the basic pitch content (the sounding pitches considered apart from their orchestration) of much of the third version is practically identical with that of the second version. Yet the third version does incorporate significant revisions in three areas.¹⁷

1. Bruckner altered the form of certain portions of the scherzo and finale. The reprise of the scherzo, which had been a literal *da capo* in the second version, was shortened by the removal of sixty-five measures following m. 26. Additionally, a new transitional passage leads quietly from the scherzo to

¹⁶Gutmann's edition was published under the title *Vierte (romantische) Symphonie (Es-Dur) für grosses Orchester von Anton Bruckner*. Although copies of Gutmann's edition are now very rare, the text of this version of the symphony is available in several other editions, notably a "new revision" [which amounts to little more than the correction of misprints] by Josef V. Wöss, published by Universal Edition in 1927 (plate number W.Ph. V. 197 U.E. 3596) and an edition by Hans Redlich (1955), published by Eulenberg (plate number E.E. 3636) and reprinted by Kalmus (Kalmus Miniature Scores no. 93). Redlich's edition has essentially the same text as Gutmann's edition, but does not include the full text of the reprise of the scherzo. Instead, it uses a cumbersome series of instructions for abbreviating the scherzo on its repetition after the trio. (i.e., "von [Takt] 24b springt auf [Takt] 93" and "von Takt 245 auf den Schluß [S. 136] springen").

The only available recordings of the third version date from the 1940s and 1950s. They include concert recordings by Wilhelm Furtwängler with the Vienna Philharmonic, 19 October 1951 (Music and Arts 796), and Hans Knappertsbusch with the Berlin Philharmonic, 8 September 1944 (Music and Arts 249 or Preiser 90226), as well as two studio recordings from the mid-1950s: Hans Knappertsbusch with the Vienna Philharmonic (Palladio PD 4105) and Lovro von Matačić with the Philharmonia Orchestra (Testament SBT 1050). [Note that Furtwängler modifies the text of the third movement by playing the entire first half of the scherzo on its reprise.] For more discographic details, see Lee T. Lovullo, *Anton Bruckner: A Discography* (Berkeley, 1991), pp. 81–88.

¹⁷A detailed list of the textual differences between the second and third versions is found in Haas, "Vorlagenbericht," *Bruckner Sämtliche Werke*, 4/1, pp. xvii–xxiv.

¹¹On Gutmann's career, see Leon Botstein, *Music and Its Public: Habits of Listening and the Crisis of Musical Modernism in Vienna, 1870–1914* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1985), pp. 688–750.

¹²Postcard from Levi to Gutmann, dated 1 October 1886 (A-Wn Mus. Hs. 27.877/1).

¹³Gutmann had insisted on, and received, a similar fee as a condition for publishing the Seventh Symphony. As he was to do for the Fourth Symphony, Levi raised this sum for the Seventh Symphony.

¹⁴"Herr Gutmann will selbe übernehmen, meint aber, ich soll mir vom Hofe 1000 fl. für ihn erbitten, welche er mir als Honorar anzubieten möchte.—Das kann ich nicht thun! und fühle ich mich dessen nicht fähig! Herr Gutmann soll diese romant. 4. Sinfonie nur so ohne Honorar hinnehmen" (Franz Gräßlinger, *Anton Bruckner: Leben und Schaffen (Umgearbeitete Bausteine)* [Berlin, 1927], p. 334).

¹⁵"NB. Herrn Gutmann trete ich gern die 1000 Mark zum Verlage ab [4. romantische Sinfonie in Es]" (Gräßlinger, *Anton Bruckner: Leben und Schaffen*, p. 337).

the trio; thus, the rhetorically decisive, *fortissimo* cadence in the tonic that rounds off the scherzo is withheld until the end of the movement. The beginning of the recapitulation of the finale was also revised: the grand statement of the primary theme in the tonic (mm. 383–412 in the second version) was removed and the recapitulation of the first section of the second theme group (mm. 413–30 in the second version, compare mm. 385–96 in the third version) was slightly abbreviated and transposed from F# minor to D minor (see Table 2).

2. This score—like all of the others published during Bruckner's lifetime—contains an abundance of performance indications (primarily markings of phrasing, dynamics, articulation, and tempi) absent from both Bruckner's earlier unpublished manuscript versions and the modern critical edition based on them. In addition, metronome markings were added at the beginning of each movement and at m. 43 of the finale.¹⁸ These new indications probably do not reflect a changed interpretative concept on Bruckner's part but simply make explicit nuances taken for granted in earlier unpublished and thus essentially private manuscript versions. (Table 2 shows the most important of the new tempo indications in the finale.)

3. Pervasive changes were made in the orchestration, especially in heavily scored tutti passages, in which the brass writing was generally lightened, and the musical profile sharpened by highlighting important lines and uncluttering the texture (e.g., first movement, mm. 51–74 and 253–69; third movement, mm. 231–49; fourth movement, mm. 155–82 and 321–36). The third version includes some added doublings between the woodwinds and the strings (e.g., first movement, mm. 103–07 and 365–76). In the third version, the strings are muted in several passages that were given to unmuted strings in the second version (e.g., first movement, mm. 193–213 and mm. 365–76 [first violins only]; fourth movement, mm. 360–66), and in the second movement, muted and unmuted strings alternate somewhat more complexly. Two new instruments were also added to the score: a part for a player doubling third flute and piccolo was added in the scherzo and the finale, and a cymbal crash was added to a climactic arrival point early in the finale (m. 76), as were two *pianissimo* cymbal strokes in the coda of the same movement (mm. 473 and 477). Additionally, the notation

¹⁸The first movement is marked half note = 72; the Andante, quarter note = 66; the scherzo, quarter note = 126; the beginning of finale is marked half note = 72, while at m. 43 the tempo is modified to half note = 66.

of the horns and trumpets was brought into line with standard practice.¹⁹

The revisions found in the third version of the symphony are musically significant; they affect not only the formal argument of the scherzo and finale but also the overall sonority of the work and, by means of the new tempo indications, its temporal unfolding.²⁰ Yet before the significance of the revisions can be addressed or even seen clearly, it is necessary to explore the contested authorship of the third version of the symphony.

THE TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE THIRD VERSION

The central document in any investigation of the genealogy of the third version is the *Stichvorlage*, or engraver's copy, used to prepare Gutmann's edition.²¹ The *Stichvorlage* is the only extant manuscript source that transmits the text of the third version of the work. It is not an autograph score, but appears to have been prepared by three main copyists, one of whom worked on the first and fourth movements and two others who each copied one of the two remaining movements.²² In addition, some tempo and expression markings appear in yet another hand, perhaps that of Hans Richter, the conductor of the first performance.²³ The

¹⁹Specifically, key signatures were eliminated and all nondiatonic notes are notated with accidentals. On Bruckner's eccentric notation for brass instruments in the early versions of his symphonies, see Theodor Wünschman, *Anton Bruckners Weg als Symphoniker* (Steinfeld, 1976), pp. 89–90. The third version also employs horns in E \flat and low B \flat and trumpets in E \flat and C in addition to the F instruments called for in the second version.

²⁰I am currently at work on a study of the musical, historical, and critical significance of the third version.

²¹This document is currently in an inaccessible private collection in Vienna. A set of black and white photographs of the entire manuscript is, however, in the collection of the Wiener Stadtbibliothek (A-Wst M.H. 9098/c).

²²Pages 113–15 of the finale appear to have been copied by someone other than the main copyist.

²³These markings may have originated in rehearsal. Göllicher and Auer reported that Bruckner took an active role in supervising such details at the rehearsals for the first performance: "He was concerned to see his remarks strictly followed and several times said: 'Please, would one of the gentlemen possibly write that down—here's a pencil!'" (Er wollte seine Bemerkungen streng respektiert wissen und pflegte mehrmals zu sagen: "Bitte, will einer der Herren sich das vielleicht hineinschreiben—da wär a [sic] Bleistift!") (Göllicher and Auer, *Anton Bruckner*, 4/2, p. 586).

Table 2

A Comparison of two versions of the finale of the Fourth Symphony

VERSION IIb (1880)				VERSION III (1888)			
Exposition: mm. 1-202				Exposition: mm. 1-202			
	<i>Keys</i>	<i>Mm.</i>	<i>Tempi</i>		<i>Keys</i>	<i>Mm.</i>	<i>Tempi</i>
A ₁	B♭m	1	Bewegt doch nicht zu Schnell	A ₁	B♭m	1	Mäßig bewegt ¹
A ₂	E♭m	43	Langsamer	A ₂	E♭m	43	Breit. Hauptzeitmaß ²
A ₃	Dm	51		A ₃	Dm	51	
A ₄	E♭	79		A ₄	E♭	79	Bewegt (doch etwas breit)
B ₁	Cm	93	Noch langsamer	B ₁	Cm	93	Die Viertel wie vorher die Halben
B ₂	C→F	105	a Tempo	B ₂	C→F	105	Belebter
B _x	G♭→	143		B _x	G♭→	143	a tempo
C ₁	B♭m	155		C ₁	B♭m	155	Im Hauptzeitmaß
C ₂	G♭	183	poco a poco ritard	C ₂	G♭	183	Beruhigend
C ₃	G♭	187	Langsam	C ₃	G♭	187	
C _{3'}	G♭→B♭	193		C _{3'}	G♭→B♭	193	Immer ruhiger
Development: mm. 203-382				Development: mm. 203-382			
A ₁	B♭m	203	Tempo wie anfangs	A ₁	B♭m	203	Zeitmass wie zu Anfang
B ₂	G♭→E	237		B ₂	G♭→E	237	a tempo
B ₁	Fm	269	Langsamer ³	B ₁	Fm	269	Viertel wie Früher die Halben
A ₂ /C	(Cm)→	295		A ₂ /C	(Cm)→	295	Im Hauptzeitmass
B _x /C	D	339		B _x /C	D	341	a tempo
A ₂ inv. (Dm)		351		A ₂ inv. (Dm)		353	Hauptzeitmass (etwas gedehnt)
Reprise: mm. 383-476				Reprise: mm. 385-476 (The A ₂ Section is omitted!)			
A ₂	C♭	383	Tempo Imo ⁴	B ₁	d	385	Viertel wie vorher die Halben
B ₁	F♯m	413		B ₂	D→	397	(etwas belebter)
B ₂	D→	431	Etwas bewegter	B _x /C	C♭m	431	Ruhig
B _x /C	C♭m	465	Langsam				
Coda: mm. 477-541				Coda: mm. 443-507			
A ₂	E♭m	477	Tempo I ^{mo}	A ₂	E♭m	443	
A ₂	E♭m	505		A ₂	E♭m	471	
A ₄	E♭	533		A ₄	E♭	499	
SOURCE: Anton Bruckner <i>Sämtliche Werke</i> , 4. Band: IV. <i>Symphonie Es-Dur (Originalfassung)</i> , ed. Robert Haas (Vienna, 1936; rpt. Leipzig, 1944).				SOURCE: Anton Bruckner, <i>Vierte (romantische)</i> <i>Symphonie Es-Dur für grosses Orchester</i> (Vienna, 1889).			

¹MM. half note = 72.

²MM. half note = 66.

³Langsamer (wie bei der Gesangsperiode im 1. Teile).

⁴Tempo I^{mo} wie im 1. Teile das Hauptthemas.

handwriting of the copyists does not match that of any of the professional copyists that Bruckner employed in the 1880s, and since the score was not signed by the copyists, their identity has remained elusive. It is likely, however, that the copyists included Ferdinand Löwe and Franz Schalk—that is, the two figures who are often alleged to have bowdlerized the score.²⁴

Although the *Stichvorlage* was not copied by Bruckner himself, it does contain extensive revision and annotation by him. The composer made four types of notations: written comments, sometimes including dates; tempo or other performance indications; so-called metrical numbers—measure-by-measure numerical analyses of the periodic structure of the music; and, perhaps most importantly, actual recomposition of several passages. (The most important entries are listed in Table 3.)

It is not clear what exemplar was used to prepare the *Stichvorlage*. The original textual layer of the *Stichvorlage* (that is, the copyists' text as it stood before subsequent revisions) is very clean and shows no traces of having been worked-out directly on the page. As no earlier score shows substantial evidence that it was used for this purpose, an early draft, now lost, may well have served as the basis of the *Stichvorlage*.²⁵ The extant *Stichvorlage* itself is a composite manuscript. The finale is of differ-

ent provenance than the first three movements: its pagination and paper differ from those of the other movements, and it seems clearly to be the oldest layer.²⁶ There is no doubt that the *Stichvorlage* was used to prepare Gutmann's edition. Its text is virtually identical to that edition, and it contains numerous handwritten indications regarding the location of the page breaks and the arrangement of the printed staves. Furthermore, on each odd-numbered page the engravers wrote "9360" vertically in crayon or colored pencil in the left margin; this

²⁶The first three movements are each paginated separately starting from 1, while the finale is numbered from 101 through 142, even though the first three movements occupy sixty-eight pages, not one hundred. (The score of the first movement consists of thirty pages, the Andante sixteen pages, the scherzo twenty-five pages, and the finale forty-two pages. Note that the reprise of the scherzo is not simply signaled by a *da capo* indication but is written out in full.)

The finale is on twenty-stave paper that has no logo, while the first three movements are on twenty-four-stave bifolios emblazoned with the logo of Breitkopf and Härtel: a bear holding a staff and a hammer seated behind a shield above the inscription: "B & H nr. 14A." Bruckner also used this paper for the preliminary sketches and drafts of the first movement of the Ninth Symphony, many of which date from 1887. See Mariana Sonntag, *The Compositional Process of Anton Bruckner: A Study of the Sketches and Drafts of the First Movement of the Ninth Symphony* (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1987), I, pp. 19–25.

Two facts suggest that the score of the finale is the oldest part of the manuscript. In each of the first three movements, the initial page contains a list of the abbreviation of the instrument names to be used on subsequent pages. (Presumably these abbreviations were instructions to the engravers.) Although the score of the finale lacks these indications, a list of abbreviations of the instruments used in the finale is found, however, on a loose page that follows the score of the scherzo. This page, which is on the paper used for the first three movements and is in the hand of the copyist of the scherzo, was probably prepared when the first three movements were copied to make the older score of the finale suitable for the engravers. Moreover, the notation of certain passages in the third flute/piccolo also suggests that the extant score of the finale predates the other movements. The third and fourth movements of the third version of the symphony include, unlike the earlier version, a third flute part doubling on piccolo. In the scherzo, the third flute/piccolo part was copied when the score was initially prepared. The score of the finale, however, did not originally include this new part: whenever an independent part for the third flute/piccolo is called for, it appears on a hand-drawn staff added above the topmost printed staff (see mm. 131–54, 302–08, 317–23). Apparently Bruckner decided to add the piccolo at some time after the finale had been copied, but before the extant score of the third movement had been readied.

²⁴Alfred Orel identified Ferdinand Löwe as the main copyist; see Orel, "Ein Bruckner-Fund [Die Endfassung der IV. Symphony]," *Schweizerische Musikzeitung* 88 (1949), 323. The packet containing the photographs in the Stadtbibliothek was labeled, quite likely by Orel himself, "von Ferdinand Löwe geschrieben." The qualifying word "teilweise" was added by a later hand.

Lili Schalk reported that her late husband, Franz Schalk, identified the copyists of the *Stichvorlage* as "Scherzo Franz good/the rest badly Löwe" (Scherzo Franz gut/sonst mangelhaft Löwe); see "Gespräche über Bruckner mit Franz," unpublished typescript in the *Nachlaß* of Lili Schalk (A-Wn F18 Schalk 360/4/4).

²⁵In Bruckner's autograph score of the second version of the symphony (A-Wn Mus. Hs. 19.476), in the finale, there are some penciled sketches and indications of possible revisions that may derive from the preparation of the third version. Although these jottings, which are not in Bruckner's hand, correspond only partially to the third version, they may be remnants of the process of revision that produced this text. See my *First Edition of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony*, pp. 308–10, for tabulation of these notations.

Important autograph entries and revisions in the *Stichvorlage*

First Movement

mm. 64–73: Extensive revisions to the orchestration.
 after m. 66: Bruckner made marginal notes about the voice leading between mm. 66–67, which are separated by the page turn between pp. 5 and 6.
 below mm. 287–89: "Zum 2 Mal fertig."
 mm. 305–29: Extensive revisions to the orchestration: Bruckner added the upper woodwinds and rewrote the horn and string parts.
 after m. 356: "fertig z. 3 Male. Feb. 88."
 mm. 421–33: Extensive revisions to the orchestration.
 above m. 485: "bis hierher fertig 2 Mal."
 mm. 533–73: Extensive revisions to the orchestration, especially in the wind and brass parts.
 mm. 545–73: Bruckner entered metrical numbers below these measures (5–8, 1–8, 1–8, 1–9).
 below mm. 569–73 (i.e., at the end of the movement): "ganz fertig 8. Feb."

Second Movement

below m. 192: "bis hier fertig."
 mm. 195–204: Extensive revisions to the orchestration, especially in the wind and brass parts
 below m. 204: "fertig."
 mm. 217–28: Extensive revisions to the orchestration.
 below mm. 236–37: "Streicher fertig/Alles fertig."
 mm. 238–47: Revisions in the oboe and clarinet; Bruckner entered metrical numbers below these measures (2–8, 1–3).
 after m. 247 (i.e., the end of the movement): "Alles fertig 18 Fb. [1]888."

Third Movement

mm. 143–50: Revisions in the strings.
 below mm. 146–47: "Pauke es-e/es-g."
 mm. 229–40: Revisions in the woodwinds, horns, and bass.
 below m. 348: "bis hierher."
 mm. 378–85: Revisions in the strings.
 after m. 385: Bruckner made marginal notes ("Clar es/Fag d es/1. Vln d =es") about the voice leading between mm. 385–86, which are separated by the page turn between pp. 19 and 20.
 mm. 483–92: Revisions to the winds and brass.
 mm. 483–92: Bruckner entered metrical numbers below these measures (2–8, 1–3).
 after m. 492 (i.e., end of the movement): "Fertig."

Fourth Movement

mm. 59–62: Extensive revisions to the orchestration, especially in the wind and brass parts.
 after m. 62: Bruckner made marginal notes about the orchestration and voicing of the passage beginning at the start of the following page (mm. 63ff.).
 below mm. 93–94: "bis hierher."
 m. 110: "Massig im Hauptzeitmass" is crossed-out and replaced by "Belebter."
 mm. 123–28: Revisions to the orchestration.
 mm. 147–52: Revisions in the flute, clarinet, and first violin.
 m. 155: "Im Hauptzeitmass" is crossed-out and replaced by "etwas belebter."
 below m. 202: "1. Theil fertig gesehen."
 below m. 207–08: "2. fertig gesehen."
 below m. 232–35: "2. Abth. genau gesehen."
 mm. 269: "Langsam" is crossed-out and replaced by "Viertel wie früher die Halben."
 mm. 281–85: "2. Abth. durchgesehen ganz zum 2. Mal."
 m. 295: "bis hierher."

Fourth Movement (cont.)

- mm. 295–99: "Im Hauptzeitmass" is crossed-out and replaced by "breit."
 mm. 304–08: Revisions in the brass and the double bass.
 m. 309: "Im Hauptzeitmass" is crossed-out and replaced by "a tempo."
 mm. 331–46: Extensive revisions to the orchestration.
 mm. 331–52: Bruckner entered metrical numbers below these measures (1–8, 1–14).
 mm. 369: "noch u. noch etwas belebend" is crossed-out and replaced by "schnell belebend (*ppp*)."
 mm. 369–414: Bruckner entered metrical numbers below these measures (1–16, 1–8, 1–8, 1–14).
 mm. 385: "Langsam" is crossed-out and replaced by "Viertel wie früher die Halben."
 m. 397: "Im Hauptzeitmass" is crossed-out and replaced by "etwas belebter."
 mm. 421–30: Extensive revisions to the orchestration.
 mm. 423–25: Bruckner entered metrical numbers below these measures (1–3).
 below mm. 428–30: These measures were rewritten by Bruckner. He also wrote at the bottom of the page: "NB: Tromp u. Hörner in Einkl[ang]
 Violinen/Fag.=Posaunen Viola."
 m. 443: "Im Hauptzeitmass" is crossed-out and replaced by "Sehr Langsam."
 mm. 455–65: Revisions to the oboe and clarinet.
 mm. 491–94: Oboe, clarinet, bassoon, trombone, and tuba all added.
 mm. 497–507: Extensive revisions to the orchestration.
 after m. 502: Bruckner made marginal notes about the voice leading between mm. 502–03, which are separated by the page turn between pp. 141 and 142.
 mm. 499–507: metrical numbers added below these measures (1–9).
 after m. 507 (i.e., at the end of the symphony): "1. u. 2. Theil fertig gesehen."

figure appears in Gutmann's edition in small type under the final measure of the finale. The engravers even wrote their names on the score.²⁷

Since the central text-critical problems presented by the third version of the Fourth Symphony concern the extent of Bruckner's involvement in its preparation, it is crucial to consider what is known about the origins and evolution of the *Stichvorlage*. The earliest apparent reference to any revision of the second version is found in a letter from Joseph Schalk to Franz Schalk dated 9 May 1887. "Friend Löwe—who along with Hirsch sends you best wishes—has re-orchestrated many parts of the Romantic very advantageously and with Bruckner's approval. His enormous meticulous exactitude, not to

say pedantry, has, however, markedly delayed the work, so that Gutmann, who is publishing it, only received the first movement a few days ago."²⁸ Previous scholars have assumed that this letter refers to the preparation of the *Stichvorlage* and have taken it as a demonstration that the text of third version of the symphony was more Löwe's concoction than Bruckner's.²⁹

²⁸"Freund Löwe, der sowie auch Hirsch Dich herzlichst grüßen läßt, hat die Romantische in vielen Theilen, sehr vorteilhaft und mit Bruckners Zustimmung uminstrumentiert. Die unerhört peinliche Genauigkeit um nicht zu sagen Pedanterie hat ihn aber die Arbeit sehr verzögern lassen, so daß erst vor einigen Tagen Gutmann, der sie verlegt, den ersten Satz bekam" (A-Wn F 18 Schalk 158/8/4). I am grateful to Morten Solvik for obtaining the full text of this letter for me. Leopold Nowak quoted part of the letter in *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, Band 5: V. Symphonie B-Dur, Revisionsbericht*, prepared by Robert Haas, supp. Leopold Nowak (Vienna, 1985), p. 90. It is also partially quoted in Thomas Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner* (Tutzing, 1988), p. 267.

²⁹See, for example, Nowak, foreword in *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, Band IV/2: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur (Fassung von 1878/80)*, Studienpartitur, n.p.

²⁷The names Vogl and Backofen appear twice in the same hands that the casting-off did. As Orel suggested, they must be the names of the engravers; see Orel, "Ein Bruckner-Fund (Die Endfassung der IV. Symphony)," p. 323.

Yet this reading fits poorly with what is known about the *Stichvorlage*. Löwe did not copy the entire *Stichvorlage*; it is clear the score was prepared by three copyists. Yet Schalk seemed to imply that Löwe worked alone. Moreover, it is impossible that Gutmann received the final *Stichvorlage* as early as May 1887. Because Bruckner revised and dated the score in February 1888, he undoubtedly had the score in his possession well after the date of Schalk's letter. In any case, the final score was not sent to the printing firm Engelmann and Mühlberg of Leipzig until 20 June 1888.³⁰ Thus, rather than referring to illicit tampering by Löwe, Schalk's letter probably refers to an early stage—perhaps the initial copying of the score—in the evolution of the third version.³¹

Other evidence also casts doubt on interpretations that radically minimize Bruckner's involvement in the preparation of the third version. The entries Bruckner made in the *Stichvorlage* show that he devoted substantial energy and care to the manuscript. He rewrote several passages directly in the manuscript (notably, first movement, mm. 305–29; second movement, mm. 195–201 and mm. 217–28; fourth movement, mm. 479–507), and the presence of metrical numbers and marginal voice-leading notations—both of which were part of Bruckner's compositional process—testify that in February 1888 the composer was engaged in serious compositional revision, and was not merely touching up the score or unenthusiastically glancing through it.³²

Further information is provided by the hand-

copied orchestral parts used for the first performance of the third version on 22 January 1888. These parts are only partially preserved: all the wind, brass, and percussion parts are lost, but several copies of each string part remain in the archive of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna.³³ (Haas described these parts in considerable detail, but his principal concern was to list discrepancies between the parts and the text of the first printed edition. His apparent objective was to delegitimize the text of Gutmann's edition by distancing it from the text performed under Bruckner's supervision in January 1888.³⁴) This set of parts was used only once: new parts, now lost, were prepared for the second performance in December 1890 and were used for the three performances that preceded the publication of Gutmann's printed orchestral parts in 1892.³⁵

³⁰On this date, Bruckner wrote to Arthur Nikisch: "The Fourth Symphony has gone off via Gutmann to print in Leipzig" (Die 4. Sinf. ist zum Drucke durch Gutmann nach Leipzig abgegangen) [letter dated 20 June 1888 in Steffen Lieberwirth, "Anton Bruckner und Leipzig: Einige neue Erkenntnisse und Ergänzungen," in *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1989/90*, ed. Othmar Wessely [Linz, 1992], p. 285].

³¹It seems reasonable to surmise that in early 1887 Löwe copied an initial draft of the third version that was subsequently reworked and partially discarded. If this is the case, the extant *Stichvorlage* of the finale (i.e., pp. 101–42 of A-Wst 9098/c) may well be the only surviving portion of Löwe's original copy.

³²On the important role of metrical numbers in Bruckner's compositional process, see Timothy L. Jackson, "Bruckner's Metrical Numbers," this journal 14 (1990), 101–31.

³³This archive was closed for renovations from 1992 through early 1995, and for this reason I have been unable to study the orchestral parts.

³⁴See Haas, "Vorlagenbericht," pp. xxiv–xxviii. The revised version of the *New Grove* article on Bruckner similarly attempted to isolate the version of the symphony performed in the composer's presence in 1888 from the first printed edition. In the work-list of this article (Deryck Cooke, rev. Hans-Hubert Schönzeler), these two texts are artificially separated. The version performed in January 1888 is identified as "revised version 1887–8; first performed: Vienna, 22 Jan. 1888; slight rescoring of 1880 version." The first publication is identified as "version by F. Schalk and F. Löwe (1889)"; see Cooke, "Anton Bruckner," *The New Grove Late Romantic Masters*, p. 56.

³⁵Gutmann's printed parts were first used in a performance in Vienna conducted by Joseph Schalk on 15 June 1892; see Göllicher and Auer, *Anton Bruckner 4/3*, pp. 237–42. They were preceded by a second set of hand-copied parts prepared for the second performance of the symphony's third version on 10 December 1890 in Munich under Franz Fischer, Levi's assistant. On 11 December 1890, Levi reported to Bruckner that "the first rehearsal had had to be ended because of the wholly defective parts" (Leider, mußte die erste Probe unterbrochen werden wegen der gänzlich fehlerhaften Stimmen) and that he had had new parts prepared by a local copyist (see Bruckner, *Gesammelte Briefe, neue Folge*, ed. Auer, p. 322). Presumably, these parts served until the appearance of the printed parts. Indeed they may well have been used to prepare the printed parts: on 18 April 1891, Bruckner wrote to Levi and asked him to send these new, corrected parts to Gutmann (Gräflinger, *Anton Bruckner*, pp. 347–48).

Table 4

Correspondences between unique readings in the original orchestral parts and Bruckner's autograph revisions to the *Stichvorlage*BENJAMIN
MARCUS
KORSTVEDT
Bruckner's
Fourth

First Movement

mm. 21-23: Viola
 mm. 64-73: All string parts
 mm. 267-68: Viola
 mm. 283-84: Viola
 mm. 305-30: Revisions to the strings throughout
 mm. 422-35: Revisions to the strings throughout
 mm. 456-57: All strings revised
 mm. 465-71: Revisions to both violin and viola
 mm. 533-73: Revisions to strings throughout

Second Movement

mm. 55/8: Viola
 mm. 135-36: 1. Violin
 mm. 155: 1. Violin
 mm. 202-03: Both violins
 mm. 221-30: Revisions to strings throughout

Third Movement

mm. 143-50: Revisions to strings throughout
 mm. 211-13: Viola
 mm. 331-38: Double bass

Fourth Movement

m. 66: 2. Violin
 mm. 79-82: Both violins
 mm. 85/89: Viola
 mm. 123-28: Revisions to strings throughout
 mm. 295-338: Revisions to the double bass
 mm. 424-26: Revisions to all strings
 mm. 480-83: Revisions to all strings
 mm. 497-98: Viola

The first set of parts is of special interest: unlike the *Stichvorlage*, which was extensively revised in February 1888, they preserve the state of text as it stood at the premiere on 22 January 1888. Comparing the orchestral parts and the *Stichvorlage* suggests that all of Bruckner's revisions in the score were made after the first performance. Virtually every unique reading preserved in the parts corresponds to a passage that Bruckner revised in the *Stichvorlage*. (The most important of these are listed in Table 4.) Since a large percentage of Bruckner's revisions

were made to the brasses and winds, the extant material provides only inconclusive evidence, but the correspondence between anomalous passages in the string parts and Bruckner's revisions in the *Stichvorlage* is striking. On the basis of this evidence, it seems probable that the divergences between the *Stichvorlage* and the first set of parts resulted from Bruckner's failure to have the parts updated to match the late revisions he made in the score.

That Bruckner's revisions to the extant *Stichvorlage* were made in the wake of the first

performance is further supported by a notation Bruckner made in his personal calendar in February 1888.³⁶ It reads:

Finale
Seite
123 Contrabaß 123
124 124
125 125
128 Contrabaß u.
128 Flöten Klarinetti
Oboen
132 Streicher
133 Corn.
124 und 125 Blech
I. Satz Seite:
110 viola 19, 20, 21.
I. Violin im Holz geändert
I. Satz Seite 16
Viola

I. Feber 888 für Kathi
für Feber 7. Fl.³⁷

Finale 111 Clarinetti Oboe?
112 Clarinet
114 Tromp.³⁸

This hitherto largely disregarded note is of prime importance: the cited page numbers and instruments correspond to autograph revisions in the *Stichvorlage* so exactly as to leave no room for doubt that these notes refer to Bruckner's revisions to this document (see Table 5).

All of this suggests that the *Stichvorlage* must have been copied in its first state by late 1887 and orchestral parts drawn from it by January 1888. Following the first performance on 22 January 1888, Bruckner revised the score. This timetable is corroborated by his correspondence. Hermann Levi planned to perform

the Fourth Symphony in Munich on 14 April 1888. Although the concert was eventually canceled when Levi fell ill, on 27 February 1888 Bruckner sent him the score. The accompanying letter opened with these lines:

I am hereby taking the liberty of sending you the score of the Romantic Symphony. It is newly orchestrated and tightened up. The success in Vienna [the concert of 22 January 1888] is unforgettable to me. Since then I have, at my own initiative, made changes that are found only in the score; thus I ask for your indulgence! The attached slips of paper list the pages and instruments that have since been revised.³⁹

Bruckner then asked Levi to make the necessary alterations to the parts at Bruckner's expense, if Levi had a "very reliable copyist." The letter included this note: "NB. The alterations are found only in the score. It is the only score I possess."⁴⁰

A few days earlier, on 23 February 1888, Bruckner had written to Franz Schalk and asked him to "give my thanks to Herr Löwe for the *slip of paper* for the Finale. I expect the *Finale*

³⁹"Ich bin so frei hiemit die Partitur von der romantischen Sinfonie zu senden. Selbe ist neu instrumentiert und zusammengezogen. Der Erfolg in Wien ist mir unvergesslich. Seitdem habe ich aus eigenem Antriebe noch Veränderungen gemacht, die nur in Partitur stehen; bitte daher um Nachsicht! Die beiliegenden Zettel zeigen die Seiten und die Instrumente an, die seither neu sind." The letter is in Gräßlinger, *Anton Bruckner*, pp. 340–41. The "new pages" to which Bruckner referred may be pp. 113–15 of the finale in the *Stichvorlage*, which appear to have been copied by someone other than the main copyist of the movement.

⁴⁰"Sollten Herr Hofkapellmeister einen sehr verlässlichen Kopisten in München besitzen, so bitte ich sehr, auf meine Rechnung so viel wie möglich die Veränderungen vornehmen lassen zu wollen. (Geht es nicht, so ist es so in dieser Form auch gut.)" "NB. Die Veränderungen merkt man obenhin in der Partitur. Es ist die einzige Partitur, die ich besitze" (*ibid.*). Haas was aware of this letter, but not knowing the *Stichvorlage*, he (not surprisingly) misinterpreted Bruckner's statements as a reference to the autograph score of the second version (A-Wn 19.476) and pressed them into service as evidence against the authority of the first edition. Haas assumed that the sole score in Bruckner's possession in 1888 was the autograph score of the second version and that the revisions mentioned in the letter were the changes Bruckner made to the Andante, the trio and the trombone parts of the finale in 1881. On this point, see my *First Edition of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony*, pp. 337–38.

³⁶It is found in Bruckner, *Frommes Österreichischen Professoren- und Lehrer-Kalender für das Schuljahr 1887/88* (A-Wn S.m. 3179/2).

³⁷These two lines refer to wages paid to Katharina Kachelmaier, Bruckner's housekeeper.

³⁸Auer's transcription of this note is inaccurate; see Göllicher and Auer, *Anton Bruckner*, 4/2, p. 582. He jumbled the lines and left out the reference to Bruckner's payment to Kachelmaier, and with it the date. Although they were clearly dated 1 February 1888 by Bruckner, Auer dated these notations October 1887 because they appear on the blank page of the calendar labeled "Oktober."

Table 5
Correspondences between Bruckner's calendar notations
and his revisions to the *Stichvorlage*, February 1888

BENJAMIN
MARCUS
KORSTVEDT
Bruckner's
Fourth

Finale

Page 123 (mm. 295–301)

- m. 295: lower left, Bruckner's hand: "bis hier"
- m. 295: alla breve sign added
- m. 295: "Im Hauptzeitmaß" replaced by "Breit."
- Bassoon and double bass altered.
- 2. and 4. horns altered

Page 124 "Contrabaß" (mm. 302–08)

- Upper flute staff added free hand (not Bruckner's hand).
- All *ffs* indications added.
- Horns, 3. trombone, tuba, double bass altered.

Page 125 (mm. 309–16)

- mm. 309: "Im Hauptzeitmaß" replaced by "a tempo."
- Flute, oboe, horn, trumpet, trombone, 2. violin, viola, double bass were revised.

Page 128 "Contrabaß, Flöten, Klarinetten" (mm. 331–37)

- Flute, oboe, clarinet, horns, trumpets, viola, cello, double bass were revised.
- mm. 331–32: flute, oboe, clarinet, horns, trumpets have new readings on a collette.
- mm. 331–37: Bruckner entered metrical numbers (1–7) below each measure.

Page 132 "Streicher, Oboen" (mm. 389–404)

- m. 397: "Massig im Hauptzeitmaß" crossed-out, "etwas belebter" added.
- Viola and clarinet revised.
- mm. 389–404: Bruckner entered metrical numbers (5–8, 1–8, 1–4) below each measure.

Page 133 "Corn" (mm. 405–20)

- mm. 413–20: Double bass has a new text added on a collette.
- Clarinet, bassoon, horn, 1. and 2. violin, viola revised.

Page 124 and 125 "Brass" (mm. 302–08 and 309–16)

- Brass parts were revised on both pages, especially on page 124.

First Movement

Pages 19–21 "im Holz geändert" (mm. 300–11, 312–24, 325–56)

- All three pages were heavily revised with the most extensive revisions made on collettes.
- At the bottom of page 21 Bruckner wrote: "fertig z. 3 Male."
- "Im Holz geändert" must refer to the extensive additions Bruckner made to the woodwinds and brass in mm. 305–33.

Finale

Page 110 "Viola/I. Violin" (mm. 113–30)

- Woodwinds and strings were revised.

First Movement

Page 16 "Viola" (mm. 262–72)

- Viola altered in mm. 267–68.

Finale

Page 111 "Oboe?" (mm. 131–40)

- Among other revisions, the oboe was revised in m. 140.

Page 112 "Clarinett" (mm. 141–54)

- Among other revisions, the clarinet was erased in mm. 147–50.

Page 114 "Tromp." (mm. 163–70)

- The brass, especially horns, were revised.

with the *slip of paper* as soon as possible."⁴¹ Apparently, Bruckner had asked Löwe to prepare a list of the passages in the finale that the composer had just revised in order to alert Levi to places that would need correction in the parts. After Levi wrote to inform Bruckner that the concert would have to be canceled, Bruckner replied on 9 March 1888:

As far as the orchestral parts go, I ask you—as I did before—to have them re-done from the ground up, in Munich if an entirely reliable copyist is available—naturally at my expense. Otherwise, I ask you kindly to send me the score and orchestral parts. Then if my proposal for a special concert should fall through, I will arrange for publication after the correction of the parts.⁴²

Ultimately, Levi had an entirely new set of parts drawn up, and thus did not fix the old parts, which evidently remain uncorrected.

It is possible, after surveying this material, to draw a fairly complete picture of the genesis of the third version of the Fourth Symphony (see Table 6). The stage was set by Bruckner's rejection of the second version in 1886 and Gutmann's agreement in January 1887 to publish the Fourth Symphony. During 1887 the third version was prepared and the score and parts were readied. This new version of the symphony was given its first performance on 22 January 1888. Bruckner made his final revisions in February 1888, signed a contract with Gutmann on 15 May 1888, and sent the score to the printer in June 1888. Finally, in September 1889 Gutmann's edition was published.

⁴¹"Bitte Sie sehr, Herrn Löwe auch meine Bitte um den *Zettel* zum Finale zu sagen. Möglichst bald erwartet das *Finale* mit dem *Zettel*!" (emphasis in the original) (quoted in Schalk, *Briefe und Betrachtungen* [Vienna, 1935], p. 72).

⁴²"Was die Orchesterstimmen betrifft, so bitte ich selbe, wie schon gebeten, in München von Grunde ausbessern zu lassen, wenn ein ganz verlässlicher Kopist vorhanden ist, natürlich auf meine Rechnung. Im andern Fall bitte ich die Partitur und Orchesterstimmen mit gütigst senden lassen zu wollen. Wenn dann mein Projekt wegen Extrakonzert durchfallen sollte, so werde ich nach Ausbesserung der Stimmen die Drucklegungen veranlassen" (Gräflinger, *Anton Bruckner*, p. 342).

Although the extant documentary record provides a fairly complete picture of the later stages of the textual history of the third version, it does not answer some important questions. In particular, a crucial, earlier episode of the story still remains in darkness: no solid evidence exists about the initial stages of the revision process that produced the *Stichvorlage* and the original orchestral parts. All that can safely be surmised is that at some time during the first half of 1887 one or more persons prepared a revised score of the Fourth Symphony; Schalk's notorious letter of 9 May 1887 probably refers in some way to this process. The whereabouts of this early score are unknown: it may be wholly or entirely lost, some of it—most likely the finale—may be preserved in the *Stichvorlage*, or perhaps the extant *Stichvorlage* constitutes the whole of this original document.

The absence of adequately complete textual evidence has prompted considerable speculation. It could not be otherwise: textual criticism always involves an element of extrapolation. Even an autograph score does not make editorial conclusions self-evident; as James Hepokoski has argued recently about Verdi's *Falstaff*, an operative hypothesis, "the inductive construction of a web of likely occurrences and situations that . . . render[s] the existing evidence comprehensible," is always needed to bridge the inevitable absences in the documentary record.⁴³ Thus, that current views about the authorship of the Fourth Symphony are speculative is not in itself problematic. The speculative conclusions that have been reached—which have concentrated on explicating the putative inauthenticity of the third version—are based, however, on weak evidence and poor historiography. Thus, although it has long been widely accepted, the tradition of rejecting the third version as inauthentic demands critique.

The dismissal of this text began with Haas's work as the editor of the Bruckner *Gesamt-*

⁴³James Hepokoski, "Overriding the Autograph Score: The Problem of Textual Authority in Verdi's 'Falstaff,'" *Studi Verdiani* 8 (1992), 36.

Table 6
The Chronology of the third version

August 1886	Second version set aside.
October 1886	First discussion with Gutmann about publishing the Fourth Symphony.
January 1887	Gutmann receives his requested fee.
ca. Spring/Summer 1887	Preparation of the third version in its first state.
Late 1887	The third version was finished in its first state. (This text is partially preserved in orchestral parts used in January 1888.)
14 December 1887	Planned first performance of the third version (Munich under Levi). Ultimately canceled due to unavailability of orchestral materials.
22 January 1888	First performance of the third version (Vienna under Richter).
February 1888	Bruckner makes his final revisions to the <i>Stichvorlage</i> .
14 April 1888	Planned performance in Munich under Levi. Canceled due to Levi's illness.
15 May 1888	Bruckner signs final agreement with Gutmann.
June 1888	Score sent to printer.
ca. September 1889	First printing of Gutmann's edition appears.
10 December 1890	Second performance of the third version (in Munich under Fischer), the first to use the printed score. A new set of manuscript parts is prepared.
Spring 1892	Gutmann publishes printed orchestral parts.

ausgabe during the 1930s. The main thrust of Haas's argument about the Fourth Symphony was to deny the authorial status of Gutmann's printed edition, and to elevate in its place the second version, which is the last one transmitted in an autograph manuscript text. The second version, then, was regarded as the "Fassung letzter Hand," and Haas based his edition on this text alone. On the opening page of his critical report on the Fourth Symphony, Haas wrote: "On the basis of inner source criticism, which is here a faced with a particularly ticklish problem, the text of the first edition must, according to the principles of the *Gesamtausgabe*, remain out of consideration, since it obviously must be judged a murky source." Writing at a time before the *Stichvorlage* was rediscovered, Haas argued that the third version "is substantiated by no authentication whatsoever

from Bruckner's hand."⁴⁴ This is now known to be incorrect, as both the *Stichvorlage* and Bruckner's calendar demonstrate. Haas also believed that Bruckner's autograph score of the second version contained written instructions—notably requests that cuts in the Andante and the finale indicated in that manuscript not be made in print—that belied the authority of Gutmann's edition. Haas surmised that these instructions must have been made in connection with the preparation of Gutmann's edi-

⁴⁴"Aus Gründen der inneren Quellenkritik, die hier eine besonders heikle Aufgabe zu lösen hatte, muß der Text der Erstausgabe nach den Grundsätzen der Gesamtausgabe unberücksichtigt bleiben, da er offenkundig als getrübe Quelle beurteilt werden muß. . . . Für den Erstdruck ist keinerlei Beglaubigung durch Bruckners Hand nachzuweisen gewesen" (Haas, "Vorlagenbericht," p. i).

tion, and he asserted that since the text of Gutmann's edition did not honor these instructions it was not authentic.⁴⁵ But, again, later evidence reveals that Haas's inference was mistaken: the two copyists' scores of the second version of the symphony—both were unknown in Haas's day—show that the notations in question refer not to the third version of the symphony, but to the second version and were made not in 1887 or 1888 but in 1881 or 1882.⁴⁶

From the beginning, of course, Haas's dismissal of the third version as a "murky source" had to confront one uncomfortable fact: Bruckner himself had had this text published. Haas formulated a biographical narrative that minimized the significance of Bruckner's participation in the process of publication.⁴⁷ In short, Haas considered the published version a makeshift compromise between Bruckner's real wishes and the expedient demands of the practical musicians, who ostensibly prepared it—namely Franz and Joseph Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe.⁴⁸ Haas contended that the Schalks and Löwe prompted Bruckner to make compromising revisions and thus modify the work in ways that would render it acceptable to a musical culture characterized by "poorly-developed orchestral technique," and "above all, the limited power of intellectual comprehension of

listeners." Thus the third version, Haas asserted, "has been superseded today, because it changes the meaning of the well thought-out and sensible intention of the creator and can have been tolerated by Bruckner as, at best, an unavoidable stopgap."⁴⁹

The plausibility of this interpretation rests finally on the premise that Bruckner made editorial concessions that contravened his "real wishes." During the 1930s Haas and his supporters proposed a constellation of explanations for Bruckner's supposed capitulation, ranging from his peculiar psychology to actual coercion by Löwe and the Schalk brothers. One argument, for instance, held that Bruckner's acceptance of a bowdlerized text was engendered by the "spiritual crisis" that he suffered as a result of Hermann Levi's rejection of the first version of the Eighth Symphony in September 1887. As Haas put it: "In the fall of 1887 there was a mighty collision between Bruckner's ideal demands and the practical considerations of friendly *Praktiker*, to whom Bruckner must have acquiesced against his better judgment. The cause of this was the frightful experience with the Eighth and its reception by [Bruckner's] 'artistic father,' Hermann Levi."⁵⁰ But again Haas's chronology is mistaken. Bruckner had begun the preparation of the third version of the Fourth Symphony long before he had learned of Levi's response to the Eighth Symphony in October 1887. On another occasion, Haas reportedly suggested that the first published texts of Bruckner's symphonies were simply arrange-

⁴⁵"Er hat ihn zu einer späteren Zeit hingesetzt als die Niederschrift der partitur erfolgte, nämlich unzweifelhaft gelegentlich der Vorbereitung der Drucklegung eben bei Gutmann" (Haas, "Vorlagenbericht," p. i).

⁴⁶These scores are the one now in Columbia University (see n. 6 above) and one in the collection of the Wiener Stadtbibliothek (A-Wst M.H. 6780). (This latter source has largely escaped scholarly attention; see my *First Edition of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony*, pp. 271–76.) When Bruckner had these copies prepared in 1881 and 1882, he did not want the copyists to leave out the lengthy sections marked "Vi-De" in the Andante (mm. 139–92) and in the finale (mm. 351–430) in his autograph score. The copyists did follow his wishes; in both scores these passages were copied as they stood in Bruckner's autograph.

⁴⁷In addition to his "Vorlagenbericht," Haas discussed these matters in the preface to his study-score edition of the Fourth Symphony, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, 4. Band: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur (Originalfassung)*, and in "Zur Originalfassung von Bruckners Vierter Symphonie," *Der Anbruch* 18 (1936), 181–83.

⁴⁸In the preface to his study-score edition of the Fourth Symphony, Haas identified the text of the first edition as "the result of opinions of the *Praktiker* around Bruckner" (als Ergebnis der Auffassung der Praktiker um Bruckner).

⁴⁹"Diese vertraten einen Standpunkt, dessen Berechtigung in den besonderen, ungünstigen Verhältnissen der Veröffentlichungszeit begründet erscheint, wo auf eine wenig entwickelte Orchestertechnik, auf Aufführungsmöglichkeiten mit Orchesterkörper zweiten Ranges und überhaupt auf eine beschränkte geistige Fassungskraft der Zuhörer Rücksicht genommen werden müsste, der aber heute überholt ist, weil er den wohldurchgedachten und sinnvollen Schöpferwillen umgedeutet hat und von Bruckner höchstens als unvermeidlicher Notbehelf geduldet werden konnte" (foreword in *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, 4. Band: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur (Originalfassung)*).
⁵⁰"Es ist im Herbst 1887 zu einem heftigen Zusammenstoß zwischen den Idealforderungen Bruckners und die praktischen Erwägungen befreundeter Praktiker gekommen, bei dem der Meister gegen sein besseres Wissen nachgeben mußte. Der Anlaß war das furchtbare Erlebnis mit der Achten und ihre Aufnahme durch den 'künstlerischen Vater' Hermann Levi" (Haas, "Vorlagenbericht," p. ii).

ments prepared not by Bruckner but by his associates, who "made cuts, changed instrumental color and tempi, added instrumental effects and [orchestral] reinforcements and so forth, partly with and partly without Bruckner's participation." These changes "often excised 'the best,' blurred oppositions, destroyed beautiful effects—a list of sins for which Bruckner's friends, Franz Schalk, Joseph Schalk, and possibly also Ferdinand Löwe, are to blame."⁵¹ Moreover, Haas claimed, although without evidence, that these changes were extracted from Bruckner by threat of "sanctions."⁵²

In sum, Haas's hypothesis that the third version represents little more than a temporary compromise wrung from Bruckner under duress may no longer be supported by his arguments; indeed, the hypothesis itself seems untenable, its evidential bases outdated, and the convictions behind it mistaken. In the Germany of the 1930s and early 1940s, however, the editorial position of the *Gesamtausgabe* quickly assumed a mantle of truth. Bruckner reception was sharply politicized in the Third Reich, and soon, especially after Goebbels granted to the new Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe* Adolf Hitler's imprimatur in 1937, Haas's text-critical position gained such an aura of legitimacy and truth that its authority was generally unquestioned in the Third Reich.⁵³ This authority has proven oddly durable; even today, Haas's premise that only autograph manuscripts

are authentic sources of Bruckner works continues to inform attempts to address the textuality of this repertory.

The lasting influence of Haas's position is evident in the response accorded to the rediscovery of the *Stichvorlage*. Alfred Orel announced its existence in 1940, but was tentative about the importance of this new source. Orel suggested that with its abundant autograph entries the *Stichvorlage* might prove the validity of the first edition, but pronounced no judgement: "Whether and to what extent the questions about the authenticity of the original printed editions are explained by this discovery will no doubt result from precise scholarly study."⁵⁴ In 1948, however, Orel took the step he shied away from in 1940: "The *Stichvorlage*, most precisely worked-over by Bruckner, is the latest known, fully credible source of the Fourth Symphony. According to present standards, it offers Bruckner's last, clearly recognizable wishes for the textual form of the Fourth Symphony: it is the 'Fassung letzter Hand,' Bruckner's definitive wishes for posterity."⁵⁵

Few Bruckner scholars have been willing to follow Orel's lead and accept this source as centrally important.⁵⁶ Curiously, however, in his only published reference to the *Stichvorlage*, Haas suggested that he had come to see this source as crucial evidence of Bruckner's authorship of the third version. In a sentence appended to the introduction of the 1944 reprint of his study-score edition of the Fourth Symphony, Haas wrote: "Since the *Stichvorlage* from 1889 [in a foreign hand] was discovered,

⁵¹"Um 1888 habe ein Bearbeitungssystem eingesetzt, das teils mit, und teils ohne Teilnahme Bruckners Kürzungen, instrumentale Umfärbungen, Tempoänderungen vornahm, Klangeffekte einführte, Verstärkungen anbrachte und dergleichen mehr." "Oft sei 'das Best' herausgenommen, seien Gegensätze verwischt, schöne Wirkungen zerstört worden, ein Sünderegister, das offenbar den Freunden Bruckners, Franz Schalk, Josef Schalk, vielleicht auch Ferdinand Löwe, angelastet wurde" (quoted in E[rnst] D[ecsey], "Die Urfassung von Bruckners Fünfter Symphonie," *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 15 March 1936, p. 13).

⁵²Paul Stefan reported that Haas explained the changes to the Fifth Symphony thus: "Bruckner sei in den letzten Jahren seines Leben unter 'Sanktionsdrohnungen' von außen her bewogen werden, seine früheren Werke zu ändern oder ändern zu lassen" ("Um Bruckner," *Die Stunde*, 15 March 1936, p. 4).

⁵³For a full discussion of this complex issue, see my "Return to the Pure Sources: The Ideology and Text-Critical Legacy of the First Bruckner *Gesamtausgabe*," in *Bruckner Studies*, ed. Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson (Cambridge, forthcoming).

⁵⁴"Ob und inwieweit durch diesen Fund die Fragen der Authentizität der ursprünglichen Druckausgaben geklärt werden wird, wird wohl erst die genaue wissenschaftliche Untersuchung ergeben" (Orel, "Ein Bruckner-Fund," *Die Pause* 5 [1940], 44 [41–44]).

⁵⁵"Die von Bruckner genauestens durchgearbeitete Stichvorlage ist die jüngste bisher bekannte, voll beglaubigte Quelle für die IV. Sinfonie, sie offenbart nach dem heutigen Stande den letzten klar erkennbaren Willen Bruckners für die Textgestaltung der IV. Sinfonie, sie ist die 'Fassung letzter Hand,' für die Nachwelt der endgültige Wille Bruckners" (Orel, "Ein Bruckner-Fund [Die Endfassung der IV. Symphony]," p. 324).

⁵⁶Even in the preface of his edition of the third version score, Hans Redlich cast some doubt on the credibility of this version: "It seems quite certain that the published score of 1889 contains a number of emendations of doubtful authenticity" (p. vi).

the full original text, with the performance indications from 1888 removed, can soon be restored to the *Gesamtausgabe*.⁵⁷ Apparently Haas was prepared to admit the third version of the Fourth Symphony to the canon of Bruckner's work, but was prevented from doing so by the German surrender in 1945 and his subsequent removal as editor of the *Gesamtausgabe*.

Haas's successor, Leopold Nowak, was not convinced that the third version originated with Bruckner and refused to admit it to the *Gesamtausgabe*. Nowak was familiar with the *Stichvorlage*, but did not accept its authority since Bruckner did not sign the document: "He did not sign it, thus his original [that is, the second version] was to be valid 'for later times'."⁵⁸ But this evidence is hardly conclusive: true, Bruckner did as a rule sign his manuscripts, but he did not sign copyist's scores; his failure to do so in this instance seems outweighed by other evidence. Nowak also adopted some of Haas's (now discredited) arguments against the authority of the third version; for example, he repeated Haas's suggestion that this text could not be authentic because it did not follow the instructions Bruckner wrote on the autograph of the second version that the score not be abbreviated in its printed edition.⁵⁹ Nowak echoed Haas's argument linking Levi's rejection of the Eighth Symphony with Bruckner's decision to revise the Fourth Symphony. This position founders on the fact that the preparation of the third version was under

way before Levi rejected the first version of the Eighth Symphony in October 1887. Aware of this problem of chronology, Nowak proposed a refinement of Haas's argument: "Under the shattering impact of Levi's rejection of his Eighth Symphony in the autumn of 1887, Bruckner found himself ready to accept the third version of his Fourth Symphony, which did not originate with him."⁶⁰ Nowak seems to suggest that although Bruckner had already agreed to let Löwe reorchestrate the Fourth Symphony, it was not until his psyche was shaken that he could accept Löwe's revisions. Once again, a modern editor took it on himself to undo what he saw as textual compromises born of Bruckner's unreasonable willingness to collaborate.

While Nowak did at least present arguable reasons for rejecting the *Stichvorlage*, other writers—especially those writing in nonscholarly contexts—have relied on far less thoughtful dismissals of the third version. Many of these writers have simply ignored the existence of the *Stichvorlage* or have repeated old arguments from the 1930s.⁶¹ Perhaps the most influential instance is Deryck Cooke's well-known article "The Bruckner Problem Simplified."⁶² Cooke worked at a time when access to Bruckner's manuscripts was at best difficult, thus he tended to recycle the existing secondary literature.⁶³ In this much-read essay, Cooke reiterated Nowak's claim that Bruckner "withheld his ultimate sanction by refusing to sign

⁵⁷"Da die Stichvorlage von 1889 [-in Fremdschrift-] aufgefunden wurde, kann in der Gesamtausgabe demnächst der volle ursprüngliche Text wiederhergestellt werden, also mit Beseitigung der Ausführungszeiten von 1888" (*Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, 4. Band: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur (Originalfassung)*, ed. Robert Haas [Leipzig, 1944], p. 1).

⁵⁸"Er unterschrieb nicht, denn sein Original soll gelten, aber 'für spätere Zeiten'" (Nowak, foreword, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, Band IV/2*). Bruckner's failure to sign this *Stichvorlage* has been cited as a sign of its inauthenticity by several other scholars; see, for example, Franz Grasberger, *Anton Bruckner: zum 150. Geburtstag: Eine Ausstellung im Prunksaal der Österreichische Nationalbibliothek* (Vienna, n.d. [1974]), p. 32.

⁵⁹See Nowak, foreword, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, Band IV/2*. See also Nowak, "Neues zu Anton Bruckners 'Romantischer,'" *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 8 (1953), 163, rpt. in Nowak, *Über Anton Bruckner: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1936–1984* (Vienna, 1985), p. 26; and van Zwol, "Bruckners Vierte Symphonie," pp. 28–29.

⁶⁰"Unter dem erschütternden Eindruck der Zurückweisung seiner VIII. Symphonie durch Levi im Herbst 1887, findet Bruckner sich bereit, diese nicht von ihm stammende dritte Fassung seiner IV. [Symphonie] durchzusehen" (Nowak, foreword, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, Band IV/2*).

⁶¹See, for example, Erwin Doernberg, *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner* (London, 1960; rpt. New York, 1968), esp. "The Original Versions of Bruckner's Work," pp. 113–24, which paraphrases arguments made in the 1930s by Max Auer, Fritz Oeser, and Robert Haas. Also compare the similar attitude in Robert Simpson, *The Essence of Bruckner* (rev. edn. London, 1992).

⁶²Cooke, "The Bruckner Problem Simplified," pp. 59–62.

⁶³In the 1960s and 70s, Nowak guarded the Bruckner manuscripts in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek quite jealously. It may be that Cooke was not permitted to study them. Hans Redlich, for one, was denied access to these sources; see Redlich's prefatory essay to his edition of Bruckner's Mass in F Minor (Edition Eulenberg no. 961) (London, 1967), p. 40.

the copy sent to the printer" and maintained further that the "Wagnerian orchestration," "the recasting of the actual texture," and "the pointless cuts in the scherzo and finale invalidate the Löwe-Schalk score," his term for the third version.⁶⁴

Cooke also attempted to buttress his dismissal of the third version of the Fourth Symphony by repeating a suggestion first made by Redlich in the preface to his edition of the symphony—namely, that in 1890 Bruckner made a fresh copy of the second version.⁶⁵ This act, Cooke wrote, "could be considered not only (as Redlich admits) a 'silent protest' against the publication of the Löwe-Schalk score in 1890, but also an annulment of the revision made (in what circumstances we do not know) for Seidl's performance of 1886. It seems undeniable that Bruckner's final decision was to abide by his first definitive version of 1880."⁶⁶ Were it true that Bruckner made such a copy, Cooke's claim would merit consideration. But Bruckner never did. Redlich and Cooke were misled by a photograph in Haas's biography of Bruckner.⁶⁷ This photograph, which shows the first page of Bruckner's autograph score of the second version, is cropped in such a way that the date "18. Jänner 1878"—which is mentioned by Haas—seems to read "18. Jänner 1890."⁶⁸ Unfortunately, Cooke's is not an isolated example.⁶⁹ It is largely because of such unfounded claims that the editorial view promulgated by the *Gesamtausgabe* in the 1930s and its stories of Bruckner's psychological naiveté and neurotic uncertainty continue to shape public consciousness about Bruckner.

⁶⁴Cooke, "The Bruckner Problem Simplified," pp. 59–60.

⁶⁵Redlich, preface to *Anton Bruckner Symphony No. 4 in E♭ Major (The Romantic)*, ed. Hans F. Redlich (London, 1955), pp. v–vi.

⁶⁶Cooke, "The Bruckner Problem Simplified," p. 61.

⁶⁷Haas, *Anton Bruckner* (Potsdam, 1934), plate IV, following p. 128.

⁶⁸Redlich did state that Haas never mentioned the 1890 date. See Redlich, preface, *Bruckner Symphony No. 4*, n. 12, p. ix.

⁶⁹See, for example, Richard Osborne, "The Gramophone Collection: Bruckner," *Gramophone* 69 (August 1991), 33–36, which closely follows Cooke's lead.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE THIRD VERSION RECONSIDERED

BENJAMIN
MARCUS
KORSTVEDT
Bruckner's
Fourth

Schalk's letter of May 1887, which states that Löwe had "reorchestrated many parts of the Romantic," does raise important questions about the status of the third version: without concluding that Schalk was somehow mistaken or deliberately lying, one is obliged to conclude that Löwe must indeed have played a significant role in the preparation of the third version. Yet, especially in light of the evidence laid out above, Schalk's letter is not adequate justification of the prevalent conviction that the third version is "inauthentic," that it was prepared without Bruckner's participation—or even his full awareness—and was accepted by him grudgingly, if at all. Indeed, to hold dogmatically that the third version is illegitimate is to play too freely with implausibility: for the sake of temporary expedience, Bruckner first permitted other people to rewrite his symphony; he then published it under his own name without protest or any visible sign of dissent, all the while secretly believing that the unpublished second version was the "real" one—presumably in the hope that posterity would resurrect it.

Whatever specific evidence they draw on, efforts to dismiss the third version have been grounded by what Jerome McGann has called the "Romantic ideology" of authorship, which constructs the author as an autonomous agent who creates in a cultural space ideally free from social, political, or even material influence.⁷⁰ In the field of textual criticism, this ideology has supported two crucial assumptions: first, that authorship is—or ought to be—a purely personal process; and, second, that therefore modern critical editors ought to attempt to recover a text free from any external influence. Within this conceptual framework, it has proven impossible to comprehend the third version of the Fourth Symphony. If we, however, rethink our text-critical approach and enlarge and

⁷⁰Jerome McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Chicago, 1983; rpt. Charlottesville, 1992), p. 42.

historicize the category "authorial intention," it is possible to reconcile the complex authorship of this text with Bruckner's clear acceptance of it as authoritative.

We begin by acknowledging that Bruckner did not prepare the third version of the Fourth Symphony without assistance; in revising the score he enlisted the aid of Ferdinand Löwe and perhaps Franz and Joseph Schalk. We must recognize too that this circumstance was by no means extraordinary. In the age of print, authorial intentions ordinarily include the intention to publish, and publication is inevitably collaborative.⁷¹ Not only does publication involve editors, proofreaders, and engravers, but it draws texts into the sphere of public discourse, the sphere in which meaning emerges. As Miroslav Cervenka has argued, the "act of publication" transforms a text: what had been merely a "private affair" becomes "a socio-cultural fact."⁷² Pursuing this line of reasoning, McGann has suggested that "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," and since the most important locus of this engagement is publication, published texts are the most authoritative.⁷³ Indeed if we accept that "the material facts of literature's [and music's] making are neither contextual nor subtextual but, in a primary and inherent sense, textual," then published texts carry a certain depth and legitimacy of meaning only partially realized in unpublished manuscripts.⁷⁴

Moreover, an element of social negotiation inheres in all artistic creation. Creative activity—including musical composition—typically involves collaboration between author and advisors of various sorts, be they sympathetic

readers or practical interpreters. Although Bruckner's collaboration is hard to reconcile with the mythology of the solitary creator, to dismiss the first published edition of the Fourth Symphony in pursuit of a "pure" authorial text is to insist on a principle contradicted by Bruckner's own actions. In other words, this collaboration is not grounds to reject this text; Bruckner's compositional intentions included the intention to collaborate in this way; whether this pleases us or conforms to our notions of what composers should do is immaterial.

Uncertainty must remain about how this collaboration unfolded in practice. There is no written record of it; probably much of it occurred in face-to-face conversation. In the absence of a documentary record of this process, any conclusions that might be drawn must (of course) be largely speculative. I believe that the most likely scenario runs something like this. Having reached agreement with Gutmann to publish the Fourth Symphony, Bruckner decided to revise the symphony before releasing it to the public. (There is no reason to believe that Gutmann would have had anything to do with this decision; once he received his fee he would have published any text that Bruckner submitted to him.) During this process, presumably in early 1887, Bruckner undoubtedly discussed possible revisions with Löwe and Franz Schalk and then presumably gave instructions to his copyists, whether verbal or written, that he thought adequate to guide the preparation of the initial layer of the *Stichvorlage*. In considering this hypotheses, bear in mind that the original textual layer of the *Stichvorlage* probably incorporated little more than the abbreviations to the scherzo and the finale and a partial revamping of the orchestral texture. This score probably did not originally include many of the most thoroughgoing changes (for example, the reorchestration of mm. 305–32 of the first movement and the coda of the finale); these resulted primarily from Bruckner's revisions of February 1888. All of the revisions contained in the initial text of the *Stichvorlage* could well have been made on the basis of Bruckner's verbal instructions and directions. Other revisions, including many of the changed tempo indications, probably arose during rehearsals. Finally, in February 1888, Bruckner himself

⁷¹On this point, see Peter Shillingsburg, "An Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism," *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989), 60.

⁷²Miroslav Cervenka, "Textologie und Semiotik," in *Texte und Varianten: Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*, ed. Günter Martens and Hans Zeller (Munich, 1971), p. 144.

⁷³McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*, p. 75.

⁷⁴John Sutherland, "Publishing History: A Hole at the Centre of Literary Sociology," *Critical Inquiry* 14 (1988), 584.

made a final set of revisions after hearing the first performance.⁷⁵

Bruckner's revision of the Fourth Symphony in 1887–88 was in keeping with his lifelong tendency to revise his work. Indeed, this instance seems less open to critical gainsaying than do several others: at least three times Bruckner decided to revise symphonies against the advice of others or canceled a performance in order to revise.⁷⁶ Similarly, any appeal to his supposed psychological peculiarities—either a neurotic need to revise or an inability to resist persuasion—are unnecessary to explain the revisions he made in preparing the third version. Not only had Bruckner's musical thinking evolved considerably between 1880 and 1887, but the composer had definite, practical reasons to revise the second version. His scores were proving extraordinarily difficult for both

⁷⁵It is not clear why Gutmann took more than a year to publish the symphony after he received the *Stichvorlage* in May or June of 1888. While some additional editing during this time is not out of the question, it seems unlikely that any significant changes could have been made during this period. Gutmann's edition is textually all but identical with the *Stichvorlage*, and because this manuscript appears not to have been revised after February 1888, Gutmann's slowness in producing the printed score was almost certainly not the result of last-minute revision by either Bruckner or someone else. More likely, the delay was due simply to Gutmann's own tardiness. The firm was not skilled at producing orchestral scores, rather it specialized in piano music and various types of salon music. Bruckner had not been satisfied with Gutmann's work in publishing the Seventh Symphony and the Quintet, and this dissatisfaction was undoubtedly why Bruckner had sought another publisher before settling on Gutmann. Bruckner's doubts about the quality of Gutmann's work seem to have been well founded: the initial state of Gutmann's edition of the Fourth Symphony (which appeared in September 1889) contained a number of misprints. Under pressure, Gutmann produced a corrected text in 1890; see my *First Edition of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony*, pp. 314–16.

⁷⁶As is evident, Bruckner's desire to revise the first version of his Fourth Symphony in 1877 prompted him to cancel the performance that Bilsé had planned. In 1888 Bruckner stuck to his plan to revise the Third Symphony despite Gustav Mahler's counsel not to do so (see Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*, pp. 132–36). In 1889 Bruckner insisted on revising his First Symphony, even though this decision forced him to cancel a planned performance by the Vienna Philharmonic and threatened to cost him a substantial sum. This episode is recounted in Clemens Hellsberg, *Demokratie der Könige: Die Geschichte der Wiener Philharmoniker* (Zurich, 1992), pp. 272–73. I am grateful to Dr. Hellsberg for bringing this story to my attention.

conductors and players, and the composer must have been aware of this.⁷⁷ Although the changes to the recapitulation of the finale and to the reprise of the scherzo reflect a new compositional concept, many of the other revisions, particularly those to the orchestration and especially the brass, seem designed to minimize unnecessary difficulties in performance.⁷⁸ These changes also likely reflect Bruckner's experience of hearing the work performed; indeed, they may have resulted more from a clearer understanding of how to orchestrate an imagined sonority than from a change in the imagined sonority itself. In other words, Bruckner did not change his mind about what he wanted to hear but rather about the way to get it, presumably after having heard the effect of his original scoring.

Another important part of the process of making the score more amenable to practical use was to notate explicitly many nuances of tempo, dynamics, articulation, and phrasing that had been left unwritten in the second version. As a rule, in the 1870s and 80s Bruckner was present at performances of his symphonies, and he often participated in rehearsals.⁷⁹ Moreover, many,

⁷⁷To cite one example, as a young violinist, Franz Schalk participated in the second performance of the second version of the Fourth Symphony on 10 December 1881 in Karlsruhe under Felix Mottl. He reported to his brother Joseph that the work was frankly beyond the capabilities of the orchestra, that the players openly rebelled against the symphony, and that Mottl persuaded them to play the work only by threatening to quit. Liszt's Dante Symphony, not an easy work by any standard, was on the same program. See Franz Schalk's letter, dated 10 December 1881, to Joseph Schalk (F 18 Schalk 158/3/5); quoted in Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*, pp. 46–47.

⁷⁸Franz Liszt reportedly commented on such problems in the brass. After the performance of the first and third movements of the second version of the symphony in Sondershausen on 6 June 1886, August Göllerich, who was a pupil of both Liszt and Bruckner, wrote: "In the first movement of the coarse and under-composed Eb-Major Symphony, Liszt's wholly heterogeneous nature took exception to the armor-plated triplet theme on the 'brutal horns'" (Die ganz heterogene Natur Liszts stieß sich im ersten Satze der derb und zu wenig ausgearbeitet gebrachten "Es-Dur Symphonie" bei dem geharnischten Triolenthema an den "brutalen Hörner") (Göllerich, *Franz Liszt* [Berlin, 1908], pp. 155–56).

⁷⁹Bruckner felt that his presence at rehearsals of his works was very important. For example, on 3 March 1887, following some disputatious rehearsals for a performance of the Fifth Symphony on two pianos, Bruckner wrote to Joseph Schalk: "Yesterday brought me to the firm decision

if not most, of the few performances that were given in these years without Bruckner's presence were led by conductors who were personally acquainted with Bruckner.⁸⁰ In manuscript scores with such limited circulation, Bruckner was under less constraint to notate fully all performance indications, but when preparing his scores for publication he invariably wrote out his performance indications more fully.⁸¹ (This means, incidentally, that Bruckner's manuscript scores and the modern editions based on them, with their relative absence of notated tempo changes and dynamic nuances, cannot be considered adequately complete representations of Bruckner's conception of the way these works were to be performed, nor do they certainly provide a clear picture of nineteenth-century performance styles.)

In the course of these revisions, Bruckner undoubtedly sought the advice of Löwe and the Schalks, but there is no reason to suppose that Bruckner did so unreasonably or that he followed their suggestions slavishly. At the very least, old stories suggesting that Bruckner was

definitely to refuse *all* performance of my works if they are not preceded by more than a week of painstaking study—and indeed in my presence" (Der gestrige Tag brachte mich zu dem festesten Entschlusse, mich für *alle* Aufführungen meiniger Werke auf das entschiedenste zu bedanken, wenn nicht vorher ein mehrere *wochenlanges gründliches* Studium vorhergegangen ist—und zwar ein Studium in meiner Gegenwart) (quoted in Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner*, p. 114).

⁸⁰Bruckner himself conducted the first performances of his First, Second, and Third Symphonies. The first performance of a Bruckner symphony conducted by someone other than the composer was the premiere of the Fourth Symphony in Vienna, on 20 February 1881, under Hans Richter. The first performance given outside of the composer's presence was the second performance of the Fourth Symphony in Karlsruhe under Mottl, on 10 December 1881. See the list of performances in Göllicher and Auer, *Anton Bruckner*, 4/4, pp. 232–60.

The two most important German exponents of Bruckner's works were Hermann Levi and Arthur Nikisch. Levi was obviously closely associated with Bruckner. Nikisch was personally acquainted with Bruckner's interpretive approach; he had been won over to Bruckner's cause when, at seventeen, he played second violin in the first performance of the Second Symphony, conducted by Bruckner on 26 October 1873. See Steffen Lieberwirth, *Anton Bruckner und Leipzig*, Anton Bruckner Dokumente und Studien 6 (Graz, 1988), p. 17.

⁸¹Donald H. Reiman has discussed the importance of the distinction between public and private sources; see his "Public and Private in the Study of Manuscripts," *Text* 6 (1994), 49–62.

manipulated against his will should be rejected. In the 1930s—when Haas's text-critical regime was ascendant and promulgating dark rumors that Bruckner had been exploited—several of Bruckner's old friends and students protested this point. Without exception, they argued that, although Bruckner may have consulted others, he certainly did not accept advice with which he did not agree. Friedrich Eckstein, who had studied with Bruckner both at the Conservatory and privately in the 1880s, wrote:

For me there is no doubt that all of the differences between the printed scores and the [autograph] manuscripts had Bruckner's authorization. . . . It is certainly true that these conductors [namely Franz Schalk, Löwe, and Gustav Mahler] gave Bruckner advice at least about changes in instrumentation and also about tempo and dynamic indications. But it was merely advice, and if it found its way in to the long-accepted printed scores, that means that Bruckner accepted it. Accepted it freely—I can testify that it was impossible to coerce him in artistic matters.⁸²

Although Bruckner's modern editors have framed his collaboration as a process of coercion, this view is, in short, not justified historically.⁸³ Moreover, any such interpretation is

⁸²"Für mich steht es außer Zweifel, daß alle Änderungen der Druckvorlagen gegenüber der Handschriften die Billigung Bruckners hatten. . . . Es ist gewiß, daß die genannten Dirigenten Bruckner Ratschläge mindestens zu Instrumentationsänderungen gaben, auch zu Änderungen der Tempo- und der Stärkebezeichnungen. Aber es waren lediglich Ratschläge, und wenn sie sich in den bisher geltenden Drucken finden, so bedeutet das, daß Bruckner sie angenommen hat. Freiwillig angenommen—denn ich kann bezeugen, daß es unmöglich war, ihm in künstlerischen Dingen Gewalt anzutun" (quoted in "Leidenschaftliche Erörterungen um Bruckner," *Anbruch* 18 [1936], 48; this unsigned article was probably written by Paul Stefan).

⁸³Perhaps it is worth stressing that such collaboration was by no means unheard of during the late nineteenth century; think, for example, of Brahms's Violin Concerto and Liszt's symphonic poems. These three instances—Brahms's concerto, Liszt's symphonic poems, and Bruckner's symphony—have one important common denominator: in each case, a composer who performed only on keyboard instruments and who had begun to write orchestral music only relatively late in his career sought assistance in instrumentation from musicians more expert and experienced in such matters. Note too that in each case collaboration only occurred after composition was relatively far advanced and aimed primarily at making a work suitable for practical performance.

incompatible with a nuanced understanding of the dynamics of interpersonal action. As Stephen Mailloux has written:

A Foucauldian notion of power rejects the usefulness of viewing the theoretical issue in editing as a choice between an unconstrained author's intentions and an equally problematic collective authorship. Power, as a network of force relations, works positively as well as negatively, constraining and enabling the individual agent who is constituted as an authoring subject, one who is never "unconstrained" in the ideal Platonic sense.⁸⁴

Mailloux's position means to overcome the belief, which has been a powerful force in Bruckner reception, that since publication inevitably involves collaboration, it must degrade a text by compromising its authorial purity. Bruckner's collaboration with Löwe and Schalk such as it was may, in some abstract sense, have constrained Bruckner's pure authorial conception. But there is no reason to conclude that it was coercive; rather, it empowered Bruckner to disseminate *his* work to the public in a guise that benefited from the expertise of others.

TOWARD A NEW UNDERSTANDING OF THE THIRD VERSION

Once we accept the legitimacy of the third version of the Fourth Symphony and recognize Bruckner's authorship of it, it can be admitted without apology to the canon of his works, and it will begin to fit into the critical discourse about Bruckner's music. This admission does not entail claiming that the third version is the sole "authentic text" of the Fourth Symphony. There exist several texts of the work (including those that are now called the first, second, and third version) that Bruckner regarded as definitive at one time or another, and all of these have claims to our attention. Indeed, this textual multiplicity throws into question the appropriateness of couching the critical issues surrounding the Fourth Symphony in terms of

⁸⁴Stephen Mailloux, "The Rhetorical Politics of Editing: A Response to Eggert, Greetham, and Cohen and Jackson," in *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory*, ed. Philip Cohen (Charlottesville, 1991), p. 130.

a narrowly conceived model of textual authenticity. Similarly, recognizing the third version as authorial will doubtless motivate reevaluation of its musical value. As the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of this text demonstrates, estimations of its authorship have moved in concert with musical judgements.

In the 1920s and early 1930s—when it was innocently assumed that the third version was simply the score of "Bruckner's Fourth Symphony"—several critics, notably Ernst Kurth and Donald Francis Tovey, considered the score a masterwork.⁸⁵ Interestingly enough, both Kurth and Tovey singled out for praise features unique to the third version. For example, in 1935 Tovey commented on the reprise of the scherzo and its "extremely effective short cut from the first stage of the exposition to the beginning of the development, the sudden hush being highly dramatic." He also wrote of the beginning of the recapitulation of the first movement (mm. 365ff.): "Few things in orchestration are more impressive than the new depth of Ex. 1 [the opening horn call], in octaves, with a flowing figure in muted violins [the violins are muted only in the third version] surrounding it as with clouds of incense."⁸⁶ In 1925 Ernst Kurth had similarly praised the final version of this passage; he wrote that Bruckner's tempo indication "so ruhig und leise als möglich" (as calmly and softly as possible) captured the "rapt character" of a passage in which the "entrance of the theme appears like a 'Klangvision'." Kurth also admired the effect of beginning the recapitulation of the finale (at m. 385) with the second theme group in D minor. Perhaps the most provocative praise Kurth offered this final version was his lauding of the new woodwind parts Bruckner added to the choralelike passage near the end of the development section (mm. 305ff.). Kurth heard this woodwind music as a transformation of the second theme of the

⁸⁵As late as 1939, the year before his death, Donald F. Tovey was unconvinced by the claims of the *Gesamtausgabe*. See his comments in "Retrospect and Corrigenda," in *Essays in Musical Analysis, Volume VI: Supplementary Essays, Glossary and Index* (London, 1939), p. 144.

⁸⁶Tovey, "Bruckner: Romantic Symphony in E Flat Major, No. 4," in *Essays in Musical Analysis, Volume II: Symphonies (II), Variations and Orchestral Polyphony* (London, 1935), pp. 77, 74.

movement (mm. 51*ff.*); its presence prompted Kurth to suggest, perhaps a bit fancifully, that this passage was a synthesis of the three main themes of the movement ("eine Synthese der drei Themen!"), with the brass chorale fusing elements of the first and third themes of the movement.⁸⁷

Criticism follows changes in the prevailing text-critical wisdom. More recent critics have seen the third version as a corrupt text and have condemned it as a musical distortion. Thus, in *The Essence of Bruckner*, Robert Simpson wrote that Bruckner "must surely have been appalled, in his helpless way, at the 'improvements' made in the spurious Gutmann edition of 1889, a model of how to ruin glorious music." Simpson found the revisions in mm. 305–32 of the first movement so patently ridiculous that no explanation was needed: "But to turn it into a *pizzicato*, to add triplets rippling prettily up and down in the flutes and oboes, to make the horns play pulsating har-

monies!"⁸⁸ Simpson's "triplets rippling prettily up and down in the flutes and oboes" are, of course, what Kurth identified as a trenchant transformation of the second theme. Ironically enough, the offensive wind and brass parts in this passage were written in the *Stichvorlage* by Bruckner himself after the first performance.

The reception of Bruckner's music has long been based in a central mythology about the authorship, revision, and publication of his works. Clearly it is time to reexamine this entire topic more broadly, and to reevaluate how traditions of biography, textual criticism, and analysis have fostered both insight and, more importantly, misperception. For the moment, however, if the third version of the Fourth Symphony strikes us as musically absurd, at least we can ascribe this absurdity to Bruckner himself. Of course, it might be that this "absurdity" resides not in the music, but in our own critical estimations of it.



⁸⁷Kurth, *Bruckner* (Berlin, 1925), II, 625, 622–23.

⁸⁸Simpson, *The Essence of Bruckner*, p. 93. In the original edition of the book, this passage read: "But to turn it into a *pizzicato*, to add triplets rippling prettily up and down in the flutes and oboes, to make the horns play pulsating harmonies! Bruckner cannot have committed such a crime" (p. 87).