

The Finale of Bruckner's Ninth: an alternative vision

By Jacques Roelands

[The present article is based on a more extensive work not yet published. It consists of a performing version without coda, preceded by an introduction and critical account.]

In the last decades three performing versions of the incomplete Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony have been presented and performed more or less successfully. In 1984 and 1985 there were performances of William Carragan's version in New York and in Utrecht and Amsterdam in the Netherlands. In 1986 Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca presented their version in Berlin and Milan. Later, from 1991 on, there were several performances of a new score by Samale, Phillips, Mazzuca and Cohrs. This score is built on Samale and Mazzuca's work, with some important changes. Recently Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs presented this version in Moscow (2000) and, as one could read in *The Bruckner Journal*, in Tokyo (2001) with some (minor?) changes of his own. There were reviews in newspapers by critics of whom most, if not all, got acquainted with the work for the first time and had no knowledge of the history and problems of the piece. As a matter of course these reviews were momentary impressions and not thorough discussions of the manuscript material and the completions in the performing versions. For that one must study the editions and publications concerning the work.

The first edition was published in 1934 by Alfred Orel in the form of a transcription of all the then available manuscripts.¹ This edition gives a valuable notion of the history of the creation of the piece, but has a great number of faults and misunderstandings. As a result, performing versions based on Orel (there exist about ten) are unreliable. William Carragan seems to be the first who returned to the manuscript, albeit in the form of photocopies. His score is not always philologically right and retains some of Orel's misunderstandings. A revision, which includes new scholarship, was performed recently in Saratoga, California.²

John Phillips, one of the authors of the afore mentioned performing version, published in the *Bruckner Jahrbuch 1989/90* a monumental article, *Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der neunten Sinfonie Anton Bruckners*, about the finale problem, which outdated most of the older publications.³ Moreover, sixty years after the Orel edition, he published in the *Bruckner Gesamtausgabe* a *Reconstruction*⁴ of the finale and, in 1996, the facsimile edition of the manuscripts⁵. For the first time, discussion based on the facts is possible, but where is this discussion? There are editions, performances, releases on LP and CD and superficial reviews but no real judgements of the reconstruction or comparisons of the performing versions.⁶ This is what I have tried to do for some years and this article is meant to be a short survey of the results. These are provisional because the announced *Study-volume* by John Phillips, with the latest results of his investigation of the manuscripts, has not yet been published. A new score of the S/P/M/C version is also to be expected and Gunnar Cohrs will publish a volume on the piece in the series *Musik-Konzepte*. What did appear is a *Dokumentation des Fragments*⁷ (*Documentation of the fragment*), meant to 'present the surviving fragments of the score and, as far as can be established philologically, reconstruction of its missing sections in a practical, performable version [...]', with joining text. Nikolaus Harnoncourt gave the first performance in 1999, without the coda sketches.

First, one could ask if and why a piece of which more than one third is not transmitted to us in the last form in which the composer put it on paper, should be made performable. The work not only is left incomplete as a result of the composer's death, but also portions are lost by an

irresponsible dealing with the manuscripts Bruckner left. So we have: a largely complete exposition (with an older form of the very beginning) of which the second theme group, the *Gesangsperiode*, is also only known in an older form; two gaps in the beginning of the development, for which only problematical sketches exist; a gap - partly in sketch - in the fugue which forms a part of the further development; and for the rest a score with the strings for the most part complete but with fewer and fewer wind parts and again three lacunae, of which one lacks any sketches. Moreover the greatest problem lies in the totally absent coda, where we have only a few very problematical sketches. How much Bruckner do we hear in the performing versions, which give the impression of a complete work, including a monumental coda? As for me, I would like to hear a continuous work, if it cannot be helped without coda, but very near to what Bruckner left. This means reconstructing the continuity in the first place, filling in the gaps and, only after that, some - the least possible - necessary additions regarding instrumentation. This is a much more moderate approach than in the three known versions. But, returning to our question: what are the arguments for making a performable reconstruction? The first is the very determined will of the composer to complete the work. Bruckner never regarded his last symphony as a three-movement work. The serene end of the Adagio is most certainly not Bruckner's end of the symphony. If he could not complete it, his *Te Deum* should serve as finale. A century of performing practice has established a false picture of Bruckner's intentions. Moreover, there are so many wrong ideas and myths⁸ about the finale that it is necessary to reveal the facts to an interested public. All this is very convincingly described in Phillips's article *Neue Erkenntnisse*.

Given the reasons to make the work accessible to a greater public (with respect for those who are against any such undertaking), next comes the question if it is really possible to make an accountable performing version. I would like to quote Leopold Nowak: "*The symphony can in no way be completed, because nobody can know how Bruckner would have accomplished it, and because nobody had that fullness of spirit and genius which Bruckner possessed.*"⁹

I agree with Nowak regarding the unknown coda and the final instrumental form, but think that it is possible to make an acceptable, philologically accountable and performable reconstruction of the piece up to that point.

Phillips's *Reconstruction* of the structure is the best result so far and starting point for every other attempt, but in some instances, which will be reviewed later on, one can criticize it. About the reconstruction, that is the use of existing material in the overall structure of the piece, there is room for discussion. Of course the bridging of the gaps, where there is no or insufficient original material, has subjective elements and different solutions remain possible. Regarding instrumentation, my position is that one should supplement no more than necessary. I don't think we should give the work the final touch, because this can easily spoil it.

Here is the place to cite the starting points of the performing versions. Carragan, in his foreword to the score,¹⁰ writes: '*The purpose of the completion is to present Bruckner's final utterances faithfully, in such a way that the listener experiences the music as part of a unified Brucknerian structure. Accordingly, the sketches are retained without alteration, each in what appears to be its most fully thought-out form, and are supplemented both vertically and horizontally in a manner consistent with Bruckner's compositional methods.*' The last part shows the will to produce a fully completed work.

Very similarly, Phillips, *Concerning the performing version* of Samale/Phillips/Mazzuca/Cohrs:¹¹ '*The intention of this score is to present as faithfully as possible the surviving*

fragments of the Finale of the Ninth Symphony of Anton Bruckner in a continuous, performable concert version, with the least editorial additions necessary for the realisation of that end. [...] The guiding editorial principle of the authors has moreover been to present a score conforming as closely as possible to the "ideal form" in which Bruckner might have been expected to have left the autograph had he lived to see its completion, inclusive even of such details as characteristic articulation and bowing. 'The least editorial additions necessary' in the first sentence clashes with the 'moreover' in the second, which leaves much room for speculation (and here I don't mean articulation and bowing). The second sentence is also contrary to Phillips's statement at another point: *'A completion shouldn't try to appropriate the prerogatives of the composer; in that case the completion becomes an 'adaptation'. The performing version of an 'incompleted' work shouldn't go further than to make possible a realisation in sound and by doing so to offer a representation conforming to the original intention, though it be only approximately.*'¹² Here, I fully agree with Phillips and I have tried to follow this principle in my own performing version, without coda.

The remainder of this article is a short, but more detailed review of the most important problems and the different solutions.

But first, a short picture of Bruckner's very systematic manner of work. First there are particella sketches on 3 to 5 staves with the first inspirations. Some of these contain longer passages. There is for instance one continuous particella with the complete first and second theme groups. After that, these sketches are worked out on bifolios (*Bogen*), prepared with measure divisions and instrument names. The bifolios are laid one on top of the other and numbered. So the composer can easily replace a bifolio with a later revision. There are many replaced bifolios. Bruckner also used prepared bifolios for so-called *Satzverlaufsentwürfe* [*SVE*] or *Continuity drafts*. These represent an intermediate stage between the particella sketches and the numbered bifolios. Some of these *Continuity drafts* are also numbered and can be considered as unelaborated score bifolios.

Bruckner elaborated first the so-called *Streichersatz* (strings) with only some important wind parts, maybe even to the end of the piece, and then the remaining instrumentation. What we have is a score in progress with many fully orchestrated passages, not a collection of unconnected sketches. At several points we possess only older, replaced bifolios, for instance the very first bifolio and the greatest part of the *Gesangsperiode* (lyrical period). Where the most recent, possibly 'definitive' bifolio is missing, one has to fall back on older forms, if available. In some instances there are only sketches.

The bifolio numbers by Bruckner, and Orel's letters for the bifolio preparation are, in Phillips's *Facsimile edition* and *Reconstruction*, the basis for an elaborated system. Some examples can make it clear.

Bg. 1^dC means: Bruckner's number 1; the fourth item with the same number and bifolio preparation type C.

Bg. "2"E means: Bruckner's number 2, bifolio written after the renumbering; bifolio preparation type E. The renumbering by Bruckner of all the bifolios after no. 3 became necessary because in a late stage he rewrote Bg. 2F on two new bifolios, "2"E and "3"E.

Bg. 4C/"5" means: Bruckner renumbered the bifolio from no. 4 to no. 5; preparation type C.

Bg. ["4"] means: lost bifolio, supposedly no. 4; written after the renumbering.

SVE "15"E means: *Satzverlaufsentwurf/Continuity draft* with no. 15; preparation type E; written after the renumbering.

SVE "13"^bE means: the second SVE with no. 13; preparation type E; written after the renumbering.

SVE "13a"^bE means: as extension inserted SVE with no. 13a; preparation type E; written after the renumbering.

SVE ="13b"^bE means: unnumbered SVE, as extension inserted, supposed no. 13b; preparation type E; written after the renumbering.

In reconstructing the continuity of the piece, two items are recurrent. First, the connection of bifolios, SVE, and sketches, according to a logical history of the composition process. Second, Bruckner's famous metrical numbering, which can help to avoid wrong connections.¹³ Here the most problematical fragments and the solutions of Carragan (his version of 1985, see note 2), Samale/Mazzuca¹⁴ (abbrev. S/M) and Samale/Phillips/Mazzuca/Cohrs (abbrev. S/P/M/C) will be reviewed and compared with Phillips's *Reconstruction*. It is true that the Samale/Mazzuca score has been withdrawn, but as will be seen, a great deal of it returns in the S/P/M/C score and the changes in the latter are not always favourable. S/M is also reviewed because it can elucidate some of the problems of the piece. In some cases, which will be mentioned, Phillips's *Documentation of the fragment* seems to distance itself from the S/P/M/C performing version. In other places it takes over, albeit in small notes, supplementations from that version. In reviewing a problematical fragment, I will offer my own solution, following from the argument.

1. Introduction

As stated, bifolio (*Bogen*)1 is already problematical. Bg. 1^dC (here we cannot go into all the other 20 bifolios nr. 1) was completed by Bruckner, but became later subject to revisions of the metrical numbers and to erasures. Nevertheless it is the best we have and it was used by Carragan and Samale/Mazzuca.

S/P/M/C make up a new Bg.1 from three different sources: one of the oldest sketches, the possibly late but undecisive and very incomplete Bg. 1^eE and the last four measures of 1^dC. By this operation, the very first timpani note changes from G to A and the flute motif at the end of the introduction perishes. Phillips prints in his reconstruction score 1^eE as an alternative beneath 1^dC, but the fact that p. 4 of 1^eE has many obscurities and doesn't connect to 2^eE" makes this rather speculative.

Here we have the first example of a common trait of the S/P/M/C score. It tries to penetrate into an unknown stage of the composition process, possibly not accomplished by the composer and of which we certainly do not have convincing evidence. This can be necessary where no other material exists, but where we have an older form of the same passage there is no need to put oneself in the place of the composer.

In the *Documentation of the fragment* Phillips returns to the complete Bg. 1^dC. 'As a conclusive reconstruction [based on 1^eE, J.R.] (as undertaken in the *Performing Version*) appeared less valid [...] 1^dC was selected as a compromise solution.'¹⁵

Because 1^dC is older than the next Bg. 2^eE", there is a joining problem. The lighter instrumentation of the younger 2^eE" should be transferred to the last four measures of 1^dC, as S/P/M/C do. The *Documentation of the fragment* does the opposite here.

2. *Gesangsperiode* (lyrical period) in the exposition

The latest form of the greatest part of the *Gesangsperiode* is unknown, but there are replaced bifolios, which give a continuous picture of the passage in an older state, possibly revised

later. As in the Introduction, joining problems must be solved, in order to integrate these bifolios.

In fact Phillips thinks that, after writing the recapitulation of the *Gesangsperiode*, Bruckner revised it in the exposition. The only source for this is the unnumbered SVE “#”D, but integrating it needs a great deal of speculation. SVE “#”D contains only the first violin, six measures in the middle of it are empty and it seems to overlap four measures on both sides with the older bifolios 4C/”5” and 5B. The metrical numbers also cause joining problems. Carragan integrates it, taking into consideration the overlaps, so he adds 8 measures of which 6 measures are his own composition. However, Carragan does not care very much about Bruckner’s metrical numbering.

Samale/Mazzuca take into account the first overlap, but not the second. To avoid here an eightfold repetition of the motif on the same tone, 4 measures are inserted from the rejected bifolio 15C (also in sketch-form on 4C/”5”). This cannot be justified and does not return in the S/P/M/C score. As a result there is really an eightfold repetition of the main motif, albeit with different harmonisation. They added some variation by octavation and instrumentation. Phillips and S/P/M/C add 2 measures at the beginning of the passage. The situation here is rather complicated as a result of the loss of bifolios and the renumbering by Bruckner of all the bifolios after no. 3. He rewrote the 36 measures of Bg. 2F on two new bifolios, “2”E and “3”E, containing only 34 measures. So there is a gap of 2 measures between “3”E and the not renumbered but replaced 3A. Phillips tries to reconstruct content and metrical numbering of the lost ‘definitive’ bifolios, starting with the last two measures of 2F. The content of the known older bifolios 3A and 4C/”5” moves 2 measures ‘to the right’. So there remain two measures to overlap in the first page of SVE “#”D. To solve this problem, two measures are repeated at the beginning of the *Gesangsperiode*. Here his supposition is the normal bifolio preparation of 16 measures.

However, Bg. 4C/”5” (although maybe not definitive) is renumbered by Bruckner, so at some stage it must have connected to a foregoing Bg. [“4”], otherwise renumbering has no sense. This is possible by supposing that [“4”] contains 18 measures (the two ‘missing’ from Bg. 2F and the sixteen of 3A). Subdividing prepared measures is a normal procedure by Bruckner, especially in revisions, when more measures are needed. There are several bifolios where this is the case. To reconstruct the older situation therefore gives no problems regarding measure numbering and joining of the bifolios.

Phillips¹⁶ writes: *‘That Bruckner could virtually have reached the end of the movement [...] without establishing the continuity of the Gesangsperiode in the exposition, defies all comprehension of his compositional technique.’* Correct - but this is not the case; Bruckner composed the whole passage in an older form and possibly returned to it - as Phillips himself writes - only after the composition of the recapitulation. So there is no contradiction, only a shortage of material for the revised form. The different compositional stages show a clear continuous growth from the particella sketch to the last known score bifolios.

Here is the second instance where S/P/M/C and Phillips in his *Reconstruction* and even in the *Documentation of the fragment* (where he acknowledges that it is an extreme instance of his methodology¹⁷) try to reconstruct what maybe hasn’t even existed, whereas restoring an older situation is much more simple and, more important, avoids speculation. The extra, third, repetition at the beginning sounds rather unmusical and the eightfold repetition mentioned isn’t convincing either.

The six empty measures in “#”D are filled in with a passage of the continuous particella sketch, where the violins have a countermelody playing an important role in the development

and returning in somewhat changed form in the recapitulation. This *lyrical counterpoint* (Phillips) appears on none of the score bifolios in the exposition. This is one of the reasons for S/M and S/P/M/C to use “#”D. As the *lyrical counterpoint* is only four measures long, they have to add two measures of their own composition. Carragan puts the counterpoint in another place, in the next Bg. 5B, where the second violin part is empty. Therefore it would be possible to use the counterpoint without using “#”D. Orel saw it as a possibility that SVE “#”D is an eventually rejected attempt.

Another passage in the particella, named by the composer *Fis-dur Trio* (trio in F-sharp major) has a counterpoint which does not recur in the score. All three performing versions fill it in, but therefore have to change a measure of the second violin in the score. The latest bifolios show a very ascetic *Gesangsperiode*. It's possible that Bruckner intentionally left out all lyricism. Several other counterpoints from the particella don't return either in the score. Regarding a last joining problem, pencil sketches by Bruckner (*Variande*) on the last of the older bifolios, 6^CB, show the way to the later continuation on the fully completed Bg. 7C/”8”. Here Carragan uses an older form, Bg. 7B, but in that case Bruckner's *Variande* should be ignored, as belonging to the newer stage. There is also an adaptation on the last page of 7B, derived from 7C/”8”. Carragan mixes here in one passage two compositional stages. One should adapt 6^CB and use the whole of 7C/”8” or not adapt both 6^CB and 7B. Here the indistinct presentation of the passage by Orel still influenced Carragan and also Samale/Mazzuca. They used the first half of 7C/”8” and then the second half of 7B. This was corrected in S/P/M/C and in Phillips's *Reconstruction*.

3. The beginning of the development (2. *Abtheilung*)

After a fully completed third group, a gigantic chorale theme with blazing triplet string figures, new problems loom at the beginning of the development. Bruckner uses the term 2. *Abtheilung* (*second part*) for all that comes after the exposition. Here apparently two bifolios are lost, then there is the largely complete Bg. 13E/”14” and after that another bifolio is lost. These problems cannot be solved without some speculation. What we do have is a series of continuity drafts (SVE) trying different orders of motifs. Only some can be integrated in the score.

The older Bg. 12C contains the appearance in the flute of the accompaniment motif from Bruckner's *Te Deum*, and the start of a development of it in inversion. The last two measures are crossed out and there is no continuation, but the end of this development returns later on in revised form in Bg. 15D/”16”. The lost Bg. [14/”15”] must therefore have contained a revision of the second half of 12C. At the end of the foregoing 11A/”12” the composer writes *12 neu* (12 new) and letters show a new course, close to the music later sketched on SVE “13”^bE. This means a first extension. The chromatic descending line on this continuity draft ends in Bg. 13E/”14”. So we had a continuous passage, before the renumbering, with the bifolios 11A, [12 *neu*], 13E, [14], 15D. After renumbering this became: 11A/”12”, SVE “13”^bE, 13E/”14”, [14/”15”], 15D/”16”. But this is not the end of the story. Later probably another continuity draft, “13a”E dated 11. Aug. [1896] was inserted between 11A/”12” and SVE “13”^bE, a second extension. SVE “13a”E contains a threefold augmentation of the *Te Deum* motif, again in the flute. A moment of slowing down the motion before restarting the development. Nothing is certain here; there are no bifolios with an elaboration of these two SVE. Probably Bruckner couldn't complete his second revision. The probably more complete bifolio for the second gap, [14/”15”], is lost.

What precedes is based on Phillips's *Reconstruction*, with an important difference. Phillips printed yet another SVE = "13b"E, which is not numbered by the composer, has no metrical numbers and of which the last page is empty. He put it above "13"^bE. The reason is that Phillips thinks SVE = "13b"E is later than "13"^bE, and that it contains the return of the introduction motif. It has however no connection with the bifolios before and after it. After "13"^bE, there is an obvious connection. Before it a connection can be reconstructed by supposing that the first four measures on 11 August 1896 were replaced with the whole SVE "13a"E and by inserting two measures. These connect the start of the chromatic line on "13a"E with the continuation in measure 5 of "13"^bE. The reconstructed sequence of bifolios and SVE should become: 11A/"12", SVE "13a"E, [+ 2 measures], SVE "13"^bE, m. 5 etc., 13E/"14", [14/"15"], 15D/"16".

Here, by using the problematic SVE = "13b"E, S/M, Phillips and S/P/M/C again try to integrate undecisive material, resulting in more speculation than necessary. It is true that the introduction motif could anticipate 13E/"14", where it appears in a mutated form. I don't deny that the sketch could belong to a late compositional stage, but I see no indication to fit it in between other bifolios, because of the afore mentioned reasons: no number, no metrical numbers, last page empty. For this passage there exist many SVE, trying different sequences of the musical elements and indeed having a number (13 or 14) and yet not figuring in any reconstruction.

The performing version of *Samale/Mazzuca* is here the one most related to Phillips's *Reconstruction*.¹⁸ The S/P/M/C version needlessly goes a step further by changing the continuity drafts. In it the chromatic line already starts before the augmented *Te Deum* motif, eight measures earlier than in the draft, and is later on even diminished, also contrary to the draft. I don't see why; without these changes the chromatic line does connect perfectly to bifolio 13E/"14" and no problems are solved by this. The *Documentation of the fragment* sees no other way to give musical sense to this passage than to take over the course of S/P/M/C, inclusive of the diminution. Phillips acknowledges however that it is 'to some extent speculative'.¹⁹ It shows the ambiguity of the *Documentation* score.

On the same date, 11. Aug., as "13a"E, Bruckner sketched on SVE "15"E a line expanded by two measures for the *Te Deum* passage in diminished sevenths on 13E/"14". So one could try to expand 13E/"14" by using the sketch. This means changing an almost complete bifolio. The date could be an argument. Moreover it results in a better connection to the following development of the introduction motif. Besides, the number 15 is a proof of the foregoing (second) extension. The consequence would have been a new renumbering of all the bifolios from [14/"15"] on, but Bruckner had no time and energy left to do this.

In the second gap, [14/"15"], both scores also take from the second half of 12C the last two measures, containing an augmented triad. However, these measures were clearly crossed out by Bruckner. Carragan adopts them as well, but at an earlier place in his score.

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE BEGINNING OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Te Deum (flute) + augmentation; chromatic descent-----; Te D. in dimin. sevenths; inverted Introd.; inverted Te D.-----
 12C, 6 mm.
 "13a"E-----[+2 mm.]-"13"^bE, mm.5-16-----13E/"14"-----[14/"15"]-----15D/"16"
 "15"E, 2 mm.

See Musical Example 1

Carragan has a totally different start of the development. He inserts in 12C the augmented *Te Deum* motif in the flute (mentioning 'Top line Bruckner') and two measures of the chromatic descent. This is the right place, but he doesn't see that the continuation on 12C should be shifted as a result of the extension. He continues the texture of the second half of 12C with 16 measures of his own composition. He uses also the syncopated motive from the closing of the principal theme of the first movement and makes a connection with 13E/'14". The second gap, [14/'15"], too is filled with his own composition. Here the chorale reappears, rather illogically. It ends in the first measures of 15D/'16" because enharmonically they have the same chord as the closing measures of the chorale. He doesn't take into consideration the fact that 15D/'16" contains the end of the development of the *Te Deum* figure in 12C. Carragan uses from the SVE's only the augmented *Te Deum* and the first two measures of the chromatic line (mm. 9-16 from "13a"E). Therefore he is forced to fill in two portions composed by himself. The whole fragment has too many elements and is very confusing.

4. Fugue

The rest of the development is known, at least in the strings and important wind parts, and it culminates in an incomparable fugue on the principal theme of the first group. After five starts of the theme separated by 4 measures, there is a sequence of three times 3 measures. Theme and harmony are based on diminished sevenths. Then follow 3 measures of a new development, with the theme in inversion in the violas and violoncelli.

The next bifolio, [19/'20"], is lost. Because the composer counted the measures from the start of the fugue, we know the gap is 16 measures long. After it there are two new groups of 3 measures. Because the great rhythm of measure groups is so important here, the first question to solve is the measure numbering in the gap. There are several indications that it must have been: 4-8, 8, 3. First, in the last measure before the lacuna the 2nd violin has a tie over the last note F into the next (lost) measure. Nowhere in the fugue are there ties between measure groups. Second and decisively, the most recent sketches (printed in Phillips's *Reconstruction* and his *Documentation of the fragment*) for the last seven measures have indeed the numbers 5-8, 3. (See nos 4 + 6 in the Scheme.) Third, older sketches also show in the first part of this passage groups of four and after that groups of three measures. (Nos 1-3 in the Scheme.) Again, by following the composition process, the definitive form of at least the metrical numbering becomes clear. There can be no doubt about the metrical numbering of this passage. Carragan, in this respect, is right here, though he doesn't mention the metrical numbering. Samale/Mazzuca however has 4-6, 6, 4, 3 and S/P/M/C 3, 3, 3, 4, 3. With the last group of 3 there begins the culmination of the passage (3 x 3). One group of 4 measures between groups of 6 or 3 is very unlikely. Here the performing score of S/P/M/C takes no advantage of Phillips's *Reconstruction* and maintains important elements of the older score. Even the very notes of the sketches for the last seven measures are not adopted. The *Documentation of the fragment* is very ambiguous here. It states: 'Metrical structure [of Bg. [19/'20"], J.R.]: probably [1-3;1-3;1-3];1-4;1-3' and, on the same page: 'Metrical structure [of the sketch, J.R.]: -5-7[8];1-3' and: 'Particello sks. [...] are extant, however, the first 4 mm. of which, as opposed to the alterations necessary in the continuous reconstruction of the Performing Version, are reproduced true to their original notation here.'²⁰

To revise the whole passage in the performing version should mean also rejecting the two arguments Phillips gives in his *Neue Erkenntnisse*²¹. First, a sketch on the last, incompleting page before the lacuna was shifted two measures later by Samale/Mazzuca and supposedly given to the B-flat clarinet. So the E-flat of the sketch becomes D-flat, fitting in the tonality.

This rather doubtful speculation returns in S/P/M/C, in Phillips's *Neue Erkenntnisse* and, with a question-mark, in his *Reconstruction*. Connected with this, another of the older sketches is used as answer, half a measure later. It has the theme, starting with D-flat, in inversion. This sketch is Phillips's second argument. In fact however, the sketch belongs to measures 51-53 (later returning in the score as 52-54) of the fugue. (See no. 3 in the Scheme.) The performing versions place them in measures 33-35. This whole idea is wrong. The sketch in the bifolio is more likely to be a fourth, rejected, start in E-flat after the foregoing sequence B-flat, C, D. There are more reasons for not using these sketches. In the first sequence (3 x 3) Bruckner explicitly writes: '*Bas[s]o 1/2 Tact gerade später als II. Violin*'. (*bas exactly 1/2 a measure after 2nd violin.*) In the last measures before the gap his text says: '*gleichz. 1/4 später II. V.*' This means, as the score shows: theme and inversion sound together and the 2nd violin (and the clarinet) a crotchet later. The shifted sketch however starts the measure half way. Why not stick to the text? In this new passage the syncopated *Engführung* is one crotchet, not two. The '1/4 later' is complicated enough. The performing versions add unnecessary complications, with starts on all four beats (S/M) or on beat one to three (S/P/M/C). Bruckner's point of view was: '*Contrapunkt ist nicht Genialität sondern nur Mittel zum Zweck*'²² (counterpoint is not genius, but only a means to an end). The end is the symphonic argument.

Most probably, after the first sequence of 3 x 3 measures, with the theme in diminished sevenths, there follows a second sequence of 4 x 4 measures. The most important part here is the tenor in viola and violoncello (the bass is silent) with the theme in inversion. From this second sequence we have the first three measures in score and the last four in sketch. Nine measures must be reconstructed. First, the tenor starts on C and the fourth time on F-sharp in B-major ('*Hd Ten*'). The most simple supposition is D and E for the second and third start. The other elements are: a ninth chord above the tenor, dissolved in the major ninth half a tone higher (from C⁹ to D-flat major) and the syncopated start '1/4 later' in second violin and clarinet. The fourth group, known in sketch, is different, with B-major as tonality, not F-sharp⁹ and another course in the transitional measures to the culmination. Here Bruckner writes: '*Bass u Steig*', (bass and climax.) It is a modulation to the last note G-sharp, leading to the C-sharp minor culmination, also known in sketch.

As we saw, Samale/Mazzuca and S/P/M/C take for granted a second sequence in groups of six or three measures, with one group of four, and don't integrate the sketches. Their sequence takes steps in thirds, C⁹, E⁹, G-sharp⁹. S/M was very complicated and was moderated in S/P/M/C. Both use also the semi-quaver figure from the first part of the fugue.

Carragan, as stated, has the right measure rhythm. In the nine unknown measures he does not write a sequence, but a free composition. He re-uses beside the semi-quavers the melodic counterpoint from the first part of the fugue. None of this is indicated in score or sketches. I believe that we have here a development of the theme only. Rightly, in the last four measures Carragan makes use of the sketches, but instrumental additions render it unclear. The whole fragment is somewhat capricious.

Measures 1-3 of the culmination itself (mm. 46-48 of the fugue) are more easily reconstructed because we have the bass and the tonality and the analogy with the following six measures.

All versions have basically the same result.

The whole second part of the fugue is a crystallisation of elements, which were more mixed in older sketches: 1. the inversion of the theme in the tenor in the second sequence (4 x 4 or 2 x 8); 2. the culmination (3 x 3) in C-sharp minor, B-flat minor and F-sharp minor; 3. the continuation (not dealt with in the preceding, with groups of 8 measures again; see nos 1 + 3

in the Scheme) based on the last part of the principal theme. This is also the reason why older sketches for the nine lost measures cannot be used. Again, the historical stages in the composition process can reveal a lot. At the start of the development we saw the same search for clarification and for the best range of different elements.

COMPOSITION PROCESS in the second part of the FUGUE

Harmony: c = C-minor; C = C-major; etc.

F.-A. = Faksimile-Ausgabe (Facsimile edition), 1996; See n.5

Orel = Entwürfe u. Skizzen, 1934; See n. 1

1. Particella F.-A. p. 21, from 3rd stave, m.no. 30 / Orel no. 13A, m.no. 30

N.B. From the start of the fugue the measures are continuously counted by Bruckner. Scheme 1 and 7 begin at m.30

Harmony	c	D-fl, e-fl	E	e	a
Start at	c'''		b	E'	
Metr. numbers	8	-----	8	-----	
			4	-----	3
Counting	30	-----	38	-----	42
Details	Theme (Sopr.) not inverted. Alto inv. Bass inv. Next to bass: 'Ten'				
			Older form	Period diminished from 4 to 3	
			of continuation		
Reference signs			†	////	///

2. Particella F.-A p. 22, 1st and 2nd stave / Orel no. 13B

Reference sign			†		
Harmony		E-flat	A-flat	f	
Start at		B-flat	e-flat	f'	
Metr. numbers		8	-----	4	-----
Details	Inversion of:	Bass	Ten.	Sopr.	The whole sketch was crossed out
		Text 'Umkehr (inversion) Baß-Ten-Sopr' changed to: Alto=Baß			

3. Particella F.-A. p. 22, 3rd and 4th stave, p. 23, 1st stave / Orel no. 13C and 13D

Reference sign				///
Harmony		C	g	G-flat
Start at		G	B-flat	d-fl' f'''e-fl'''d-fl'''
Metr. numbers		3	-----	3
Counting		45	-----	51
Details		54	-----	58
		61	-----	61
		Older form of culmination and continuation		

4. Particella F.-A. p. 23, 1st stave, m. 5 and 2nd stave / Orel no. 13D, last m. and 13E

Reference sign			////
Harmony		Modulation into -> B	
Metr. numbers		[4]5-8	----- Measure 8 crossed out
Details	Change of m. 41, see e-minor in no.1; 'Hd (B)Ten'; 'Bass u Steig (bass and climax)' in mm. 7-8. Tenor inverted		
Start at		f[sharp]	
Reference sign		†	

5. Particella F.-A. p. 23, 5th stave / Orel no. 13F

Reference sign		†
Harmony		G sharp[7]
Metr. number		[8]
Details	Change of m. 8 in no. 4 = m. 45 from the beginning	
Reference	'Cism. B. (c-sharp minor bass)'	

6. Particella F.-A. p. 23, 3rd and 4th stave / Orel no. 13G

Harmony		c-sh	b-fl	g
Start at		C-sh	B-fl	g
Metr. numbers		3	-----	3

7. Score bifolios My score m. 334-358

Harmony	C ⁹ D-fl	[?	?	B	c-sh]b-fl	f-sh
Start Ten. at; Bass at	c	[?	?	f-sh	C-sh ₁]B-fl ₁	F-sh
Metr. numbers	1-3	-----	4,5-8	-----	8	-----	3
Counting	[30	-----	33	-----	38	-----	42
Score bifolio «-18D''19''	-----	[19''20''	-----	46	-----]49	-----
Details	Ten. inverted			Ten. inv.			
				m. 45: G-sharp[7]			

See Musical Example 2

5. Gesangsperiode (lyrical period) in the recapitulation.

The highly original continuation of the fugue leads to a second culmination with a new theme, falling back into itself. Then the lyrical period is recapitulated. It is only partly similar with the exposition. We have the greater part complete in the strings. Two bifolios are lost, [24''25''] and [27''28'']. The latter is dealt with in no. 6. The former can be reconstructed with great probability, using sketches and a fragment from the exposition. Here Carragan was the first to draw the right conclusion.

The last six measures of Bg. 23D/''24'' contain the beginning of the lyrical period. They occur also on a sketch, which continues with another six measures. A *vi-de* sign shows the way to four measures on another sketch. Here Bruckner writes *Fis d. in Gesangsp. wie in 1. Abth. dann* (F-sharp major in the lyrical period as in the exposition, then), a clear reference to measures 9-14 from Bg. 5B. They continue on Bg. 25D/''26''. Here all three performing versions agree. There are however differences in instrumentation and added parts.

6. The end of the lyrical period in the recapitulation, transition into the recapitulation of the chorale

For the lost Bg. [27''28''] there exists a 17 measure sketch. The composer gives the indication *2. Abth. hier weiter* (2nd part here continued). It can explain the last word 'then' from his text cited in no. 5. The direct connection with the foregoing bifolio cannot be proven, but is possible. Measures 1-4, with the theme in the violoncelli, can be used without additions.

What follows is the lyrical motif in octave leaps with a new counterpoint in descending crotchets. The descending line isn't complete and must be supplemented. At the end, in the 17th measure, Bruckner writes *Schluß d m[oll]* (end D minor). Here the likewise descending movement of the motif reaches the note D. The passage can be seen as a double unison, which brings the lyrical period to an end and leads into a new section. The next bifolio, 28E/''29'', begins in measure 5 of a period. It is still in D minor, with a return of the string triplets from the chorale. It is obvious that they and the D minor must have started four measures earlier. Samale/Mazzuca and S/P/M/C change measures 3 and 4 from the sketch in the violoncelli, according to another sketch. It was however crossed out and newly designed by the composer. Moreover these latter sketches relate to an earlier passage. Phillips corrected it in the *Reconstruction* and in the *Documentation of the fragment*.

At the end they make things far more complicated than they are, in the manner in which they connect the end of the 'double unison' to the D minor. They insert 2 (S/M) and 4 (S/P/M/C) measures respectively from a so-called 'Gregorian' theme somewhat earlier in the score. The reason is that in this manner a connection can be made to the tone a''. This connection is concluded from a *vi-de* leap, beginning before this tone in Bg. 26F/''27'' and supposedly ending on the last page of the lost bifolio, at the point where the D minor starts. So, after the double unison, we hear the 'Gregorian' theme and then the start of the triplets (moreover *fff* and with trumpet fanfares).

In the *Documentation of the fragment* the gap after measure 17 of the sketch is left open.

However, Phillips defends here the supplementation of S/P/M/C: *'This convincing if speculative explanation [to reach the tone a'' by means of the 'Gregorian' theme, J.R.] was realised in the performing version [...] where it creates a grandiose, stylistically convincing climax.'*²³

The return of the 'Gregorian' theme here is not based on any material by Bruckner and is unnecessary. Again, why not follow Bruckner's clear indication and let the triplets in D minor start at the end of the descending double unison? The *vi-de* remains possible, with the tone A

in a lower octave. It is not necessary that the passage after a *vi-de* connects in exactly the same way as the deleted part in the *vi-de*. One example is the *vi-de* in the finale of the Fifth symphony. The *vi-de*'s in the finale of the Ninth are more compositional scaffolding than real propositions to shorten the work. The connection can be made by a tritone-transition from A-flat minor into D minor. This kind of progression is one of the most important audacities of the piece.

In both performing versions the lost bifolio is 24 measures long, in my proposition 20. Possibly the bifolio had the preparation F, like the foregoing bifolio. This would mean Bruckner drew the bar lines himself. Most bifolios in the second part of the score have 16 measures.

See Musical Example 3

Carragan in this case didn't go beyond Orel, who seems to place the sketch wrongly at the beginning of the lyrical period. Therefore Carragan didn't adopt the sketch but composed a new section of 48 measures containing successively: the flute motif from the introduction (where it was eliminated in S/P/M/C), the chorale preparation from the exposition with elements from the preparation of the main theme, ending in the main theme from the *Adagio*. From here a transition is made to the first measures of Bg. 28E/"29" with the triplets. The whole passage sounds almost convincing, but as we saw, it is totally gratuitous. The manuscript has no indications whatsoever for something like it and here no more than one bifolio of at most 24 measures is missing.

7. Continuation of the chorale in the reprise

The preparation of the chorale in the reprise is very different from that in the exposition. The chorale itself, starting in D major, has an accompaniment based on the *Te Deum* figure. Of the wind instruments, only the first trumpet is designated. Carragan doesn't supplement the instrumentation, but this fails to do justice to the long preparation, culminating in the return of the chorale. The equilibrium with the exposition in this case requires a complete instrumentation. After the first two sentences, similar to the exposition, there are another two measures, with the melody in the oboe. Then Bg. [30/"31"] is lost. The next and last transmitted bifolio 31E/"32" starts with another texture: an intricate contrapuntal elaboration of the string triplets and again the oboe. In the last known measures the theme from the culmination of the development returns. Bg. [30/"31"] is the only case where no sketches or older bifolios whatsoever exist. The problem is how to connect the different textures.

Carragan doesn't use the last bifolio because the Orel-edition gives it a wrong number and therefore cannot integrate it. Indeed the number is illegible, but the content, a free development of the chorale, and the fact that Bruckner, as in the fugue, counts the measures from the start of the chorale prove that it must be Bg. 31E/"32".

The notes of the main part in the oboe before the lacuna are b', c'-sharp. Samale/Mazzuca continue with d'-sharp, e''; e'', f'-sharp, a''-flat (2 mm.), g'' (4 mm.). Then six measures based on the middle section from the chorale in the exposition, with triplet accompaniment, are followed by 31E/"32". As this middle section in the exposition consists of twice four measures, here we have only one and a half sentences and then an inversion of the direction. In S/P/M/C this course is somewhat changed: d'-sharp, e''; e'', f'-sharp, a''-flat (2 mm.), g'', f'', e'' (2 mm.), and as continuation the middle section in inversion. In Phillips's *Reconstruction* this situation is reproduced as follows. '[...] *The periodic structure of the*

non-extant [30/''31''] can most plausibly be reconstructed as -3-12; 1-6- or -11-14; 1-6; 1-6 [...]; the triplet motive design which continues on the first p. of the following bifolio [...] may have begun in the 11th m. of [30/''31''] [...]. This is right. But Phillips continues: *'The last two mm. of the preceding as well as the first 2 mm. of the following bifolio [...] suggest the possibility that the passage may have been derived as an inversion of the chorale theme (first 12 mm.) as well as of its 8-m. middle section. In any case, an exact inversion is possible. Cf. the exposition [...]*'.²⁴ The result in S/P/M/C however shows that an exact inversion is not possible. The first interval in the chorale continuation (b', c''-sharp) is a major second and not a minor as in the chorale itself. In fact we hear the first four measures backwards and then a free inversion. And why only 12 measures from the 16-measure chorale? The inversion of the main part of the following middle section also isn't exact. That should be here: a''-flat, b''-flat, b'' (2 mm.); c''', d''', e'''-flat (2 mm.). In S/P/M/C however it is chromatic: a''-flat, a'', b''-flat (2 mm.); c''', c'''-sharp, d'''' (2 mm.). Otherwise it doesn't connect to 31E/''32''. There is a remarkable clue in the score. In the first measure after the lacuna the strings start with measure number 7 and the oboe, having the melody, with number 5. One can conclude that the oboe theme starts two measures later than the string triplets. At the beginning of the lost bifolio, moreover, there is another possibility than is offered by the known performing versions. The two oboe notes b', c''-sharp can be seen as the start of the middle section in inversion. It appears earlier than in S/P/M/C and the inversion in the main oboe part can be exact. In the middle section of the chorale in the exposition the oboe also has the melody. This solution needs less artifice and is simpler than both S/M and S/P/M/C. When the middle section is played three times (12 mm.), it ends in E-flat minor. With the triplets starting in E-minor, by a free movement of the bass, figuring at several places in Bruckner, a very natural connection to the following bifolio is possible.

See Musical Example 4

Coda

No numbered bifolios after 31E/''32'' are known. Also none of the few sketches connects to it. There is no obvious continuous course between them even. Using them to compose a coda therefore means a lot of speculation. Carragan makes use of the first 24 measures from a particella that Bruckner perhaps meant to be a part of the coda. S/M and S/P/M/C take 28 measures of the 36. It is a long climax made up of the introduction theme of the finale (from the Ninth) and of the principal theme of the *Eighth* symphony, completely built on tritone progressions. It could be the last climax before the end, but also a rejected form of the preparation of the chorale.

Falling back on literary sources - Bruckner would have said the symphony was to end with a song of praise to the dear Lord and therefore he was to use in the coda *'The Allelujah of the second part'* - Carragan includes in his coda elements from the Allelujah of Bruckner's *150th Psalm*. Phillips and his colleagues understand Bruckner's utterance as a reference to the *Trio* of the *Eighth* symphony. In his defence of the S/P/M/C coda, Phillips goes very far along the literary path. According to another tradition the score would contain a counterpoint of all the themes, as in the *Eighth* symphony.

I don't think the concrete music can be deduced from oral tradition, which could also be interpreted as biographical commonplace. In connection with the older versions of Samale/Mazzucca's score, Samale speculated that Bruckner would have had a crisis of faith and composed a non-triumphant close of the finale.²⁵ So, speculation can lead us anywhere.

Of course, it's easy to criticize without giving an alternative, but frankly, I don't feel the added codas do render Bruckner a service. Maybe there are two possibilities. First a simple, short coda, not pretending to imitate Bruckner, just to have a close. Second, a coda which isn't a Bruckner pastiche either, but is a modern comment on what precedes it. Only the tracing of lost manuscript material could save the real coda for us.

Even in its incompleting state Bruckner's final movement is a moving expression of artistic courage and creative imagination.

Instrumentation and supplementation

When the structure of a piece is not right, added instrumentation cannot help. Therefore in the preceding remarks the emphasis was laid on the problems of structure and continuity. Of course, after that, there are many problems regarding instrumentation. The composer completed 178 measures; 86 measures with completed strings could be used without additions. Then, especially in the middle section, where Bruckner was in the process of completing the parts of the wind instruments, the question is how to interpret problematical pencil sketches and texts in the score. This is the case in 52 measures. As stated I have been very reserved but did add some woodwind and brass in 84 measures, of which the chorale recapitulation was fully instrumentated. Most of the string parts are complete, but in 32 measures they are not. To complete them, however, poses little problems. Where the connection of bifolios from different compositional stages causes joining problems (reviewed in the preceding), 12 measures had to be adapted, based on Bruckner's own indications. The 57 measures of particella sketches and SVE (continuity drafts) which were elaborated and instrumentated have been extensively reviewed and 47 of them can be found in the Musical Examples. (The remaining 10 are reviewed in no. 5. *Gesangsperiode* in the recapitulation.) Finally 47 measures, where no original material at all exists, had to be supplemented. These also form part of the Musical Examples. My score contains 548 measures.

So, at some points, supplemented instrumentation is necessary, but I would prefer somewhat more restraint than in the reviewed versions. S/M and S/P/M/C, when they refer to their *Analogverfahren* (analogy method) which is the comparison of sketches and score of the first three movements of the symphony, give the impression of a real provable result. I would like to stay close to the transmitted text and only add necessary supplementations.

To conclude

As stated in the beginning, these results are provisional, awaiting further publishing. What precedes could show that the story of the piece is not yet closed.

I would welcome critical comments.

© 2003 J.J.H.M. Roelands
Nijmegen
The Netherlands

The Musical Examples follow
the end-notes overleaf

Notes

¹Anton Bruckner. *Entwürfe und Skizzen zur IX. Symphonie / vorgelegt und erläutert von Alfred Orel*. - Vienna, 1934. Also as Special ed.

²Peter Palmer drew my attention to this performance of Carragan's new version. Being so recent, it couldn't be reviewed in the present article.

³John A. Phillips: *Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners*. *Bruckner Jahrbuch* 1989/90, Vienna 1992; 115-203. There is also an article in English: *The Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony: New light on an old problem*. *Miscellanea Musicologica (Australia)*; *Adelaide Studies in Musicology*, XVII (1990), 193-277.

⁴IX. *Symphonie D-moll, Finale (unvollendet) : Rekonstruktion der Autograph-Partitur nach den erhaltenen Quellen : Studienpartitur / [Anton Bruckner] ; vorgelegt von John A. Phillips*. - Vienna, 1994; 2nd, rev. ed. 1999. ISMN M-50025-211-5.

⁵IX. *Symphonie D-Moll, Finale (unvollendet) : Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten / [Anton Bruckner] ; vorgel. u. erl. von John A. Phillips*. - (Anton Bruckner: *Sämtliche Werke: zu ix/4*). - Vienna, Musikw. Verl., 1996. - ISMN M-50025-133-0.

⁶In internet discussion groups one can find impressions of and opinions about the performing versions but no reviews based on knowledge of the reconstruction or the manuscripts.

⁷IX. *Symphonie D-Moll, Finale (unvollendet) : Dokumentation des Fragments. Partitur / vorgelegt von John A. Phillips*. - Vienna, Musikw. Verl., 1999. - ISMN M-50025-232-0.

⁸For instance, Orel's types of folio preparation should represent five or six different versions of the piece. In fact there has been one continuous composition process.

⁹*'Die Sinfonie ist auf gar keinen Fall zu vollenden weil kein Mensch wissen kann wie Bruckner das zu Ende gebracht hätte und weil kein Mensch jene geistige, geniale Gedankenfülle hätte wie sie Bruckner gehabt hat.'* Leopold Nowak interviewed by Cornelis van Zwol, 1986. Quoted from a 1990 radio-broadcast.

¹⁰Carragan's text, cited from the booklet by Noël Goodwin with the CD of Carragan's version. *Oslo Philh. Orch. / Yoav Talmi*. Chandos 7051(2).

¹¹Anton Bruckner. IX. *Symphony in D minor. Finale. Reconstruction of the autograph score from the surviving manuscripts. Performing version by Nicola Samale, John A. Phillips and Giuseppe Mazzuca with the assistance of Gunnar Cohrs*. Ed. by John A. Phillips : Adelaide, 1992. In 1993 there were some minor corrections and S/P/M/C became S/P/C/M in connection with editorial problems.

¹²*'Eine Kompletierung sollte nicht versuchen, sich die Vorrechte des Komponisten zu eigen zu machen; wenn dies geschieht, wird die Kompletierung zu einer "Bearbeitung". Die Aufführungsfassung eines "unvollendeten" Werkes sollte eher nur soweit gehen, dessen klangliche Realisation zu ermöglichen und dadurch, wenn auch nur andeutungsweise, eine Vorstellung dessen anzubieten, was der ursprünglichen Intention entspricht.'* (Neue Erkenntnisse, 148)

¹³Timothy Jackson. *Bruckner's metrical numbers*. *19th-century music* XIV/2 (1990); 101-131.

¹⁴Anton Bruckner. *Finale della IX Sinfonia, ricostruzione di Nicola Samale e Giuseppe Mazzuca*. Ricordi: Milan, 1986.

¹⁵Dok. des Fragm. p. 103.

¹⁶Rekonstr. p. 25, n. 1.

¹⁷Dok. des Fragm. p. XXI.

¹⁸In fact the Samale/Mazzuca score precedes, not only chronologically, the *Reconstruction* by John Phillips.

¹⁹Dok. des Fragm. p. XXII.

²⁰Dok. des Fragm. p. 112. In the 3rd m. I read the 3rd note as G-sharp and the 4th as E. Phillips gives F-sharp and E-sharp (E-natural in the Rekonstr.)

²¹Neue Erkenntnisse, 173/4.

²²Letter to Franz Bayer, 22 April 1893.

²³Dok. des Fragm. p. 115.

²⁴Rekonstr. p. 129, n. 1.

²⁵Thomas Röder sketched a much more ambiguous picture of Bruckner's religiosity than is usually propagated. Modernity didn't leave him unaffected. During his whole artistic career there was a conflict between his religious faith and his faith in himself as a free artist. The strange document he had drawn up for him shortly before he died stated that he *always should have his full freedom and enjoy the whole of his life*. It leaves room for the supposition that he may not have left the world at peace with his God. *Archiv f. Musikw. Beiheft XLV* (1999); 50-63: *Anton Bruckners Glaube*.

Ex. 1 continued

2 m. extension from SVE "15"E Bg. 13E/"14" continued

Musical score for measures 7-15. The score is written for a piano and includes parts for Violin 1 (Vn. 1), Flute (Fl.), Oboe (Ob.), Clarinet (Cl.), Bassoon (Bsn.), Violin 2 (Vn. 2), Viola (Vc.), and Cello (Cb.). The key signature is B-flat major. The score features various musical notations including slurs, accents, and dynamic markings. Measure numbers 7 through 15 are indicated below the staff.

Bg. [14/"15"]

Musical score for measures 6-16. The score is written for a piano and includes parts for Flute (Fl.), Oboe (Ob.), Clarinet (Cl.), Bassoon (Bsn.), Violin 1 (Vn. 1), and Cello (Cb.). The key signature is B-flat major. The score features various musical notations including slurs, accents, and dynamic markings. Measure numbers 6 through 16 are indicated below the staff.

2 m. supplemented

14 m. supplemented, based on Bg. 12C, m. 11-14

Musical score for measures 7-16. The score is written for a piano and includes parts for Bassoon (Bsn.), Violin 2 (Vn. 2), Viola (Vc.), and Cello (Cb.). The key signature is B-flat major. The score features various musical notations including slurs, accents, and dynamic markings. Measure numbers 7 through 16 are indicated below the staff.

Bg. 15D/"16"

Musical score for measures 7-9. The score is written for a piano and includes parts for Violin 1 (Vn. 1), Violin 2 (Vn. 2), Viola (Vc.), and Cello (Cb.). The key signature is B-flat major. The score features various musical notations including slurs, accents, and dynamic markings. Measure numbers 7 through 9 are indicated below the staff.

Example 2
Continuation of the Fugue

End of Bg. 18D/"19"

334 Vln 1 Vln 2 Bg. [19/"20"]

mf

Horns

Vln 1 Vln 2

Bg. [19/"20"]

9 m. supplemented

[30] [31] [32] [33] [34] [35] [36] [37]

Vln 1 Vln 2

Horns

Horns

Bg.

Ten. original: sketch F.-A. p. 23 (4 m.)

"H-d Ten"

"Bass u. Steig."

cresc.

[38] [39] [40] [41] [42] [43] [44] [45]

Bg. 20F/"21"

full orch.

Bg.

Vln

"Cis m. B." Bass original: sketch F.-A. p. 23 (3 m.)

[46] [47] [48] [49]

Example 3

End of lyrical period in the recapitulation

Bg. [27/28"]

465

Particella sketch F.-A. p. 24-25: 17 m.

4 m. of sketch without additions

Vln. 1/2, Cl

Vln. 1 original (12 1/2 m.)

Bass supplemented (1 m.)

Bass supplemented (9 m.)

Vc, Vla, Bsn

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

ff

full orch.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Str. Cl

Str

f

Vc, Cl, Bsn

dim.

Vc

Tuba

Cl

Trp

Temp

"Schluß d m[oll]"

Bg. 28E/29"

pp

Vln 1

Vln 2

Vla

4 m. supplemented

p

Vln 1/2

Vc, Vla, Cl

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

