



Phot. B. Raiffenstein, Wien.

St. Florian

Stiftskirche / The Collegiate Church / L'église Collégiale

Anton Bruckner's Symphony in D minor which had not been published at the time of the composer's death was known to the editor since the beginning of 1914, but had to be reserved for a period more favourable for its publication, in spite of its undoubted value and in opposition to the wishes expressed by many. Ten years ago Bruckner was not recognized by all as he is now. Whilst the great masterpieces of his symphonic art had to struggle for the position they deserve, it was not timely to place his more modest offsprings before the public. As this has now changed, and the publication of many works of his youth has aroused at least a historical interest, one can turn to the edition of the most significant of the unpublished works, as it is music that will meet higher — not solely historical interest.

The original score, kept in the Upper-Austrian State Museum in Linz, bears the following dates:

*Wien 24. Jänner 869. „23. Juni, at the beginning of the first movement; at the end of this movement: Wien 8. Febr. 869. Scitze Streichinstr. 1. Juli dto. Linz 12. September 1869. Anton Bruckner m. p. And after it: Symphonie beendet 12. September 1869 in Linz. — At the end of the second movement: Linz 21. Aug. 1869. A. Bruckner m. p., then: Wien 12. Juli 1869. Streichmusik Rückseite. — The Scherzo is not dated; at the beginning of the Trio stands: Wien 16. Juli comp. 1869; at the end of same: Wien 16. Juli 869. Linz 25. Aug. 869. Anton Bruckner. — At the end of the Finale one reads: Linz 19. August 1869. Anton Bruckner m. p. — A page of the manuscript contains the sketch for a Trio in A major with the final remark: 18. März 1869 Wien. — The different parts bear the following titles: at the beginning of the first movement: *Sinfonie in D moll*; then: *Andante. 2. Satz zur Sinfonie*; — *Scherzo (III. Satz)*; — *Finale zur Sinfonie*.*

From all these inscriptions can be deducted with certainty that the score of the work was finished between Jan. 24th and Sept. 12th 1869; the first movement between Jan. 24th and Feb. 8th of this year first in (score-) sketch; then the (not-dated) Scherzo was probably in-

strumented — the dating of the sketched Trio (March 18th) would indicate this. Then Bruckner had to interrupt this work, as he travelled to Nancy and Paris towards the end of April where he gave concerts as organist and achieved great success both on the 27th and 29th. After returning from this trip at the beginning of May, he at once began completing his symphony as the other dates prove. At the commencement of the summer vacation he felt drawn to his beloved Linz and there he completed the work, having added to his Scherzo the new final Trio in Vienna.

August Göllerich, the pupil, friend and biographer of the Master, upholds the view that the symphony is older and is to be set down to 1863/64. The editor only partly agrees to this view. Firstly the work certainly contains a part composed in 1869 (the Trio) and secondly the two corner-movements show the characteristic features which point to a later date of creation: the mode of their design, their "architecture" and the great gradations towards the end, of which especially the gradation in the first movement with its bass-steps reminding one a little of Beethoven's *Ostinato* in the Ninth, is of quite grand, whole-hearted Brucknerian pithiness. And herein the symphony distinguishes itself very much from Bruckner's first attempt along these lines, the modest "School symphony" in *f* minor, composed in 1863.

The Scherzo could possibly be of an older date: its clinging to one main theme and above all its striking shortness would speak for this assumption. The *Andante* at least in its first theme and its development dates back to older times: it is difficult to assume that it was created after the *A flat major-Adagio* of the first symphony (*c* minor) and after the great masses in *d*, *e* and *f* minor. A certain moderating after the "Storm and Pressure" of the first symphony cannot be overlooked in Bruckner's acknowledged Second (likewise in *c* minor). The fact that his First on occasion of its first performance on May 9th 1868 in Linz, in spite of the outwardly friendly reception which was addressed

above all to the Cathedral-organist, was not understood by any of the listeners, may have caused him to become uncertain, wavering, almost doubting himself and his mission. This giving in, this placing oneself back, this letting off from all "sky-charging" is seen in the score at hand in a much higher degree, so that it really has to be regarded as the main reaction, as the first result of that inner process, and thus may have been completely composed in the year following the above mentioned performance in Linz, or may be—as stated above—only the Andante (and possibly the Scherzo) excepted. In how far older sketches were used in working out the piece can no longer be proved to-day, and may only remain (not unwarranted) a presumption.

The master has annulled the work. Later the symphony could no longer satisfy his rigid self-criticism. Naturally measured by the artistic value of the radiating and glorious "nine", the much more modest early work had to stand back; for from the tower of the "ninth" (the annulment was executed 1895, one year before Bruckner's death) it had appeared too small and unworthy to be taken into the number of the chosen ones. This is to be understood, as he knew himself and his lifework to be at this period still misunderstood and not valued by his contemporaries—in spite of many and great successes—similar to 1868 in Linz, and besides systematically pursued by malicious criticism. Especially the worry, how this criticism would act towards his unfortunate child may have strengthened him in his resolution, to annul the work. — It has not been easy for the editor to act contrary to the clearly expressed will of the master. But the above mentioned reflections, the conviction that the composer had done injustice to his work by suppressing it, and the knowledge that in the end it would be misplaced reverence not to help to correct this injustice prompted the signed author to fulfil the wish of the publisher and edit the Symphony.

The manuscript of the score shows all characteristics of the

h early works of Bruckner in con-
-trast to his later manuscripts
- which are, especially as regards
n their execution-keys very exact
- down to the smallest detail.
- Thus it was necessary in this
st work to prescribe signs for exe-
- cution and dynamics which were
n indicated by the author here and
n there also at other corresponding
- places, besides adding such signs
st as well as signs for bow-draught,
- bow and the like where it was
- necessary (and it was very often
- necessary) and finally to correct
s obvious note-mistakes.

In view of the comparative
- scarcity of the time-notes, pre-
- scribed by the composer almost
only per movement, it was of
e value for the conception and pro-
p duction of the work to indicate
p the modifications of the funda-
c mental tempi exactly. These are
c additions of the editor and in the
p present case marked by paran-
l thesis (). For engraving reasons
n it was impossible also to place
d in paranthesis the above men-
c tioned executionkeys, bows etc.
p inserted by the editor.

Following the example of our
t classical composers, Bruckner
r likes to express the Fortissimi
I of his orchestra by *ff*, and *fff* in
c all voices of the score. But be-
p tween the Fortissimo of the string
l instruments and woodwinds on
d the one hand, and of the brass-
d und percussion instruments on
l the other hand, there exists
p a dynamic difference. The old
e masters left it to the directors
f to win from their orchestras a
q full-sounding Fortissimo which
c did not cover important leading
il voices. If the director for instance
c in a work of Mozart, Haydn or
l Beethoven understands the *ff* of
c the trumpets and drums in a
m literal way, then more often a

than not the effect, by no means planned by the composer, is that the audience only hears the above mentioned instruments distinctly but does not hear at all or only very weakly the much more important melodiousness of the other voices: the trumpets and drums "cover up" the other instruments. Master Bruckner has often met a similar fate with his symphonies at the hands of untalented or malicious directors. Who does not remember how, in the reports of hostile criticism over and over again the "crudeness" of the brass-sound in Bruckner's orchestra is pointed out spitefully. This finally prompted the master to devote special attention to the respective parts. One also finds in his printed scores in all places, where the Fortissimo is to be understood relatively only, the corresponding modifications, especially concerning the easily overloud trumpets, trombones and drums exactly given. The editor has followed this proceeding of the Master also in the present score and always where it seemed necessary there stands—in contrast to the original manuscript—in the lines of the mentioned instruments only *f*, when the orchestra has to play *ff*.

Concerning the time, one should be warned to play the Allegro too rapidly. It is known that for the master's taste the Allegri of his symphonies have been taken too rapidly by many directors. Of Bruckner's Allegro one can say similarly what Wagner had said about the Beethovenian in contrast to the Mozartian Allegro. Therefore also in the present work it is to be recommended to understand the Allegro of the first movement

as "Allegro un poco moderato", the Allegro vivace of the Finale as "non troppo vivace" and the Presto of the Scherzo as "Presto ma non troppo" and correspondingly to direct the first movement in four fourths, the Scherzo (not the Trio) in whole crotchets, the Allegro vivace of the last movement in Alla-breve-time (although $\frac{4}{4}$ is prescribed) but the second theme of the Finale "somewhat quieter" in four fourths.

To the introduction of the Finale ($\frac{12}{8}$ time) Bruckner prescribed in his manuscript the measure-word "Moderato" but to the re-entrance of this $\frac{12}{8}$ time (132 ff) "Andante". That does not signify that by this repetition one now has to play slower than at the first occurrence of the $\frac{12}{8}$ time. Both parts have the same features, the same preparatory character, the same mood. The second measure-indication "Andante" probably corresponds better to the intention of the composer but he probably forgot at the first introduction of the $\frac{12}{8}$ -measure to afterwards make the corresponding corrections. Therefore in the present edition the dual designation "Moderato (Andante)" in both cases.

The third and fourth movement of the symphony were played for the first time on May 17th 1924 by the Klosterneuburg Philharmony directed by Professor Franz Moissl. The date of the first performance of the entire work, to be given there too, is fixed for October 12th, 1924.

Vienna, September 4th, 1924.
The hundredth birthday of the Master.

The editor Josef V. Wöss.

Orchestra :

2 Flutes, 2 Oboes, 2 Clarinets, 2
2 Bassoons, 4 Horns, 2 Trumpets, r
3 Trombones, 2 Kettledrums, p
Strings.

Our picture.

In the cloister St. Florian Bruckner lived from 1837 to 1841 t
as choirboy and later again from c
1845—55 as teacher and "assi- 1
stent"-from 1851 on as "definitive" c
cloister-organist. Here the master i
acquired the thorough theoretical c
and practical schooling which 1
enabled him to issue as victor a
from the competition for the c
position of organist in Linz. Our r
picture shows the interior of the p
cloister-church which was erected c
1687—1700 with the Bruckner- l
organ erected 1771 equipped with r
92 registers and 78 sounding t
stops, in the background.