

A Bequest and a Legacy: Editing Anton Bruckner's Music in 'Later Times'

Paul Hawkshaw

The present study has been prepared on the occasion of the publication of the New Anton Bruckner Collected Works Edition's first volume, Thomas Röder's score of the Linz version of the First Symphony. The article re-evaluates a fundamental precept of the old Gesamtausgabe of Robert Haas and Leopold Nowak – the supremacy of the readings in Bruckner's autograph manuscripts over those in his first prints. It begins with a brief history of the "Bruckner-Streit" of the 1930s and 40s and a summary of more recent challenges to the Haas-Nowak policy. An overview of the composer's relationship with the brothers Franz and Josef Schalk, who were responsible for the production of many of his early editions, demonstrates that they worked closely with him at first, but began to make alterations without consulting him towards the end of the 1880s. Distinguishing Bruckner from his editors in the Third, Fourth and Eighth Symphonies is difficult, if not impossible. From an editorial perspective, it is pointless because, in these scores, the composer accepted their suggestions and made them his own. Later publications are a different matter. The discussion leads inevitably to a re-examination of a clause in Bruckner's will which exercised a controlling influence over the old Gesamtausgabe and remains a seminal factor in any editorial considerations regarding Bruckner. The article demonstrates that the composer never intended his will to have a bearing on post-mortem editorial issues or to dictate the hierarchy of versions of his pieces.

An extensive exhibition in the Austrian National Library on the occasion of the sesquicentenary of Bruckner's birth (1974), and the establishment of the *Anton Bruckner Institut Linz* shortly thereafter, served as catalysts for a notable increase in international interest in Bruckner source criticism during the last two decades of the twentieth century.¹ One consequence was a reassessment of the editorial policies that had shaped the Bruckner Collected Works Edition since its inception.² New perspectives, together with the discovery of some long-lost

¹ The widely distributed exhibition catalogue – *Anton Bruckner zum 150. Geburtstag* (Vienna: Brüder Rosenbaum, 1974) – with its hundreds of photographs and detailed commentary was the first publication to provide a comprehensive look at a broad span of Bruckner sources. The *Anton Bruckner Institut Linz* held its first annual symposium in 1977 (Franz Grasberger, ed., *Bruckner-Symposium im Rahmen des Internationalen Brucknerfestes Linz 1977: Bericht* (Linz: Linzer Veranstaltungs-Gesellschaft, 1978)) and began publishing its *Bruckner-Jahrbuch* in 1980.

² The first volume, edited by Robert Haas, appeared in 1930: *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, im Auftrag der Nationalbibliothek und der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft, XV: Missa Solemnis B-moll / Requiem D-moll* (Augsburg: Benno Filser Verlag, 1930). After the Second World War, Leopold Nowak succeeded Haas as principal editor and continued in that capacity until his death in 1991. Erich Wolfgang Partsch, 'Gesamtausgaben' in *Anton Bruckner: ein Handbuch* (Salzburg: Residenz, 1996), 175. Among the many critiques of their work are Benjamin Korstvedt, 'Return to the Pure Sources: the Ideology and Text-Critical Legacy of the First Bruckner Gesamtausgabe', in *Bruckner*

primary sources, prompted substantial revisions and additions to the existing volumes.³ By 2013 it had become obvious that patchwork repair was not a long-term solution, and *The New Anton Bruckner Complete Edition* [NBG] was launched, like the older one, under the auspices of the Austrian National Library.⁴ The present study has been prepared on the occasion of the publication of the NBG's first volume, Thomas Röder's edition of the Linz version of the First Symphony.⁵ This article focuses on a fundamental precept of the old *Gesamtausgabe* – the supremacy of the readings in Bruckner's autograph manuscripts over those in his early editions. After a brief history of the controversies this position has provoked over the years, the article provides an overview of the composer's relationship with the brothers Franz and Josef Schalk, who were responsible for the production of many of his early editions. The discussion leads inevitably to a re-examination of a clause in Bruckner's will that exercised a controlling influence over the old *Gesamtausgabe* and remains a seminal factor in any editorial considerations regarding Bruckner. A summary of the principal differences between the editorial policies of the NBG and those of the old *Gesamtausgabe* concludes the article.

On 2 April 1932 Siegmund von Hausegger conducted the Munich Philharmonic Orchestra in a concert that would alter the world's understanding of Anton Bruckner's music. The orchestra performed the composer's Ninth Symphony twice – once from the first edition edited by Ferdinand Löwe and published posthumously in 1904, and then from the version in the autograph manuscript that the composer had bequeathed to the Imperial Library in Vienna.⁶ In the face of prevailing opinion, the International Bruckner Society, which had organized the concert, hoped to demonstrate that the previously unperformed manuscript version was not only playable, but also musically superior. The Directors of the Society were so gratified by the overwhelming success of the manuscript version that they determined that same day to use all the manuscripts Bruckner had left to the library as the basis for its new Collected Works Edition.⁷ Robert Haas who, along with Alfred Orel, was co-editor of

Studies, ed. Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 101–7, and Dermot Gault, 'For Later Times' *The Musical Times* 131 (1997): 12–19. See also Wolfgang Doebel, *Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider Verlag: 2001), 409–22, for a summary and assessment of the new editorial thinking. Doebel also provides an excellent overview of the problems with the Haas *Gesamtausgabe*. *Ibid.*, 291–401.

³ For example, Paul Hawkshaw, ed. *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, XVIII: Messe f Moll* (Vienna, 2005) and Benjamin Korstvedt, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, IV/3: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur: Fassung von 1888* (Vienna, 2004).

⁴ *Die Neue Anton Bruckner Gesamtausgabe/The New Anton Bruckner Complete Edition*, ed. Paul Hawkshaw, Thomas Leibnitz, Andreas Lindner, Angela Pachovsky and Thomas Röder (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2016–). The inaugural meeting of the Editorial and Advisory Boards took place in Vienna at the offices of the publisher on 15 March 2013.

⁵ Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2016.

⁶ Anton Bruckner, *Neunte Symphonie [D-moll] für großes Orchester*, ed. Ferdinand Löwe (Vienna: Ludwig Doblinger, [1904]). The manuscript is now in the Music Collection of the Austrian National Library (Wn) Mus. Hs. 19.481.

⁷ August Göllerich and Max Auer, *Anton Bruckner: ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild*, 4 vols (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse Verlag, 1922–37), 4/4: 110. Auer was Chairman (*Vorsitzender*) of the Board of Directors (*Vorstand*) of the Society at the time. The *Missa Solemnis* and Requiem,

the Collected Works at the time, formulated the argument as follows in an essay prior to another Hausegger Munich concert – this one featuring the manuscript version of the Fifth Symphony on 28 October 1935:

Another special celebration will begin with the premiere of Bruckner's mighty "Fifth" almost sixty years after the work was completed. This performance uses the [new] score from the Collected Works Edition – i.e. the reading in Bruckner's autograph manuscript that the master identified in his will as the definitive version – not the first edition of 1896 that we have known until now. The 1896 publication contains an arrangement with extensive cuts and massive orchestration changes . . . that have no verifiable connection with the master.⁸

Haas and his supporters argued, at times on slender evidence, that, prior to the publication of the Collected Works Edition, Bruckner's editors – Franz and Josef Schalk, Ferdinand Löwe, Max von Oberleithner and Cyrill Hynais, all former students of the composer – had altered the master's printed scores without his knowledge or permission. Or worse, they and their colleagues had coerced a composer, victim of years of conflict and rejection in Vienna and notorious for revising his pieces, into making ill-advised changes. Haas, for example, wrote in his preface to the Eighth Symphony:

Baffled by the score, Hermann Levi in Munich, seconded by Josef Schalk in Vienna, applied intense pressure for extensive revisions . . . Especially the Finale betrays a soulless superficiality and cursory, casual style that one must expect of an arrangement in which cuts have been wrung out of the work.⁹

For Haas, a critical piece of evidence was Bruckner's will which contains the following passage:

I bequeath to the Imperial Library in Vienna and request that its administration assume responsibility for the autograph manuscripts of the following compositions: the symphonies, as of now eight in number, the ninth God willing soon to be finished; the three large Masses; the quintet; the Te Deum; Psalm 150; and the choral piece *Helgoland*.

In addition, I stipulate that the firm of Josef Eberle should borrow the manuscripts of the works it publishes for a reasonable time from the library, which should be prepared to loan them to Eberle and Cie. for an adequate period.¹⁰

which had already appeared in the *Gesamtausgabe* (see n.2), were excluded from the debate over the composer's early editions because neither had been published previously. For more on the politics surrounding the founding of the Society and the origins of the *Gesamtausgabe*, see Christa Brüstle, *Anton Bruckner und die Nachwelt* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1998), 73–133. For a list of directors during the early years of the Society, see Andrea Harrandt, 'Internationale Bruckner-Gesellschaft (IBG)' in *Bruckner Handbuch*, 218.

⁸ *Münchener Zeitung*, 25 October 1935. Cited in *Bruckner-Blätter*, 3–4 (1935): 24. Haas's edition of the Fifth Symphony appeared as *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, V: V. Symphonie B-Dur (Originalfassung)* (Vienna, 1935). The first edition was Anton Bruckner, *Fünfte Symphonie (B dur) für großes Orchester* (Vienna: Ludwig Doblinger, [1896]).

⁹ Robert Haas, ed. *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, VIII: VIII. Symphonie c-Moll [1890]* (Leipzig, 1939), *Einführung*.

¹⁰ This is the fourth clause in the will that Bruckner signed and dated 10 November 1893. For the text of the entire document, see Rolf Keller, 'Die letztwilligen Verfügungen Anton Bruckners', *Bruckner-Jahrbuch 1982–83*, 111–115.

Whatever had happened during Bruckner's lifetime, so the argument went, the manuscripts in the library preserved the readings that he had identified 'for later times'. Bruckner himself had used the phrase 'for later times' in his famous letter of 27 January 1891 to Felix Weingartner, who was preparing to conduct the Eighth Symphony. The composer told Weingartner to take two extensive cuts that were marked in the finale score because 'it would be much too long and is valid only for later times, to be sure, for a circle of friends and aficionados'.¹¹

Needless to say, the *Gesamtausgabe* policy did not go unchallenged. The new scores provoked the so-called *Bruckner-Streit*, one of the most vitriolic and extended controversies in the history of modern musical literature.¹² Alfred Orel resigned from his editorial position under duress over the issue.¹³ Speculation was rife on both sides, because many of the engravers' copies that might otherwise have shed some light on the genesis of the readings in the early editions were lost.¹⁴ Haas's opponents pointed out that the editors had been Bruckner's students and friends who had worked tirelessly on the composer's behalf for years in the hostile Viennese environment. Bruckner had been grateful for their support and applauded performances of the readings in their editions. Those readings were superior from a performance standpoint to those of the autograph manuscripts. Eyewitness testimony was summoned to the effect that nothing had happened in the preparation of the early editions without Bruckner's approval. Friederich Eckstein, for example, described the composer's conversations with his students as follows:

I know that every note ... was set in stone during endless conversations among Bruckner, Franz and Josef Schalk, and [Ferdinand] Löwe. ... It is certain that these conductors advised Bruckner regarding changes at least in the instrumentation, but also in tempo and dynamics.¹⁵

¹¹ Andrea Harrandt and Otto Schneidert, eds, *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke*, XXIV/1–2, *Briefe, 1887–1896* (Vienna, 1998/2009 and 2003), 2:114.

¹² Franz Schalk, one of the early editors in question, had already voiced his objections to the manuscript versions prior to the 1932 performance of the Ninth Symphony. Wn F18 Schalk 395 (1930). Cited in Thomas Leibnitz, *Die Brüder Schalk und Anton Bruckner* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider Verlag, 1988), 263–5, and Paul Hawkshaw, 'The Bruckner Problem Revisited', *19th-Century Music* 21 (1997): 105–6. The battle raged for well over two decades. Max Auer, Friedrich Blume, Deryck Cooke and Hans Ferdinand Redlich (on the Haas side), and Emil Armbruster, Max Morold, Alfred Orel and Egon Wellesz (on the Schalk side) were among the dozens of writers who weighed in. Max Auer, 'Der Streit um den echten Bruckner im Licht biographischer Tatsachen', *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103 (1936): 538–45 and 1191–6; Friedrich Blume, 'Bruckner, Josef Anton', in *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Kassel und Basel, 1952), 2:357–8; Deryck Cooke, 'The Bruckner Problem Simplified', in *Vindications: Essays on Romantic Music* (Cambridge: 1982), 43–71; Hans Ferdinand Redlich, *Bruckner and Mahler* (London: 1956), 40–50; Emil Armbruster, *Erstdruckfassung oder 'Originalfassung'?* (Leipzig: 1946); Max Morold, 'Der wahre Bruckner?', *Zeitschrift für Musik* 103 (1936): 533–7; Alfred Orel, 'Original und Bearbeitung bei Anton Bruckner', *Deutsche Musikkultur* 1 (1936): 193–222; and Egon Wellesz, 'Anton Bruckner and the Process of Musical Creation', *The Musical Quarterly* 24 (1938): 265–290.

¹³ Orel resigned as co-editor in November 1937. He explained his decision in a lengthy letter to Franz Schalk's wife, Lily, on 3 March 1938. Wn Fonds 18 Schalk 357/13/10. For more on Orel's relationship with the *Gesamtausgabe* and Robert Haas see Brüstle, *Nachwelt*, 136–142.

¹⁴ The engravers' copies for Symphonies Nos. 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8 and the Quintet survive. See Table 1.

¹⁵ Friederich Eckstein, 'Leidenschaftliche Erörterungen um Bruckner', *Anbruch* 8 (1936): 56.

For the most part, supporters of the early editions ignored the will.¹⁶ The most cogent response to Haas's insistence upon its supremacy came from Alfred Orel, who saw the will as Bruckner's method of providing multiple sources for future reference.¹⁷ The opposition notwithstanding, by the 1950s, the manuscript versions had prevailed. Haas's successor as editor of the Complete Works, Leopold Nowak, continued the policy of ignoring the early printed scores and for most of the twentieth century, with few exceptions, they remained on the library shelf.¹⁸

Even as Nowak did his work, evidence began to accumulate that supporters of the early editions were in large part correct about the Third and Fourth Symphonies. In 1959 Nowak published the third version of the Third Symphony – the 1889 reading that had served as the basis for the score published by Theodor Rättig the following year.¹⁹ Nowak demonstrated that, although the contents of the 1890 edition itself had been tampered with, the composer had been involved in the preparation of the engraver's copy.²⁰ Bruckner and Franz Schalk had in fact interacted as co-composers in the preparation of the 1889 Finale.²¹ Benjamin Korstvedt later showed that, in 1888, Ferdinand Löwe and the Schalk brothers had prepared the engraver's copy for the first edition of the Fourth Symphony (1889/90) with the composer's cooperation.²² Bruckner was thrilled with the public acclaim that performances of the new editions of the Third and Fourth Symphonies received and

¹⁶ See Franz Schalk's remarks cited in Hawkshaw, 'Bruckner Problem', 106.

¹⁷ Orel, 'Original und Bearbeitungen', 221.

¹⁸ The supremacy of the manuscript versions became almost a first principal for Bruckner performers and scholars. The present author, for example, argued in favour of the Haas/Nowak position in Hawkshaw, 'Bruckner Problem', 96–106. Among the rare notable exceptions was the conductor Hans Knappertsbusch, who continued to perform and record from the early printed scores until his death in 1965.

¹⁹ Rättig had already published a different reading of the symphony 11 years earlier: Anton Bruckner, *Symphonie (D-moll) für großes Orchester* (Vienna: Theodor Rättig, [1879]). Nowak's edition of the 1889 or third version of the work appeared as: Leopold Nowak, ed., *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werk, III/3: III. Symphonie d-Moll: Fassung von 1889* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1959).

²⁰ Nowak, ed., *III. Symphonie d-Moll, 'Vorwort'*. The engraver's copy is now Wn Mus. Hs. 6081.

²¹ Thomas Röder, 'Master and Disciple United: the 1889 Finale of the Third Symphony', in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson (Aldershot: Ashgate Press, 2001), 93–113. See also Dermot Gault, *The New Bruckner* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), 132–41.

²² Benjamin Korstvedt, 'The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity'. *19th-Century Music* 20 (Summer, 1996): 3–26. Korstvedt edited this version of the symphony as *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, IV/3: IV. Symphonie Es-Dur: Fassung von 1888* (Vienna, 2004). See also Gault, *New Bruckner*, 128–32. The engraver's copy is in private possession. A photograph is kept in the Wienbibliothek Musiksammlung M. H. 9098/c. An error-filled edition appeared in 1889 and was replaced in 1890 at the composer's insistence. Korstvedt, 'First Published Edition', xxiii. Alfred Orel had already argued (to little effect) the case for legitimizing this version of the symphony in 'Ein Bruckner Fund (die Endfassung der IV. Sinfonie)', *Schweizerische Musikzeitung* 88 (1949): 320–24. Ironically, with the publication of Korstvedt's score of the Fourth, those of us nurtured on Haas and Nowak manuscript versions found ourselves in a position very much analogous to that of Brucknerians in the 1930s who grew up knowing only the early editions.

Table 1 Bruckner's Editors

Composition	Publisher/Date	Editor(s)
Symphony No. 1	Doblinger 1893	Cyrril Hynais
Symphony No. 2	Doblinger 1892	Cyrril Hynais
Symphony No. 3	Rättig 1879, 1890	Franz Schalk
Symphony No. 4	Gutmann 1889	Ferdinand Löwe, Franz and Josef Schalk
Symphony No. 5	Doblinger 1896	Franz Schalk
Symphony No. 6	Doblinger 1899	Cyrril Hynais
Symphony No. 7	Gutmann 1885	Ferdinand Löwe, Franz and Josef Schalk
Symphony No. 8	Haslinger Schlesinger- Lienau 1892	Josef Schalk and Max von Oberleithner
Symphony No. 9	Doblinger 1903	Ferdinand Löwe
Mass in D minor	Gross 1892	Max von Oberleithner
Mass in E minor	Doblinger 1896	Franz and Josef Schalk
Mass in F minor	Doblinger 1894	Josef Schalk and Max von Oberleithner
Psalm 150	Doblinger 1892	Cyrril Hynais
Te Deum	Rättig 1885	Franz Schalk
Quintet	Gutmann 1884	Franz and Josef Schalk
<i>Helgoland</i>	Doblinger 1899	Cyrril Hynais

publicly endorsed the readings they contain. On 14 January 1893, for example, the same year he made his will, the composer wrote about the Third to Hermann Levi:

I ask you please to perform from the new edition that the emperor paid for three years ago. It is incomparably better. (I don't want to hear any more about the earlier version.)²³

Why, then, did he include in his bequest to the library autograph manuscripts with substantially different readings of the two symphonies?²⁴

²³ Harrantd and Schneider, *Briefe, 1887–1896*, 2:205. See also Bruckner's letter to Hermann Levi regarding the Fourth, 14 April 1888, and his letter to Hans von Wolzogen about the Third, 31 December 1890. Harrantd and Schneider, *Briefe, 1887–1896*, 2:34 and 2:103. The Third was performed from the new edition on 21 December 1890, and the final version of the Fourth on 22 January 1888. The earlier version to which he is referring in the letter of 14 January 1893 is almost certainly Theodor Rättig's first print of 1879, not any manuscript reading. See n.19.

²⁴ Wn Mus. Hs. 19.475 and 19.476 are the autograph manuscripts of the 1877 version of the Third and 1880 version of the Fourth respectively. At this point we should eliminate any suggestion that Bruckner's attorney, Theodore Reisch, deposited the wrong manuscripts in the library. He attempted to follow his client's instructions and deliver to the library the final complete autograph manuscripts of all the pieces listed in the will. The Mass in F minor and first three movements of the Third Symphony were not available to him. He took it upon himself to give the Mass in E minor to the diocese of Linz for which it had been written and where it remains today. Bruckner almost certainly would have approved Reisch's

The most important evidence about the relationship between Bruckner and his editors is an extensive correspondence, largely unpublished, between the brothers Franz (1863–1931) and Josef Schalk (1857–1900) that survives in the Fonds Schalk in the Music Collection of the Austrian National Library.²⁵ The correspondence came about because, during the 1880s and 90s, Franz pursued a successful performing career with a series of appointments around Germany and Austria while Josef remained in Vienna. The brothers, both of whom studied with Bruckner at the Conservatory, were by far the most active of his editors. Ferdinand Löwe (1863–1925), himself a successful conductor and friend of the Schalks, played a somewhat lesser role. Max von Oberleithner (1868–1935) was involved with the editions of the Eighth Symphony and Masses in D and F Minor, and Cyrill Hynais (1862–1913) with the First, Second and Sixth Symphonies, Psalm 150 and *Helgoland*. The Schalks began to have a professional interest in Bruckner's music in 1881, when Josef completed a piano four-hand arrangement of the String Quintet and hosted rehearsals in his home for the work's first performance.²⁶ That same year, Franz, who was playing violin in the orchestra in Karlsruhe, convinced his conductor, Felix Mottl, to perform the Fourth Symphony. Franz's effort led to one of the many public debacles in Bruckner's career. On 10 December, after a disastrous first rehearsal, Franz wrote to his brother:

The symphony will be performed. How is another matter! ... I am convinced it will be a failure here, and I don't know how to break the news to Bruckner. The orchestra is not up to it [and] unfortunately doesn't want to play the piece. ... So I will have to dress up in my tuxedo to witness the demise of a great work of art. Mottl beats without inspiration and is really only doing the piece because he doesn't want to send it back unperformed. He told me the symphony has great weaknesses. I replied briefly: 'but many greater strengths'. God be with Bruckner. His time has not yet come.²⁷

Franz's predictions proved correct. Three days later he wrote again:²⁸

The Bruckner symphony was a total failure. ... Mottl never grew to appreciate Bruckner's genius His *tempi* reduced the delicate motives to banal fiddling. The interpretation hid the densely intertwined melodic threads from the listener. I am disgusted to write any further about it and deeply regret convincing Mottl to do a performance that did more harm than good You will do your best to

decision to give that manuscript to the diocese. Reisch included the first version of the Adagio of the Eighth Symphony because the second version was in the possession of the Schalks. Leopold Nowak, 'Das Bruckner Erbe der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek'. *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 21 (1966): 526–31. Reisch could not have organized the individual movements so consistently without help. Bruckner organized the manuscripts himself prior to his move to Belvedere in 1895 as indicated by lists that he and his secretary, Anton Meissner, made in his pocket calendar of 1894/95, Wn Mus. Hs. 3179/6. Ferdinand Löwe, who was on hand when Bruckner passed away, must have assisted Reisch in his task. Elisabeth Maier, 'A Hidden Personality: Access to an "Inner Biography" of Anton Bruckner', in *Bruckner Studies*, 33.

²⁵ Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, contains an extensive analysis and selections from the letters.

²⁶ Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, 41. The first performance took place on 17 November 1881 at a concert of the Viennese Academic Wagner Society, which would become a venue for many of the Schalks' efforts on Bruckner's behalf.

²⁷ Wn Fonds 18 Schalk 158/3/5. Cited in Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, 47.

²⁸ Wn Fonds 18 Schalk 158/3/7. Cited in Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, 48–9.

conceal the extent of the failure from Bruckner; he would be discouraged to learn that the verdict about one of his most easily understood works was unanimous. In the entire hall hardly a single pair of hands stirred.

From that point on, the brothers became Bruckner's counsellors, supporters, friends, editors, arrangers, performers and, as mentioned, even co-composers.²⁹ To their credit, they and their fellow editors invested long hours with no personal gain helping Bruckner. He came to rely heavily on the brothers, and on Ferdinand Löwe in particular, during the years immediately following Hermann Levi's rejection of the Eighth Symphony in October 1887.³⁰ Bruckner was distraught upon learning of the rejection, so much so that his colleagues repeatedly expressed concern over his wellbeing. Before he communicated his decision to the composer, on 30 September 1887, for example, Levi wrote to Josef Schalk for advice:

Please write to me immediately about how I should approach Bruckner. If the outcome were merely that he would think I am an ass, or worse a traitor, I could live with that. But I fear even worse – that this disappointment will destroy him.³¹

Josef replied on 18 October that Bruckner was badly shaken by the rejection, though he had begun to revise the first movement.³² Although there is no evidence to support Robert Haas's assertion that the brothers and Löwe took advantage of Bruckner's fragile state in the late 1880s to coerce the composer into accepting their suggestions, there can be little question that it caused him to rely on them more than he might have otherwise.³³ Theirs cannot have been an easy role to fill, as Bruckner was often acrimonious and difficult to work with. Because Franz was usually away from Vienna, his brother and Ferdinand Löwe bore the brunt of the composer's ill humour.³⁴

The principal objective of the young editors was to help Bruckner avoid debacles like the Karlsruhe performance – to make it easier for conductors, performers and audiences to understand his music. In 1930, decades after the

²⁹ For a discussion of Josef Schalk's involvement in the composition of the second version of the Eighth Symphony, for example, see Paul Hawkshaw, ed. *Anton Bruckner Sämtliche Werke, VIII: VIII. Symphonie c-Moll: Fassungen von 1887 und 1890, Revisionsbericht* (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2013), 22, 271–4. The earliest sketch for the new ending of the first movement in the second version, for example, is in the hand of Josef Schalk. Wn Mus. Hs. 28.419, fol. 22v. See also n.21 above concerning Franz Schalk's participation as co-composer of the Finale of the third version of the Third Symphony.

³⁰ Levi's letter of rejection is dated 7 October 1887. Harrandt and Schneider, *Briefe, 1887–1896*, 2:23.

³¹ Harrandt and Schneider, *Briefe, 1887–1896*, 2:22. I have observed that anyone confronted by the innumerable and often impenetrable layers of change in the autograph pages of the second version of the Eighth Symphony might wonder about the composer's state of mind in preparing them. Hawkshaw, *VIII. Symphonie Revisionsbericht*, 12.

³² Harrandt and Schneider, *Briefe, 1887–1896*, 2:25.

³³ See the citation and n.9 above.

³⁴ There are contemporary reports of a number of conflagrations between Bruckner and Josef Schalk, despite the latter's tireless efforts on the composer's behalf. Bruckner was so irate with Josef's and Franz Zottmann's preparation for a performance of a piano reduction of the Fifth Symphony in April 1887, for example, that he threatened to call the police! Friedrich Klose, *Meine Lehrjahre bei Bruckner: Erinnerungen und Betrachtungen* (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1927), 140–42.

composer's death, Franz Schalk, by this time one of Austria's leading conductors, wrote:

Many of the changes would not be necessary today. ... The master himself had minimal understanding of the little comforts of music making. He seldom if ever considered it necessary in his notation and method of writing to distinguish thematically or harmonically significant notes from their neighbours. As a result, the first attempts at performance often featured masses of sound and confused intonation. This is where his students – with the deepest belief in the eternal greatness of his music – intervened and tried to create remedies. Their extremely careful work was limited ... almost without exception to technical simplifications which would make the inner meaning of this symphonic colossus easier for the listener to comprehend.³⁵

The remedies were often more far reaching than Schalk leads us to believe and were infused with Wagnerian ideology and practice. The Schalks brought Bruckner personally closer to the young Wagnerian faction in Vienna, and their musical interventions were based on their understanding of Wagnerian orchestral sound.³⁶ At the end of the Scherzo of the Fifth Symphony (Nowak edition bars 369–382), for example, among other modifications Franz replaced Bruckner's static *tutti* repeating chords with a passage marked *crescendo* and *accelerando* built in orchestral blocks full of trills reminiscent of Act 1, Scene 4, of *Tristan und Isolde* (bars 24 ff.) or of the Prelude to Act 1 of *Die Meistersinger* (bars 207–210). Throughout their scores, the editors:

1. Added innumerable performance directions (often in German in the Wagnerian fashion) such as *breit* or *hervortretend* to provide the orchestra with some direction where Bruckner wrote none
2. Re-orchestrated to ameliorate Bruckner's instrumentation in choirs, adjust balance (usually to reduce the brass), reinforce contrapuntal lines, or emphasize structural high points
3. Tried to clarify the phrase structure by adding or changing markings, inserting rests after the final notes of cadences, or adding innumerable *ritard* – *a tempo* directions
4. Despite Franz's protestations to the contrary, made or suggested numerous cuts to make the works more palatable for the audience.³⁷

Of course, it was commonplace for conductors to make such alterations to the scores of many composers at the end of the nineteenth century. By 1930, orchestras and conductors were used to the technical and musical demands of Wagnerian style, and many of the editorial changes to Bruckner's scores, whether or not they had been justified in the 1880s and 90s, were no longer necessary as even Franz Schalk conceded at the beginning of the above-cited passage.

Throughout most of the 1880s, the Schalks and Löwe worked in close collaboration with Bruckner. Leaving aside the usual incursions and mistakes that

³⁵ Wn Fonds 18 Schalk 395. Cited in Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, 265.

³⁶ Andrea Harrandt, 'Students and Friends as "Prophets and Promoters": The Reception of Anton Bruckner's Works in the *Wiener Akademische Wagner-Verein*', in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, 317–27.

³⁷ For detailed studies of the editors' incursions see Doebel, *Bruckners Symphonien*, 111–210; Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, 280–310; Haas, *Bruckner Sämtliche Werke*, V: *Vorlagenbericht*, xxv–xxvii or Hawkshaw, *VIII. Symphonie Revisionsbericht*, 381–414.

crept into many nineteenth-century editorial projects, the early editions of the Third (1890), Fourth and Seventh Symphonies, the String Quintet and the Te Deum are blessed *de facto* with his *imprimatur*. Bruckner held Franz's musical abilities in particularly high regard and sought out his opinions, as Josef noted, for example, in a letter of 26 November 1888 to Franz: 'He [Bruckner] wants to show you each of the many alterations he is now making assiduously to the Third and Eighth symphonies'.³⁸ Towards the end of the decade, the students began to lose patience with what they perceived as Bruckner's pedantry. As early as 9 May 1887 Josef wrote to Franz:

Our friend Löwe has very favourably re-orchestrated many sections of the Romantic [Fourth Symphony] with Bruckner's approval. [Bruckner's] unbelievable preoccupation with detail, not to say pedantry, forced him [Löwe] to prolong the task so that [Albert] Gutmann, who is publishing the piece, only received the first movement a few days ago.³⁹

Alfred Orel observed that the more the composer came to depend upon his young colleagues, the more acerbic and domineering he became in trying to assert his control.⁴⁰

On 10 June 1888, Josef wrote again to Franz:

[Bruckner] is still sitting over the finale of the Third [Symphony]. He has recomposed a few places. By the way, he has kept your cuts and alterations. Now he is severely plagued by the delusion of removing parallel octaves from the movement. In the process, he wastes a lot of time and struggles horribly, but is unmoved by any objections from Löwe or me. It is really sad to see how, at the expense of natural voice leading, he erases everything and makes changes for the sake of this fixation.⁴¹

As the brothers grew less and less tolerant of Bruckner's overbearing interference, they began not only to make alterations without consulting him, but also to conceal them from him. Although the Schalks were both very much involved with the preparation of the manuscript of the second or 1890 version of the Eighth Symphony, for example, Josef and Max von Oberleithner prepared the first edition (1892) entirely behind the composer's back. In the midst of corrections for the edition, on 5 August 1891, Josef wrote to Oberleithner: 'Please communicate only with the publisher about the corrections'.⁴² Josef and Oberleithner also conspired to conceal alterations to the first edition of the Mass in F minor (1894) from the composer.⁴³ Thomas Leibnitz has demonstrated that Franz Schalk made

³⁸ Harrandt and Schneider, *Briefe, 1887–1896*, 2:25.

³⁹ Wn Fonds 18 Schalk 158/8/4.

⁴⁰ Orel, 'Original und Bearbeitung', 197. The above-mentioned quarrel with Josef Schalk (see n.34) was caused, at least in part, by Bruckner's sense of loss of control. He complained that he had not been invited to enough pre-concert rehearsals. Klose, *Meine Lehrjahre bei Bruckner*, 142. In the pianists' defence, Josef replied to Bruckner in a letter of 27 March 1887 that they had been rehearsing for weeks under the composer's direction. Wn Fonds 18 Schalk 146/c/1. Cited in Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, 113–14.

⁴¹ Wn Fonds 18 Schalk 158/9/7.

⁴² Wn Fonds 32 Oberleithner 169. A translation of the entire letter is printed in Hawkshaw, *VIII. Symphonie Revisionsbericht*, 26–7. For more on the Schalks' involvement with the second version of the Eighth Symphony see Hawkshaw, *Revisionsbericht*, 19–23.

⁴³ For more on the Mass in F minor see Paul Hawkshaw, 'An Anatomy of Change: Anton Bruckner's Revisions to the Mass in F Minor', in *Bruckner Studies*, 28–30.

the entire arrangement of the Fifth Symphony (1896) that Haas later criticized without consulting Bruckner. Schalk deliberately deceived the composer by having the parts for the premiere (Graz, 8 April 1894) copied from the score of his arrangement while allowing Bruckner to believe he was using the autograph manuscript.⁴⁴ Bruckner is not known either to have endorsed or criticized any of these three editions in public, though his anger with Oberleithner with regard to the Mass was common knowledge in the inner circle. Max Auer believed that Bruckner indicated his dissatisfaction with the Schalks' and Oberleithner's efforts by turning to Cyrill Hynais for editorial help with the editions published late in his life.⁴⁵

As Thomas Leibnitz observed, the editors hoped public acclaim would overcome Bruckner's chagrin when he discovered he had been omitted from the publication process. They expected he would come to prefer the readings in the editions of the Fifth and Eighth Symphonies and Mass in F Minor as he did those of the Third and Fourth Symphonies. Leibnitz wrote:

at times the students and friends preferred the easier path of making changes on their own ... to the laborious road of discussion and persuasion [Their] alterations to Bruckner's music spanned the gamut of sought-after advice to covert manipulation.⁴⁶

Distinguishing Bruckner from his editor/co-composers in pieces where he worked closely with them is often difficult, if not impossible. From an editorial perspective, it is pointless, because the composer accepted their suggestions and made them his own. At times, editorial advice in one passage became part of the original conception in the next. The cymbal crash at the climax of the Adagio of the Seventh Symphony, for example, found its way into the autograph score at the analogous place in the first version of the Eighth (measure 269) with no external prompting. However much the Schalks and Löwe may have contributed, the composer was responsible for the 1888 version of the Fourth Symphony and the 1889 version of the Third. As Nowak, Röder and Korstvedt have demonstrated, the authenticity of these versions cannot be questioned. Publications prepared with Bruckner partially or entirely removed from the editorial process, inadvertently or deliberately, are a different matter. At this point the will comes into play, though not precisely in the manner Haas had envisioned.

⁴⁴ Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, 179–85. Bruckner was unable to attend the performance due to illness. The earliest incidence mentioned in the correspondence of the Schalks' having deliberately misled Bruckner occurred in the summer of 1888. While visiting Vienna, Gustav Mahler convinced Bruckner to reprint the old (1879) score of the Third Symphony rather than a new edition with the revisions on which the composer had been working with the Schalks. The publisher Theodor Rättig was forced to set aside 50 plates that had already been completed for the new edition. Josef intervened directly with Rättig to veto Mahler's (and Bruckner's) plan to reprint. On 13 July 1888 Josef wrote to Franz: 'There is nothing to be done now except stop the printing without Bruckner's knowledge until his beloved Francisce [Bruckner's nickname for Franz] I hope has an opportunity to restore equilibrium'. Wn Fonds 18 Schalk 158/9/9. Cited in Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, 135. The brothers prevailed. By way of illustrating how complex a web Bruckner could create with his vacillation, the new edition was the very one he endorsed five years later in the above-cited letter to Levi. See n.23.

⁴⁵ Auer, 'Der Streit', 1194. To date no documentary or anecdotal evidence has surfaced to support Auer's theory beyond the fact Bruckner did rely a great deal on Hynais during the 1890s (See Table 1).

⁴⁶ Leibnitz, *Brüder Schalk*, 279.

In November 1893, as the students' changing attitude was becoming obvious, Bruckner signed his will. The clause in question (see above) contains two instructions: one to the library and another to the firm of Josef Eberle (engraver for Doblinger). The former includes all the major works (except the *Nullte* Symphony) that Bruckner had composed since the conclusion of his studies with Otto Kitzler – that is, since 1863. The latter can refer only to those works covered under the contract that Bruckner had signed with Eberle's firm on 14 July 1892.⁴⁷ The Third (Rättig, 1879, 1890), Fourth (Gutmann, 1889, 1890), Seventh (Gutmann, 1885) and Eighth (Haslinger Schlesinger – Lienau, 1892) Symphonies; the String Quintet (Gutmann, 1884); the Mass in D minor (Gross, 1892); and the *Te Deum* (Rättig, 1885) had been or were in the process of being published elsewhere. The instruction to Eberle could not have applied to these works. All other pieces listed in the instruction to the library had been committed to Eberle in the 1892 contract or had already been published by Doblinger. The second instruction was designed to facilitate access for Eberle to Bruckner's as yet unpublished works, at the time the Fifth, Sixth and Ninth Symphonies, *Helgoland* and the Mass in E minor; and to provide the publisher a point of reference for subsequent printings of the scores in his catalogue – the First and Second Symphonies, Psalm 150 and the Mass in F minor. In accordance with the first instruction in the will, on 19 October 1896, Bruckner's attorney, Theodor Reisch, delivered the scores identified today as Wn Mus. Hs. 19.473 through 19.486 to what was then the Imperial Library, among them, as mentioned above, manuscripts containing readings of the Third and Fourth Symphonies that differed substantially from printed scores that he had endorsed.⁴⁸ Robert Haas interpreted the will as the composer's most emphatic stipulation that future editions should be based on the manuscripts Reisch deposited regardless of Bruckner's previous assertions.

In fact, the composer probably never intended his will to have a bearing on post-mortem editorial issues or to dictate the hierarchy of versions of his pieces.⁴⁹ There is no evidence that, for 30 years after his death, anyone – not even his attorney or Eberle – believed that it did. Josef Lasner, cellist in Ferdinand Löwe's orchestra the *Wiener Konzertverein*, reported, for example, that in publishing the 1904 edition of the Ninth Symphony, Löwe first prepared parts from the autograph score in the library and then made his editorial alterations throughout rehearsals for the first performance (11 February 1903).⁵⁰ If Eberle was even aware that Löwe had made alterations, when the engraver produced his score, he must have believed he was following Bruckner's verbal direction to Josef Stritzko, a former student who served in an administrative capacity for his firm. According to Stritzko, in 1892, possibly in connection with the Eberle contract, the composer said:

If something is to be published after my death, it should go through the hands of Löwe and [Franz] Schalk; or they should at least have nothing against it.⁵¹

⁴⁷ The entire text of the contract can be found in Göllicher-Auer, *Anton Bruckner*, 4/3:259–262.

⁴⁸ Nowak, 'Das Bruckner Erbe', 526–31. See also notes 20, 22 and 24 above.

⁴⁹ My view of this issue has changed in the past few years. In Hawkshaw, 'Bruckner Problem', 96–107, I argued in support of the Haas interpretation.

⁵⁰ Auer, 'Der Streit', 538 and 1194. The engraver's copy is lost.

⁵¹ Göllicher-Auer, *Anton Bruckner*, 4/3: 258.

With respect to the first print of the Ninth Symphony, editor and publisher followed the directions of Bruckner's will to the letter: they borrowed the manuscript from the library, edited and printed the work. As far as editing is concerned, they followed a practice that dated back to the 1880s with the composer's blessing. The will says nothing about how the contents of the manuscripts were to be edited beyond that Eberle should consult them. Bruckner *must* have known that, so long as Schalk and Löwe served as his chosen arbiters, similar policies would be applied to new publications, and the readings in his extant editions, authorized or not, would prevail.

In the 1982–83 issue of the *Bruckner Jahrbuch*, attorney Rolf Keller published a detailed study of Bruckner's will. He pointed out that the impetus for making the will at the end of 1893 came from Bruckner's recent illness and from his brother Ignaz's urging to put personal affairs in order, not from any concern with his professional life.⁵² In a line-by-line analysis of the entire document, Keller outlined Bruckner's top legal priorities as follows:

1. Arranging for his remains to be interred in St Florian
2. Arranging for Masses to be said on behalf of his immortal soul
3. Bequests for his brother, sister and long-time house-keeper Katharina Kachelmayer
4. Memorializing his name for posterity.

Keller sees the gift of manuscripts to the library as a cornerstone in Bruckner's effort to memorialize his name. As Alfred Orel put it, by paying for his crypt in St Florian and giving his manuscripts to the library, Bruckner was making a statement for posterity: 'I am somebody!'⁵³

In Keller's view, by publishing a Collected Works Edition, the Austrian National Library fulfilled the musical half of their donor's wish, as expressed in the will, to establish a long-term legacy. The other half was the internment in the crypt in St Florian. Beyond the instruction to Eberle, Bruckner did not take advantage of the opportunity the will offered to dictate what the musical legacy might look like, as he did with the crypt.⁵⁴ A little less than a year after the will had been signed, by which time Bruckner was well aware of his students' unapproved editorial liberties, at least with the Eighth Symphony and Mass in F minor, he added a codicil to the will.⁵⁵ It contains further detailed instructions about his final resting place in St Florian and an alternative plan for Steyr, should the monastery not work out. He could easily have added more stipulations for Eberle and the library or instructions to future editors on reconciling the contents of the manuscripts with those of his editions. Does the absence of any such direction indicate

⁵² Keller, 'Die letztwilligen Verfügungen Anton Bruckners', 97. Bruckner had been ill off and on for the better part of the spring and summer of 1893. He suffered a bad setback at the end of August and, on 21 September, his friend Franz Bayer reported that the doctors had strictly forbidden the composer to work. Göllerich-Auer, *Anton Bruckner*, 4/3: 352–353. Ignaz, who lived in St Florian, wrote to Bruckner on 9 October 1893 that the Prelate had agreed the composer could be interred at the monastery. Ignaz told Bruckner to confirm the arrangements and organize the rest of his affairs in a will which was an urgent matter, given the composer's recent illness. Harrandt and Schneider, *Briefe, 1887–1896*, 2:234–35.

⁵³ Alfred Orel, *Bruckner Brevier* (Vienna: Kaltschmid, 1953), 123.

⁵⁴ Keller, 'Die letztwilligen Verfügungen Anton Bruckners', 97.

⁵⁵ Bruckner corrected some of the Schalkisms in the F-minor Mass, for example. Hawkshaw, 'Anatomy of Change', 31. The codicil was signed and dated 25 September 1894. Keller, 'Die letztwilligen Verfügungen Anton Bruckners', 118.

that he expected editors of post-Schalk generations to prefer the manuscript readings, including those of the Third and Fourth Symphonies, whose editions he was endorsing heartily at the very time he made the will? Even Haas compromised on this point towards the end of his life and came to accept the 1888 reading of the Fourth and 1889 reading of the Third.⁵⁶ Or does it rather indicate that, for better or worse, Bruckner had reconciled himself with the editorial status quo, including the unsanctioned scores, and saw the manuscripts in the library only as an important palaeographic ornament in his legacy? A third possibility, as Alfred Orel suggested, is that he was content with a plethora of versions as long as his music was performed. At the very least, the will ensured that the versions in the autograph manuscripts survived in the public forum. None of these scenarios is very satisfying for anyone looking for help from the composer's will in ranking competing readings. They all imply a level of ambivalence, even indifference, on Bruckner's part toward some aspect of the editorial problem he was well aware that he was leaving behind.

What about the notion, made popular during the days of the *Bruckner Streit*, that the composer preserved the manuscript versions in the library 'for later times'? Whatever the composer may have intended, the question has been *de facto* asked and answered. Thanks to Haas and Nowak, the manuscript versions – and there are many of them – are here to stay.⁵⁷ Contemporary editorial and performance practices will ensure their continued supremacy for the foreseeable future; performers and scholars today are far less tolerant than their counterparts in Bruckner's time of conductors and editors altering *any* composer's scores. In the interim, Leopold Nowak, Thomas Röder and Benjamin Korstvedt, have ensured that the final versions of the Third (1889) and Fourth (1888) Symphonies have found their rightful place as contenders for our admiration.

How will the *NBG* proceed? From the outset, the new edition will have a broad perspective with an international editorial board and individual scholars to prepare each volume.⁵⁸ The editors are beginning from two perhaps obvious premises:

1. As much as possible, the final reading *the composer* left, whether it be in a print or a manuscript, must be respected.
2. Revision was an important part of Bruckner's compositional process and must be allowed to play a major role as the present generation takes its turn at shaping his legacy.

Bruckner's music survives in the manuscripts Reisch delivered to the library, in many more manuscripts not listed in the will, and in early editions. For each work, the editors of the *NBG* will consult all the sources and rank them in relative order of importance. Early editions will be evaluated according to reliability and the extent of the composer's involvement, in the same way as printed scores for a modern Collected Works Edition of any other composer.⁵⁹ Spurious editorial

⁵⁶ Haas's change of heart concerning the Fourth Symphony is expressed, for example, in a reprint of his edition of the symphony. *Bruckner Sämtliche Werke* IV, 1.

⁵⁷ Leopold Nowak, in particular, made it a policy to publish as many of Bruckner's revisions as possible, including three versions of the Third and Fourth Symphonies and two each of the First, Second and Eighth.

⁵⁸ See n.4 above.

⁵⁹ As Alfred Orel proposed almost 80 years ago: Orel, 'Original und Bearbeitung', 202–21.

additions will be set aside in favour of the manuscript readings chronologically closest to them, and editorial imperfections in the prints Bruckner approved will be corrected by consulting the manuscripts. Variants for specific readings will be listed in Editorial Reports contained in each volume. Each of the new scores will also include an extensive Introduction describing the genesis of the work and significant editorial questions it poses.

Perhaps the most difficult question in the face of Bruckner's numerous revisions is: 'What constitutes a version?' The *NBG* will identify versions of individual works on the basis of a definitive historical fact – for example, date of composition, a performance, date of a major revision or first publication. As a result, some of the new readings will differ significantly from those of Haas and Nowak whose scores of the first versions of the Mass in F minor and First Symphony, for example, reflect an accumulation of years of revision. The readings in their so-called Linz versions of the First Symphony (each a little different) both date from the 1880s, almost 20 years after the composer had left Linz. Thomas Röder's new score in the *NBG* contains the work as Bruckner first declared it finished and performed it in 1868.⁶⁰ Such decisions will be made work by work, rather than dictated by a blanket policy.⁶¹

As far as Bruckner's will is concerned, it has achieved its purpose: the readings in the manuscripts he left to the library have become a most valued part of his legacy and will continue to play a significant role in the new edition.

⁶⁰ See n.5 above.

⁶¹ In making these sorts of decisions, the editors will also have an eye to what is already available in the old Collected Works. When a perfectly good score already exists of a particular version, where appropriate, the *NBG* will produce a different version of historical significance.