

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Signature:

Mary Kate Reischmann

Date

The Journey from Wagner to Brahms: Performance Markings and Orchestration in the
1873 and 1889 Scores of Bruckner's Third Symphony

by

Mary Kate Reischmann

Adviser Kevin Karnes

Department of Music

Kevin Karnes
Adviser

Stephen Crist
Committee Member

Peter Höyng
Committee Member

Date

The Journey from Wagner to Brahms: Performance Markings and Orchestration in the
1873 and 1889 Scores of Bruckner's Third Symphony

By

Mary Kate Reischmann

Adviser Kevin Karnes

An abstract of
A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Sciences with Honors

Department of Music

2010

Abstract

The Journey from Wagner to Brahms: Performance Markings and Orchestration in the 1873 and 1889 Scores of Bruckner's Third Symphony

By Mary Kate Reischmann

Scholars have long considered Anton Bruckner's third symphony to be one of the best representative examples of the "Bruckner Problem", the term given to the complications presented by the numerous versions in existence of each of Bruckner's works, many of which contradict one another. The "Problem" has been consistently applied to Bruckner's Third, particularly in light of the poor reception of the first version of the work printed in 1873. There has been argument that Bruckner's first edition was implicitly Wagnerian and his subsequent revisions leaned more towards the works of Brahms, as scholars have postulated that Bruckner made these revisions in order to garner support by revising his works to emulate those of critic-darling Brahms. However, analysis of the 1873 and 1889 scores reveals that the characteristics of the 1873 score are maintained in the 1889 score, masked primarily by the overt Brahmsian orchestration and performance markings. I purport that audiences would receive the 1873 and 1889 versions respectively as Wagnerian and Brahmsian because of this trend, and not because of a sudden shift in symphonic influence. Thus, the changes made to the Third symphony are effectively limited to orchestration rather than structure, suggesting that Bruckner attempted to counteract negative critical response without enacting fundamental changes to the work.

The Journey from Wagner to Brahms: Performance Markings and Orchestration in the
1873 and 1889 Scores of Bruckner's Third Symphony

By

Mary Kate Reischmann

Adviser Kevin Karnes

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Sciences with Honors

Department of Music

2010

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Chapter II: Survey and Context of Scholarship.....	11
Chapter III: Biographical Context.....	20
Chapter IV: Analysis.....	32
Chapter V: Conclusions.....	55
Chapter VI: References.....	57

Chapter I: Introduction

The study of Anton Bruckner has long been a fount of confusion for music scholars. Many have pointed to the numerous revisions Bruckner made to each of his symphonies as the most obvious cause of frustration surrounding Bruckner's works. The "Bruckner Problem," as this phenomenon has come to be called, has largely been a grey area despite constant scrutiny by analysts. Bruckner was for the most part not regarded favorably in his lifetime, and was under constant criticism from a number of sources. It is difficult to distinguish between changes made by Bruckner in response to this criticism and genuine outgrowths to the works that Bruckner made without regard to his detractors. Further complicating the issue is the contention that Bruckner's students made changes without his knowledge or approval. It is clear that a fair number of the versions and publications in existence were not approved by Bruckner, and that some revisions evident in these versions were simply unauthorized changes made by Bruckner's students and publishers. Therefore, it is difficult to determine which scores Bruckner meant to be regarded as the "right" ones, and also whether Bruckner authorized some versions at all.

The Third Symphony is often regarded as a prime example of the "Bruckner Problem." There has been much controversy over this symphony, particularly because the validity of nearly all of the versions of the Third is fairly ambiguous. While there is a plethora of publications of the work, the revisions of the third most often studied by scholars represent four distinct versions, of which I will relate the

more reputable publications.¹ The first, often called the Wagner Dedication Score, is the original score composed by Bruckner in 1873. The 1873 version exists in two different editions one by Röder and the other by Nowak, though Nowak's publication is more popular today than Röder's.² The first revisions to the Third were made in 1877/1878, which most notably added a coda to the scherzo and cut large portions of the finale. This version exists in two editions, one published by Nowak and the other by Oeser. The next set of revisions was made in 1889, and the definitive edition of this version was published by Nowak. Lastly, revisions were again made in 1890, and the score was published by Rättig. While the manuscripts for each of the four versions were in fact complete during Bruckner's lifetime, it is important to note that nearly all of these editions were published much later, after Bruckner's death, and were created from the editors' interpretations of autographs of the original scores.

In this thesis, I will be analyzing the 1873 and 1889 versions of the Third Symphony, using the Nowak publications. These two versions are the first and third written, and are perhaps the most ambiguous in the context of the "Bruckner

¹ The circumstances of the revision of the Third are fairly complicated, and my description is perhaps an oversimplification of the issue. For a complete history and description of the versions see Thomas Röder, *Auf dem Weg zur Bruckner Symphonie: Untersuchungen zu den ersten beiden Fassungen von Anton Bruckners Dritte Symphonie* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1987).

² Nowak's works are now widely regarded as the most scholarly editions of Bruckner's works, and have the backing of the Bruckner Gesamtausgabe. For more on the publishers see Benjamin Korstvedt, "Bruckner editions: the revolution revisited," in Williamson, John, *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 121.

Problem.” While the 1878 version is generally regarded as viable and the 1890 is almost unanimously rejected as unauthorized by Bruckner, there is still argument among scholars as to whether the 1873 and 1889 revisions should be considered when undertaking a performance of Bruckner’s Third. I will specifically analyze the differences in orchestration and performance markings between the 1873 and 1889 versions, and I will consider ways in which the differences between these versions are reflective both of Bruckner’s personal experiences and of the criticism by the Viennese populace. This analysis will serve as the basis for my thesis.

Current scholarship regarding the Third Symphony suggests that the patterns in various versions indicate a significant paradigm shift in compositional technique in the years between revisions.³ While many Bruckner scholars, particularly Julian Horton, state that a composer’s work should be studied independently of his putative motivations or personal characteristics,⁴ I believe that it is impossible to separate the artist from his art. I do not find it credible that inherent talent or divine inspiration is the only influence on an artist’s work, and instead I contend that personal beliefs, experiences, and character exert significant influence, and should be taken into consideration when analyzing his or her work. Thus, while the majority of my thesis hinges upon analysis of the scores,

³ This point has never been contended among scholars. It is the basis or implications of this shift that are at the heart of the “Bruckner Problem.” See for example Julian Horton, *Bruckner’s Symphonies : Analysis, Reception and Cultural Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

⁴ Horton, *Bruckner’s Symphonies*, 2.

biographical contexts have played a large role in illuminating and informing my analytical conclusions.

To be sure, consideration of this biographical context certainly complicates analysis, particularly in the case of Bruckner. Julian Horton best summarizes the situation:

Bruckner has been praised as a Wagnerian and for having nothing to do with Wagner; as a composer of absolute music and of programmatic symphonies; as a dangerous modernist and a venerable reactionary; as an unworldly mystic and a ruthless pragmatist; as an apolitical innocent and as provider of the soundtrack to German military expansionism.⁵

Because of these conflicting opinions of Bruckner given by those who knew him during his lifetime, it is difficult to pinpoint any single motivation for Bruckner having made so many revisions to his works. The most credible cause might well have been the criticism Bruckner faced after the premiere of the Third—criticism published by the dominant faction of Viennese critics led by Eduard Hanslick—coupled with the composer’s widely reported timid and easily influenced personality. Some scholars have taken these circumstances to be the impetus for Bruckner’s revisionism, and many imply that Bruckner was somehow bullied into making so many changes. However, as Horton states, it is important to eschew such simple assumptions regarding Bruckner’s life, as dismissing Bruckner’s role in the revisions as submissive may lead to incorrect conclusions about Bruckner’s works.⁶

⁵ Horton, *Bruckner's Symphonies*, 3.

⁶ Horton, *Bruckner's Symphonies*, 2-6.

Thus, I will strive to take account of the complexity of Bruckner's personality and circumstances in my analysis.

With this point in mind, my thesis will strive to contribute to Bruckner scholarship regarding the revisions of the Third Symphony. While many scholars have provided a general discussion of the Third in the context of the "Bruckner Problem," they have focused primarily on harmonic progression and symphonic form; there has been little to no discussion of orchestration and performance markings. Thus, in my thesis I have chosen to perform an analysis of these latter aspects of the work, focusing on the 1873 and 1889 scores. My analysis of the performance markings and orchestration in the context of Bruckner's life has yielded significant differences between the two versions.

For the purpose of this thesis, I will frame my analysis in terms of the dichotomy evident in Viennese musical culture in the late nineteenth century. As Leon Botstein, Sandra McColl, Margaret Notley, and others have documented, the city's most widely read critics—figures like Hanslick—tended to present a highly polarized, often musically simplistic picture of many composers of the time, but particularly of Richard Wagner and Johannes Brahms.⁷ In the writings of such critics, Wagner and Brahms were portrayed as figureheads for two opposing musical camps, with Hanslick (a firm supporter of Brahms) and his contemporaries

⁷ Margaret Notley gives thorough review of the situation in "Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style, and Politics in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna," *19th-Century Music* 17(1993): 107-123. Sandra McColl does similarly in *Music Criticism in Vienna 1896-1897* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996). Leon Botstein also provides solid analysis in "Music and Ideology: Thoughts on Bruckner," *Musical Quarterly* 80.1 (1996): 1-12.

often labeling all other composers as either “Wagnerian” or “Brahmsian.” And despite this sometimes radical oversimplification of serious aesthetic issues, certain musical techniques and characteristics nevertheless became widely associated in turn-of-the-century Vienna with these two composers. In analyzing Bruckner’s scores in relation to such currents in contemporary music criticism, I do not intend to validate the language used or positions assumed by Hanslick and his contemporaries.⁸ Rather, I am attempting to understand the ways in which Bruckner’s music was likely understood *in his own time*—at a time when this “Hanslick Model” shaped much of the popular discourse about the art.

Before delving into the results of my analysis, it is important to note the inclusion of melodic quotes from operas of Wagner in the original 1873 version, taken from such works as *Die Walküre* and *Lohengrin*. Because of these quotes, it would appear that Wagner had at least some impact on the symphony. John Williamson, in his essay on the Brucknerian symphony, briefly touches on the harmonic and melodic influence of Wagner in the 1873 version, but does not mention performance markings.⁹ Likewise, in Julian Horton’s analysis of the finale

⁸ There is a multitude of scholarship that speaks to the polarity of Brahms and Wagner in Nineteenth-Century critical discourse. David Brodbeck gives particular insight into Brahms in “Brahms, the Third Symphony, and the New German School,” in *Brahms and His World*, rev. ed., ed. Walter Frisch and Kevin C. Karnes (Princeton, NJ, and London: Princeton University Press, 2009), 95-116. Kevin Karnes explores the dichotomy through a more general lens in his article “Another Look at Critical Partisanship in the Viennese *fin de siècle*: Schenker’s Reviews of Brahms’s Vocal Music, 1891-92,” *19th-Century Music* 26 (2002): 73-93. Likewise does A. Peter Brown in “Brahms’ Third Symphony and the New German School,” *Journal of Musicology* 2 (1983): 434-52.

⁹ For more on the harmonic and melodic relationship between the works of Wagner and Bruckner see John Williamson, “The Brucknerian symphony: an overview,” in Williamson, John, *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 86-88. See also Kevin

of the Third symphony, he indicates the differences between the 1873 and the three later scores relative to the influence of Wagner, and makes many of the points that I will later consider.¹⁰ However, he includes few to no mentions of performance markings. What both Williamson and Horton do note, however, is that most traces of Wagner's influence, most noticeably in the form of melodic quotations, are not present in any version after 1873.

Over the course of my analysis of the two scores, I will suggest that this excision of "Wagnerisms" bleeds into Bruckner's treatment of performance markings and orchestration as well. Such opulent and colorful markings as were typical of Wagner are littered throughout the 1873 version, but are often omitted from the 1889 score. The 1873 score is rife with performance markings and orchestration that are more brash and contrasting, often favoring more specific types of articulation and dynamics. The 1889 version conversely includes a much less dramatic range of dynamics and articulation, which is also reflected in the thinner orchestration favoring more subtle soloistic parts as opposed to doublings. For example, crescendo markings may appear in a phrase that begins forte in the 1873 score but starts piano in 1889, indicating a typical piano-to-forte crescendo in the later version in contrast to an increase from forte to an extreme volume in the 1873. Likewise, where an accented passage may be marked *marcato* in 1873, such a marking would be left off in 1889.

Swindon, "Bruckner and Harmony," in Williamson, John, *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 205-227.

¹⁰ Horton, *Bruckner's Symphonies*, 31-54.

It is important to note, however, that the orchestration and performance markings in the 1873 score did not necessarily constitute an attempt by Bruckner to emulate the works of Wagner in an overt way. It has been accepted by the majority of scholars that Bruckner's orchestration is distinctly organistic, as Bruckner literally learned to compose on the organ bench.¹¹ The stratified orchestration and the patterns of tutti-solo lines in the 1873 score are highly characteristic of organ music. The intention of my analysis is not to prove that Bruckner's orchestration is literally Wagnerian, but rather to suggest that the organistic orchestration employed in the 1873 version sounds very much like the orchestration of Wagner to an audience. Conversely, the 1889 version contains performance markings and orchestration that are clearly uncharacteristic of Wagner's works. Instead, the thinner orchestration and subtler range of dynamics recalls the stereotypically restrained symphonies of Johannes Brahms.

Taken in context of Bruckner's life, it seems possible that Bruckner's revisions to the Third could be indicative of the musical climate in Vienna at the time of the 1873 premiere. Despite the presence of such Wagnerian critics as Richard Pohl, the musically conservative Eduard Hanslick essentially ruled the critical world in late nineteenth-century Vienna. His distaste for "Music of the

¹¹ Julian Horton gives thorough analysis of the Bruckner's orchestration in relation to the organ in "Bruckner and the Symphony Orchestra," in Williamson, John, *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Future”¹² encompassed such composers as Liszt, Wolf, Bruckner, and most especially Wagner. While Wagner, defiant in the face of criticism and possessor of a loyal following outside of the conservative Viennese mainstream, refused to compromise his art in order to fit societal constraints in Vienna or elsewhere, Bruckner struggled with the readily apparent dislike shown by many critics for his music. It seems logical that the changes to the Third Symphony, including those made to the performance markings and orchestration, could have reflected Bruckner’s desire to move toward the more conservative style of critic-darling Johannes Brahms. It is impossible to make a determination on the validity of performance of the 1889 revision, however, as there are changes made to the score written in the hands of Bruckner’s students.¹³ These changes cannot simply be disregarded, however, as Bruckner’s initials are usually written next to such changes, essentially indicating that he “signed off” on the changes made by his

¹² “Music of the Future” was the title given to the music of Wagnerian composers by critics of Wagner. Piero Weiss gives a thorough account of the “Music of the Future” controversy in *Music in the Western World* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1984) on pages 380-385. “Music of the Future” is also the title of an essay by Wagner reacting to this epithet, published in French in 1860 as *La musique de l’avenir* in which Wagner set out to familiarize his audiences with his works. The term (Zukunftsmusik in German) was soon adopted by Wagner’s enemies and used pejoratively to describe works by Wagner and other composers such as Liszt, Wolf, and later Bruckner. For a translated version of the essay see Richard Wagner, *Judaism in Music and Other Essays*, trans. W. Ashton Ellis (London: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), 293.

¹³ The chronology of the 1889 revision is described by Thomas Röder in “Master and disciple united: the Finale of the Third Symphony,” in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Röder provides history of Bruckner’s students in relation to the changes made to the symphony, and concludes that Bruckner’s students did have some hand in the revisions but that they are still valid, as Bruckner agreed to them and perhaps requested that they be made.

students. The question, then, is not whether Bruckner approved of these changes, but rather whether he would have approved of them without the poor reception of his original scores or without pressure from his students. I would suggest that the 1889 revision was influenced at least in part by the harsh criticism the 1873 version received. A large part of my thesis hinges on the supposition that Bruckner made the revisions to the Third in order to make the symphony sound less Wagnerian to contemporary critics such as Eduard Hanslick.

Bruckner clearly has a unique identity separate from Wagner, but to an audience ignorant of the complexities of Bruckner's compositional innovations and organistic orientation, the 1873 score may have sounded much like Wagner's. While some have argued that Bruckner's first editions were Wagnerian in such fundamental characteristics as harmony, melody, and structure, and his subsequent revisions leaned more towards the works of Brahms, I would suggest a different view. I believe that there is enough evidence to separate all fundamental aspects of Bruckner's symphonies from those of both Wagner *and* Brahms. However, because the trend of orchestration and performance marking revision tends to shift from an organistic approach in the original to a sound more characteristic of Brahms in the revision, I purport that the organistic sound of the 1873 version of the Third would be associated with the more salient characteristics of Wagner's works, while later versions have a more prominently Brahmsian sound. Essentially, this means that audiences would hear the 1873 symphony as Wagnerian and the 1889 as Brahmsian regardless of the complexity of the true influence on or nature of the versions,

simply because performance markings and orchestration are instantly recognizable to the untrained ear. Whether these changes in orchestration and performance markings are superficial to the composition itself is open to interpretation, but it is clear from my analysis that this trend in revisionism from Wagner to Brahms exists.

Chapter II: Survey and Context of Scholarship

In general, there is little agreement among scholars as to which scores are valid. One of the first scholars to consider the problem of the versions was the editor Robert Haas in the 1930s and 1940s.¹⁴ His solution was essentially to blend all existing versions, using his own judgment to choose which parts were to be used in his definitive score. In the 8th symphony, Haas even rewrote a passage himself. Haas's editions met with much controversy, not least of all because of his associations with the Nazi party.¹⁵ Haas justified his actions by asserting that Bruckner was a simple and naïve man from the country, whose inexperience with a cosmopolitan lifestyle enabled the Jewish academia to corrupt and take advantage

¹⁴ Benjamin Korstvedt gives a complete look at Haas' editorial work in his essay, "Bruckner Editions: the Revolution Revisited," in Williamson, John, *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 121.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 127-128.

of him.¹⁶ He therefore considered it his duty to recreate what Bruckner would have written had he been sheltered from what Haas portrays as the corrupting influence of Viennese Jews.

Regardless of his reasons for the creation of his editions, most of today's scholars, led by Benjamin Korstvedt, agree that Haas took too many liberties in the development of his editions, and furthermore assert that Haas fundamentally insulted the memory of Bruckner by portraying him as such a simpleton. Haas was later let go from his position at the International Bruckner Society, and was soon after replaced as General Editor by Leopold Nowak. Although Haas may have ignored standard scholarly methodology in his editing methods, it appears that he did nothing to diminish the aesthetic appeal of Bruckner's works. It is important to note that many highly respected conductors have utilized the Haas scores in performance, despite the development of later, more "scholarly" editions.¹⁷

While Haas' scores still garner support, the most widely accepted interpretations of Bruckner's works were edited by Haas's successor as General Editor, Leopold Nowak. From the end of World War II to his retirement in 1989, Nowak strove to reproduce all known versions of Bruckner's symphonies, regardless of questions of validity. Nowak took little to no creative license in his

¹⁶ Ibid., 130-131.

¹⁷ Ibid., 130-135

editing, and kept his editions as close to the original autographs as possible. Because of this, Nowak's scores are considered the most "scholarly" in scope and practice.

A few other editions were published by editors such as Fritz Oeser (under the International Bruckner Society and later the Brucknerverlag), Alfred Orel (Haas's assistant), and Bruckner's students: Ferdinand Löwe and the two Schalk brothers, Josef and Franz. Barring a few irregularities however, these editions are generally considered superfluous to the scores printed by Haas and Nowak. Current debate among scholars regarding the "Bruckner Problem" almost exclusively utilizes original autographs of Bruckner's scores, or the published works of Haas and Nowak.

While edited scores have been consistently published since Bruckner's lifetime, discussions of the "Bruckner Problem" did not become commonplace until the publications of Robert Simpson and Deryck Cooke. In 1969 Cooke published "The Bruckner Problem Simplified," which detailed all versions of each of Bruckner's symphonies.¹⁸ For each symphony, he methodically studied the versions and summarily determined which edition should be considered for performance. This method allowed for no ambiguity, as Cooke divided the versions into categories: performable or "spurious."¹⁹ He made these determinations based on the degree of influence editors and students had on each version, and most often chose the 'correct' version to be the one that reflected the least outside influence.

¹⁸ Cooke, *The Bruckner Problem Simplified*, 5-15.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

Cooke categorized all editions published during and shortly after Bruckner's life as unplayable, as he claimed that they were most affected by misguided collaborators. He also dismissed several versions as not being "definitive."²⁰ In other words, Cooke claimed that many of the early scores were nothing more than drafts, and were certainly not "performing versions." In the Third Symphony, for example, Cooke dismissed all versions preceding the 1878 score, including the original 1873 score.²¹ In recent years, Cooke's theories have been met with harsh criticism. Scholars almost unanimously reject Cooke's conjecture that the mere presence of revisions in Bruckner's hand on a score invalidates earlier scores. As Julian Horton states of the original 1873 version of the Third Symphony, "The fact that this score was not performed before it was revised does not render it illegitimate."²²

Three years earlier, in 1966, Robert Simpson had written a book titled "The Essence of Bruckner: An Essay Towards the Understanding of his Music." As in Cooke's analysis, Simpson leans toward the assignation of black and white labels for each version.²³ However, while Cooke's analysis relies more on sources outside the changes made to the music itself, (letters, autographs, biographical information, etc.), Simpson's is almost exclusively music-based. Essentially, Simpson focuses on the musical revisions themselves, and not the supposed reasons behind them. His

²⁰ Ibid., 5.

²¹ Ibid., 9.

²² Horton, *Bruckner's Symphonies*, 14.

²³ Robert Wilfred Levick Simpson, *Essence of Bruckner an Essay Towards the Understanding of His Music*, (London: Gollancz, 1992). Simpson's work is still considered to be one of the most complete English analyses of the "Bruckner Problem" but has been harshly criticized by current scholars. See the works of Benjamin Korstvedt and Julian Horton for an idea of this criticism.

book provides a much more in-depth analysis of each score, in which he decides its validity by comparing it to his own predetermined characteristics of ‘truly’ Brucknerian music. He often begins his analysis of each symphony with a movement-by-movement analysis of the most widely accepted version. This is then followed by an explanation of the differences in other editions, and an assignation of which score he deems to be the correct one. Even as study of Bruckner has blossomed among scholars, Simpson’s book remains the most thorough English analysis of the versions by a single author.

While Cooke and Simpson may not have much influence in the current debate over the Bruckner Problem, their methods and analyses are more justifiable when viewed in context. Up until even the 1980’s, Bruckner held little place in the European or American canon. The associations of Bruckner’s works with Viennese Wagnerism and later Hitler forged an indelible connection between Bruckner’s works and the Third Reich, which further influenced the popularity of an already struggling Bruckner.²⁴ Cooke and Simpson were first and foremost concerned with furthering Bruckner’s music in Britain and overseas. With this in mind, I believe that the evident simplicity of the analyses performed by the two in their respective publications was intentional. Complicating the issue of the “Bruckner Problem” by

²⁴ Christa Brüstle discusses Bruckner’s image as a composer in her essay “The Musical Image of Bruckner,” in John Williamson’s *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 244-260. Because of Bruckner’s association with Nazism, Wagner, Beethoven, Catholicism, and Nationalism Bruckner’s twentieth-century reception was incredibly complicated, and often was influenced negatively by the political associations that had been formed with his works.

highlighting the ambiguities in Bruckner's method and the purpose of his revisionism would do nothing to garner support for the unpopular composer. By designating one version as "playable," Cooke and Simpson erased at least one extra-musical issue clouding Bruckner's artistry and preventing the performance of his symphonies. Simpson took this a step farther by diving headlong into what Floros would later call an "internal experience" analysis in which he cast Bruckner as a deeply devout possessor of divine inspiration who undertook the "patient search for pacification" in his music.²⁵ This characterization is perhaps not completely realistic, but it does paint a romantic picture of Bruckner's music as other-worldly that would be likely to spark the interest of conductors and audiences.

Since the sharp rise in Bruckner's popularity both in America and abroad, published works concerning Bruckner have abounded. If one trend underlies most of present scholarship on the "Bruckner Problem," it is that the validity of many of the symphonic scores is now believed to be much more ambiguous than it was once portrayed by Cooke and Simpson.

Julian Horton's book, *Bruckner's Symphonies: Analysis Reception and Cultural Politics* (2001), gives a thorough reworking of the "Bruckner Problem" as a whole. Horton's views tend to stray from the typical "internal experience" methodology, which he refers to as the "revisionist motivation."²⁶ Instead, Horton strives to

²⁵ Constantin Floros, "One Unity Between Bruckner's Personality and Production", in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 285-297.

²⁶ Horton, *Bruckner's Symphonies*, 2.

provide a completely analytical representation of the “Problem” separate from issues of biography and reception. He particularly criticizes Simpson, Benjamin Korstvedt, Floros, and Donald Tovey for over-romanticizing Bruckner and his works. Horton gives a fairly complete history of the symphonies and analyzes certain passages of many of the works. While there are many facets to Horton’s argument, he essentially asserts that there is no absolute philosophy regarding editorial action.²⁷ He does, however, debunk arguments made by other scholars, particularly Cooke. Horton states that Cooke’s preference for the Haas scores must be challenged on political grounds because of Haas’ Nazi affiliations and ideology, and also purports that Cooke’s designation of one correct edition is ridiculous.²⁸ He instead argues that Bruckner’s legacy is one of “irreducible pluralism,” meaning that more than one score must be considered for each work.²⁹ Likewise, Horton considers it to be “untenable” that Cooke dismisses the first non- ‘performing version’ of many of the symphonies.³⁰

Benjamin Korstvedt provides another view, lending Bruckner and his works a more sympathetic eye with clear emphasis on Bruckner’s character and personal experiences. To Korstvedt, Bruckner is a composer separate from Wagner, Brahms,

²⁷ Horton, *Bruckner's Symphonies*, 15.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 13-14.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 13.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 14. Horton is by no means the only scholar critical of Cooke’s work. Most current scholarship strays from Cooke’s, but Horton gives the clearest breakdown of the most fallible arguments in Cooke’s analysis.

and Beethoven. Where critics and audiences of Bruckner's time tended to unanimously lump Bruckner in with other Wagnerians, Korstvedt maintains that Bruckner's works cannot be so simply categorized.³¹ Most critics now agree with this view, though many point toward Bruckner's use of avant-garde harmonic and structural techniques as being proof of Wagner's influence.³² As for the problem of the revisions Korstvedt is unique in his treatment of the Haas publications. Unlike Horton, Korstvedt believes that the majority of Haas' work is viable, but he does concede the flaws of a few of his publications.³³ Along with Leon Botstein, Korstvedt asserts that the first editions of most of the symphonies are viable, a point which has been highly contended among scholars since the study of Bruckner's will.³⁴

Paul Hawkshaw discusses the issue of the first editions in his article in *19th Century Music*, stating that they must be taken on a case-by-case basis.³⁵ Likewise, he says that there has indeed been evidence of tampering with scores between Bruckner's approval and the time at which they are sent to the publisher. In the

³¹ Benjamin Korstvedt, "Harmonic Daring and Symphonic Design in the Sixth Symphony: an Essay in Historical Musical Analysis," in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*, ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 199-201.

³² John Williamson, "The Brucknerian Symphony: an Overview," in Williamson, John, *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 86-88.

³³ Korstvedt, "Bruckner Editions," 128-132.

³⁴ The issue of Bruckner's will is extremely contested, as many contend that statements made in Bruckner's lifetime are contradictory to what was put in his will. For a full discussion see Benjamin Korstvedt, "The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity," *19th-Century Music* 20 (1996), 3-26. See also Leon Botstein, "Music and Ideology: Thoughts on Bruckner," *Musical Quarterly* 80.1 (1996), 1-10.

³⁵ Paul Hawkshaw. "The Bruckner Problem Revisited," *19th-Century Music* 21.1 (1997): 96-107

Third Symphony, Hawkshaw specifically notes that the changes to the 1889 version were done at the behest of Bruckner, but were actually carried out by his student Franz Schalk. Hawkshaw cites the Schalk brothers as saying: "We must let [Bruckner] believe that the most important thing is his approval."³⁶ His article relies much on this evident intervention by Bruckner's students, which has been cited to a lesser degree in the works of other scholars.

In a recent article, Margaret Notley reviews many of these scholars' works, and fall somewhere between the strictly analytical work of Horton and the more biography-related work of Korstvedt, Hawkshaw, and Botstein.³⁷ Notley particularly focuses on Bruckner's music in relation to his devout faith and the political atmosphere of Vienna. She states that Bruckner is more than the naïve and pious country man that in the past he has often been characterized as, and spends much of her essay outlining the other influences on work that complicate the image we have of Bruckner.

Notley's approach is similar to that of other modern Bruckner scholars: with the extremely varied accounts of Bruckner the man, even from the people who knew him, it is difficult to make simple assumptions about any of his motivations or those

³⁶ Ibid., 101-102.

³⁷ Margaret Notley, "Bruckner Problems, in Perpetuity," *19th Century Music* 30.1 (2006): 81-93. Notley's work is first and foremost a review of other scholars' work. She spend little time on specific symphonies outside of the Eighth, but her work is still useful in giving a general picture of the many factors surrounding the greater issue of the "Bruckner Problem."

of his collaborators. If there is one argument that is consistent throughout current scholarship, it is that there is no single right answer to the “Bruckner Problem.”

Chapter III: Biographical Context

Born into an Upper Austrian family of humble means in 1824, Bruckner is often regarded as the paradigm of rural simplicity.³⁸ In some ways, this characterization may be true. Bruckner was born near the city of Linz, a beautiful countryside consisting almost entirely of farmland.³⁹ The tenth of twelve children and the eldest son, as was typical for the dominantly agrarian society, he dutifully became his father’s assistant, and eventually succeeded his father as a schoolteacher.⁴⁰ It was in fact his father’s position as a schoolteacher that enabled Bruckner to explore the world of music, as the teachers of each village were expected to play the organ for church services.⁴¹ By age ten, Bruckner could substitute for his father on the organ, receiving musical instruction from family members and professors at his schoolteacher training school, but certainly never

³⁸ A detailed and reliable biography of Bruckner has been written by Crawford Howie, *Anton Bruckner: A Documentary Biography*, Vol. 1, *From Ansfelden to Vienna* (New York: Edwin Mellen, 2002), 1-2.

³⁹ Derek Watson, *Bruckner* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1.

⁴⁰ Watson, *Bruckner*, 2.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

from a master or virtuoso.⁴² The most salient point of Bruckner's early dalliances into music is that they were born from economic necessity.

As he matured, Bruckner spent much of his free time from teaching composing music.⁴³ This new passion was only magnified by Bruckner's appointment to a position in a village near St. Florian's Monastery, which provided him with greater opportunities to explore his music.⁴⁴ In 1848, Bruckner was appointed provisional organist at St. Florian's, which is said to have been the beginning of the transition from Bruckner the teacher to Bruckner the musician.⁴⁵ Bruckner was eventually able to obtain a position as assistant teacher and deputy organist at St. Florian's, a position he held for 10 years.⁴⁶ Because Bruckner experienced much of his compositional maturation at the seat of the organ of a monastery, many cite his time at St. Florian's as irreversibly fusing his faith (and the organ) to his music.⁴⁷

⁴² Wolff Werner, *Anton Bruckner: Rustic Genius* (New York: Cooper Square, 1973), 19.

⁴³ Watson, *Bruckner*, 4.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁴⁵ Hans-Hubert Schoenzeler, *Bruckner: Illustrated Musical Biography* (New York: Marion Boyars, 1978), 31.

⁴⁶ Watson, *Bruckner*, 9.

⁴⁷ Horton, "Bruckner and the Symphony Orchestra," 5-15.

The next great transition in Bruckner's life began with his appointment as cathedral organist at Linz, where he blossomed as a composer.⁴⁸ Other than a few trips abroad, Bruckner travelled little, and then only to perform his music.⁴⁹ However, while Bruckner's secluded life had little impact on his musical talent, it had a very large effect on his success as a composer. Because he had little contact with the world outside of Upper Austria, he had little experience with its habits, ways and behaviors.⁵⁰

By the time Bruckner moved to Vienna in the 1860's he was in his forties, and consequently much set in his ways as a country schoolteacher. Bruckner never got used to city life, and more importantly to its social politics. His dress and looks were made fun of, and often made it hard for his audiences to take him seriously.⁵¹ Likewise, his manners lacked poise and servility, and Bruckner could sometimes be inappropriately direct to prospective patrons. The more removed from the world he became in later years, the more he used odd turns of speech which sounded ridiculous to other people in Vienna. Some scholars say that audiences' indifference to Bruckner was exacerbated by Bruckner's thick Upper Austrian dialect.⁵² What is

⁴⁸ Evidence of Bruckner's transition to composition in Linz is given in Erwin Doernberg's *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner* (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1960), 39. Another perspective is found in Schoenzeler's *Bruckner*, 37.

⁴⁹ Schoenzeler, *Bruckner*, 14.

⁵⁰ Watson, *Bruckner*, 1.

⁵¹ Schoenzeler, *Bruckner*, 110.

⁵² Many scholars cite Bruckner's dialect as impeding him in Vienna, but a good summary is given by Constantin Floros, "One Unity Between Bruckner's Personality and Production," in *Perspectives on*

more, Bruckner removed himself from intellectual matters outside of music, further isolating himself from other composers like Wagner who attracted followers through the metaphysics or politics attached to their compositions.

This marked disparity between Bruckner the simple country man and Bruckner the complex and talented artist was obvious to both his critics and enthusiasts, particularly once Bruckner came to Vienna. Most who knew Bruckner acknowledged this puzzling inconsistency, and often found themselves held back from fully enjoying his works because of the apparent lack of philosophy or thought behind the compositions. His students themselves often wrote his programs, and have been noted as begging him to give them some philosophical insight into his compositions, hoping to incorporate some of the ideas, and more importantly popularity, of Wagner into the works of Bruckner.⁵³ Bruckner's responses, often nothing beyond his intention to use his musical gifts for God, did little to erase his image as a simpleton.

In the context of 'fin-de-siècle' Vienna, Bruckner's idiosyncrasies became even more apparent.⁵⁴ The critical atmosphere of Vienna from 1860 to 1900 was

Anton Bruckner, ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1997, 288.

⁵³ Doernberg, *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, 22.

⁵⁴ The concept of "fin de siècle" refers to a cultural movement in late 19th-century Europe's cosmopolitan areas. For Bruckner, this atmosphere was completely foreign, and became an extremely alienating force when he moved to Vienna. For complete context of "fin de siècle" specific to Vienna, see Carl Schorske's *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1981).

undergoing a number of large-scale changes at the time of Bruckner's arrival, in the musical, social, and political realms. The nineteenth century was a time of incredible transformation in Europe, following on the heels of hundreds of years of relative constancy. As Europe changed, so did its musicians, composers, and audiences. This is particularly evident in the musical Mecca of Vienna, which exemplified the great effects of these changes on music and criticism.

The largest of these changes was social. In the middle of the nineteenth century, Vienna was experiencing a period of rapid growth and increased urbanization. Where the city had previously been highly stratified, with a clearly defined upper and lower class, the impending industrialization of Europe and the weakening of the Habsburg Monarchy were quickly facilitating the growth of a large middle class. In earlier periods, viewing and listening to the arts was primarily a pursuit of royalty, the church, and the aristocracy. With the vast changes of the nineteenth century, however, these activities became increasingly accessible to the masses. This resulted in a comparatively poorly educated audience with an insatiable desire to indulge in the arts that had previously been inaccessible to them.

As many audience members did not have the education to understand much of what they were hearing in performances, they largely relied on the brief review columns, or *Feuilletons*, of various newspapers.⁵⁵ The period marked an explosive growth of music criticism in journalism, which was increasingly directed at the

⁵⁵ Sandra McColl discusses the phenomenon of the *Feuilleton* at length in the Introduction of *Music Criticism in Vienna*, 1-10.

untrained public, and was therefore extremely influential in swaying the public opinion. The foremost author of these columns in Vienna was Eduard Hanslick. Hanslick held conservative views regarding music, and believed that this period in Vienna should be one of celebration of the golden past of Beethoven, Schubert, Haydn and the like. In fact, Hanslick maintained that there was a lack of talent in Vienna in the 1880s, essentially finding worth solely in Johannes Brahms, whom he regarded as the greatest living composer.⁵⁶

Hanslick's views were further enforced in Vienna by the city's budding culture of music study. It was in Hanslick's time that studying music as a profession became a viable career option. In fact, Hanslick himself was the first university professor of music history, which only served in gaining him more influence with the younger generation of aspiring musicians in Vienna. Under his guidance, much of music education in Vienna turned away from newer and modern compositions in favor of the study, elucidation, and distribution of the music of the "golden age," which Hanslick saw as the time of Beethoven, Mozart, Haydn, and ending in Schubert.⁵⁷ Hanslick saw his time as one of enrichment in music history, theory, and understanding, and not of composition.

It was with this general set of ideals that Hanslick critiqued modern composers. While Brahms escaped Hanslick's censure, most others in Vienna did

⁵⁶ Leon Botstein gives extended discussion of Eduard Hanslick in "Music and its Public: Habits of Listening and the Crisis of Musical Modernism in Vienna, 1870-1914," (Ph.D diss., Harvard University, 1985), 863-888. Botstein's treatment of this subject is found on pages 869-170.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 872.

not. This was especially true for Richard Wagner, and the many composers Hanslick labeled as “Wagnerian.” The philosophical and musical ideals of modern composers, particularly Wagner, threatened Hanslick’s conservative vision of music. He believed that Wagner and his Wagnerians would entice composers of the younger to eschew the “healthy” models of the golden era in favor of the dangerous, albeit fleetingly popular, styles of the new “moderns.”⁵⁸ Hanslick maintained that the popularity of these composers relied not on an inherent musical beauty, but instead gained support because of its unrefined appeal. That is, it was superficially easy to understand and enjoy, not requiring the refined appreciation necessary for the music of a Haydn or Brahms.

For Anton Bruckner, the views of Hanslick were not in any way beneficial. Hanslick essentially characterized Bruckner as a poor man’s Wagner, panning performances of his works on a regular basis. These harsh reviews exemplify the extremely personal and emotional stances taken by composers, performers, and critics in Vienna during this period.

This polarization was increased by the political affiliations of many composers.⁵⁹ The political system of Vienna was an emotionally charged backdrop to the arts in the late nineteenth-century. The Habsburg monarchy seemed to be on its last legs and the social tensions of militant nationalists and unwelcome

⁵⁸ Ibid., 873.

⁵⁹ Sandra McColl writes of the affect of Viennese politics on its composers and its music in *Music Criticism in Vienna*, 87-107.

immigrants co-existing in a crowded Vienna created wide divisions among the populace. These political schisms bled into the musical realm, and further stratified the already tense environment. Strangely enough, the more conservative figures such as Brahms and Hanslick, aligned themselves with the Liberal political party, who relied on a platform of laissez-faire economics and the free market system.⁶⁰

Because of these large-scale political and social divisions that also had a profound impact on the artistic community, criticism at times seemed black and white. Composers were strongly praised or strongly censured, and often extra-musical elements played a role in the review. Thus, for Bruckner, Vienna was a rather harsh change from the humble beginnings in a small Christian farming community. As Bruckner had all of the critical censure and little of the public popularity of Wagner, there is much speculation over whether the many revisions made by Bruckner to his works were in response to this criticism. It is impossible to know if Bruckner consciously decided to revise his symphonies into something more akin to the critic-friendly Brahmsian style, but it seems apparent that many of the changes he made did reflect a stylistic shift in orchestration and performance markings from Wagner to Brahms.

The cosmopolitan Viennese also had difficulty understanding Bruckner's seemingly outdated view of religion. To most of the city's populace, the Church no

⁶⁰ Margaret Notley discusses the politics of Wagnerians and their liberal counterparts at length in "Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism," *Bruckner Studies*, ed. Paul Hawkshaw and Timothy Jackson (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997), pages 54-71. She gives considerable discussion of the politics of Brahms and Hanslick in "Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style, and Politics in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna," *19th-Century Music* 17(1993): 107-123.

longer had the oppressive hold over Europe that it once held.⁶¹ Certainly, the vast majority of Austrians identified themselves as Catholics, and greatly valued their religious identity, but the rise of nationalism in nineteenth century Europe was quickly supplanting the concept of a uniquely Catholic identity. While there are many political, social, and economic reasons for this important and historically remarkable shift, this essentially meant that people began to view their national identity as an important label in addition to their religious identity.

However, outside of Vienna and other European cities, this new outlook towards religion, and life in general, had not yet taken root. As I have previously intimated, Europe was undergoing tremendous social, political, and economic changes, but these changes were relatively limited to the cities. Rural Austria saw little of the changes that were taking root in cities like Vienna, and Austrian village life was still dominated by deep devotion to the Catholic Church.⁶² There was little of the liberalism seen in other parts of Europe, affording the inhabitants of rural Austria a rather black and white view of faith and the world, as dictated by the Church. Bruckner was no exception. In his years in Vienna, Bruckner garnered criticism and ridicule for what others saw as a blind and extreme devotion to his faith. Bruckner spent significant periods every day meditating and praying, and

⁶¹ Robert Kann, *A History of the Habsburg Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 187-192.

⁶² The period preceding the changes of the late nineteenth-century is known as the Vormärz, characterized by strict control of the people by the Church and the government. The Vormärz is thoroughly discussed by Robin Okey in *The Habsburg Monarchy: From Enlightenment to Eclipse* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2001).

lived a life of self-imposed celibacy.⁶³ What is perhaps more significant is how outspoken and unwavering Bruckner was about his beliefs and practices and their connections to his music. To a populace that viewed this sort of devotion as outdated and perhaps slightly medieval, Bruckner represented the Catholic of the past, blindly following a Church that was losing its power.

This is particularly evident in Bruckner's hapless interactions and associations with the Wagnerians, as he was completely unaware of the consequences of his actions in the scope of a highly nuanced and complex sociopolitical structure.⁶⁴ Shortly after moving to Vienna, Bruckner joined the *Akademischer Richard Wagner-Verein*, most likely because of his admiration for Wagner's works.⁶⁵ However, this membership only fueled the fire Hanslick had created with his criticisms of Bruckner's works, and Bruckner began to be considered Wagnerian by critics and enthusiasts alike. What is more, Bruckner came to be regarded as belonging to the Wagnerian camp, and particularly to the Neo-German School, which encompassed the modern and contemporary works of German composers such as Liszt and Wagner.⁶⁶ This created still more hostility toward Bruckner, this time perhaps more impassioned because of its political basis. It would seem that Bruckner, forever oblivious to the nuances of musical Vienna,

⁶³ Schoenzeler, *Bruckner*, 130.

⁶⁴ Notley, "Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism."

⁶⁵ Watson, *Bruckner*, 30.

⁶⁶ For more on the Neo-German school in the context of Bruckner see Doernberg's *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, 20.

never realized how much he was hurting his career by associating himself with Wagner.⁶⁷ When Bruckner came to Vienna, the climax of the struggle between the two parties, Wagner versus Brahms, had barely begun.⁶⁸ Unfortunately, with relentless sharp opposition to Wagner, and all those associated with him, the Brahms party contributed its share to the lateness with which Bruckner's genius was recognized.⁶⁹

As this conflict intensified, Bruckner's personal problems became noticeable. Bruckner's first nervous breakdown had occurred while he was the head organist at Linz.⁷⁰ He had to work very hard in his career, but he also had inherited a nervous weakness from his mother, a problem that many current scholars attribute to symptoms of Obsessive Compulsive Disorder.⁷¹ He had another nervous collapse after he completed his C minor symphony and the Mass in E Minor.⁷² Bruckner had also become obsessed with numbers, which is often pointed out in the irregular and seemingly ridiculous numbering in his scores, and in the margins of his manuscripts.⁷³ Likewise, he had an endless need for constant assurance and

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁶⁸ Werner, *Anton Bruckner*, 67.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 100.

⁷⁰ Schoenzeler, *Bruckner*, 56.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 56.

⁷² Watson, *Bruckner*, 22.

⁷³ Bruckner's use of metric numbers in his works is fully studied in Timothy Jackson's article, "Bruckner's Metrical Numbers," *19th-Century Music* 14.2 (1990): 101-131. It is also discussed in Watson's *Bruckner*, 23.

organization in his financial affairs throughout his life.⁷⁴ This obsession often translated into his music, arguably in the form of perfectionism which caused him to constantly revise his works.⁷⁵

While his problems were certainly noticeable in Linz, Bruckner's problems only intensified in Vienna. However, in Vienna, Bruckner's problems were no longer limited to the relatively harmless scope of his compositions. Throughout his time in Vienna, Bruckner was intermittently hospitalized for breakdowns, and he exhibited symptoms of paranoia attributed to his apparent unpopularity, and the unyielding and ruthless criticism by Hanslick.⁷⁶ In fact, Bruckner was reluctant to compose in Vienna at all, because of Hanslick and other critics who made his life a misery there.⁷⁷ Part of the problem was that he was not confident about his ability as a composer, unlike child prodigies such as Beethoven or Brahms who had been praised for their abilities since youth.⁷⁸ Hanslick and his followers were consistently hostile to Bruckner right up to the end, and must have done a lot of damage to Bruckner's already fragile state of mind.

Whatever conclusions regarding Bruckner's revisions one draws, I would assert that the frequent revision of Bruckner's symphonies was significantly

⁷⁴ Howie, *Anton Bruckner*, 1:17.

⁷⁵ Watson, *Bruckner*, 23.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁷⁷ Simpson, *Essence of Bruckner*, 12.

⁷⁸ Schoenzeler, *Bruckner*, 115.

influenced by the circumstances surrounding his life. It cannot have been easy for Bruckner to compose in a Vienna that neither understood nor particularly liked him, especially in the face of his probable mental illness. Furthermore, the pressure from his beloved students to make audience-friendly changes would surely have been hard to ignore in the face of such ardent dislike. Regardless, I believe that there is significant evidence to support the fact that Bruckner was under significant pressure to revise his works towards the more critically acceptable models created by Brahms, and this pressure must be taken into account when analyzing the various versions of his scores. In my analysis, I will show that this pressure is evidenced in the overt shift from the Hanslickian notions of the Wagnerian to the Brahmsian in the performance markings and orchestration of Bruckner's Third Symphony.

Chapter IV: Analysis

Because performance markings are inherently ambiguous it is often left to performers and conductors to interpret their meanings. How short should a staccato eighth note be played, and how fast is "sehr schnell?" Often enough, performance markings are not exact measurements and are instead some way for the composer to notate a musical mood. For example, in the last movement of Tchaikovsky's Sixth Symphony, conductors' interpretations of the tempo have been staggeringly varied.

Bernstein often conducted the movement at nothing faster than the pace of a funeral dirge, and his interpretation is full of heart-rending drama and pain. Karajan, on the other hand, opted for a subtler but no less emotional performance, with a noticeably faster tempo. The two performances are extremely different, but it would be ridiculous to label either as the “wrong” one. Likewise, orchestration is in some part up to the discretion of the conductor, as the effect of the written orchestration is highly influenced by the size of the performing orchestra. While these decisions made by conductors are variable between performances, they are immediately recognizable, even to uneducated audiences. To someone who has never heard Beethoven before, the opening strains of his Fifth Symphony are remarkable not because of the pithy use of imitation and sequence, but because they are startlingly bold and stark in orchestration and dynamics, marked as a fortissimo tutti: essentially in performance markings. Orchestration and performance markings are easily one of the most prominent characteristics of a piece of music.

I would argue that this is particularly true in the case of Bruckner’s Third. Many scholars have argued that the revisions made to the Third were the result of a shift in Bruckner’s artistic vision, and indicate a significant change in the composition itself. I believe that it is more likely that the changes made were reactionary, instigated by the poor reception of the Third and further catalyzed by Bruckner’s perfectionism and need to appease his critics. Furthermore, while many of the revisions appear to be dramatic, I would purport that they often consist of small changes in orchestration and performance markings, which collectively add

up to a larger and striking affect. The vast majority of the differences between the 1873 and 1889 versions are in the realm of performance markings and orchestration. These changes would have been immediately noticeable to critics and audiences, and they may have masked the fact that fairly little had been changed, structurally, in the core characteristics of the symphony.

Perhaps more importantly, since Bruckner learned to compose at the organ, many of his works have a distinctly “organistic” texture and feel, specifically achieved through his orchestrational technique. This fact has been the impetus for much debate among scholars regarding the influences on Bruckner’s orchestration. While many scholars once emphasized Wagner’s putative influence, more recent analyses have shifted toward a view based more on Bruckner’s background as an organist.⁷⁹ Stylistically, Bruckner’s compositional skills were founded on his experience with organ music, which is reflected in his scores. With respect to many aspects of orchestration, Wagner’s works can sound similar to Bruckner’s, but this is not necessarily because of Wagner’s influence on Bruckner’s work. Because Bruckner’s organistic approach can sound so similar to Wagner’s own approach to orchestration, many audiences perceived Bruckner’s organistic style as Wagnerian pure and simple, and not as the more accurate combination of the two.

In my analysis of the Third, this is an important distinction to make. It may not have been Bruckner’s intention to compose in a Wagnerian style, but it is

⁷⁹ Horton, “Bruckner and the Symphony Orchestra.”

evident from the contemporary critical response that his symphony was essentially received as a disastrous attempt at creating a Wagnerian symphony. In his review of the symphony, Hanslick wrote, “Rather than criticize [...] we would own in all humility that we have failed to understand his gigantic symphony. The poetic meaning was never revealed to us—perhaps it was a vision of how Beethoven’s Ninth befriends Wagner’s *Walküre* and finds itself in the end under her hooves—nor did we succeed in grasping the continuity of the music.”⁸⁰ The premiere itself, in 1877, was a total failure. Most of the audience, and even some members of the Vienna Philharmonic performing the symphony, walked out in the middle of the premiere.⁸¹ After the publication of Hanslick’s review, the symphony’s fate was sealed.

It seems a little too convenient that the revisions Bruckner, in his subsequent revisions of the work, shifted its performance markings and orchestration away from what was widely heard as Wagnerian and toward what would have been regarded as characteristic of one of the most popular composers of the period with Viennese critics and audiences: Johannes Brahms. This shift to Brahmsian performance markings and orchestration in Bruckner’s revisions is critical to my argument. If the shift had been in the opposite direction, the purpose of the revisions could not have been to please the critics, and therefore might more readily have been taken to reflect a real transformation in Bruckner’s artistic vision.

⁸⁰ Doernberg, *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, 78.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 71.

Instead, I would argue that Bruckner may well have made the changes he did in order to eschew the Wagnerian label given to the original score, and to achieve a more Brahmsian sound in the 1889 version. In light of the previously enumerated points regarding the circumstances of Bruckner's life, I would maintain that the differences between the two versions responded to the contemporary critical atmosphere in Vienna, particularly in relation to the relative popularity of Brahms and Wagner.

In order to prove that the 1873 and 1889 performance markings and orchestration align with what Bruckner's contemporaries would likely have heard as Wagnerian and Brahmsian respectively, it is necessary to detail the differences between the performance markings and orchestration in the works of those two composers themselves. Similarly, relating the similarities between Wagner's orchestration and characteristic of an "organistic" approach will also prove critical. This differentiation will be important to my analysis of the two Bruckner scores, and will serve as my model for comparison.

Richard Wagner is known to scholars as a fiery and temperamental man and composer. This provides an apt background for Wagner's ideas regarding performance markings, and the actual performances of his pieces. Wagner saw the purpose of the orchestra as being the instrument of the composer's inspiration, and felt extreme distaste for conductors and orchestras that dared to take liberties in the interpretation of his works. In a letter to King Ludwig II, Wagner even proposed the formation of "a specially chosen group of artists trained expressly for the purpose of

performing these works in the correct style,” which would serve as a model for later performances of his music.⁸² Along these lines, Wagner believed that the conductor should “add nothing to it nor take anything away; he is to be your second self.”⁸³ This need for control is reflected in Wagner’s scores. Wagner’s orchestration is extremely detailed, including rare and previously unknown instruments, and requires large numbers of winds and strings. This increase in the number of performers has led to the distinctly Wagnerian sound of an expanded orchestra that allows for extremes in volume, and often includes a good deal of doubling of parts to create a broad sound.⁸⁴

Perhaps the most salient point of this description of the characteristics of Wagner’s performance markings and orchestration is the extremely thick texture and orchestration of Wagner’s works. This is important because of its similarity to Bruckner’s organistic approach to orchestration. Wagner’s use of separation in faster tempi is similar to Bruckner’s own technique. This is a remnant from the necessary use of separation on the organ when playing faster tempos. Where Wagner often doubles a voice, assumedly to increase the volume or thicken the texture, Bruckner’s orchestration seems to mimic this in his use of the tutti-solo technique found in organ music. Tutti-solo passages are common to organ music,

⁸² Barry Millington and Stewart Spencer provide a thorough analysis of Wagnerian performance practices and their manifestation in his works, in *Wagner in Performance* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), 99.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 100.

and indicate that the organist should play a passage first as a solo on one keyboard, and then that the same passage should be played by the full organ, with all of the stops and couplers open. Likewise, Bruckner's layering of instruments in this tutti-solo style reflects the opening and closing of stops on the organ. To an audience, this would certainly sound nearly identical to the often-doubled orchestration of Wagner.

Brahms, on the other hand, represented a much more classical view of performance markings to critics such as Eduard Hanslick. In his scores, dynamics and articulation markings are sparse, and are often left to the performers. Under the "Hanslick Model," Brahms's music symbolized a continuation of the Classical tradition, aligning with the compositions of Mozart and Haydn. His orchestration is much thinner than Wagner's, and makes use of a more traditional orchestra size, without the expanded wind or string sections. Likewise, audiences and critics came to associate Brahms with less frequent doubling, with solo parts in the winds more as the rule than the exception. Dynamics are much more subtle, and eschew the bold and highly contrasting passages characteristic of Wagner. It is these characteristics that I will strive to identify in my analysis of the 1873 and 1889 scores of Bruckner's Third. In order to support the claim that that the changes to performance markings and orchestration in Bruckner's Third symphony shift from a sound characteristic of Wagner in the 1873 version to that of Brahms under the "Hanslick Model" in the 1889 version, I will discuss representative examples of this shift in the scores of the Third symphony.

Movement I

Before delving into the performance markings and orchestration of the score of the first movement, it is important to understand the Wagnerian associations that had accrued to Bruckner's Third Symphony before it was even performed. Around the time of the composition of the Third, Bruckner is noted as discovering the works of Wagner, a discovery that led to a profound admiration for the German composer. As such, Bruckner decided to send the scores of his Second and Third Symphonies to Wagner, requesting that Wagner choose one of the scores to be dedicated to him.⁸⁵ Wagner chose the Third Symphony, leading the Third Symphony to be nicknamed the "Wagner Symphony." The 1873 score in fact had "Wagner Dedication Score" printed at the top, leading many audiences and critics to expect the symphony itself to be distinctly Wagnerian. Thus, it is important to note that the state of mind of the audience would have been biased at the very start by this presupposition, and any hint of Wagnerism in the work would have been immediately identified as such.

When opening the scores, an immediate difference in orchestration is visible between the two versions. In the 1873 score, Bruckner uses trumpets in D, while in the 1889 he uses trumpets in F. This change is a fairly obvious revision, but it is an important one. Trumpets in D create a more brilliant tone, and allow performers to have a greater range in the higher register. More importantly, they are traditionally

⁸⁵ Derek Watson details the entirety of the events surrounding the composition and premiere of Bruckner's Third Symphony in *Bruckner*, 30.

used in opera and in heavier orchestrations to require a trumpet more capable of penetrating through a thicker orchestra. The trumpet in F, on the other hand, has a more classic tone with a smooth and mellow sound, fit more for blending in than for standing out. This example serves for the main thesis that the shift from the sound of a Wagnerian orchestra to that of a Brahmsian orchestra. The fact that a more penetrating trumpet is needed in the 1873 version reflects the thicker orchestration of the original score.

Perhaps the most obvious examples of factors that would influence audiences to hear the 1873 version of the Symphony as Wagnerian are in the first movement and in the finale. The opening of the first movement has direct quotes from some of Wagner's operas, particularly *Die Walküre* and *Tristan und Isolde*. The *Tristan und Isolde* quotation (mm. 134-146) is obvious, and would have been immediately recognizable to a listener familiar with Wagner's music, which would most likely have influenced listener's view of the symphony in its entirety. As the quotes are in the opening of the first movement, they also would have set a Wagnerian tone for the work as a whole.

The differences between the two scores become increasingly apparent in the texture before letter A (1873, m. 17; 1889, m. 14). In the 1873 score, the melody is played by both the first and second horns, while in the 1889 score it is played only by the first horns. To compensate for this reduction in melodic texture, the thick A-minor block chord accompaniment in the flutes, oboes, and clarinets in the 1873 score is thinned down to only the first oboe and the first clarinet in the 1889

version, which is further thinned down with a pianissimo dynamic marking. This creates a chamber wind sound, an effect prominent in the works of Brahms.

At letter E, the revisions again reveal a textural change (1873, m. 171; 1889, m. 139). In the 1873 version, Bruckner employs a typical doubling scheme. With the melody in the first horn, the oboes and bassoons provide the octave, while the third and fourth horns play the fifth. In the 1889 score, however, the oboes and lower horns, playing the third and seventh of the E⁷ chord respectively, are taken out, and the trombones provide additional support of the tonic in the lower octave. This orchestrational change provides a more condensed range, where in the 1873 score a wider tonal and notational range was established. Likewise, the 1873 score has a greater emphasis on the seventh, creating a more jarring and foreboding harmony underlying the serene melody in the horns, while the 1889 score emphasizes the typical tonic-dominant harmony, eliminating much of the tension from the series of tonic chords.

Many similar examples exist. At Letter F in the 1st movement, the texture is varied between the two scores. This short segment shows the frequent doubling employed by the 1873 version (m. 207), as opposed to the thinner texture of the 1889 version (m. 173). This type of textural difference seems to be a subtle change in scoring, but makes large impact on the audience. The inclusion of the bassoon and flute in these two measures of half notes adds noticeably different colors to the middle-ranged oboe and clarinet half notes. By cutting flute and bassoon in the 1889 version, Bruckner excludes both a higher and lower register, creating a thinner line,

further emphasized by the exclusion of the string bass in these two measures. Likewise, all instruments are given a piano dynamic marking in the 1873 score, while the thinner texture is magnified by a pianissimo dynamic marking in the 1889 version.

Brahms's penchant for more soloistic passages is reflected in the 1889 version of letter K (1873, m. 301; 1889, m. 267). In the original score, the melody in this section is passed between the horns and the bassoons at a piano dynamic, with pianissimo eighth-note support in the strings. More noticeably, the horn and bassoon melodies overlap in the 1873 score, creating an alternating tutti-solo texture typical of Bruckner's organistic style. In the 1889 version, however, the melody in this section is passed between solo horn, solo bassoon, and solo oboe, and the melodies overlap much less often than in the 1873 score. In the 1889 score, the melodies are reduced down to pianissimo, further generating the thinner texture generally characteristic of Brahms.

Another example of these textural differences in the 1st movement is shown at letter M in the scores. In this passage, the strings come in with an arpeggiated eighth-note line that becomes the background to a quiet sighing motive in the woodwinds. In the 1873 version (m. 333), the woodwinds play a thicker chord and the horns have a countermelody, while in the 1889 version (m. 299), the woodwinds play a soft unison with no horns. More importantly, in the 1873 score the strings play two piano eighth notes per beat, providing a constant and thick texture, while in the 1889 score the strings are marked pizzicato, pianissimo, and play one eighth

note followed by an eighth note rest for each beat. This drastically reduces the texture, allowing for a thinner sighing motive in the winds. Likewise, the strings have a crescendo with the horns in the 1873 version that is excluded from the 1889, indicating a more dramatic and sudden push into the woodwinds sighing motive.

Movement II

The second movement of the Third Symphony is a baleful adagio, drawn out into a lengthy and profound expansion of the seemingly simple central theme. The 1873 score takes this length to an extreme, with a total of 272 measures, many of which are to be performed adagio. The 1889 score almost seems to overcompensate for the extremity of the 1873 score's length, cutting around 70 measures and increasing the tempo of some sections to andante or allegretto. The removal of a significant number of measures is found in many of Bruckner's revisions, and could certainly have been associated with Wagner's own lengthy style by audiences.

The beginning of the movement in both scores essentially foreshadows the changes made to the movement as a whole (1873 and 1889, m. 9). In the 1873 score, a crescendo is built in the winds and strings at a deliberate and increasingly agitated pace. If there is one characteristic that sets the 1873 version of the movement apart from the 1889 revision, it is that the original movement is relentless. From the beginning, the strings are given more turbulent parts, and the woodwind orchestration is thicker. Crescendos are bigger and faster, and there is a constant

sense of foreboding. In the 1889 version, the crescendo at measure nine is less dramatic, and is broken up by more subtle sighing motives in sequence throughout the woodwinds and upper strings.

A similar effect is evident in the pounding climax before rehearsal E (1873, m. 102; 1889, m. 106). The removal of the horns from the texture in the 1889 score eliminates much of the harsh and texturally thick feel, creating a thinner and lighter fugue in the strings and bassoon. Likewise, Bruckner cuts a few measures in the 1889 score, making the fugal gesture much more fleeting before the light and dancing flute melody at E. This type of trimming is typical of the changes made to the movement, as Bruckner was particularly criticized for this movement's prolix and exhausting seriousness, a characteristic that is mirrored in many of Wagner's operas. Brahms himself referred to Bruckner's works as "symphonic boa-constrictors," a sentiment that was echoed by critics ranging from Hanslick to those overseas in England.⁸⁶

Bruckner again alters the feel of his adagio in the recapitulation of the opening theme (1873, m. 129; 1889, m. 154). In the original score, Bruckner sets the theme in the woodwinds against a similarly sorrowful countermelody in the strings. This section is perhaps the most unyielding in its message content and in its scope, and is dominated by dramatic swells of sounds, compounded with strong accents in the woodwinds. In the 1889 score, however, the countermelody in the strings is

⁸⁶ Doernberg, *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*, 88.

replaced with a dancing triplet pizzicato, which completely changes the mood of the section to something much lighter. Likewise, many of the woodwind parts that are tutti in the 1873 score are changed to solos in the 1889 version. The changes made to the movement give the adagio a much more discernible form, a trait much more in line with the symphonic style of Brahms, while the wandering and sometimes indistinguishable form of the 1873 score is reminiscent of Wagner's deliberately avant-garde operatic style, which eschewed traditional separation of arias and recitatives. These kinds of textural changes appear throughout the movement in the two versions.

Movement III

In the 3rd movement, differences of orchestration are immediately noticeable between the two versions. The rhythmic scherzo at the beginning of the movement (1873, m. 20; 1889, m. 19) becomes almost frenzied in the 1873 score at measure twenty, as the D-minor chord is accompanied by a shrieking and sustained tonic pitch in the woodwinds. All of the other instruments play a pounding rhythmic melody underneath. This is true for every repetition of the main scherzo theme, which grows successively longer with each of its appearances. This thicker texture creates an extreme contrast between the held note in the high register of the woodwinds and the rhythmic motive in the strings and brass, and seems to magnify the fury of rhythm in the lower instruments. In the 1889 version, the held note is

absent, and is replaced by the rhythmic motive found in the lower instruments.

Likewise, all instruments are instructed to play the motive with shorter articulation than in the 1873 score, creating a more restrained and less chaotic effect. In general, the 1873 score has more moving lines in the woodwinds, creating a maelstrom of motion in the higher registers. In the 1889 score, these moving lines become more distinct as they are placed in registers in the string parts that are more discernable to the ear, which seem to subdue the tension generated in the original score.

As the movement develops, crescendos become more and more frequent, as is evidenced in the measures before the trio (1873, m. 130; 1889, m. 135). In the 1873 score, the build up to this and subsequent crescendos is much more quickly executed, and instruments are added sooner, particularly in the brass. The oboes come in with octaves starting on A that rise semi-chromatically to climactic triple forte eleven measures later at rehearsal G. This rising chromaticism, paired with a poco a poco crescendo provides a more noticeable build in the 1873 score that is left out in the 1889 version. The trombones also come in four measures earlier in the 1873 version than in the 1889 score with accented block chords that rise chromatically to the climax. In the 1889 score the trombones come in later, and have separated quarter notes that thin the texture. Similarly, much of the bassoon part in the 1873 version consists of notes played in grandiose octaves that steadily build to the climax, while in the 1889 score the bassoons have minor thirds that provide less textural support in the lower octave. In general, the 1889 score has a thinner texture throughout this crescendo and many others, and is less accented in some places.

The trio in the 1873 score provides an immediate and striking contrast from the preceding scherzo (1873 and 1889, m. 1). The melody in the first violins is legato and flowing, a stark contrast from the separated articulation of the scherzo. In the 1889 score, the trio melody is still separated, maintaining much of the original character of the scherzo. Similarly, the melodic motives that follow in the woodwinds are much smoother and legato in the original version. This drastic contrast between the scherzo and the trio is maintained throughout the movement in the 1873 score.

Toward the end of the movement, the 1873 score maintains much of its earlier fervor, with broad tuttis in the flutes, oboes, and clarinets in particular (1873 and 1889, m. 110). It is texturally thick, featuring woodwinds playing toward the top of their registers. This texture is altered in the 1889 score, which has soloistic woodwind parts in the flute and clarinet, and a much more transparent texture. This is heightened by the crescendos in the 1873 version, which begin at a mezzo-forte in the woodwinds. In the 1889 score, these crescendos start at piano many bars earlier, providing for a much more gradual buildup to the final note. Finally, the viola part in the 1889 version is marked as separated, slightly thinning out the texture.

Movement IV

The differences between the fourth movements of the 1873 and 1889 scores are by far the most striking. As in the second movement, the most striking feature of

the movement in its original form is its length, which became one of the foremost criticisms regarding all of Bruckner's Symphonies. After the first performance of the Seventh Symphony in London, critic Charles Barry wrote, "Reasons for [the symphony's failure] may be found in extreme length – a fault substantially aggravated by lack of proportionate interest."⁸⁷ And of the Third Symphony's premiere, Hanslick wrote that "we did not understand his gigantic symphony."⁸⁸ Likewise, a review in the *Weiner Zeitung* stated "it is an enormous work, whose audacities and peculiarities cannot be characterized in a few words"; and a review in the *Deutsche Zeitung* declared that "many of the audience seem to have sensed something ominous in the air, and as time was getting on they headed for the exits. What followed showed how wise they had been In the event we heard an utterly bizarre work, which might rather be described as a motley, formless patchwork fabricated from scraps of musical ideas."⁸⁹

While the fourth movement of the 1873 score lasts for an incredible 764 measures, the 1889 version is much shorter, coming in at 495 measures. The astonishing length of the 1873 movement was immediately noticeable to audiences. It is also probable that audiences would have associated this characteristic with

⁸⁷ Charles Barry, "Richter Concerts," *Musical Times* 28 (1 June 1887), 342: quoted in Crawford Howie, *Anton Bruckner: A Documentary Biography*, Vol. 2, *Trials Tribulation and Triumph in Vienna* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 543.

⁸⁸ Hanslick's review in full is in Stephen Johnson's *Bruckner Remembered* (Danbury: Faber & Faber, 1998), 113.

⁸⁹ Both reviews can be found in *A German Reader, Music in the Making*, ed. John Martin and Sigrid Martin-Wünscher, (London: Hugo's Language Books, 1994), 133-136.

Wagner, whose operas often lasted upwards of five hours. Thus, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Bruckner's dramatic cuts to the movement may have been partly inspired to the perception of the movement's Wagnerian length.

In the score itself, the two versions of the fourth movement also feature obvious orchestrational differences similar to those already seen in the first movement. Whereas in the first movement Bruckner changed the type of trumpet he called for, in the 1889 version of the fourth movement he changed his horn designation. In the 1873 score, the first and second horn parts are played on horns in F, while the third and fourth horn parts are played on horns in B flat. Typically, horns in B flat are used in order to achieve higher pitches than those available on the standard horn in F. The highly demanding horn parts in the 1873 score explain this orchestration choice, as the 1873 parts often call for notes out of the comfortable range of a horn in F. As in the situation of the trumpets in the first movement, the horn in B flat was ideal for cutting through the thicker textures in the 1873 version, and enabled an expanded range of instrumental tones (beyond the requisite woodwinds) in the upper registers – an expanded range no longer necessary in the thinner textures of the 1889 version.

The first example of Bruckner's changes to the movement is evident within the first few bars. In the original score (1873, m. 5) the entrances are louder and more pronounced, enabling a more dramatic and faster crescendo to the accented climax at measure nine. As in the 1889 score, the entrances in the 1873 score are staggered. But in the 1889 score, the entrances of the clarinets and horns in

measure five are piano instead of mezzo-forte, and the bassoons and lower horns in measure seven are marked mezzo-forte instead of forte. Bruckner has changed the 1889 score in order to provide for a slower and more predictable buildup to the climactic chord, which is accented with a ^ accent, indicating that the chord should not have the initial burst of articulation present in the bold and strong > accent given on that chord in the 1873 version, but instead should be played marcato.

Perhaps one of the most interesting features of the movement in its original form is also one of the most controversial. Before the premiere of the Third symphony, Bruckner's student August Göllerich spoke of a conversation he had with the composer while the pair was taking a stroll through the first district of Vienna. As they passed the resting place of a noted Viennese cathedral architect, they heard lively music coming from a party inside a nearby home. Upon hearing this, Göllerich recorded Bruckner as saying "Listen! There in that house is dancing, and over there lies the master in his coffin- that's life. It's what I wanted to show in my Third Symphony. The polka means the fun and joy of the world and the chorale means its sadness and pain."⁹⁰ This idea finds its realization in the final movement of the 1873 score (1873, m. 69). A poignant chorale is found in the woodwinds, while the strings play a lively polka underneath. Such a striking and prolonged juxtaposition of ideas is notably absent from the 1889 score (1889, m. 65). Although the idea itself

⁹⁰ This conversation was originally recorded by August Göllerich in *Anton Bruckner. Ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild* (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1922-36), vol. 4, part 2, 663. It has since been detailed by Simpson in *The Essence of Bruckner*, 75-76, and by Watson in *Bruckner*, 84.

is still presented, it is obscured and essentially lost in Bruckner's revisions.⁹¹ The chorale is moved from the woodwinds in the 1873 version to the horns and trombones in the 1889 revision, making it much less noticeable, as the brass have a similar register to the strings playing the polka. And whereas the chorale is marked *mezzo-forte* in the 1873 score, it is marked *pianissimo* in the 1889 score, further obscuring its presence in the later version. Finally, this motive is played for over 100 measures in the 1873 score, while it is reduced to around sixty-five measures in the 1889 version.

With Hanslick and other influential critics set firmly against the programmatic music associated with Wagner and the "New Germans," combined with the widely reported associations between Bruckner and Wagner himself, many in Vienna's musical circles already considered Bruckner's symphonies to be a bastardized form of absolute music. And although it is unclear whether Göllicher's story was common knowledge at the time of the premiere of the Third Symphony, Bruckner's modifications of the section he described suggests that it may well have been circulated to audiences and critics either before or shortly after the work's premiere. The overtly programmatic nature of this section would have lent further fuel to antagonistic critics' attempts to link Bruckner with Wagner, and its partial

⁹¹ Julian Horton analyzes this portion of the 1873 score in *Bruckner's Symphonies* on page 33, in which he claims that the original form of the chorale is a reference to the Liebestod in Wagner's *Tristan und Isolde*. In the 1889 score, this reference is obscured and the harmony is altered to mesh with the polka underneath, as if it was not a chorale at all, and instead was an accompaniment to the polka.

suppression in the 1889 score may well have been a conscious effort to distance the symphony from this classification.

An example of the doubling techniques in the original score characteristic of Bruckner's organistic texture, which would most likely be received by audiences as Wagnerian, is found after performance marking C (1873, m. 100; 1889, m. 90). The flutes and oboes play a unison melodic line, providing a solid block of sound reminiscent of the stops on an organ. In the 1889 revisions, the melody is played by a solo oboe, which has a much more classical, Brahmsian sound.

Another change in performance markings is found in a horn melody against moving string lines (1873, m. 130; 1889, m. 120). In the 1873 score, the strings are thickly textured with abrupt, accented eighth-note passages. The bass and cello lines are marked as accented pizzicato, and all of the strings begin as mezzo forte and swell through a crescendo at the height of the horn line. The horn line provides a strong contrast, marked as forte, and legato against the accented strings. In the 1889 score, on the other hand, the strings are more thinly scored, and the pizzicato and accent marks are removed from the cello and bass lines. Likewise, both the strings and the horn are marked down to pianissimo and piano respectively, with an absence of legato markings in the horns. These changes make for a more sedate and restrained feel, typical of a Brahmsian symphony.

The performance markings at K and L (1873, mm. 209 and 245; 1889, mm. 155 and 185) represent another textural shift in the two scores. In the 1873 score,

the two sections feature quarter notes in the strings and woodwinds that are supported by accented solid chord blocks, providing thick textural support. In the 1889 score, the brass chords are changed into unaccented quarter note passages, which have the effect of thinning the texture. This type of change in texture is typical of the rest of the movement, particularly in its use of accented notes.

At performance marking CC of the 1873 score (1873, m. 675), Bruckner surprises the listener. Seemingly interrupting the movement, he recapitulates each of the three previous movements in short, five- to ten-measure bursts of tempo change that correspond to the dominant themes and tempos of the first three movements. This short section is immediately followed by a direct plunge into the finale of the 4th movement, almost as if Bruckner is reminding the audience of the path taken up until this point in the symphony. While almost certainly a compositional decision made independently of any influence of Wagner, this short segment of the movement nonetheless calls to mind Wagner's use of the leitmotif, for Bruckner effectively brings us back to the emotional state of each of the previous movements with a mere suggestion of their salient melodic and harmonic "signatures." Of course, this technique is also used by Beethoven in the finale of his Ninth Symphony, which may partly account for Hanslick's interpretation of the symphony as a mix between Beethoven and Wagner in his review of the premiere.⁹² Bruckner removed this entire section from the 1889 version, possibly in another

⁹² Hanslick's review in full is in Johnson, *Bruckner Remembered*, 113.

attempt to distance the composition from anything that might possibly associated with Wagner.

The finale of the 1873 score (1873, m. 725; 1889, m. 451) serves as a dramatic and fiery conclusion to the movement, achieving an incredible contrast to the measures preceding it. The finale of the 1873 score is marked triple-forte “sehr schnell,” while the section preceding it is a light allegro. This exemplifies perfectly the sort of extreme dynamic and performance markings in the 1873 score that would so easily be associated with Wagner. And significantly, this effect is largely muted in the 1889 score. For example, the tempo is marked as “sehr schnell” (very fast) in the 1873 score, as opposed to a less drastic “schnell” (fast) in the 1889. Likewise, the 1873 score is marked as triple-forte in all parts with heavy usage of accents, where the 1889 score is marked as fortissimo in some parts, and even mezzo forte in others. The 1873 score again utilizes the first movement’s bright trumpets in D, while this passage in the 1889 score uses mellower trumpets in F. Bruckner ends the 1873 score with a ruthless rhythmic repetition of the tonic, which culminates in a startlingly abrupt, accented and triple-forte quarter note tonic chord in all parts, after an incredibly long buildup – a gesture that would have been seen, even against the backdrop of all of the nineteenth century’s symphonic innovations, as pushing the acceptable limits of compositional pathos. In the 1889 score, Bruckner cut much of this culminating finale, ending the movement with a much more complicated and subtle chord progression giving way at the end to the unison tonic. In effect, the changes made in the 1889 version resemble a much more

traditional finale to a symphony, and would certainly have been received as more typically Brahmsian, and as adhering to critical norms, than the 1873 score.

Chapter V: Conclusions

My analysis reveals some of the greater patterns in performance markings and orchestration in the revisions of the Third. Individually, these changes might seem to be insignificant. Each involves the addition or omission of as little as one instrument, or represents a shift in one dynamic level. However, when added together, these small details make the 1873 version sound much more akin to a traditional Wagnerian orchestra, and they make the 1889 sound similar to a Brahmsian orchestra under the “Hanslick Model.” Thus, the orchestration and performance markings represent a shift in performance markings and orchestration in Bruckner’s revisionism from Wagner in the 1873 score to Brahms in the 1889.

Whether Bruckner did in fact compose the original version of the Third Symphony from a Wagnerian compositional viewpoint is irrelevant to its reception as such. It is my view that Bruckner indeed admired Wagner, but that the creation of the Third was essentially independent of Bruckner’s veneration of the elder composer. There is too much evidence pointing toward the influence of Bruckner’s background as an organist on his compositions. Likewise, it is evident from Bruckner’s own frustration with the poor reception of his works that such a man

would not consciously choose to incorporate characteristics of works composed by one of the most critically lambasted composers in Vienna. It seems much more likely that Bruckner was erroneously labeled as a Wagnerian early in his career, a moniker that stuck with him throughout the rest of his life, and which particularly haunted him in the case of the Third Symphony. I assert that this association was made because of the similarity between Wagner's orchestration and performance markings, and Bruckner's "organistic" sound.

At the conclusion of his book, *Bruckner's Symphonies*, Julian Horton asserts:

Ultimately, [understanding Bruckner] may entail abandoning the pursuit of an empirically determined 'authentic' Bruckner, conceived of in philological, biographical, hermeneutic or analytical terms: there is no accessible 'essence of Bruckner', to use Simpson's phrase. There are instead multiple contexts for Bruckner, each arising from a particular convergence of disciplines, circumstances, techniques and ideologies, and each demanding its own contextually sensitive response...It is precisely this diversity that should be embraced and made productive if we are to do justice to this remarkable composer.⁹³

Scholars may never fully understand Bruckner as a man or as a composer, but it seems clear that we may be able to elucidate certain elements of his art. While my thesis explores a fairly small portion of the "Bruckner Problem" it opens a greater topic of debate. My analysis suggests that the changes to performance markings and orchestration in Bruckner's Third Symphony shift from a sound characteristic of Wagner in the 1873 version to that of Brahms in the 1889 version. This transition is perhaps representative of a greater trend in Bruckner's revisions as a whole, and further study may uncover similar changes.

⁹³ Horton, *Bruckner's Symphonies*, 265.

Chapter VI: References

- Botstein, Leon. "Music and Ideology: Thoughts on Bruckner." *Musical Quarterly* 80.1 (1996): 1-12.
- . "Music and Its Public: Habits of Listening and the Crisis of Musical Modernism in Vienna, 1870-1914." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1985.
- Brodbeck, David. "Brahms, the Third Symphony, and the New German School." In *Brahms and His World*. Rev. ed. Ed. Walter Frisch and Kevin C. Karnes. Princeton, NJ, and London: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Brown, A. Peter. "Brahms' Third Symphony and the New German School." *Journal of Musicology* 2 (1983): 434-52.
- Bruckner, Anton. *Briefe*. Vol 1, 1852-1886. Ed. Andrea Harrandt and Otto Schneider. Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag der Internationalen Bruckner-Gesellschaft, 1998.
- . Third Symphony Scores, 1873 and 1889, ed. Leopold Nowak.
- Brustle, Christa. "The Musical Image of Bruckner." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "Siegfried von Hausegger: a Bruckner Authority from the 1930's." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Cooke, Deryck. *The Bruckner Problem Simplified*. Borough Green: Novello & Company Limited, 1975.
- Doernberg, Erwin. *The Life and Symphonies of Anton Bruckner*. London: Dover Publications, 1960.
- Floros, Constantin. "One Unity Between Bruckner's Personality and Production." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Geiringer, Karl. *On Brahms and His Circle: Essays and Documentary Studies*. Sterling, Michigan: Harmonie Park Press, 2006.
- Göllerich, August and Max Auer. *Anton Bruckner. Ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild*. Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1922-36.
- Hamann, Brigitte. *Hitler's Vienna: A Dictator's Apprenticeship*. Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Harrandt, Andrea. "Bruckner in Vienna." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "Musical Life in Upper Austria in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "Students and Friends as 'Prophets' and 'Promoters': the Reception of Bruckner's Works in the *Wiener Akademische Wagner-Verein*," In *Perspectives on Anton*

- Bruckner*. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hawkshaw, Paul. "The Bruckner Problem Revisited." *19th-Century Music* 21.1 (1997): 96-107.
- . "A Composer Learns His Craft: Lessons in Form and Orchestration, 1861-3," In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Horton, Julian. *Bruckner's Symphonies : Analysis, Reception and Cultural Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Horton, Julian. "Bruckner and the Symphony Orchestra," In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Howie, Crawford. *Anton Bruckner: A Documentary Biography*. 2 vols. New York: Edwin Mellen, 2002.
- . "Bruckner- the Travelling Virtuoso." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Howie, Crawford, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. "Introduction" in *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Ingrao, Charles. *The Habsburg Monarchy 1618-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Jackson, Timothy. "Bruckner's Metrical Numbers." *19th-Century Music* 14.2 (1990): 101-131.
- . "Bruckner's *Oktaven*: the Problem of Consecutives, Doubling, and Orchestral Voice-Leading." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Johnson, Stephen, and Charles Boyle. *Bruckner Remembered*. Danbury: Faber & Faber, 1998.
- Kann, Robert. *A History of the Habsburg Empire 1526-1918*. London: University of California Press, 1974.
- Karnes, Kevin. "Another Look at Critical Partisanship in the Viennese *fin de siècle*: Schenker's Reviews of Brahms's Vocal Music, 1891-92." *19th-Century Music* 26 (2002): 73-93.
- Korstvedt, Benjamin. "Anton Bruckner in the Third Reich and After: An Essay on Ideology and Bruckner Reception." *Musical Quarterly* 80.1 (1996): 132-60.
- . "Between Formlessness and Formality: Aspects of Bruckner's Approach to Symphonic Form." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "Bruckner Editions: the Revolution Revisited." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "The First Published Edition of Anton Bruckner's Fourth Symphony: Collaboration and Authenticity." *19th-Century Music* 20 (1996): 3-26.
- . "Harmonic Daring and Symphonic Design in the Sixth Symphony: and Essay in Historical Musical Analysis." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford

- Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Leibnitz, Thomas. "Anton Bruckner and 'German music': Josef Schalk and the Establishment of Bruckner as a National Composer." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- McCull, Sandra. *Music Criticism in Vienna 1896-1897*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Millington, Barry and Spencer, Stewart. *Wagner in Performance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Notley, Margaret. "Brahms as Liberal: Genre, Style, and Politics in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna." *19th-Century Music* 17(1993): 107-123.
- . "Bruckner Problems, in Perpetuity." *19th-Century Music* 30.1 (2006): 81-93.
- . "Bruckner and Viennese Wagnerism." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Nowak, Leopold. "Die Anton Bruckner-Gesamtausgabe. Ihre Geschichte und Schicksale." *Bruckner-Jahrbuch* (1982-83): 203.
- Oestreich, James R. "Problems and Detours on Bruckner's Timeline," *New York Times* (July 10, 2005), Arts and Leisure, 23.
- Okey, Robin. *The Habsburg Monarchy: From Enlightenment to Eclipse*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2001.
- Palmer, Peter. "Ludwig Wittgenstein's Remarks on Bruckner." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Phipps, Graham. "Bruckner's Free Application of Strict Sechterian Theory with Stimulation from Wagnerian Sources: an Assessment of the First Movement of the Seventh Symphony." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Röder, Thomas. *Auf dem Weg zur Bruckner Symphonie: Untersuchungen zu den ersten beiden Fassungen von Anton Bruckners Dritte Symphonie*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1987
- . "Master and Disciple United: the Finale of the Third Symphony." In *Perspectives on Anton Bruckner*. Ed. Crawford Howie, Paul Hawkshaw, and Timothy L. Jackson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Schoenzeler, Hans-Hubert. *Bruckner: Illustrated Musical Biography*. New York: Marion Boyars, 1978.
- Schorske, Carl. *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.
- Scott, Derek. "Bruckner's Symphonies- a Reinterpretation: the Dialectic of Darkness and Light." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Simpson, Robert Wilfred Levick. *Essence of Bruckner: An Essay Towards the Understanding of His Music*. London: Gollancz, 1992.

- Solvik, Morten. "The International Bruckner Society and the N.S.D.A.P.: A Case Study of Robert Haas and the Critical Edition." *Musical Quarterly* 82.2 (1998): 362-83.
- Swinden, Kevin. "Bruckner and Harmony." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Wagner, Richard. *Judaism in Music and Other Essays*. Trans. W. Ashton Ellis. London: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.
- Watson, Derek. *Bruckner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Weiss, Piero, and Richard Taruskin. *Music in the Western World*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1984.
- Werner, Wolff. *Anton Bruckner: Rustic Genius*. New York: Cooper Square, 1973.
- Williamson, John. "The Brucknerian Symphony: an Overview." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "Conductors and Bruckner." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "Introduction: a Catholic composer in the Age of Bismarck." *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "Programme Symphony and Absolute Music." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*. Ed. John Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.