

ANTON BRUCKNER SYMPHONY NO. IX D-MINOR, FINALE

COMPLETED PERFORMING VERSION BY
SAMALE–PHILLIPS–COHRS–MAZZUCA (1983–1991)

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW CRITICAL EDITION (1996–2004/REV. 2006) BY NICOLA SAMALE & BENJAMIN–GUNNAR COHRS

CONTENT

THE NEW EDITION OF THE COMPLETED PERFORMING VERSION SAMALE ET AL.....	2
BRUCKNER'S NINTH IN THE PURGATORY OF RECEPTION	2
BRUCKNERS OWN WORK ON THE FINALE	4
WHY ATTEMPTING TO RECONSTRUCT THE FINALE?	6
WORK IN PROGRESS: THE COMPLETED PERFORMING VERSION.....	10
REQUIRED RECONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION WORK	13
TABLE: THE SOURCES FOR THE FINALE AS USED IN THE NEW EDITION OF THE CPV	14
TABLE: RECONSTRUCTION WORK ON THE FINALE, COMPARED WITH MOZART/SUESSMAYRS REQUIEM	17
REGARDING HE CORRECTED SECOND IMPRESSION OF THE NE 2004 (REV. 2006)	19
TABLE: CORRIGENDA 2006	19
REPORT ON THE NEW EDITION	21
I. THE NEW RECONSTRUCTION OF BIFOLIO [»1«E]	21
II. THE NEW RECONSTRUCTION OF BIFOLIO [»4«]	23
III. THE NEW RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SONG PERIOD (4C/»5«; [5/»6«]; [6/»7«])	24
IV. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE BEGINNING OF THE DEVELOPMENT (»13a«E; ⇒13b«E; [14/»15«])	27
V. THE NEW RECONSTRUCTION OF BIFOLIO [19D/»20«]	29
VI. THE TRANSITION AFTER THE SONG PERIOD IN THE RECAPITULATION ([27/»28«])	32
VII. THE NEW DESIGN OF THE CHORALE RECAPITULATION ([30/»31«]; 31E/»32«; [32/»33«])	33
VIII. THE PARTIAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CODA FROM THE SKETCHES	36
IX. THE ELABORATION OF THE FINAL <i>HALLELUJA</i> PLENO	40
X. REVISED INSTRUMENTATION	41
XI. REVISED DYNAMICS, PHRASING, AND ARTICULATION	42
XII. REVISED TEMPI	43
TABLE: CONCORDANCE OF TEMPO INDICATIONS.....	44
TABLE: FORMAL ANALYSIS OF THE COMPLETED FINALE (NE 2004/REV. 2006).....	45
A BRIEF ANALYSIS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MUSICAL SEMANTICS	47

THE NEW EDITION OF THE COMPLETED PERFORMING VERSION SAMALE ET AL. Introduction by Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, © Bremen (2006) ¹

»Just a simple remark – if you don't approve of performing versions of composer's unfinished sketches, no one is holding your hand to the fire forcing you to listen. In the meantime, those of us with intellectual curiosity, although we know such things as this and other performing versions can never really exist as the composer would have completed them, would still rather hear the sketches in some way rather than having them remain mute in archive drawers. Again: no one is forcing you to listen ...«
[Bruckner-Fan Dace Gisclard, Houston/USA, 26. 8. 2003, www.amazon.com]

BRUCKNER'S NINTH IN THE PURGATORY OF ITS RECEPTION

To this day, Bruckner's Ninth burns in a purgatory of misunderstanding, erroneous interpretation, appropriation, even barbaric abuse, having long fallen »prey to taste« (Adorno). Bruckner had scarcely taken his last breath when souvenir hunters swooped down on the manuscripts lying around the room where he died, which was only secured some time later. The executors of his estate entrusted Bruckner's pupil Joseph Schalk to inquire into the correlation of the remaining 75 score bifolios for the Finale of the Ninth, but he died on 7 November 1900 without having undertaken the task. His brother Franz quietly took those manuscripts into his possession which, according to Bruckner's testament, should have belonged to the *Hofbibliothek* (Court Library), today *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Wien* (=ÖNB, Austrian National Library, Vienna).

During rehearsals for the first performance on 11 February 1903 in Vienna, the conductor Ferdinand Löwe was frightened by the Ninth's radical nature, and completely re-orchestrated its first three movements; the material for the Finale, still unexamined, was dismissed. Löwe, »out of piety for the master's wishes«, as he wrote, indeed included the Te Deum, but had not considered the stylistic discrepancy between his altered arrangement and the Te Deum, left in its original form. Löwe's conviction, cited in his foreword, that the three completed movements constituted in themselves a performable, closed unit, ultimately became dogma, for the distorted first editions maintained their validity on the concert podium for decades; in the meantime such opinions hardened into concrete. Löwe even published his own arrangement without comment as Bruckner's authentic score. The Te Deum was excluded from his edition, although Bruckner would certainly have wished it to be published with the symphony.

Only slowly it became common knowledge among Bruckner scholars that »there was something wrong« about the first editions. In 1929 the Critical Bruckner Complete Edition was begun, in 1934 publishing the original score of the Ninth, edited by Alfred Orel, together with a study volume which contained transcriptions of many of the Finale manuscripts for the first time. But Orel omitted several sources, scattered to the four winds as they were; his presentation was not entirely clear and full of mistakes. Apart from that, his edition, like Nowak's 1951 reprint, contained only the first three movements, although at least Universal Edition had published a study score of the Ninth together with the Te Deum before 1920, and thus to some extent realised Bruckner's intentions. The Te Deum was first published separately in the Complete Edition in 1961, and without any reference to Bruckner's wishes regarding the Ninth.

¹ This text is a large extract from the English notes to Repertoire Explorer Study Score No. 444, available on sale from www.musikmph.de, re-arranged by Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs in 2006. (Some material was taken from earlier text publications, such as booklet and programme notes, including texts which were originally conceived in collaboration between B.-G. Cohrs and John Phillips, in particular from the *Musik-Konzepte* Vol. 120–22.) It was prepared for www.audio-muziek.nl and abruckner.com, to provide all important information on the philological insights which led to the New Edition, in order to better understand the nature of the reconstruction work being undertaken; to explain why it was necessary to publish a New Edition (which for some reason had to be corrected and slightly revised again in 2006); and to inform about the differences between this and the older editions of the SPCM-score, as being available on the recording of the completed Ninth under Johannes Wildner (Naxos 8.55933/34). I am especially grateful to Thomas Ohlendorf, who did the typesetting of score and all musical examples given here, and to Ken Ward, who did the proofreading on the English Notes.

Proper critical discussion of Orel's *Entwürfe und Skizzen* never occurred. Nonetheless, attempts to complete the Finale were repeatedly based on this misleading source. Some were never published or later withdrawn; other scores were occasionally performed or even published, but have not established themselves, and justifiably so: none of their authors ever published a detailed commentary on their activities, an absolute necessity in a case such as this. Apart from that, all these scores reveal severe errors in their methodologies and astonishing carelessness in their handling of Bruckner's manuscript texts. On the one hand the arrangers dispensed with significant original passages; on the other, a high proportion of free composing can always be found. One arranger, for example, filled a demonstrably 16-bar-long gap in the score with no less than 100 bars of his own composition; others seem to prefer such »own visions of Bruckner's work« even when there was sufficient original material, overlooked by them. New steps in the resolution of this problem were only undertaken in 1985, as the renowned Italian conductor and composer Nicola Samale published his *Ricostruzione* – the first soundly-based and properly documented performing version of the Finale, undertaken in collaboration with the composer Giuseppe Mazzuca. Due to philological research of the Australian musicologist and composer John A. Phillips, a revision of this score was published in 1992 by the »Editorial Team« Samale, Phillips, Cohrs and Mazzuca (= PV 1992). This research also stimulated new interest to edit the surviving manuscripts within the Bruckner Complete Edition. Leopold Nowak, its former director, was no longer able to undertake such a demanding task, but shortly before his death, he entrusted this to Phillips. Until 2006, this extensive project included six volumes: Phillips edited the Facsimile Edition (=FE) of all surviving manuscripts of the Finale, the Reconstructed Autograph Score (=RAS) and the Documentation of the Finale Fragment (=DFF), an arrangement of the score (being left incomplete) for workshop concert performance. Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs edited a new Critical Edition of the first three movements of the Ninth, wrote the extensive Critical Report and also published a study volume, containing the manuscripts for the 2nd Mvmt. (including the autograph score of the discarded Trio with Viola solo). Thus, only a hundred years after the composer's death, the sources for his Ninth have been made clear.

Hence, in the 100th anniversary of its first performance, the editors of the series *Musik-Konzepte*, Heinz-Klaus Metzger and Rainer Riehn, for every good reason chose to publish a triple issue with the title *Bruckners Neunte im Fegefeuer der Rezeption* (i. e. »Bruckner's Ninth in the Purgatory of Reception«). This expression makes it clear that the misjudgement of the Ninth is mostly based on the imperatives of the Romantic era. Scholars such as Willem Erauw and Peter Schleuning had already shown that the way music was experienced in Central Europe gradually took on features of a kind of »Ersatz-Religion« in the course of the 19th Century: As much of the influence of the Church declined, cultural activities adopted its transcendental function in bourgeois life. Since then, the German/Austrian tradition of musical aesthetics has worshipped at a limited canon of selected musical »monuments«, as Erauw described cynically, yet accurately: »With Beethoven's symphonies as the new Holy Scripture, the audience would never become bored of listening to the same music, in the same way people in a Church would never tire of listening to the same words at Holy Mass every Sunday.« His assertion is confirmed by the dominant position of such »Holy Scriptures« in the world of classical music on the one hand, and the neglect to which major composers of other countries tend to be subjected to on the other.

Erauw also observed that »in classical music, almost all music making has to do with texts. The belief that the real truth is only to be found in the score, this obsession with the musical text, means that during a classical concert, musicians are interpreting musical texts instead of playing music.« This may be put a little drastically, but many musicians and musicologists who rely entirely on the score still frown at the idea of trying to understand a work from the context of its origin. Scholars outside Central Europe have long since begun to focus on the complex relationships between the listeners and the music they hear, whereas many German and Austrian music researchers continue to see themselves as closet music critics, thus proceeding with aesthetic concepts of late-romantic musical experience never being questioned. This already started with a particular spelling. Romantic aesthetics changed Beethoven's »Sinfonia« into »Symphonie« to give this form more weight – an ideologically burdened spelling which was avoided in the German version of the present text, since this language still allows »Sinfonie«. Unfortunately, there is no English equivalent, so we must continue here with »symphony«, but at least we should bear this in mind. Quite as much, the term »historically informed performance practice« is frequently used in a derogatory fashion. And no wonder: anyone who finds the positive example of a revived practice to reveal his own shortcomings cannot help but respond with rejection. Indolence and ignorance have found a perfect excuse – music-historical knowledge and skill is claimed to be ACADEMIC in nature, and thus of no relevance to actual MUSICAL PERFORMANCE.

This ideology is still propagated in musical education, sometimes with consequences nothing short of grotesque, as indignantly criticised by Author Peter Lamprecht in 2002 in *Das Orchester*: »When a successful conductor admits in a rehearsal, without blushing, that he has never heard of the 18th or early 19th Century rules and practice on bowing; when another one fails to understand the wavy lines stipulating a ›Bogenvibrato‹ [i. e., a vibrato with the bow] in Gluck's opera *Orphée* and asks the orchestra to play a trill on every single semiquaver, then the tolerance threshold has clearly been crossed – all the more so when such gentlemen concerned hold university positions, giving them the chance to multiply the gaps in their own education with impunity.« In the light of this, it is not hard to comprehend how critics and musicians who have fallen prey to a misunderstood ›Werktreue‹ (i. e., fidelity to the original), have taken hold of Bruckner's Ninth in a way that is diametrically opposed to the composer's intentions. Giving the lie to the widespread cliché of ›Preußische Gründlichkeit‹ (Prussian thoroughness), it took an entire Century for the sources of the Ninth to be re-evaluated. It appears that hitherto no-one wanted to know exactly what new findings had come to light, in order not to damage a much-loved Romantic legend. According to this, Bruckner was allegedly suffering from »too much mental decline« in the last months of his life to be able to jot down more than a »pile of disjointed sketches« for the Finale; moreover – thus the general opinion – the first three movements were seen as »unfinished, but not requiring completion«. Only Phillips, in his *Musik-Konzepte* essay ›Erst fakteln, dann deuteln‹ (›First fiddle with the facts, then quibble over the interpretation‹), got to the bottom of this legend: he was able to show without any shadow of a doubt that this scholarly opinion that has prevailed up to now is chiefly the result of a campaign cleverly staged by Ferdinand Löwe and a couple of music critics whom he had briefed accordingly. If, on the other hand, we summarize the more recent research findings on the Ninth, a completely different picture emerges.

BRUCKNER'S OWN WORK ON THE FINALE

Bruckner of course designed the Ninth Symphony, on which he started work on 12th August 1887, in four movements. He spent at least a year working on the Finale while still in fairly good health (not much better or worse as in the years between 1889 and 1894), and its actual composition was probably finished by June 1896, with just the instrumentation of Woodwinds and Brass awaiting completion. Its gestation was not significantly different from that of Bruckner's earlier works: From the very beginning onwards he sketched the formal elements with a fundamental conception of their position within the score and relation to earlier or subsequent sections. This position was mostly so clear that for later revisions a personal shorthand writing – consisting of symbols, pointers, figured Bass numbers, cuts, repetitions and other special signs – was sufficient enough. Due to this alone it seems to be very unlikely that Bruckner should not have had a clear idea of the entire structure of the Finale during the phases of working out the score. Usually the procedure of composing in Bruckner followed four phases:

— A first notation of the basic continuity of the music, sketched in three- or four-staved particella, at least until the end of the Exposition.

— The gradual preparation of the score and its main elements – the metrical numbers, the elaboration of the String parts intended to be the fundament of the instrumentation, as well as entries or endings of important Wind or Brass parts, often first in pencil, later erased and overwritten with ink.

— The systematic elaboration of the score, usually first the Woodwinds, then Brass instruments, first the leading voices, later the additional, resonant or supporting parts.

— A last correction phase, by Bruckner himself called as »Nuancieren« – the addition of nuances in playing, ties, slurs, dynamics, accents as well as final corrections, refinements and touches.

These phases were not always clearly separated from each other. Obviously Bruckner proceeded from section to section (Exposition, Development & Recapitulation, Coda). If required he made further sketches from time to time. The valid score bifolios were laid one on another and subsequently numbered in the right top corner of their first pages. If larger revisions were required, he often discarded earlier bifolios and replaced them by newly written ones. If he intended such replacements, he quite often used score bifolios already prepared for their use, to sketch the changed continuity, often in one leading voice only. Phillips called such bifolios ›Satzverlaufs-Entwürfe‹ (= SVE, i. e., continuity drafts). Sometimes all the corrections, cancellations, and passages being pasted over made it necessary to write a clean copy of a bifolio without changing its content. Hence, one cannot speak of a complete ›sketch‹ and ›score‹ phase. Even more simple forms like the tripartite A-B-A'-Scherzo or Trio movements were usually sketched only until the beginning repeat of their first sections.

Therefore it is simply wrong to think about a ›draft score‹ here: the sequence of hitherto valid, numbered bifolios must be considered to be the ›emerging autograph score‹ itself, as Phillips earlier pointed out. It is not easy to decipher Bruckner's early sketches, being intended as strictly private jottings, somewhat hastily notated in pencil. Also paper, glue and ink used by Bruckner were extremely sensitive. In the case of the Ninth, Bruckner's handwriting also represented his condition of health, as one may also trace from his last pocket calendar (1894/95), published by Elisabeth Maier in 2001 (*Verborgene Persönlichkeit*, Vol. II, p. 397–415). Given such circumstances, it is astonishing how clearly wide sections of the score have been written down, despite better or worse days, or weaknesses coming from old age. The analysis of all surviving primary and secondary sources (including thorough paper and script research) could be called an almost ›forensic‹ undertaking if we consider the loss of so much important material. Its results, presented *en detail* in the various publications of the Complete Edition, seems to be sometimes more, sometimes less speculative, as in every forensic examination, depending on where more or less material was lost. The results of many years of debate and research, as presented in what follows, can be considered sufficient enough foundation.

As pointed out by Phillips, in the Finale Bruckner used six different types of paper. His last assistant and secretary, Anton Meissner, had to help with the preparation of most of the score bifolios. He had to write down the names of the instruments, clefs, key signatures, and to rule the barlines, usually dividing a single page into four bars. Hence, most of the surviving score bifolios and SVE consist of 16 bars in all. Those bifolios intended to be used were taken from a pile, replenished from time to time with new paper bought. Paper being prepared earlier remained, the new paper was put upon this. However, Bruckner and Meissner did not prepare those bifolios consistently, and every pile of paper shows small differences in assignments, for instance, the spelling of the instruments, or, most significantly, the use of the lower Horns alternating with Wagner Tubas. Alfred Orel interpreted such differences on various paper types as different ›versions‹, or better stages of composition. However, Bruckner's own working processes proved this to be wrong. The six main paper piles have been merely used for the composition in at least five working phases. Therefore John Phillips rightly revised Orel's nomenclatura thoroughly in his own publications for the Complete Edition. The results of his examinations made it possible to describe the chronology and genesis of the Finale quite accurately.

The composition of the last movement was not much different from the first three movements of the Ninth. Following Bruckner's severe illness in Winter 1895, obviously his calendar entry »24. Mai 895. 1.^{mal}, Finale neue Scitze« represented the beginning work. The words »neue Scitze« (new sketch) may be interpreted that he already sketched some ideas when still working on the foregoing movements. (The surviving bifol. 1A could indeed have been finished already early in 1895, because it survived from the estate of Richard Strauss, who is said to have received it from Bruckner when he visited him in Vienna, but his only known presence in Vienna during this period of time was from 1st to 3rd of April 1895.) Also the secondary literature revealed many hints that Bruckner had played music from all four movements to visitors at the Piano, and that he also may have used in his late Organ improvisations material obviously intended for the Finale.

Early drafts for the Exposition up to the Chorale Theme of *Working Phase 1* date back from a time before he moved into the Kustodenstöckl of the Belvedere on 4th July 1895 (see the date »8. Juni«, FE, p. 9). According to the report of his physician, Dr. Richard Heller, Bruckner started to compose the full score immediately after moving in, hence the Exposition would have been laid out in those six to eight weeks following 24th May. This is comparable to the 1st Mvmt. – the manuscripts preserved in Cracow show Bruckner's intense work on the Exposition between the first surviving sketch (»12. August«) and the first score bifolio (»1«, later discarded) dating from 21st September 1889. Since Bruckner progressed gradually with the score, the Exposition of the Finale must have been more or less finished in a relatively short time (c. July and August 1895).

Working Phase 2 (until c. December 1895) included the continuation of the score with the Development up to the beginning of the Fugue. By use of paper from the C pile he had obviously finished an initial version of the entire Exposition, possibly including some clean copies of earlier bifolios. It is most likely that only at about this time (Autumn 1895) Bruckner decided to introduce a Fugue on the Main Theme. The initial sketches show that his first idea was to prepare a regular Recapitulation by a series of variants of the theme in inversion. Then Bruckner undertook a re-conception of the Development, giving procedures of preparing the Fugue a concrete shape. The score thus developed until the bifol. 17, which included the beginning of the Fugue.

In *Working Phase 3* (Winter 1895–6) Bruckner made several sketches for the Fugue and its continuity; several discarded score bifolios with different ideas for the beginning are extant. The beginning of this phase is represented by bifol. 17^aD, dated by Bruckner on December 16th, 1895 (FE, p. 169). Until May 1896 Bruckner may well have finished the score in this primary shape, including the entire 2nd Part with Strings elaborated and several jottings for Woodwind and Brass. Sketches for the Coda date from the days before Whit Sunday (18th to 23rd May 1896), including links to a bifol. »36«. In accordance with this, Bruckner's friend Franz Bayer reported on May 10th 1896 in the *Steyrer Zeitung* that the composer had already »den Schlußsatz seiner 9. Symphonie wohl vollständig skizziert« (»the final movement of his Ninth Symphony entirely sketched out«).

In *Working Phase 4* (Spring 1896) Bruckner obviously started to finish the instrumentation and also reshaped parts of the Exposition. In doing so, he split up the bifol. 2F, which increased up to 36 bars, into two separate bifolios. This made it necessary to renumber all subsequent bifolios – something similar had happened earlier in the last working phase on the 1st Mvmt. (see its Critical Report, p. 48) – by erasing and overwriting all the following numbers. This phase found its sudden end with Bruckner's severe pneumonia in the beginning of July.

Even if Bruckner physically quickly recovered by July 19th, in a last *Working Phase 5* (Summer 1896) the Finale did not significantly progress any further, due to his mental constitution which drastically switched between better and worse days. However, he still continued to work on details whenever possible. The last surviving date in the manuscripts is August 11th, when Bruckner sketched an important extension of the beginning of the Development on two surviving SVE, one »13^a« and one unnumbered, but obviously »13^b«. He had undertaken a similar last-minute expansion earlier in the 1st Mvmt. (see Critical Report of Mvmts. 1–3, p. 31ff, and its Preface, p. XIV).

At the time Bruckner died, the score must have contained at about 40 last-valid bifolios including perhaps more than 600 bars of music; the Exposition and further sections in the 2nd Part were obviously finished in full score. From this last stage, today we miss five bifolios from both the 13 of the 1st Part and from the 2nd Part up to bifol. 31/»32«, in all, 10 or 11 bifol., including the last-valid [»1«], [»4«], perhaps a new bifol. [»5«], [5/»6«], [6/»7«] and [»13«] – later obviously intended to be replaced with »13a«E and »13b«E –, as well as [14/»15«], [19/»20«], [24/»25«], [27/»28«] and [30/»31«]. From the following, we miss at least bifol. [32/»33«] and most likely six or seven more bifolios from the Coda until the end of the movement, at least containing all String parts. This would mean that from the final score, originally intact up to the end, up to 18 or 19 bifolios are lost today – almost a half.

WHY ATTEMPTING TO RECONSTRUCT THE FINALE?

The taste of the audience varies as far as performing versions of unfinished works by another hand are concerned. Despite their quality, some of them were accepted after some time (Mozart/Süssmayr's Requiem; Mahler/Cooke's Tenth Symphony; Bartok/Serly's Viola Concerto; Elgar/Payne's Third Symphony), other performing versions are mostly rejected or don't play a big role in the world of classical music today (Schubert/Newbould's unfinished symphonies in b minor, E- and D Major; Bach/Schulenberg's *Contrapunctus XIV*, Liszt/Maxwell's *De profundis*; Borodin/Glazunov's Third Symphony; Caikovskij/Bogatryyev's Seventh Symphony). Arguments for or against such efforts are discussed rather irrationally within Critique and Aesthetics of Music. However, in such debate, philological research is not of much concern. This is the more remarkable if one considers the usual obsession of critics with the musical text or the concept of »*Werktreue*«, as explained above.

Music history has handed down to us fragments of all kinds. Some are purely noted-down ideas, from the outset not intended to be worked out in full; many are simply studies; others could not be finished for biographical reasons – perhaps because their creator turned his attentions elsewhere or died during their conception. Still others are the remains of works which were once complete, but have only come down to us in fragmentary form. Should one permit them to be completed by others? If one tries to answer this question one should be clear from the outset about a basic, underlying issue.

»In order that music can actually sound, can really exist, it has to be placed in score; the compositional process has to be complete. This necessity leads to the fact that musical fragments play a far lesser role in the aesthetics of art than do torsos in all the other arts. On the other hand, this imperative that music must be finished – experienced at times by great musicians as a real burden – leads in many cases to the fact that works that have been ›completed‹ are nonetheless not ›perfected‹ – a most unpretentious concept. The Germans speak of Schubert's ›Unvollendete‹ (unperfect), the English are more pragmatic and call it merely the ›Unfinished‹. The German concept of ›Vollendung‹ not only implies that something has been brought to an end, but that it has been brought to a conclusion in a ›perfected‹ manner. The result is almost hyperbole, which in language and in our conceptual thinking appears greater and more radical than it really is.« This is how conductor and musicologist Peter Gülke – himself a prominent editor of Schubert's late symphonic fragments – has formulated the problem.

Even more comprehensively this problem was discussed by conductor and composer Robert Bachmann, who directed the first performances of the Ninth in its New Critical Edition as well as the British and Russian premiere of the completed Finale: »It is merely a utopia of ›work idea‹ that a work should be ›perfect‹ in shape, form and content. This seems to be most likely a perverted misinterpretation by aesthetics, from which we rather suffer. The movements of the Ninth are not ›vollendet‹ (perfected). By the way, even the ›most perfect‹ work as we know it is *per definitionem* not yet ›perfected‹; it would merely be perfected in the infinite diversity of possible realisations in concert. Every performance would then become additionally a part of this realisation of an utopia of perfection. It is simply wrong to think or speak here in terms of perfection. One has merely finished something only in order to begin its realisation. Here we simply deal with notation, with something being fixed in written form, and only thereby it became for us an inspiration to make it sounding, based on particular ideas. The word ›Vollendung‹ should not be addressed even; it is not worth it, an absurd option to think about it this way. Whoever tries to understand himself as an ›entirety‹, his being in the world not as something separated from the world around us – the latter became in the last years even an intrinsic part of our language –, whoever looks at himself as being part of the real world, won't be able to follow such an idea of ›perfection‹, since everything is in a permanent flow. Such it is with musical works being finished with a double barline.«

Bachmann asked a provoking question: »What then is perfected in Bruckner's Ninth? We have the task everytime anew at least to make this work sound, and to master it on the ground of performing practice, not even to mention the spiritual ability to let Bruckner's music appear as a emanation of the divine presence. This does not matter yet when we start to rehearse it. Then consider the imponderabilities of a concert, and then you carry this later to the Studio in order to realize the in itself impossible idea of the ›perfect, ultimate‹ recording of the work: that is presumption, totally beyond every reality. Even the *per se* finished work, where the composer says with a double barline ›This is the work as I have considered it to be‹, just begins. There starts the search within the work. What shall it constitute, and where is its deeper truth? And so there is no ›Vollendung‹. It would be impossible to achieve. In the best case, we are always close before achieving it, but next time failure may be even closer again. If there is any myth at all, it would be the ›Myth of the Perfected‹ and not that of the ›Unperfected‹. The world is permanently in gestation, and we don't know where it comes from and where it goes to. We are ›in a flow‹ ourselves all the time; our life, the whole world is part of an incredible energetic dynamic. The music reminds us constantly that this inextinguishable force is there. It is the miracle of music-making that we can evoke this experience again and again. The concept of ›Vollendung‹ has no room here. Related to Bruckner's work we should perhaps ask: wherein lies the ›perfected‹? Perfection is in death. Only then you can discuss the man. But still it reaches out beyond this, since this work develops autonomy. Also there is no ›perfection‹, merely a physical one of the person's presence. But the work itself dissolved, and Bruckner's work is, as a whole, a ›work in progress‹ as it could not be any more modern at all. Perhaps there is one problem of the reception, that one would like to fix him to ONE work, to THE ONE symphony and not three or four, revised, edited or perhaps withdrawn versions, which, on the other hand, Bruckner did NOT destroy. He left them as they were, not because he could not get away from that, but because he let them stand there as independent works, and in his efforts to find different solutions he thus found another shape for the selfsame work. This is a very up-to-date principle of composing, that somebody from his own material creates something new again and again.«

Whether it is really appropriate to produce a performing version of a fragment has to be determined on the individual merits of each case. How can one value the surviving original material, and is it sufficient enough for a performing version? Was the material further fragmented by events in history, or did the fragment occur by biographical circumstances (illness, death of the composer)? And, above all: did the composer explicitly wish to complete his work or not? Mozart's Requiem, for instance, was a commissioned work. He had already got a payment of half the sum in advance, which could not have been easily returned by his widow, and the commissioner, Count Walsegg, had the right to expect a completed work. It would be a different question, however, if Mozart had agreed to our custom to perform the Requiem completed by another hand under his own name, since he had already agreed to write it anonymously and to give it out of his hands. The Pro and Contra of reconstructions or performing versions of other unfinished compositions may be discussed likewise, of which perhaps two are especially problematic – Cerha's performing version of Berg's opera *Lulu* and the recent performing version of Puccini's *Turandot* by Luciano Berio. In the case of Berg, Cerha used the material as he had found it, but we now know from Berg's own surviving letters that he intended to massively reassemble the opera's formal structure. And Puccini was simply never able to agree with his librettists on a dramaturgically satisfying end for *Turandot*. (By the way – Alfano's ending works astonishingly well here; one should only perhaps thoroughly revise his performing version, which would have to be better adapted to Puccini's own instrumentation.) Certainly composers of later times may actively discuss Schubert's sketches for his last symphony D 936a (Luciano Berio: *Rendering*), or even material from the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth (Gottfried von Einem: *Bruckner-Dialog*, which includes its Chorale Theme) in works of their own. Also, the posthumous, creative elaboration of Elgar's sketches for a Third Symphony by Anthony Payne brought such a convincing and moving result that this enrichment of the repertory was not even criticized by ingrained purists. But who would now benefit from six further elaborations of these sketches? In my opinion it exceeds the limit of good taste if only for a media sensation a composer's original concept is intentionally distorted – for instance by the commissioned work *Pluto*, which Colin Matthews incorporated into the orchestral suite *The Planets* by Gustav Holst without any good musical reason. And if a composer of our time would dare to supplement the three movements of Bruckner's Ninth with a brand new Finale of his own, the posthumous incapacitation of Bruckner would be perfect – as demonstrated by the composition by Peter Jan Marthé in 2006, or the one to be expected from Heinz Winbeck, commissioned by Dennis Russel Davies in 2004.

However, the attempt to reconstruct and complete the Finale seems to be admissible for various reasons. Robert Bachmann suggested that this would mean to »reconstruct a work which had been handed down to us already in large portions. In such a case I always expressed my opinion that posterity is required to preserve such a cultural heritage, quite as much as it is demanded on the premises of a well-based performing practice. From all we know about the history of this movement, it was absolutely necessary to make it somehow performable. It is almost an act of barbarity to uphold the fatal situation of presuming the symphony would be already »perfected« as a three-movement-torso. (...) This is an arrogance built on ignorance and not on a passion in terms of philosophy, also not on love for the music or the work, not to mention respect for the composer himself. Let us imagine this in the Fine Arts – somebody goes straight into a National Gallery and attacks a painting with acid. Without any delay all necessary efforts would be undertaken to rescue that painting, and reconstruct it, if possible, on the knowledge what has been there before. Now let us assume that during this rescue one were also to find some earlier layers of the painting, hitherto unknown – hence one would perhaps start to reconstruct something which has not yet been known, but which is possible to reconstruct based on sufficient scientific criteria. I would like to explain this further: Let us assume it is the picture of a man. He has his limbs, he has his head. Even if the forearm were missing one would still know there has to be a hand with five fingers (unless the artist wanted to show a cripple or monster). This transferred back to that what survived from Bruckner's Finale means quite the same – an acerbic reconstruction, based on established scientific research. This is not only legitimate; one has an obligation to do this, in particular in music, since this is a linear medium, manifesting itself in the dimension of time. Hence, one should not let a work break off which exists almost finished, especially if one knows from established results what was intended for the missing end. Certainly some speculation remains. But such speculation is also to be found in what went before. There is no such thing as a final version of the first three movements of Bruckner's Ninth, unless that what he left were already his »last word«. However, we do know from the practice of performing this work that many questions remain unsolved – regarding tempi, refinements in dynamics *et cetera*. Bruckner had the habit to »finalize« a composition once more at the end, and this is missing here as well.«

Even if the final double barline is not included anymore somewhere in the material today, one can scan the entire movement surprisingly well, due to Bruckner's systematical approach of composing and the surviving earlier stages. For this purpose, techniques of reconstruction are required as they are not only legitimate in Natural Sciences, but are of a vital use if one wishes to demonstrate certain processes. Unfortunately, in other areas such reconstruction techniques are accepted much more than in music: In medicine, victims of accidents are more than grateful for the possibility of replacing lost parts of their body by plastic surgery. Also in forensic pathology, such reconstructions are of value. This was demonstrated very effectively in 1977, when Dr. Quincy in the eponymous TV series reconstructed from a single femur not only the general appearance of the deceased but also his murderer (*The Thigh Bone's Connected to the Knee Bone* by Lou Shaw, also available as a novel by Thom Racina).

Reconstructions are also well known in the Fine Arts and in Archaeology. Paintings, torsos of sculptures, mosaics and fresco, ship wrecks, castles, theatres (Venice!), Churches (Dresden!), and even entire ancient villages have been successfully reconstructed. The resistance in Musicology to the use of such techniques for musical scores may come from the fact that in the 20th Century the dogma of ›the one and only‹, untouchable text of a ›final version‹ has been established once and for all. Hence in Musicology to this day the search for the presumably ›authentic‹ dominates over the ›trivial‹, and grants canonical status to the ›original artwork‹ only. But what would we have to lose if, being aware of editorial responsibility and fully knowing the philological foundations, we try to reconstruct a movement on which the composer himself had worked hard and for a long time, but which then was partially lost due to the disrespectful action of posterity?

Additionally, in this case speculation can be much reduced, since Bruckner himself already made analytical and music-theoretical adjustments and examinations again and again, which are understandable from a thorough knowledge of his ›scientific‹ approach to composing. Amongst his rules regarding setting, harmony and counterpoint is also his systematic control of arsis and thesis in his bar periods, regulated by the metrical numbers, his use of ›Kustoden‹ (i. e. voice leading short hand), his tendency to compose in block-like structures or sequences of regular bar periods as well as the systematic layout of the notation of the composition itself. The assertion that Bruckner did not write anything worthwhile for the 4th Mvmt. is thus already untenable from a philological point of view. Some scholars realised this early on. Already in 1949, Hans Ferdinand Redlich wrote that »every single bar is carried forward by the overwhelming momentum of an imagination nothing short than Michelangelesque. The astonishing originality of the architectural plan deserves special praise in its own right.« Hence, that it is customary to perform just the first three movements constitutes a gross injustice to the composer. Bruckner even expressly ordered – what other composer was so far-sighted? – that in the event of his premature death, his *Te Deum* should be played as the best possible substitute for the missing *Finale*.

We owe it to Ferdinand Löwe that the composer's instruction is rarely followed, as already mentioned above. He indeed performed the *Te Deum* on 11th February 1903, but his conviction that the Ninth made more sense as three-movement torso rapidly became the accepted doctrine. On the other hand, the *Te Deum* does actually constitute a worthy ›substitute *Finale*‹ for many reasons: The tonal tendencies within the symphony would allow an interpretation of the first three movements making some kind of a cadence for the C major of the *Te Deum*, especially since Gustav Mahler had already experimented with progressive keys. Even the harsh Bruckner critic Max Kalbeck referred to a »pedantic and outmoded ban« after Löwe's performance: »After the E major of the *Adagio*, a C major sounds neither better nor worse than d minor would have sounded.« And it is true that, even today, many critics still find a C major ending to the Ninth to be out of question, although the E major close of the *Adagio* doesn't seem to bother them particularly. Further prejudices against the *Te Deum* as a *Finale* result from Löwe's own performing practice, where he confronted the unchanged *Te Deum* of the first edition with his own, ›Berliozesque‹ arrangement. Nowadays, a choir, four soloists and an organ mean additional costs for any concert promoter, and – let's be honest: most concert-goers are already perfectly happy with 60 minutes of Bruckner ...

»WORK IN PROGRESS«: THE COMPLETED PERFORMING VERSION

In 1983, Nicola Samale initiated the arduous task of completing the Finale. The first phase, finished in 1984, was published one year later by Ricordi and subsequently recorded for CD with Eliahu Inbal (Teldec) and Gennadij Roshdestvenskij (Melodiya) conducting. His collaborator Giuseppe Mazzuca, after the 1985 Ricordi publication, showed no further interest in the Finale. At about the same time, Nicola Samale started a collaboration with Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, and developed with him further phases of the score, recorded, among others, under Hubert Soudant for the Netherlands Broadcasting Company NCRV (Producer: Cornelis van Zwol) and recorded live under Samale himself, released on CD by Melodram Italia. The latter already included important new features – apart from massive changes in instrumentation, also for the first time the realization of a final *Halleluja* in D major, based upon the *non confundar* motif, further elaborated by Cohrs in 1989. In that same year, arranged by Cohrs, Samale also started to collaborate with the Australian scholar John A. Phillips, who re-checked the philological findings by Samale, Mazzuca, and Cohrs and correlated them with his own research on the manuscripts in 1990/91. He later published his findings in his Thesis (Adelaide 2002) as well as in some volumes within the Bruckner Complete Edition. Of particular interest is his *»Faksimile-Ausgabe sämtlicher autographen Notenseiten«* for the Finale (*»Facsimile Edition of all Surviving Musical Autographs«*; =FE), which appeared in 1996 in the Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, Vienna, making available all that survived from Bruckner's own hand for this movement for the very first time to a large public. It serves as an indispensable reference source for this New Edition (=NE). Phillips also edited the next phase of the score, which appeared as a self-publication in 1992 in Adelaide and Bremen. It comprised the earlier results from 1983 until 1989, enriched with further new findings, later becoming known as the version by Samale-Phillips-Cohrs-Mazzuca, or SPCM version (=PV 1992).

This version, premiered by the Bruckner Orchester Linz under Manfred Mayrhofer, was very successful – almost 40 performances in nine countries, by 17 orchestras under 14 conductors, including a Studio-CD-Production (Bruckner Orchestra Linz, Kurt Eichhorn/Camerata Tokyo), a Live-CD-Recording (Neue Philharmonie Westfalen, Johannes Wildner/SonArte & Naxos), a Studio-Radio-Production (*BBC*) and three Live-Radio-Recordings (Netherlands Broadcasting Company, Hilversum; *DeutschlandRadio*, Cologne; *Bayrischer Rundfunk*, Munich) between 1991 and 2003. The Completed Performing Version gained additional support from the Documentation of the Finale Fragment, edited by Phillips, first performed by the *Wiener Symphoniker* under Nikolaus Harnoncourt (Vienna, 1999), and repeated by the same conductor with the *Wiener Philharmoniker*, performed in Salzburg in 2002 and later issued on CD by RCA/BMG. (This production also contained for the first time the Critical New Edition of the first three movements, edited by Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs for the Bruckner Complete Edition.) Why then publish a newly revised score now?

Above all, the present writers maintain that two equally important approaches are needed to make this music performable – a) the sonic realisation of the surviving manuscripts themselves, as in the DFF edited by Phillips, suitable for workshop concerts, concert introductions or media presentation; as well as b) a completed performing version which would allow an at least approximate impression of the Ninth Symphony as a four movement unity. While the DFF allows one to compare the surviving material with its completions in aural experience, listeners want to hear MUSIC in a concert, not philology. For this reason we frankly do not understand the motivation to conflate these two approaches, as was done in the past in the *Ricostruzione* by Neill/Gastaldi (1962), and more recently suggested again by Jacques Roelands. Philological questions should certainly be addressed in scholarly debate, but what is the point of producing a score which would necessarily still include speculative reconstructions of lost portions, while not making any use of the substantial sketch material that survives for the Coda? Apart from ignoring an audience which does not consist mainly of scholars, this approach could only replace the old legend of a three movement Ninth as being sufficiently *»vollendet«* already by a new myth of an *»Unfinished«* – this time with an even more clearly audible break.

The CPV as edited in 1992 was the fruit of a difficult collaboration, including several stages emerging from the research by Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca, begun in 1983. Already in 1996 Phillips published some of his own revisions (version *»1992/rev. 1996«*). Likewise, the present writers were never totally satisfied with certain *»compromised«* passages. Both had the opportunity to conduct the Ninth and the Finale on various occasions; each performance brought new insights. Finally, in 2003 they became convinced that a revision of the entire score should be the next step. However, when they presented their ideas for a newly revised score in 2004, Dr. Phillips did not agree to most of the substantial changes suggested by them.

Eventually, the editors could only agree to disagree, and Dr. Phillips expressed his wish to officially distance himself from this New Edition – a decision the present writers regret but have to respect. However, the editors wish to explicitly express their gratitude for his most valuable contribution, and also for that of Giuseppe Mazzuca. Hence, the New Edition appeared under the following title: »Anton Bruckner / Ninth Symphony in d minor: / Finale (unfinished) / Completed Performing Version / Samale-Phillips-Cohrs-Mazzuca (1983–91) / New Critical Edition / (1996–2004) / Score / edited by / Nicola Samale & Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs / Critical Commentary by Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs / (Revised Second Impression 2006) /© Bremen & Rome 2006 «.

Such a protracted process of development and publication may appear as being confusing, however, it is not without precedent, as an example taken from literature demonstrates. The scholar Stefan Schenk-Haupt demonstrated in his comprehensive study on A. Pope and T. S. Eliot (*Dulness Never Dies*, Europäische Hochschulschriften 399, Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt 2003) that *The Dunciad* by Alexander Pope – a book holding a key position in the 18th Century – should not only be understood as ›work in progress‹, being developed between 1728 and 1743 (i. e. ca 15 years), and in at least four working phases, but also has been published during this time in 15 editions corrected or authorized by Pope himself as well as in three further ›pirate editions‹, in all, 18 editions and 59 further reprints, and many of them being available simultaneously on the market.

Similarly, the New Edition of the Finale only represents a further stage of a ›work in progress‹, which could be considered to be finished only under the condition that all lost score bifolios had come back to light – apart from the fact that a ›final‹ evaluation of certain details was rendered impossible by Bruckner's death anyway. Some of the changes presented in this New Edition are the result of new philological research and insight. Others merely represent variants and not necessarily ›improvements‹, but based on now almost 20 years of experience in examining, discussing, editing and performing this music. This also comprises the new elaboration of what were hitherto believed to be gaps within the Second Theme of the Exposition and within the Fugue (now fully established from the original sketches) as well as many refinements of instrumentation, phrasing, articulation, dynamics and tempi. Particularly in the Coda many changes have been undertaken in order to give a more coherent impression of these important final bars.

And this is indeed the main reason for presenting this NE: from a fresh re-examination of the manuscripts it was possible to find some convincing new solutions, binding the music better together. This impression was confirmed by some notable Brucknerians, for instance, well-known author Prof. Harry Halbreich, who, after listening to Cohrs' performance of the Ninth (Gmunden 2002), enthusiastically wrote to the conductor in May 2003: »This is to express my admiration for this last version of the Finale for Bruckner's Ninth. For years I remained sceptical about this undertaking and also the highly problematical movement in general. But now the coherence and integrity awaited for a long time seems to be achieved. The piece now sounds totally organic and unified, the few transitions in question successfully abridged, and above all, the Coda now grows as a matter of course out of all the movements preceding, not only the Finale. As in every great work of Bruckner, the ›bridge-maker‹ (he so well deserves his last name!) successfully closed the giant arc between the opening and final bars – musically and spiritually now finally a sufficient whole. In short, I don't think one could come much further with the surviving manuscripts, unless unknown, new material would come to light – not very likely, but not absolutely impossible. This last version needs to be urgently printed now, and made available for musical performance. Good luck! In admiration, Harry Halbreich« And Nikolaus Harnoncourt asserted: »Only from an experiment in practice, the musical world could come to an adequate judgement.« The present writers decided to follow such wishes, and to ignore the possibility that a certain confusion could arise from the existence of newly revised ›Fassungen‹, since they are convinced that the revised NE will decisively contribute to the comprehensive impression of the Finale on its own as well as of the symphony as a whole.

Philological research undertaken during the last decades had already revealed beyond doubt that Bruckner did not leave a pile of disconnected sketches for the Finale, but actually an emerging autograph score, which was most likely finished at least in its primary work phase almost half a year before Bruckner's death. The surviving manuscripts constitute material from various working phases, which could be combined to a surprisingly complete extent; for a very few bars only no material survived at all. It was possible to cover such gaps not so much by using ›free composition‹, but merely a technique of ›synthesization‹ (similar to reconstruction techniques in forensic medicine and plastic surgery), in which the musical fabric of lost bars can be regained to a certain extent from deductive analysis, observing the material before and after the gap as well as Bruckner's own, strictly ›scientific‹ approach of composing, hence to dispense with a free composition in the true sense of the expression.

The PV 1992 had a hard time to this day: despite its almost 40 performances and productions even in important cities such as Berlin, Brussels, Frankfurt, London, Munich, Moscow and Tokyo, the classical music establishment showed little interest, and star-conductors stay away from the completed Finale. The reasons for this may be left undecided here, though, the most wellknown conductors of the Finale – Peter Gülke, Philippe Herreweghe, Eliahu Inbal and Gennadij Roshdestvenskij – deserve mention. A similarly small number of critics warmly welcomed the performing version. Hence, with the ›musical public‹ it is still very controversial, despite the fact that the basic information has already been provided by publication of texts and printed music, CD productions and performances since the middle of the Eighties. A debate was taken up again only after Autumn 2003, when two important CD productions were internationally released – the first release of the Critical New Edition of Mvmts. 1–3 plus the ›Documentation of the Finale Fragment‹, played by the *Wiener Philharmoniker* conducted by Nikolaus Harnoncourt (RCA/BMG), as well as the entire Ninth including the CPV 1992 (rev. 1996), recorded live with the New Philharmonia Orchestra of Westphalia under Johannes Wildner (Naxos). At about the same time, also *Musik-Konzepte* Vol. 120/121/122 appeared, introducing some important results of philological research on the sources of the Finale. The present writer collected more than 100 reports and reviews on these three publications (in both English and German) between summer 2003 and 2004. However, Music Criticism once more gave a poor account of itself. Critics found at least some well-worded compliments for the recording of the Finale fragment under Harnoncourt, but also often enough hymns of praise not underlined by facts. On the other hand, the reviews on the Naxos recording only once more displayed the well-known prejudices, sometimes using critical remarks on the artistic quality of the production against the performing version itself, quite often in a rude manner, or even defaming its editors. Vienna critic Walter Dobner did the splits and underlined the naive upholding of the cliché against Bruckner's own intentions in the *Mitteilungsblätter der Bruckner-Gesellschaft* in December 2003: »Nevertheless, Harnoncourt's way to perform that what remained from the Finale and in doing so to open up perspectives is by no means unproblematic, since he gives the impression that Bruckner's Ninth, despite being in three movements, would be unperfected, which it is not, quite as much as other unfinished works ...«

Only exceptionally few critics accepted their responsibility to gain sufficient information on the topic. In general, a debate of the facts themselves continued to be rejected. Instead, there seems to be the rather clear tendency to switch over to purely aesthetic argument. Illuminatingly, alone the fact that the renowned Nikolaus Harnoncourt and *Wiener Philharmoniker* – some kind of ›Keepers of the Holy Grail‹ in Occidental tradition of orchestras – performed and recorded the Finale-Fragment of the Ninth, seemed to make this movement fit for good society. More than half of the collected reports appeared on this topic, and almost no critic dared any longer to question the quality of Bruckner's music itself, or the basic value of such a ›Documentation of the Fragment‹. On the other hand, the published sources for the Ninth yet remain to be reviewed or become the subject of scholarly debate. It may well take years before the information provided here may find some larger interest. Also the musicians, as Nikolaus Harnoncourt pointed out, have almost no experience of playing this music yet, in fact making it for them somehow ›contemporary‹, and hence it may well be simply too early to talk about possible results of the publication of the Finale concerning the reception of the Ninth. But it seems also to be clear that the new findings on the Finale still await to be much better known than it is the case today, if one wishes to make Bruckner's own ideas on the Ninth understandable – if the lack of interest shown by the reception cannot already be seen as a capitulation before the mass of new information and material on the topic. Even the eminent Bruckner scholar Elisabeth Maier clearly spoke out in a review in June 2004 that there may well be more than a handful of colleagues, »which are not capable of or unwilling to work through the ten volumes on the Ninth«.

The audience reaction, however, was overwhelmingly positive to the possibility of experiencing the believed-lost Finale in sound, as witnessed by many letters to the editors as well as statements in internet-newsgroups. A letter from Gerd Fassbender (Mönchengladbach, Germany) may be quoted here as being representative: »It is my concern to whole-heartedly thank you and your colleagues for the wonderful reconstruction of the Finale of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony. As with most music enthusiasts and admirers of Bruckner, I had also thought for long that the Ninth would remain unfinished into eternity, which is certainly still true somehow. However, I can hardly express in words what I felt when listening to the completed version. I had already read much on Bruckner's original plans with this Finale. But what then came to sound was just thrilling and great, in particular the very ending, which arises from an apparent breakdown to nothing up to a glory which must simply be moving for every listener to music. Does it really play a role then that this is not 100% by Bruckner himself?«

»Without any prejudice: if one did not know that Bruckner was not able to complete the Finale, one would not notice that this music is indeed a reconstructed, not fully authentic version, so congenially you and your colleagues have found the typical Brucknerian tone. I would like to wish your work now by all means many performances, since I cannot imagine that the esteemed conductors could escape from this version of the Finale and remain performing three movements only without being accused of a know-all attitude. This opens up a chance to make the magnificence of the original Finale available for a large audience.« Thus, the interpreter has a number of choices: He can combine performances with the DFF in order to give at least an idea of Bruckner's concept. He can also adhere to Bruckner's own wish and round off the three movements with the *Te Deum* (certainly nobody would have objections to perform it after a concert break following the *Adagio*). And last but not least, the symphony can also be ended with the CPV – a score that was produced with next to no new composition, and used restoration techniques familiar from the arts, or plastic surgery.

However, it should go without saying that ›music-forensic‹ arrangements like the DFF or CPV can only have a provisional status: Such works aim to give the interested listener an idea of music that, strictly speaking, must be regarded as lost. And, at the same time, these projects also represent a ›work in progress‹, since we can by no means rule out the possibility of lost material coming to light again. Only in summer 2003 a previously unknown page of sketches (c. June 1895) turned up from a private collection – originally from the estate of a Munich critic. Also serious rumours about a Viennese autograph collector remain, who is said to own several of the hitherto unknown score bifolios, but selfishly keeps them under lock and key. But if we want to do justice to Bruckner's own wishes, we need finally to bid farewell to the transfiguration of the *Adagio* as the ›true Finale‹ of the Ninth. The boldness of the composer's original concept of a 4th Mvmt. doesn't fit into the popular Bruckner cliché that so many people adhere to. If we were not looking at THE FINALE here, but simply some ›Toccata infernale‹ found amongst the papers of a composer like Liszt, then the music itself would doubtless find easier acceptance. And one is more inclined to accept a compromise solution worked out with care and love – good examples are Mahler/Cooke's Tenth or Elgar/Payne's Third – than to throw away the bold Finale entirely, when so much has actually survived. But even in the fragmentary form that has come down to us, this is still Bruckner's very own music and an indispensable part of a symphony that he designed in four movements. Anyone who pretends in retrospect that Bruckner needs to be ›protected from himself‹, as it were, is arrogant, and is also showing the deepest lack of respect to the composer.

REQUIRED RECONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION WORK

Very often, the editors of the CPV have been asked to what extent the movement was completed by Bruckner himself, how much original material survived, what kind of reconstruction or completion had to be undertaken, and above all, how much composition by another hand it contained. In advance of the detailed Introduction and Critical Commentary, the following chapter provides a comprehensive overview to answer such questions. As already explained above, *Working Phase 5* on the emerging autograph score must have contained at least 36, perhaps up to 40 bifolios, including well over 600 bars, already in June 1896. We have every good reason to assume that Bruckner had completed the entire Exposition in full score (12 bifolios with over 200 bars) and also finished the 2nd Part (24, or up to four bifolios more, including c. 400 to 450 bars) at least in the initial score stage (all String parts elaborated, jottings for Woodwind and Brass, some pages already fully instrumented). Of this last phase, today ca. 10 bifolios are lost up to the abrupt end of the score, as well as at least four, perhaps up to eight bifol. of the Coda, in all 14 to 18 bifolios, hence almost the half of the bifolios from *Working Phase 5*. Apart from this, a large amount of material from earlier working phases survived – discarded score bifolios, SVE (explained above), sketches for continuity and details. In order to be able to reconstruct and complete the continuity of the movement, an intimate knowledge is required of the working processes which Bruckner followed systematically throughout years and years of composing practice. Already from the surviving previous material for the first three movements (in particular for the 1st Mvmt.) we can draw conclusions important for the work on the Finale. Furthermore, a thorough examination of the working phases and compositional changes during the genesis of the Finale is indispensable. Some of the last surviving bifolios show that Bruckner fixed certain passages already very early and did not considerably alter them in later working phases, for instance, the Chorale Theme, of which many bifolios from the early working phases remained untouched up to the end. On the contrary, other sections were worked over and over again, particularly the beginning of the Finale up to the end of the Main Theme with its various versions, before Bruckner found a final solution in a very late working phase. The following table gives an overview of the sources as used in the New Edition.

The Sources for the Finale as used in the New Edition (Concordance with FE and PV 1992)

NE (bars)	PV 1992	Bifol.	FE (page)	Length	Metrical Numbers	Condition / Structure
1–16	1–16	»1«E	--- 67–70 95–98	16	1–4; 1-[–2–5–]-6–8; 1–2; 1–2–	Reconstr. [»1«E] (16) from: 1 ^d C, t. 1–5, 8–9, 14–16, 21–24 SVE 1 ^e E; Sketch FE p. 3 & 12
17–34	17–34	»2«E	135–38	18	–3–4; 1–8; 1–4; 1–4–	Finished, valid bifol.
35–50	35–50	»3«E	139–42	16	–5–12; 1–8–	Finished, valid bifol.
51–68 [51–66?]	51–68	»4«E	--- 131 143–46	18? 16?	–9–10-[–11–12; 1–4;] 1–8; 1–2–?Reconstr.[»4«E] from: 9–10-[–11–12; 1–4;] 1–8;?	2F, last 2 b. (finished instr.) and text from 3A
69–84	69–80; 83–86	4C/»5« ?	151–54	16	–3–8; 1–2– [;–1–8];	4C/»5« »giltig« (= valid)?
		»5«[?		16? 20?	1–8; 1–8? 1–2; 1–8; 1–2; 1–8? [1–2] [1–2]	Or a re-copied [»5«] lost? [b. 75–6 <i>ad lib.</i>] [Repetition of b. 75–6 <i>ad lib.</i>]
[67–86?] [75–66] [85–86]	[75–76] [87–88]					
87–102	99–114	[5/»6«]	--- 33 164–66	16	[1–8]; 1–8; 1–4– –5–8; 1–8	Reconstr. [5/»6«] (4-4-4-4) from: Sk., 4.–6. syst., and 5B, last 12 b.
103–20	115–32	[6/»7«]	--- 173–76	18 18	1–6 (or 1–3; 1–3); 1–8; 1–4– 1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–4	Reconstr. [6/»7«] (18 b.) from: 6 ^c B, almost compl.
121–38	133–50	7C/»8«	181–84	18	–5–8; 1–6; 1–2; 1–6–	Finished, valid bifol.
139–54	151–66	8B/»9«	189–92	16	–7–8; 1–8; 1–6–	Finished, valid bifol.
155–70	167–82	9B/»10«	193–96	16	–7–8; 1–8; 1–6–	Finished, valid bifol.
171–86	183–98	10A/»11«	197–200	16	–7–8; 1–8; 1–6–	Finished, valid bifol.
187–202	199–214	11A/»12«	201–04	16	–7–12; 1–8; 1–2–	Finished, valid bifol.
203–18	215–30	»13a«E	217–20 205–07	16	–3–8; [1–8; 1–2–] –7–8; 1–8	SVE, instr. & supplemented from: 12C, first 10 b.
219–34	231–46	= »13b«E	221–24 213–16	16	[–3–12; 1–6–] –7–8; 1–8; 1–6–	Incompl. SVE, instr.; part. supplemented from: SVE »13« ^b E
235–50	247–62	13E/»14«	225–28	16	–7–8; 1–8; 1–6–	Bifol. almost complete
251–66	263–78	[14/»15«]	--- 207–08	16	–7–8; 1–6-[–7–8; 1–6–]	Reconstr. [14/»15«] (16 b.) from: 12C, last 8 b.; Connection to 15D/»16« synthesized from the surviving (8 b.).
267–82	279–94	15D/»16«	253–56	16	–7–8; 1–6; 1–4; 1–4–	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
283–98	295–310	16C/»17«	257–60	16	–5–8; 1–12;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
299–314	311–26	17 ^c D/»18«	277–80	16	1–8; 1–8;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
315–30	327–42	18D/»19«	281–84	16	1–4; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3; 1–3–;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
331–46	343–58	[19/»20«]	--- 21 23	16	–4–8; 1–8; 1–3;	Reconstr. [19/»20«] (16 b.) from: Sketches on 18D/»19«; Sk., 3. & 4.syst., b. 33–41 and 1. syst., last b., 2., 3. & 5. syst.
347–62	359–74	20F/»21«	285–88	16	1–3; 1–3; 1–8; 1–2–	Bifol. almost complete

NE (bars)	PV 1992	Bifol.	FE (page)	Length	Metrical Numbers	Condition / Structure
363–78	375–90	21D/»22«	289–92	16	-3–8; 1–8; 1–2-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
379–94	391–406	22D/»23«	293–96	16	-3–8; 1–8; 1–2-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
395–410	407–22	23D/»24«	297–300	16	-3–12; 1–6-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
411–26	423–38	[24/»25«]	--- 24 25 165–66	16	-7–8; 1–8; 1–6- -7–8; 1–[2]–3–[»4«]- -5–8; 1–6;	Reconstr. [24/»25«] (16 b.) from: Sk., 2. syst., 6 b.; 3. syst., 4 b. and 5B, 6 b., Str. almost complete
427–42	439–54	25D/»26«	301–04	16	-7–8; 1–6; 1–8;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
443–58	455–70	26F/»27«	305–08	16	1–4; 1–8; 1–4;	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
459–82	471–94	[27/»28«]	--- 24 25	24	1–8; 1–8-[9–12; 1–4-] 1–8; 1–4- 5–8; »Schluß d-moll«	Reconstr. [27/»28«] (24 b.) from: Sk., 3. & 4. syst., 12 b. and 1. syst., 4 b.; 8 b. synth. from 26f/»27«, last 4 b. (transp.) and beginning of 28E/»29«
483–98	495–510	28E/»29«	309–12	16	5–6; 1–12; 1–2-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
499–514	511–26	29E/»30«	313–16	16	-3–8; 1–8; 1–2-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
515–30	527–42	[30/»31«]	---	16	[-3–12; 1–6-]	Reconstr. [30/»31«] (16 b.) from: Inversion of the Chorale, respecting last 2 b. from 29E/»30« and first 2 b. from 31E/»32«
531–46	543–62	31E/»32«	317–20	16	-7–8; 1–8; 1–6-	Str. compl.; main Wind parts sketched
FROM THIS POINT ONWARDS, THE REMAINING SCORE BIFOLIOS ARE NO LONGER EXTANT						

547–64	563–86	[32E/»33«]	--- 319–320 6	18?	[-7–8; 1–8;]1–8- 1–8	Reconstr. [32/»33«] from: 31E/»32«, 2 b. continued, b. 11–14 transp., and augmented to 8 b. Sk., 1. syst., first 8 b. (transp.)
565–80	587–602	[33/»34«]	--- 6	16	1–8; 1–8; 1–8; 1–8	Hypothetical [33/»34«] (16 b.) from: Sk., 1. – 3. syst., 16 b. (transp.)
581–96	603–18	[34/»35«]	--- ---	16	1–4; [1–8; 1–4] 1–4 [1–8; 1–4;]	Hypoth. [34/»35«] (16 b.) from: Sk., 4. syst., 4 b. synth. Coagmentation of Main Themes
597–612	619–34	[35/»36«]	--- 305 45	16	[1–8;] 1–4-[5–8] [1–8] 1–4-[5-]-6-[7–8;]	Reconstr. [35/»36«] (16 b.) from: Chorale: first 4 b. from 26F/»27« augm., Sk. 5 b.; 3 b. continuation synth.
613–28	635–50	[36/»37«]	--- 47	16	1–8; 1–8; 1–8; 1–8;	Reconstr. [36/»37«] (16 b.) from: Sk., cadence, 16 b.
629–48	651–70	[37/»38«]	--- 47 ---	20?	1–8; [1–8; 1–4-] 1–8; [1–8; 1–4-]	Hypoth. [37/»38«] from: Sk., pedalpoint, last 8 b. Pedalpoint continued / <i>Halleluja</i> synth.
649–65	671–807	[38/»39«]	---	17?	[-5–8; 1–4; 1–4; 1–5]	Hypoth. [38/»39«] Final Pleno / <i>Halleluja</i>

Since their insertion is not totally proven, bars 75/76 and 85/86 have been designated *ad libitum* in the score, but not indicated in the parts. If he doesn't wish them to be played, the conductor may ask the musicians to cross them out with pencil. However, in order to achieve a convincing structure, he should either decide for deleting all four bars, hence providing two periods of eight bars (8;8), as in the recapitulation, or maintaining all of them (2+8, 2+8).

Total length: 665 bars (4 optional)

Taken from surviving score bifolios: 1–218 [= 218], 235–250 [= 16], 267–330 [= 64], 347–410 [= 64], 427–458 [= 32], 483–514 [= 32], 531–546 [= 16]: = 442 bars

Elaboration of original sketches or drafts (SVE) in their correct position: 219–230 [= 12], 331–346 [= 16], 411–426 [= 16], 459–474 [= 16], 557–584 [= 28], 605–608, 610 [= 5], 613–636 [= 24]: = 117 bars

Elaboration of dislocated sketches or drafts: 231–234 [= 4], 253–258 [= 6] = 10 bars

Gaps supplemented by the editors: 251/2 [=2], 259–266 [= 8], 475–482 [= 8], 515–530 [= 16], 547–556 [= 10], 585–604 [= 20], 609, 611/12 [=3], 637–665 [= 29]: = 96 bars

As the foregoing table has shown, the following passages had to be reconstructed or completed:

- 1.) The final phase from the beginning of the movement, most likely a bifolio[»1«E], of 16 bars length, as indicated in the manuscripts. For such a reconstruction enough sufficient material survived, giving much credibility to the solution being presented here.
- 2.) The climax of the Main Theme and the transition to the Song Period, written down on a missing bifolio [»4«], of 16 or perhaps 18 bars length. Its content is preserved in discarded bifolios and sketches.
- 3.) Bifolios [5/»6«] and [6/»7«] of the Song Period, perhaps also a lost [»5«], their content being preserved largely in discarded bifolios and sketches. Only bars are not entirely certain; hence they were included *ad lib*.
- 4.) The beginning of the Development, opening two possibilities: a) the reconstruction of a last-valid, lost bifolio [12/»13«] of 16 bars length (as demonstrated by Jon Phillips; see *Musik-Konzepte* Vol. 120–2, p. 43), or b) respecting Bruckner's last expansion, as given in two surviving SVE, one »13a« (Bruckner) and one subsequently written, yet unnumbered SVE of both 16 bars length. Despite the fact that the last page of »13b« is empty, requiring bridging a gap of four bars from some of Bruckner's jottings, the editors already decided in 1985 to elaborate the latter possibility, as in the 1st Mvmt., where Bruckner himself decided upon such a last-minute expansion, in order to intensify the characteristic zone of quietness at the beginning of the Development.
- 5.) The missing bifolio [14/»15«] from the Development. For its 16 bars, eight were regained from the surrounding bars and earlier drafts; for the other eight bars material was no longer extant.
- 6.) Bifolio [19/»20«D] including bars 33 to 48 of the Fugue. Latest philological research made it now possible to recover these 16 bars fully from the surviving sketches.
- 7.) Bifolio [24/»25«] including parts from the Recapitulation of the Song Period. The music was fully recovered from the parallel section of the Exposition and the extant sketches.
- 8.) Bifolio [27/»28«] at the end of the Recapitulation of the Song Period. Here the sketches end after 16 bars, however, the metrical numbers of the sketch compared with those on the surviving 28E/»29« suggest a gap of four or eight bars. Since the music is directed towards a »Schluß d-moll« (Bruckner), which was certainly the climax of a crescendo and had to have some weight, and due to some other reasons being explained in the Critical Commentary, the editors decided for the longer option, regained here from succession and sequence technique.
- 9.) Bifolio [30/»31«] in the Recapitulation of the Chorale. These 16 bars were able to be regained as an inversion from the parallel passage of the Exposition, already found by Samale and Mazzuca in 1985.
- 10.) Bifolio [32/»33«] with the end of the Chorale Recapitulation, and perhaps the beginning of the Coda, thoroughly sketched by Bruckner in 28 bars. The exact length of the missing section between the end of bifolio 31E/»32« and this sketch is not exactly known, but the metrical numbers as well as a comparison with the parallel passage at the end of the Development make clear that it could have been only very few bars, most likely continued with eight bar periods. The NE has found a rather short, yet convincing transition of 10 bars, ending the period begun on 31E/»32« with its two missing bars, and adding one further eight bar period, taken from the first four bars of the previous period, augmented and transposed into G major, formed by sequence and succession technique to a cadence zone as it is typical in Bruckner, ending characteristically and once more with a general rest before the beginning of the Coda.
- 11.) For the Coda itself, significant sketches survived for its important sections, namely, a) 28 bars of the initial crescendo, built on the Motto from the beginning; b) sketches for five out of eight bars of a chorale-like ascent, preparing c) the final cadence of the movement, sketched in 16 bars, and d) eight bars of the certainly final pedalpoint on D. Additionally, several clues from witnesses and secondary literature were to be respected here, in particular the memories of Dr. Heller, to whom Bruckner had played the final »Song of Praise« at the Piano, obviously in a manner similar to the Te Deum. The following elements have been supplemented: a) a synthetic coagmentation of the Main Themes from all four movements, including a break-through of the Main Theme from the 1st Mvmt. as typical in Bruckner's Finales, here given in 12 bars, due to the structure of the Adagio theme; b) a last appearance of the Chorale Theme, as a typical cadence for the previous climax, in eight bars, using an augmented and transposed repeat of a String Chorale from the Recapitulation; c) the missing three bars of the chorale-like ascent before the final cadence; and finally e) 29 bars of a synthetic final Pleno, continuing the pedalpoint sketched by Bruckner. The assumed length of the final section with 37 bars follows the observation that all previous movements had also ended with a »coping-stone« of precisely that length.

Certainly the results of a reconstruction could not compensate for the loss of original material, and even less that of a score finished by Bruckner himself. On the other hand, when Bruckner died, the Finale had not only been fixed in a definitive text, laid out in a musically and structurally matured primary stage – some of its sections already had been developed beyond this. Since it was now possible to bridge fully two of the earlier assumed gaps within Exposition and Fugue with material from Bruckner's sketches, reducing also the total length of this performing version, the quantity of original material being used increased significantly. From the 665 bars of the NE, 569 bars are from Bruckner himself.

From the 96 bars supplemented, 68 were to be regained from succession, repetition, sequence or transposition of original material; merely 28 bars have been synthesized without a direct model, and also less than two thirds of the whole had to be subsequently instrumented. This is, in all, less than 5 minutes of music and much less than Franz Xaver Süssmayr's input into Mozart's Requiem: Mozart himself left only 81 bars in full score and 596 bars of continuity in vocal parts and Bass. 187 out of 864 bars (=c. 22% , or 11 min. of music) have been composed by Süssmayr, 783 bars instrumented by him – almost the entire work. Despite this, Mozart/Süssmayr's Requiem remains extremely popular. Why apply two different standards here? To demonstrate this, a comparative overview of both performing versions follows.

Anton Bruckner, Symphony No. IX with Finale (unfinished) Finale, CPV by Samale-Phillips-Cohrs-Mazzuca (NE 2004/rev. 2006)

Introit: 1–42 (=42) full instrumentation original; *b. 8/9 sequence altered by SC (=2)*

Main Theme: 43–54 (=12), 67–74 (=8) full instr. orig.; 55–66 (=12) full Str.; Winds in shorthand notes. 55–8 (=4): *Woodwind & Brass replenished*; 59–66 (8) *shorthand notes written out in full (1. Klar., Fag., Pos., K.-Btb.)*

Song Period: 75–94 (=16/opt. 20) full instr. orig.; 95–108 (=14) Str., 103–7 Klar. orig.; 109–30 (=22) full instr. orig.; 85–90 (=4/opt. 6) *recovered from sketch and 23D/»24«*; 1. Fl., 1. Klar. 97f, 1. Ob. 92f & 96–8, 1. Hrn. 93–98, 2. Hrn. 96–8, 3.4. Hrn. 93–96 *supplemented*.

Transition: 131–56 (=26) full instr. orig.; 133–56 3.–6. Hrn. *parts reversed to facilitate change from Tb. to Hrn.*

Chorale Theme: 157–208 (=52) full instr. orig.; 2.3. Klar., 1. Fag. 201–4 *written out in full from »13a«E*; 205–8 Vla. *cancelled*.

Development: 209–30 (=22) leading parts sketched; 235–50 (=16) almost full instr. orig.; 267–86 (=20) Str. complete; Winds in shorthand notes; 287–90 (=4) full instr. orig.; 291–8 (=8) Str. complete; Winds in shorthand notes; 209–30 (=22) *instr. elaborated (Klar., Fag., Hrn., Vla., Vc., Kb.)*; **231–34 [=4] composition supplemented from sketches**; 239–44 1. Ob. with 2.3. and Fag. continued with Vc. from 237f.; 248–51 1. Hrn. added; **251f [=2] reconstructed as sequence from 249f.**; **253–8 [=6] transposed elaboration from 12C**; **259–64 [=6] composition supplemented from the surrounding**; **265f [=2] reconstructed from the following (267f)**; 267–78 shorthand notes written out in full (1. Fl., Ob., Klar., Fag., Hrn., 1. Trp., Pos.; 276–9 1. Viol.); 279–86 shorthand notes written out in full (2.3. Ob., 2.3. Klar., 7.8. Hrn., Trp.), 1.–6. Hrn. added; 283f 1. Ob., 1. Klar., Pos. added; 291f 1. Ob., 1. Klar., 1.3. Hrn., 1. Trp. added; 221–7 shorthand notes written out in full (Ob., Klar., Fag., Hrn., Pos., K.-Btb.).

Fugue: 299–330 (= 32) Str. complete, Winds in shorthand notes; 331–46 (=16) sketched; 347–52 (= 6) full instr. orig.; 299–330 (=32) *shorthand notes written out in full*; 331–43 (=13) *instr. elaborated from sketches and 328–30*; 344–6 (=3) *full instr. adapted from 345–50*.

Epilogue: 353–84 (=32) Str. complete, Winds in shorthand notes; 353–64 (=12) *shorthand notes written out in full (Klar., Fag., Hrn.)*; 365–84 (=20) *some shorthand notes written out in full (Fl., Ob., Klar., Trp.)* *Woodwind and Brass supplemented*.

Horn Theme: 385–404 (=20) Str. complete, Winds in shorthand notes; 385–404 (=20) *shorthand notes written out in full*; 385–92 *Woodwinds, Tb., Pos., K.-Btb.*; 393–7 Fl., Ob., Klar., Hrn.; 397–404 Ob., Klar. *supplemented*.

Song Period: 405–10 (=6) Str. complete; 411–20 (=10) sketched; 421–26 (=6) sketched as repeat from Exposition; 427–34 (=8) Str. complete; 435–58 (=24) Str. complete, 435–7 1. Fl.; 405–10 (=6) *Hrns. supplemented (comp. 77–82)*; 411–20 Str. *instr. elaborated from sketch and continued from 405–10*; 1.2. Ob., 1.2. Klar., Fag., 1.–4. Hrn., Trp. added; 427–34 (=8) *Woodwinds, Hrns., Tb. & Trp. supplemented*; 435–58 (=24) *all Winds supplemented*.

Transition: 459–74 (=16) sketched; 483–96 (=14) Str. complete, Winds in shorthand notes; 459–74 (=16) *Str. elaborated from sketch; some Winds supplemented*; **475–8 [=4] transp. repeat of 455–8 in Tutti instrumentation**; **479–82 [=4] Str. reconstructed from 483ff backwards and Winds elaborated**.

Chorale Theme: 497–514 (=18) Str. compl., 497–512 1. Trp.; 513f 1. Ob.; 531–40 (=10) Str. compl., Winds in shorthand notes; 497–512 (=16) *Brass replenished from 157–72*; **514–530 [=16] reconstructed and elaborated as inversion of Chorale Theme**; 531–40 (=10) *shorthand notes written out in full, some Winds supplemented*.

Horn Theme: 541–46 (=6) Str. compl., 1.–4. Hrn.; **547f [=2]: reconstructed from 545f.**; **549–56 [=8] composition supplemented as transposed and augmented repeat of 543–6**.

Coda Introit: 557–84 (=28) sketched; 557–84 (=28) *Str. elaborated from Sk., Winds supplemented*.

Coagmentatio: 585–596 [=12] composition supplemented as overlay of Main Themes; **597–604 [=8]; composition supplemented; elaborated as transposed and augmented repeat of 443–6, also consulting 533–40**.

Cadenza: 605–8, 610 (=5) , 613–28 (=16) sketched; **609, 611–12 [=3] composition supplemented from 605–8**; 605–28 (=24) *sketch elaborated for Str., all Winds elaborated*.

Halleluja: 629–36 (=8) pedalpoint sketched; **637–65 [=29] composition supplemented from Halleluja and Te Deum motif**; 629–65 (=37) *entire instrumentation elaborated*.

TOTAL LENGTH OF MOVEMENTS I–III finished by Bruckner	1369 bars
CALCULATED TOTAL LENGTH OF FINALE	665 bars
Score bifolios: Instrumentation finished by Bruckner	208 bars
Score bifolios: Strings complete, shorthand notes for Woodwinds and Brass	234 bars
Continuity sketches by Bruckner (10 of them dislocated)	127 bars
Continuity reconstructed by sequence, transposition, repetition, adaption of original material	68 bars
Composition supplemented, synthesized from inherent theme material	28 bars

569 bars original; 96 bars had to be reconstructed and supplemented. This corresponds to c. 14,43% of the Finale, c. 5 % of the entire symphony, or c. 4 minutes of music out of a total duration of c. 90 minutes.

Wolfgang Amadé Mozart, Requiem KV 626 (unfinished) CPV by Franz Xaver Süßmayr, 1790/91 (NMA)

I. INTROIT (100 bars)

Requiem (48): Full instrumentation by Mozart.

Kyrie (52): Vocal Parts & Basso Continuo (V/B) by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

II. SEQUENCE (330) [+20]

Dies Irae (68): V/B, Str. 1-4, 1. Viol. 5-9, 19-31, 40-57, 65-68 by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

Tuba mirum (62): V/B, Pos. 1-19, Viol. 44-62 by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

Rex tremendae (22): V/B, 1. Viol. by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

Recordare (130): V/B, 1-13, 126-30 compl., also 1. Viol. 34-38, 52f, 68-79, 109f, 2. Viol. 109f, Vla. 52f by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

Confutatis (40): V/B, 1. Viol. 7-12, 17-40, 2. Viol. 38-40; B.-Hrn., Fag. 26-29 by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

Lacrymosa (8) [+20]: 1-3 complete; 1-8 V/B by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*. **9–28 [20] composed by Süßmayr**. *Amen* (16): Fugue, 16 bar sketch for exposition by Mozart; *not elaborated by Süßmayr*

III. OFFERTORIO (167)

Domine Jesu (43): V/B, 1. Viol. 43 by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

Quam olim (35): V/B, 1. Viol. 1-3, 24-35, 2. Viol. 24-28 by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

Hostias (54): V/B, 1-2 obviously complete, also 1. Viol. 44-54, 2. Viol. 44f by Mozart; *Instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

Quam olim da capo (35): as above.

IV. SANCTUS [114]

***Sanctus* [11]: Composed by Süßmayr**. (c. 1-5 sketched by Mozart?)

***Osanna* [27]: Composed by Süßmayr**. (c. 1-16 sketched by Mozart?)

***Benedictus* [53]: Composed by Süßmayr**. (c. 1-22 sketched by Mozart?)

***Osanna da capo* [23]: Composed by Süßmayr, transposed from D into B flat maj.**

V. AGNUS DEI [53] (+80)

***Agnus Dei* [51]: Composed by Süßmayr**. (sketches by Mozart?)

Lux Aeterna [2] (+28): **1-2 composed by Süßmayr**. 3-30 (=28) repeated from Mozarts Introit. *Adaption by Süßmayr*.

Cum sanctis tuis (52): repeated from Mozart's *Kyrie*. *Adaption and instrumentation by Süßmayr*.

TOTAL LENGTH:	864 bars
Instrumentation by Mozart fully finished (28 bars of repeated material included)	81 bars
Vocal parts & Basso Continuo with some instrumentation sketched by Mozart	596 bars
Continuity of composition by Mozart in all	677 bars
Composed by Süßmayr (use of some original sketches assumed, but not proven)	187 bars
Instrumentation elaborated by Süßmayr	783 bars

187 bars composed by Süßmayr correspond to c. 22 % of the Requiem length, or c. 11 minutes of music.

[Abbreviations of instruments as original in German, according to the score; annotations on supplemented scoring in italics; reconstructed bars additionally bold; length of sections in square brackets; formal sections from the Finale as in the tabular analysis; sections from Mozart's Requiem as given in Christoph Wolff, *Mozart's Requiem*, p. 74 (Kassel 1991).]

REGARDING THE CORRECTED, SECOND IMPRESSION (REV. 2006)

Unfortunately, for various reason, a further corrected and amended second impression of the New Edition was inevitable: In 2006, Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs started to prepare his own Dissertation on the Finale, which includes a new ›Presentation of the Fragment‹, incorporating new philological findings, and following different editorial principles as in the ›Documentation of the Finale‹, prepared by Phillips ten years earlier. Further studies of the FE brought a new understanding of some hitherto uncertain passages. A first amateur performance of the NE (3 December 2005, London; Fulham Symphony Orchestra, Marc Dooley) revealed some printing errors. The first aural impression also suggested slight reorchestrations to strengthen the argument. These changes required correction of the Critical Commentary. For various reasons some of the musical examples of the first impression had to be removed, all of them hence to be re-arranged. The second impression appears as well from musikmph.de, marked as such on the title page. A corrigenda list of all differences between the first and second impression is given in the following and will be also available as a separate download pdf-file from musikmph.de.

Table: Corrigenda 2006

<i>page</i>	<i>bar</i>	
202	61	Vc.: natural to 3 added (=g)
	62	Vc.: natural to 3 deleted
	63	Vc.: natural to 2 added (= c)
203	68	B.-Pos.: natural to 2 added (= d)
	69	A.-Pos.: natural replaced by flat
204	75–76	now marked <i>ad lib.</i> (for details, see Critical Commentary)
208	101	1. Viol.: natural to 6 added (= g)
221	189–90	Viol. 1 & 2.: sharp added to each 3 (= cis)
223	204–5	B.-Pos.: missing slur into final crotchet added
225	222–3	2. Fag.: wrongly in 220–1, corrected here
227	231	Viol. 1, Vc.: natural to 1 added (= d)
	233–5	Viol. 1, Vc.: natural to 5 of each bar added (= a, g, e)
228	241	Viol. 1: natural to 3 and 5 added (= g)
229	243	1.–3. Ob.: 1 corrected from b' into h'
	244	1.–3. Fl.: minim rest replaced by h'
231	260	Viol. 1 & 2: 4 wrong flat deleted (= a)
232	263	1.–3. Ob.: 1 unnecessary flat deleted
237	293–4	1. Fag.: with Vc. (tenor clef); 3. Ob., 2. Klar.: deleted
	295–7	1.2. Fl.: with Viol. 1; 1. Ob.: with Viol. 2; 1.2. Hrn. = 1.; 3.4. Hrn. = 2.; 5.6. Hrn. = 3.; 7.8. Hrn. = 4; 3. Ob., 2. Klar., 2.3. Fag., 5.–8. Hrn.: deleted
242	331	5. Hrn.: all transposed a fourth higher
	332	1. Klar.: 2 changed into b'
	332–3	Viol. 1.: changed into es'-ces"-ges'-es" / ces"-as"-e"-h"
242–3	332–7	Kb.: deleted, whole bar rests added
243	338–9	Vla.: 338/2 changed into h', 5 e", 6 f", 339/1 f"
244	340–1	Kb.: deleted, whole bar rests added
	342	Viol. 2: 5 corrected from e' into dis'
	343	Viol. 1: 2 corrected from ais' into gis'
247	360	5.6. Hrn.: <i>hervortretend</i> added
	361	7.8. Hrn.: <i>hervortretend</i> added
	363	7.8. Hrn.: <i>cresc. poco a poco</i> added
250	377	1.–3. Ob., 1.–3. Trp.: natural added to last note
254	405	Viol. 1 & 2, Vla., Vc.: natural to 1 added

<i>page</i>	<i>bar</i>	
255	414–5	1. Ob., 1. Hrn.: deleted, whole bar rests added
	416–7	2. Ob.1. Hrn.: deleted, whole bar rests added
257	427	1. Ob.: natural to 7 added (= f)
258	439	Vc.: natural to 2 and 3 added
260	455–8	3.4. Hrn.: overlooked sustained a in the lower octave added
	461	A.-Pos., Viol. 2: tied semi-breve des'; Viol. 1: 2 f' instead of asas'';
		B.-Pos., Kb.: tied semi-breve B; Vc.: 2–4 as, b, asas'
	462	Vc.: as in b. 442
267	505	2. Trp.: natural added; T.-Pos.: tie added
	507–12	1. Trp.: tie added (see b. 167–72); Tenuti 507–8 deleted
269	523	Viol. 1 & 2: natural to 1 added
270	527	1.2. Hrn.: <i>ff</i> deleted
	531	Vla.: natural to 3 added
271	538	T.-Pos.: tie added
273	548	Str.: all ^ deleted
274	553–5	Str.: ' to 1 added (see b. 588ff)
274–277	557–84	New elaboration of Bruckner's sketch; for more details see Critical Commentary
	558–71	1. Klar.: now starting with a prime, not a fifth
	567f, 571f	3. Hrn.: replaced by 1. Fag.
	574–580	2. Trp.: replaced by 2. Hrn.
	576–9	1.2. Hrn.: 1. Hrn. only
	580–4	Entirely new elaborated from Bruckner's sketch
278	585f	1.2. Ob.: d'' instead of d'''; 2. Hrn.: d' instead of d''; 3. Hrn.: d'' instead of d'
	589	Viol. 1 & 2: natural to 4 added (= e)
280	601	1. Hrn.: natural replaced by flat (= es)
281	607	Viol. 1 & 2: flat to 5 added (= b)
282	613–6	2.3. Fag., 1.–4. Hrn., B.-Pos., K.-Btb.: new (es/es-ces-ges-es/ces-ges-es-b/b-ces; rhythm maintained, notated a third higher)

A major change occurred at b. 237–44. In particular unclear was the final note of b. 244: Fl. have b', which is not likely against the a' in Viol. 1. Hence, the older realisations of the CPV truncated the line, cancelling the final note, similar as Bruckner's own line in b. 268 (Fl.). However, the sketch of the low doubling in 2.3. Ob. gives b, corrected to h. Also, on the upper edge Bruckner wrote »gut« (= good) and also »h F«. In his shorthand writing this must be read as: »h against the F major chord is good.« A similar situation occurred in the first mvmt., b. 219–22 – a h'' and h' of Fl. and pizz. Viol. 2 within the F major chord. Hence, in this impression Bruckner's own words were finally respected, adding h' in the Fl.

In b. 293–97, a close look at the sketched rests seemed to indicate that they were intentionally placed by Bruckner between the lines (FE, p. 260), in order to already prepare for the final instrumentation of woodwinds, connecting with the preceding bars 287–88, only paired and not triple. This allowed even for a credible reconstruction of all required woodwinds here.

In b. 461/2, the text of the original sketch, altered in the earlier stages of the PV, was finally restored.

The most serious structural change occurs at the beginning of the coda: In march 2006 Nicola Samale re-examined the important sketch (FE, p. 6) and came to the conclusion that the entire passage had to be transposed a fourth lower. The reason why Bruckner sketched this transposition again (note his own indication »2te Domin.«) was obviously that the first idea led too early too high at the end. His second pencil sketch brings four bars more at the very end, directly leading into the tonic. Hence, also the initial 16 bars of the sketch had to be transposed, the instrumentation slightly to be adapted. In doing so, we regained four further bars from Bruckner himself.

REPORT ON THE NEW EDITION²

I. The New Reconstruction of Bifolio [»1«E]

Bruckner's final version of the very beginning, a bifolio [1], is lost, but we have evidence that it must have belonged to a sequence of E-paper bifolios continued with »2«E and »3«E, all of which were prepared by Meissner with four bars on each page. This makes it rather likely that Bruckner intended to have a [»1«E] of only 16 bars, instead of 24 as given on the discarded 1^dC (FE, p. 67–70). Further evidence can be found in the manuscripts: Bruckner obviously estimated the different length of the beginning (as he also often did by counting sections with bars continuously numbered, for instance, the Fugue, or the Chorale Recapitulation). 1^dC has on its last page (FE, p. 70) several times the figure »60«, which is the precise length of temporarily valid bifolios 1^dC plus 2^cC (FE, p. 117: »50«; p. 118: »60«). When, in the last revision, Bruckner decided to split up 2F (FE, p. 131ff) into two bifolios, he wrote on the last page of »2«E (FE, p. 138) »50«, and below this »18«. This is best explained as an estimate of the length of the first three new E-bifolios, of which »2E« has 18, »3«E 16 bars, thus leaving 16 for [»1«E]. Note that, remarkably, all surviving SVE for bifolio 1 on E paper (FE, p. 83–106) contain only 16 bars (and not 24), even if their content is not absolutely clear. One could opt here for using the longer version from 1^dC, however, this is not satisfying for musical reasons.

If we compare the various stages of the beginning as it survives in full score with the initial sketches (see FE, p. 3–6, 12, 31f and 37), we find that Bruckner originally intended to start the Finale with four sequential steps of Tritone progressions, given on 1A as »Des/G–C/Fis–A/Es–Fes(E)/B«. About the final two steps, however, he was in doubt: on 1^bC (FE, p. 60) he replaced the 3rd step with »Ces/F« and cancelled the 4th in order to replace it with a chorale-like interjection of 1.–4. Hrn. and 1. Fl. Bruckner obviously could not find a harmonic progression convincing enough for him, joining the initial stasis with the ensuing first crescendo, starting with B⁶. Also, his decision to change the initial pedalpoint from A to G (SVE 1^{b,c,d}C) – underlining the Dorian aspects of harmony, perhaps also as a kind of perfect cadence to the »emergency exit«, the Te Deum in C – is mainly an effort to achieve a better link. But the various SVE on E-paper as well as heavy pencil markings show that Bruckner worked towards another solution. On 1^dC he again changed the 3rd step, now from Ces/F to As/D, and, remaining still uncertain about the pedalpoint, corrected it once from G to F, but later cancelled this again, to re-instate the G.

On the other hand, Bruckner must have finally achieved a solution. From the surviving »2«E as well as from the preceding, discarded versions of bifolio 1, we already have some information about the content of [»1«E]: its last four bars obviously were structurally and musically identical with those of 1^dC (beginning of the crescendo; metrical numbers 1–2; 1–2–), but with its scoring reduced to Str. and 1. Ob. only, as proven by the beginning of »2«E. The first 12 bars then needed to be reconstructed from earlier versions. It is very likely that the basic features, which Bruckner never changed, would have been maintained – the stasis with a pedalpoint, the Tritone sequence, and its overall scoring (1. Klar., 1.2. Hrn., Pk., Viol., Vla.). To convincingly reconstruct the music itself, we need here some analysis and further review of the sketches.

First of all, the metrical structure of 12 initial bars preclude retaining the Hrn./Fl. interjection; hence the beginning of b. 13 needs a proper harmonic connection. Considering the material from 1^dC, the most convincing way would be to use Bruckner's final sequence As/D, but not on a Bass with G as its root. This would imply an incomplete G⁹, not optimal for preparing the following B⁶ – perhaps the reason why Bruckner inserted the Hrn./Fl. interjection in the first place. Most interestingly, the 2nd page of 1^dC (FE, p. 68) seems to include already some sketches for revisions, shortening the bifolio down to 20 bars, and proving that he planned indeed to finally exclude this earlier interjection: On top of the Fl. stave, Bruckner sketched the metrical numbers 1–4 – indicating that obviously the entire first page of the bifolio should be excluded (6 bars) – and then sketched the new continuity in »Tonbuchstaben« (i. e. sound letters) on top of the stave of B.-Pos. On each of these first four bars of the 2nd page (FE, p. 68) we find repeatedly »a« there, proving that Bruckner indeed wished to return to the a pedalpoint.

² The following report shall serve as a summary of new philological research, insights and revisions, leading step by step through the most important new features of the NE in comparison with the old PV 1992. In order to fully understand the reconstruction procedures of this performing version, reference to the Facsimile Edition is indispensable.

To re-establish the A pedalpoint from the very first sketch seemed to be a good device indeed, connecting much better with the preceding Adagio as well as initiating a long-term preparation for Bruckner's sketched final cadence for the Coda. Then he continued the sketch with (each twice) »*fces es d*«, »*e b d #*« and »*c ges b a*«, up to the end of the 3rd page (FE, p. 69), where we find the last »*c ges b a*«, now at the right margin, behind the staff of B.-Pos., because for those two bars there was no space any more. Obviously due to this reason, Bruckner wrote »NB 2 Tacte« on top of the 2nd page where the sketch began, establishing 16 bars, plus those four certainly maintained on the last page, in all suggesting a bifolio of 20 bars length.

However, later in the Finale – in particular, twice in the Development (FE, p. 227f and 253–5; see also the transition to the Chorale Theme, FE, p. 184 and 189) – Bruckner significantly used four sequential steps, and not three. Even in the very first sketches he strove hard towards a four-step progression, decisively given on FE, p. 12. Since the very beginning of the Finale should serve as a motivic core, initiating later processes of development, and convincingly link it together with the Adagio, Bruckner already prepared the Tritone progression in the Coda of the Adagio (see b. 225/6). Ten.- and B.-Tb. there unmistakably announced four sequential steps as well. Despite this, the 2nd period of PV 1992 retained a sequence of three Tritone progressions, repeating the last one, making a period of 2+2+(2x2). This created a quite unlikely break in the tension already built up gradually by harmony; the energy should carry on here.

The most straightforward way to reconstruct a new four-step progression from what we find on 1^dC is to simply insert one stage: *Des/G – C/Fis – B/E – As/D*. (**Illustration I**) This progression returns finally to Bruckner's very first sketch for the beginning of the Finale (FE, p. 3), where we find indeed, even if crossed out later, the progression *B/E* (2nd syst., b. 4–7, and 3rd syst., first b.) It also allows for strong connections with later events in the Finale: strangely, all parts of the harmony would include the first Tetrachord of the Chorale Theme, if shaken and ordered subsequently, likewise the four notes from the Motto itself. It is also interesting to note that shortening this sequence as given here – from the initially sketched 16 bar structure with repeated stages down to an eight bar structure with single stages – may well coincide with the surviving sketch for the beginning of the Coda (FE, p. 6), where the inversion of the Tritone progression is now given four times in two bar augmentation, expanding a parallel stasis by essentially doubling the length of the original eight bar period. This new reconstruction of [»1«E] may also serve to illustrate the general aim of the NE – to make the CPV a musically even more comprehensive whole, often by minimal intervention, but with much positive effect on the entire musical development. This was precisely the compositional stage of the Finale achieved by Bruckner himself, as we can deduce from comparing sketches, SVE and discarded with surviving final bifolios.

Illustration I: New reconstruction of [»1«E] by Samale and Cohrs (b. 1–12)

II. The New Reconstruction of Bifolio [»4«E]

After Bruckner decided to split up the 36 bars from 2F (FE, p. 131–4) into »2«E (18 bars) and »3«E (16 bars), the last two bars from 2F were given to the beginning of a bifolio [»4«], now lost. This raises some questions. Why did Bruckner renumber the old bifolio 2 into »2.« and »3.«, with the consequence that he had to renumber all subsequent bifolios hitherto written as well? Why did he not simply make a »2a« and »2b« of it, as appears to have been in the case of the expanded bifolio 13, marked by himself as »13a« (FE, p. 217; discussed in Section IV of this report), thus avoiding the labour of scratching out old numbers and overwriting them? We will never know unless this bifolio comes back to light.

However, we have to take what was left for a reconstruction, in this case, the only surviving, early 3A (FE, p. 143–6) and the sketches (FE, p. 31–4; some earlier sketches partially lost). The musical content of »3«E, pre-sketched on 2F, demonstrates that the lost bifolio was most likely again on E-paper and continued the new musical design of the Main Theme. In this stage, Bruckner supported the ›Toccata Rhythm‹ (Str., Woodw.) with resonant minims, for good reason, namely, to strengthen the relationship of the Main Theme with the Song Period, which contains the self-same ›Minim Progression‹. However, given that the ensuing 4C/»5« (FE, p. 151–4) was indeed valid, as Bruckner's annotation »giltig« implies, [»4«E] would have contained 18 bars, somehow including the two final bars from 2F not taken over into the new »2« and »3«.

This hypothesis is supported by the extant sketch, if we bear in mind the particular importance of this insight into Bruckner's practice: this and other extended sketches were not a pre-draft, but merely a ›working paper‹ that Bruckner continued to use during his elaboration of score bifolios and their revisions. ÖNB 6086/1&2 is in fact such a sketch (FE, p. 31–4); another important one is ÖNB 3194/13&14 (FE, p. 21–4), which includes the Fugue and Recapitulation of the Song Period (discussed in Section VI). The Main Theme was obviously worked out first on a lost [2A], preceding 3A. In later stages, Bruckner decided to change its first two entries, originally starting from C and B, later re-designed into D and F. But the general structure of the climax of the theme and the two subsequent eight bar periods (the descending *passus duriusculus* and the Brass Chorale bridge) obviously remained musically unchanged, since even the sketch does not contain any changes or bars subsequently crossed out or replaced.

If we simply stick to this music as outlined on 3A, the content of the lost bifolio seems to be quite clear. The most elegant way to explain a [»4«E] of 18 bars is to assume that Bruckner inserted an extra bar line in the very first and last bar. B. 51 has only a semibreve in all instruments; the two initial bars of the Chorale bridge likewise consist of semibreve and minims only; this would opt for a page disposition of 5–4–4–5 bars – especially if we consider that all other bars contain the Toccata Rhythm, demanding the identical amount of space on the page. Bruckner indeed quite often inserted extra barlines (for instance on »2«E with 6–4–4–4 bars, fol. 1^r, b. 2 and 3 subdivided, see FE, p. 135). However, if [»4«E] maintained the 16 b. standard length, this would have required to write an entirely new [»5«], as discussed in Section III.

The scoring of the 3rd entry and climax of the Main Theme was easily adapted from 2F, 3A, and »3«E, but the following two bars differ from PV 1992 in the NE: 3A contains Bruckner's advice »8^{va}« above the high *Ces* (b. 55 / FE, p. 143, 3rd bar). This »8^{va}« can only be justified if this four bar period was intended to be the Tutti climax of this sequence *D-F-As-Ces*, followed by an eight bar descent in the one period before the Chorale bridge. A much reduced scoring of those four bars can hardly be justified (see, for instance, *Te Deum*, b. 249f, or *Seventh Symphony*, 1st Mvmt., b. 245–8); however, all performing versions of the Finale (with the exception of SM 1985 and PV 1992), came to such a sudden descent (but note Bruckner's own changes, strengthening the basic Tritone progressions in the Finale, *D/As* and *F/Ces*). Related to the »8^{va}« is Bruckner's »loco« (FE, p. 148, 152), which only makes sense if Viol. rest throughout the entire 16 bars between climax (b. 55–8) and Song Period (b. 75ff). In fact, on 3A the ink notation of Viol. ends at b. 59 (FE, p. 11). The re-scoring of this passage supports the most important harmonic line with tremolo by Vla., in order to foreshadow the design of this motif as it reappears likewise at the end of the Chorale Theme (Vc./Kb., b. 193ff, Vla., 201ff, see also 209). The solution of PV 1992 (sustained semibreve and minims in Viol. and Vla.) seemed to be atypical for passages where Bruckner decreases energy from preceding climaxes (see, for instance, in the 1st Mvmt., b. 77ff, which served as a model here).

III. The New Reconstruction of the Song Period (4C/»5«; [5/»6«]; [6/»7«])

One of the crucial points in the Finale is an adequate reconstruction of the Song Period, of which at least two bifolios of the final stage, [5C/»6«] and [6C/»7«], are lost. SM 1985 and PV 1992 incorporated Alfred Orel's old theory that a surviving SVE »#«D (FE, p. 155–8) was intended as a substantial extension. (Orel, p. 103, No. 28: »Außerdem ist ein Partiturentwurfbogen vorhanden, der auf eine geplante Erweiterung des Bogens 5 hindeutet.«) The musical result was Phillips' »reconstruction« of two assumed bifolios [»5a«] and [=»5b«] (Illustration II).

Illustration II: Hypothetical [»5a«] and [=»5b«] as assumed by Phillips (SPCM 1992)

Yet this solution remained unconvincing, since a re-assessment of Bruckner's ternary Song Periods in his late-period sonata structures (Exposition and Recapitulation) revealed that the structure of the Initial Section (A) and most of the Trio Section (B) remained essentially untouched in the Recapitulation. Massive changes appear only in the Repeat of the Beginning after the Trio (A'):

VI. Symphony, Finale	Exposition	A = 16, B = 16, A' = 16+12
	Recapitulation	A = 16, B = 16+2; A' replaced with transition
VII. Symphony, Finale	Exposition	A = 16, B = 14, A' = 20+8
	Recapitulation	A = 16, B = 18, A' replaced with transition
VIII. Symphony, Finale (Initial Version)	Exposition	A = 30, B = 12, A' = 20+16
	Recapitulation	A = 32, B = 14+4; A' replaced with transition

Only in the revised Finale of the Eighth Symphony, the beginning of the Song Period is substantially shorter in the Recapitulation (to the regret of Robert Haas and many later conductors, who have re-established the full-length repeat of this section for good reason from the Initial Version). In the Finales of the Sixth and Seventh Symphony, for instance, the A-Section is 16 bars long in both the Exposition and Recapitulation. Also in the 1st Mvmt. of the Ninth, the A-Section preceding the Trio is 26 bars in both the Exp. and Recap. (compare b. 97–122 and 421–446). In the Finale of the Ninth, the Initial Section of the Song Period in the Recap. is only 16 bars long, as a comparison of the surviving 23D/»24« and the sketch shows (FE, p. 24f). In the Exp., this section could not have been much longer, but the reconstruction given in PV 1992 (developed from SM, which had already included »#«D as an extension), brought it to 32 bars – twice as long as in the Recap. Even worse, Phillips' interpretation of »#«D as SVE for an intended »5b« also meant dispensing with 4C/»5«, despite the fact that Bruckner explicitly wrote »giltig« (valid) on its first page.

Hence in 2002 the present writer re-examined the original manuscripts in Vienna, with the surprising result that all the music believed lost may in fact be there, if we understand the sketch as a ›working paper‹ used by Bruckner during the various stages of elaborating the score, and if we follow his particular annotations and pointers correctly. The sketch for the Song Period (FE, p. 33) shows the entire course of the A-Section and the Trio. The surviving bifolios 4A, 5A and 6A show that Bruckner initially transferred this sketch directly into score. Only one section was changed – the 2nd half of the eight bar period before the Trio, crossed out in the sketch (5th syst.). Hence Bruckner discarded 5A (see FE, p. 160) and replaced it with 5B, composing these four bars anew (FE, p. 164), re-designing the beginning of this 2nd period over a pedalpoint on G (5B, FE, P. 163) that was not to be found in the sketch at all (4th syst.). This first draft of the Song Period was rather empty, much like the initial stages (1887) of the Exposition for the 1st Mvmt.

Obviously, in a revision phase following work on the 2nd Part of the Finale, Bruckner intended to fill in some well-balanced counterpoints to bind Exposition and Recapitulation motivically better together. The changes contained in 6^cB and 7B (FE, p. 173–7) show that Bruckner already was working towards a continuous accompaniment in quavers (see Klar., p. 173, and the »Variande« sketches, p. 176f), much like the fabric of the Song Period in the 1st Mvmt. Another important clue is the Lyrical Counterpoint to be found before the Fugue on 16C/»17« (FE, p. 258), obviously deriving from the Song Period. Already this makes Phillips' theory on »#«D unlikely: all evidence points to the counterpoint additions being part of *Working Phase 2* (c. Autumn 1895), written mostly on C-paper. A supporting argument for this is the valid 7C/»8« (FE, p. 181), continuing those quavers sketched on 6^cB and 7B. Also, the Lyrical Counterpoint must have been inserted somewhat earlier in the lost 5C and 6C, because the Vla. part on 7C/»8« (FE, p. 181) is already a clear variant deriving from it (b. 121f). Why should Bruckner have written a draft for an extension on D-paper, to include a ›new‹ counterpoint – as assumed by Phillips – which most probably HAD been included already, on earlier C-paper?

On the other hand, »#«D can easily be explained as a discarded 5D (see also Orel, p. 103, No. 28: »5. Bogen D«), written perhaps before Bruckner re-validated 4C/»5« as »giltig«, if we imagine how one fills such a bifolio – in fact: a ›double-folio‹ – with written music. The bifolios were already prepared with clefs, key signature and barlines, four on each page. Since they are rather large, one would prefer to put them on the table, as often as possible displaying only one page on top, because if two pages are exposed, one can easily smear one page with the resting arm while writing on the other. Certainly Bruckner would have preferred to write on a single exposed page, dry the written lines with blotting-paper, then re-fold the bifolio to display the ensuing page. If we look at »#«D as an intended newly-written 4C/»5« on D-paper, the first six bars of this bifolio would have to contain the end of the Chorale bridge, already written out several times.

Presumably Bruckner simply left these bars empty for convenience, and then eventually made a mistake: he may have folded the bifolio so that the entire first folio, recto and verso, was skipped, instead of only one page (perhaps simply due to an interruption of his work), and then erroneously begun work on the page facing him, without realizing it was already the 2nd fol. recto, indicated the number »5« on top of the same (wrong) page, and continued the Viol. line to the end of the bifolio, 10 bars later, automatically re-folding and writing page by page. This would perfectly explain the strange design of the bifolio The »#« given next to the almost fully scratched-out, original »5« would then most probably be intended to indicate that this bifolio was not valid, or perhaps that the cancelled number »5« should not be overwritten later with a renumbering. The changes in the metrical numbers could likewise be easily explained, if Bruckner were to have used the now invalid bifolio as a metrical sketch later. What a bad twist of fate that let this misleading »#«D survive and the important [»4«] disappear.

For these reasons, the NE decided not to accept at all the theory of an expansion sketched on »#«D, but stick to surviving bifolios and the sketch, which nowhere indicates such a massive expansion. Bruckner inserted the Lyrical Counterpoint at the beginning of the 2nd period, however, it would not be possible to paste it into the first page of 5B, because the clashing voice-leading would create an odd simultaneity of suspension (*g-fis*, Viol. 2) and dissolution (*fis*, Vla./Vc.) as well as a parallel Octave (*e-fis*) in the last bar. (**Illustration III**)



Illustration III: Impossible introduction of the counterpoint into the beginning of 5B

If we also consider that this rash pedalpoint idea would anticipate the beginning of the Trio a semitone higher, and perhaps prematurely, it seems possible that Bruckner, on the lost 5C, intended to return to the old idea as sketched – a simple repeat of the first period, now replenished with the timid counterpoint, without Bases, to be followed by the seraphic Woodwind passage. But another hint in the manuscripts needs to be observed as well. 4C/»5« bears an important pencil annotation at the beginning of the Song Period (FE, p. 152) – »R.n. G. D. G.«, under a slanting line. According to Bruckner's usual abbreviation practice, this reads as »Repetition G-Dur Gesang« (i. e., repeat of the Song Period in G). Furthermore, we find a pointer (X) on top of Viol. 1. This pointer has its equivalent in the sketch, most significantly, directly before the repeat of the first period, now including the sketched counterpoint. The most likely interpretation of this is that Bruckner indicated here an inclusion of the two opening bars as well, hence underlining his early idea of judging these two bars not as a separation, but as being part of a ten bar period, which was to be fully repeated as (3x2)+4 (see FE, p. 33, 2nd syst., 3rd b., »3« overwritten with »1«; see also »#«D, end of the last period, altered into »7–8–9–10«). If we summarize all this, we can deduce four hypothetical layouts of the Song Period:

- 1.) [»4«] of 18 bars length plus 4C/»5« still valid. If we then want to accept a symmetrical structure of the Song Period beginning as 2+8, 2+8 we must also assume that the lost [5C/»6«] would have contained 18 instead of 16 bars to include the repeat of the opening two bars as well (perhaps with a page disposition of 4-6-4-4).
- 2.) [»4«] of 18 bars plus 4C/»5« still valid, however, if Bruckner maintained the content of 5B, we would come to 2+8 and 8 bars, without the two initial bars being repeated.
- 3.) [»4«] of 16 bars length plus a newly re-written, lost [»5«] in 20 bars. In this case we could assume Bruckner may have subdivided all bars on the 1st p. of [»5«], bringing it to 8-4-4-4 bars, with the 1st p. with 1–8, containing the eight bars Brass Choral with its large notes, then the beginning of the Song Period as 1–2; 1–2- / -3–4–5–6- / -7–8; 1–2, hence allowing as well the 2+8; 2+8 structure.
- 4.) [»4«] of 16 bars plus a newly re-written, lost [»5«] in 16 bars. This would suggest – against all evidence from the surviving sketch – that Bruckner finally deleted the two initial bars as well, simply bringing the Song Period to 8 + 8 bars, as in the Recapitulation. Musically this seems to be the most convincing solution.

However, since [»4«] and [5C/»6«] did not survive and the indicated repeat is not explicitly written out in the sketch, the NE indicated the in all four inserted bars as optional, including an explanatory footnote (see p. 193), allowing for the conductor to try out the possibilities sketched above. (**Illustration IV**)

Illustration IV: New reconstruction of Song Period by Samale and Cohrs

IV. The Reconstruction of the Beginning of the Development (»13a«E; »13b«E; [14/»15«])

From fresh examination of the manuscripts, the New Edition was able to establish the entire Exposition with almost unbroken continuity, even if with the exception of four optional bars and some minor ambiguities. The first serious gap only occurs at the beginning of the »2. Theil« (second part), as Bruckner named the Development + Recapitulation + Coda of his own sonata form. From the sequence of final valid bifolios, [12/»13«] and [14/»15«] are lost. However, some of their musical content seems to be preserved already in the extant, earlier 12C and some SVE. [12/»13«] could easily be reconstructed from them, as suggested by Phillips, and this does not entail much speculation. However, at a very late date Bruckner tried a credible expansion of this section, sketched in two SVE from August 1896, according to the positive annotation »11. August neu« on »13a«E (FE, p. 217). If Bruckner wanted to avoid a further time-demanding renumbering phase, he would be perfectly justified in assigning »13a« here, making a subsequent »13b« plausible, even if it remained unnumbered (FE, p. 221–4). Already SM 1985 and later PV 1992 decided to elaborate those two SVE for strong musical reason, even if this required some speculation to fill a gap of four bars for which Bruckner left no sketch at all *in situ* (FE, p. 224), because obviously the music for those was to be re-copied from the last p. of the lost, to be discarded [»13«]. But note the sketched Motto, FE, p. 223, and the letters on p. 204, right margin, suggesting twice a chromatic descent, in ink »d-cis-c-h-b-a-gis-g-fis-e-d-cis«, repeated in pencil as »d-cis-c-h-b-a-gis-g-fis-f-e«; comp. with FE, p. 225, last four Bass notes *fis-f-e-dis*, continued in Vc. as *es-d-des*. These dislocated sketches were obviously not intended for a re-conception of the previous bass line (FE, p. 202: *c-h-b-a-g-fis-f-e* etc.). First of all, obviously Bruckner found it necessary to extend the typical stasis following the final climax from the Exposition here. A similar last minute extension occurred in the 1st Mvmt. on bifolio »10« (explained in the Critical Report, p. 31f). Likewise, the enormous length of the Finale Chorale – almost 48 bars of fortissimo full Brass – seems to require a succeeding quiet zone of some length.

More important, however, is Bruckner's typical late-stage device to intensify connections between themes and motives and strengthen parallels between formal sections: the *passus duriusculus* (here: *d-cis-c-h*, b. 209ff) is of crucial importance, since it is the core of the Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt., already well known from the Eighth Symphony as »Todesverkündigung« (Annunciation of Death). In the Finale, Bruckner re-introduced it in the transition before the Song Period (b. 63–6) and also used it to finish the Chorale Theme (b. 193ff). One reason for expanding this motif at the beginning of the 2nd Part may well be Bruckner's intention to bring back the Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt. later in the Finale: already the sketch of the beginning of the Coda prominently introduces this motif (*a-gis-g-fis*, see Ob., b. 557ff). In order to make sure the listener hears the connection, the beginning of this line cannot be located too far from the end of the Chorale. This is why the editors introduced it immediately after the Te Deum motif (1. Fl.), at the beginning of the 2nd Part. This is another parallel to the 1st Mvmt., where Bruckner cites the selfsame motif (see there, b. 235ff: *es-d-des-c*). A further reason to adhere to the unnumbered, subsequent SVE can again be found in its content: the leading voice (Ob.) consists of *e''-e''-h'-h'-a'-a'*, which can be seen as a double augmentation of the later Gregorian motif (FE, p. 308, as discussed in Section VI), hence it was complemented here with *-h'-h'-e'*. In all, the NE had reason enough to maintain the reconstruction as given in PV 1992. However, the overly-thick scoring and dynamics at the beginning of the Te Deum motif (PV 1992, b. 217–20; NE: 205–8) created an ugly sonority (a resonant upper Fifth as *h'*, audible on both the Eichhorn and Wildner recordings). Precisely for a similar reason Bruckner himself reduced dynamics and scoring at the end of the Exposition of the 1st Mvmt. (see there, b. 225–7), used as a model here (NE, b. 205ff).

The reconstruction of [14»15«] given earlier in PV 1992, basically already part of SM, showed that the last period from 13E»14« (1–2–3–4–5–6–) needed to be continued as –7–8. Likewise, the ending of [14»15«] had to contain the first six bars of a period (1–6–) to connect with the following –7–8 at the beginning of 15D»16«, leaving room only for a further eight bar period between them. There is only one important difference in NE: the decision to change the first two bars in order to finish this period with the sequential steps naturally following one another, instead of suddenly switching to the triplet figuration in the seventh bar of a period. (Illustration V)

Illustration V: Partially new reconstruction of [14»15«] by Samale and Cohrs

Such a kind of joint-overlap as given in PV 1992 (there: b. 263f) seemed to be atypical for Bruckner, particularly if we consider that in the model used here – the last 8 bars of 12C – these two bars were intended to continue the figuration established from the beginning of the Chorale. This device brings more coherence into the structure, because now the reconstructed very beginning of the Finale is clearly ›developed‹ here in eight bars, as later repeated by Bruckner (FE, p. 253f). It is much more typical for him to separate such blocks with short rests to take a breath – note the similarity with the Development of the 1st Mvmt.: a stasis, built upon the Introit, leading into a Crescendo (1st Mvmt., b. 226–44), finishing with a first quotation of the Horn call in eight bars (cf. b.19–26 with 245–52), a short pause, then a second Crescendo on the Introit (b. 253–68), again leading into an eight bar repeat of the Horn call (b. 269–76).

V. The New Reconstruction of Bifolio [19D/»20«]

Already Orel believed that some bars of the lost [19D/»20«] were not contained in the sketches. Even Phillips assumed in his thesis (p. 494f): »An unbroken musical continuity for the Development of the Fugue was not achieved in the earlier pc. sks. (...), but there is every indication that [19D/»20«] would have consisted of a clear and to some extent probably reconstruable structure.« Therefore, also SM 1985 and PV 1992 provided at least nine bars of additional composition, even if based on a sequential technique using Bruckner's own material, and firmly established by Phillips on the grounds of Sechterian theory (*Musik-Konzepte*, Vol. 120–2, p. 44f). But to the surprise of the present writer, a re-evaluation of the original sketch, undertaken by him in 2002, proved this assumption to be false. If we carefully follow these sketches (ÖNB 3194/13 & 14, FE, p. 21–4) and order them periodically, in their most likely chronological order of gestation, we find roughly four phases of the Fugue's composition – two of them incomplete, but two complete indeed. (Illustration VIa–c)

[Skizze, Phase I – IV]

[Partitur]

Viol. 1

Viol. 2

Klar.

1.-4. Hrn.

Vla., Vc.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

33

34

35

36

37

[19/»20«]

Illustration VIa: Fugue, bars 30 – 37: Periodically ordered transcription of the sketches by Cohrs

[Phase I - IV] [Phase I]

E moll a moll

Alt

6^h e^l 2do 8ba g a

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45

[Phase II] As D Ten

6 4 6 7

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

[Phase III]

6 4 1 45

[Phase IV] H D Ten

e g h e

cis fis

5 6 7 8

Cis m. B.

[19/»20«]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45

Illustration VIb: Fugue, bars 38 – 45: Periodically ordered transcription of the sketches by Cohrs

[Phase I]

[Phase II]

Sopr. f m

[Phase III]

[Phase IV]

Cis m

[20/»21«]

Illustration VIc: Fugue, bars 46 – 53: Periodically ordered transcription of the sketches by Cohrs

We can summarize these four phases as follows:

Phase I (1–48; incomplete): Initially, Bruckner sketched the entire Exposition of the Fugue including its beginning, which many commentators indicated to be missing (note Bruckner's shortcut ♯ before the very first bar of 13^r, and his annotations on the entries of instruments above it). He continued the Fugue well into its Development, but finally he deleted the last four bars (45–8, last three unnumbered).

Phase II (1–49; incomplete): Bruckner decided to rewrite the continuation of the Fugue's Development, inserted a pointer behind b. 37, started anew with b. 38 (unnumbered, see pointer on 13^v, above b. 1), and continued until the end of the 2nd syst. (not continuously numbered, metrical numbers 1–8, 1–4). Again, this was crossed out.

Phase III (1–61; complete): Now Bruckner re-instated the original bars 38–44, but also wrote a new continuation, inserted a new pointer /// from b. 44 (13^r, below last syst., b. 1) to the new b. 45 (13^v, beginning of 3rd syst.), and then fixed 45–61 (14^r, 1st syst., b. 4), now again continuously numbered.

Phase IV (1–62; complete): Finally Bruckner again returned to the first page, decided to sketch a new continuation, beginning with b. 41, and indicated this with a further pointer (//// below b. 41), directing to 14^r (1st syst., b. 5). He started to re-sketch b. 42–62, unfortunately again without any continuous numbering, but clearly until the end of the Fugue (14^v, 1st syst., four bars). As an afterthought, he decided to replace the single bar before the sketched climax (b. 45) with another solution, indicated by a final pointer (last syst. of 14^r), followed by the annotation »Cis m. B.« (= »Cis-moll, B moll«, or perhaps »Cis moll Bass«), referring to that very progression of the climax.

Interestingly, this sketch shows that Bruckner originally intended to continue the Fugue directly with the Recapitulation of the Song Period, as indicated on 14^v (see voice-leading sketch at the end of 1st syst.). The entire Fugue Epilogue with Horn Theme was an afterthought. This whole new conception was completed before the renumbering phase. Obviously Bruckner also used this sketch as a ›working paper‹ while laying out of the score, as many annotations reveal. Bruckner did not depart very far from it in the bars surrounding the gap. He only sharpened the harmony from b. 21 onwards and replaced the 3rd sequence step of the climax with a new one a semitone higher, in order to achieve a more convincing transition to the newly composed Epilogue. Hence it was possible to reconstruct the entire fabric of the lost [19D/»20«] with a high degree of certainty using Bruckner's own, clearly established metrical numbers (-4–8; 1–8; 1–3). The instrumentation layout was based on the surviving bars before and after the gap.

VI. The Transition after the Song Period in the Recapitulation ([27/»28«])

Philological research revealed that the Gregorian motif, alluding perhaps to the old hymn ›Christ ist erstanden‹ (FE, p. 308), was a quite late device. The Ob. line sketched on the late »13a« indicates this as well. Originally Bruckner stated only the first two bars here (26F/»27«, last p.), which were then repeated once (*a-e-d-e*, *a-e-d-e*). Later, the two repeated bars were scratched out and replaced by the entire line, now four bars long. Bruckner's indicated corrections of the metrical numbers (p. 308, lower line: 1–2–3–4) suggest an interpretation of this as an intentional four bar insertion into normally regular eight bar periods. This gives support to the suggested Tutti repeat of the Theme, which is further justified by the mutation processes. Bruckner must have noted earlier that this line derives from the beginning of the repeated Song Period (see ÖNB 3194/14^v, 2nd syst., -5–6–7–8 from the 1st period). Interestingly, it also includes the motif which we think Bruckner may have intended for the final *Halleluja* (discussed in Section IX): transposed as in PV 1992 (b. 487–91; NE: 475–9), the line reads *d-a-g-a-d-c-f-g-a*, foreshadowing the final progression of the CPV (*e-fis-a-d-e-fis*; here *g-a-c-f-g-a*). The structure of this passage is certainly a Crescendo, which must at least lead to some kind of a break-through by using important motivic material with the weight of a »Schluß d-moll« (Bruckner).

At the beginning (bifolio 26D/»27«) Bruckner developed elements from the Trio and Song period; then he introduced the String Chorale in minims in order to prepare the double unison crescendo, both of which anticipate the Chorale Recapitulation (*ces-b-as-ges*). Those steps all contain the minim, which emerged from the accompaniment of the Main Theme in the Exposition, was continued in the Song Period, taken up again in the Development of the Te Deum motif at the beginning of the 2nd Part (also in our elaboration of the *d-cis-c-h* Passacaglia), intensified within the Recapitulation of the Song Period, and finally in the Gregorian motif.

After this culmination, Bruckner brought back the triplet figuration of the Chorale, including reminiscences of the end of the 1st Mvmt. (the open Fifth *D/A*) and – as in the Exposition – the Adagio (the ascending Vla. line preceding the Chorale, taken from the Adagio, b. 13–16). Indeed, across this entire zone Bruckner moulded together important motifs (Minim Progression, Toccata Rhythm, Triplet Figuration, Chorale-like Descent) from all Finale themes (Main Theme, Song Period, Trio, Chorale) as well as reminiscences from earlier movements in a dense field of continuous development. Hence, a climactic repeat of the Gregorian motif seems to be indispensable for musical reasons, as a preliminary destination of a long-term development of the Minim Progression.

Even more important is the fact that the sketched Crescendo by Bruckner ended in the root position of d-minor, displacing the tonic note on top, but the surviving 28E/»29« continues with the fifth in the treble, and with the fifth bar of a period as well. The structure of this surviving continuation of a period strongly suggests that the string design (repeated bars of triplet figuration in Viol., Vla. melody and D/A pedalpoint in Vc. and Kb.) must already have been there in the missing first four bars of that period. Hence, the inclusion of a transposed repeat of the Gregorian motif as *d-a/-g-a/-d-c/-f-g* in four bars seemed to be inevitable in order to naturally reach the top note *a* of the missing beginning of the following period, continued on 28E/»29«. This convincing reconstruction of the lost [27/»28«], taken from the sketches and strictly limited to material by Bruckner himself, as given in PV 1992, This was basically maintained in the NE, although some changes to the scoring have been undertaken (see Section IX).

VII. The New Design of the Chorale Recapitulation ([30/»31«]; 31E/»32«; [32/»33«])

The reconstruction of the missing [30/»31«] also retained here was essentially developed by Samale and Mazzuca, and later only corrected and confirmed by PV 1992. The first period had to continue from 1–2- with [-3–12], the second to start with [1–6-], as the surviving 31E/»32« suggests. Bruckner certainly would have begun its imitative counterpoint there. The reconstruction is based on a strict inversion of the Chorale in the Exposition (excluding the non-invertible sustained note in four bars, hence reducing the solution here from 16 to 12 bars), determined also by the first two bars of 31E/»32«, where Bruckner designed the first two notes as a Fifth and a Sixth in the harmony (Ob.: »5«, »6«). Phillips supported this reconstruction with a Sechterian analysis of the fundamental harmonies.

It is hard to understand why other completed performing versions insisted upon a soft layout for solo Trp. and Str. at this point; the indications in the manuscript are indisputable: Bruckner indicated two whole bar rests before the entry of the Chorale in both Trp. syst. (FE, p. 312); this clearly indicates that all Trp. should join in together with the 1. Trp., which was obviously written down by itself in order to save time and effort here. Bruckner's own »dim.« in the eighth bar (FE, p. 314, b. 2) makes clear anyway that at its beginning the music must have been loud enough to support such a diminuendo. The entire setting for Strings with tremolo Vla. providing supporting harmony, and with both Viol. and Vc./Kb. in unison, is laid out for a loud Tutti, not a soft instrumentation. The last two bars from 29E/»30« (FE, p. 316) make it evident that the following line must bring about a still further reduction in dynamics (silent Kb.); the cessation of the Vla. tremolo and the register change (Ob.) imply that the harmonic support needs to be taken over by Woodwinds (comp. with Te Deum, b. 15ff). The reconstruction by SM and confirmed in PV 1992 followed these indications precisely (**Illustration VII**).

Herleitung als Umkehrung des Choralthemas der Exposition mit Analyse der Fundamente nach Sechter

Choral in der Exposition

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Bg. 29E/»30«
letzte 2 Takte

Bg. [30/»31«] 16 T., rekonstruiert als Umkehrung des Choralthemas

9 10 [11] [12] [13] [14] [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6]
1 2 [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12]

5 6 7 8 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

Bg. 31E/»32«

(Diese 4 Takte wohl nicht verwendbar,
da durchgehaltene Note unumkehrbar)

(Tritonus - Fortschreitungen in der Umkehrung beibehalten)

[11] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] 7 8

Rekonstruierter Bogen [30E/»31«]

Viol. 1, Viol. 2 8va b.

[11] [12] [13] [14]
[3] [4] [5] [6]

[1] [2] [3] [4]
[7] [8] [9] [10]

[5] [6] [11] [12]
[1] [2]

[3] [4] [5] [6]

Illustration VII: Sechterian root analysis by Phillips / Reconstruction of [30/»31«] by Samale et al.

The musical score is presented in four systems, each with a grand staff (treble and bass clef).
 System 1 (measures [7] to [3]): Features Trp. (Trumpet) and Hrn. (Horn) parts. Trp. has triplet markings (3) in measures [7], [8], [1], [2], and [3]. Hrn. has triplet markings (3) in measures [7], [8], [1], [2], and [3].
 System 2 (measures [4] to [8]): Continues the triplet patterns for Trp. and Hrn. in measures [4], [5], [6], [7], and [8].
 System 3 (measures 1 to 4): Introduces 1. Ob. (First Oboe) and Klar. (Clarinet) parts. The Viola (Vla.), Violoncello (Vc.), and Kontrabaß (Kb.) parts are marked (loco).
 System 4 (measures 5 to 8): Continues the woodwind parts. Klar. and Hrn. have triplet markings (3) in measures 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Illustration VIII: New reconstruction of [32E/»33«] by Samale and Cohrs

SM 1985 and PV 1992 concluded that Bruckner might have intended to repeat four bars from 31E/»32«, because his continuous numbering was repeated on its last page (FE, p. 319, upper margin, »43–44–45–46«, faintly in pencil on p. 320 again). However, the Recapitulation of the Horn Theme is different from its first appearance at the end of the Fugue Epilogue. There it was gradually decreasing; but here it is obviously used in order to increase energy, initiated by the triplet figuration in a variety of contrapuntal devices. The repeated pencil numbers may represent simply a writing error of Bruckner. Therefore the New Edition follows the text precisely as Bruckner wrote it. This decision was followed by a reconsideration of how to reconstruct the lost [32/»33«]. To complete the period already given as 1–6- on 31E/»32« seemed to be quite natural, by repeating -5–6- as -7–8-, in symmetry with its first half (comp. 1–2- with -3–4-). The first appearance of the Horn Theme on 31E/»32« passed by in a mere four bars.

On the other hand, considering its structural importance, it seemed clear that it had to be repeated somehow. Furthermore, it was obviously intended to finish an important section again, as it had done earlier, before the Recapitulation of the Song Period, corresponding somehow with the abrupt end there, which produced raised eye-brows within the Wiener Philharmoniker when Nikolaus Harnoncourt first rehearsed it. It should be noted that Harnoncourt very convincingly described this as a *memento mori*. In fact, this explains perfectly the character of the various endings of Finale sections with a musical reminder of mortality (as already in the 1st Mvmt. of the Eighth, where every theme group in the Exposition ended with a reference to the famous ›Grail's Bells‹ from Wagner's *Parsifal*). The older versions already included an extended repeat of the Horn Theme based on *G*, developed for eight bars (PV 1992, b. 565–72), convincing enough in itself, considering the Neapolitan progression (here: *Cis/G*), and also the fact that the 1st Mvmt. contains similar cadences (before its Coda, b. 493–504, based on *F*; within the Coda, significantly, on *G*, b. 541–8).

The old idea from SM 1985 and PV 1992 was to re-introduce the Main Theme from the 1st Mvmt. before the Coda, as a goal of the Chorale Epilogue. This solution lacked conviction, appears to extract energy and produce a blockage – even if for a good reason: the six bar truncation of the Main Theme would lead into the surviving sketch of the Coda beginning in a harmonically convincing manner; also, it completes the missing bifol., so that the Coda begins on a new, hypothetical [32/›33‹]. However, repeated listening and debate between Samale and the present writer had a strange effect: In Summer 2002, almost simultaneously, but independently, we both found the entire quote of the Main Theme to be simply wrong in the light of motivic development. The Horn Theme in itself already contains the triplet core (*passus duriusculus*) of the Main Theme. Hence it is designed to be merely a subliminal representative of the Main Theme, not its herald. It is even more likely that Bruckner's very late device to introduce this theme had the purpose of heralding the real hero – the *Halleluja*, which needed to be prepared motivically, and which is in fact included in the core of the Horn Theme –, giving strong support to its hypothetical elaboration at the end of the present score. The present writer tested the idea of totally dispensing with the Main Theme before the Coda in his Gmunden performance. Its apparently good effect was confirmed, for instance, by Harry Halbreich and by Ken Ward, Editor of *The Bruckner Journal*, England, who wrote in a personal letter to me: ›The Finale, from my point of view, benefits enormously from the cut of the Hauptthema return in the Coda – that destructive HALT is avoided.‹ Hence this decision was carried into the NE. Thus the Chorale Epilogue ends with a simple eight bar period, designed as a cadence to the Coda, built on a sustained *G*, with a typical general rest at the end, also similar in effect to a passage of the revised Third Symphony, note in particular 1st Mvmt., b. 393–404. (see **Illustration VIII**)

VIII. The Partial Reconstruction of the Coda from the Sketches

To this day, critics remain sceptical of the attempt to elaborate the Coda from the few surviving sketches; the result in PV 1992 aroused controversy. Music lovers were often grateful for the possibility to hear the Finale as a whole and also considered the closing section with the elaborated *Halleluja* satisfying or even moving. On the other hand, professional writers especially criticised the entire development from the Chorale Recapitulation onwards as being ›incoherent‹ and ›in blocks‹ – even if many of them showed only a limited knowledge of the philological problems of the Finale. Also, the importance of the Coda sketches was widely ignored. Unfortunately, even Nikolaus Harnoncourt omitted them, arguing that they were not part of the score as it survived. Hence the editors felt obliged to reconsider the Coda yet again (as elaborated in the preliminary versions) for the NE, in order to achieve an even greater coherence of this section which is so crucial for the entire symphony. The aim of such a (necessarily provisional) Coda must be to bring thematic processes to a close – an aim that is comprehensive enough under the circumstances given.

The examination of all extant sources revealed that, in a preliminary stage, the Coda was evidently finished in Summer 1896; hence it is still appropriate to speak of a ›reconstruction‹ at this point, even if the result is speculative in places. Perhaps it would be best to call it an ›elaboration‹, based on all available information – which is by no means scanty. Our philological studies revealed that without doubt Bruckner renumbered the bifolios of the score only in May/June 1896, after he had at least sketched the coda, and we have even a date for this as an evidence – ›14.6.96‹, given on 13E/›14‹ (FE, p. 225). This renumbering was done, because in this phase of the composition he had decided to split up the very long bifolio 2F (which increased now to 36 bars) into a ›2‹ and ›3‹, all written on the late-used E-papertype; hence, all subsequent bifolios had to be renumbered. Most likely his secretary Meissner may have had the task to scratch out the old consecutive numbers with a razor blade, which would be overwritten then with one number higher.

We had noted something similar in the first movement already: Only after finishing its score for a first time (which had 23 numbered bifolios in autumn 1892), during a revision in autumn 1893 Bruckner decided to expand the bridge to the recapitulation of the song period and to include a new bifolio »18« (see Critical Report, p. 50ff), which made it necessary to renumber all subsequent bifolios from »18« to »23« into »19« to »24«. Such a procedure would make sense only when the entire score was already there. But if this renumbering in the Finale indeed happened in May/June 1896, as the paper studies of Phillips imply, then this gives us a clue even to estimate the entire length of the original score (even if now partially lost), at least with a high degree of certainty:

In one of the sketches for the coda, we find the famous annotation of Bruckner »Bogen 36. 19. Ces« (FE, p. 45). This would read: On May 19th Bruckner reached the *Ces*, the beginning of the »final cadenza«, as two days later clearly re-sketched and furtherly established (FE, p. 47: »am 21. Donnerstag, 22. Freitag, 23. Samstag«). If we follow Bruckner's usual practice, he would write such a bifolio indication precisely at that point of the sketch where the new bifolio (here: 36) would have to start. (We have several other instances in the manuscripts where he did the same, note, for instance, the particello sketch of the exposition, FE p. 33, where Bruckner wrote »neuer Bog.« precisely at the same spot where later 4C/»5« started). But this indication was written in May, obviously BEFORE the renumbering; Bruckner would have had outwritten the primary score bifolios for the coda perhaps immediately after sketching their content (again: this was part of his usual compositional practice; as soon as a music was clearly sketched, first lay it out in score, for strings; it could be revised later anyway) and only thereafter returned to the exposition and renumber the bifolios subsequently. Hence the bifolio on which the cadenza had started was later to be a renumbered [36/»37«].

In any case, this single indication of Bruckner in the sketch allows now for almost PRECISELY to estimate the length of the gap between the final surviving score bifolio [31E/»32«] and the cadenza beginning on the lost [36E/»37«]!! Four bifolios must be missing here ([32E/»33«, [33E/»34«, [34E/»35«, [35E/»36«]), most likely all on E-paper, prepared with 16 bars each, implying a gap of 64 bars. Furthermore we would know that most likely the Chorale Bridge constituting the eight bar period before the *Ces*-Cadenza would be then the second half of the lost [35/»36«]. What we do NOT know is, where exactly the coda would have started, of which we have the beginning sketched (28 bars), hence we do not know EXACTLY how much music was between the last bar of 31E/»32« and the first bar of the sketch for the beginning of the coda, and how much music was there between the last bar of it and the first bar of this C major chorale fragment preparing the cadenza. We also do NOT know whether Bruckner himself followed strictly the 16 bar structure of the E paper bifolios, or whether he would have inserted some further barlines, as, for instance, already on the first page of »2«E which contains 6 instead of 4 bars.

On the other hand, »2«E is the only surviving E-paper with such a subdivision at all, and the musical structure of 31E/»32« and the cadenza sketch would only suggest one further of such subdivisions: The last period on 31E/»32« ends with its sixth bar, and we do not know precisely whether Bruckner would have completed it with [-7-8] in an 8-bar-period or not. But [36/»37«] would certainly have started with the first bar of a period. If we consider Bruckner would have continued the lost music in periods of 4, 8 and 12 bars length, it is quite likely that he somewhere had to include two bars more, if he not decided somewhere to have 10 or 6 bars only, but this is more unlikely. However, the little annotation »Bogen 36. Ces« provides enough information to establish at least a hypothesis, based on facts and some fruitful deduction, and estimate the length of this huge gap almost precisely, with perhaps only two bars in doubt.

One of the earliest sketches appears to contain the beginning of the Coda, including the Motto, repeated relentlessly in the fundamental Tritone sequences in a solemn, slower speed (Bruckner: »4/4«). Its design as a stasis, then proceeding by gradual compression of metrical structures in perfect symmetry into a crescendo, is very similar to Bruckner's other Finale codas. Such a design must have lead naturally into a big climax. We have sufficient evidence to believe this was an overlay of all themes. The elements from the Chorale Recapitulation onwards can be interpreted as a gradual preparation for such a synthesis, mainly built on the triplet core (Str. counterpoint; Horn Theme) and the Octave Fall (see Vc./Kb., FE, p. 319/20) of the Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt. This is continued in the first Coda sketch, including Motto and *passus duriusculus* (Ob.) – an allusion to the »Annunciation of Death« in the 1st Mvmt. of the Eighth, but mainly recalling the *memento mori* before the Fugue that culminates in the clash of the Trp. fanfare (FE, p. 260), which can also be seen as a preparation of the Scherzo rhythm.

The realisation of such a climax as an overlay of the Main Themes seems to be musically inevitable as the ultimate point of reunification. If we analyse them, their ability to be combined with one another actually seems to be as predictable as Nottebohm's discovery that the themes in *Contrapunctus XIV* can be overlaid by the B-A-C-H motif. This technique was a characteristic part of the Baroque fugue, named *coagmentatio*, and it is prominent in Bruckner's own fugues as well.

SM and PV 1992 constructed the *coagmentatio* upon the Adagio Theme in augmentation, but it seems to be more typical of Bruckner to use the Main Theme from the 1st Mvmt. in the Bass (as in the Codas of the Fifth and the Eighth), with the solemn Adagio Theme in the Tenor, the Finale Theme in the Alto (in its form as the basis for the Fugue, which Bruckner actually seems to have constructed in order to make it more suitable for such an overlay), the typical quaver figuration in the Soprano (as in all Finale Codas), and the Scherzo rhythm on Timpani (such a ›Tattoo‹ is by no means impossible with Bruckner, see for instance the Main Thema of the Finale of the Eighth Symphony, the Scherzo of the Ninth, b. 97ff, 115ff, or its Trio, b. 77ff, 109ff, and 229ff). (see **Illustration X**)

The clash of the *d/es* progression (from the end of the 1st Mvmt.) and the climactic nature of this Coagmentation could certainly have led into a broad zone of final glory – if we did not have further evidence for the continuation of the Coda. The next surviving sketches clearly indicate that Bruckner intended to include four further elements – a Chorale ascent starting on *C* in eight bars (of which the last four are not completely laid out), leading into eight bars to present the Tritone progression (*Ces/F* here) for a last time, followed by another eight cadential bars built on a pedalpoint of a Dominant Eleventh (perhaps evoking the climax of the Adagio), and a final peroration built on a Tonic pedalpoint. We have every reason to accept these sketches, thanks to Bruckner's indication for their use in a lost bifol. 36 (FE, p. 45) and the surviving dates from May 1896. It seems to be likely that they indeed contained all that Bruckner needed for the elaboration of the Coda.

Such an ascent as sketched would certainly initiate a new crescendo, but it would not be appropriate to make a jump from the *coagmentatio* into it. Furthermore, the sketch for the Coda beginning might well be a re-conception of a passage earlier intended as a transition to the Chorale (see also the initial sketch of this passage, FE, p. 13, ÖNB 3194/7r), of which the Recapitulation was basically destructive. For these reasons, as early as 1986, as a first fruit of their collaboration, the editors augmented the promising String Chorale from the Recapitulation (NE: b. 443–6), now laid out for full orchestra, and transposed it from *Ces* into *D*, which here allowed a perfect cadence to the initial *C* of the ascent, which seems to be also an inversion of the end of the Main Theme of the Finale (see b. 63–6). At this point SM and PV 1992 changed the Str. figuration into triplet quavers. Since Bruckner never changed the figuration once it was established for the Coda, the NE decided to maintain the quavers from the Coagmentation instead, creating an allusion to Bruckner's very last surviving Coda, that of *Helgoland*, and including the significant ›Cross‹ of notes prefigured in the final bars of the Adagio and continued in the Main Theme of the Finale.

The completion of the Chorale ascent (-5–6 and 8 of the period not yet finished by Bruckner) had to connect with the *Ces* of the following period (FE, p. 45). It was a quite straightforward task to continue harmony and melody. The Adagio of the Fifth (b. 169ff), and that of the Eighth Symphony (b. 23ff) served as a model here – in fact, once more Bruckner's »*Himmelsleiter*« (=Jacob's Ladder, most likely a quotation from Mozart's Requiem, *Lacrymosa*, b. 5–8), in the Finale culminating in the final *Halleluja* Pleno. The entire instrumentation of this progression and the following Neapolitan cadence was thoroughly reworked once again, now continuing the quaver figuration and introducing a last appearance of the inverted Fugue Theme in the Bass, and redistributing the disposition of the partwriting, in order to achieve a better balance and a more audible connection with the climax of the Adagio evoked by the harmony sketched by Bruckner (Triplets in the Woodwinds, filling parts in Vla. and Wagner-Tb., falling Ninths in low Brass).

[Adagio: Haupt - Thema]

[Finale: Fugen - Thema]

[1. Satz: Haupt - Thema]

[Scherzo: Haupt - Thema]

1 2 3 4

5 6 7 8

9 10 11 12

Illustration IX: New elaboration of the main themes' coagmentation by Samale and Cohrs

IX. The Elaboration of the Final *Halleluja* Pleno

Critics insist that a completion of the final peroration is impossible, because nowhere does a final double bar exist in the surviving material. However, we can regain a suprising amount of it by simple deductive reasoning. The last eight bars of the cadence sketch indicate that the last section was to be built on a Tonic pedalpoint, as usual with Bruckner. Furthermore, it seems to be very likely that the length of this last coping-stone was to be 37 bars, as was likewise the case for all the foregoing movements (1st Mvmt.: beginning of the Bass triplets, b. 531–67; Scherzo: beginning of the variations to the Exposition, b. 210–47; Trio: 36 bars from 229–64, plus the extra rest added by Bruckner at the beginning of the Scherzo da capo = 37; Adagio: b. 207–43, entire Coda after the general rest). This Tonic pedalpoint would make the symphony come full circle, since the 1st Mvmt. started with the same kind of stasis. This can be impressively experienced by concluding the DFF with this very sketch, ending where the symphony had begun. It is also likely that the fabric of this apparently 37 bar long final section would start very softly, as is usual in Bruckner, in order to build an effective final crescendo, leading into a glorious, culminative Pleno, ending with the typical extraordinary weight of an irregular period (as found by Wolfgang Grandjean; see discussion in Section XI). No musical material would be better suited for this than the *Te Deum* motif, with its majestic open Fifth, Fourth and Octave, which was already evoked in the 1st Mvmt. (note also its final section with a ›vertical‹ reading of this motif as a sound field on *D/a/d*), and then re-appeared prominently at the end of the 1st Part of the Finale, its Development, and Chorale Recapitulation. Consequently, the NE uses this motif here as the main feature of the last 37 bars, recalling the end of the Adagio (Viol. in perfect metrical proportion: quaver=crotchet), as well as that of the 1st Mvmt. (open Fifth) and Scherzo (Trp.). Its use in the Woodwinds was now limited to minims, as prefigured by Bruckner in the Development, in order to complete the ›history‹ of the Minim Progression. This is all the more convincing if we consider that Bruckner himself wished the *Te Deum* to be used as the best substitute, should he not live long enough to complete the instrumental Finale – another strong hint that the Finale itself should end in a similar manner. The Viol. figuration was now changed into crotchets, recalling the unique, solemn procession from the end of the Fourth Symphony (Finale 1880).

Additionally, the editors may refer to the memoirs of Dr. Heller, who related Bruckner's playing of the conclusion of the Finale to him on the Piano as a »Song of Praise to the Dear Lord«, according to the composer. There has been much speculation as to how this should be understood – particularly Heller's enigmatic reference to Bruckner's words that he wished to »AGAIN conclude the Finale with the Alleluiah from the 2nd Mvmt.«. (Note that Heller's spelling of the word is different from Bruckner's own use; Bruckner explicitly wrote »*Halleluja*« in his personal annotations, calendars and letters. Hence, »*Halleluja*« has been maintained here.) The present writer would like to add a new interpretation of this: before trying to locate such an »*Halleluja* from the 2nd Mvmt.« within other late Bruckner works, can convincing evidence not be found from the Ninth itself? In fact, the Adagio contains a highly significant *Halleluja*-like phrase (Trp., b. 4–6), quoting the *non confundar* from the *Te Deum* as well as the *Halleluja* from Psalm 150. But this is the 3rd Mvmt. However, is it not possible that Heller, or Bruckner himself, was simply momentarily confused regarding its position in the symphony?

We know that Bruckner sometimes struggled with the inner balance of movements, especially in the Second, Seventh, and Eighth Symphony. Perhaps he was also not absolutely certain about the position of the Adagio in the Ninth for some time: as shown in the Critical Report, the cover bifolios, designating the Scherzo as »2. Satz« and the Adagio as »3. Satz«, were written very late, possibly as late as the Autumn of 1895, considering the similarity of the cover of the original and copy of the 1st Mvmt. (Critical Report, Facsimiles, p. 206 and 207). The first score page of the 2nd Mvmt. contains the heading »Scherzo« alone (Critical Report, Facsimile, p. 81); that of the Adagio in fact reads »III. Satz. Adagio (E-Dur) 9. Sinf.« (Critical Report, Facsimile, p. 145), but it looks as if the 3rd beam of the III was added later, hence it was only in 1895 that Bruckner decided upon the order of the movements. It could be likewise possible that Bruckner in fact said »Adagio«, but that Heller remembered it as »2nd Mvmt.«, simply assuming that the Adagio was in fact intended to be the 2nd Mvmt., ›as usual‹. Interestingly, even Joseph Schalk, in his Piano reduction of the symphony (preserved in the ÖNB, re-examined by the present writer in 2002), arranged the Adagio second, explicitly marked by him as »II.«, only then followed by the Scherzo, which after his death in 1900 was completed by Löwe from bar 110 onwards. Hence one suspects that Schalk worked from a copy which is no longer extant (perhaps the ›Stichvorlage‹ used by Löwe for his later arrangement of the instrumentation, now lost), consisting of three separate volumes in which Scherzo and Adagio were perhaps not expressly marked as 2nd and 3rd Mvmt. at all.

A further possible support for the use of this material in the Finale Coda is to be found in *Helgoland*: the prayer ›Der du in den Wolken thronest‹ serves there as the Song Period, which one could well interpret as a »zweiter Satz« as well, since it is the second subject. This music contains the same melodic material as the *Halleluja* and is also repeated in the Horns in augmentation at the very end of the Coda. Elisabeth Maier's assumption that Bruckner would have used the second *Halleluja* from ›Christ ist erstanden‹ in the version sung in Austria at the time seems to be less likely, since it contains musical material which cannot be easily related to the symphony. This would not be appropriate, considering the strong musical argument of the symphony as a ›final exercise‹ for Bruckner, in which, as Heller quoted him, »the thematic idea should be elaborated once again in the greatest clarity.« It also contradicts Bruckner's own efforts to motivically prepare the *Halleluja* in the Finale.

Musical evidence should test the case: Bruckner indeed finished the Adagio with this *Halleluja* phrase, transformed by the four Horns shortly before the end. Perhaps Romantic approaches interpret this as a »nostalgic reminiscence from the Seventh«, likewise considering the Chorale (Wagner-Tb., b. 231–4) shortly before as a »last farewell to the Adagio Theme from the Eighth«. In fact, this is a very early variant from 1893 sketches for the Ninth's Adagio theme itself. Such reception can only detract from considering the underlying motivic processes which support the coherence of the Ninth. However, the decision to use this phrase for the elaborated conjectural end of the Finale makes perfect musical sense within the parameters of the symphony itself.

The original ending of SM was designed in an open Fifth, similar to the end of the 1st Mvmt. For the *Halleluja* conception, the present writer discovered the evidence of Heller's memoirs as early as 1985. In 1988, he and Samale developed an intermediate solution that included the Horn motif from the Adagio Coda in augmentation as well as the self-imitating Trumpet triplets, combining the Chorale figuration with the *Halleluja* and thus relating it to the end of the Scherzo and of *Helgoland*. It was also the present writer who first sketched the final PV 1992 layout of the *Halleluja* in October 1989. This was part of the four hand Piano version presented by Samale and Phillips in a lecture held at the Conservatory of Bremen on 25 January 1990. The motif gains credence from the opening *Halleluja* of Psalm 150 (*c-d-e-g-c*). This sequence was maintained in the NE (here: *d-e-fis-a-d*) in a rising Minim Progression, in self-imitation, thus containing the entire *Halleluja* with which Bruckner often concluded movements of his symphonies (see *Bruckner Jahrbuch* 1989/1990, p. 202). The progression seems to be the ultimate destination of the very beginning of the Ninth (b. 1–18), containing those notes in minor (Hrns.) when arranged in rising order, *d-e-f-a-d* (note also its inversion in the Third Theme Group, Fl., b. 167ff as a quotation of the *Agnus Dei* from the Mass in d minor). Only their final return, transfigured into the major, would make the symphony come full circle.

X. Revised Instrumentation

Preparation of the New Edition also required a re-examination of the instrumentation. Particularly the limitations of the instruments available in Vienna during the late 19th Century and Bruckner's particular practice of writing for them had to be observed. Indispensable here was Dieter-Michael Backes' dissertation *Die Instrumentierung und ihre Entwicklung in Anton Bruckner's Symphonien* (Mainz 1993).

For the Flutes Bruckner avoided notes higher than *b'''* by choosing lower alternatives or Octaves (but note, for instance, PV 1992, Fl., b. 55, *ces'''*, now corrected to the lower Octave). The Tenor Trombone would not climb beyond *b'* (Scherzo, Ten.-Pos., b. 223; but note, for instance, PV 1992, b. 55, now corrected). He also avoided higher notes than *e''* for Violoncello in the Ninth (Finale, bifol. 15D/»16«, PV 1992, b. 287). This made the reconstruction of [19D/»20«] in PV 1992 rather unlikely (Vc. up to *g''*/PV 1992, b. 355). Likewise, Bruckner made no use of the five-stringed double-bass and preferred notes in higher Octaves to notes lower than *E*. The one exception in the Finale (18D/»19«; FE, p. 281) may originate from the *col Basso* notation of the Vc., which certainly go down to the low *C* here; but a typical Octave was chosen for Kb., following b. 45 as a model (this is b. 3 of the Main Theme).

The extreme notes of Viol. 1 presented in this new elaboration of the Coda, up to *d'''*, may be surprising, given that in the other movements as well as in the final valid bifolios of the Finale Bruckner did not write for them higher than *ces'''*. However, considering the extremes of the coagmentation, the editors felt justified in using this range once, referring to Bruckner's own »8^{va} sempre« above Viol. 1 on bifol. 2^aC (FE, p. 109, see also 2^bC / p. 113, 2^cC / p. 118); likewise his own one use of the *d''* in the first Horn pair there, which he usually avoided.

Inevitably, Bruckner left much of the Wind and Brass scoring – particularly in the 2nd Part – to the imagination of posterity. The situation is now worse than ever, since so many of the final bifolios are lost. If one wishes to recapture something of Bruckner's original sound conception, it is most important to develop an aural imagination of how the lost portions could have sounded to Bruckner himself. This can only be achieved from experienced listening to instruments of the period: Bruckner was used to hearing gut strings, played with much less vibrato, but some portamento, in more distinct intonation and in a »pure tone«: the habit to cover bad intonation with large vibrato only occurred after 1923, following the fatal suggestions by Carl Flesch in his Violin School. The Viennese Flutes had a distinct, wooden, but thin sound. Quite new were the pungent Viennese Oboes (from ca 1875, sounding quite similar to a Baroque Oboe d'amore), and pungent Clarinets and Bassoons were common, in particular the sharp Viennese Bassoon with its metallic soundcup. The famous Viennese Horns were handmade, more narrow bored, and, like all other Brass instruments, about one third smaller, and produced much less volume than today's Brass. The Wagner Tubas, the smaller Bass-Tuba and larger Doublebass-Tuba were of a particular Viennese manufacture as well. The blazing, large F-Trumpet and lighter, more narrow bored Trombones were also common. All this must be taken into account when attempting to finish the instrumentation of the Finale. On the contrary, the PV 1992 was shaped very much from the experience of listening to modern instruments.

In many instances, revisiting the manuscripts solved some further questions. Some of the major changes are already described above (end of the Main Theme; beginning of the 2nd Part; the entire Coda). Some more differences of instrumentation between PV 1992 and NE follow from a new examination of the first three movements and some other works (the famous »Analogverfahren«, as already described in 1985 by Samale and Mazzuca in their Commentary). Another important decision was to substantially reduce the scoring of the Trio in the Song Period (PV 1992, b. 107–20; NE: 95–108) to create a greater contrast to its enriched Recapitulation (PV 1992, b. 433–46; NE: 421–34). Such an approach was typical for Bruckner, for instance in the Finale of the Eighth. The Song Period from the Adagio of the Sixth (see there, b. 25ff) with its enriched Recapitulation (b. 113ff) presents another very similar case. A particular problem for the lower Horn players occurred at the beginning of the transition to the Chorale (NE, b. 131ff): the manuscript gives them only five bars to change from Ten.-Tb. back to Hrn. For this reason, Bruckner's partwriting was changed in order to give them substantially more time (NE, b. 131–56). At the first appearance of the Gregorian motif (NE, b. 455ff), the instrumentation of the PV 1992 was so thick that the dotted rhythm of Viol. 1 was hardly audible. The new scoring supports them with 1. Ob. and Klar. (Viol. 2 and Vla. with 2.3. Ob. and Klar). Likewise, the strange partwriting for Klar. and Fag. before the Chorale Recapitulation (PV 1992, b. 503–6; NE: b. 491–4) was changed, now following the model of a passage in the 1st Mvmt. of the Fourth (b. 305ff).

XI. Revised Dynamics, Phrasing, and Articulation

Bruckner left very rare indications of phrasing, articulation, dynamics, and tempi. Hence, a thorough understanding of his practice is indispensable. These features were thoroughly revised in the NE, with particular reference to the comprehensive studies on Bruckner's technique undertaken by the present writer when preparing his Critical Report for the first three movements. Generally speaking, the PV 1992 preferred fluid dynamics which often contradicted Bruckner's block-like instrumentation. For instance, Phillips' organisation of the crescendo into the Main Theme twice included a *cresc.* in long, repetitive sections (b. 19, Str.: *f cresc. poco a poco*; b. 31: *cresc. sempre*; b. 39: Bruckner's own *dim.*). The New Edition follows the structure perhaps more consistently (b. 19: *f*; b. 27: *cresc.*; b. 31: *ff*; b. 39: *dim.*; b. 41: *p dim. sempre*). Here the editors would also like to underline the importance of Bruckner's own »*accel.*« and »*dim.*« in the four bars before the Main Theme (FE, p. 133), since most conductors maintain the crescendo and tempo at this point. But note the particular dramatic expression of this sudden fall – certainly the genuflection of the sinner confronted with the appearance of the Eternal Judge. This too is not without a model in Bruckner's music – see the 1st Mvmt. of the Sixth Symphony, before the Recapitulation of the Main Theme (there, b. 191–4, again often neglected by conductors). In the gradually increasing sequences of the Motto in the Development, PV 1992 gave a continuous crescendo (*p cresc. sempre*). The New Edition (b. 244, 268) prefers terraced dynamics instead, designing these four sequences gradually (*pp*, *p*, *mf*, *f*). It was also very important to observe the development of the climaxes: Bruckner was always careful about his *fff*, reserving this only for the peaks, but marking »local highlights« no stronger than *ff*. Hence the two climaxes in the Fugue (PV 1992, b. 327 and 356; NE, 315 and 344) were reduced to *ff* only (see also 1st Mvmt., b. 207).

Similarly, the phrasing and articulation was re-examined. For instance, the imitation of the Motto first introduced by 1. Klar. (b. 5) was not consistently notated by Bruckner. His three different variants were harmonized here as ›semiquaver; single-dotted-quaver; semiquaver; quaver‹, in order to avoid discrepancies, particularly in Development and Fugue. Since Bruckner developed the Song Period directly from the relentless Main Theme, it should contrast strongly with the lyrical character of its counterpoints. Consequently, all slurs from PV 1992 (b. 75ff) were removed from the insistent motif. It seemed to be appropriate to basically maintain the articulation of its lyrical variants in half bar divisions (see, for instance, 1. Fl. before the Trio, PV 1992, b. 103–6, one four bar slur; NE, b. 91–4, revised here to half bar slurs). One notable exception was PV 1992, b. 121–9 (Klar.), where retaining long slurs seemed inevitable in order to maintain resonance (NE, b. 107ff). Longer slurs would be required only if Woodwinds doubled String parts to give them more resonance for instance, the Klar. doubling of Vla. at the beginning of the Fugue Epilogue (NE, b. 353ff), here with two bar legato added (PV 1992, b. 365: no legato). Likewise, String counterpoints in continuous chains of quavers were given half bar slurs, following the model of the 1st Mvmt. (note, for instance, PV 1992, b. 129ff, ›zart gestrichen‹, now NE, b. 117ff, half bar legato; also before the Fugue, PV 1992, b. 301ff, ›gezogen‹, now NE, b. 289ff, with lyrical legato added). Drawing on practical experience, the triplet figuration of the Chorale Theme was supplemented with tenuto on every crotchet, in order to avoid stop-gap bowing before each triplet. In the Chorale Recapitulation, the slurs were re-adjusted following the model of the Te Deum (half bar legato in *p*, whole bar legato in *pp*).

The important book by Wolfgang Grandjean, *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner* (Tutzing 2001), provided invaluable new insights into Bruckner's formal structures, particularly regarding the metrical numbers, which refer to the systematic regulation of emphasis within periods. Research by the present writer revealed also that Bruckner's typical accents (›Druck‹ >, and ›Keil‹ ^) were mostly used to underline the rhetorical phrasing which seems to be essential for Bruckner interpretation. This led to some crucial additions of accents in order to bring a certain Baroque eloquence into this Toccata-like Finale: Bruckner himself already gave some clear idea of this in surviving, discarded bifolios (see 2^aC, FE, p. 107, and 2^bC, p. 111). Some further features were added: following the model of the 1st Mvmt., the Motto (b. 4 ff) was consistently marked with > on the 2nd note; its companion (1.2. Hrn., Viol. 2, Vla., b. 4 etc.) received an additional > on the 1st note as well (see 1st Mvmt., Woodwinds, b. 78ff; Scherzo, Pos., b. 202ff; 2^bC, lower Str.). The Main Theme originally bore only Bruckner's ^ on the very first semibreve to indicate the four bar phrase. However, the various two- and one-bar truncations of this seemed to require an additional > for the 3rd bar as well. This device particularly helps the listener to follow the contrapuntal writing in the Fugue, where a much more refined phrasing was achieved in the NE by additional articulation. In the tremolo of lower Strings in the Chorale, > have been added, according to the changes of harmony (note Bruckner's own writing on 2^aC, lower Str., FE, p. 109). Likewise, in the Chorale Recapitulation, the > added here follow the model of the beginning of the Te Deum.

XII. Revised Tempi

The PV 1992 introduced no fewer than 36 Tempo indications (see table on p. 42); however, only seven of them derived from Bruckner's manuscripts, and most of them were on discarded bifol. In the 1st Mvmt. – not significantly shorter than the Finale – Bruckner used only 25 such indications. The main reason for these Löwe-like tempi of the PV 1992 was the assumption that the movement required three tempi – the main one, a slower one for the Song Period, and an even slower one for the Trio, following the model of the Finale of the Eighth. However, the Song Period is derived directly from the Main Theme, hence there is no reason why they should not share the same tempo, especially if we observe Bruckner's late introduction of the Minim Progression into the Main Theme (›3«E), not extant from older versions. Considering the basic tempo, the relationship to the 1st Mvmt. established by the common dotted rhythm should be respected: the Main Theme of the Finale was certainly not intended to be faster than the end of the 1st Mvmt. Another important clue is Bruckner's device of re-introducing the String accompaniment of the Te Deum in the Chorale Recapitulation. The shared, main tempo of Finale, 1st Mvmt. and Te Deum should hence be Bruckner's typical, moderate Allegro, as respected here (›Misterioso; nicht schnell‹; note that in his later Finale movements, Bruckner avoided Italian tempo indications in symphonies VI, VII and VIII). Bruckner's own characterization of the end of the 1st Mvmt. of the Eighth Symphony as a »Clock of Death« suggest that this should be chosen perhaps with one beat per second, consistent also with his own metronome marking in the Finale of the Eighth Symphony (minims = 60), or, considering the slower »Moderato« in the 1st Mvmt. of the Ninth, perhaps slightly less than that (56–60).

Precisely the relationship with the 1st Mvmt. seemed to require another important addition. The NE decided to add a 4/4 time signature for the Trio in both Exposition and Recapitulation, considering that its character and counterpoint bears many similarities with the Song Period of the 1st Mvmt. and that of the Adagio as well. Interestingly, also in the 1st and 3rd Mvmt. Bruckner decided to use a slower tempo for the Song Period only in the very last stage of composition, as the present writer has shown in the Critical Report (p. 13, see also Critical New Edition of Mvmts. I–III, p. XIX). To acknowledge two basic tempi, and not three, is also in line with the Te Deum and its main »allegro moderato«, and the »moderato« of its 2nd and 4th section. Bruckner himself considered a change to 4/4 in the Finale at least twice – in a later discarded version of the Fugue (marked as »*bedeutend langsamer*«, F. E., p. 261 and 265), and in the initial sketch for the Coda. He obviously later decided to keep the Fugue in the basic moderate allegro after composing its Epilogue, which includes quotations from the Te Deum and would hence require the same tempo. (The New Edition suggests »*Mäßig bewegt*« here, replacing the unsuccessful »*bedeutend langsamer*« from the PV 1992.) However, a slower 4/4-speed had to be established somewhere, and Bruckner's design of the Trio, so similar to the Song Period of the 1st Mvmt., seemed to be evidence enough to justify such a suggestion. Another hint for a considerably slower tempo can also be found in Bruckner's own indication »*sehr langs.*« before the Fugue (FE, p. 259) – though, without any change of time signature, but it is quite typical for Bruckner to require such a momentary return to a slower tempo (1st Mvmt., b. 375–76). Interestingly, a re-examination of the manuscripts even revealed a further tempo device by Bruckner himself at this point, hitherto overlooked: in the 2nd bar (FE, p. 259), above Viol. 1, one can find a letter, transcribed by Phillips in his RAS (p. 75) as »n [?]«, but this is certainly an »r«, a Brucknerian shortcut in *Kurrentschrift* (running hand), indicating a »rit.«, which indeed serves well here to prepare the slower tempo that follows. Of particular importance for the tempi of the NE was another observation made by the present writer during his preparation of the Critical Report on the Ninth. In his late works, Bruckner almost invariably used »ritardando« before returning to the previous tempo, but »ritenuto« when followed by a new tempo. With great care, he frequently wrote only the initial »r« or »rit« without using a dot, thus leaving room for later amendments. In all, the revised tempi allowed us to reduce 36 indications (PF 1992) to 25 in the NE (and precisely in line with the 1st Mvmt.).

Table: Concordance of Tempo Indications

Indications by Bruckner	bar	PV 1992	bar	NE 2004	metrum
<i>Finale</i>		FINALE		FINALE	
2/2	1	2/2; Misterioso, nicht schnell	1	2/2; Misterioso. Nicht schnell	Minims; Tempo I
<i>accel.</i> [2F/discarded]	39	<i>accel.</i>	39	<i>accel. sempre</i>	
<i>langs.</i> [2 ^a C/discarded]	41	- - -	41	- - -	
<i>a tempo</i> [2 ^a C/discarded]	43	<i>a tempo</i>	43	Tempo I	Minims; Tempo I
	75	<i>Langsamer</i>	75	- - -	Minims; Tempo I
	106	- - -	94	<i>riten.</i>	
	107	<i>Noch langsamer</i>	95	4/4; <i>Langsamer</i>	Crotchets; Tempo II
<i>rit.</i>	118	<i>rit.</i>	106	- - -	
	121	<i>a tempo</i>	109	2/2; <i>a tempo</i>	Minims; Tempo I
	141	<i>accel. sempre</i>	129	<i>accel.</i>	
	143	<i>Erstes Zeitmaß</i>	131	<i>Erstes Zeitmaß</i>	Minims; Tempo I
<i>langs.</i> [erased]	289	<i>Langsamer</i>	277	<i>ritard.</i>	Tempo II (in 4)
	290	<i>rit.</i>	278	- - -	
	291	<i>a tempo (langsamer)</i>	279	<i>a tempo</i>	Tempo I (beat in 4)
<i>r.</i>	304	- - -	292	<i>riten.</i>	
<i>sehr langs.</i>	305	<i>Sehr langsam</i>	293	<i>Sehr langsam</i>	Tempo II (in 4)
	307	<i>accel. sempre</i>	295	<i>accel. sempre</i>	
<i>Bedeutend langsamer</i>	311	<i>Fuge. Bedeutend langsamer</i>	299	<i>Fuge. Mäßig bewegt.</i>	Tempo I (beat in 4)
[17C/discarded]			(344)		(beat in 2)
	413	<i>riten.</i>	401	- - -	
	417	<i>Langsamer</i>	405	- - -	Minims; Tempo I
	431	- - -	419	<i>riten.</i>	
	433	<i>Noch langsamer</i>	421	4/4; <i>Langsamer</i>	Crotchets; Tempo II
- - -	444	<i>rit.</i>	432	- - -	
	447	<i>a tempo</i>	435	- - -	
	455	<i>Sehr langsam</i>	443	- - -	
	457	- - -	445	<i>riten.</i>	

Indications by Bruckner	bar	PV 1992	bar	NE 2004	metrum
	459	a tempo	447	2/2; a tempo	Minims; Tempo I
	463	accelerando	451	---	
	467	Erstes Zeitmaß	455	---	
	471	Langsamer	459	Langsam	Tempo II (but in 4)
	475	---	463	---	(in 2; minim=minim)
	479	Stringendo poco a poco	467	Stringendo poco a poco	
	487	Erstes Zeitmaß	475	Erstes Zeitmaß	Minims; Tempo I
	572	rit.	556	---	
	573	Sehr feierlich	---		
	578	riten.	---		
4/4	579	4/4; Ruhig	557	4/4; Langsamer	Crotchets; Tempo II
	595	accel. poco a poco	573	accel. poco a poco	
	603	accel. sempre	581	accel. sempre	
	607	2/2; Sehr feierlich	585	2/2; Feierlich	Minims; Tempo I
	649	riten.	627	---	
	651	a tempo	629	---	
		[687 bars total length]			
			[665, optional 663 bars total length]		

Recommended Tempo I: Minim = 56–60 (should be identical with main tempo of 1st Mvmt. and Te Deum)

Recommended Tempo II: Crotchet = 84–92 (should be identical with tempo of Song Periods in both 1st Mvmt. and Te Deum)

Table: Formal Analysis of the Completed Finale (NE 2004/rev. 2006)

Bars	Section	Length	Periods	Annotations
1–42	EINGANG [Introit]	42		
1–12	Motto	12	4 / 8	From 1 st Mvmt., Hrns., b. 19 / Toccata Rhythm
13–30	Condensation; crescendo	18	2 / 4 / 8 / 4	Cross motif in mutation (Adagio-Coda)
31–42	Theme antic. / Pre climax; reduction	12	12	Augmentation & Diminution simult.
43–74	THEMA [Main Theme]	32		
43–58	Main Theme (Toccata Rhythm)	16	12 / 4	Cross motif; Minim Progression; Trp. Fanfare
59–68	Reduction (<i>memento mori</i>)	8	8	<i>passus duriusculus</i> [=PD]; Cross motif
69–74	Chorale bridge (Brass)	8	8	
75–130	GESANGSPERIODE & TRIO	56 [opt. 52]		
75–92	» <i>Gesangsperiode</i> « [Song Period]	20 [16]		
75–84	(Toccata Rhythm, deriv. fr. Main Theme)	10 [8]	[2] / 8	Cross motif; Minim Progression; PD
85–94	Repetition	10 [8]	[2] / 8	Lyrical Counterpoint; Woodwind bridge
95–108	» <i>Trio Fis-Dur</i> «	14		
95–102	Trio ... (Toccata Rhythm)	8	8	Cross motif; Lyrical Counterpoint;
103–08	... to be continued	6	3 / 3 [= 6]	PD and <i>memento mori</i>
109–30	Song Period da capo (var.)	22		
109–16	» <i>F-Ges</i> « (Klar., Fag., Hrn., Tb.)	8	8	Cross motif; Minim Progression
117–24	Variant in G major / Str.	8	8	Cross motif; PD; Lyrical Counterpoint (Vla.)
125–30	Pendulum of low notes (<i>Ges-F</i>)	6	6	<i>Ges-F</i> (Phrygian) as <i>memento mori</i>
131–56	ÜBERGANG [Transition]	26		
131–40	Motto (inv.)	10	2 / 8	Toccata Rhythm
141–56	Ascent; annunciation (Woodwinds)	16	8 / 8	Quot. from Adagio (b. 151–4)
157–208	CHORAL [Chorale Theme]	52		
157–72	» <i>Choral E-Dur</i> «	16	8 / 8	Triplet figuration; Chorale Theme
173–80	Interjection	8	8	
181–92	Chorale repeated (var.)	12	12	
193–208	Reduction; Te Deum	16	8 / 8	PD; Te Deum motif as <i>memento mori</i>

Bars	Section	Length	Periods	Annotations
209–98	DURCHFÜHRUNG [Development]	90		
209–44	Passacaglia: PD + Te Deum (Ob.: Gregorian motif in semibreve)	36	8 / 12 / 8 / 8	Triplets; Motto & Toccata Rhythm + dimin.; PD; Te Deum motif rect. (augm., dimin.)
245–52	Motto	8	8	(inv. only), imit., augm., dimin.
253–68	Passacaglia repet.	16	8 / 8	Triplets; Motto & Toccata Rhythm + dimin.; PD; Te Deum motif rect., inv., imit., augm., dimin.
269–78	Motto	10	6 / 2 / 2	inv., rect., augm., dimin.
279–98	Song Period & Lyrical Counterpoint	20	8 / 6 / 6	rect., inv.; Trp. Fanfare; <i>memento mori</i>
299–352	FUGE [Fugue]	54		
299–318	Fugue Exposition	20	8 / 8 / 4	Theme Variant; Motto & Toccata Rhythm, dimin.
319–43	Fugue Development	25	3x3 / 8 / 8	Theme imit., rect., inv., augm., dimin. (quot.: Beethoven, Ninth, 1 st Mvmt., b. 427ff.)
344–52	Pleno <i>cis</i> / <i>b</i> / <i>fis</i>	9	3 / 3 / 3	Theme simult. rect., inv., dimin., imit.(!)
353–84	FORTGANG [= Continuation]	32		
353–68	Fugue Epilogue; pedalpoint	16	8 / 8	<i>Halleluja</i> (Vc.), Theme inv., imit. (quot.: <i>Toccata BWV 565</i>)
369–74	»Unisono <i>c-moll</i> «	8	8	Theme rect., imit.; dimin., imit.
375–84	Pedal progression; Pleno	8	8	Theme rect., imit. (quot.: <i>Aeterna fac</i> / Te Deum and Symphony No. 6, Finale).
385–404	HORN-THEMA [Horn Theme]	20		
385–92	Horn Theme (imit.)	8	8	Triplet; <i>Halleluja</i> ; Octave Fall from Main Theme 1 st Mvmt.; Toccata Rhythm <i>memento mori</i>
393–404	Continuation (Trp.; Woodw.)	12	12	
405–62	GESANGSPERIODE & TRIO	58		
405–20	»Gesangsperiode« [Song Period]	16	8 / 8	Cross motif; Minim Progression; Lyrical Counterpoint; PD
421–34	»Trio <i>Fis-Dur</i> «	14		
421–28	Trio ...	8	8	Cross motif; Lyrical Counterpoint;
429–34	... to be continued	6	6 [= 3 / 3]	PD; <i>memento mori</i>
435–62	Trio, Chorale, Gregorian motif	28		
435–42	Trio developed (4 b. Viol., 4 b. Vc.)	8	8	Cross motif imit.
443–46	Chorale antic. in minims (Str.)	4	4	Chorale; Minim Progression
447–54	Song Period (inv.)	8	8	Cross motif inv.; Minim Progression inv.; PD
455–58	Gregorian motif	4	4	Cross motif and Minim Progression; Allusion to »Christ ist erstanden« and <i>memento mori</i>
459–62	Trio repet., Vc.	4	4	
463–78	UNISONO; PLENO; TRANSITION	16		
463–74	Double Unison; stringendo	12	12	Chorale antic.; Cross motif; Minim Progression
475–78	Pleno: Gregorian motif (rep.)	4	4	Cross motif; Minim Progression
479–96	TRANSITION	18		
479–88	Climax and reduction	10	10	Octave Fall; Triplet motif
489–96	Ascent; annunciation	8	8	Triplet motif; Adagio reminiscence (b. 13–6)
497–540	CHORALE + TE DEUM	44		
497–512	»2. Abtheilung: Choral <i>D-Dur</i> «	16	8 / 8	Chorale; Te Deum motif
513–24	Repeat (inverted; sustained four b. omitted)	12	12	Chorale inv.; Te Deum motif
525–32	Interjection (inverted)	8	8	Triplet motif rect., inv., imit.
533–40	Chorale variant	8	8	Chorale var.; Triplet motif rect., inv., imit.
541–56	HORN-THEMA	16		
541–48	Horn Theme	8	8	Triplet motif; <i>Halleluja</i> ; Octave Fall
549–56	Horn Theme repeated	8	8	<i>memento mori</i>
557–84	CODA INTROIT	28		
557–72	Motto (stasis); <i>memento mori</i>	16	8 / 8	Motto inv., imit. (Ob.: PD)
573–84	Condensation; crescendo	12	8 / 4	Elements from transition into Chorale (Part I)
585–604	PLENO (<i>Coagmentatio</i>)	20		
585–96	Fugue + Adagio + Scherzo + Main Theme	12	8 / 4	Overlay of four Main Themes in Pleno
597–604	Chorale (variant from b. 457ff.) + Te Deum	8	8	(Viol.: Cross motif; cf. Adagio, b. 235)
605–28	KADENZ [= Cadence]	24		
605–12	Chorale ascent	8	8	Cross motif; Te Deum
613–20	» <i>Ces</i> / <i>F</i> «: Fugue Theme inv.	8	8	+ triplets (Woodwinds); Motto
621–28	Pleno (Dominant Eleventh)	8	8	Motto; Trp. Fanfare and <i>memento mori</i>
629–65	HALLELUJA	37		
629–44	D pedalpoint; crescendo	16	8 / 8	Te Deum augm. dimin., rect., inv., imit.;
645–65	Pleno	21	8 / 4 / 4 / 5	Triplet motif; Te Deum; Minim Progression; <i>Halleluja</i>

A Brief Analysis with Special Reference to Musical Semantics

If one respects the images evoked by the ancient ›*Figurenlehre*‹ and ›*Affektenlehre*‹ (i. e., theories of emotional expression and figures), we can construct such a determined sequence of scenes from Bruckner's Ninth, that it would seem to be a perfect example of a *Sinfonia Characteristica*. The ›infra-musical programme‹ of this symphony, dedicated to the ›Dear Lord‹, appears to be a final study in musical eschatology. Following an analysis by Hartmut Krones in *Musik-Konzepte* Vol. 120–2, the question arises what in particular may be the function of the Finale within the context of such a symphony? To answer this, in the following analysis I have sketched some ideas which may serve as an illustration of such characteristic images. This is by no means intended to be comprehensive, but may be sufficient enough to provide some insights into the spiritual dimension of the movement which may explain some of its original features, and hence had to be respected also in considering a reconstruction and completed performing version.

The Motto from the very beginning (b. 4–6) one could characterize as ›Fall of Man‹, since it contains the ›Devil's‹ Tritone, a falling motion and a dotted rhythm. The crescendo preparing the Main Theme refers to the ›Gräberton As‹ (A flat as a ›tone of the tomb‹; see Krones), in the Lydian tone, thus symbolizing the Last Judgement, but also hope for Salvation. The tonal Cross motifs and sighs (b. 14ff) seem to paint in music a cemetery – much similar to the Apocalypse of St. John, with the dead climbing out of their graves (remember also the Mass in d minor, in which a similar scene preceding the *Resurrexit* seems to come straight from Weber's *Wolfs-Schlucht*). Directly before the Main Theme (b. 43), the music falls down into the dust, like a priest when entering the sacred Church, making the sign of the Cross, as also seems to be expressed in music here, if we note the motifs, as well as Bruckner's original *accelerando* and *diminuendo*. (A similar passage is to be found in the 1st Mvmt. of the Sixth Symphony, b. 189–94, however, both are unfortunately usually neglected by conductors in performance.)

Opposite to the 1st Mvmt., expressing perhaps only the ›Genesis principle‹ in general, the Main Theme of the Finale may express the manifestation of the Divine itself. Its immensity at least finds appropriate expression in the spectrum of all available chromatical notes. Good and Evil are intermingled with each other; the descending broken chords appear like a worm, perhaps the ›Old Dragon‹, roaring loud at the end, in that descending, diminished Seventh Chord we already know from the 1st Mvmt. of the Seventh (there: b. 243ff) and from the end of the *Aeterna fac* in the Te Deum, with the words ›in gloria‹. After this Apocalypse follows a trembling, contrite descent (b. 59–66) with repeated, helpless Cross symbols, finally ending in a Brass Chorale (b. 67–74) which seems to come directly from a tomb, in sheer despair, but is also reminiscent of that one before the Coda of the 1st Mvmt.

The poor Song Period (b. 75ff) may well express misery on earth. Since the chant derives directly from the Main Theme (as annotated by Bruckner himself), it may serve as a symbol for the Incarnation of Christ, who, according to Catholic dogma, took away the sins of the world by his death – note also the relentlessly repeated motifs in shape of a Cross. However, here is also an intimation of the expected salvation, the later Chorale Theme – if one fills up the upper line, one finds *g(-fis)-e(-d)-c-h*, hence, the beginning of the Chorale, transposed into G major. The Fl. solo above the Cross-shaped ascent of Klar. (b. 91) before the Trio then appears as looking up to Christ nailed to the Cross. The Trio itself is in F sharp major, a key which Leopold Nowak characterized as a typical symbol for Christ – a comforting music, disposed like a temporary refuge, a ›Paradise Island‹, as in the Adagio of the Sixth Symphony.

The following repeat of the Song Period first continues this idea in F major, G flat major and G major. But the Basses already move in *Fauxbordon* – an expression of doubt, or delusive security? The closing of the Song Period with the *Ges / F* pendulum (b. 125) forms a relentlessly repeated figure of sighs (*suspiratio*). The Bass line is hence a *passus duriusculus* (*G-Ges-F-E*), the Baroque ›difficult path‹, a descending chromatic line, symbolizing mourning for the death or sorrow in ancient Music Theory. The transition to the Chorale Theme exposes again the Motto from the very beginning of the movement, but now inverted and with an ascending chromatic line, thus to be interpreted as an effort to ›reverse the sin‹, or to resist. However, the mocking Klar. sits above all in sheer haughtiness.

The Chorale Theme itself (b. 157) must by all means stand for the Resurrection (E major); indeed, the Chorale of the Tubas from the Adagio (there: b. 29ff), which Bruckner named ›Farewell to life‹ returns here in glory. The Viol. figuration is taken from the *non confundar* triplet core in the Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt., an additional element of confidence in view of the monumental appearance. But the end of the Chorale falls back into resignation as, confronted by death, even faith cannot help (*passus duriusculus*; falling Octaves).

Harry Halbreich spoke once of his impression here of »the wreck of the *Titanic*«. This is also necessary in terms of a logical dramaturgy, since maintaining this glorious mood would make it impossible to continue the movement, and certainly Bruckner intended to hold back the final salvation for the closing section of the movement and the symphony itself.

The beginning of the 2nd Part (b. 209) constitutes a very long torpidity on a pedalpoint. Helplessly the Ob. calls a Gregorian-like motif in semibreves, reminding us of »*Christ ist erstanden*«, as being alone in the desert. Thus Bruckner musically creates almost an agony of pain and sorrow (*passus duriusculus*, the emptiness of the Te Deum ostinato). Even the Viol. rhythm, earlier so full of hope, now starved, being merely an endless murmuring of sighs (*e-dis*). But such a condition is most susceptible to temptation: new appearance of the diabolic Motto from the beginning, first as a sheer rhythm, later in its original shape (Ob.), finally in a full repeat of the opening sequence in eight bars, but now with the motif being developed simultaneously straight and inverted as well as in imitation (b. 244).

Then follows a second run, the ostinato begins anew, the music gradually gains confidence (Te Deum motif with climax in G flat major, hence connected with the key of Christ, F sharp major, b. 265). Temptation enters again, more strongly, but it ends abruptly and dissolves. This is, by the way, a structural parallel with the 1st Mvmt., where two calls of the Horn (b. 19ff), in full Brass now, follow two episodes, taken from material of the Introit. This is once again followed by an intermediate episode, now in e minor (b. 279), representing the Song Period in inversion. The »walking Basses« in pizzicato (again, just as in the 1st Mvmt.) suggest a certain confidence, but chromatic progressions and strange jumps in the melody also may show that the chosen path may remain elusive.

The following repeat of the Lyrical Counterpoint from the Song Period appears like a soothing reminiscence (b. 287), as well as the ensuing short »prayer«, significantly in A flat major (»*Gräberton*«, as explained above), but this is closed with a *memento mori* given in the sudden ascent and brutal Trp. fanfares, foreshadowing the sketched final cadence, a Dominant Eleventh. Again the Devil appears, within the significant Neapolitanic tension of *As-d*.

The Fugue would, according to Baroque semantics, represent »Supreme Divine Order and Principle«. The Exposition, using regular metrics in four bars, but exposing an uncommon fifth entry of the theme, seems to be affirmative, but is also accompanied with derivatives from the Motto in Woodwinds and Brass (b. 299). This is followed antithetically with the principle of »Questioning the Divine Order« in the Fugue's development, laid out in two parts of irregular metrics and in »sinful« harmony (diminished chords, Tritone progressions). The tripartite climax of the Fugue in 3x3 bars and descending Thirds appears as an enforcement of the divine principle, an utmost musical expression of Holy Trinity, but at the same time fierce and inescapable (c sharp, b flat and f sharp minor; b. 344).

Hence, this entire structure seems to be not an »ordinary« fugue, as for instance in the Finale of the Fifth, but merely a fugato-like scheme (as in the Recapitulation of the Closing Period in the Finale of the Eighth), giving the movement an additional semantic meaning with the principle of order. It should not be surprising that the usual main concern of a fugue, the synthesis of the contrapuntal potential of a theme, cannot be the subject here, since this is represented already by the ENTIRE movement as well as the elaboration of its sections. Every theme and important motif is successively developed in »Fields of Development« *in situ*, in the main forms of counterpoint – imitation, canon, in mirror, upright and inverted. Hence the entire Finale itself stands for the principles of development and synthesis. Within such a conception, a fugue could not possibly play a large, central role, as it was the case in the Finale of the Fifth, where the fugue had to serve as a focus of all thematic synthesis from the entire symphony.

The Epilogue of the Fugue, again in the »*Gräberton As*«, seems to mark the beginning of a new path of being confounded, with the Vc. murmuring a repeated »*non confundar in aeternum*« (b. 353). This is accompanied by the Main Theme (Klar., Vla.), already providing a coagmentation typical for a Baroque fugue. Even if this is followed again by descending chromatic lines, the instrumental fabric gains steadiness. This Toccata-like crescendo bears various quotations (for instance, the apocryphal *Toccata ex re* BWV 565, more likely by Johannes Ringk) and let us think about Bruckner playing the Organ, where alone he was allowed to be the sole sovereign. We also find allusions to the *Totenmarsch* (»March-past of the Dead«) from the Finale of the Eighth, *aeterna fac* from the Te Deum and the pugnacious Finale of the Sixth Symphony (b. 379). All this may stand for the fight with the »Old and Evil Enemy« as well as for a beginning of acceptance of the inevitable.

Then follows, like a sudden illumination, as a climax, a new theme on the Horns, making affirmative use of the *non confundar* in the ›Christian‹ G flat major (b. 385), however, again with an abrupt end. Once more, the *memento mori* appears as a principle of order here. We also get the impression that now an important break has been achieved – by the way, very close to the ›Golden Section‹ of the assumed total length of the CPV. As if the 2nd Part of the Finale were only beginning now (b. 405), here an important new process starts – the successive preparation and condensation of the main important motifs from the Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt. (Octave Fall, *passus duriusculus* with triplet core, diatonic ascent, Neapolitan cadence). This process, being so typical for Bruckner, is a strong argument for the *coagmentatio*, as realised in the Coda of this CPV – the ›Herankomponieren‹ (i. e., composing towards) to important structural points of the movement by long term compositional processes of preparation, especially observing the mutation of motifs. The increasingly ordered appearance of such elements could be justified only with the explicit re-appearance of the Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt. itself. Hence, the elements of the Recapitulation were intended as an intensification and affirmation of the entire processes of the 1st Part of the Finale.

The Song Period re-enters, but now less desolate than in the Exposition, and strengthened by the Christus idea, since the accompaniment in minims already contains the germ of the later ›Christ ist erstanden‹ (b. 409–12); likewise the following repeat of the ›Trio Fis Dur‹, now even further developed, and despite its spaciousness and the *Fauxbordon*. It closes with a comforting, descending Chorale of the Strings (b. 443), reminiscent to a similar idea of the Adagio (there: b. 155), but now in C flat major, a key which will be prominent also in the final cadence (b. 613). Harmony moves along now following the ›exercise in harmony‹ of the 1st Mvmt. (there: b. 19–26) in a contrary motion, from A flat major to d minor. Bruckner himself sketched a derivative from the beginning motif of the Trio as an imitation of the Fl. (b. 435f), supporting the idea of a mutation process towards the re-appearance of the Main Theme from the 1st Mvmt.

Most significantly, the following transition (b. 463) to the Chorale Theme nowhere contains the diabolic Motto anymore, but, opposed to this, the Gregorian-like ›Christ ist erstanden‹. Furthermore, the melodic line anticipates the Chorale Theme itself (*ces-b-as-ges-fes-es*), and the Toccata Rhythm will soon be conquered by the triplet figuration. Bruckner makes the transmutation from Song Period into Chorale Theme happen almost in front of us. The climax, following a crescendo in double unison as outlined by Bruckner, represents the first break-through of the Tonic and thus confirms regained order in the ›Key of the Kings and the Divine‹, D (b. 475).

Some last doubts (chromatic ascent above a pedalpoint) are soon wiped out by an exalted music in the ›Christian‹ G flat major, which almost sounds a little insane, but also answers an old question: the ascending scales from Vla. and Klar. repeat music from the Adagio (b. 15/16), which was there followed by a massive Cross motif built on a *Quinta deficiens*. But here, the Trp. triplets quote the *lumen de lumine* from Bruckner's Mass in d minor (see also later the ending of the Chorale Recapitulation). The re-introduction of the triplet in the Strings (b. 479) also initiates a further sequence of mutations, now on the triplet core of the Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt.

But now, in the Finale, this is not followed by doubts about Christ, as in the Adagio (b. 17–28), but a re-affirmation of the Chorale in the royal key D major (b. 497). This is consequently followed by a ›return to salvation‹ – here the precise inversion of the Chorale in Woodwinds and Strings, leading up to the light. At the same time, the form proceeds in the reverse of the Exposition (there A-B-A'; here A-A'‹^{inv}–B'‹^{inv}). Additionally this is followed by a first repeat of the String Chorale in C flat major from b. 443ff, now in mirror and augmented to eight bars. The music can even become quite playful here, and not only elaborated – note the intricate multiple imitation of the triplet core, again enriched by the *lumen de lumine* (Trp., b. 525). The overlay of the Chorale Theme and the Te Deum motif again represents a Baroque *coagmentatio* (note for instance the surviving sections from Bach's *Contrapunctus XIV*). Also this demonstrates that for the very ending Bruckner already must have had a different idea in mind. A further simple repeat of the Chorale Theme and Te Deum in the Coda would not be possible, since Bruckner would certainly have avoided presenting such an important argument twice.

The return of the *non confundar* Horn Theme in G flat major (b. 541) makes a formal bracket with the Fugue's Epilogue, but also forms an intensification of the triplet core from the Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt., as already indicated by the Strings which relentlessly repeat *Cis*, the leading note to the Tonic. The CPV added here fittingly the Octave Fall in the Basses, which represents the head of the Main Theme. Hence, the Epilogue Theme reveals itself to be merely a substitute of the Main Theme itself, and not so much its herald. It seems as if Bruckner were reserving the Main Theme itself for the coagmentation.

This also makes some sense if we re-visit the Finale of the Eighth Symphony. There, Bruckner needed to re-introduce, firstly, the sheer rhythm from the Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt. at the end of the Exposition (the Hrn. in the ›March-past of the dead‹), and then to almost stage its full return before the coda, much in the manner of an ›arrival of the king‹, and all this only with the aim to make the re-appearance of the truncated Main Theme in the final bars of the symphony plausible and audible. But differently from the Ninth, in the Eighth there is almost no preparation of this re-entry by mutation of partial motifs of the Main Theme. Furthermore, the final tableaux of the Eighth is so well staged, that one would easily overlook the fact that it is not so much a full coagmentation of all themes, but only one of their truncated beginnings, and in a very simple variant in C major. On the other hand, and most remarkably, the structure of the themes in the Ninth would allow for their complete coagmentation. They even seemed to be invented for such a purpose, particularly if we consider the change which Bruckner undertook in the Finale Theme, which had an *E* in its 3rd b. in the Exposition, hence would be impossible to bring together with the Main Theme from the 1st Mvmt., but which was changed then to *E flat* in the Fugue Theme, making it thus ready to be combined. This was quite as much the case in the Fifth Symphony, where Bruckner combined the Finale Theme and Chorale in the Fugue, but in the Coda brought together the Fugue Theme with the Main Theme from the 1st Mvmt. With a *coagmentatio* as outlined in the CPV, an ultimate idea of synthesis would have been achieved.

The Coda (b. 557) begins with a recurrence for a last time of the diabolic Motto, but again inverted, and somehow overcoming. Temptation circulates within itself, and also the *passus duriusculus*, now explicitly in the rhythm of the *Todesverkündigung* from the Eighth Symphony (b. 559, see also already b. 292 ff), seems to be helpless here. How could one, from the understanding of Baroque semantic meaning in Church music, characterize more fittingly that death will lose his power? Furthermore, the processes of preparing the return of the Main Themes continue in a condensed manner. In the *coagmentatio* of those themes (b. 585ff), the principle of synthesis would find its utmost expression. At the same time this and the following cadence constitutes a point of *catharsis*, to finally overcome all the fear and anger. The Adagio theme, an extreme *exclamatio*, finds an ultimate resolution in the presence of the Divine (Main Theme of the 1st Mvmt.), of power (Scherzo Theme) and order of God (Fugue Theme). Such a cataclysmic event would then, as usually in Bruckner, require a field of gradual reduction. The CPV added here a last repeat of the Chorale Theme (b. 597), but in the manner as already prepared by Bruckner at the end of the Recapitulation (b. 533–40), and now in the version as presented much earlier in the Strings (b. 443ff), augmented to eight bars and transposed into D major, in Pleno. This works here so sufficiently, since the Chorale which doubtlessly represents Christ, finds fulfillment in the final, Cross-like Fourths (*es-b-c-g*), once more the ›*Gralsglocken*‹ from *Parsifal*. Hence we find almost a dramatic condensation of the main contents of Passion: the *passus duriusculus* in the ensuing crescendo, the Last Judgement (Coagmentation), Christ the Mighty on the Cross dying for us, then the intimate, chorale-like Ascension (605ff), a last appearance of the Devil's Neapolitan sequence *Ces/F* (613ff), its power ultimately broken by the mighty annunciation of the law (inverted Fugue Theme in the Basses, b. 613ff), all this formed in a long, ascending procession. And then the Dominant Eleventh Pleno (b. 621ff), with fanfares of Last Judgement (Trp.). However, the ›Old Dragon‹ is already on the ground and gives his last roar; hence this climax should not supercede the parallel field in the Adagio. Then a moment of amazement in a last *memento mori* – and the final ›Song of Praise‹ can freely unfold itself, like the Phoenix from the Ashes, on the sketched Tonic pedalpoint (b. 629ff), using the ›Jacob's ladder‹, the *non confundar*-like *Halleluja*. This passage from the Te Deum and Psalm 150, transposed into D major (*d-e-fis-a-d-e-fis*), brings the symphony to a convincing end, in particular if we consider that the germ of this material was already in its beginning (notes of the Hrn. in the 1st Mvmt., b. 1–18: *d-f-d-a-d-e-d*, or in ascending order *d-e-f-a-d*). Hence this is a logical, ultimate symbol of eternity and permanence, similar to the final affirmations of the preceding symphonies, and a fitting end for this work dedicated to the ›Dear Lord‹.

Bruckner's final Finale represents an economy and stringency of musical architecture deserving special praise. Every element has found its place. The characteristic images and scenes as described here coincide with Bruckner's comprehensive scientific approach in composing. This can also be seen from the manner in which Bruckner's complex order allows all themes and motifs to be developed systematically and ingeniously in all their various possibilities of elaboration in counterpoint – rect., inv., in mirror, augmented, diminished, imitated, truncated and coagmented in their various forms. Bruckner's extraordinary innovations culminate in the Finale of the Ninth in the synthesis of Baroque elements and most modern harmony, as one can even see with great clarity from the fragmented, surviving material.

[Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, revised 23. 12. 2006]