

Anton Bruckner's Second Symphony: Versions, Variants and their Critical Editions

by Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs (Bremen, April 2009)

The Versions, Variants and Editions of Symphony N° II

There are at least two versions of Symphony N° II in roughly five phases:

II/1a	Sketches ca. September; Score 11. 10. 1871 – 11. 9. 1872 (rehearsed under Dessoff in October 1872)
II/1b	Revisions until 26. 10. 1873 (first performance conducted by Bruckner)
II/2a	Revisions until 20. 2. 1876 (second performance conducted by Bruckner)
II/2b	Revisions of 1877 (as part of the revision period of Symphonies I to IV before finishing N° V)
II/2c	Revisions until 1892 (in preparation of the Doblinger first print edition, November 1892), as first performed by Hans Richter (25. 11. 1894)

For these phases, the sources were for the first time examined by Robert Haas, described in his extensive *Vorlagenbericht* (1938), and revisited by Prof. William Carragan for his new editions. Carragan obviously came to some different views on the chronology of their gestation; however, his Critical Report has not yet been published, and only some information can be taken from the prefaces of his new editions of 2005 and 2007 resp. in the *Bruckner-Gesamt-Ausgabe* (=BGA). These extant sources are:

- Autograph score (*Österreichische Nationalbibliothek*, Mus. Hs. 19.474) (= Haas A)
- Score copy, begun by Tenschert, from the office of Hlawaczek in Vienna, and completed by Carda in autumn 1872 (*ÖNB* Mus. Hs. 6035), containing revisions by Bruckner and also serving as engraver's copy for the first print edition, revised by Bruckner and Cyril Hynais in 1892. (= Haas D)
- Set of parts by Carda and four other copyists from 1872, (today in St. Florian) (= Haas C)
- A violin part for a discarded, long solo in the Adagio, copied by Carda (*ÖNB*, Mus. Hs. 6061 / = Haas M)
- Score copy by Carda of the same period (*ÖNB*, Mus. Hs. 6034), containing further revisions by Bruckner. (= Haas B)
- Discarded bifolios from Mus. Hs. 6034, in *ÖNB* (Mus. Hs. 6059 & 6060 / = Haas I), Kremsmünster (= Haas K) and in private possession (= Haas L)
- Score copy, prepared in 1877 by Franz Hlawaczek (today *Wienbibliothek*, MH 6781/c), dedication copy for Franz Liszt, who did not accept the dedication. (= Haas G)
- Four discarded score bifolios, today in the *ÖNB* (Mus. Hs. 6023 / = Haas E), Kremsmünster and in private possession. (= Haas F)
- FPE (= first print edition, Doblinger, pl. nr. D.1769, November 1892 / = Haas H)

If for a moment we do not take account of the editions which exist today, let us consider which variants of the symphony should best be considered a ›version‹, and which not. For this, we would first have to define what a ›version‹ is. The most important criterion seems to be this: a ›version‹ should be a score which was once performed, or at least intended for performance (represented, for instance, by the existence of orchestral parts), and at a certain point considered to be ›finished‹ by the composer himself. Another criterion should perhaps be the existence of a printed edition, in particular if we have more than one of them, as in the case of N° III (October 1878, and November 1890, Theodor Rättig, Vienna), which clearly represent two different versions with significant changes. A third, major criterion would be: are there changes so significant that they change the perception of the work as a whole? This would include, in particular, major cuts or amendments, and movements composed entirely anew, as in the case of Symphonies N° I (new Scherzo), N° IV (new Scherzo and Finale), and N° VIII (new Trio). Anything else would be merely a ›variant‹ or ›correction‹.

Haas obviously had similar views on Symphony N° II: Phases 1a & b he called the symphony's *1. Fassung*, also arguing that all corrections and changes of 1872/3 are included in the autograph score, but not the later revisions. II/1a (Mus. Hs. 19.474) is of particular interest, because the order of movements was different for a while: the Scherzo was placed second. However, one should best refer to this reversed order of the inner movements merely as an initial phase, because the surviving full set of parts and the early score copies show that already when it was played in a rehearsal of the Vienna Philharmonic under Otto Dessoff (between the 23rd and 26th of October 1872, in the presence of Franz Liszt), Bruckner had changed the order to the conventional schedule, with the Scherzo placed third. II/1b represents the shape of the symphony in which Bruckner himself performed it for the first time, including further revisions in the 1872 parts, some of them even from the time of the rehearsals.

The text of what Haas called *2. Fassung* and *3. Fassung* is all included in the copies, the one which is obviously the first of them (Haas: D) serving for the engraving. II/2a contains those revisions prepared by Bruckner for his second performance in 1876. II/2b is the revision made in 1877, part of a workphase in which, before completing Symphony N° V, he revised all of his valid earlier symphonies, mainly for the purpose of metrical regulation of bar periods. II/2c constitutes, finally, the FPE, prepared by Bruckner himself in collaboration with Cyril Hynais. According to Haas, who spoke of three versions, three different volumes would be required for them. However, the editors of the *BGA* chose a different approach:

- *Symphony N° II, ›Originalfassung‹ BGA 1938 (Robert Haas)*

The first critical edition of Symphony N° II was the one prepared by Haas in 1938. As we can see from its preface (February 1938), Haas tried to achieve a unique ›best of‹ version, based on the 1877 text, but incorporating numerous bars from the earlier version as well – a dubious approach. To his credit, however, one should not overlook the fact that the original 1938 edition contains the score as well as his extensive *Vorlagenbericht*, in which he offers all variants and revisions as musical examples, all within the same volume. This enabled every conductor to include whichever of those variants he wished.

- *›Version 1877‹, BGA 1965 (Leopold Nowak)*

When Leopold Nowak revised this edition in 1965, he merely prepared a corrected reprint of the Haas score, even if eliminating some of the passages from II/1, but not all. So Nowak's edition remained a ›mixed version‹. He never published the different versions of the symphony.

- *›Version 1872‹, BGA 2005 (William Carragan)*

Because he has been working on the sources for Symphony N° II for many years, William Carragan was chosen by the *BGA* to prepare new editions of both versions of the symphony. However, in a way his first edition of the first version conflates various work phases between 1872 and 1876 and even includes indications from the first print edition, making it not entirely reliable as a pure text as Nowak would have seen it.

- *›Version 1877‹, BGA 2007 (William Carragan)*

Carragan's edition of the second version is basically FPE of 1892, presented anew in a scholarly fashion, and offering alternative endings for the first and last movements. This seems to be justified, since FPE was indeed prepared under Bruckner's supervision, and Carragan's edition makes a clear distinction between those additions and the 1877 text. On the other hand, the Andante includes an optional cut (b. 48–69) with material from the older version. So even if this score is welcome on the whole, it also in a way replaces Haas' and Nowak's older ›mixed versions‹ with a new ›mixed version‹ and leaves some questions unanswered.

Haas's *Vorlagenbericht* is out of print and only available from some libraries, but for the moment it remains the only extensive source for examining the philology of the symphony more closely and, despite its obvious errors and mistakes, has been used here, since Prof. Carragan has not yet published his Critical Report. Only recently he has provided his article ›Some Notes on Editing Bruckner's Second Symphony‹, published in *The Bruckner Journal* (Vol. 13, N° 1, March 2009, p. 27–30), also containing some information not to be found at all in the prefaces of his two scores: It looks as if some fundamental insight came to him only after finishing his editorial work. For instance, in the preface of his 2007 edition of the 1877 version, he called Mus. Hs. 19.474 the ›composition score‹. However, from his TBJ notes we now learn that perhaps another, earlier manuscript score may have existed, which may have been used for copying the parts, and perhaps was only ›discarded when Bruckner moved into the Belvedere‹. (4th July 1895)

Unfortunately, not only playing indications from FPE found their way into the new II/1 edition which are alien to Bruckner's style of 1872 (however musically justified they might be or not), but also for both versions the prefaces suggest a slower tempo for the second theme of the outer movements, due to a tradition established from ›some early recordings‹, but despite the fact that, as Carragan himself observed, Bruckner in no source indicated such a slower tempo. Following this suggestion would mean to eliminate the rustic, polka-like character of these sections and make the tempo question even more difficult than it is already. It reads fine in the TBJ notes that ›of course the conductor does not need to follow these markings‹. But the preface of the 1872 score nowhere explicitly indicates these additions as being optional – just the opposite, it implicitly suggests them to be essential. An editor whose polemic is very critical to those editors and conductors who ›perpetuate a falsehood‹ because they continue to prefer those old editions (this comment here is not to excuse them!), should perhaps be more careful himself not to obtrude his own extraneous interpretative ideas on others. Such suggestions are poison for those conductors who blindly follow the ›holy word‹ of a ›critical edition‹ (as recent recordings of II/1 painfully reveal), and they are in a way something of an impediment to any conductor seriously interested in historically informed performance practice. All this brings the poor conductor who has to decide on an edition of Symphony N° II into a real quandary, since none of the existing ›critical editions‹ is entirely reliable.

The following observations are intended to provide some insights which might be of help in deciding upon which edition to perform. For the conductor, of particular interest is this question: how different does II/1 sound, and why should it be performed? Let us now have a closer look at II/1 and roughly compare it with II/2. Limited space here does not allow us to go too far into detail; only the most important differences will be indicated, based on the two editions by Carragan, if necessary referring to Nowak, Haas's Critical Report and FPE.

Symphony N° II, ›Fassung 1872‹: Differences to the ›Fassung 1877‹

First Movement. Allegro. Ziemlich schnell.

As a basic tempo indication, II/1 gives ›Allegro. Ziemlich schnell‹; the 1877 version ›Moderato‹. Bruckner gave 4/4 throughout in the autograph and first copy, but already some of the 1872 parts have alla breve, likewise FPE (›Moderato‹, 2/2). However, from a conducting point of view as well as observing the motion of the harmony, the movement would have to be conducted in two. (Bruckner gives no original metronome markings in the entire symphony.) Only a few sections were reworked later, mostly due to corrections of the metrical structure, as we can see from Haas's Critical Report. (Unfortunately, Carragan's editions do NOT give the metrical numbers.)

The entire exposition (b. 1–184) remained formally the same. There are only a few points where the structure has been changed: Between b. 257 (II/1) and 272, Bruckner made several metrical corrections, deleting, repeating or adding numerous bars, making the text of II/2 ten bars shorter than in 1872, and from **L**, there is a difference of ten bars between the two versions, as follows. **I**, II/1: = b. 251–60 (10 bars); II/2: = b. 251–58 (8 bars); **K**, 1872: = b. 261–84 (24 bars); II/2: = b. 259–74 (16 bars). Following b. 327 (II/1), Bruckner deleted two bars, reducing three general rests to one, so that **M** is at b. 330 in II/1 and at b. 318 in II/2. The beginning of the coda was longer in 1872: The first 32 bars, b. 500–31 (II/1), were given as optional cut by Haas and Nowak (Haas/Nowak: b. 488–519), and for II/2 were fully left out by Carragan, because these bars are not extant in the sources except the autograph of 1872. Hence, **S** of II/1 (b. 532) corresponds with **R** of II/2 (b. 488). For metrical reasons, the bar following 546 (II/2: = b. 502) was deleted (= II/1, b. 547), likewise the general rest before **T** (II/1; b. 557). So in all, in II/1, from **S** to **T** there were 26 bars, corresponding with **R** to **S** of II/2, of 24 bars only. In order to make sure that the final bar of the coda would end on an odd, heavy bar, Bruckner added one bar at the end later. In II/1 there were four bars only (as also in Haas), in II/2 five bars, adding one bar after 580 of 1872 (II/2: = b. 535). The entire movement had 583 bars in II/1, and 538 bars in II/2, so it was, in all, shortened by 45 bars. There are also only a few instrumental retouches: In b. 129–35 the trombones have got a different text, likewise in b. 446–50 (II/1; = b. 434–40 of II/2). In b. 194/5, Bruckner added bassoons in II/2, in b. 197/8 trumpets, and in b. 558–62 (II/1; = 512–16 of II/2) first clarinet, always presenting an inversion of the main theme. A few further changes occur regarding tempi, articulation and dynamics, but they can be considered marginal. In all, surprisingly large sections of the movement remained untouched.

Second Movement. Scherzo: Schnell. Trio: Gleiches Tempo.

Carragan insisted in presenting the Scherzo second place, but as explained, Bruckner himself gave up this early idea already at a time when the copying of parts was still under preparation. Perhaps following an idea by Herbeck, Bruckner also decided to eliminate all the repeats of the sections; according to Haas he did this quite early, thus making the entire movement half as long as it was in 1872. The tempo was quicker in 1872, due to the length of the movement. After eliminating the repeats, Herbeck suggested ›Mäßig schnell‹ only, which was kept by Bruckner and found its way into the first print, too. Also, some general rests have been deleted in II/2. At the end of the Scherzo, b. 124 was additionally repeated in II/2, making it one bar longer before the Trio. At the beginning of the coda, in II/2 Bruckner added two general rests (b. 125bis and 126 of II/2) and indicated to jump over b. 125, going directly from b. 124 to 125bis. In II/1, there was a literal repeat of the 124 bars of the Scherzo, and then going into the coda, which had no general rests. Also at the end of the coda, Bruckner included one further bar in II/2 and changed the text from the six bars of b. 149–54 (II/1) to seven bars in II/2 (b. 151–7), again with the purpose to end with an odd, heavy bar of a period. So in all, the Scherzo repeat with coda has three bars more than in II/1. There were only a few further instrumental retouches: b. 51–4 has two flutes in II/1, one in II/2, likewise the clarinets in b. 57–61. In the Trio, Bruckner only deleted the repeats and four general rests from II/1 (b. 1/2, 40/41), thus making it four bars shorter in 1877.

Third Movement. Adagio. Feierlich, etwas bewegt.

The slow movement was later given a quicker tempo, ›Andante‹ instead of ›Adagio‹. However, ›Feierlich, etwas bewegt‹ remained in both versions. The movement was only slightly longer, 211 bars instead of 209 in II/2. **B**. 28 of II/1 was deleted, so **B** is b. 35 in II/1, b. 34 in II/2. Other metrical corrections occurred only towards the end: At **O**, in II/1 Bruckner had a general rest at b. 182, deleted in II/2, making **O** there b. 180. Before **Q**, b. 201 of II/1 was deleted, making **Q** b. 199 in II/2. On the other hand, one bar was added in II/2 – b. 206, again creating an odd period here (10 b. in II/1, 11 b. in II/2), bringing the final bar to an odd, heavy bar.

A real pity is Prof. Carragan's way of presenting the music following **K**: because of his plan to present the earliest possible concept of the symphony, it was impossible for him to include the 1873 variant of this long crescendo, which included an extensive violin solo, from **K** to **N**, obviously suggested by Herbeck. This variant with violin solo was performed by Bruckner in 1876; he only discarded this idea when he prepared FPE. Haas gives the final text of this variant from p. 50 to 55 of his Critical Report. The initial version from **K** onwards is included in II/1. The layout is much different in II/2, with an easier violin figuration in sextuplets instead of the later quintuplets. Bruckner also changed numerous details of the instrumentation later. In II/1 there is one bar more after **M** (b. 169), deleted in II/2. There are also some further revisions of the instrumentation. In particular, II/1 has in b. 144–6 the melody in the first violins; in II/2 (b. 143–5) this was given to the violas instead. As already mentioned, at the very end II/1 gave a beautiful horn solo (b. 203–9), which was recomposed for clarinet and viola for the 1873 performance (II/2, b. 200–7). In all, the movement has 211 bars in II/1, 209 bars in II/2.

Fourth Movement. Finale. Mehr schnell.

The Finale contains more different passages than the other movements. In II/1 it is 806 bars long, in II/2 193 bars less, in all only 613. Firstly, II/1 has eight general rests which were deleted in II/2, namely b. 52, b. 77/8, 237/8, 482, 567, and 694. (Haas's report is not accurate here, see p. 22* of his *Vorlagenbericht*.) Other sections were recomposed in II/2: The period from b. 121–8 was shortened from eight to six bars. The beginning of the development is ten bars longer in II/1, later reducing 14 bars (b. 237–50) to four only (II/2, 232–35). Several times recomposed later was the passage following b. 305 to 402 of II/1, in all 98 bars, which were replaced with 38 bars only (II/2: b. 290–327). **N** of II/1 corresponds with **M** of II/2. At the end of the recapitulation of the main theme, II/1 has three bars more (b. 507–9; see b. 430–31 of II/2). Recomposed and shortened was also the passage from b. 601 to 638, from 38 to 19 bars, corresponding with b. 521–39 of II/2. Between b. 639–66, II/1 has 28 bars more, including a repeat from the string chorale at the end of the exposition (II/1: b. 205ff), entirely left out in II/2. Also the first part of the coda, II/1 b. 695–760, was later cut, even if regretted by Bruckner, who was obviously never fully convinced of this idea. (See below.) In some other places Bruckner later revised the instrumentation, but these retouches are by no means extensive.

The First Version: Résumé

It seemed to be perhaps a good start to trace back the earliest concept to be made out from the sources, as Prof. Carragan also explained in his TBJ notes. But the score is not entirely consistent in this regard, because it incorporates obviously later phases as well, even if for good reason. Hence, his ›Version 1872‹ incorporates some (but not all) changes from 1873 to 1876. For the very ending of the Finale, he offered the different phases from 1872, 1873 and 1876, indicated by him as an alternative. Particularly questionable is his decision to place the Scherzo second, and clearly for dogmatic reasons only, as Carragan explained in his preface (p. XII): »At any rate this edition is intended to present the symphony in its earliest concept, and therefore must place the Scherzo as second movement.« Carragan presents only one argument to support this idea, suggesting the symphony was »consciously modeled on the great Ninth of Beethoven«. On the contrary, there is not much thematic material in common; Bruckner's symphony has of course no choral finale and, more significantly, its first movement is much closer related to the first movement of Beethoven's Third, as already evident from the main theme, and to Beethoven's Fifth as well (note only the important triplet head of the Finale theme, similar to the famous ›fate motif!‹). On the other hand, Bruckner's Second seems to be the first emanation of an idea recurring in the following symphonies as well – but not entirely clear from the f-minor Symphony, Symphony N° I, and the d-minor Symphony: the idea of a kind of a monumentalized ›Post-Beethovenian‹ symphony.

Bruckner's decision to replace the horn solo at the end of the slow movement with clarinet and violas may be the result of experiencing a bad playing, perhaps already during the rehearsal under Dessoff – even if it may be a correct observation that this change perhaps also occurred, as Carragan wrote, and due to instrument-maker Andreas Jungwirth, »because of inherent problems with the instruments themselves, which tended to render that note more falsely as they became worn out.« However, Bruckner himself, in his own performances in 1873 and 1876, obviously preferred the clarinet / viola variant, as it is to be found in II/2. However, in practical editions it would have been better to include in both scores both versions indicated as optional, and if only for musical reasons, as previously Nowak had decided, because today for horn players it is no problem anymore. The passages which Bruckner later recomposed are interesting and daring, but I can't help but feel that most of the recomposed passages seem to be more effective for the symphony as a whole. (On the other hand, not all later cuts are entirely convincing.)

In his TBJ notes, Prof. Carragan made the accusation that Haas's edition of N° II was »a lie«, but his arguments to support this can be likewise taken against his approach to editing the 1872 version: Like Haas in his edition of the Seventh Symphony, Carragan tried to »reconstruct« and establish an earliest-possible »beginning point« of the symphony which was, however, clearly never intended to be performed as such. Despite this, I think it is important to know and perform this edition, but the conductor should carefully study its problems. The conductor should be aware that the 1892 indications were not part of the 1872 version and should be treated circumspectly. I suggest that if the 1872 ending of the Finale is performed, the impractical 4th trombone part should be ignored; indeed, it may be even better to choose the 1876 ending that Carragan offers as an alternative. The position of the Scherzo in the symphony, and its repeats, should be left to the decision of the conductor. There are unfortunately some printing mistakes also (wrong notes and errors in articulation and dynamics). The BGA should consider a thoroughly corrected reprint of the score or provide a detailed corrigenda list.

Symphony N° II, »Fassung 1877«: Differences between the Editions of Haas, Nowak and Carragan

First Movement. Moderato.

All three editions differ in length: Haas gave 569 bars, Nowak 570, Carragan 538 only, and this for two reasons: at the very end of the movement, Haas decided to re-introduce the original ending of II/1, which was only four bars long. Nowak replaced this with the corrected, longer version of 1877, in which Bruckner inserted one more bar after the first one (Nowak: 567). The reason why Bruckner added this one bar is explained by Wolfgang Grandjean in his book *Metrik und Form bei Bruckner* (Tutzing 2001, p. 120f): in the final bars of his earlier versions, Bruckner preferred to place the final sound at even bars of a period, corresponding with the theory of Johann Christian Lobe. But in his revisions after 1876 he developed a new system of weighting, creating what Grandjean calls the »arsis/thesis-pendulum«, establishing final sounds at odd bars of a period.

Both Haas and Nowak give in bar 566 a continuation of the triplet rhythm of the trumpets, as it was evident from 1877. In Prof. Carragan's edition (b. 534) this was eliminated altogether. This trumpet is not in II/1, and also not in the variant from FPE, which Carragan gives as an alternative ending on p. 60–62 of his score. Only from Carragan's TBJ notes we learn that in fact Mus. Hs. 19.474 provides these notes (as already reported by Haas) with a repeat sign, but that the parts from Bruckner's first performances don't have them at all. This makes the repeat sign in the autograph score likely to be a writing mistake of Bruckner, requiring an editorial decision. But why did the preface of the score not provide this information, which is important for the curious conductor?

At the beginning of the coda, Haas had included 32 bars from II/1, but indicating them as optional (b. 488 »Vi—«; b. 520 »—de«). Nowak did not eliminate this and other cuts, because he prepared his edition from the plates for the Haas edition; he obviously wanted to avoid the preparation of entirely new plates. Carragan consequently excluded these bars from his edition. Hence, his bars 488 to 538 correspond more or less with Nowak's bars 520 to 570. The alternative ending is two bars longer, bringing the final period now to seven bars. B. 522a–533a of this are not substantially different, but introduce a strange subito *f cresc.* at 530a, and then only *ff* at 534a instead of the throughout *fff* of Nowak and Haas. (*ff cresc.* and *fff* would be more convincing here.)

There is at least one instance where I wonder about the irregular metrical structure of the original itself: regarding bars 177 to 184, the general rest at b. 177 seems to be wrong, because the two bar structure clearly indicates b. 178 as heavy, 179 as light, and continuing so. This has the effect that suddenly b. 184 seems to be ›heavy‹, connecting directly with another, ›heavy‹ 185, breaking the ›arsis-thesis-pendulum‹ to such an extent that sometimes conductors and even horn players are irritated here. Bruckner might have felt that already himself when, in 1892, he added ›rit.‹ in b. 184. Personally I would even dare to correct him here in performance, eliminating b. 177 altogether, but inserting a second bar at the end of the horn solo instead (first bar: semibreve, tied to second bar minim, and last note augmented from crotchet to minim).

Second Movement. Andante. Feierlich, etwas bewegt.

Haas's tempo indication ›Adagio‹ was taken from II/1. The correct ›Andante‹ refers more clearly to the tempo relationship to the first movement (crotchets = minims). In all three critical editions, the movement is 209 bars long. However, as Carragan and Haas explained in their prefaces, there is a passage which Bruckner wished to be excluded – b. 48–69. In fact this music is not included in FPE, which has 187 bars only. Carragan explains this omission as being on account of the exposed horn note in b. 67, but this note occurs quite often in the symphony, also in *p* or *pp* situations. Both argue this cut would disturb the formal balance of the movement. Hence, all three editions include this passage, but mark them with »Vi—« »—de«, leaving the cut to the discretion of the conductor. On the other hand, this theme will be developed more extensively later (b. 107–48), and the cut was obviously Bruckner's decision. Strictly speaking, all three editions represent a ›mix‹ here, including material from II/1.

Other problems occur at the ending of the movement: Haas used the ending from II/1 from b. 180, which is metrically different. (One extra bar at 180, one bar less at 206.) As we know, this ending has a beautiful horn solo. In the revised version he decided to replace this with violas and clarinet, respecting the limitations of the horn of that time, or of its player. However, today there are no such limitations, even if the solo is still difficult. Nowak had found a very practical solution: he gave both endings, adding the revised version with clarinet and violas as p. 73* and 74*, thus leaving the decision to the conductor. For musical reasons every conductor will be happy about that choice. Carragan gives the revised ending only, leaving the horn solo for the end of his ›1872 Version‹. Grandjean notes that at the end of the Andante Bruckner may have overlooked a metrical revision, because it ends untypically with an even bar, but this is correct only for the early horn ending of II/1. In the revision Bruckner added one bar, repeating the seventh (Carragan, b. 206), making the pedalpoint 11 bars long.

The slurs from the 1892 edition in the opening theme look rather strange. All earlier scores show that Bruckner originally wanted to have this theme played not legato, but only sostenuto, characteristically ›gezogen‹, creating a contrast to the legato passages from b. 17 onwards. The only slur which seems to make real sense is the one in the head of the theme, in b. 2 (1. to 2.), since this is a typical *suspiratio* and hard to be imagined without a slur. But regarding all other additions, the conductor should thoroughly reconsider the articulation. A good decision was to correct Bruckner's wrong notation of the duplets in 12/8 meter between b.150 and 171, changing Bruckner's crotchet-duplets into the correct quaver-duplets (see also Symphony N° IX, Trio, song period, b. 53ff, with correct quaver-duplets in 3/8 meter).

Third Movement. Scherzo. Mäßig schnell. Trio. Gleiches Tempo.

The Scherzo is in all three editions less problematic. However, Haas had included the repeats of the Scherzo (b. 48, 124) and Trio sections (b. 37, 121) from II/1, deleted by Nowak and Carragan. This explains why, if observed, performances of the Haas edition have a Scherzo which lasts much longer – and even more so when the repeats are also respected in the Scherzo da capo, as indeed should happen then: Bruckner most likely respected the classical convention that in Scherzos or Minuets in the da capo the repeats must be done; when composers did not wish them, they usually wrote »da capo ma senza replica« (see Neal Zaslaw, *Mozart's Symphonies: Context, Performance Practice, Reception*, Oxford 1989, p. 502ff). Before the beginning of the coda, Haas again chose the ending from II/1. Nowak and Carragan repeat Haas's bar 123 and then go *dal segno* into the coda, which has two general rests in Nowak and Carragan, but not in Haas. Also the Tempi are different: Haas gave ›Schnell‹, due to the repeats, Nowak and Carragan ›Mäßig schnell‹. In addition, Carragan offers an editorial slower tempo for the middle section of the Scherzo (b. 65–84), but without any reference to a source. This is strange in particular if we remember that even the Trio itself has no slower tempo, but expressedly ›gleiches Tempo‹. Carragan also gives some different rehearsal figures. In the Trio, Carragan corrected numerous omissions of slurs and small mistakes regarding the articulation. The old editions are much less reliable here.

Fourth Movement. Finale. Mehr schnell.

Also in the Finale, the length is different in all three versions: Haas has 698 bars, Nowak even 702, Carragan and FPE have 613. The difference of four bars between Haas and Nowak is because after b. 647 and 649 of his edition Haas twice replaced two general rests with an editorial Fermata, reinstated from II/1 by Nowak (hence, for his edition, a new plate for p. 148 had to be prepared). Carragan's new edition eliminated, as in FPE, two cuts which Haas/Nowak indicated as optional with »Vi–« »–de«. The first cut of 23 bars occurs at Haas b. 540–62 (Carragan: between b. 539 and 540), the second, of 62 bars, at Haas b. 590–651 (Carragan: between 566 and 567). For musical reasons, the second cut is indeed to be regretted, because it eliminates not only the half of the coda, but also reminiscences of themes from the first movement. This being a generally shorter version, the shortened coda seems to make musical sense; on the other hand, the remaining coda of 47 bars seems altogether too short for such a lengthy symphony. Carragan again offers here, as an alternative, the ending from FPE as changed by Bruckner himself in 1892 (b. 591a–613a). This is of particular interest, because the ›non confundar‹-like motif of the trumpets is here supported by trombones, creating a real third element next to the string unison and wind ostinato, and thus achieving a much better balance than the 1877 ending, in which trumpets and trombones played the ostinato as well – a real improvement and musically one of the best ideas of the new edition, because it gives more weight to the end.

The tempo is, in all critical editions, ›mehr schnell‹ (›more than fast‹, equivalent to an ›allegro assai‹ or ›allegro molto‹). This makes sense, because this movement is in *alla breve*, but the first movement in four (note also the ›Tempo des 1. Satzes‹ and 4/4 in Haas, b. 640). The first print indicates ›Ziemlich schnell‹ only (›rather fast‹, hence merely an ›allegro moderato‹). Of particular interest also is to note the tempo of the coda stretta, which is ›sehr schnell‹, if we compare it with the first movement. At the corresponding place in the coda, Bruckner had originally written ›Tempo I°‹, as re-instated by Haas (b. 554), but corrected by Nowak. The earlier ›Tempo I°‹ referred to the quicker ›Allegro. Ziemlich schnell.‹ of II/1, but the correction shows that Bruckner wished the end of both movements being played in the same, fast tempo, proven by the re-occurrence of the rhythmic wind ostinato from the first movement in the Finale. So originally Bruckner intended the first movement to be in the same fast tempo as the Finale; later he decided to have the basic tempo slower, but the end of first and last movement quicker.

In b. 366, Carragan offers ›*accelerando sempre*‹, and the same in b. 382 again. But it should be noted that in similar passages Bruckner usually wrote first ›*accel. poco a poco*‹, and then later perhaps ›*accel. sempre*‹. Carragan's chosen terms are not in line with Bruckner's own style; however, the editorial decision itself is correct and important, since Bruckner, due to the habits of his earlier style, applied only ›*rubato*‹ here; the *accelerando* however is evident, with ›*Tempo I*‹ at **O**.

The Second Version: Résumé

The Carragan edition of the 1877 version has some advantages. It brings for the first time additional bar numbers at the first bar of every new system. The strange layout of the Haas and Nowak edition presenting many woodwind parts in two systems has been reduced to one system only, wherever convenient, in accordance with modern practice. Also there are no additional accidentals to notes tied over the barline, as in the earlier editions. This makes Carragan's edition more legible. In the orchestral parts, the Violoncello is also edited to be practical, with modern clefs (violin clef loco, and the tenor clef, replacing the old-fashioned violin clef in octave position, as in the score).

Carragan did not only include some tempo suggestions of his own, but also further tempo indications from Bruckner himself. While there is still no Critical Report available which would explain all these additions, constructing the tempo concept of the movement is more complicated. Particularly dubious is the generally slower character of this musically wild movement, which reflects some ideas from the first movement of Beethoven's *Eroica*. Personally I can't help but feel that Haas's suggestion ›*Ziemlich schnell*‹ from II/1 is more adequate for performance than the later ›*moderato*‹. However, it may be that the slower tempi of the later version were intended to compensate for the cuts Bruckner suggested.

Regarding dynamics, one should note that in the manuscripts of the early symphonies, written on oblong paper, the staves were very close. One should also not overlook the fact that Bruckner included his playing indications only as a last working phase, after completing the notes. Very often he wrote a *cresc. poco a poco* in a very large line at the bottom or on top of a page, and only thereafter marked intermediate phases such as *mf*, *f*, *ff*, *fff*. The manuscripts seem to indicate that very often he simply did not repeat a *cresc.* after such intermediate markings. Terraced dynamics seem to be very unusual for him. It is more likely that he was not all the time so meticulous about these things, in particular in all the scores written before 1878. Only the business of finishing N° V seemed to have made clear to him he had better be more distinct with his accents, bowing, articulation, and dynamics: later scores leave questions of such a nature far less open. Unfortunately Carragan's new edition does not answer all of these questions, but even sometimes raises new questions instead.

If we compare all critical editions, some differences in detail are apparent. The two following tables list the major differences, different formal aspects and length of the movements. On the other hand, leaving aside the question of optional cuts to be respected or not, the differences are rather small. There are some further, secondary differences between Haas and Nowak, as already noted by Wolfgang Doebel (*Bruckners Symphonien in Bearbeitungen*, Tutzing 2001, p. 477) which we now can correlate with Carragan's edition, as given in the following table. (Some editorial additions of Carragan, indicated in brackets, or with dotted lines, have been omitted here, since they are obvious from the score. Sometimes they are already to be found in the earlier editions, sometimes not, but here of minor interest.)

Nowak's corrected reprint of the Haas edition had some advantages. The conductor had still the choice to respect some or all of the optional cuts, and he even got the lucky choice between the horn or clarinet/viola-variant at the end of the Andante. Haas or Nowak should not be a question anymore, since Nowak gives all the music which Haas gives, too. Haas's inclusions from II/1 seem to be rather interesting musically but, philologically viewed, they have to be considered marginal today, particularly since Carragan edited II/1 as well, in which all of the passages are to be found which Haas and Nowak included in their editions of the 1877 version, and indicated by them already as optional. Also, the few metrical corrections by Bruckner, as included by Nowak, seem to make more musical sense, if we consider them being a fruit of his changed ideas of the metrical fabric, in particular the idea of giving the very end of a movement more weight by placing the final bar at an odd, heavy bar, and not, as often in the first versions, at an even, light bar, as noted by Wolfgang Grandjean.

The Bruckner Complete Edition intended the new edition by Carragan to replace the Nowak edition, so parts of the Nowak edition are no longer officially available. If, on the other hand, conductors continue to use their own old scores and materials from archives and orchestral libraries, it would be no big problem to compare the Nowak and Haas with the Carragan edition and include Carragan's additions and corrections into the older text, according to the wishes of the conductor. His edition certainly has some advantages: it provides the endings of the outer movements from the 1892 edition as an alternative, of which in particular the ending of the Finale seems to be much better balanced and musically more convincing. There is also an entirely new set of orchestral material available, it is much more legible and it includes numerous helpful corrections.

But there are also some questions and problems. The conductor no longer has the freedom to choose between the horn- and clarinet/viola-variant at the end of the Adagio, as in the Nowak edition, which is musically much to be regretted. The slow movement should also perhaps have included the violin solo section after **K** as an alternative, indicated as optional. If we consider the 1892 edition as being Bruckner's own last word (neglecting those playing indications and little corrections that are not original), then the optional inclusion of the cut in the Andante (b. 48-69) is not consistent, because Bruckner approved this cut for the first print. The elimination of the beginning of the Finale coda in Carragan's score, given as an optional cut from R to X in Haas and Nowak, is one of his most questionable editorial decisions. Bruckner, in the engraver's copy, had written the words »Auf X nur im höchsten Notfall!«, demonstrating that he was not fully convinced of this cut, which makes the ending of the entire symphony simply too short and even deletes an important return of the initial theme from the first movement.

From a conductor's point of view, I would vote for more options. I would personally like at least to try the violin solo section in the Adagio at **K**, to have the horn ending of the slow movement available, and I would like to be able to include at least the section cut at the beginning of the coda of the Finale, because without this the Finale loses weight (different from the first movement, where one would like to come to a quick, dramatic end). But unfortunately, there is no edition available giving me such options. I would have to include the violin solo section from Haas's *Vorlagenbericht* (p. 50*) and the ending of the Finale from the Nowak edition of II/2 (b. 590–655) by hand into the material. For the horn ending of the Adagio, I would use the Nowak edition p. 73* and 74*, of which I find the period structure more convincing (from **O**: 6 + 6 + 8, instead of the strange 4+6+9 of II/2), but I would also respect Bruckner's metrical correction from II/2, repeating b. 206, in order to achieve a structure of 8 + 3 bars, and even allow the horn player to end his solo with the high c, as also given in the clarinet variant of 1877.

In all, it would have been better if Carragan had at least decided to publish a ›Version 1873‹ as first performed by Bruckner himself, perhaps including variants from 1872 and 1876 as an alternative, and to publish the revised, corrected First Print Edition as a ›Version 1892‹, offering alternatively the variants from 1877 and those optional cuts still valid at that time.

**TABLE: Symphony N°II/2, ›Version 1877‹
Major Differences between the Critical Editions**

<i>bar</i>	<i>Haas 1938</i>	<i>Nowak 1965</i>	<i>Carragan 2007</i>
FIRST MOVEMENT			
1	›Ziemlich schnell‹	›Moderato‹	›Moderato‹
38–42	Woodwind: whole-bar slurs	Woodwind: slurs	Woodwind: all slurs eliminated
49	---	---	›beruhigend‹ (1892)
73–87	---	---	Vc.: slurs as in 1892 edition
77	---	---	›poco rit.‹ (1892)
81	---	---	›[a tempo]‹ (Carragan)
96	---	---	Str.: <i>dim.</i>
112	1.2. Klar., 1.2. Ob.	1.2. Klar., 1.2. Ob.	1. Klar., 1. Ob. only
117	Klar.: slurs into b. 118	Klar.: slurs deleted	Klar.: no slurs
127–34	Fl., Ob.: triplet slurs	Fl., Ob.: triplet slurs	Fl., Ob.: triplet slurs removed
146	---	---	›breit‹ (1892)
151	---	---	›a tempo (ruhig)‹ (1892)
161	---	›Langsamer‹	›Langsamer‹
183	1. Hrn.: 1. no >	1. Hrn.:1. >	1. Hrn.: 1. >
184	---	---	›rit.‹ (1892)
251	---	---	›Etwas langsamer‹
254	---	---	›wiederzunehmen bis ...‹ (1892)
258	---	---	›Tempo I ^o ‹ (1892)
287	---	---	›ritard.‹
290	---	---	›Etwas langsamer‹
296	---	---	›Nachlassend im Tempo‹
317	Fermata on rest in brackets	no Fermata	no Fermata
318	---	---	›Tempo I ^o ‹
354	1.2. Hrn.: slurs into next b.	1.2. Hrn.: no slurs	1.2. Hrn.: no slurs
362	---	---	›breit‹ (1892)
370–401	---	---	Vc.: slurs as in 1892 edition
401	---	---	›dim. e rit.‹ (1892)
402	---	---	›a tempo‹ (1892)
415	---	---	›rubato‹
432, 433	Viol. 1: wrongly 2. a'	Viol. 1: wrongly 2. a'	Viol. 1: 2. corrected to f''
434	Viol.1: 1. b flat''	Viol.1: 1. b flat''	Viol.1: 1. changed to d'''
434, 435	Fl., Ob.: triplet slurs	Fl., Ob.: triplet slurs	Fl., Ob.: no slurs (corrected)
460	---	›Langsamer‹	›Langsamer‹
478	---	---	›ritard.‹
480	---	---	›ritard.‹ (!)
478f	1. Fag.: slur	1. Fag.: slur	1. Fag.: no slur
488–519	optional cut (Vi—de)	optional cut (Vi—de)	eliminated
520	S	S	= 488: R
521f	Ob., 1.2. Hrn.: hairpins	Ob., 1.2. Hrn.: no hairpins	= 489f: hairpins as in Haas
525f	Ob.: hairpins	Ob.: no hairpins	= 493f: hairpins as in Haas
543	Fermata on rest in brackets	no Fermata	= 511: no Fermata
544	T	T	= 512: S
553	---	---	= 521: ›rit.‹ (1892)
554	U	U	= 522: T
554	›Tempo I ^{mo} ‹	›Sehr schnell‹	= 522: ›Sehr schnell‹
554–62	All triplets with slurs	All triplets with slurs	= 522–530: no slurs (corrected)
566	Trp.: as in 565	Trp.: as in 565	= 534: Trp., 1. crotchet only
567	---	one bar added	= 535: one bar added
568–70	= 567–9	= 568–70	= 536–9
			OPTIONAL: Ending of FPE

<i>bar</i>	<i>Haas 1938</i>	<i>Nowak 1965</i>	<i>Carragan 2007</i>
ANDANTE			
1	›Adagio. Feierlich, etwas bewegt‹	›Andante. Feierlich, etwas bewegt‹	›Andante. Feierlich, etwas bewegt‹
17	Ob.: no slurs	Ob.: no slurs	Ob.: slurs
59	›accelerando sempre‹	›accelerando sempre‹	---
60	---	---	›accelerando sempre‹
62	›ritenuto sempre‹	›ritenuto sempre‹	---
66	---	›ritenuto‹	›ritenuto‹
100	Ob.: no slurs	Ob.: no slurs	Ob.: slurs
140	Kb.: 2. d flat	Kb.: 2. b flat	Kb.: 2. b flat
141	›(a tempo)‹	›(a tempo)‹	---
143	---	---	›rit.‹ (1892)
143–5	---	---	Viol. 1, Vla. as in 1892
145–7	Kb.: no slurs	Kb.: no slurs	Kb.: slurs
150–171	wrong duplet notation (crotchets)	wrong duplet notation	corrected duplet notation (quavers)
168f	Vla.: no slur	Vla.: no slur	Vla.: slur
170f	Viol. 2: no slur	Viol. 2: no slur	Viol. 2: slur
177	Viol. 2: small note f#	Viol. 2: small note deleted	Viol. 2: small note deleted
178	Viol. 2: small note f	Viol. 2: small note deleted (but not on p. 73*)	Viol. 2: small note deleted
180	180: extra bar from 1 st Version	(not in 2 nd Version)	(not in 2 nd Version)
180ff	181–206, 1 st Version	= 180–205, 2 nd Version	= 180–205, 2 nd Version
184	---	---	P added
199	---	---	Q added
206	(not in 1 st Version)	(added in 2 nd Version)	(added in 2 nd Version)

<i>bar</i>	<i>Haas 1938</i>	<i>Nowak 1965</i>	<i>Carragan 2007</i>
SCHERZO			
1	›Schnell‹	›Mäßig schnell‹	›Mäßig schnell‹
48	repeat sign	no repeat sign	no repeat sign
49	---	---	C added
63	---	---	›poco rit.‹ (1892)
65	C ; ---	C ; ---	D ; ›[Langsamer]‹ (Carragan)
85	D ; ---	D ; ---	E ; ›[Tempo I]‹ (Carragan)
107	Pos.: <i>fff</i>	Pos.: <i>ff</i>	Pos.: <i>ff</i>
109	Trp.: <i>ff</i>	Trp.: <i>fff</i>	Trp.: (<i>ff</i> continued)
110	E	E	F
124	1 st Version	124/5 2 nd Version	2 nd Version
---	---	---	›attacca il Trio‹
125	no <i>dal segno</i> ; bar not extant	<i>dal segno</i> before coda	<i>dal segno</i> before coda
125	coda-beginning/Timpani	125bis: two general rests	125bis: two general rests

TRIO			
1	›Gleiches Tempo‹	›Gleiches Tempo‹	›Gleiches Tempo‹
24–37	---	---	articulation often corrected
37	repeat sign; Fermata in brackets	no repeat sign, no Fermata	no repeat sign, no Fermata
38	---	---	A
58	A	A	B
88	B	B	C
104	C	C	D
118	---	›ritardando‹	›ritardando‹
121	repeat sign	no repeat sign	no repeat sign

<i>bar</i>	<i>Haas 1938</i>	<i>Nowak 1965</i>	<i>Carragan 2007</i>
FINALE			
1	›Mehr schnell‹	›Mehr schnell‹	›Mehr schnell‹
33	Woodwind: 1.–4. slur	Woodwind: 1.–4. slur	Woodwind: no slurs
51	Fermata in brackets	no Fermata	no Fermata
71	---	---	Winds: <i>cresc.</i>
74	---	---	Winds: <i>dim.</i>
75	Fermata in brackets	no Fermata	no Fermata
95	Kb.: 1. a	Kb.: 1. d	Kb.: 1. d
109	---	---	›ritard.‹ (1892)
112	---	---	›a tempo‹ (1892)
117	Kb.: 1. b (seems to be correct!)	Kb.: 1. e flat	Kb.: 1. e flat
126f	Fl.: slur in brackets	Fl.: slur in brackets	Fl.: no slur (seems to be wrong)
134	<i>poco a poco dim.</i>	<i>poco a poco dim.</i>	<i>poco a poco cresc.</i>
139	---	---	<i>dim.</i>
148	---	---	›[Tempo I]‹ (Carragan)
171	some Winds: slur (not Fl, Ob.)	some Winds: slur (not Fl, Ob.)	no slurs at all
231	double barline	single barline	single barline
302	---	---	›poco a poco ritard.‹
308	---	---	›Tempo I°‹
328	›(Tempo I°)‹	›(Tempo I°)‹	›Etwas langsamer‹
344	---	---	›[ritard.]‹ (Carragan)
348	---	---	›[a tempo]‹ (Carragan)
349	T. Pos.: as in 1 st Version	T. Pos.: corrected	T. Pos.: corrected
351	T. Pos.: as in 1 st Version	T. Pos.: corrected	T. Pos.: corrected
361	T. Pos.: as in 1 st Version	T. Pos.: corrected	T. Pos.: corrected
366	›rubato sempre‹	›rubato sempre‹	›rubato‹; ›[sempre accelerando]‹;
382	---	---	›[accelerando]‹;
388	---	---	›[Tempo I]‹ (Carragan)
406	Fermata in brackets	no Fermata	no Fermata
443	Kb.: 1. c	Kb.: 1. f	Kb.: 1. f
488	Fermata in brackets	no Fermata	no Fermata
489	›ritard.‹; ›rubato‹	›ritard.‹; ›rubato‹	›ritardando‹
493	›Tempo I‹	›Tempo I‹	›Tempo I°‹
533	›(Tempo I)‹ (seems to be correct)	›(Tempo I)‹ (seems to be correct)	---
537	›(rubato)‹	›(rubato)‹	›rubato‹
540–62	optional cut (Vi—de)	optional cut (Vi—de)	eliminated
562	Fermata in brackets	no Fermata	---
563 (540)	V	V	= 540; U
582	---	---	= 559; V
589 (566)	Fermata in brackets	no Fermata	no Fermata
590–651	optional cut (Vi—de)	optional cut (Vi—de)	eliminated
633	Fag.: 4. natural forgotten (= a)	Fag.: 4. corrected to a	---
647	Fermata in brackets	no Fermata, 2 general rests added	---
649	Fermata in brackets	no Fermata, 2 general rests added	---
652 (567)	Z	= 656; Z	= 567; W
676 (591)	---	---	= 591; X
			OPTIONAL: Ending of FPE

TABLE: Symphony N°II/2, Version 1877
Different Length of Movements and Structure in the Various Editions

<i>Mvmt.</i>	<i>Haas 1938</i>	<i>Nowak 1965</i>	<i>Carragan 2007</i>
I. 1. Satz	569 (opt. 537)	570 (opt. 538)	538 (opt. 540)
<i>Optional</i>	488–519 (<i>1st Version</i>)	488–519 (<i>1st Version</i>)	[488–519 (= 32) eliminated]
Concordance	520–566 ...	= 520–566 ...	= 488–534
Different	567 omitted (<i>1st Version</i>)	567 (from <i>2nd Version</i>) ...	= 535
Concordance	567–569 ...	= 568–570 ...	= 536–538
<i>Optional</i>	---	---	522a–540a (<i>1892 ending</i>)
II. Andante	209 (opt. 187)	209 (opt. 187)	209 (opt. 187)
<i>Optional</i>	48–69 (<i>1st Version</i>)	48–69 (<i>1st Version</i>)	48–69 (<i>1st Version</i>)
Different	180–209: <i>1st Version</i>	180–209: <i>2nd Version</i>	180–209: <i>2nd Version</i>
Concordance	180 ...	---	---
Concordance	181–206 ...	= 180–205	(= 180–205)
Concordance	---	206 (<i>2nd Version</i> only)	(= 206)
Concordance	207–209 ...	= 207–209	(= 207–209)
<i>Optional</i>	---	180–209 (<i>1st Version</i>)	---
III. 3. Satz			
Scherzo	124 (with repeats: 248)	125 (no repeats indicated)	125 (no repeats indicated)
Different	---	124, <i>2nd Version</i> (123 repeated)	(= 124)
Concordance	124 (<i>1st Version</i>) ...	= 125 (<i>2nd Version</i>)	(= 125)
Trio	121 (with repeats: 242)	121 (no repeats indicated)	121 (no repeats indicated)
Scherzo d. C.	124 (with repeats: 248)	124 (no repeats indicated)	124 (no repeats indicated)
coda	31 (<i>1st Version</i>)	33 (<i>2nd Version</i>)	33
Different	---	125bis (general rest)	125bis (general rest)
Different	---	126 (general rest)	126 (general rest)
Concordance	125–155 (<i>1st Version</i>) ...	= 127–157 (<i>2nd Version</i>)	(= 127–157)
IV. Finale	698 (opt. 609)	702 (opt. 613)	613 (opt. 613)
<i>Optional</i>	540–562 (<i>1st Version</i>)	540–562 (<i>1st Version</i>)	[540–62 (= 23) eliminated]
Concordance	563–589 ...	= 563–589 ...	= 540–566
<i>Optional</i>	590–651 (<i>1st Version</i>)	590–651 (<i>1st Version</i>)	[590–651 (= 62) eliminated]
Concordance	---	648–649	---
Concordance	648–649 ...	= 650–651	---
Concordance	---	652–653	---
Concordance	650–651 ...	= 654–655	---
Concordance	652–698 ...	= 656–702 ...	= 567–613
<i>Optional</i>	---	---	591a–613a (<i>1892 ending</i>)

Symphony N° II/2: First Print Edition 1892

I.	1. Satz	540 b.
II.	Andante	187 b.
III.	Scherzo	125 b.
	Trio	121 b.
	Scherzo d. C. & Coda	124 + 33 b.
IV.	Finale	613 b.