

1950

The problem of form in the symphonic works of Anton Bruckner

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/4679>

Downloaded from DSpace Repository, DSpace Institution's institutional repository

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

THE PROBLEM OF FORM IN THE SYMPHONIC WORKS

OF ANTON BRUCKNER

by

John E. Hasson

(B. Mus., Boston University, 1942)

(A.M., Harvard University, 1947)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

1950

AM
1950
has
copy!

Approved by

Karl J. Jorgensen

First Reader

Donald T. Ferguson

Second Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	i
I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS OF BRUCKNER'S ART	1
II. THEMATIC MATERIAL OF THE SYMPHONIES.	15
III. FORMAL PATTERNS OF THE SYMPHONIES.	28
IV. THE QUESTION OF EDITIONS	57
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	70
APPENDIX	73
I. Historical Data on Bruckner's Symphonies	73
II. Bibliography	82

INTRODUCTION

The symphonic works of Anton Bruckner were the subject of violent controversy during that composer's lifetime and even today, more than fifty years after his death, these works are still looked upon by many with some question. This is especially true in America where Bruckner is but little understood. The chief question seems to be over the matter of Bruckner's particular style and just where his symphonies fit into the historical development of the Viennese symphony after Beethoven.

The purpose of this thesis is to establish by analysis one phase of the style and individuality of the composer. The works to be examined are the nine numbered symphonies as well as the two earlier ones known as the Linz Symphony and the symphony No. 0. The chief emphasis of the thesis will be on the form or structural patterns of Bruckner's works, for it is over this matter of form that much of the misunderstanding of the symphonies arises. Besides form, the thematic material of the symphonies will also be considered as the nature of Bruckner's themes and his way of treating them determines, in many cases, the formal peculiarities of his works. Complete detailed analyses of each individual work will not be given but rather an attempt will be made to establish and set forth general principles found throughout all the works. Such generalizations are, however, based on a thorough analysis of the above mentioned compositions.

Of all the problems one encounters in making a study of Bruckner's

compositions, the most difficult to solve is that involving the two different editions of the works. For years the first editions, printed during the composer's lifetime,¹ were accepted without question. During the 1920's and 1930's certain scholars interested in Bruckner's works undertook a study of the autographs of the symphonies which were in the National Library at Vienna. The leaders in this investigation were Professors Alfred Orel and Robert Haas, both of the University of Vienna. These musicologists began comparing the manuscript copies with the printed versions and found many discrepancies between the two. The revelation of these differences led to a white-hot controversy over the authenticity of the published versions. Equally competent scholars upheld the first editions. The battle has raged ever since and it is a matter of some doubt as to whether the question ever will be settled conclusively. It has been nearly impossible to prove just how many of the changes in the scores Bruckner himself approved. The printers' proof sheets, for one thing, have never been found. We know that Bruckner revised nearly every work he wrote, some of them several times. In view of this, which of the versions are we to accept as his final will? Which of the changes did the composer make of his own accord and which on "advice" from others? An attempt will be made to answer the first question. It seems impossible to answer the second. The whole matter will be dealt with more fully later on.²

1 The Ninth Symphony was, of course, published after Bruckner's death as he had not completed the work.

2 The Question of Editions, Chapter IV.

In the present work both the older edition of the symphonies and the so-called Urtext edition have been examined and compared and the degree of variance in the forms between the two editions has been determined. The initial analysis was made from the older scores published by Universal-Edition, Vienna, because all of the symphonies were immediately available in that edition. Only five of them were available in the Urtext Edition when this work was begun (1948), others appearing one by one since that time. At present (1950) all but Symphony No. 3, and the two very early unnumbered symphonies, Nos. 0 and 00, are obtainable in the Urtext version. In either case, the differences are, in general, insufficient to alter the generalizations.

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF BRUCKNER'S ART

During and shortly after the French Revolution the rulers and statesmen of Austria feared for their own personal futures and for the future of the state system which they knew. This fear was due primarily to the infiltration of revolutionary ideologies from the West which were in direct contradiction to the old traditional absolutist and patrimonial order of the Habsburg state. The rulers saw that if this trend continued it would lead ultimately to the downfall of their state system. To guard against this Austria elaborated a most complete program of international reaction. The influence of Austria could be seen in the government of practically every major country of Europe. Francis II (1792-1835) had taken the lead in the coalition against Napoleon and after the downfall of the latter again took the lead in organizing Europe along such lines that any future outbreak of "radicalism" would be virtually impossible. Alliances were formed with more powerful countries, and the thirty-nine German states were organized into the Bund under the presidency of Austria. These states drifted back into the same way of living they had enjoyed during the eighteenth century. These little German despotisms were well characterized by Heine when he said, "when I was at the top of the St.

Gotthard Pass I heard Germany snoring."¹ Metternich, the "almighty chancellor," conducted the whole inner and outer policy of the Austrian Empire, and this policy became almost a state religion. This system, called the system of Metternich," which dominated Austria during the whole first half of the nineteenth century, represents one of the most consequent and audacious attempts in history to conserve an antiquated system.² This policy was inspired partly because of Metternich's own views on liberalism but was due even more to the peculiar make-up of the Austrian realm. This polyglot empire contained nearly half the races and religions of Europe and thus had no truly national basis. It operated purely on a policy of domination and suppression.

The nucleus of the Metternich program was a rigid system of police spying on all activities and conversations touching social or political matters. No one was above suspicion, for even Gentz, a close associate of the chancellor himself, had his correspondence inspected. A similar system of ecclesiastical surveillance was also set up. The Roman church assumed a position of steadily increasing importance in the country and could be relied on to maintain an extremely conservative point of view on any controversial matter. Between the government and the church practically every phase of a man's existence was touched. Universities, especially the departments of philosophy, history and geography, came under very close scrutiny, and a rigid check was kept on the opinions and activities of teachers and students alike.

1 F. B. Artz, Reaction & Revolution, 1814-1832, New York, 1945, p. 137.

2 O. Jaszi, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy, Chicago, 1929, p.75.

Under the next emperor, Ferdinand I (1835-1848) these reactionary and clerical tendencies developed to full maturity. Clerical domination continued to increase until even Metternich himself came more and more under the influence of the Jesuits. The prevailing spirit was akin to that of the period of the Spanish counter-reformation. Thus Austria lived medieval days in a time when the third French Revolution was rapidly approaching.¹ For some years under Francis Joseph (1848-1916) the same state system existed. Although Metternich fell from power during the period of the 1848 revolts, his policies were continued by Bach, the new Minister of the Interior, and became known as the "system Bach." The concordat of 1855 with the Vatican placed the entire system of education almost entirely under the jurisdiction of the representatives of Rome.²

The system of repression choked the whole literary and much of the scientific life as well. Many of the English and German poets were banned either in whole or in part and a close check was kept on the writings of Austrians. Grillparzer, the great Austrian poet, adequately characterized the influence which the spirit of the times had on his own when he said, "despotism has destroyed my literary life."

While the elder statesmen of Europe were busy stamping out the last of the revolutionary fires, a new generation was coming of age. The men of this generation had not yet attained the high positions in state or church but could be found in business, the professions and in the lower

1 Jaszi, op. cit., p. 85.

2 Ibid., p. 101.

ranks of the political administration. These men found many of the political and intellectual formulas of their elders worn out and meaningless, and as a result new schools of republicanism, socialism, and Liberal Catholicism appeared. In the Philhellenic movement romanticism formed an alliance with liberalism.¹

The basic philosophy of this younger generation was that of romanticism. It involved a denunciation of the rationalistic and academic canons of eighteenth-century classicism, and in their place demanded the right of free, imaginative expression.² Whereas French Romanticism springs from a revolutionary and militant spirit, German Romanticism comes from a purely ideal source. German and Austrian Romanticism was rising during the period from about 1780 to 1830, appearing first in literature and later being transferred to music. German writers like the Schlegel and Grimm brothers, Tieck, Wackenroder, Arnim and Brentano, Heine, E. T. A. Hoffmann and others were leading German literature along paths diametrically opposed to the styles of the classical period. Their works had to do with the past-ancient German folk lore with the beauties and phenomena of nature, with the individual's reactions, emotions and aspirations. After the Revolution of 1830 Heine went to Paris where he began to attack the forces of reaction, clericalism, the Holy Alliance, and royal absolutism. In his enthusiasm for liberty and the rights of man, he carried into German literature the attitudes of Byron.³ Everywhere the signs of

1 Artz, op. cit., p. 184.

2 Ibid., p. 193.

3 Ibid., p. 194.

the future could be seen struggling but the old order was to die fighting, especially in Austria, where it fought off the advances of the newer forces longer than did the other states.

In the musical world as well Austria, and particularly Vienna, was generally under the control of the reactionaries. The younger and more daring composers might write what they pleased but the chances of successful public performances were rather meager. Conservative elements had the upper hand in the concert halls for a good part of the nineteenth century. Most of the concerts were of the virtuoso sort; operatic potpourris were the rule, and the performance of a serious piano sonata was still a rarity in public. Even the Gesellschaft Concerts largely for chorus and orchestra were such that a serious-minded musician would find little on the program to interest him. For the most part they were organized and directed by dilettantes, and gave little or no attention to the progressive trends of the time.¹ As the century advanced however, the situation gradually improved due largely to a succession of forward-looking directors of the Philharmonic.

It was into this world of conflicting ideas and philosophies that Anton Bruckner was born on September 4, 1824, in the small town of Ansfelden, near Linz, in Upper Austria. He was strictly a son of conservative, Catholic Austria. His father and grandfather had been village schoolmasters and young Anton was destined for the same life. Besides the usual schooling, at about the age of ten he began studying organ and theory with a relative named Weiss. Not long after this, however, Anton's father

1 D. Newlin, Bruckner, Mahler, Schönberg, N. Y., 1945, p. 25.

died and the boy was sent to the secular music school of St. Florian where he remained for about four years studying theory, organ, piano, and violin. After the period at St. Florian, Bruckner then went to the teachers' preparatory school at Linz. Upon finishing the prescribed course there for the elementary teacher's certificate he went to his first teaching assignment in the remote country village of Windhaag. Bruckner was now seventeen years old. In May 1845 he passed the final examination for a schoolteacher's license and was appointed to serve at St. Florian. Here he was again happy as he had at his disposal one of the greatest organs in Europe.¹ In 1851 Bruckner was appointed organist at St. Florian. Two years later he made his first visit to Vienna and made his first contacts with Simon Sechter, the famous Viennese theoretician and teacher. Sechter became his teacher and thus began for Bruckner a long period of hard drudgery while he was led through the rigorous training in counterpoint afforded him by Sechter. The teacher once remarked that Bruckner was certainly the most diligent pupil he ever had. In 1856 the post of organist at the Cathedral of Linz fell vacant and a new organist was to be chosen by open competition. Bruckner entered the contest and won easily, astonishing the judges by his powers of improvisation. This post he held for some twelve years and during this period did practically no composing, applying his energy solely to his studies under Sechter. Most of these studies were carried on by correspondence, Bruckner going to

¹ A four-manual organ with a 30 key pedal, 94 stops, and 4993 pipes.

Vienna in person only during the penitential seasons when he was not required to play the organ at the Cathedral. As if to prove to himself that he had mastered his lessons, he insisted on taking a series of examinations in the various phases of theory and counterpoint, easily passing them all. The final one - the well-known incident of the fugue examination - was taken and passed in 1861. Shortly after this Bruckner decided on studying under a different teacher, one who would train him along broader musical lines. Accordingly he went to one Otto Kitzler. This new master first made him analyze the Beethoven sonatas with great thoroughness, then led him into the study of orchestration, mainly from the score of "Tannhauser." Two years of study under Kitzler crowned by hearing two performances of "Tannhauser" convinced Bruckner of his mission and settled the path he was to follow into the future. The year 1863, then may be taken as the end of Bruckner's long "student period."

The two men under whom Bruckner studies profoundly influenced him in his creative work. Sechter, the grammarian, imparted to him all the intricacies of musical rhetoric while Kitzler introduced him to the larger world of Beethoven and the "Master of Masters," Wagner. It is important to note also that Bruckner's first attempts at symphonic composition date back to 1863 while he was still studying under Kitzler, and it was during the next year that his first great Mass, that in D, was written.

On April 14, 1866, Bruckner's first Symphony was completed and was performed in Linz two years later. Shortly after this performance he accepted a post at the great Conservatory of Vienna (only after considerable encouragement from his bishop) and therewith began a life-long struggle against the powerful conservative forces whose stronghold was

Vienna. It was a desperate fight for the recognition he deserved but which he did not get until the last few years of his life. The bulk of the years spent in Vienna were rewarded only with the most caustic, cheap criticism, much of which bordered on ridicule and insult. As each new work was performed the signal was set for another outburst by the critics, of whom Hanslick was the leader. "Bruckner writes like a drunkard"¹ "...the anti-musical ravings of a half-wit";² remarks such as these were common in the Viennese press describing Bruckner performances. The arrival of Wagner in Vienna in 1875 and his words of praise for Bruckner's works resulted in even more ferocious attacks on the luckless Bruckner. Throughout his life, however, even in the face of this sort of criticism, Bruckner's idealism and fervor were to remain unshaken by the malice of his critical enemies and by the lack of recognition accorded him in his own country. Having faint hope of hearing his works performed he continued to turn out one enormous masterpiece after another, and his belief in his own artistic mission was to become stronger as the years progressed. On more than one occasion he personally paid all the expenses of hiring the Philharmonic Orchestra solely for the purpose of having one of his works performed.

While in England on a concert tour as organist Bruckner began work on his second symphony but this work, owing to the atmosphere in Vienna as well as to the composer's own hesitant nature, was to be less bold and

1 Dömpke, quoted in Engel, Anton Bruckner, p. 40.

2 Bülow, ibid., p. 32.

original than the first symphony. It was almost in the nature of a compromise. Even so, it was refused by the Philharmonic on the ground of its being unplayable. Even the musicians of the orchestra had a hand in this anti-Bruckner attitude which prevailed and they did not hesitate to express their opinions of the man's works, neither were they anxious to play them. This was to be the only time that Bruckner was to take a step backward in his work. From this point on he went his own way regardless of the reception conservative Vienna was to give him. The third, or "Wagner" symphony, begun shortly after the completion of the second, was to be proof enough of this. This symphony is probably his first really mature symphonic work stylistically speaking. It marks a definite departure from the previous period of restraint. The performance of it was, as could be expected a disgraceful fiasco, a demonstration taking place in the middle of the concert. Bruckner, discouraged by this reception, spent the next two or three years revising (mainly the orchestration) of the second, fourth, and fifth symphonies and in composing a completely new scherzo for the fourth. It was during this period also that he made his only excursion into the realm of chamber music composing his quintet for strings, a lofty and beautiful piece of music, completely symphonic in its scope, and a worthy companion piece to the symphonies.

A year or so before the ill-fated performance of the "Wagner" symphony Bruckner received an appointment to teach counterpoint and harmony at the University of Vienna. One might wonder why, Bruckner being so vehemently denounced as a radical, he should receive appointments as teacher at the two great strongholds of Viennese conservatism, the Conservatory and the University. It should be remembered that Bruckner the man and the teacher

was not the same as Bruckner the composer. Regardless of the nature of his creative work, it could not be doubted that Bruckner was a thorough-going sincere Austrian with good orthodox Catholic background and training. Even his musical study had been done primarily under the guidance of the great Sechter whom everyone accepted without question. We know also that in his teaching Bruckner held to very strict orthodox ideas merely leading his students through the same rigorous training which he himself had undergone with Sechter. Furthermore, he taught mainly counterpoint and even forbade his students to compose while they were studying with him. In earlier days he had taken and passed the regular examinations in musical theory and counterpoint and had received his certificates from the state examiners. Had Bruckner dared to stand on the University platform and expound the more heretical doctrines of Wagner or Liszt there is little doubt that his stay at the school would have been a short one. More than one Viennese musician or critic was ready and willing to accept him as a teacher but at the same time considered his compositions to be nothing short of musical treason. Vienna, therefore, must have seen in Bruckner a man of dual nature, one side of which met their requirements of orthodoxy and conservatism while the other definitely rubbed them the wrong way. Bruckner was quite successful as a teacher at Vienna and was well liked by the students. His lectures were always well attended and enthusiastically applauded. The students, though, belonged to a younger generation than did Bruckner's most avowed adversaries and were beginning to be noticeably influenced by the inevitable influx of new ideas from the north and west. This may be borne out by the fact that during the late years of his life the attitude of Vienna toward Bruckner gradually changed until the picture became

completely reversed. True, this Viennese recognition came long after he had been accepted and sought after in Germany as well as in other countries but it came nevertheless. It was not until the same period that the conservative barriers in other fields were broken down in Austria.

Once Bruckner took up residence in Vienna he remained there for the rest of his life except for occasional visits to other cities or to spend his summer holiday elsewhere. His most important visits were, of course, to Bayreuth where he could converse with Wagner and hear performances of that master's works. The associations and atmosphere of Bayreuth did much to strengthen Bruckner's convictions in his own work and to build up his courage to face the adverse criticism he received in his own city. Each time he went to the Bavarian town he was able to take up his work with renewed vigor upon his return. In July, 1882, Bruckner went to Bayreuth for the opening performance of "Parsifal." This was to be his last meeting with Wagner who died not too many months later. Bruckner at this time was already deep in the composition of his seventh symphony and had a premonition that Wagner would not live much longer. With this thought in mind he wrote the beautiful and lofty adagio of this symphony and considered it a sort of eulogy for the Master.¹ The eventual death of Wagner was, of course, a great blow to Bruckner.

As if to make up for the personal loss sustained by the death of Wagner, Bruckner himself was now on the threshold of the success he had

¹ Some interesting anecdotes are told regarding this matter.

See for instance Auer, op. cit., p. 139-140.

long merited. His first great public acclaim came on the occasion of the first performance of his seventh symphony in Leipzig, December 30, 1884, under Nikisch. The shy Austrian was literally overwhelmed by the tremendous ovation given him at the end of the concert, a demonstration lasting fully fifteen minutes. A subsequent performance in Munich under Levi, a staunch Wagnerite, prompted one of the pro-Bruckner critics to declare the work the most important symphony since 1827. Obviously this statement was solely intended for the benefit of the pro-Brahms group. Performances of this symphony as well as of other works by Bruckner were now sought by many cities of Germany and even of neighboring countries. Vienna, however, still remained cold to its own composer, but the day was not far distant when that citadel of conservatism was to be forced to change its opinions. Karl Muck performed the seventh successfully in Graz thus practically forcing a Vienna performance. Such a performance took place on March 21, 1886, under Hans Richter with the hostile Philharmonic Orchestra. Publically, the concert was a great success, the composer being called to the stage four or five times after each movement. The older die-hard critics held to their earlier opinions, however. Hanslick wrote, "to tell the truth, the music of Bruckner so rubs me the wrong way that I am hardly in a position to give an impartial view of it. I consider it unnatural, blown-up, unwholesome and ruinous."¹ The day of liberation had come, though, for the weight of public opinion was now on Bruckner's side. Later Richter stated that the members of the Philharmonic had changed their opinions regarding Bruckner's music and that there would be

¹ Engel, op. cit., p. 39.

no difficulty about performing his music in Vienna in the future.¹

Bruckner's status as a composer in Vienna now settled in his favor, the first performance of the eighth symphony was given there in December, 1892, also by Richter and the Philharmonic. Success again greeted the aging composer even resulting in his being honored by the emperor. Two years later, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, he received the homage of practically the entire world. In his native Austria he was given keys to cities, honored by the various musical societies, and was praised in many newspaper articles. By this time, of course, a totally new generation had risen in Austria with ideas totally different than those of its forefathers. The stern conservatism of the early years of the century was now a thing of the past. The last quarter of the century was marked by a new and broader world-outlook on the part of all nations. It was a progressive age and Austria could not but be influenced by it.

Bruckner was an ailing man even at the time of his seventieth birthday. Two years later he died and, according to his own wish, was buried back at St. Florian. The great organ there that he knew and loved so well was to become his tombstone.

Thus it may be seen that Bruckner's musical life in Vienna was largely a fight against established traditions. The reactionary principles of the post-Napoleonic era were to influence public opinion in the Austrian capital for nearly three-quarters of the century. In Germany, where the spirit of liberation and romanticism had made far greater inroads, Bruckner

¹ Ibid., p. 40.

had been received and praised long before his native country recognized him. Germany had given acceptance to Wagner, Liszt, Berlioz, and, during the last twenty years of the century, even to such a progressive composer as Richard Strauss. Bruckner, therefore, was among artists of his own type in that country. In Austria this was not true. There the high priest of symphonic music during this entire period was Brahms, for that composer, representing the continuation of the classical spirit, was turning out works which met the conservative artistic standards of the day. Bruckner, as a composer, did not fit into the Viennese picture during most of his life, but by the power and originality of his work, as we shall see later, was able to reorient the Viennese symphony in such a way that others coming after him were able to use his symphonic concepts as their point of departure from which to go into the next century.

CHAPTER II

THEMATIC MATERIAL OF THE SYMPHONIES

Before examining the structural details of Bruckner's symphonies it might be well to give some consideration to the thematic material used in these works, for in many cases it is the type of theme that largely determines the style of treating the development throughout the work. Bruckner's themes are, like those of Wagner after Lohengrin, definitely of instrumental origin or conception. Some of those found in the works of Schubert show unmistakable song-influence. This influence is completely lacking in Bruckner. Wagner got his ideas for this type of melody from the late instrumental works of Beethoven, and we know that Bruckner also studies these same works with some thoroughness. Thus the latter composer drew from the same source but has his ideas further tempered by the Wagnerian ideas.

The thematic material Bruckner uses in his first movements must be classified according to the sections of the exposition in which it is used. His opening themes may be divided rather roughly into two classes. The first, and by far the most common, is the short, cryptic, plastic Wagnerian type of motif, one that is hardly ever a complete musical phrase, but one which contains merely the germ of his idea. Ordinarily it will consist of only a few notes but will make use of some very significant intervals and highly potent rhythms. Frequent use is made of the strong primary intervals and even greater use made of dotted rhythms. The opening motif

of the fourth symphony is an excellent example of this:¹



Occasionally a thematic section begins with a statement of some short motif, incomplete in itself, out of which a complete theme eventually is built up. In other words, the theme is evolved rather than stated; it is a cumulative process. In cases like the above quoted fourth symphony, the initial motif constitutes the entire material used. The opening section of this symphony consists of nothing but sixteen repetitions of the original motif in which the rhythm never changes although some change is made in the intervals; several times the motif is transposed and there are some important harmonic changes. The opening theme of the second symphony is a further example of the cumulative type. It is constructed from three brief, melodic fragments, each somewhat different in character. These are used so as to build up a fairly lengthy theme, but a theme more lyrical than that quoted from the fourth symphony. The strong, wider intervals are lacking this time.



Whereas the motif-type used in the fourth symphony makes use of fairly large intervals, that of the second symphony is of a closer nature and is

¹ A similar type theme may be found in opening movement of the ninth symphony.

even somewhat chromatic. In the finale of the same work Bruckner uses a motif that is actually a combination of motifs A and B quoted above.

The second class of thematic material is made up of themes which might be termed "trumpet themes."¹ These themes are frequently sounded by trumpets or horns and have certain melodic characteristics that make them wont to be associated with these instruments. In the third symphony we find the best-known example of this:



This type of theme is somewhat more complete in its initial statement. It is also built up entirely out of notes outlining a chord.² A shorter motif of this nature may be found in the introduction of the fifth symphony:



Themes of a slightly different category, a sort of combination of the ideas of the first class plus the longer complete melody may be found also. In the first C minor symphony the following theme appears:



1 Newlin, op. cit., p. 86.

2 See also opening theme, first movement, of the string quintet; first themes of Sym. IV, VII; Sym. IX, first mov't., measure 19-26.

It is evident that the germ of the whole theme is contained in the first four notes which actually give us the entire rhythmic scheme as well as the motif pattern.

The second theme sections of Bruckner's first movements present a totally different type of thematic material. These themes are really of a composite nature - multiple themes - as will be described more fully later. The main element of these theme groups is far more lyrical than are the themes found in the first sections. They are longer, more self-explanatory, if we may use the term, and stand out in marked contrast with those of the sections before and to follow. Dividing the second themes into classes as has been done with the first themes would be rather difficult and in many cases even arbitrary. The subsidiary motifs of these theme-groups are usually less lyrical, different rhythmically, and often make use of larger intervals.

V.1
 V.2
 Vla
 Vcl
 CB *Pizz*

The above example from the fourth symphony will give a fair idea as to the nature of these theme-groups.

The motifs used in the third sections are inclined to be of much the same character as those of the first. In two symphonies they are actually derived from the first theme, but in the last four works they are independent thematically. Again we find the short, non-lyrical type of motif, exhibiting wide intervals occasionally as well as strong rhythms. The rhythmic element is usually of great importance as it is used to emphasize the climactic character of the third-theme section.

Turning to the slow movements we find that Bruckner here uses themes of a character somewhat different from any used in the first movements. These themes are far more flowing melodically, and are of an almost-hymn-like nature. It is in the slow movements chiefly that we find the element of religious fervor, sometimes even bordering on mysticism, most strongly. This is due in no small part to the nature of the themes used. The opening themes of the movements are more in this character, than are the second or third themes although the latter still breathe pretty much the same spirit. It is interesting to note that the main themes of the slow movements in the earlier symphonies are more diatonic than are those found in the later works. The turning point seems to be about the fifth symphony. A comparison of the following melodies will illustrate this.



A similar comparison might be made between the early and late works of Wagner, between Lohengrin and Götterdämmerung, for instance.



In the case of each composer, as the harmonic idiom becomes more complicated the melodies are built along such lines as to keep pace with the harmony. The nature of the themes in the first movements would be enough to make this trait less obvious there. A motif similar to the opening one of the fourth symphony would admit almost any harmonization. In the earlier

works also the rhythms of the opening themes of the slow movements seem a little simpler than in the later works.

The second and third themes of these slow movements often show a little more rhythmic activity than do the first melodies. The same spirit is present in all of them however. For instance, compare the following B theme from the adagio of the seventh symphony with the sombre, intense melody that opens the movement.



Nowhere in Bruckner's slow movements do we find themes that compare in character or meaning with those of other composers of the romantic period, for romanticism in the sense that it applies to composers such as Liszt, Wagner, or even Schubert or Schumann is totally absent from the works of Bruckner. Bruckner's romanticism, it must always be remembered stems mainly from an all-embracing religious fervor and religious outlook on life, the result of his early life and training.

It has often been said that whereas the slow movements of Bruckner's symphonies represent his loftiest inspirations in a religious or mystic sense, his scherzos are the only movements in which he has his feet solidly on the ground. Certainly they are the most tangible of all in a wordly sense. These scherzo movements at once bring to mind the peasant

connections of the composer, and the scherzos and dances of Schubert. It is in these movements that Bruckner and Schubert have the most in common. Bruckner's, however, are perhaps a little more rugged in nature, Schubert's being under the song influence. Use is made by Bruckner of the short motif idea again, strong rhythmic patterns, and wide intervals based on primary notes of his chords.



Occasionally we find a motif of very short length which is used in endless repetitions giving somewhat of an ostinato effect throughout large sections of the movement.



The above motif from the eighth symphony is used in this manner. When the second section of the movement begins this motif is merely inverted and used the same way.

The themes of the trios take on a smoother, less rugged aspect and resemble the melodies of Schubert more than ever. These thematic types used by both composers show strong connections with the spirit of the

Austrian countryside and are good evidence of the Austrianism of the men. The wide intervals tend to disappear and the more connected type of melodic writing is used. A marked exception to this is, however, the theme found in the sixth symphony.



Several times the character of the trio theme is further removed from that of the first themes by using a different time signature. The theme from the fifth, quoted above, is in 4-8 as against 3-4 for the first part of the scherzo. In four other symphonies this same type of change is found.¹

The finales show a type of thematic material that is largely of the same character as that found in the opening movements. The type found at the beginning of the fourth and ninth symphonies is not made use of here, but in its place we find opening themes that often are of the fanfare variety. They usually are of a rather imposing nature and give the finale a climactic aspect right from the beginning. In some ways they remind us of the C themes in the expositions of the first movements. The finale of the eighth symphony opens very auspiciously in this manner, all three sections of the A theme groups being of the same nature.²

¹ Sym. IV, 2-4 to 3-4; V, 3-4 to 2-4; VII, 3-4 to 2-4; IX, 3-4 to 3-8.

² Also I, A1; III, A1; VI, A2; VII, A1.



Of the other three symphonies having fourth movements, number two begins rather quietly with a theme that is a composite of elements of the first theme of the opening movement, while numbers four and five have opening themes of a broad nature beginning with octave skips. The theme of the fourth symphony begins in whole-note rhythm while that of the fifth is more active rhythmically, making use of the ever-present dotted rhythms.

In four cases out of the eight the second themes are of the same multiple type as the B themes of the first movements.¹ Those in the remaining four symphonies are nearer to the single-theme type, although the accompanying voices to in a couple of cases have some slight melodic direction or pattern. In the codas we frequently find themes taken from other movements or from the same movement. Here they are often transformed somewhat, usually appearing in augmented form and in a new key.

Two or three other classifications of themes remain to be mentioned.

¹ Sym. III, IV, VI, VII.

The first and most important of these is the well-known Bruckner "chorale." These chorale themes are not really chorales at all, in the strict sense of the work, none being based on any known German chorale, but are merely reminiscent of that type of music. They usually appear in the brass or woodwind instruments in comparatively slow rhythm, and accompanied by block harmony. The hymn-like effect produced by these themes is unmistakable. None are of very long duration and they are apt to appear almost anywhere in the work. A common place to find them is in the transition sections although one plays an extremely important part in the finale of the fifth symphony. This particular chorale, quoted below, appears first as a sort of interlude between the exposition and development but soon becomes one of the subjects in the double fugue which constitutes the development section.



Whether or not these chorales are expressions of Bruckner's religious aspirations and feelings may be debatable but it seems certain that there is a strong connection between them and Bruckner's fondness for the organ. When it comes to the matter of the quotations from some of his earlier masses we apparently have little choice as to the meaning of them.

Whatever the chorales may have meant to Bruckner, the quotations from the masses certainly have a religious significance. These quotations constitute still another class of thematic material. The first use of this device appears in the adagio of the second symphony, where a passage from the Benedictus of the F minor mass occurs.¹ Another appears in the finale, one taken from the Kyrie of the same mass. In the third symphony, first movement, there is a short fragment from the mass in D. Several others are found scattered throughout the rest of the symphonies. Ordinarily not too much is made of these, all of them being of short duration and never is one used as a major thematic element of the piece as a whole. The greatest number of these quotations plus others from his earlier symphonic works appear in the adagio of the ninth symphony, where they are used no less than five times.

The one remaining class of themes is that comprising reminiscences of Wagnerian themes. The first version of the third, or "Wagner" symphony, contained several quotations from the works of the German master. Auer interprets this as simply Bruckner's naive homage to his idol.² Later versions of this symphony did away with the Wagner themes except the one in the adagio (meas. 209-211) reminiscent of the "slumber" motif from Die Walkure. The Wagnerian similarities of parts of the adagio of the seventh symphony are brought about more by the character of the themes and

1 Measure 158, at the beginning of the coda.

2 Auer, op. cit., p. 136.

by the orchestration than by any direct quotations.¹

A study of the several theme types mentioned will show how essentially Wagnerian many of Bruckner's themes are. Such themes almost of necessity demand a type of treatment similar to that found in the music-dramas of Wagner. In later chapters it will be seen how far these themes go in determining both the form and the contrapuntal treatment of the different movements of the symphonies.

1 Similar instances might be cited, as in Sym. I, Kundry's ride motif in the first movement, meas. , Sym. II, first mov't., meas. 161, a theme similar to one in Rienzi.

CHAPTER III

FORMAL PATTERNS OF THE SYMPHONIES

Bruckner's concept of symphonic style was largely in the nature of a compromise.¹ While having his roots firmly in the past he proceeded to erect structures that looked toward the future.² Taking as his point of departure the structural principles of Beethoven he at once enlarged upon them and combined his newer forms with a romanticism and Austrian flavor inherited from Schubert and his own past, and with a type of thematic expression akin to and derived from Wagner. Specifically, what Bruckner aimed at was an incorporation of the Wagnerian leit-motif technic into the symphonic form. This, of course, was not a completely new departure for Wagner himself took the symphonic principles of Beethoven and used them as the basis for the spinning of the elaborate symphonic web of his music dramas. Thus Bruckner fits into the picture by taking the symphonic form of Beethoven plus taking the Wagnerian dramatic adaptation and welding the two into a newer type of the absolute symphony. The bonds between Beethoven, Bruckner, and Wagner are extremely close and strong.

1 Newlin, op. cit., p. 41.

2 See Orel, Alfred, Anton Bruckner, (Vienna, 1925), p. 74.

Before taking up Bruckner's symphonies in detail it might be well to make a few brief general observations regarding both these compositions and the minor works. The first two symphonies, those in F minor and D minor, are the product of Bruckner's experimental period, at least as far as symphonic composition is concerned. While they show many of the traits of the nine "regular" symphonies they are less mature in style, are noticeably shorter, and are more orthodox and simple in their harmonic as well as in their symphonic style. Once his true style is reached, however, in the symphony in C minor reckoned as number one, Bruckner undergoes far less change over the course of his subsequent works. We find no such difference separating his first and ninth symphonies as we find between the first and last of Beethoven. The exact reason for this may be somewhat difficult to pin down but one or two plausible explanations may be advanced. Bruckner went through an extraordinarily long training period and did not start composing in this form until he was about thirty-eight years old.¹ By that time his mind would have reached maturity and any ideas he may have had regarding symphonic forms might have become pretty well settled, at least in their major aspects. Again, Bruckner was a conservative Austrian peasant in origin and he never outgrew the traits of this class. He was not given to deep thinking and philosophizing as were men like Wagner or Beethoven who were continually searching for something, for more adequate and exact means for expressing

¹ The F Min., "School Symphony," was begun in 1862/3, and the C min. No. 1, was not commenced until 1865.

their innermost emotions and convictions. Being of a rather complacent turn of mind we would hardly expect him to undergo any such great evolution as did Beethoven.

Although the first movements of Bruckner's symphonies are in the customary sonata-allegro form, this does not mean that they are literal copies of the classical conception of this form. The movements appear now with lengthy three-theme expositions and recapitulations, developments totally different in style than those of Brahms or Beethoven, radically different key relationships, and a number of other distinctive characteristics. The slow movements vary in form from one symphony to another and are interesting in that they keep undergoing changes and modifications throughout the course of the nine symphonies. While the scherzos all conform to the usual A B A pattern some change in the handling of the musical material within this form is noticed. Bruckner's finales are more varied than are his first movements but most of them turn out to be in either sonata-form or modifications of this form, some with rondo characteristics added. The Bruckner coda is found to be of far greater proportions than is the corresponding section in the works of the earlier composers.¹ The codas in the finales generally make use of the main theme of the opening movement, thus rounding out the whole work and making the final movement truly the climax of the entire symphony.

¹ Beethoven, however, occasionally uses very lengthy codas; that to the final movement of the piano sonata op. 31, no. 2, for example, or to the finale of the fifth symphony.

One very important Brucknerian characteristic is his block-like type of construction. Instead of the long, continuous endless melody idea found in Wagner, Bruckner's works are constructed of blocks of thematic material definitely separated from one another by cadences, long notes, general pauses, or some similar device. Little attempt ever is made to interlace his material or to connect his sections; one section is ended cleanly and then another commences. Later in his life, however, Bruckner does make some slight attempt to bridge over these joints by use of transitionao material but the result never approaches the smoothness of transition to be found in the work of such symphonists as Beethoven or Brahms.¹ Bruckner placed his contrasting groups side by side whereas Brahms used almost undetectable transitions from one theme to another.² This technique of thematic use and development is responsible in no small way for the peculiarities in Bruckner's symphonic structures. He had a highly developed faculty for building climaxes. Each theme in turn was developed until it reached its full force after which it subsided to give way to a new theme which would be treated in like manner. This type of treatment naturally would tend to divide a movement into a series of well-defined "blocks." Wellesz states that "...in every movement he (Bruckner) reaches several climaxes, around which all the rest is grouped. Not from the manipulation of the themes are these summits achieved, as in the classical symphony but the theme in its full power is revealed for

1 See, for example, the first movement of the D major Sym. of Brahms, especially the wonderful development section, or the third sym. of Beethoven in which the skilled hand of a master-craftsman may be seen throughout.

2 Wellesz-Egon, "Anton Bruckner and the Process of Musical Creation," Musical Quarterly, N. Y., July, 1938, pp. 265-290.

the first time when these summits are reached, as the thought which is the goal of the development."¹ Robert Simpson, an English analyst, explains it this way: "Beethoven relies on key for his symmetry, and Wagner upon dramatic stage situations; so Bruckner is completely dependent upon the proportions of his great climax-building passages."²

In considering the structural characteristics of Bruckner's symphonies in more detail it seems advisable to take the opening movements as a group, then the slow movements likewise, and so on for the simple reason that in studying the symphonies many characteristics keep reappearing in the various works so that we may venture certain generalizations concerning all similar movements.³

As was stated previously, the first movement of each of the nine numbered symphonies, as well as of the two unnumbered ones, is in sonata-allegro form. Basically this is the same form as can be found in the symphonies of Beethoven but the details within the form vary considerably. The most obvious Brucknerian trait is the use of three theme sections in the exposition and recapitulation. Instead of the usual A B Codetta order an A B C pattern is set up to which is added the codetta or coda. Bruckner's precedent for this modification was the use of independent

1 Wellesz, op. cit., p. 284.

2 Robert Simpson, "Anton Bruckner and the Symphony," Music Review, Cambridge, 1946, vol. 7, pp. 35-40.

3 Alfred Orel, in his book on Bruckner, uses a similar organization. Orel, Alfred, Anton Bruckner, Vienna, 1925, pp. 75-96.

coda themes in the works of the classical composers.¹ The use of new thematic material in the closing groups was reasonable common in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Bruckner merely took this idea as he found it and expanded it while at the same time increasing the thematic importance until what originally had been but a closing section now became a strong theme section in its own right standing in contrast to the preceeding second-theme section and balancing the mood and character of the first.

The typically Brucknerian block-like type of construction is used throughout. In the expositions the A B C sections are all neatly blocked off, double bars being placed at the ends of some sections to further emphasize the division. The development sections are treated in like manner.² Other composers made use of the same sectional material but (with the exception of the extended third-theme section) they never divided their sections as sharply nor did they end them as abruptly as did Bruckner. Adding even more emphasis to this block idea is the fact that the composer very frequently follows a routine dynamic pattern also. A section will begin softly and as the thematic development progresses to its climax there is a corresponding increase in dynamics the climax being forte or fortissimo. During the dissolution following the climax the music becomes softer and ends about the same as it had begun.

1 An excellent example may be seen in the early piano sonato of Beethoven op. 14, no. 2, first movement.

2 Sym. III, first movement, for example, the development is divided into four sections.

The exposition sections of Bruckner's first movements conform, almost without exception to a pattern. The openings are of particular interest. Every one of the nine, except the fifth which has an introduction of fifty measures, opens either with a tremolo in the strings (sometimes augmented by sustained notes in the wind instruments) or with a series of repeated rhythmically equal chords or pedal tones against which the main theme is set.¹ This device sets the main theme off against a neutral background that is static both rhythmically and harmonically and allows the theme to be heard without any interference to its rhythms or its melodic contours. Where Bruckner's main themes are so sharply punctuated rhythmically it is probably best that they are placed in this setting for their initial hearing so that the full impact of their rhythms and intervals may be realized. Even the fifth symphony is treated in exactly the same way immediately following the introduction. A certain dramatic effect is also gained by this procedure. Wagner used it at the opening of his Flying Dutchman and Walkure, and even as recent a composer as Sibelius uses the same technic when introducing the main theme of the opening movement of his E minor symphony. After the main motif has been stated there is no attempt made to expand the idea or to develop it; Bruckner's technic is merely to repeat this motif over and over, transposing it, perhaps transforming it, and changing the tonal color

1 An exception is noted in the string quintet which does not open in this manner but with the principle theme set off against changing harmonies and mildly contrapuntal lines in the other voices.

by his orchestration. From the original motif brief two or three note rhythmic patterns are taken and these reiterated over and over again. When the composer is satisfied that he has made enough of this material he brings it to a close just as definitely as he had begun it. A comparison of the opening section of any one of Bruckner's symphonies with the corresponding section of the second symphony of Brahms or of the eighth symphony of Beethoven, to name but two well known examples, will show how different the two styles can be.

The nature of the second, or B, themes has already been dealt with, but a few additional observations may be made regarding them. In the first place they are not the simple, single line, clear-cut themes one finds in the A theme sections, but are, in many cases, multiple or composite themes. While the main portion of the melody is stated by one or more instruments two or even three subsidiary motifs appear simultaneously in other instruments. At first appearance this thematic system seems to be but one melody plus counterpoints but the actual effect is that of two or three component elements all going to make up one musical idea. The main element may predominate but the subsidiary lines cannot be disregarded. In the following development sections Bruckner frequently makes use of material drawn from each element. One of the best examples of this type of multiple element theme is to be found in the B section of the exposition of the fourth symphony.¹ The principle melody begins in the violas, a very lyrical theme in long phrases.

¹ Sym. IV, meas. 75 ff., Similar examples may be found in the other symphonies.

Simultaneously with this theme appears the first subsidiary motif, one consisting of pairs of staccato eighth notes followed by longer notes, a motif of little lyricism and not much melodic flow. The second violins enter two beats after the first two voices with a third element of the theme group, a motif consisting of quarter and eighth notes broken up into short phrases and involving larger skips (fifths and sixths) than either of the other two melodies. In subsequent development sections all three of these elements are used. This is not an exceptional example but is typical of the majority of Bruckner's second themes. The keys of these themes as well as their key relationship with the other sections will be taken up shortly.

Following the second theme section comes that part of the exposition which differentiates Bruckner's expositions from those of his predecessors and contemporaries. The precedent for this third theme section has already been dealt with. The type of theme used here is one that gives good contrast with the second theme and approaches the character of the first. In some cases this third theme is actually drawn from the first theme section but more frequently it is of independent origin.¹ The theme used will be a single one similar to that of the A section and in contrast to the compound theme of the B section. The type of treatment of the motif, its development and contrapuntal treatment, is practically the same as is used in the first theme section. In many instances the C theme first

¹ In Symphonies II, III, and IV there is clear use of first theme material, numbers I and V of B derivations, while VI, VII, VIII, and IX have new themes.

appears fortissimo giving a sort of climactic character to the section as a whole. A codetta usually follows the C section but in some instances this is quite short, being little more than cadential extensions.

In these sonata-form movements a harmonic problem arises immediately owing to the use of three theme sections rather than two in the expositions and in the recapitulations. The customary tonal relations between the sections in the classical sonata-form are too well known to need explaining here. Bruckner, in his sonata-forms, preserves this relationship between two of his three sections, the first and the third. In every case in the first movements the third theme section is basically in the dominant or the relative major key, as the case may be, following the classical pattern. It is the second, or B, theme sections which vary. There seems to be some consistency on his part in choosing the key for the B sections. Symphonies I, II, and III follow a simple plan with the B section in the relative major of the key of the A section, thus putting both B and C in the same key. In symphonies IV and V the plan follows more experimental lines. In number IV the A is in E-flat major but the B section begins in D-flat major then changes to G-flat major. The A theme of number I is in B-flat major and the B section is in F minor and D-flat-major. The relations here are more remote. In the last four symphonies, while keeping away from the simple pattern of the first three Bruckner puts the B theme sections in keys that bear a closer relationship to the A themes than is the case in numbers IV and V. In symphonies VI and VII A is in a major key and B appears in the dominant minor. The A themes of numbers VIII and IX are in the minor keys and the B themes now

are in the dominant major. Thus these key systems are not too distant from those of the classical period but yet they are different enough to admit some new relationship and new harmonic change. The recapitulations follow along similar lines, but the keys of B sections are a little more closely related to those of the A themes. In number III, for instance, A is this time in D minor while the B theme is in D major. The C theme returns to D minor. The A theme of symphony V is in B-flat major while the B section appears in G minor. The sections in the other symphonies bear out much the same relationship.

Bruckner's developments are hardly real developments in all the sense that that work implies. We are familiar with the Beethoven, Schubert, or Brahms type of development in which the themes of the exposition are further expanded or dissected are interlaced one with another, played off against each other and contrasted, and the whole fabric run through a continuously modulating harmonic pattern. The development section of the first movement of Brahms' second symphony is an exceedingly fine example of this sort of thing. The logic and smoothness with which the development is built up is truly marvelous. In the symphonies of Bruckner we find a different sort of treatment altogether. The Wagnerian technic of taking a given motif and running it through a number of repetitions and transpositions, sequences building the texture up layer by layer, is used with one big exception, and that is that Bruckner makes little or no attempt to make his texture conform to the style of the Wagnerian endless melody. We again find the familiar block structures, each block of material being complete in itself and distinct from its neighbors. The type of treatment does not differ essentially from that used in the

exposition; indeed it is frequently little more than an extension of the exposition section. The development usually begins with a statement of the A theme.¹ This theme then becomes the basis for the first part of the development. The theme may be used in its original form running through sequential patterns each transposed; very frequently it is used in inversion even appearing in this form against its own original form; it may be transformed, augmented or diminished or changed rhythmically. A good amount of free imitation of a motif is used; the imitations being both literal and in contrary motion such as is found in symphony number V, around measures 310-315. On other occasions a pair of themes may be used; the A theme may be played against the B or C theme, or some similar combination. When two themes are to be used they are treated in exactly the same way that a single theme would be handled. The length of a given section of the development depends on nothing but the composer's sense of proportions. An entire block may be built up by the use of two or three subsections or layers. One set of imitations or repetitions may be used for a few measures in a certain set of instruments then the whole process starts over again with the orchestration changed and perhaps with the motifs somewhat transformed. When a theme or set of themes has been used long enough, the composer merely selects another set of materials and starts all over again, the treatment of the new material being exactly the same as with the first. Each of these sections is kept clearly by itself. New material is rarely entered in the middle of one of these

1 In Sym. I, the development section of the first movement begins with the B theme.

blocks. This same process is carried on throughout the entire development section. Materials from the A and B sections are used more than are those from C, and of the two the A motifs or ideas derived from them predominate. Bruckner always keeps coming back to his original or main theme. Another characteristic to be noted is that he tends to introduce his thematic material in the development sections in the same order as in the expositions. In the fifth symphony he starts his development with material drawn from the introduction then follows it with A material. Throughout the developments the composer usually sets up some sort of background against which he employs his thematic material. This often takes the form of elaborate passage work (arpeggio or broken arpeggio figures) in the strings or woodwinds, incessant repetitions of single rhythmic and melodic figures, some sort of passage work involving continuous motion in one denomination of notes, longer notes in the brass instruments to furnish a solid harmonic basis, repeated rhythmic figures in other wind instruments to give a sense of continued motion. Chordal figures in both fast and slow rhythms in the brass instruments are much used. The development generally comes to a close softly and ends either in long sustained notes or in a general pause. The recapitulation then begins just as clearly as did any of the earlier sections.

Bruckner's recapitulations do not differ in essentials from his expositions. In most cases, however, each section is somewhat shorter than its corresponding section in the exposition. This is especially true of the A and B sections. It cannot be said that Bruckner ever was given to using literal repetitions in his works. Although the recapitulations are, in general, the same as the expositions, the details change consider-

ably. The sequences of the imitation of his motif change, motifs receive further transformation, the orchestration invariably changes, different counterpoints and harmonic figurations are added, all of which go to minimize any effect of dull repetition. The one other change, and that a rather important one, is the building up of the C section to a climax and the reintroduction of the A theme. The return of this theme generally marks the beginning of the coda. The length of the coda may vary but in every case it is longer than the codetta at the end of the exposition. Bruckner's codas usually end with a series of repetitions on a single chord, many of the instruments having the same notes for as many as a dozen measures. Other instruments, very often the horns and trumpets, will have repetitions of rhythmic figures derived from the main motif and usually conforming to arpeggio or other chordal patterns melodically. The closings are all fortissimo except in the eighth symphony. The recapitulation is thus built up into the climax of the entire movement; the return of the main theme rounds out the form perfectly.

Regarding the proportions of the various sections of the movements we find a few things of note. No serious deviation from the classical standards is to be found, however. It does not seem possible to establish the fact that Bruckner was working toward any particular solution to the problem of proportions. In general it might be stated that his recapitulations balance his expositions fairly well. Ordinarily if one section is to be shorter than the other it is the recapitulation which

will be shortened.¹ The fourth symphony is a good example of this form, 188 measures in the exposition as against 166 in the recapitulation. The seventh likewise presents the same proportions, 164 measures in the exposition and 131 in the recapitulation. But how are we to fit such a late work as the first movement of the eighth symphony into such a picture? Here the total number of measures in the exposition comes to 126 while in the recapitulation the length is 145 measures. In every case the development section is found to be shorter than either the exposition or the recapitulation. This scheme of having the development shorter than either of the other main section is not new. Such proportions are typical of both the pre-classical and romantic periods, and many examples may even be found in the classical period. The particular nature of Bruckner's symphonic work may have some bearing on the matter also. The development sections differ in character and treatment but slightly from the expositions, sometimes even giving the impression of being merely continuations of the expositions in different keys. In view of this, Bruckner may have felt that a lengthy development was not needed. Structurally, then, we see that Bruckner's sonata form first movements, while showing some individualism in the details, are essentially rooted firmly in the traditional sonata form of the earlier Viennese composers.

B

Where the first movements of Bruckner's symphonies all adhere to a single pattern the sonata-form, the slow movements show more variation from one to another. Some of them tend to have similar patterns but in

1 This same treatment may be found in the works of many other composers even dating back to the pre-classical period. See, for example, some of the works of K. P. E. Bach, Domenico Paradisi, and others.

these the proportions of the sections vary. It probably is best to discuss them according to the two or three types into which the movements may be divided.

The most common type found is the small rondo with variations form which has this design A B A1 B1 A2 Coda. It may be found in Symphonies II, V, VII, VIII, and IX. This is the same form Beethoven used in the slow movement of his ninth symphony, a work which Bruckner studies much and admired greatly. In using this form Bruckner never repeats his theme sections exactly. Each time a theme reappears in a new section it is varied or developed beyond the previous appearance.

Although it has been said that the proportions vary there are one or two characteristics regarding the length of the sections that are fairly general. In four of the five cases using this form the second appearance of the A section is of greater length than the first, the eighth symphony having exactly equal parts. It so happens also that, taking the four cases mentioned, Sym. II, V, VII, and IX, this second appearance of A is increasingly longer in each one in that same order. The number of measures increase in each is 4, 21, 23, and 51, respectively. The final appearance of the A material does not follow such a pattern. In No. II the final A is shorter than the opening A; in No. V, longer; No. VII, longer; No. VIII, longer, but in No. IX, it is again shorter. Returning to the first peculiarity noted, namely, the increasing length of the middle section, some attention may be given this. It seems fairly safe to assume that Bruckner was attempting to work out a certain balance of pattern. The idea must have been rather vague in his mind and he tried to crystalize

it by successive experimentations. It is not improbable that he was seeking to impart into this A B A1 B1 A2 form the more general aspects, at least as far as proportion is concerned, and the same balance that the sonata-form possesses. We know that Bruckner was fond of the sonata-form and that he could handle it capably. Is it not possible that in enlarging the central A section of his slow-movement form he was attempting to match the proportion of the development section of the sonata-form? In the sonata-form the development section has roughly the same length as the A and B theme sections of the exposition. In the slow movements of the Seventh and Ninth symphonies of Bruckner, the center A section is also roughly as long as the first A and B sections combined. We might have the following comparative pattern:

	Exposition	Development	Recapitulation	Coda
Sonata-form	---- A B	A & B	A B	--
Bruckner	----- A & B	A	= B & A	--
	(small rondo form)			

It must be understood that this comparison is of proportions only, not use of thematic development. In the Bruckner form this middle section is in no wise a real development as it involves only the A thematic material which is not even treated in true development style. In real repetition of the A or the B theme sections Bruckner varies them one way or another. In some cases he develops them through different key sequences, different contrapuntal treatment, by using the main theme in

augmentation, and so on. Very frequently he changes the background; elaborate passage work appears in the strings against which the theme may be set while the woodwinds or brass may have long sustained chords. Most always this passage work appears in the violins rather than in all the strings simultaneously. The lower strings supported by instruments from the wind groups carry the main theme.

The reason so much has been said of this particular form is that it seems to be the one toward which Bruckner tended to lean more and more. Furthermore, Bruckner made very little advance in his forms during his life which makes this change stand out all the more. As he progressed through the composition of his symphonies, the use of this form became more frequent.

In two other cases Bruckner used slow movement forms somewhat close to the one just described. The first symphony uses the following form A B C A B Coda. Here we have a third thematic element introduced. The C section is framed between two sets of A and B, and is seventy measures long. The first A and B combined total forty-five measures while the last pair is forty-seven measures. The fourth symphony has a slow movement which may be divided into two main sections each of an equal number of parts. The pattern is thus A B A A B A Coda, a complex binary form. The odd feature of this pattern is the use of two A sections in succession; there is, however, a clear break between them in the score.

Two symphonies have quite different forms, the third and the sixth. The third has a straight compound ternary A B A with the middle section being subdivided into another A B A. The balance is about even, however,

as the two A sections total 106 measures while the B has 11⁴. The sixth symphony has the most complex form of all. Again the movement is divided in half, the first having this pattern, A B C A, while the second half is changed to A B C B Coda (A). The proportions work out very well, though, and a good symmetrical pattern results. The total number of measures in the first half is 92, and in the latter half, 85. In this second half the Coda is all A material and is one measure longer than the first A in this half. Within the halves a similar balance exists.

In all the slow movements certain traits exist which are common to all of Bruckner's symphonies. The first is the use of the sectional idea. A theme section is developed as long as desired then completely stopped. The next theme is then taken up and treated in like manner. There is a clear-cut division between all sections. Another characteristic is that in each of the theme sections only the material of that particular section is used; there is seldom any mixing of material.

The whole direction of the movement is toward a climax which usually comes in the section immediately preceeding the coda, the final section being used merely to return to the mood and color of the beginning of the movement.

C

Structurally, the scherzos are the simplest of any of the movements of Bruckner's symphonies. They are all built along exactly the same lines, being in the classical scherzo, trio, da capo form as used by Beethoven and Schubert. These movements are the only ones in which the composer uses literal repetition to any degree. In every symphony except

I, IV, and IX there is a da capo after the trio which means, of course, that the third section of the movement is to be exactly the same as the first in every respect. The scherzos of the other three symphonies show some change in the third sections although they are essentially the same as the first. It is in the orchestration that much of the difference occurs although there is frequent alteration of the thematic material also. Take, for example, the scherzo of the first symphony; in the third section both of the A subdivisions are identical with those in the first section, while the B subdivision has a few measures which are orchestrated differently. In the fourth symphony the only change is the shortening of a couple of the sub-sections in the final part.

In character these movements are the only ones in which Bruckner keeps both feet solidly on the ground. There is no trace of the lofty idealism or the mysticism of the other movements. In these the Austrian folk-spirit, so pronounced in the scherzos of Schubert, is given full play. In the scherzos of Symphonies I through IV Bruckner writes the conventional type of Austrian dance movement. From the fifth symphony on there is some experimentation. The opening figures of the scherzo in the fifth are identical with those of the preceeding adagio except that they are sped up considerably and a new counter-melody is written. This is a device familiar in the music of the late sixteenth century, the Tanz and Nachtanz.¹ The chief differences in these later works is more in the style than in the forms; themes are treated in a somewhat lighter manner,

1 Newlin, op. cit., p. 94.

the texture becomes lighter, and such. The Austrian dance spirit is still present in all, though, even in the ninth.

Structurally the movements are built up on but two sets of thematic material. Generally speaking, the scherzo section, that is, the part as far as the trio, is built up chiefly on one motif. This motif, plus derivation from it, is used over and over again, the composer's technic being to hammer it into the listener's mind. The scherzo of the eighth symphony is an excellent example of this type of writing. The second, or B, section of the scherzo is based on the same A material but this is transformed or inverted. In the eighth symphony it is merely inverted. When the A returns again it is nearly a literal repetition of the opening measures. Trios in every case are based on entirely new material generally of a somewhat more lyrical character. A striking exception to this is the theme of the trio in symphony number six which is a very light playful motif, making use of wide skips, and is played by the strings pizzicato. While the form in the first or scherzo section is always A B A, that in the trio may vary. In the first symphony the trio form is an asymmetrical binary as is that of the eighth. The others may be subdivided into small ternary forms.

Once again the sectional or block type of construction is used just as in the other movements, each section being clearly separated from its neighbors. As a class these scherzos are the most orthodox of all Bruckner's movements. The proportions of the sections balance up fairly well throughout.

D

Of all the movements of Bruckner's symphonies it apparently was the finales which gave him the greatest concern. He undoubtedly struggled somewhat with the problem of the exact function of the finale and came to the conclusion that it should have some connection with the earlier movements. Bruckner's ideal finale is that which accomplishes the greatest synthesis, but he was not able to reduce this ideal conception to terms of practical form too often. He was most successful in the fifth and eighth symphonies. In these works he makes more headway with the cyclic principle. It is rather difficult to tell just why he did not carry out more often the designs used in the two works mentioned. Perhaps it was due to purely technical problems which he was not able to solve to his own satisfaction, but on the other hand it may have been the result of his rather hesitant, conservative nature which made him hold back on any radical ideas in face of the hostile attitude of the Viennese musical world.

Many of the characteristics of the sonata-form first movements are to be found also in the finales, consequently they will not be gone over again in detail. The theme-types have been dealt with; the block-like structures, the multiple-theme B sections, the three-theme sections, the usual type of development technic, all are found in the finales. Only those aspects which belong specifically to the last movements will be discussed here.

The finales of the symphonies may be divided into three classes according to their formal patterns. First there are those that are in

straight sonata-form, the two unnumbered symphonies and numbers I, VI, and VIII. Four others, numbers III, IV, V, and VII, might be classified as modified sonata-forms, while number II is a rondo of a rather modified type.

Of those in the first class, the finale of number I is the most orthodox and straight-forward, having the customary three theme exposition and recapitulation. The development makes use of the same thematic material in the exact same order and manner as in the exposition. The proportions of the sections are fairly equal except that the development section here is slightly longer than is usual with Bruckner. Symphonies VI and VIII, being more mature works, present a more complex picture. In number VI, for instance, the exposition is the longest single section having six thematic subdivisions, four of which are based on A material.¹ The development is based solely on A and C material and is considerably shorter than either the exposition or the recapitulation. This latter section again uses the A B and C themes, but only the A2 is used this time, and following the C the A theme of the first movement appears. The coda is built on A3, A2 and finally on A1 of the first movement to end the work. Much more emphasis is placed, therefore, on A material in this movement than was the case with the first symphony. Also, the use of the introductory theme of the work to close with gives a completely rounded out connection between the first and last movements. The exposition balances the recapitulation very well (176 measures in the

¹ A1 (Meas. 3), A2 (27), A3 (37), A2 (47), B (65), and C (129).

former to 173 in the latter, including the coda) but the development section is but 68 measures in length. This carries out a previous statement that Bruckner's developments are in many cases not real developments in the usual sense of the word but merely modulatory extensions of the exposition. Sym. VIII presents a slightly different picture. Where in VI A dominated the exposition, in VIII the balance is a little more equal.¹ The development is again shorter but is nearer the proportionate length of the average development section of the first movements. This section begins with about twenty measures of the A1 theme of the adagio, and is followed by development of C2 and A1 and 2 of the finale. Oddly enough, in both this and the sixth symphony, the B themes are omitted entirely from the developments. The recapitulation is not quite as complex thematically as the exposition, and, like the sixth, includes a statement of the A1 theme of the first movement which in turn is again used at the end of the coda. The exposition balances the recapitulation (208 measures as against 210) but the coda following the latter is sixty-two measures in length, making a section of major proportions. The development is just twice this length. Apparently Bruckner is using the coda here as a final summary and synthesis of the work,² making it of sufficient length so that it stands clearly as a section in itself.

1 A1 (meas. 3), A2 (31), B1 (70), B2 (75), B3 (93), C1 (129), C2 (153), and C3 (169).

2 In this coda the main motif from the scherzo is used in augmentation in combination with the main themes of both the first and last movements.

Several distinctive features are to be found in the finales of the second group, those in modified sonata-form. Number VII is the simplest of the group and is unique in that it marks the only time that Bruckner reverts to the classical practice of using a two-theme exposition. The recapitulation goes one step further and makes use of nothing but the A theme. In the coda, however, both the A and the A of the first movement are used. It is the shortest finale to be found in the later works and in proportions resembles symphony I; the development is just about twice the length of either of the other two sections. The chief feature of symphony III is the use, for the first time by Bruckner, of the opening theme of the first movement in the finale. In this case it first appears briefly at the beginning of the recapitulation and later is the basis of the coda. The A of the finale is not used in the recapitulation, the section proper really starting with the B theme (meas. 333). In proportions, the balance here is more normal, exposition, 192 measures, development, 140, and recapitulation, 165. Number IV is similar to VIII in that it has a very full exposition and development, but unique in that it has a very short recapitulation and coda. The latter two sections have a combined length of but sixty-four measures while the other two sections have over two hundred each.

It is the finale of fifth symphony which deserves the greatest consideration of all as it probably comes closer to fulfilling Bruckner's ideas of an ideal finale than does any other. It is difficult to understand why he did not follow this pattern, along general lines at least, more frequently. The movement obviously is modeled after the finale of

Beethoven's ninth and it probably represents Bruckner's greatest effort at combining and reconciling the harmonic and polyphonic styles. Like the first movement of the same symphony, it begins with an introduction which copies the pattern of the Beethoven ninth almost literally. The theme of the introduction of the first movement opens this finale and eleven measures later a hint of the A of the finale is heard. At measure 13 the A of the first movement appears, followed at 21 by the A of the finale once more. Two measures later the A of the adagio is heard. Thus, like Beethoven, he picks up the themes of the previous movements one by one only to discard them almost immediately. The exposition begins at the twenty-ninth measure and is fairly regular except that when the C theme comes in it appears against the A. The second element of the C theme is a chorale. It is the development which is the most unusual part of this movement. This section is a double fugue one hundred twenty measures in length, on the chorale theme and the A theme of the exposition (meas. 221-341).¹ The major part of the contrapuntal motion is supplied by the thematic material based on the A theme while the solidarity of the chorale supplies a definite harmonic feeling thus giving the listener a splendid effect of the combination of these two forces, the harmonic and the contrapuntal. The recapitulation again recalls the A of the first movement but does not present the full use of all the regular material belonging to the finale that the exposition does. Although it makes use

¹ The use of fugal treatment in the development of sonato-allegro forms is not new, however. Beethoven makes use of this device in his late works. e.g. Sonata for Pianoforte, op. 101, fourth movement. See also Orel, op. cit., p. 94.

of nothing but the A theme and the chorale, and the coda of the A of the first movement, in number of measures it balances the exposition almost exactly, 170 as against 176 for the exposition.

The one remaining symphony, the second, has a finale which is cast in a rather free rondo-form. It even shows some vague relationship with the sonata-form. Its pattern presents a somewhat arbitrary arrangement of three themes.¹ In counting the number of measures in each section we find the result equally incoherent. No consistent pattern presents itself. It is difficult to see just what Bruckner was searching for in this movement. At any rate, he never wrote another finale that resembled this one.

Bruckner's finales do not, therefore, constitute a homogeneous group as do his first movements. Where the first movements may easily be discussed as a group, the finales must be considered individually. We can notice, however, that Bruckner does make some progress in the over-all conception of the finale. It becomes clearer from one work to another that he believes the function of the finale should be that of a true climax to the entire symphony. The nature of the music of the finale itself gives this feeling which is considerably strengthened by the use in the coda of the main theme of the first movement. While the two unnumbered symphonies and the first two of the regular series do not make use of this cyclic principle, all the symphonies from the third on end

1 A B A C B Episode A C B A C B A (episode) A B A.

with strong returns to the opening theme of the work.¹ It should be added that in some cases this return is made by employing only the rhythm of the opening theme, not the complete melody.² The wind instruments usually thunder out chordal figures based on this rhythm while the rest of the orchestra continues with melodies or figurations belonging to the last movement. In the matter of proportions it seems impossible to discover any scheme that appears throughout the symphonies. A given section may be longer in one or two cases only to become shorter later on and longer again still later. Apparently Bruckner was counting on a relative importance and force of a section musically more than he was on its measured length to give him the desired sense of balance.

Bruckner's forms, therefore, while showing certain peculiarities of their own, are solidly based on the structural principles of the late Viennese classicists. Beethoven undoubtedly exerted the strongest influence on Bruckner in this matter, and of the works of that master the great ninth symphony seems to have been the one in which Bruckner took the greatest amount of interest. Bruckner's connection with the past, then, is unmistakable. The ways in which he varied the details of the symphonic forms due largely to the nature of his thematic material and his contrapuntal treatment show he was to take these forms and orient them along different lines toward the future. His interpretation of the

1 Orel, op. cit., p. 95.

2 Compare use of first movement material in codas of Symphonies IV and VIII, for example.

synphony was to be one of compromise between the classicism of Beethoven and newer dramatic ideas of Wagner. The forms of Beethoven are to be treated in a Wagnerian manner.

CHAPTER IV

THE QUESTION OF EDITIONS

As was stated in the introduction, one of the most serious questions arising in making a study of Bruckner's symphonies is that of the editions. The published works of Bruckner were the property of several publishers owing to certain business transactions involving one company being bought out by another. Eventually the works all became the property of Universal Edition, Vienna. The symphonies No. 1 through No. 8 were all published during Bruckner's lifetime. The early "Student Symphony" in f minor, the Symphony in d minor, No. 0, and the unfinished Symphony No. 9, were not published until after Bruckner's death. But one movement, the second, of the f minor symphony has been published. (Universal Edition, 1924)

The controversy began about 1925 when Dr. Orel compared the autograph of the Ninth Symphony¹ with the printed version and at once became aware of many changes in the orchestration. He not only made this fact known but with his colleague, Professor Haas, began making similar comparisons of the other symphonies. In most of the works changes in the orchestration were found, and in several of the symphonies cuts had been made in the various movements. The obvious question was, of course, who was responsible

1 The manuscripts of Bruckner's works are in the National Library, Vienna.

for the changes? As some of the changes were not in Bruckner's handwriting, who was this third person, and by what right did he alter the works?

During Bruckner's years of teaching in Vienna several young musicians studied under him who later became leading figures in the musical world. Among these pupils were the brothers Franz and Josef Schalk and Ferdinand Löwe.¹ Franz Schalk and Löwe became world-renowned conductors. These same men, along with the composer Hugo Wolf became extremely ardent champions of the music of both Bruckner and Wagner. In many cases the Schalk brothers and Löwe made certain recommendations to Bruckner regarding his works. Exactly what proportion of these recommendations was sought by Bruckner himself and how much was "offered" by his pupils we cannot determine with any degree of accuracy. We do know that Bruckner was not particularly opposed to their suggestions, and in some cases was actually enthusiastic over the results obtained through them.² It must be remembered that these men had behind them the experience of practical orchestral conductors while Bruckner had no such experience or training. As a result they may have been able to calculate results far more accurately than could Bruckner. In some cases these suggested changes were actually made in the manuscript scores by one or another of these men, but, as they later swore, only with Bruckner's approval and with his best interests at heart.

At any rate, when the great controversy arose some twenty-odd years

1 Dr. Karl Muck, Artur Nikisch, and Gustav Mahler were also Bruckner's pupils.

2 First Vienna performance of the Fifth Symphony, for example. Bruckner was very pleased with the results of experimenting with the brass chairs. (See Wellesz, op. cit., p. 265.)

after the composer's death, the Schalk brothers and Löwe were immediately accused of mutilating the works of a great master in their attempts to revamp them along lines more pleasing to themselves. Investigations into the matter were undertaken both by individuals and by committees. Letters of the men concerned were sought out and examined, interviews were held and verbal testimony taken. One of the chief witnesses was Ferdinand Löwe's widow who produced letters and gave sworn statements that her husband had never acted contrary to the will of Bruckner; anything changed in the scores or in performance by him was done only with the composer's approval. The files of the publishers were thoroughly searched for any information that they might contain. The proof-sheets of the first editions particularly were sought as they might solve the entire riddle. Before these sheets were returned to the publisher they would have been initialed or signed by the composer and the authority for any changes could be known. Unfortunately they have never been found, apparently having been lost or discarded when the property of one or another of the publishers changed hands.¹

The problem is still far from being solved and the authorities still adhering to the older editions are about as numerous and as competent as those who condemn them.²

1 For much of this information, I am indebted to Dr. Paul Pisk, of Redlands Univ., Calif., who was a member of one of the investigating committees, and to Dr. Karl Geiringer, of Boston Univ., who was living in Vienna during the most turbulent period of the argument.

2 The leading men attacking the validity of the old editions are, of course Drs. Haas and Orel whose chief works on Bruckner are listed in the bibliography. Notes by these men are also given in the introductions to the Urtext scores. Dika Newlin, in this country, in her book Bruckner, Mahler, Schoenberg, follows the same line although many statements are open to question. On the opposite side, men like Kurth, Machabey and Wellesz, are able to produce strong evidence to uphold their positions.

At present there are two editions of the works of Bruckner in publication, the older one and a new edition based on the manuscripts. In the following discussion the term Urtext signifies the edition based on the text of the Bruckner autographs, edited by Professors Haas and Orel. This edition was first published by the Musikwissenschaft Verlag, Vienna, and at present by the Brucknerverlag, Wiesbaden, Germany. The term Universal means the first published editions, now the property of Universal Edition, Vienna.

The editions vary chiefly in two ways, the orchestration differs considerably in some cases, and cuts are made in several movements. These changes are to be found in the Universal Edition of the symphonies. It is with this matter of cuts that we will be concerned here as such changes may have some bearing on the formal patterns of the works. A careful comparison of the two editions yields the following results.

The two early unnumbered symphonies (f minor and d minor) were not published during Bruckner's lifetime and exist only in the form found in the Vienna manuscripts. (Urtexte)

Symphony No. 1

Both the Linz version of 1865/66 and the much later Vienna version (1890/91) of this symphony are given in the Urtext edition. The authenticity of either version is not to be doubted but the latter obviously is to be taken in preference to the former. Bruckner made a complete revision of this entire work in 1890 revamping whole movements. The resulting forms naturally differ at times, but owing to the fact that the second version was the only one Bruckner had published, this will be the only one considered here. A comparison of Vienna version as published in Urtext

edition with Universal's edition of the first symphony, we find the two identical as regards the form. There are no discrepancies at any point.

Symphony No. 2

First movement - The two editions coincide as far as measure 438. At this point an optional cut of 32 measures (438-520) is indicated in the Urtext.¹ This cut is actually made in the Universal edition, the 32 measures being deleted. After this cut both editions are the same as far as measure 566 of the Urtext. Three additional measures of cadential extension are to be found in the Universal edition.

Second movement - Both editions are the same through measure 47. A cut is then suggested in the Urtext. (meas. 48-70) and made in Universal. The remainder of the movement shows no change.

Third movement - Scherzo - The only change in this section of the movement is an added measure in the cadence in Universal Edition. The trio and the da capo are identical in both editions. However, the two-measure G. P. at the beginning of the Coda in the Universal Edition does not appear in the Urtext.

Finale - This movement shows several differences. Both editions coincide through measures 387. A cut of measures 388-513 is suggested but not made in the Universal Edition; no such indication appears in the Urtext. However, two cuts are indicated further along in the Urtext, one of twenty-three measures at measure 540 and a second one of sixty-one measures at 589.

¹ This cut as well as others appearing in the Urtext editions are undoubtedly Bruckner's own recommendations.

Both of these cuts are made in the Universal Edition. Thus in the Urtext the movement is eighty-four measures longer, 697 measures as against 613.

Symphony No. 4.

Neither the first nor the second movements of this symphony shows any change in the form.

Third movement - The opening scherzo is the same in both editions except that the Urtext is four measures longer, (259 as against 255) the extra measures being in the final cadence of the section. The trio shows no discrepancies. With the return to the scherzo, however, changes appear. In the Urtext there is a da capo indication at the end of the trio but in the Universal Edition the scherzo is again written out. This time it is identical with the opening scherzo only as far as measure 26. Measures 27-92 are now omitted. No further change appears until the final cadence which is now shortened by two measures.

Fourth movement - Bruckner wrote two finales to his fourth symphony. The original one of 1878 was replaced by another two years later. This second version is, of course, to be preferred to that of 1878. The two are quite different both thematically and in length, the second being nearly one hundred measures shorter. Both finales are published in the Urtext score.

The finale published in the Universal Edition is an alteration of the 1880 movement mentioned above. Comparing these two we find them identical through measure 382. Measures 383 through 430 of the Urtext are cut out in the Universal Edition, the resulting gap being bridged by twelve new measures which do not appear in the Urtext at all. The remainder of the movement shows no differences.

Symphony No. 5

As in the fourth symphony, the first two movements of the fifth are identical in both editions. In the third movement, however, there is one significant change. The da capo direction at the end of the trio in the Urtext requires that the entire three hundred eighty-five measures of the scherzo be replayed. In the Universal Edition the direction reads Scherzo da capo dal segno. In following this direction the first two hundred forty-five measures of the scherzo section are cut out completely. (140 measures as against 385)

Finale - The differences between the two editions in this movement are considerable. In the introduction measures 13 and 14 of the Urtext are omitted in the Universal Edition. From here on there is no further change until measure 271 of the Urtext. Here a cut to measure 374 is indicated but the indication does not appear in the Universal Edition. Again there are no differences through measure 321 of the Urtext. Measures 322-353 of the critical edition are omitted in the older edition and two new measures (Universal 320-321) are inserted. Then measure 354 of the Urtext equals 322 Universal. The following nineteen measures are the same in both copies but the next eighty-five measures of the Urtext (374-459) are omitted in Universal. Thus when the recapitulation is reached, measure 460 of the Urtext equals 342 of Universal. No further change takes place until the end of the movement where four measures of the final cadence are cut out in the Universal Edition.

Symphony No. 6

This symphony is the only one of the nine which was published in its original form, consequently both editions are the same.

Symphony No. 7

A comparison of the two editions of this symphony shows them to be identical as far as the form and number of measures are concerned.

Symphony No. 9

The only change in this symphony comes at the end of the scherzo section of the third movement. Both editions are the same to measure 243, but from here there are four measures to the end of the section in the Urtext while in the Universal Edition there are but three. In the Urtext there is a da capo direction at the end of the trio. This does not appear in the Universal Edition, the section being rewritten owing to changes in the orchestration.

The third and first movements show no discrepancies at all in the number of measures.

Urtext Editions are not available as yet for the third and eighth symphonies. Thus no comparison can be made in the case of these two works.

After noting all the changes made in these scores the next step is to try to determine the effect of this editing on the structural patterns of the symphonies. A great deal has been made of this matter from time to time, so much so that one is occasionally apt to get the impression that the symphonies have been mutilated in a rather wanton manner.¹ This is not the true picture, however. Symphonies I, VI, and VII are identical in

¹ See, for example, Newlin, op. cit.

both editions, while IX differs by but one measure. Thus four of the nine symphonies are automatically taken out of the argument at once. What of the others?

In the second symphony the cuts in the first, second, and fourth movements which are suggested in the Urtext, are made in the Universal Edition. Bruckner, therefore, is himself responsible for these cuts.

The scherzo of the fourth symphony has measures 27-92 of the A theme section deleted in the da capo. The result here is a restatement of the A theme following the trio but in shortened form. In recapitulation sections of many older works the theme sections are frequently shorter than in the expositions and transition material is often left out altogether. Such is the effect in this movement. Furthermore, there is a long restatement of A following the second theme section. Shortening the first appearance would tend to emphasize the climactic effect of the full final statement. A similar instance occurs in the final movement. While the omission of the main theme (meas. 382ff.) may violate the purely formal scheme of the symphony, the architectural effect is greatly improved. The main theme had been stated fully just previous to this cut.

In the fifth symphony there is a long cut in the da capo of the scherzo. This cut eliminates the entire restatements of both the A and B theme sections. The result is a short return after the trio, the section beginning with the A theme but the B theme appearing almost immediately and both then progressing simultaneously. The result here again is the creating of a summation effect, contrary, no doubt, to the classical symphonic pattern, yet not without a certain logic and sense of balance along broader lines.

Two cuts are made in the final movement, both coming in the development section. The first (meas. 322 ff.) shortens the fugue by some thirty measures, while the second (meas. 374 ff.) takes out the entire development of the B theme, 85 measures. This B development has no connection with the main section of the development, the double fugue, and its omission actually strengthens the work. The fugue then reaches its conclusion and climax at the point where the recapitulation begins. In the Urtext there is an indicated cut which, if made, would be far more damaging to the whole movement than the two cuts made in the Universal score. Here the bulk of the entire double fugue, one of the most impressive sections of the symphony, would be omitted while keeping the relatively unimportant section developing the B theme. As far as the balance of the sections is concerned, if no cuts are made the development is considerably longer than either the exposition or recapitulation; with the deletions it is shorter than the other sections. Thus these cuts are not really as detrimental to the over-all plan and effect of the work as they may seem at first.

As has been shown, certain of the cuts made in the scores of Bruckner do alter the balance and detail of the symphonic forms. If we approach this problem from the standpoint of the classical forms we are almost sure to arrive at the conclusion that this cutting is very detrimental to the works as a whole. But after all, was Bruckner particularly set on adhering to the strict letter of the law regarding these classical forms? Did he originally plan on preserving them just as he had inherited them from his predecessors? Bruckner was heavily under the influence of Wagner, and while that composer used the idea of the symphonic development of Beethoven,

he made no attempt whatever to carry the forms of Beethoven into his music dramas. Nevertheless it is generally agreed that the Wagnerian musical structure has a certain logic in its design that is quite satisfactory from the artistic point of view. This is due to the fact that Wagner deals with structures and designs larger and more massive than can be contained within certain closed forms. He creates musical architecture. Bruckner, in his symphonies, also deals with these huge masses and the design here is likewise of an architectural nature. Dr. Egon Wellesz points this out very clearly and his conclusion seems to be quite logical.

"If one approaches Bruckner from the point of view of musical architecture--which does not always necessarily coincide with the symphonic scheme--one will be able to observe, from an analysis of his works, that in every movement he reaches several climaxes, round which all the rest is grouped. Not from the manipulation of the themes are these summits achieved, as in the classical symphony, but the theme in its full power is revealed for the first time when these summits are reached, as the thought which is the goal of the development. The arrival at such a summit does not always follow a single upward surge, but more often comes after several shorter passages. When, therefore, it appeared that an intermediate climax weakened the effect of the main theme, it was very often decided to make an heroic cut. With such a cut the scheme of the symphonic form might well be damaged, but the total effect heightened. From the peculiarity, just described, in Bruckner's architecture, it is clear that passages could be deleted without the composer's making intolerable concessions. If we--to employ a parallel easily comprehensible--may compare a classical symphony to a Greek temple, we may also compare the constructive plan of a Bruckner symphony to a Gothic cathedral. In the first pair juxtaposed one can think of no alteration that would not disturb the essential form. In the second, the form is composed of many single parts, and the total effect remains practically undisturbed even though little changes are made in the composition of the parts."¹

¹ Wellesz, Egon, op. cit., p. 284-285.

We know for a fact that Bruckner was forever revising his works, always seeking to improve them. The ardent followers of Bruckner who have been condemned for mutilating their master's symphonies solemnly vowed that they did nothing against the will or wishes of Bruckner, that any changes they made or recommended were made only with his approval and in the best interests of the works themselves. Nowhere do we find any evidence of Bruckner's having voiced an objection against the edited versions of his compositions. In the case of the fourth symphony, as stated previously, the cut in the last movement actually improves and strengthens the over-all effect. Since Bruckner himself had heard this version of the symphony several times, without remonstrance, we must conclude that he had realized that the deletion was necessary or advisable. This is not to imply in the least that Bruckner was a weak-willed individual who was readily influenced by anyone. History is full of cases in which a composer would seek or accept advice regarding his compositions. To quote Wellesz again.

"The nameless boy, favored by no external circumstances, sets himself a goal--he will be a teacher. He achieves it. Now he will be a music teacher besides. This also he achieves. Now he will be a teacher of higher forms; he succeeds. Then organists; again he succeeds. Now he wills to be a composer; he feels in himself the strength to achieve the highest. He succeeds in remodeling his life on a totally new basis; and in the sphere of art he mounts from work to work until in the Adagio of the Ninth Symphony he reaches classical greatness and perfection.

Can one, in the light of such a development, support the legend which says that Bruckner was like a child and accommodated himself to the will of every stranger? It seems not."¹

¹ Wellesz, op. cit., p. 269.

The authenticity of the original manuscripts is not to be doubted for a moment, but it is possible to put too much emphasis on these. They are, after all, only the original manuscripts and not the final proofs for publications. The missing proof sheets might answer many questions but they undoubtedly are lost forever. Whether the changes were made by Bruckner personally or not seems of minor consequence; the fact that he did not repudiate these alterations or suggestions is sufficient. Until more concrete and conclusive evidence is discovered it seems as though we should accept the older published versions as Bruckner's final will.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The problem was to determine the characteristics of the style of Anton Bruckner and to place him in his proper historical position in the development of the nineteenth century Viennese symphony. A composer reared under highly conservative conditions trained by rigid pedantic teachers, and living most of his life in the most reactionary city of the western world, Bruckner turned out symphonic masterpieces that were to set the path for the less tradition-bound composers of the late nineteenth and the twentieth centuries.

An analysis of his symphonic works shows a number of characteristics peculiar to his work alone. His first movements make use of no form other than the sonata-form. In them he uses three-theme expositions and recapitulations, which is an extension of a principle found in Beethoven.¹ The forms of the scherzos are all regular, each being in the customary scherzo form. In the slow movements some variance is found but the form most used is the rondo with variations. The finales have greatly varying forms, nearly all being modifications of the sonata-form. The thematic material used in these works is largely the short Wagnerian motif-type rather than the long melody complete in itself. It is entirely of instrumental origin.

¹ Beethoven's use of independent thematic material in the closing sections of his sonata-forms is the precedent for Bruckner's structure.

In developments this material is handled somewhat in the Wagnerian fashion, more repeated than actually developed. The themes frequently undergo considerable transformation. One of the major characteristics of Bruckner's symphonies is their block-like method of construction. Instead of interlacing his melodic material as does Wagner or Brahms, he prefers to use one or two themes exclusively for a while then completely discard them and take up some new material which is then treated in exactly the same manner.

The question of the editions of Bruckner's works and the differences between them, is nearly impossible to solve conclusively owing to lack of convincing evidence. Structurally, arguments may be advanced in support of either edition. Taking into consideration the fact that Bruckner heard performances of the "edited" versions without voicing any objection can lead only to the conclusion that he was content to let them pass as his final version.

The Viennese musical world, used to the music of the Classical composers, condemned Bruckner as a radical but it is questionable whether he really was or not. A strong element of classical restraint is visible throughout his work even in the midst of his most Wagnerian movements. If Bruckner were really the radical he was claimed to be, why did he base his work so heavily on the symphonic principles of Beethoven and Schubert instead of leaving the classical circle altogether and throwing in his lot with Liszt and Berlioz? The logical answer is that he could not, owing partly to his own nature and partly to his origins and training. Bruckner was always a good patriotic Catholic Austrian, good enough, in fact, to

warrant being appointed a teacher in the two strongholds of Austrian musical conservatism, the conservatory and the university. In examining his works we find so many connections between them and the works of the Viennese classicists that his relation to them is easily established. The influence of his predecessors on him was strong enough, but his influence on his successors was probably even stronger. Mahler certainly owed much to him, and even Schonberg is not free from his influence. Bruckner took the classical Symphony as it had left the hands of Beethoven and Schubert and imparted to it a new life and a new meaning through the force of his own personality and idealism. Brahms had continued the conservative aspects of the classical symphony and at his death the end of that road was reached. Beyond Brahms there was nothing. Bruckner starting from the same place set out along more daring paths and thereby opened up an avenue for future composers to travel. He did little that was radically new, but took ideas he saw in the works of his predecessors and expanded them, adding something from the more advanced German school, thus reorienting the entire concept of the symphony. Thus Bruckner's final place is between Schubert and Mahler. The romanticism of the former is continued in him, and it is his mystic romanticism which paves the way for the highly complex personal expressions of Mahler at the close of the century.

APPENDIX

HISTORICAL DATA ON BRUCKNER SYMPHONIES

Symphony in F minor: (also known as the "Student Symphony"). Composition of this work was begun on February 15, 1863. The andante was finished on April 10, 1863. The scherzo was composed between April 11-13, and the entire symphony finished on May 16, 1863.¹ This symphony, Bruckner's first work in that form, was written during his Linz period while he was studying under Otto Kitzler. Only the andante has been published, and that movement not until some years after Bruckner's death. (Published by Universal-Edition, Vienna). The work was performed, however, by Franz Moissl and the Klosterneuberg Orchestra in Klosterneuberg on March 18, 1923.

Symphony in D minor, No. 0: There are various dates entered at the beginning and end of the various movements of this symphony indicating the periods of composition. It appears certain that the entire work was composed between January 24, and September 12, 1869, partly at Linz and partly in Vienna. August Göllerich, a pupil of Bruckner, claims that the symphony is older than this, dating back to 1863/4, but Josef Woss disagrees both on the basis of the ms. dates and on the style of the work which certainly is different and more mature than that of the so-called "school symphony" in F minor, composed in 1863.² Max Auer also gives the 1869 date.³

1 Kurth, E., Bruckner, V. 2, p. 1103.

2 Wöss, J., in Intro. to V. Ph. Ed. Pocket Score.

3 Auer, Max, A.B., p. 415.

If we accept this later date, the symphony would then come chronologically between the first and second of the nine regular symphonies. Bruckner himself annulled the symphony in 1895. The work was not published until 1924; neither did it receive a performance until the same year. The third and fourth movements were played for the first time on May 17, 1924, by the Klosterneuberg Philharmonic Orchestra, and on October 12 the entire work was first performed by the same organization.

Symphony No. 1, C minor: Bruckner began work on this symphony early in 1865. When he went to Munich to attend the first performance of "Tristan" (June 10) he took the manuscript with him. While there the scherzo was completed and after the "Tristan" performance the finale was begun. After Bruckner returned to Linz he set to work on the adagio, completing it and therewith the entire work on April 14, 1866. During 1890/91 the work was revised.

The first performance was on May 9, 1868 at the Redouten Saal, Linz, by the orchestra of the local theater augmented by members of a military band. The composer conducted. Although applauded by the audience, the critics found fault with it and did not understand Bruckner's idiom. Bruckner, by nature apprehensive, thought the work misunderstood by both public and critics and fell into a period of deep depression even requiring him to undergo treatment for his nerves. The first important performance in Vienna was on December 13, 1891, under Hans Richter on the occasion of Bruckner being awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Vienna.

Symphony No. 2, C minor: (Dedicated to Franz Liszt)

While still in London, following his Albert Hall organ concert, Bruckner began composing the finale of his second symphony on August 10, 1871 but did not finish the movement until July 26, 1872. In the meantime the first movement was written between October 11, 1871 and July 8, 1872; the adagio July 18-25, and the scherzo July 16-18, 1872. The entire work was revised, shortened, and the orchestration altered during 1877/8 and was further revised during the '80's. The cut indicated in the last movement is of a later date and is the result of adverse criticism.

Shortly after the symphony was finished it was submitted to the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, conducted at the time by Otto Dessoff but was rejected as being implayable. It did, however, receive a successful performance by the same orchestra conducted by the composer on October 26, 1873, at the close of the Vienna Exposition. Bruckner also appeared as organist at the same concert.

Symphony No. 3, D minor: (Dedicated to Richard Wagner)

The manuscript of the third symphony contains no date indicating when the work was begun, but it probably was started in 1872. The draft of the first movement was completed on February 23 of that year, and the score of the movement was finished on July 16; between February 23 and May 24 the adagio was composed and its orchestration completed at Vienna, March 11, 1873. The manuscript score of the scherzo has the following remark at the beginning, "Vienna, March 11, 1873." Composition of the finale was completed August 31 at Marionbad (Bohemia) and the scoring on December 29, 1873. During 1876/77 and again in 1889 Bruckner revised the symphony.

The first version of the symphony contained several quotations from Wagner which Auer interprets as Bruckner's naive homage to the Master.¹ Later versions of the work did away with the Wagner themes except the one in the adagio (209-211) reminiscent of the slumber motif from "Die Walküre."

Bruckner went to Bayreuth to ask Wagner if he would accept the dedication of the work. The meeting resulted in a rather amusing incident in which Bruckner, after drinking too much beer with Wagner, couldn't remember which symphony the Master preferred to have dedicated to him.²

The first performance of the symphony (second version) took place in Vienna on December 16, 1877, by the Philharmonic Orchestra under the direction of the composer. The performance was a complete failure, for both the press and public disliked the symphony. Few of those present were able to follow Bruckner along his new path or to understand him. Nevertheless, Rättig, the Viennese publisher, liked the work and courageously published the score, parts, and piano arrangement.³

Symphony No. 4, E-flat major: (Dedicated to Prince Constantine Hohenlohe)

Bruckner drafted the first movement of his fourth symphony while still working on his third. On January 2, 1874, the first movement was completed, and the second was written between April 10 and July 7. Between June 13 and July 25 the first scherzo was written and on July 30

¹ Auer, op. cit., p. 136.

² This anecdote is related in detail in Auer, op. cit., p. 137 ff.

³ Wöss, in V. Ph. Ed. Score, intro.

the finale was begun. The last movement was finished at St. Florian on August 31. The orchestration of the entire work, in its first version, was completed on November 22, 1874, at Vienna. In 1878 and 1880 the symphony was completely revised and the original scherzo replaced by a new one. The score of the new version was finished June 5, 1880.

The first three movements of the symphony were played on two occasions at private auditions by an orchestra of Conservatory students under Bruckner. Following these hearings the orchestration was again revised, in which form it was printed. On February 20, 1881, the first public performance took place at a Charity concert under Richter given at the Grosser Musikvereins-Saal in Vienna. This performance was a great personal triumph for Bruckner, who was in the audience, and even the chronically hostile Viennese press could not suppress it.

Symphony No. 5, B-flat major:

The adagio was the first movement of this symphony to be written; it was begun on February 14, 1875. Following this movement the scherzo was commenced on April 16, and the finale on May 10. The first movement was composed last, being started on March 3, 1876. It was not until August 9, 1877, that the entire symphony was completed and it was then further revised and altered in 1878. The symphony was not performed until sixteen years later, not until after the successful performances of both the seventh symphony and the Te Deum. Franz Schalk conducted the first performance of the fifth at Graz, April 8, 1894, with sensational success. Bruckner was not at the performance, in fact, he never heard the work in its entirety. In spite of the success of the premier, no later performance

is recorded until Ferdinand Löwe performed it at Vienna with the Kaim Orchestra from Munich in March, 1898, a year and a half after Bruckner's death. After that the symphony began to be successful. Bruckner's contemporaries found the work incomprehensible; his enemies found it obtruse, lacking in form, and unplayable due to the great technical difficulties.

Symphony No. 6:

Upon returning to Vienna after his summer vacation (1879), Bruckner began the composition of his sixth symphony. This symphony was not completed for two years, however, the first movement being finished September 27, 1880, the adagio on November 22; the scherzo begun December 17, 1880, was finished on January 17, 1881. The draft of the finale was completed on June 28, and the entire score finished September 3, 1881. The sixth is the only one of Bruckner's symphonies which was not revised at some later date; it retained its original form.

Bruckner never heard the first and last movements of the sixth symphony. Wilhelm Jahn, provisional conductor of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, performed the adagio and scherzo February 11, 1883. Mahler performed the entire work-with-cuts on February 26, 1899. The first uncut performance was on December 13, 1901, by the Vienna Konzertverein Orchestra under Göllerich.

Symphony No. 7, E major:

The first movement of this symphony was begun on September 23, 1881, and not finished until December 29, 1882. In the midst of working on this movement, however, Bruckner wrote the scherzo (July 14-October 16, 1882).

About a month after finishing the first movement work was commenced on the adagio, January 22, 1883, and the movement finished April 21. The finale, and with the whole symphony, was completed in September, 1883.

On December 30, 1884, the seventh symphony received its first performance at Leipzig under Artur Nikisch. The performance was tremendously successful, and this initial success was enough to warrant performances in many other cities. By 1886 it had been performed in Graz, Cologne, Amsterdam, Vienna, New York, and Chicago. The die-hard anti-Bruckner critics in Vienna, nevertheless, continued their tirade against the composer. In other places, however, the symphony proved to be the most successful Bruckner had yet written.

Symphony No. 8, C minor: (Dedicated to Emperor Franz Josef I)

As far back as the summer of 1884 Bruckner was formulating plans for his eighth symphony. The draft of the first movement was completed on October 1, 1884, and that of the adagio on February 16, 1885. The remaining movements were written during 1885; the scherzo being completed on July 23, the trio on Aug. 25, and the finale being written between July 9 and August 16. The last page bears the inscription, "Steyr, Stadtpfarrhof, 16. August, 1885. A. Bruckner. Halleluja!" During the years 1886/87 and 1889/90, and again in 1891 the symphony was thoroughly revised and rearranged. During 1889 the trio of the scherzo was withdrawn and replaced by an entirely new one.

The first performance of the work took place at the Grosser Musikvereins Saal, Vienna, on December 18, 1892, by the Philharmonic Orchestra under Hans Richter. It was an excellent performance and the

symphony was enthusiastically received. Bruckner was obliged to appear many times during the ovation. The critics praised the work, except for the same few anti-Brucknerites who stuck by their guns and damned the symphony.

Emperor Franz Josef, to whom the work is dedicated, honored Bruckner for it and defrayed the cost of publication.

Symphony No. 9, D minor:

The draft of the ninth symphony dates from the spring of 1889. The orchestration of the first movement was done between April 1891 and October 14, 1892. On February 15, 1894, the score was completed, although the trio of the movement had been finished a year earlier, February 27, 1893. (This trio replaced an earlier one which contained a viola solo.) The adagio was finished on October 31, 1894. Bruckner was still working on the finale on the day of his death, October 11, 1896. There was to have been a great fugue in this last movement, and it was on the fugue itself that the composer was working at his death. Extensive sketches of the movement remain.¹

Bruckner stated that if he should die before completing the finale, the "Te Deum" should be used in place of the fourth movement at the first performance. He had planned composing a rather long interlude connecting the adagio of the symphony with the "Te Deum" but even this never got beyond the sketch stage. Ferdinand Löwe, in his preface to the piano arrangement of the score, writes: "Fidelity towards the intentions of the composer prompted the promoters of the first

¹ Published in the Urtext Edition (ed. by Haas and Orel).

performance to close it with the "Te Deum." It would seem perfectly justified, however, to omit the latter, especially since the ninth, in its present form, may well be regarded as a work complete in itself."¹ Löwe's suggestion has since been accepted generally and performances of the ninth symphony close with the adagio movement.

The first performance of the symphony took place at a concert of the Wiener Konzert Verein under Löwe on February 11, 1903. It was highly successful and the the audience was indescribable.

¹ Wöss, J., in introduction to V. Ph. Ed. Pocket Score.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. The foregoing thesis is based almost entirely on an analysis of the scores of the symphonies of Bruckner.

The scores used were

1. Those in the critical (Urtext) edition: Symphonies I, II, IV, V, VI, VII, IX, edited by Professors Robert Haas and Alfred Orel of the University of Vienna in the interest of the Deutsche Bruckner-Gesellschaft. These were first published by the Musikwissenschaft Verlag, Vienna, and later by the Brucknerverlag, Wiesbaden, 1934/49.
2. The older editions of all the symphonies from No. 0 to No. 9, first published by A. Gutmann, later becoming the property of Universal Edition, both of Vienna, 1877 / 1924.

B. The following secondary works were consulted:

- Artz, F. B., Reaction and Revolution, N. Y., 1934.
- Auer, Max, Bruckner, Zurich, 1923.
- Engel, Gabriel, The Life of Anton Bruckner, N. Y., 1931.
- Haas, Robert, Anton Bruckner, Potsdam, 1934.
- Jászi, Oskar, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy, Chicago, 1929.
- Kurth, Ernst, Bruckner, 2 vols., Berlin, 1925.
- Láng, Paul, Music in Western Civilization, N.Y., 1941.

Machabey, Armand, Anton Bruckner, sa Vie et ses Oeuvres,
Paris, 1945.

Newlin, Dika, Bruckner, Mahler, Schoenberg, N.Y., 1945.

Orel, Alfred, Anton Bruckner, Vienna, 1925.

Sechter, Simon, The Correct Sequence of Basic Harmonies,
compiled and adapted by C.C. Mueller,
N.Y., 1871.