

Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs, Bremen & Nicola Samale, Roma (August 2004)

The unfinished Finale of Bruckner's Ninth (SPCM Performing Version): Report on the New Edition by Samale and Cohrs (SC 2004)

This Essay is intended to introduce a score, published as „Anton Bruckner, Symphony No. IX in d minor, WAB 109, Finale (unfinished), Completed Performing Version by Samale-Phillips-Cohrs-Mazzuca (1983–91): New Critical Edition (2004) by Nicola Samale & Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs; Score & Commentary; © Bremen/Roma 2004“. Interested readers are kindly asked to consult the various publications by *Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag*, Vienna, in particular the Facsimile Edition of all surviving manuscripts from the Finale (=FE; Vienna, 1996). For more information on the new score, please contact Benjamin-Gunnar Cohrs [Postfach 10 75 07, D-28075 Bremen, Germany; bruckner9finale@web.de].

Introduction

The Completed Performing Version of Bruckner's unfinished Finale from the Ninth Symphony by Samale-Phillips-Cohrs-Mazzuca (= SPCM 1983–91, edited by John A. Phillips, 1992) was rather successful – 34 performances in nine countries, by 17 orchestras under 14 conductors, including a Studio CD-Production (Camerata Tokyo), a Live CD-Recording (SonArte/Naxos), a Studio Radio-Production (*BBC*) and three Live Radio-Recordings (Netherlands Broadcasting Company, Hilversum; *DeutschlandRadio*, Cologne; *Bayrischer Rundfunk*, Munich) between 1991 and 2003. Why publish a newly revised score now?

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

Other fragments should teach us that reality may be totally different from legend anyway: Bach's *Art of the Fugue*, for instance, did not only survive in a complete, initial version (Christoph Wolff, Ed.; Peters) all too rarely considered by performers. According to modern research, the famous last ‚Quadruple Fugue‘ was finished long before the composer's death, its conclusion being lost on its way to the engraver, who finally decided himself to fill up the space reserved for the missing final section with other, fitting music of Bach. The Completion of *Contrapunctus XIV* by David Schulenberg (1992, the only one based on philological research so far) has even been included in the Bärenreiter Urtext Edition (Klaus Hofmann, Ed., Kassel 1998), but people still prefer the breaking-off, and performers almost never dare to play this brave and convincing attempt at a completion ...

Due to the incomplete transmission of the manuscripts, all active work on the Finale should best be regarded as ‚work in progress‘. Even if all the missing bifolios could be found, any edition would naturally lack ‚completeness‘, since Bruckner did not live long enough to finish the Woodwind and Brass scoring. SPCM as edited in 1992 was the fruit of a difficult collaboration, including several stages emerging from the initial research by Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca beginning in 1983. But in 1996 Phillips published some of his own revisions (Version „1992/rev. 1996“). Likewise, the present writers were never totally satisfied with certain ‚compromised‘ passages. Both had the opportunity to conduct the Ninth and the Finale on various occasions; each performance brought new insights. Finally, in 2003 they became convinced that a revision of the entire score should be the next step. When they presented their idea of publishing a newly revised score in 2004, Dr. Phillips did not agree to most of the substantial changes suggested by them. Eventually, the editors could only agree to

disagree: Dr. Phillips expressed his wish to officially distance himself from this New Edition – a decision the present writers regret but have to respect.

Whoever considers publishing the completion of a work left unfinished by its composer should feel practically obliged to provide detailed information on working processes and philological problems. Unfortunately, Samale/Mazzuca 1985 (=SM) was the only Performing Version of the Finale ever providing such a Commentary. SPCM at least included an extended preface and tables, since John Phillips planned to publish multi-volume information in due course. However, his Commentary is to be found only in his thesis (Adelaide, 2003), to which the public has very limited access, and some of his planned volumes on the Ninth for the Bruckner Complete Edition have yet to appear. Hence the New Edition includes a detailed Commentary, various Tables and Supplements, explaining philological problems and reconstruction procedures as well as the differences between it and SPCM.

Since an English version is not available, this Essay will serve as a summary of new philological research, insights and revisions, leading step by step through the most important new features of SC. Tables are taken from the New Edition, also referring to Bruckner's own terms of formal analysis, such as „Gesangsperiode“, „Eingang“, or „Pleno“ (if necessary, equivalents in English will be given). **Table I** provides an overview of the source material as used in the New Edition. **Table II** gives a formal analysis of the Finale as presented here. To strengthen the argument, **Table III** compares the input of Süßmayr in his completion of the Mozart Requiem with the necessary supplementations to the Finale. Revised Tempi are discussed with reference to **Table IV**. **Ten Musical Examples** will be given at the end, but Phillips' FE of the manuscripts is the indispensable main reference. It would be also of considerable help to consult ‚Musik-Konzepte‘ Vol. 120-22 with its synoptic short score (which includes a continuous bar numbering, largely congruent with SPCM). Terms and abbreviations are basically congruent with the principles of the Bruckner Complete Edition. To provide a more direct reference to Bruckner's own terminology in the manuscript, German terms have been retained (eg., read ‚B‘ as B flat, ‚H‘ as ‚B natural‘ etc., large caps for major, small caps for minor keys). Instruments have been abbreviated as in Cohrs' Critical Report on the Ninth (German terms, such as „Kb.“ for „Kontrabaß“ or „1.2. Fl.“ for „First and Second Flute“).

Main Features of the New Edition by Samale and Cohrs (SC 2004)

I. The New Reconstruction of Bifolio [„1“E]

Bruckner's final version of the very beginning, a bifol. [1], is lost, but we have evidence that it must have belonged to a sequence of E-paper-bifolios continued with „2“E and „3E“, all of which were prepared by Meissner with 4 bars on each page. This makes it rather likely that Bruckner intended to have a [„1“E] of only 16 bars, instead of 24 as given on the discarded 1^dC (FE, p. 67–70). Further evidence can be found in the manuscripts: Bruckner obviously estimated the different length of the beginning (as he also often did by counting sections with bars continuously numbered, for instance, the Fugue, or the Chorale Recapitulation). 1^dC has on its last page (FE, p. 70) several times the figure „60“, which is the precise length of temporarily valid bifolios 1^dC plus 2^cC (FE, p. 117: „50“; p. 118: „60“). When, in the last revision, Bruckner decided to split up 2F (FE, p. 131ff) into two bifolios, he wrote on the last page of „2“E (FE, p. 138) „50“, and below this „18“. This is best explained as an estimate of the length of the first three new E-bifolios, of which „2E“ has 18, „3“E 16 bars, thus leaving 16 for [„1“E]. Remarkably, ALL surviving ‚Satzverlaufs-Entwürfe‘ (Continuity Drafts; = SVE) for bifol. 1 on E paper (FE, p. 83f, 85ff, 89ff, 93f, 95ff, 99f, 101f, 103f, 105f) contain only 16 bars (and not 24), even if their content is not absolutely clear.

One could opt here for using the longer version from 1^dC, however, this is not satisfying for musical reasons: if we compare the various stages of the beginning as it survives in full score with the initial sketches (see FE, p. 3–6, 12, 31f and 37), we find that Bruckner originally intended to start the Finale with four sequential steps of Tritone Progressions, given on 1A as „Des/G–C/Fis–A/Es–Fes(E)/B“. About the final two steps, however, he was in doubt: on 1^bC (FE, p. 60) he replaced the third step with Ces/F and cancelled the fourth in order to replace it with a choral-like interjection of 1.–4. Hrn. and 1. Fl. lasting four bars. Bruckner obviously could not find a convincing harmonic progression joining the initial Stasis with the ensuing first Crescendo, starting with B⁶. Also, his decision to change the initial pedalpoint from A to G (1^{b,c,d}C) – underlining the Dorian aspects of harmony, perhaps also as a kind of Perfect Cadence to the ‚emergency exit‘, the Te Deum in C – is mainly an effort to achieve a better

link. But the various SVE on E-paper as well as heavy pencil markings show that Bruckner still worked towards another solution. On 1^dC he again changed the third step, now from Cēs/F to As/D, and, remaining still uncertain about the pedalpoint, corrected it once from G to F, but later cancelled this again, to re-instate the G. On the other hand, Bruckner must have finally achieved a solution.

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

First of all, the metrical structure of 12 initial bars preclude retaining the Horn Interjection; hence the beginning of bar 13 needs a proper harmonic connection. Considering the material from 1^dC, the most convincing way would be to use Bruckner’s final sequence As/D, but not on a bass with G as its root. This would imply an incomplete G⁹, not optimal for preparing the following B⁶ – perhaps the reason Bruckner inserted the Horn Interjection in the first place. To re-establish the A pedalpoint from the very first sketch (as in SPCM) seemed to be a good device, connecting much better with the preceding Adagio as well as initiating a long-term preparation for Bruckner’s sketched Final Cadence for the Coda. However, the second period of SPCM retained a sequence of three Tritone Progressions, repeating the last one, making a period of 2+2+(2x2). This created a quite unlikely break in the tension already built up gradually by harmony; the energy should carry on here. Also, the very beginning of the Finale should serve as a motivic core, initiating later processes of development, and convincingly link it together with the Adagio. Bruckner already prepared the Tritone Progression in the Coda of the Adagio (see b. 225/6); Ten.- and B.-Tb. there unmistakably announced four sequential steps. Later in the Finale – in particular, twice in the Development (FE, p. 227f and 253–5; see also the Transition to the Chorale Theme, p. 184 and 189) – Bruckner significantly used four steps, not three. Even in the very first sketches he strove hard towards a four-step progression, decisively given on FE, p. 12.

The most straightforward way to reconstruct a four-step progression from what we find on 1^dC is to simply insert one stage (see **Example 1**: Des/G, C/Fis, [B/E], As/D). This progression allows for strong connections with later events in the Finale: strangely, All parts of the harmony would include the first Tetrachord of the Chorale Theme, if shaken and ordered subsequently, likewise the four notes from the Motto itself. It is also interesting to note that shortening this sequence as given here – from the initially sketched 16 bar structure with repeated stages down to an eight bar structure with single stages – may well coincide with the surviving sketch for the beginning of the Coda (FE, p. 6), where the inversion of the Tritone Progression is now given four times in two bar augmentation, expanding a parallel Stasis by essentially doubling the length of the original eight bar period. This new reconstruction of [„1“E] may also serve to illustrate the general aim of the New Edition – to make the Completed Performing Version a musically even more comprehensive whole, often by minimal intervention, but with much positive effect on the entire musical development. This was precisely the compositional stage of the Finale achieved by Bruckner himself, as we can deduce from a comparison of the initial sketches, SVE and discarded bifolios with surviving final bifolios.

II. The New Reconstruction of Bifolio [„4“E]

After Bruckner decided to split up the 36 bars from 2F (FE, p. 131–4) into „2“E (18 bars) and „3“E (16 bars), the last 2 bars from 2F were obviously given to the beginning of a bifol. [4], now lost. This raises some questions: why did Bruckner renumber the old bifol. 2 into „2.“ and „3.“, with the consequence that he had to renumber all subsequent bifolios hitherto written as well? Why did he not simply make a „2a“ and „2b“ of it, as appears to have been in the case of the expanded bifol. 13, marked by the composer himself as „13a“ (FE, p. 217; see discussion in Section IV), thus avoiding the labour of scratching out old numbers and overwriting them? Did he totally recompose bifol. 3/„4“ at least? We will never know unless this bifolio comes back to light. However, we have to take what was left as a foundation for a reconstruction – in this case, the only surviving, early 3A (FE, p. 143–6) and the sketches (FE, p. 31–4; some earlier sketches partially lost). The musical content of „3“E, pre-sketched on 2F, demonstrates that the lost bifolio was most likely again on E-paper and continued the new musical design of the Main Theme. In this stage, Bruckner supported the Toccata Rhythm of Strings and Woodwinds with resonant Minims –and for a very good reason: to strengthen the relationship of the Main Theme with the Song Period, which contains the self-same Minim Progression. However, given that the ensuing 4C/„5“ (FE, p. 151–4) was indeed valid, as Bruckner’s annotation „giltig“ implies, there is only one possible conclusion: [„4“E] must have contained 18 bars instead of 16, somehow including the two final bars from 2F not taken over into the new „2“ and „3“.

This theory is supported by the extant sketch, if we bear in mind the particular importance of this insight into Bruckner’s practice: this and other extended sketches were not a pre-draft, but merely a ‚working paper‘ that Bruckner continued to use during his elaboration of score bifolios and their revisions. ÖNB 6086/1&2 is in fact such a sketch (FE, p. 31–4); another important one is ÖNB 3194/13&14 (FE, p. 21–4), which includes the Fugue and Recapitulation of the Song Period (see discussion in Section VI). The Main Theme was obviously worked out first on a lost [2A], preceding 3A. In later stages, Bruckner decided to change its first two entries, originally starting from C and B, later re-designed into D and F. But the general structure of the Climax of the Theme and the two subsequent eight bar periods (the descending *Passus Duriusculus* and the Brass Chorale Bridge) obviously remained musically unchanged, since even the sketch does not contain any changes or bars subsequently crossed out or replaced. If we simply stick to this music as sketched and outlined on 3A, the content of the lost bifol. seems to be quite clear: the most elegant way to explain a [„4“E] of 18 bars is to assume that Bruckner inserted an extra bar line in the very first and last bar. B. 51 has only a semibreve in all instruments; the two initial bars of the Chorale Bridge likewise consist of semibreve and minims only; this would opt for a page disposition of 5–4–4–5 bars – especially if we consider that all other bars contain the Toccata Rhythm, demanding the identical amount of space on the page. Bruckner indeed quite often inserted extra barlines (for instance on „2“E, b. 2 and 3, see FE, p. 135).

The scoring of the third entry and Climax of the Main Theme was easily adapted from 2F, 3A, and „3“E, but the following two bars differ from SPCM in the New Edition: 3A contains Bruckner’s advice „8^{va}“ above the high Ces (b. 55 / FE, p. 143, third bar). This „8^{va}“ can only be justified if this four bar period was intended to be the Tutti Climax of this sequence D-F-As-Ces, followed by an eight bar descent in the one period before the Chorale Bridge. A much reduced scoring of those four bars can hardly be justified (see, for instance, *Te Deum*, b. 249f, or *Seventh Symphony*, 1st. Mvmt., b. 245–8); however, all completions of the Finale (with the exception of SM and SPCM), came to such a sudden descent (but note Bruckner’s changes, strengthening the basic Tritone Progressions in the Finale, D/As and F/Ces). Related to the „8^{va}“ is Bruckner’s „loco“ (FE, p. 148, 152), which only makes sense if Viol. rest throughout the entire 16 bars between Climax (b. 55–8) and Song Period (b. 75ff). In fact, on 3A the ink notation of Viol. ends at b. 59 of the New Edition (FE, p. 11). The rescoring of this passage supports the most important harmonic line with Tremolo by Vla., in order to foreshadow the design of this motif as it reappears likewise at the end of the Chorale Theme (Vlc./Kb., b. 191ff, Vla., 199ff, see also 207). The solution of SPCM (sustained semibreve and minims in Viol. and Vla.) seemed to be atypical for passages where Bruckner decreases energy from preceding climaxes (see, for instance, in the 1st. Mvmt., b. 77ff, which served as a model here).

III. The New Reconstruction of the Song Period (Bifolios 4C/„5“, [5/„6“, and [6/„7“])

One of the crucial points in the Finale is an adequate reconstruction of the Song Period, of which two bifolios of the final stage, [5C/„6“] and [6C/„7“], are lost. SM and SPCM incorporated Alfred Orel's old theory that a surviving SVE „#“D (FE, p. 155–8) was intended as a substantial extension. (Orel, p. 103, No. 28: „Außerdem ist ein Partiturentwurfbogen vorhanden, der auf eine geplante Erweiterung des Bogens 5 hindeutet.“) The musical result was Phillips' ‚reconstruction‘ of two assumed bifolios [„5a“] and [=„5b“] (cf. Musik-Konzepte, Vol. 120–22, p. 42, reprinted here as **Example 2**). Yet this solution remained somehow unconvincing.

A re-assessment of Bruckner's ternary Song Periods in his late-period Sonata structures (Exposition and Recapitulation) revealed that the structure of the Beginning Section (A) and most of the Trio (B) remained essentially untouched in the Recapitulation. Massive changes appear only in the Repeat of the Beginning after the Trio (A'). Only in the revised Finale of the Eighth Symphony is the Beginning of the Song Period substantially shorter in the Recapitulation (to the regret of Robert Haas and many conductors, who have re-established the full-length repeat of this section for good reason from the Initial Version). In the Finales of the Sixth and Seventh Symphony, for instance, the A-Section is 16 bars long in both the Exposition and Recapitulation. Also in the First Movement of the Ninth, the A-Section preceding the Trio is 26 bars in both the Exp. and Recap. (compare b. 97–122 and 421–446).

In the Finale, the Beginning Section of the Song Period in the Recap. is only 16 bars long, as a comparison of the surviving 23D/„24“ and the sketch shows (FE, p. 24f). In the Exp., this section could not have been much longer, but the SPCM reconstruction (developed from SM, which had already included „#“D as an extension), brought it to 32 bars – twice as long as in the Recap. Even worse, Phillips' interpretation of „#“D as SVE for an intended „5b“ also meant dispensing with 4C/„5“, despite the fact that Bruckner explicitly wrote „giltig“ (valid) on its first page.

Hence in 2002 Cohrs re-examined the original manuscripts in Vienna, with the surprising result that all the music believed lost is in fact there, if we understand the sketch [**Example 3**] as a ‚working paper‘ used by Bruckner during the various stages of elaborating the score, and if we follow his particular annotations and pointers correctly. The sketch for the Song Period (FE, p. 33) shows the entire course of the A-Section and the Trio. The surviving bifolios 4A, 5A and 6A show that Bruckner initially transferred this sketch directly into score. Only one section was changed – the second half of the eight bar period before the Trio, crossed out in the sketch (5th Syst.). Hence Bruckner discarded 5A (see FE, p. 160) and replaced it with 5B, composing these four bars anew (FE, p. 164), redesigning the beginning of this second period over a pedalpoint on G (5B, FE, P. 163) that was not to be found in the sketch at all (Example 3, 4th Syst.). This first draft of the Song Period was rather empty, much like the initial stages (1887) of the Exposition for the First Movement.

Obviously, in a Revision Phase following work on the Second Part of the Finale, Bruckner intended to fill in some well-balanced counterpoints to bind Exposition and Recapitulation motivically better together. The changes contained in 6^cB and 7B (FE, p. 173–7) show that Bruckner already was working towards a continuous accompaniment in quavers (see Klar., p. 173, and the „Variande“ sketches, p. 176f), much like the fabric of the Song Period in the First Movement. Another important clue is the Lyrical Counterpoint to be found before the Fugue on 16C/„17“ (FE, p. 258), obviously deriving from the Song Period. Already this makes Phillips' theory on „#“D unlikely: all evidence points to the counterpoint additions being part of the Second Work Phase (ca. Autumn 1895), written mostly on C-paper. A supporting argument for this is the valid 7C/„8“ (FE, p. 181), continuing those quavers sketched on 6^cB and 7B. Also, the Lyrical Counterpoint must have been inserted somewhat earlier in the lost 5C and 6C, because the Vla. part on 7C/„8“ (FE, p. 181) is already a clear variant deriving from it. Why should Bruckner have written a draft for an extension on D-paper, to include a counterpoint – as assumed by Phillips – which most probably had been included already, on earlier C-paper? On the other hand, „#“D can easily be explained as a discarded 5D (see Orel, p. 103, No. 28: „5. Bogen D“], written perhaps before Bruckner definitively re-validated 4C/„5“ as „giltig“, if we imagine how one fills such a bifolio – in fact, a ‚double-folio‘ – with written music.

The bifolios were already prepared with clefs, key signature and barlines, four on each page. Since they are rather large, one would prefer to put them on the table, as often as possible displaying only one page on top, because if two pages are exposed, one can easily smear one page with the resting arm while writing on the other. Certainly Bruckner would have preferred to write on a single exposed page, dry the written lines with blotting-paper, then re-fold the bifolio to display the ensuing page. If we look at „#“D as an intended newly-written 4C/„5“ on D-paper, the first six bars of this bifolio would have to contain the end of the Chorale Bridge, already written out several times.

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

For these reasons, the New Edition decided not to accept at all the theory of an expansion sketched on „#“D, but stick to surviving bifolios and the sketch, which nowhere indicates such a massive expansion: Bruckner inserted the Lyrical Counterpoint at the beginning of the second period (**Example 3**, 4th Syst.), however, it would not be possible to paste it into the first page of 5B, because the clashing voice-leading would create an odd simultaneity of suspension (g-fis, Viol. 2) and dissolution (fis, Vla./Vlc.; see **Example 4**). If we also consider that this rash pedalpoint idea would anticipate the beginning of the Trio a semitone higher, and perhaps prematurely, it seems possible that Bruckner, on the lost 5C, intended to return to the old idea as sketched – a simple repeat of the first period, now replenished with the timid counterpoint, without basses, to be followed by the seraphic passage (Klar., Ob., 1. Fl.) looking up into the heavenly Trio. Such a structure of „2; (2+2)+4; (2+2)+4“ would also make a good balance to the Recapitulation with its (2+2)+4 – (2+2)+4 bars. But another hint from Bruckner in the manuscripts needs to be observed as well.

4C/„5“ bears an important pencil annotation at the beginning of the Song Period (FE, p. 152) – „R.n. G. D. G.“, under a slanting line. Due to Bruckner’s usual abbreviation practice, this reads as „Repetition G-Dur Gesang“ (i. e., repeat of the Song Period in G). Furthermore, we find a pointer (X) on top of Viol. 1. This pointer has its equivalent in the sketch, most significantly, directly before the repeat of the first period, now including the sketched counterpoint (**Example 3**, before 4th Syst.). The most likely interpretation of this is that Bruckner indicated here an inclusion of the two opening bars as well, hence underlining his early idea of judging these two bars not as a separation, but as being part of a ten bar period, which was to be fully repeated as (3x2)+4. Such an expansion could be easily realized if we assume the lost 5C to be 18 bars long instead of 16. For Bruckner, the most comfortable way to write this out would have been to insert two extra bar lines in the last two bars of the second page of 5C, because the counterpoint itself requires rather more space in the bars than the simple design of the Woodwind’s Bridge with semibreve accompaniment (possible page disposition of [5C/„6“]: 4-6-4-4).

However, since [5C/„6“] did not survive and the indicated repeat is not explicitly written out in the sketch, the New Edition indicated these two inserted bars (84*, **) as optional, including an explanatory footnote for the conductor (see **Example 5**). From fresh examination of the manuscripts, the New Edition was able to establish the entire Exposition with almost unbroken continuity, with the exception of two optional bars and some small ambiguities. The first serious gap only occurs at the beginning of the „2. Theil“, as Bruckner named the Development + Recapitulation + Coda of his Sonata Form.

IV. The Reconstruction of the Development Section (Bifolios „13a“E, [=13b?]E, and [14/„15“])

From the sequence of final valid bifolios, [12/„13“] and [14/„15“] are lost. However, some of their musical content seems to be preserved in the extant, earlier 12C and some SVE. [12/„13“] could easily be reconstructed from them, as suggested by Phillips, and this does not entail much speculation (cf. *Musik-Konzepte* 120–22, p. 43). However, at a very late date Bruckner tried a credible expansion of this section, sketched in two SVE from August 1896, according to the positive annotation „11. August neu“ on „13a“E (FE, p. 217). If Bruckner wanted to avoid a further time-demanding renumbering phase, he would be perfectly justified in assigning „13a“ here, making a subsequent „13b“ plausible, even if it remained unnumbered (FE, p. 221–4). Already SM and later SPCM decided to elaborate those two SVE for strong musical reasons, even if this required some speculation to fill a gap of four bars for which Bruckner left no sketch at all (FE, p. 224).

First of all, obviously Bruckner found it necessary to extend the typical Stasis following the final climax from the Exposition here. A similar last minute extension occurred in the First Movement on bifol. „10“ (explained in the Critical Report, p. 31f). Likewise, the enormous length of the Finale Chorale – almost 48 bars of fortissimo full Brass – seems to require a succeeding quiet zone of some length. More important, however, is Bruckner’s typical late-stage device to intensify connections between themes and motives and strengthen parallels between formal sections: the *Passus Duriusculus* (here: d-cis-c-h) is of crucial importance, since it is the core of the Main Theme of the First Movement, already well known from the Eighth Symphony as „Todesverkündigung“ (Announcement of Death). In the Finale, Bruckner re-introduced it in the Transition before the Song Period and also used it to finish the Chorale Theme (last 12 bars). One reason for expanding this motif at the beginning of the Second Part may well be Bruckner’s intention to bring back the Main Theme of the First Movement later in the Finale: already the sketch of the Beginning of the Coda prominently introduces this motif (a-gis-g-fis).

In order to make sure the listener hears the connection, the beginning of this line cannot be located too far from the end of the Chorale. This is why the editors introduced it immediately after the Te Deum Motif (1. Fl.), at the beginning of the Second Part. This is another parallel to the First Movement, where Bruckner cites the selfsame motif (b. 235ff: es-d-des-c). A further reason to adhere to the unnumbered, subsequent SVE can again be found in its content: the leading voice (Ob.) consists of e’-e’-h’-h’-a’-a’, which can be seen as a double augmentation of the later Gregorian Theme (FE, p. 308, as discussed in Section VI), hence it was complemented here with -h’-h’-e’. In all, the New Edition had reason enough to maintain the SPCM reconstruction. However, the overly-thick scoring and dynamics at the beginning of the Te Deum Motif (SPCM, 217–20) created an ugly sonority (a resonant upper Fifth as h’, audible on both the Eichhorn and Wildner recordings). Precisely for a similar reason Bruckner himself reduced dynamics and scoring at the end of the Exposition of the First Movement (see b. 225–7), used as a model here (b. 207ff).

The SPCM reconstruction of [14/„15“], basically already part of SM, showed that the last period from 13E/„14“ needed to be continued as –7–8. Likewise, the ending of [14/„15“] had to contain the first six bars of a period (1–6–) to connect with the following –7–8 at the beginning of 15D/„16“, leaving room only for a further eight bar period between them. There is only one important difference in the New Edition: the decision to change the first two bars in order to finish this period with the sequential steps naturally following one another, instead of suddenly switching to the Triplet Figuration in the seventh bar of a period [**Example 6**]. Such a kind of joint-overlap as given in SPCM (bar 263f) seems to be atypical for Bruckner, particularly if we consider that in the model used here – the last 8 bars of 12C – these two bars were intended only to continue the figuration already established from the beginning of the Chorale onwards. This device brings more coherence into the structure, because now the reconstructed very beginning of the Finale is clearly ‚developed‘ here in eight bars, as later repeated by Bruckner (FE, p. 253f). It is much more typical for him to separate such blocks with short rests to take a breath – note the similarity with the Development of the First Movement: a Stasis, built upon the Introduction, leading into a Crescendo (First Mvmt., b. 226–44), finishing with a first quotation of the Horn Call in eight bars (cf. 19–26 with 245–52), a short pause, then a second Crescendo on the Introductory Motif (253–68), again leading into an eight bar repeat of the Horn Call (269–76).

V. The New Reconstruction of Bifolio [19D/„20“]

For long time it was believed that some bars of the lost [19D/„20“] could not be contained in the sketches. Hence Phillips assumed in his thesis (p. 494f): „An unbroken musical continuity for the Development of the Fugue was not achieved in the earlier pc. sks. (...), but there is every indication that [19D/„20“] would have consisted of a clear and to some extent probably reconstruable structure.“ Therefore, SM and SPCM provided at least nine bars of free composition, even if based on a sequential technique using Bruckner’s own material, and firmly established by Phillips on the grounds of Sechterian theory (Musik-Konzepte, Vol. 120–22, S. 44f). To Cohrs’ surprise, a re-evaluation of the original sketch, undertaken by him in 2002, proved this assumption to be false. If we carefully follow the sketch, we find roughly four phases of the Fugue’s composition, two of them incomplete, two complete indeed (ÖNB 3194/13 & 14, F. E., p. 21–4, see **Example 7**):

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

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

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

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

Interestingly, this sketch shows that Bruckner originally intended to continue the Fugue directly with the Recapitulation of the Song Period, as indicated on 14^v (see voice-leading sketch at the end of 1st Syst.). The entire Epilogue and Horn Theme was an afterthought; this whole conception was completed before the renumbering phase. Obviously Bruckner also used this sketch as a ‚working paper‘ while laying out of the score, as many annotations reveal. Bruckner did not depart very far from it in the bars surrounding the gap. He only sharpened the harmony from b. 21 onwards and replaced the third sequence step of the Climax with a new one a semitone higher, in order to achieve a more convincing transition to the newly composed Epilogue. Hence it was possible to reconstruct the entire fabric of [19D/„20“] with a high degree of certainty using established metrical numbers (–4–8; 1–8; 1–3). The score layout was based on the three surviving bars before and after the gap. **Example 8** (Fugue, b. 30–51) gives a transposition of the sketch for Strings, including some reconstructed parts which could be assumed with enough certainty, given here in small type.

VI. The Transition after the Song Period in the Recapitulation (Bifolio [27/„28“])

Philological research revealed that the Gregorian Theme, alluding perhaps to the old hymn ‚Christ ist erstanden‘ (FE, p. 308), was a quite late device: the Ob.-line sketched on the late „13a“ indicates this. Originally Bruckner stated only the first two bars (26F/„27“, last p.), which were then repeated once. Later, the two repeated bars were scratched out and replaced by the entire line, now four bars long. Bruckner’s indicated corrections of the metrical numbers (p. 308, lower line: 1–2–3–4) suggest an interpretation of this as an intentional four bar insertion into normally regular eight bar periods. This gives support to the suggested tutti-repeat of the Theme, which is further justified by the mutation

processes: Bruckner must have noted earlier that this line derives from the beginning of the repeated Song Period (see **Example 7**, 14^v, 2nd Syst., 5–6–7–8 from the 1st Period). Interestingly, it also includes the motif which we think Bruckner may have intended for the final Alleluiah (discussed in Section IX): transposed as in SPCM (b. 487–91, New Edition: 473–7), the line reads d-a-g-a-d-c-f-g-a, foreshadowing the final progression of this Completed Performing Version (e-fis-a-d-e-fis; here g-a-c-f-g-a). The structure of this passage is certainly a Crescendo, which must at least lead to some kind of a break-through using important motivic material with the weight of a „Schluß d-moll“ (Bruckner).

At the beginning Bruckner developed elements from the Trio and Song period; then he introduced the String Chorale in minims in order to prepare the double unison Crescendo, both of which anticipate the Chorale Recapitulation (Ces-B-As-Ges). Those steps all contain the minim, which emerged from the accompaniment of the Main Theme in the Exposition, was continued in the Song Period, taken up again in the Development of the Te Deum Motif at the beginning of the Second Part (also in our elaboration of the d-cis-c-h Passacaglia), intensified within the Recapitulation of the Song Period, and finally in the Gregorian Theme. After this culmination, Bruckner brought back the Triplet Figuration of the Chorale, including reminiscences of the end of the First Movement (the open Fifth D/A) and – as in the Exposition – the Adagio (the ascending Vla.-line preceding the Chorale, taken from the Adagio, b. 13–16). Indeed, across this entire zone Bruckner moulded together important motifs (Minim Progression, Toccata Rhythm, Triplet Figuration, Chorale Descent) from all Finale Themes (Main Theme, Song Period, Trio, Chorale) as well as reminiscences from earlier Movements in a dense field of continuous development. Hence the climactic repeat of the Gregorian Theme seems to be indispensable for musical reasons, as a preliminary destination of a long-term development of the Minim Progression. In SPCM the continuity of the lost [27/„28“] was given in a convincing reconstruction, taken from the sketches and strictly limited to material by Bruckner himself. This was basically maintained in the New Edition, although some changes to the scoring have been undertaken (see Section IX).

VII. The New Design of Chorale Recapitulation and Horn Theme [Bifolios [30/„31“] and [32/„33“]]

The completion and reconstruction of the missing [30/„31“] also retained herewas essentially developed by Samale and Mazzuca, and later only corrected and confirmed by SPCM. The first period had to continue from 1–2– with [–3–12], the second to start with [1–6–], as the surviving 31E/„32“ suggests (Bruckner certainly would have begun its imitative counterpoint there). The reconstruction is based on a strict inversion of the Chorale in the Exposition (excluding the non-invertible sustained note in four bars, hence reducing the solution here from 16 to 12 bars), determined also by the first two bars of 31E/„32“, where Bruckner designed the first two notes as a Fifth and a Sixth in the harmony (Ob.: „5“, „6“). Phillips supported this reconstruction with a Sechterian analysis of the fundamental harmonies (Musik-Konzepte Vol. 120–22, p. 46, reproduced here as **Example 9**). It is hard to understand why other Performing Versions insist upon a soft layout for Solo Trp. and Str. at this point; the indications in the manuscript are indisputable: Bruckner indicated two whole bar rests before the entry of the Chorale in both Trp. Syst. (FE, p. 312); this clearly indicates that all Trp. should join in together with the 1. Trp., which was obviously written down by itself in order to save time and effort here. Bruckner’s own „dim.“ in the eighth bar (FE, p. 314, b. 2) makes clear anyway that at its beginning the music must have been loud enough to support such a diminuendo. The entire setting for Strings with tremolo Vla. providing supporting harmony, and with both Viol. and Vlc./Kb. in unison, is laid out for a loud tutti, not a soft instrumentation. The last two bars from 29E/„30“ (FE, p. 316) make it evident that the following line must bring about a still further reduction in dynamics (silent Kb.); the cessation of the Vla. tremolo and the register change (Ob.) imply that the harmonic support needs to be taken over by Woodwinds. Our reconstruction followed these indications precisely.

SM and SPCM concluded that Bruckner might have intended to repeat four bars from 31E/„32“, because his continuous numbering was repeated on its last page (FE, p. 319, upper edge, „43–44–45–46“, faintly in pencil on p. 320 again). However, the Recapitulation of the Horn Theme is different from its first appearance at the End of the Fugue Epilogue: there it was gradually decreasing; but here it is obviously used in order to increase energy, initiated by the Triplet Figuration in a variety of contrapuntal devices. Therefore the New Edition follows the text precisely as Bruckner wrote it.

This decision was followed by a reconsideration of how to reconstruct the lost [32/„33“]. To complete the period already given as 1–6- on 31E/„32“ seemed to be quite natural, by repeating -5–6- as -7–8, in symmetry with its first half (comp. 1–2- with -3–4-). The first appearance of the Horn Theme on 31E/„32“ passed by in a mere four bars; on the other hand, considering its structural importance, it seemed clear that it had to be repeated somehow. Furthermore, it was obviously intended to finish an important section again, as it had done earlier, before the Recapitulation of the Song Period, corresponding somehow with the abrupt breaking-off there, which produced raised eye-brows within the Vienna Philharmonic when Nikolaus Harnoncourt first rehearsed it. It should be noted that Harnoncourt very convincingly described this breaking-off as a ‚Memento Mori‘. In fact, this explains perfectly the character of the various endings of Finale sections with a musical reminder of mortality (as already in the First Movement of the Eighth, where every Theme Group in the Exposition ended with a reference to the C-G-A-E ‚Gralsglocken‘ from ‚Parsifal‘). The older versions already included an extended repeat of the Horn Theme based on G, developed for eight bars (SPCM, 565–72), convincing enough in itself, considering the Neapolitan Progression (here: Cis/G), and also the fact that the First Movement contains similar Cadences (before the Coda, 493–504, based on F; within the Coda, significantly, on G, 541–8).

The old idea from SM and SPCM was to re-introduce the Main Theme from the First Movement before the Coda, as a goal of the Chorale Epilogue. This solution lacks conviction. It appears to extract energy and produce a blockage – even if for a good reason: the six bar truncation of the Main Theme would lead into the surviving sketch of the Coda beginning in a harmonically convincing manner; also, it completes the missing bifol., so that the Coda begins on a new, hypothetical [32/„33“]. However, repeated listening and debate between the two present writers had a strange effect. In Summer 2002, almost simultaneously, but independently, both found the entire quote of the Main Theme to be simply wrong in the light of motivic development: the Horn Theme in itself already contains the Triplet Core (*Passus Duriusculus*) of the Main Theme. It is designed to be merely a subliminal representative of the Main Theme, not its herald. It is even more likely that Bruckner’s very late device (Autumn 1895) to introduce this theme had the purpose of heralding the real hero – the Alleluiah, which needed to be prepared motivically, and which is in fact included in the core of the Horn Theme –, giving strong support to its hypothetical elaboration at the end of the present score.

Cohrs tested the idea of totally dispensing with the Main Theme before the Coda in his Gmunden performance. Its apparently good effect was confirmed, for instance, by Harry Halbreich and by the British Bruckner enthusiast and critic Ken Ward, who wrote in a personal letter to Cohrs: „The Finale, from my point of view, benefits enormously from the cut of the Hauptthema return in the Coda – that destructive halt is avoided.“ Hence this decision was carried into the New Edition. Thus the Chorale Epilogue ends with an eight bar period, designed as a Cadence for the Coda, built on a sustained G, with a typical breaking-off. Interestingly, there is at least one parallel to be found: in the Third Symphony, First Movement, following the Recapitulation of the Main Theme (see there b. 393–404), Bruckner used almost the same Triplet Motif in a very similar manner. As has been observed by Harry Halbreich, this passage was the fruit of a very late revision (1888) by Bruckner from a time when he was also already working on the First Movement of the Ninth. Halbreich even suggested that Bruckner could have worked from a sketch for this particular passage when he composed the parallel passage in the First Movement of the Ninth (b.366–76), which reveals the origin of the Horn Theme in the Finale as well.

Critics remain sceptical of the attempt to elaborate the Coda from the few surviving sketches. The result in SPCM aroused controversy: music lovers were often grateful for the possibility to hear the Finale as a whole and also considered the Closing Section with the elaborated Alleluiah satisfying or even moving. On the other hand, professional writers especially criticized the entire development from the Chorale Recapitulation onwards as being „incoherent“ and „in blocks“– even if many of them showed only a limited knowledge of the philological problems of the Finale. Also, the importance of the Coda sketches was widely ignored. Unfortunately, even Nikolaus Harnoncourt omitted them, arguing that they were not part of the score. Hence the present writers felt obliged to reconsider the Coda yet again (as elaborated in the preliminary versions) for the New Edition, in order to achieve an even greater coherence of this section which is so crucial for the entire Symphony.

VIII. The Beginning and Cadence of the Coda, Reconstructed from the Sketches

The aim of such a (necessarily provisional) Coda must be to bring thematic processes to a close: an aim that is comprehensive enough under the given circumstances. The examination of all extant sources revealed that, in a preliminary stage, the Coda was evidently finished in Summer 1896; hence it is appropriate to speak of a ‚reconstruction‘ at this point, even if the result is speculative in places. Perhaps it would be best to call it an ‚elaboration‘, based on all available information – which is by no means scanty.

One of the earliest sketches appears to contain the beginning of the Coda, including the Motto, repeated relentlessly in the fundamental tritonal sequences in a solemn, slower speed (Bruckner: 4/4). Its design as a Stasis, then proceeding by gradual compression of metrical structures in perfect symmetry into a Crescendo, is very similar to Bruckner’s other Finale Codas. Such a design must have lead naturally into a big Climax. We have sufficient evidence to believe this was an overlay of all Main Themes: the elements from the Chorale Recapitulation onwards can be interpreted as a gradual preparation for such a synthesis, mainly built on the Triplet Core (String Counterpoint; Horn Theme) and the Octave Fall (see Vlc./Kb., FE, p. 319/20) of the Main Theme of the First Movement. This is continued in the first Coda sketch, including the Motto and the prominent *Passus Duriusculus* (here: a-gis-g-fis etc) – an allusion to the ‚Death Announcement‘ in the First Movement of the Eighth Symphony, but mainly recalling the ‚Memento Mori‘ before the Fugue that culminates in the clash of the Trp. Fanfare (FE, p. 260), which can be seen as a preparation of the Scherzo Rhythm.

The realisation of such a Climax as an Overlay of the Main Themes seems to be musically inevitable as the ultimate point of reunification. If we analyse them, their ability to be combined with one another actually seems to be as predictable as Nottebohm’s discovery that the themes in *Contrapunctus XIV* can be overlaid by the B-A-C-H motif. This technique was a characteristic part of the Baroque fugue, named ‚*Coagmentatio*‘, and it is prominent in Bruckner’s own fugues as well. SM and SPCM constructed the Coagmentation upon the Adagio Theme in augmentation, but it seems to be more typical of Bruckner to use the Main Theme from the First Movement in the bass (as in the Codas of the Fifth and the Eighth), with the solemn Adagio Theme in the Tenor, the Finale Theme in the Alto (in its form as the basis for the Fugue, which Bruckner actually seems to have constructed in order to make it more suitable for such an overlay), the Quaver Figuration in the Soprano, and the Scherzo Rhythm on Timpani (see **Example 10**). The clash of the d/es progression and the climactic nature of this Coagmentation could certainly have led into a broad zone of final glory – if we did not have further evidence for the continuation of the Coda.

The next surviving sketches clearly indicate that Bruckner intended to include four further elements – a Chorale Ascent starting on C in eight bars (of which the last four are not completely laid out), leading into eight bars to present the Tritone Progression (Ces/F here) for a last time, followed by another eight cadential bars built on a pedalpoint of a Dominant Eleventh chord (perhaps evoking the Climax of the Adagio), and finally a Peroration built on a Tonic pedalpoint. We have every reason to accept these sketches, thanks to Bruckner’s indication for their use in a lost bifol. 36 (FE, p. 45) and the surviving dates from May 1896.

Such an Ascent as sketched would certainly initiate a new Crescendo, but it would not be appropriate to make a jump from the Coagmentation into it. Furthermore, the sketch for the Coda Beginning might well be a re-conception of a passage earlier intended as a Transition to the Chorale, of which the Recapitulation was basically destructive. For these reasons, as early as 1986, as a first fruit of their collaboration, Cohrs and Samale augmented the promising String Chorale from the Recapitulation (b. 441ff) and transposed it from Ces into D, which here allowed a perfect cadence in falling fifths to the initial C of the Ascent. At this point SM and SPCM changed the string figuration into triplet quavers. Since Bruckner never changed the figuration once it was established for the Coda, the New Edition decided to maintain the quavers from the Coagmentation instead, creating an allusion to Bruckner’s very last surviving Coda, that of *Helgoland*, and including the significant ‚Cross‘ of notes prefigured in the final bars of the Adagio and continued in the Main Theme of the Finale.

The completion of the Chorale Ascent (bars -5–8 of the period not finished by Bruckner) had to connect with the Ces of the following period (FE, p. 45). It was a quite straightforward task to continue harmony and melody. The Adagio of the Fifth (b. 169ff), and that of the Eighth Symphony (b. 23ff) served as a model here – in fact, once more Bruckner’s „Himmelsleiter“ (=Jacob’s Ladder, most likely a quotation from Mozart’s Requiem, Lacrymosa, b. 5–8), in the Finale culminating in the final Alleluiah. The entire instrumentation of this progression and the following Neapolitan Cadence was thoroughly reworked once again (now continuing the quaver figuration and introducing a last appearance of the inverted Fugue Theme in the Bass), redistributing the disposition of the partwriting, in order to achieve a better balance and a more audible connection with the Climax of the Adagio evoked by the harmony sketched by Bruckner.

IX. The Elaboration of the Final Alleluiah Peroration

Critics insist that a completion of the Final Peroration is impossible, because nowhere does a final double bar exist in the surviving material. However, we can regain a surprising amount of it by simple deductive reasoning: the last eight bars of the Cadence sketch indicate that the last section was to be built on a Tonic pedalpoint, as usual with Bruckner. Furthermore, it seems to be very likely that the length of this last coping-stone was to be 37 bars, as was likewise the case for all the foregoing movements (First Movement: beginning of the Bass triplets, 531–67; Scherzo: beginning of the variations to the exposition, 210–47; Trio: 36 bars from 229–64, plus the extra rest added by Bruckner at the beginning of the Scherzo da capo = 37; Adagio: 207–43, entire Coda after the breaking-off).

This Tonic pedalpoint would make the Symphony come full circle, since the First Movement started with the same kind of Stasis. This can be impressively experienced by concluding the ‚Documentation of the Fragment‘ with this very sketch, ending where the Symphony had begun. (Isn’t it remarkable that Cohrs, in his various performances of the ‚Documentation‘, was the only conductor who ever included the transcriptions of these Coda sketches in performance – at least until 2004?) It is also likely that the fabric of this apparently 37 bar-long final section would start very softly, as is usual in Bruckner, in order to build an effective final Crescendo, leading into a glorious, culminative Climax, ending with the typical extraordinary weight of an irregular period (as found by Wolfgang Grandjean/see Section XI).

No musical material would be better suited for this than the Te Deum Motif, with its majestic open Fifth, Fourth and Octave, which was already evoked in the First Movement (note also its final section with a ‚vertical‘ reading of this Motif as a sound field on D–a–d), and then re-appeared prominently at the end of the First Part of the Finale, its development and Chorale Recapitulation. Consequently, the New Edition uses this motif here as the main feature of the last 37 bars, recalling the end of the Adagio (Viol. in perfect metrical proportion: quaver=crotchet), as well as that of the First Movement (open Fifth) and Scherzo (Trumpets). Its use in the Woodwinds was now limited to minims, as prefigured by Bruckner in the Development, in order to complete the ‚history‘ of the Minim Progression. This is all the more convincing if we consider that Bruckner himself wished the Te Deum to be used as the best substitute, should he not live long enough to complete the instrumental Finale – another strong hint that the Finale itself should end in a similar manner. The Viol. Figuration was now changed into crotchets, recalling the unique, solemn procession from the end of the Fourth Symphony (Finale 1880).

Additionally, we may refer to the memoirs of Dr. Heller, who related Bruckner’s playing of the Conclusion of the Finale to him on the piano as a „Song of Praise to the Dear Lord“, according to the composer. There has been much speculation as to how this should be understood – particularly Heller’s enigmatic reference to Bruckner’s words that he wished to „AGAIN conclude the Finale with the Alleluiah from the Second Movement“. The present writers would like to add a new interpretation of this: before trying to locate such an „Alleluiah from the second movement“ within other late Bruckner works, can convincing evidence not be found from the Ninth itself?

In fact, the Adagio contains a highly significant Alleluiah-like phrase (Trp., b. 4–6), quoting the Non Confundar from the Te Deum as well as the Alleluiah from Psalm 150. This is the Third Movement. However, is it not possible that Heller, or Bruckner himself, was simply momentarily confused regarding the position of this Movement in the Symphony?

We know that Bruckner sometimes struggled with the inner balance of movements, especially in the Second, Seventh, and Eighth Symphony. Perhaps he was also not absolutely certain about the position of the Adagio in the Ninth for some time: as shown in the Critical Report, the cover bifolios, designating the Scherzo as „2. Satz“ and the Adagio as „3. Satz“, were written very late, possibly as late as the Autumn of 1895, considering the similarity of the cover of the original and copy of the First Movement (Critical Report, Facsimiles, p. 206 and 207). The first score page of the Second Movement contains the heading „Scherzo“ alone (Critical Report, Facisimile, p. 81); that of the Adagio in fact reads „III. Satz. Adagio (E-Dur) 9. Sinf.“ (Critical Report, Facsimile, p. 145), but it looks as if the third beam of the III was added later, hence it was only in 1895 that Bruckner decided upon the order of the movements.

It could be likewise possible that Bruckner in fact said „Adagio“, but that Heller remembered it as „second movement“, simply assuming that the Adagio was in fact intended to be the second movement, ‚as usual‘. Interestingly, even Joseph Schalk, in his Piano Reduction of the Symphony (preserved in the ÖNB, re-examined by Cohrs in 2002), arranged the Adagio second, explicitly marked by him as „II.“, only then followed by the Scherzo, which after his death in 1900 was completed by Löwe from bar 110 onwards. Cohrs hence suspects that Schalk worked from a copy which is no longer extant (perhaps the ‚Stichvorlage‘ used by Löwe for his later arrangement of the instrumentation, now lost), consisting of three separate volumes in which Scherzo and Adagio were perhaps not expressly marked as second and third movement at all. A further possible support for the use of this material in the Finale Coda is to be found in *Helgoland*: the prayer „Der du in den Wolken thronest“ serves there as the Song Period, which one could well interpret as a „zweiter Satz“ as well, since it is the second subject. This music contains the same melodic material as the Alleluiah and is also repeated in the Horns in augmentation at the very end of the Coda. Elisabeth Maier’s assumption that Bruckner would have used the second Alleluiah from ‚Christ ist erstanden‘ in the version sung in Austria at the time seems to be less likely, since it contains musical material which cannot be easily related to the Symphony. This would not be appropriate, considering the strong musical argument of the Symphony as a ‚final exercise‘ for Bruckner, in which, as Heller quoted him, „the thematic idea should be elaborated once again in the greatest clarity.“ It also contradicts Bruckner’s own efforts to motivically prepare the Alleluiah in the Finale.

Musical evidence should test the case: Bruckner indeed finished the Adagio with this Alleluiah phrase, transformed by the four Horns shortly before the end. Perhaps Romantic approaches interpret this as a „nostalgic reminiscence from the Seventh“, likewise considering the Chorale (Wagner-Tb., b. 231–4) shortly before as a „last farewell to the Adagio Theme from the Eighth“. In fact, this is a very early variant from 1893 sketches for the Ninth’s Adagio theme itself... Such reception can only detract from considering the underlying motivic processes which support the coherence of the Ninth. However, the decision to use this phrase for the elaborated conjectural end of the Finale makes perfect musical sense within the parameters of the Symphony itself. The original ending of SM was designed in an open Fifth, similar to the end of the First Movement. For the new Alleluiah conception, Cohrs deserves much credit: as early as 1985, he discovered the evidence of Heller’s memoirs. In 1988, he and Samale developed an intermediate solution that included the Horn Motif from the Adagio Coda in augmentation as well as the self-imitating Trumpet Triplets, combining the Chorale Figuration with the Alleluiah and thus relating it to the end of the Scherzo and of *Helgoland*. It was also Cohrs who first sketched the SPCM layout of the final Alleluiah in October 1989. This was part of the four hand piano version presented by Samale and Phillips in a lecture held at the Conservatory of Bremen on 25 January 1990. The motif gains credence from the opening Alleluiah of Psalm 150 (c-d-e-g-c). This sequence was maintained in the New Edition (here: d-e-fis-a-d) in a rising Minim Progression, in self-imitation, thus containing the entire Alleluiah with which Bruckner always concluded his symphonies. The progression seems to be the ultimate destination of the very beginning of the Ninth (b. 1–18), containing those notes in minor (Hrns.) when arranged in rising order, d-e-f-a-d (note its inversion in the Third Group, Fl., b. 167ff as a quotation of the Agnus Dei from the d-minor Mass). Only their final return, transfigured into the major, would make the Symphony come full circle.

X. Revised Instrumentation

Preparation of the New Edition also required a re-examination of the instrumentation. Particularly the limitations of the instruments available in Vienna during the late 19th Century and Bruckner's particular practice of writing for them had to be observed. (Indispensable here was Dieter-Michael Backes' dissertation ‚Die Instrumentierung und ihre Entwicklung in Anton Bruckners Symphonien‘, Mainz 1993). For the Fl. Bruckner avoided notes higher than b'' by choosing lower alternatives or octaves (but note, for instance, SPCM, b. 55, the ces''', now corrected to the lower octave). The Ten. Trb. would not climb beyond b' (Scherzo, b. 223; but note, for instance, SPCM, b. 55, now corrected). He also avoided higher notes than e'' for Vlc. in the Ninth (Finale, bifol. 15D/„16“, SPCM, b. 287). This made the SPCM reconstruction of [19D/„20“] rather unlikely (Vlc. up to g''/b. 355). Likewise, Bruckner made no use of the five-stringed Kb. and preferred notes in higher octaves to notes lower than E. The one exception in the Finale (18D/„19“; FE, p. 281) may originate from the *col basso* notation of the Vlc., which certainly go down to the low C here; but a typical octave was chosen for Kb., following b. 45 as a model (b. 3 of the Main Theme). The extreme notes of Viol. 1 presented in this new elaboration of the Coda, up to d''', may be surprising, given that in the other movements as well as in the final valid bifolios of the Finale Bruckner did not write for them higher than ces'''. However, considering the extremes of the editorial coagmentation, we felt justified in using this range once, referring to Bruckner's own „8^{va} sempre“ above Viol. 1 on bifol. 2^aC / FE, p. 109, 2^bC / p. 113, 2^cC / p. 118; likewise his own one use of the d'' in the first Horn pair there, which he usually avoided.

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

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

XI. Revised Dynamics, Phrasing and Articulation

Bruckner left only very rare indications of phrasing, articulation, dynamics, and tempi; hence a thorough understanding of his practice is indispensable. These features were thoroughly revised in the New Edition, with particular reference to the comprehensive studies on Bruckner's technique undertaken by Cohrs when preparing his Critical Report for the first three movements. Generally speaking, SPCM preferred fluid dynamics which often contradicted the block-like instrumentation. For instance, the SPCM organisation of the Crescendo into the Main Theme twice included a *cresc.* in long, repetitive sections (b. 19, Str.: *f cresc. poco a poco*; b. 31: *cresc. sempre*; b. 39: Bruckner's own *dim.*). The New Edition follows the structure more consistently (b. 19: *f*; b. 27: *cresc.*; b. 31: *ff*; b. 39: *dim.*; b. 41: *p dim. sempre*). Here the editors would like to underline the importance of Bruckner's own „*accel.*“ and „*dim.*“ in the four bars before the Main Theme (FE, p. 133), since most conductors maintain the Crescendo and tempo at this point. Note the particular dramatic expression of this sudden fall – certainly the genuflection of the sinner confronted with the appearance of the Eternal Judge. This is too not without a model in Bruckner's music – see the First Movement of the Sixth Symphony, before the Recapitulation of the Main Theme (b. 191–4), again often neglected by conductors. In the gradually increasing sequences of the Motto in the Development, SPCM gave a continuous Crescendo (b. 256/280: *p cresc. sempre*). The New Edition prefers terraced dynamics instead, designing these four sequences gradually (*pp*, *p*, *mf*, *f*). It was also very important to observe the development of the climaxes: Bruckner was always careful about his *fff*, reserving this only for the peaks, but marking ‚local highlights‘ no stronger than *ff*. Hence the two climaxes in the Fugue (SPCM b. 327, 356) were reduced to *ff* only (see also First Movement, b. 207).

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

The important book by Wolfgang Grandjean (‚*Metrik und Form bei Bruckner*‘, Tutzing 2001) provided invaluable new insights into Bruckner's formal structures, particularly regarding the metrical numbers, which refer to the systematic regulation of emphasis within periods. Research by Cohrs revealed also that Bruckner's typical accents (‚*Druck*‘ >, and ‚*Keil*‘ ^) were mostly used to underline the rhetorical phrasing which seems to be essential for Bruckner interpretation – as performances under Sergiu Celibidache, Roger Norrington or Nikolaus Harnoncourt have revealed. This led to some crucial additions of accents in order to bring a certain baroque eloquence into this toccata-like Finale. Bruckner himself already gave some clear idea of this in surviving, discarded bifolios (see 2^aC, FE, p. 107, and 2^bC, p. 111). Some further features were added: following the model of the First Movement, the Motto (b. 4 ff) was consistently marked with > on the second note; its companion (1.2. Hrn., Viol. 2, Vla., b. 4 etc.) received an additional > on the first note as well (see First Movement, Woodwinds, b. 78ff; Scherzo, Trb., b. 202ff; 2^bC, lower Str.). The Main Theme originally bore only Bruckner's ^ on the very first semibreve to indicate the four bar phrase. However, the various two- and one-bar truncations of this seemed to require an additional > for the third bar as well. This device particularly helps the listener to follow the contrapuntal writing in the Fugue, where a much more refined phrasing was achieved in the New Edition by additional articulation. In the Tremolo of lower Strings in the

Chorale, > has been added, according to the changes of harmony (note Bruckner's own writing on 2^aC, lower Str., FE, p. 109). Likewise, in the Chorale Recapitulation, the > added here follows the model of the beginning of the Te Deum.

XII. Revised Tempi

SPCM introduced no fewer than 36 tempo indications (see **Table IV**); however, only seven of them derived from Bruckner's manuscripts, and most of them were on discarded bifolios. In the First Movement – not reasonably shorter than the Finale – Bruckner used only 25 such indications. The main reason for these Löwe-like tempi of SPCM was the assumption that the movement required three tempi – the main one, a slower one for the Song Period, and an even slower one for the Trio, following the model of the Finale of the Eighth. However, the Song Period is derived directly from the Main Theme, hence there is no reason why they should not share the same tempo, especially if we observe Bruckner's late introduction of the Minim Progression into the Main Theme („3“E), not extant from older versions. Considering the basic tempo, the relationship to the First Movement established by the common Toccata Rhythm should be respected: the Main Theme of the Finale was certainly not intended to be faster than the end of the First Movement. Another important clue is Bruckner's device of reintroducing the string accompaniment of the Te Deum in the Chorale Recapitulation. The main tempo of Finale, First Movement and Te Deum should hence be Bruckner's typical, moderate Allegro, as respected here („Misterioso; nicht schnell“).

Precisely the relationship with the First Movement seemed to require another important addition: the New Edition decided to add a 4/4 time signature for the Trio in both Exposition and Recapitulation, considering that its character and counterpoint bears many similarities with the Song Period of the First Movement and that of the Adagio as well. Interestingly, also in the First and Third Movement Bruckner decided to use a slower tempo for the Song Period only in the very last stage of composition, as Cohrs has shown in the Critical Report (p. 13, see also Critical New Edition of Mvmts. I–III, p. XIX). To acknowledge two basic tempi, and not three, is also in line with the Te Deum and its main „allegro moderato“, and the „moderato“ of the second and fourth section. Bruckner himself considered a change to 4/4 in the Finale at least twice – in a later discarded version of the Fugue (marked as „bedeutend langsamer“, F. E., p. 261 and 265), and in the initial sketch for the Coda. However, he obviously later decided to keep the Fugue in the basic moderate allegro after composing its Epilogue, which bears quotations from the Te Deum and would hence require the same tempo. The New Edition suggests „Mäßig bewegt“ here, replacing the unsuccessful „bedeutend langsamer“ from SPCM. However, a slower 4/4-speed had to be established somewhere, and Bruckner's design of the Trio, so similar to the Song Period of the First Movement, seemed to be evidence enough to justify such a suggestion. Another hint for a considerably slower tempo can also be found in Bruckner's own indication „sehr langs.“ before the Fugue (FE, p. 259), though without any change of time signature, but it is quite typical for Bruckner to require such a momentary return to a slower tempo (First Movement, b. 375–76). Interestingly, a re-examination of the manuscripts even revealed a further tempo device by Bruckner himself at this point, hitherto overlooked: in the second bar (FE, p. 259), above Viol. 1, one can find a letter, transcribed by Phillips in his ‚Reconstruction of the Autograph Score‘ (p. 75) as „n [?]“, but this is certainly an „r“, a Brucknerian shortcut in *Kurrentschrift*, indicating a „rit.“, which indeed serves well here to prepare the slower tempo that follows.

Of particular importance for the tempi of the New Edition was another observation made by Cohrs during his preparation of the Critical Report (1998–2001): in his late works, Bruckner almost invariably used „ritardando“ before returning to the previous tempo, but „ritenuto“ when followed by a new tempo. With great care, he frequently wrote only the initial „r“ or „rit“ without using a dot, thus leaving room for later amendments. In all, the revised Tempi allowed us to reduce the 36 indications in SPCM to 25 in SC (precisely in line with the First Movement).

Conclusion

And this is indeed the main reason for presenting the New Edition: from a fresh re-examination of the manuscripts it was possible to find some convincing new solutions, binding the music better together. This impression was confirmed by some notable Brucknerians, for instance, the well-known author Prof. Harry Halbreich, who, after listening to Cohrs' Gmunden 2002 performance of the Ninth, enthusiastically wrote to the conductor in May 2003: *„This is to express my admiration for this last version of the Finale for Bruckner's Ninth. For years I remained sceptical about this undertaking and also the highly problematical movement in general. But now the coherence and integrity awaited for a long time seems to be achieved. The piece now sounds totally organic and unified, the few transitions in question successfully abridged, and above all, the Coda now grows as a matter of course out of all the movements preceding, not only the Finale. [...] This last version needs to be urgently printed now, and made available for musical performance. Good luck! In admiration, Harry Halbreich“*

Another advantage of the New Edition is that it was possible to reduce ‚second-hand input‘ even further. One might regard the invasive compositional elaboration required here as a kind of ‚plastic surgery‘: if a victim of an accident loses body parts, doctors do their utmost to restore it by transplantation techniques. If a famous picture becomes the target of an acid attack, one does everything possible to restore it. Why, then, should it be different in the case of this Finale – particularly since the surviving manuscripts do not represent the stage of composition at which Bruckner left it when he died, but are only the remainder of a fabric whatwas once intact? Hence it would be more than justifiable to regard this enterprise as a ‚reconstruction‘, particularly because the music was once there. Even if the degree of creative speculation must naturally increase towards the end, due to the loss of many bifolios, there is enough significant material left to produce something musically fairly convincing.

This New Edition contains 663 + 2 optional bars. More than a third of these required almost no supplementary instrumentation. Only 111 bars had to be reconstructed or supplemented, but of these, 68 were regained by quite straightforward repetition, sequence, or transposition from existing original material; only 43 bars needed to be added in what could be rightly named ‚free composition‘. Even if the nature of the losses requires some compositional decision-making and creative imagination on the part of the editors, we have to consider that observing Bruckner's strict compositional practice, with its tight metrical fabric and carefully directed motivic development, significantly limits ‚compositional freedom‘.

Mozart's Requiem Fragment, in Süßmayr's completion, quickly became one of the most beloved pieces in the repertory– despite the completer's compositional shortcomings and dubious decisions, which have led recently to new attempts to complete the work. A close examination of Süßmayr's score reveals an even larger input of second hand composition (see **Table III**): of its final 864 bars, Süßmayr avowedly composed 187, as well as repeating the final 80 bars from the Introit at the end, perhaps following Mozart's own suggestion. But of 677 bars of Mozart's own composition, roughly two thirds of the piece, only 81 survived in full score, including 28 bars repeated from the Introit. Of the remainder, we have only the first stage of the score (Vocal Parts and Basso Continuo) plus a very few instrumental indications, mainly in the rare passages intended to be purely instrumental.

Süßmayr, in all, supplemented ca 22% of the Requiem (ca 11 minutes of Music) with his own composition and had to complement the full scoring of 783 bars. One should not forget that the device of simply repeating the Kyrie-Fugue at the end creates some awkwardness, particularly the unsolved open Fifth at the end, contradicting the text „quia pius est“. On the other hand, the New Edition needed to supplement only ca 17% of Bruckner's Finale (=5.4% of the entire Symphony, or ca. four minutes) and complement less than two thirds of its scoring. Concert-goers have always been more than happy with Süßmayr's completion of Mozart's Requiem for over 200 years; Anthony Payne's ingenious „Elaboration of Elgar's Sketches for the Third Symphony“ was most warmly welcomed. Why then should one treat Bruckner's Ninth any differently?