

## Focus on Anton Bruckner

### New Recordings Cast Light on Bruckner's Ninth Symphony

by Jim Cyphers

Anton Bruckner, Symphony No. 9 in D Minor: first to third movements, ed. Leopold Nowak (1951); Finale – performing version by Nicola Samale-John A. Phillips-Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs-Giuseppe Mazzuca (1983-1991, rev. 1996). Johannes Wildner/New Philharmonic Orchestra of Westphalia. Recorded live at the Schillertheater, Gelsenkirchen, April 20-21 and May 12, 1998. NAXOS 8.555933-34 (2 CDs). Previously released on SonArte CD ST13 (2 CDs).

Anton Bruckner, Symphony No. 9 in D Minor: premiere recording of the new critical edition of first to third movements, ed. Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs (2000); Finale – premiere recording of the *Dokumentation des Fragments*, ed. John A. Phillips (1999, 2002). Nikolaus Harnoncourt/Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. Recorded live at the Salzburg Festival, August 14-20, 2002. RCA/BMG 82876 54332 (2 CDs).

These recordings are products of the revolution in Bruckner studies that has occurred over the past generation. To get an overall sense of changes in the state of knowledge, the questions being raised and the methodologies employed to address them, compare Deryck Cooke's article on this composer in the first edition of the *New Grove* (1980) with its replacement by Timothy Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw in the second edition (2001). (The forthcoming *Cambridge Companion to Bruckner*, edited by John Williamson, should provide an even more current overview of these issues).

This sea-change has effected our understanding of Bruckner's Ninth Symphony and its imperfectly-preserved Finale. Perhaps the most striking recent example of scholarly interest is the triple-issue of *Musik-Konzepte* (vols. 120-121-122, 245 pp.), completely devoted to this topic, that appeared in September 2003.

#### **The Role of Performing Versions in Changing Perceptions of the Bruckner's Ninth**

What Robert Simpson described as "pathetic relics" in *The Essence of Bruckner* (1967, p. 181), the late A. Peter Brown described as "another manifestation of Bruckner's looking into the future" (*The Symphonic Repertoire*, vol. IV, 2003, p. 310). While generally dubious about the value of performing versions, Brown also acknowledged their role in this one instance in making a case for this movement. And indeed, attempts to make performable Bruckner's *whole* conception of his culminative work were crucial.

The sources for the Finale received their first fresh review since the early 1930s by Nicola Samale and Giuseppe Mazzuca (who more recently have turned their attention to Mahler's Tenth Symphony) in the early stages of preparing their performing version (1983-1985). Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs, Samale's later collaborator, discovered literary evidence for the conclusion of the movement—a circumstantial account by Bruckner's physician of the composer playing it for him at the piano.

Finally, the Australian musicologist John A. Phillips also lent his expertise. While working with Samale on a thorough overhaul of the existing performing version, he was commissioned by the Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag (MWV), the publishers of the Bruckner complete edition, to undertake a full review of the sources. The first fruits of this commission were a reconstruction of the surviving sources for the autograph score as it was left at Bruckner's death (1994) and a facsimile edition of all known sources (1996). Phillips also published his research in a string of articles beginning in 1990.<sup>1</sup> As a result, all the

<sup>1</sup> The most important of these being "Neue Erkenntnisse zum Finale der Neunten Symphonie Anton Bruckners," in the *Bruckner Jahrbuch* for 1989-1990 (Linz, 1992), pp. 115-204. Phillips has also been commissioned to prepare volumes discussing the sources for movements 1, 2, and 4 of the Ninth and a study volume for the entire work, currently ready for the press or in preparation.

source material for any performing version is in print. Moreover, the philological conception behind the "sketches and fragments" as edited by Alfred Orel (1934)—though a landmark in its time—has had to be radically revised.

#### **Composition of the Ninth and the Fate of the Manuscripts**

From the start, Bruckner envisioned his Ninth Symphony as a four-movement instrumental work. From the time he began systematic work on it in 1891, he envisioned it as the culmination of his compositional career, dedicated to "the dear Lord." The three completed movements are redolent of anguish, terror and death. But to friends, he spoke of it concluding with "a song of praise to the Divine Majesty." Sometime in mid-1895, he described its conclusion to his physician, Richard Heller, as "the Alleluia from the second movement, brought back with full power" before playing a version of it on the piano. Heller recalled the use of the accompaniment figure from *Te Deum*—the so-called Quintmotive—as part of its texture. The "Alleluia" has been credibly identified as a theme from the Trio of the *Eighth* Symphony (mm. 25ff.), indicating that the Ninth was to be ultimately "rescued," in effect, by material outside its thematic orbit.

But after its premiere in 1903, the Ninth entered the repertory as a three-movement work, while what remains of the Finale has been marginalized in discussions of the work, let alone performance. A brief account of its compositional history and the fate of the manuscripts may be helpful here.

Six months of illness separated the completion of the *Adagio* and work on the Finale. Bruckner began sketching it in May 1895 and worked steadily on it until his death fifteen months later.<sup>2</sup> In the days immediately following his death, colleagues and former students who gathered in his apartment took away sketch sheets and fully-scored bifolios of the emergent autograph of the Finale as souvenirs. (The score of the three completed movements were in sealed packets and turned over to the Imperial Library in accordance with the terms of his Will.) What was undone in a couple days has not been fully restored over a century later. Material moved slowly into institutional collections; at present seven libraries hold pertinent manuscripts, with an uncertain portion still in private possession. (One such sketch sheet emerged as recently as May 2003.)<sup>3</sup> No doubt some material has fallen victim to war, fire, damp, neglect, the cupidity of collectors, and the rat.

#### **Impact of Philology in Understanding the Ninth's Finale**

Orel's publication of the sources available to him some thirty-five years later for the most part successfully established the essential continuity of the surviving fragmentary score. However, he limited himself to presenting the evidence, rather than offering any interpretation of sketch material that might extend that continuity further or fill in the gaps. Moreover, his presentation of the compositional layers as six *Fassungen* ("versions") led to the mistaken belief that Bruckner had made six passes through intractable material without ever seeing the movement as a whole.

Phillips has established that the Finale was composed in the same manner as the rest of the Ninth Symphony, following what can be documented as Bruckner's normal compositional process: particello sketches transferred to consecutively-numbered score bifolios and orchestrated in two stages (strings in full with prominent wind entries; remainder of instrumentation later), dynamics and expression marks

<sup>2</sup> The last dateable work on the score—a cogent draft for expansion of the development—comes from August 11, 1896. While Bruckner is frequently regarded as having become absolutely demented after his catastrophic illness in July 1896, the reality appears to be more complicated: there were fluctuations in his acuity, though he obviously spiraled downwards. Bruckner was diagnosed as a diabetic as far back as May 1890—a fact rarely discussed. Fluctuation in mental acuity such as Bruckner displayed in his final months is more characteristic of untreated late-stage diabetes (as opposed to stroke or uremia) and could be attributed to unregulated blood sugar levels. His diabetic condition might also explain the neurological symptoms in his extremities that destroyed his organ technique and made writing a burden in his last years.

<sup>3</sup> It is from the earliest sketches and does not add to the known continuity of the movement.

added last of all. The six “versions” are in fact no more than separate rulings of score paper—first by Bruckner himself, later by his secretary Anton Meissner—useful for plotting the relative chronology of individual pages of the manuscript but witness to a single, seamless process.

By Phillips’s account, Bruckner worked methodically on the score from beginning to end, with periodic reviews leading to occasional revisions and replacements of individual bifolios that made up the score. The surviving material shows that Bruckner had in fact completed the first phase of orchestration (string *particello*) and was halfway through the second stage; Phillips suggests that the entire exposition was fully scored (though some of the final bifolios are missing).<sup>4</sup> Moreover, he suggests that the *types* of late revisions Bruckner undertook imply a review that would logically have taken place after he had completed the string scoring to the end of the whole movement. Indeed, there is a press notice of May 1896 from a source close to the composer stating that the Finale was “completely sketched,” and sketches exist from May 1896—with autograph notations (that Orel suppressed) indicating their use in bifolios numbered higher than any that presently survive. These can only have been intended for the coda.

If Bruckner indeed completed the Finale, if only in continuous string score, we would have a score consisting of approximately forty two consecutively-numbered bifolios. Phillips estimates that the last eight of these, containing the very end of the recapitulation and the entire Coda, have been lost. Of the remaining 34 bifolios,<sup>5</sup> containing the main body of the movement, ten final-version bifolios are missing. Three of these are represented by late drafts in score that Bruckner may never have worked out completely. However, most of the contents of the remaining seven can be recovered with a large degree of confidence from earlier, rejected versions of these bifolios—some completely scored—or *particello* sketches.

Looked at another way: as a result of Phillips’s philological work, the gaps in continuity before the score breaks off have been reduced to no more than 42 measures, or 7%—and many of those gaps can be filled by extrapolation from existing portions of phrases. Counting the sketch material used in the Coda, only 107 measures—approximately 16% of the whole score—are editorial constructs. According to Phillips’s preface to the score of the SPCM performing version, 164 of its 687 measures are “precisely as Bruckner scored them,” about 280 are supplemented or otherwise edited, and about 243 are “reconstructed.” “Of those, no more than c 82 mm. are not directly based on, or reconstructed from, autograph underlays of some kind, and even these measures rely on relatively obvious extrapolations of the material;...none make recourse to any kind of material not readily derived from the sources.”

The final form of the performing version likewise aimed at tightening and in some cases working out unrealized implications in Samale-Mazzuca’s 1986 text, as well as reducing the need for supplemental composition. The supplemental orchestration was also thoroughly reworked with close reference to Bruckner’s practice in his other scores of the 1890s, *Psalm 150* and *Helgoland*. The Bruckner Orchestra of Linz premiered it under the direction of Manfred Mayerhofer on December 3, 1991. Since then it has received over thirty performances in continental Europe, Great Britain and Japan. It has yet to be performed anywhere on the Western Hemisphere.

<sup>4</sup> Scoring is highly advanced (though not finalized) in the surviving bifolios of the development. Indeed, the last fully-scored measures—including whole-measure rests—come at the end of the fugue that comprises the first phase of the recapitulation. Wind entries become increasingly sporadic thereafter, but the string texture (in ink) is continuous to the point where the surviving score breaks off in mid-phrase at the end of a bifolio.

<sup>5</sup> The latest surviving score bifolio actually bears the number “32;” however, Bruckner drafted inserts to follow bifolios “5” and “13.”

## Overview of Symphony No. 9/Finale (SPCM performing version)<sup>6</sup>

### Principal Motives:

- [A]=*Kernmotive* (falling fourth, sixth, and semitone) mm. 4-5.
- [B]=*Hauptthema* (unison theme, falling sixths) mm.51ff.
- [C]=*Gesangsperiode* (based on *Hauptthema*) mm 83ff.
- [D]=Semitone figuration, mm. 145ff.
- [E]=*Schlussthema*/Chorale, mm. 177ff.
- [F]=Quarter/triplet accompaniment rhythm/figure, m. 177.
- [G]=*Te Deum* Quintmotive, mm. 221ff.
- [H]=*Hornthema*, mm. 388 [+17]

<b>1. Teil (Exposition): 220mm.</b>		<b>1-220</b>
<u>1. Gruppe (74 mm.)</u>		<u>1-74</u>
A	Introduction 1-42 <i>Kernmotive</i> [A] manipulated	
B	<i>Hauptthema</i> 43-58 [B]	
C	Epilogue 59-74	
<u>2. Gesangsperiode (68 mm.)</u>		<u>75-142</u>
A	75-94 [C]	
B	95-106	
B'	"Trio" A/B 107-120	
	121-136	
	Epilogue/Transition 137-142 [D]	
<u>3. Schlussperiode (78 mm.)</u>		<u>143-220</u>
A	Introduction 143-168 [A] inverted	
B	Chorale (ABA') 169-212 [E over F]	
C	Transition 213-220 [G] (Introducing <i>Te Deum Quintmotive</i> )	
<b>2. Teil A): Durchführung (90 mm.)</b>		<b>221-310</b>
A	Episode on [G] 221-256	
B	Interlude on [A] (inverted) 257-264	
A'	Episode on [G] 265-278	
B'	Interlude on [A] (inverted) 279-290	
C	Episode on <i>Gesangsperiode</i> 291-298	
	Transition 299-310	
<b>2. Teil B): Reprise (268 mm.)</b>		<b>311-578</b>
<u>1. Gruppe (106 mm.)</u>		<u>311-416</u>
A	Fugue [based on B] 311-364	
B	Transition 365-396	
	→ Interpolation: <i>Hornthema</i> 397-416 [H]	
<u>2. Gesangsperiode (74 mm.)</u>		<u>417-490</u>
A	[C] 417-423	
	"Trio" (A/B/A') 434-455	
	→ Interpolation: Chorale A phrase 455-458	
A'	459-466	
	→ Interpolation: 'Gregorian Theme' 467-470	
A' continued	471-474	
	→ Transition: 'Gregorian Theme' 475-490	
<u>3. Schlussperiode (88 mm.)</u>		<u>491-578</u>
A	Introduction 491-506	

<sup>6</sup> Measure numbers from the 1996 revision of the SPCM performing version, which is structurally identical to the 1991 score; the revision process affected only a few points of the supplemental orchestration.

B	Chorale: A phrase <b>[E over G]</b>	509-524	
	A phrase inverted	525-536	
	B phrase inverted <b>[over F]</b>	537-552	
	→ Interpolation: <i>Hornthema</i>	553-572	<b>[H]</b>

**[m. 562: END OF SURVIVING SCORE]**

→ [Recall of *Hauptthema* from 1<sup>st</sup> movt. 573-578

**2. Teil C): Coda (109 mm.) 579-687**

A)	Introductory crescendo	579-606	
	<b>[sketch material, 4 mm. supplemented]</b>		
B)	Thematic overlay	606-618	
	<b>[editorial]</b>		
C)	Recall of Chorale ( <i>Schlussperiode</i> )	619-626	
	<b>[editorial]</b>		
D)	Ascending sequence	627-634	
	<b>[4 mm. Sketch; 4 mm. supplemented]</b>		
E)	Final cadence (Cb-F-A)	635-650	
	<b>[sketch material: harmonic template]</b>		
F)	Final D Major Peroration/Pedal	651-687	
	<b>[editorial]</b>		

**Description of the Movement**

The Finale is constructed in Bruckner's usual two-part sonata form using three thematic groups. It opens with a fluttering motive [A] over a series of tritonal sequences. Mutations of this motive build a long *crescendo* leading to the massive *Hauptthema* [B] proclaimed by the whole orchestra in unison. While beginning on the keynote D, this theme quickly casts aside any sense of establishing the tonic; its epilogue ends on F minor.

Uniquely, the second theme (Bruckner's *Gesangsperiode* [C]) is based on the first principal theme. Beginning in E minor, it is among the bleakest music Bruckner ever wrote, though it blooms briefly in episodes in G and F#. Ominous semitones in the bass register [D] sweep it away.

A passage based on an inversion of the opening motive builds into another *crescendo* introducing the third principal theme, an ecstatic chorale in E major [E], fully harmonized in the brass, cutting through the triplet-based string accompaniment [F] like a *cantus firmus*. It eventually ends with a dissonant outcry. The accompaniment figure from Bruckner's *Te Deum*—the so-called *Quintmotive* [G]—appears as a still, small voice on solo flute over the muttering ostinato of the strings [D in F rhythm] in E phrygian minor.

The first phase of the development (mm. 221-280) is perhaps the most astonishing part of the movement. The *Quintmotive* is treated to a number of contrapuntal manipulations—augmentation, inversion, intervallic distortions—over a pair of *ostinatos*. The effect resembles Renaissance puzzle canons. I know of nothing in the symphonic literature quite like it. Episodes based on the inversion of the opening motive intersect this process, and the whole section ends with a short burst of Mahlerian *Naturlaut*. Subsidiary elements from the *Gesangsperiode* follow, cut off by a series of falling sevenths and a trumpet fanfare on D that herald the beginning of the recapitulation.

While in the first movement of the Ninth Bruckner fused the recapitulation of its *Hauptthema* with the development, here he reshaped the first major theme of the Finale into a fugue subject—fugue being in itself a developmental process. Though a normal fugal exposition should reinforce the tonic D minor, here there is an early entry in D flat. As the fugue moves into an episode, the tonic is left far behind. The fugue eventually comes to a climax with a series of thunderous three-bar phrases on C sharp minor, B flat minor, and F sharp minor. Its epilogue, beginning over an Ab pedal, eventually leads to a short new theme on horns [H] in G flat, restated by the trumpets first in E flat, closing on the dominant of E.

The *Gesangsperiode* returns in its original key but formally altered. Its material is interlarded with interpolations: first, a wistful reharmonization

of the chorale's opening phrase, then by a Gregorian-derived motive that Phillips identifies as an allusion to the Easter hymn *Christ ist erstanden*. Finally a double unison, surviving only in an 18-bar sketch, concludes this section. While the unison restatement of the *Christ ist erstanden* motive (mm. 487-490) is editorial, Bruckner's verbal notes on this sketch indicate that he planned to definitively establish D minor at this point.

The next surviving portion of the manuscript (mm. 495ff) confirms the key; the music seethes in D minor before leading into a reprise of the chorale—now in D major, and accompanied by the *Te Deum Quintmotive* on strings. The chorale is also formally altered at its return, with a stormy epilogue leading to a reprise of the "horn theme" in G flat.

The existing portion of the score ends in the middle of this process (at m. 562 of the SPCM performing version). The editors continued with a restatement of the "horn theme" in G, a further truncated restatement leading to a return of the first movement's principal theme (following the precedent of the Eighth Symphony.)

**The Basis for the Coda in the SPCM Performing Version**

Orel stated that "the coda remains in darkness," but in fact sketches for it were hiding in plain sight among material he himself published. Indeed, one such sketch bears a note indicating its place in bifolio 36 of the score—a notation Orel suppressed—while the last surviving bifolio is numbered "32." Three such sketches are used in the SPCM performing version. All three contain what one might consider "connective tissue" leading to structural goals; the structural goals themselves remain somewhat conjectural.

The first sketch contains material from the opening of the movement similar to that which Bruckner uses to open the codas of his finales: in this instance, inversions of the opening motive over accelerating tritonal sequences. Bruckner inked in this sketch, setting it aside for future use; it is apt for the purpose here.<sup>12</sup> A four-bar extension links it to the first structural goal: an overlay of themes from all four movements.

The thematic overlay that concludes the Eighth Symphony has been one of the most celebrated features of that work. Bruckner might have been expected to repeat that feat in the Ninth, though not in the same way. While reports of a sketch for such an overlay appear in the Bruckner literature, no such sketch has survived—if one ever existed. Nevertheless, the themes do in fact combine in a D minor context, with the *Scherzo* reduced to its rhythm and the Finale's *Hauptthema* as reshaped into a fugue theme. The editors resolve the resulting musical battle by a brief recall of the chorale as it appeared in the reprise of the *Gesangsperiode*.

The next sketch follows: a four-bar chorale-like ascending sequence. Extended editorially by another four bars, it links to the third sketch, which Phillips identified as containing the final cadence of the movement. It is really a harmonic template outlining space for the progression C flat-F-A (as a dominant eleventh) and one measure where the A in the bass is bifurcated semitonally into B flat-G sharp. This process recalls what the German musicologist Peter Gülke termed the *Kernspaltung* (literally, "nuclear fission") that began harmonic motion in the opening movement (m. 19.)

Bruckner concluded this sketch with eight measures of D in the bass—nothing more. At this point, the editors present the final D major peroration. Over permutations of the *Quintmotive*, recalling the development, the "Alleluia" figure is slowly proclaimed on the trumpets. It is treated in canon by the brass choir "with full power" and ultimately combined with the *Te Deum* figuration in its original form. The movement ends succinctly with formal matter partly derived from the conclusion to *Helgoland*—Bruckner's last completed score—with a final huge augmentation of the *Quintmotive* embedded in the texture.

One may object to the degree of speculation necessary to construct this coda, but this is *highly informed* speculation at the farthest possible

<sup>12</sup> William Carragan also used this sketch as the basis for the second element of the five-part coda in his performing version (1979-1983).

remove from fantasy. The editors have grounded their contributions on a thorough investigation of all known sources—musical and verbal—and a deep understanding of Bruckner's compositional practice, theoretical preoccupations, and treatment of the orchestra in his late works. One of the Medieval scholastics tells us that art is a way of knowing, and as a consequence it is endowed with the potential to transform our lives. What the editors have given us may be but a reflection of Bruckner's final vision, but surely this is better than no vision at all. I for one find this performing version, coda and all, a stylistically plausible and satisfying resolution of the problems (both musical and extramusical) that Bruckner posed in the three completed movements.

#### The Wildner Recording of the Ninth and the SPCM Performing Version

Wildner's performance is the only commercially available recording of the 1996 revision of the SPCM performing version.<sup>13</sup> Fortunately it is a strong interpretation, coupled with an equally strong performance of the three completed movements, played with zeal by a mostly young orchestra. As a whole, it is perhaps not quite on the same level as the competing version on Naxos by George Tintner; while Wildner's account of the first movement is particularly vital, the *Scherzo* is somewhat lacking in tension. The performance of the *Adagio* returns to the higher level set by the first movement. The conductor's sense of pace and of the tempo relations between movements is admirable and contributes to the listener's sense of the Finale as an integral part of the work, including the reconstructed coda. The pressing from Naxos is noticeably clearer and fuller in effect than the original SonArte release, and contains informative liner notes by one of the editors, Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs.

#### The Dokumentation des Fragments and the Harnoncourt Recording

The contents of Harnoncourt's recording require less commentary. Cohrs, who was one of the collaborators on the SPCM performing edition, has been a contributing editor to the Bruckner complete edition since 1995, entrusted with preparing a new critical edition (2000) with critical report (2001) of the Ninth's three completed movements, as well as a comprehensive survey of the sources for its *Scherzo* and *Trio* (1998). As well as undertaking a fresh review of the autograph score, Cohrs's edition takes into account a copy of the first movement made in the fall of 1895 by Anton Meissner under Bruckner's supervision. The most striking difference between this and the 1951 Nowak edition is the addition of some tympani strokes on A flat in the first movement, mm. 299-301. The critical report explains that these notes were notated in pencil but neither inked in nor erased later by the composer.

While the MWV declined to publish the full-dress SPCM performing version, it commissioned Phillips to prepare what might be regarded as an educational tool or "performing version for purists," excising editorially-derived continuity and with minimal supplemental scoring. The 578-measure *Dokumentation des Fragments* (1999, 2002), which has been issued as part of the Bruckner complete edition, was the result. By this means, one can hear the surviving sources of the score almost as Bruckner left it. The need for supplemental scoring is particularly noticeable for the *Gesangsperiode* during both the exposition and recapitulation, where the string writing contains gaps in the harmony and the climaxes cry out for greater richness of sound.

The *Dokumentation* is in "workshop concert" format, with narration explaining how the four gaps in the main body of the movement might have been filled at the point where each arises. The score also contains settings, for strings alone, of the sketch material intended for the coda with additional commentary. The bilingual commentary is presently the fullest account in English of Phillips's philological work on the Finale. Harnoncourt led the Vienna Symphony Orchestra in the premiere of the *Dokumentation* on November 12, 1999; it was first heard in the USA on November 16, 2002, with Hans Graf leading the Houston Symphony Orchestra.

<sup>13</sup> The recording of the 1991 score by Kurt Eichhorn, conducting the Bruckner Orchestra of Linz (still available as part of a Camerata boxed set) contains unauthorized additions to the supplemental orchestration stemming from the conductor.

The real interest in this recording lies in Harnoncourt's interpretation and the incandescent performance by the Vienna Philharmonic, brilliantly captured by RCA's engineers. It is charged with downright paranormal intensity, sustained throughout the three completed movements. Some may cavil at the somewhat sectional quality to Harnoncourt's approach to the opening movement; however, the underlying vision holds it all together. A major surprise comes in his treatment of the *Adagio*, which for once does not sound like a substitute finale. Part of this is a matter of pacing: the timing (23:55) is on the lower end of contemporary performances of this movement. But the trick lies in Harnoncourt's shaping of the whole, setting up the listener's expectation of resolution to come.

These expectations are naturally frustrated by the *Dokumentation*, which breaks up the continuity with spoken text, but particularly the opening segment—278 measures of continuous music, from the opening to the midpoint of the development, and performed with real fire—gives a good hint of what might have been.

Harnoncourt chose to omit the sketches for the coda; however, their text is included in the wonderfully full liner notes by Benjamin Gunnar Cohrs—by themselves worth the price of the CD. He also gratuitously interpolated a discussion of the dissonant trumpet fanfare (minor ninth resolving to octaves) in a passage of the development in order to criticize unnamed "improvers" of Bruckner's text.<sup>14</sup> The conductor also chose to create his own rather longwinded narration rather than sticking to the script. One can be grateful that RCA chose to duplicate the musical portions in the English version, thus precluding the need to program tracks. Despite these non-musical shortcomings, one can only echo Harnoncourt's charge to the audience: *Only a few pages are missing that would make these fragments a complete movement, and we know that they existed. So I beg of you, search your homes! Throw open those old Biedermeier bureaus and see if someone in the past tossed something in it from Bruckner one evening, and gave little thought to it thereafter. Or perhaps today, someone owns them without realizing it. Therefore I ask you: look around! These pages exist!*

Jim Cyphers is an archivist for the City of Boston's Department of Neighborhood Development. He has a long avocational involvement in music as flutist, organist, singer, student, and composer. For the past three years he has been engaged in a study of performing versions of unfinished symphonic works by Beethoven, Schubert, Bruckner, and Elgar, from which this article was adapted.

#### Daniel Barenboim to Conclude Tenure as Music Director of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra at end of 2005-2006 Season

Maestro Barenboim announced his decision to not renew his contract with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra in press release issued on February 19, 2004 (from the orchestra website):

"The 2005-2006 season will mark my seventeenth year since I was appointed as music director of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra," said Mr. Barenboim. "Chicago has been an important part of my musical life for more than forty-five years. I could not be more proud of this extraordinary Orchestra and all that we have accomplished together. After much soul-searching and reflection, I have come to realize that the position and responsibilities of a music director in America are changing in that they require many non-artistic activities and I feel I have neither the energy nor the time to fulfill them. It is this consideration that has led to this very difficult decision."

Maestro Barenboim was appointed Music Director Designate in 1989, and began his tenure as the Music Director in 1991.

<sup>14</sup> Harnoncourt's target appears to be William Carragan, who alters Bruckner's text at this point in his performing version.