UPCOMING

Sunday, Nov. 17 | 3 p.m. at Beall Concert Hall

Matthew Halls, Oregon Bach Festival Artistic Director, will conduct Mozart’s “Mass in C Minor” with the University Singers and the University Symphony Orchestra. He will also conduct the Chamber Choir in Benjamin Britten’s “Hymn to St. Cecilia,” programmed to mark the Britten centenary, and Herbert Howell’s “Take Him Earth for Cherishing.” The latter piece was composed in memory of John F. Kennedy, and has been selected to mark the 50th anniversary of the president’s death.

Tickets are available at the door or in advance from the UO Ticket Office, 541-346-4363 tickets.uoregon.edu.
This “sinfonietta,” or small symphony, for sixteen instrumentalists inscribes a musical terrain that is at once angular and incisive, yet also warm and familiar. The concise contrapuntal dialogue that begins the piece gives rise to a driving, motoric passage integrating counterpoint with ostinato. Some later passages continue this integration, while others focus on one technique alone. Following the final hard-driving moment, the piece concludes with a series of sparsely scored but still very incisive passages, the last being a duet for contrabass and piano.

-Jacob Walls

Joseph Anton Bruckner was born in Ansfelden, Upper Austria, on September 4, 1824, and died in Vienna on October 11, 1896. He began composing his Fourth Symphony late in 1873, completing a preliminary version in November of the following year. He undertook a thorough revision in 1878, bringing it to completion on June 5, 1880.
The revision involved a substantial reworking (with considerable tightening) of the first and second movements, substantial rewriting of the fourth, and, finally, substitution of a completely different third movement, the so-called "hunting scherzo" that is now in the score. The first performance took place on February 20, 1881, in Vienna, with Hans Richter conducting. Since later changes, including some made for the unfortunate first edition of 1890, are of dubious authenticity (see below), it is the version of 1878-80—Bruckner’s conception of the work as it was first played in public—that is most convincingly taken as authentic.

Picture, if you will, Anton Bruckner at his arrival in Vienna in 1868. He was forty-five years old and had come to take up the professorship in harmony and counterpoint at the Vienna Conservatory. This position of considerable prestige in the elegant and fashionable capital of the Austro-Hungarian Empire had been bestowed on a composer of extraordinarily refined technique. When Bruckner had been tested in 1861 for a diploma from the Conservatory, one of his judges exclaimed, “He should have examined us! If I knew one tenth of what he knows, I'd be happy.” He had begun to make a name for himself as a composer of Masses, having already written his three major works in that medium, and he had composed his Symphony No. 1 (two earlier symphonic essays remained outside the official canon), though it was not yet known in the capital. But for all his growing reputation as a composer and the support he had received in the reviews of the influential critic Eduard Hanslick, Bruckner must have been a strange apparition. A child of the country, born and raised in rural Upper Austria, he continued to dress in the simplest costume characteristic of his peasant background—baggy black pants (ending above the ankles so as not to interfere with his pedal-work when playing the organ), a loose coat of notably unstylish cut, and comfortable white shirt with an unashionably
broad collar. Short and stocky, a valiant trencherman, bearing in his profile a sharp physiognomy, he could easily be taken for a peasant farmer. More important in its effect on his well-being and acceptance in Vienna was his characteristically simple nature—pious, trusting, deferential, and naive. He came, a true innocent, and found himself in that musico-political snakepit that was Vienna. Utterly unable to be anything other than himself, Bruckner quite simply failed to understand the intricate pattern of backbiting, of personal grudges and attacks, of quid pro quo that made up the Viennese musical scene. He made one devastating political mistake and—characteristically—kept on repeating it, quite ignorant of its consequences to himself: he expressed and constantly reaffirmed a strong admiration for Wagner. After arriving in Vienna Bruckner devoted almost his entire creative energy to the composition of symphonies.

The years 1871 to 1876 saw the pouring out of symphonies 2, 3, 4, and 5. The Vienna Philharmonic (then as now an ensemble of conservative, if not to say reactionary, taste) refused to play the First on account of its “wildness and daring,” then the Second, claiming that it was “nonsense.” Yet when a patron was found to finance a performance of the Second, it received a standing ovation from the audience. But it was the next symphony that really set the cap on Bruckner’s problems in Vienna. In sincere admiration of the musical accomplishments of Wagner, Bruckner showed him the manuscript of the Third Symphony, in D minor, and even dedicated the score to him. He was delighted that Wagner accepted the dedication, and he ever after naively referred to the symphony in all his letters as “my Wagner Symphony,” apparently quite oblivious to the fact that he had thereby totally lost the good will of the critic Hanslick, who from that time on lost no opportunity to attack Bruckner and his works, even conveniently forgetting the favorable things he had said in the past. The Wagner party in Vienna was delighted to find a composer of symphonies in their camp, and they promptly
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The scherzo was the last movement to be composed, when Bruckner wrote it to replace an earlier, discarded version. He himself described this as music for the hunt (with the Trio providing the musical entertainment at the hunt banquet). Again the musical gestures make this identification self-evident. The scherzo itself is a brilliant achievement, compounded of varying treatments of the composer's favorite rhythm, one beat divided into two even eighth-notes followed by another divided into triplets. Nothing could be simpler and more homey than the Ländler of the Trio, though its second half has a chromatic turn that would certainly not be found in peasant dances. The scherzo is repeated literally.

The finale begins in B-flat minor with a melodic figure in the clarinets and first horn (G-flat to F) that will recall the C-flat to B-flat heard at the very opening of the symphony; it is, in fact, an echo of that figure at the higher fifth. A lengthy crescendo leads to the main theme of the finale, a forceful unison statement in E-flat (with an important role for the polar alternative of C-flat). The finale itself is an extremely complicated movement filled with a number of diverse ideas (some of which may seem trivial for the role they are called upon to play), but at the end, Bruckner pulls himself together in a grand, organ-like coda that sets the universe ringing in E-flat with a hint of the opening fanfare now blared by the entire mass of brass instruments, while the single note of C-flat (which represented the first pitch outside of the tonic chord back at the beginning) continues to assert its presence in the strings until the last possible moment.

--Steven Ledbetter, additions and edits by David Jacobs

hailed Bruckner as a master they could use to browbeat the Brahmsians. But the entrenched powers were all in the Brahms camp, and though Brahms himself seems to have respected Bruckner’s work, the Brahmsians were relentless.

Thus, after a devastating performance in 1877 of the Third Symphony, which Bruckner himself had to conduct, at which he heard catcalls and jeers during the performance and saw the hall emptied of its audience before the end, leaving only some twenty-five young musicians (among them Mahler) to applaud the work, Bruckner began to revise his previously composed symphonies in an attempt to make them somehow more accessible. The Fourth underwent this process of rewriting without ever having been heard in public. But unlike most of his other symphonies, the revision of 1878-80 that produced the first definitive version was also the last time that Bruckner seriously attacked the score, so that the inevitable problem of choosing an “authentic” version is, for No. 4 at least, a relatively simple one.

The first performance of the Fourth, which took place in Vienna in 1881, was a considerable success, though it did not immediately overwhelm opposition to Bruckner. His symphonies are so individual and personal that we still tend to misunderstand them. Until relatively recently Bruckner's name was always linked in the same breath with Mahler’s, as if Bruckner and Mahler were no less inseparable than Gilbert and Sullivan. But though Bruckner and Mahler each wrote lengthy and demanding symphonies that were rarely performed, in other respects their music looked in opposite directions. Mahler’s symphonies involved (as he himself said) the creation of entire worlds, with all of the diversity that entails; they were, moreover, filled with existential doubt and anguish, and no matter how assertively positive the endings might be (in some cases), the search and the doubt always remain at the core.
Bruckner could hardly have been more different. Though he was in many respects insecure as an individual, when it came to composing symphonies his music reflects throughout the absolute conviction of his faith, and each symphony seems from the beginning to be aiming for a predestined conclusion of grandeur and almost heavenly glory. If Mahler's symphonies are in some sense acts of self-psychoanalysis, Bruckner's symphonies are liturgical acts. Or, to use a very different comparison: Haydn, another composer who came from the peasantry in the Austrian countryside, wrote Mass settings that were profoundly symphonic in character; Bruckner wrote symphonies that were deeply liturgical. It is not only that he often quoted themes from his Masses in his symphonies, but rather the nature of the musical rhythm, the grand, measured progress from certainty to certainty, leading in confident assertion to the final glory, that gives his symphonies their special character. (And perhaps this is why today, in an age of endless questioning of values, Mahler's symphonies seem to strike a more generally responsive chord than Bruckner's.)

The Fourth is the only symphony to which Bruckner gave any kind of official nickname or programmatic guide. Several years after the premiere Bruckner sought to sum up or reconstruct his program for the Fourth Symphony by describing the first movement as a scene from the days of chivalry, the second as a rustic love scene (other sources say funeral march), and the third as a hunt broken by a dance interlude; but when pressed for details on the finale he could only say, "I'm sorry, but I have forgotten what it was about." Since the music came before the program, it is just as well that Bruckner forgot parts of his after-the-fact scenario and thereby relieved listeners from being concerned with it. The title "Romantic" is program enough, and it suits the spirit of the work in both its original form and its subsequent ones.

The first movement opens with a hushed rustle of string tremolos barely breaking the stillness. A solo horn call sounds the notes B-flat–E-flat–B-flat, then repeats the phrase, stretching the first note up an evocative half-step to C-flat, a note that will play an important role, both melodic and harmonic, throughout the symphony. The fanfare figure moves to the woodwinds over the continuing string tremolo to lead gradually to the first full orchestral tutti and a new thematic idea built of one of Bruckner's favorite rhythmic gestures: two quarter-notes followed by three triplet quarters. This material provides the preparation for the dominant key of B-flat, though at the last moment Bruckner shifts to D-flat for the contrasting theme; its most noticeable element at first is the folk dance figure in the first violins, but gradually an interior line first heard in the violas takes on greater significance. A spacious tutti brings us around to the B-flat we were denied earlier for a shortened statement of the folk dance figure and the conclusion of the exposition. The development moves in grand, stately sequential steps through the harmonic universe culminating in a hushed string passage that treats the interior viola line of the secondary theme in an expressive expansion before moving—so quietly!—to the recapitulation with a new flute countermelody to the string tremolos and horn calls.

The slow movement has the character of a subdued, muted funeral march in C minor, first heard in the cellos against muted strings. At its restatement in the woodwinds an accompaniment of plucked cellos and basses sets up the sound of steady marching that remains in the ear even during a mysterious chorale followed in its turn by sustained cantabile melody in the violas that ends finally in C major. These various materials are developed richly in extended keys exploiting the brass and woodwinds (who have barely been heard). An abbreviated restatement of the opening leads to a lengthy coda with wide-ranging expansion of the funeral march.