

CHAPTER 1

MAX REGER AND KARL STRAUBE:

STRAUBE'S REGER EDITIONS

1 Max Reger and Karl Straube: A musical partnership

Max Reger (1873–1916) and Karl Straube (1873–1950) met for the first time on 1 April 1898, when Straube included Reger's *Suite e-moll*, op. 16 in his programme for a series of three concerts in the Paulskirche in Frankfurt (am Main). In the ensuing years Straube was to champion the organ works of the controversial German master. Reger, in turn, vowed to rescue German organ music from its lengthy period of decline (since the death of J.S. Bach) and restore it to its former position of pre-eminence.¹

To this end Reger produced a plethora of organ pieces in quick succession. Between the years 1898 and 1901 alone a huge repertoire of medium to large-scale organ works from op. 27 to op. 60 was completed: sonatas, preludes and fugues, fantasies and fugues, chorale fantasies, character pieces and trios.

Op. 27 and 29 were published by Forberg (Leipzig); op. 30, 33, 40/1 & 2, 46, 47, 52/1–3, 56 and 57 by Aibl (Munich); op. 59 by Peters (Leipzig); and op. 60 by Leuckart (Leipzig). Three of these were dedicated to Karl Straube (op. 27, 30 and 52/2) and he gave the first performances of at least eleven of them (op. 27, 29, 30, 33, 40/1, 46, 52/1–3, 57 and 59/7 & 9).

These works are of a technical and musical complexity far beyond that of any other organ pieces produced in nineteenth-century Germany, and make huge demands on the organist. Karl Straube applied himself self-sacrificially to the performance and promotion of these works, and Reger became somewhat dependent on and indebted to Straube for this service. Straube's early dominance in Reger organ performance may be gleaned from Appendix 3.

This musical partnership of sorts, a close association between composer and performer, led to a system of double autographs. Starting with the *Phantasie für Orgel über den Choral: 'Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott'*, op. 27, Reger simultaneously prepared fair copies of his organ works, op. 27, 29, 30, 33, 40/1 & 2, 46 and 52/1–3, for the publishers and for Straube. This practice enabled Straube to influence the genesis of the works before they were sent to the printers. Straube's suggestions were mostly, but not exclusively, confined to the performance indications. This

¹ See, for instance, Popp C 29: 'Reger and Straube had...a joint ambition: the rejuvenation of organ music, which had been consigned to a shadowy existence in the nineteenth century'. ['Reger und Straube hatten...ein gemeinsames Ziel: die Erneuerung der im 19. Jahrhundert zu einem Schattendasein verbannten Orgelmusik.']. See also Lindner A 147 – 149, where he explains how Reger was determined to provide the 'modern' organ with adequate repertoire, despite his lack of direct contact with the 'modern' instrument.

routine petered out during the composition of the three chorale fantasies that form op. 52, and finally Reger sent the sole autograph of the *Symphonische Fantasie und Fuge*, op. 57, to Straube with the request that he have a copy made, as, after all, ‘it’s a *miserable job*’.²

The extent of the influence exerted in this manner by Straube over Reger’s compositions is difficult to gauge, as their correspondence up to 7 May 1901 has disappeared – perhaps deliberately destroyed³ – and Straube remained mostly silent on this issue.⁴ Although a number of authors⁵ agree that a study of the double autographs is important for a full understanding of Straube’s Reger performance practice, examples cited in print of divergences in performance indications between the originals and Straube’s personal autographs seem largely inconsequential.

2 Leipzig: Home to Reger, Straube and the publishing house C.F. Peters

On 6 January 1903, his thirtieth birthday, Karl Straube moved to Leipzig to take up the position of organist at the church once graced by J.S. Bach, the *Thomaskirche*. Reger followed in April 1907, when he was appointed teacher at the conservatory and musical director to the university.

By this time the careers of both men were in full flight and, as a result, meetings between them were often sporadic and hasty.⁶ Reger composed virtually no organ music between 1905 and 1913; and so, although Straube was still very active as a performer of Reger’s organ works,⁷ this point of musical contact was no longer as crucial as it once had been.

Leipzig was also the home of the famous publishing house, C.F. Peters, which had published Reger’s *Zwölf Stücke*, op. 59, in 1901. A previous submission by Reger in 1898 of piano pieces and *Ein’ feste Burg...*, op. 27, had been refused by Peters. For his second attempt at an organ submission, Reger made sure that the pieces presented were ‘averaging four pages in length, *completely* in accordance with [the publisher’s] wishes’, ‘not technically difficult’, ‘not more than of medium difficulty...[and] numbers 2, 4, 9 and 11 couldn’t be easier at all’.⁸

That Reger’s second attempt with Peters was successful was perhaps partly due to the recent transfer of ownership of the firm from the deceased Max Abraham to his nephew, Henri Hinrichsen, but more likely due to the marketability of the less complex material presented. Indeed, the reception of op. 59 was favourable ‘especially due to the fact that, while undeniably

² ‘...es ist eine *miserable Arbeit*.’ From a letter of 7 May, 1901, Popp B 19

³ See Stein B 60

⁴ See Popp B 13

⁵ e.g., Popp B 11, Anderson 71

⁶ For an idea of how busy Reger became during this period, see Schreiber B 2 or Popp & Shigihara A 26 ff.

⁷ See Appendix 3

⁸ In letters to Henri Hinrichsen from Peters publishing house of 31 May, 2 June and 13 July 1901 (in Popp & Shigihara B 46-51) ‘...es werden einige derselben 3, andere 5-6 Druckseiten ergeben, als Mittelzahl 4 Seiten, was ja da *vollkommen* Ihren Wünschen entspricht...Die Stücke sind *alle nicht* schwer technisch...**Keines** der Stücke ist *mehr als mittelschwer*. N^o 2, 4, 9, 11 sind sogar “*allerleichtest*”...’.

“echter Reger” it was still possible for reasonably proficient organists (as opposed to virtuosos) to play’.⁹

The attractiveness of the Twelve Pieces for the average organist was borne out in practice. Keller, in a 1923 overview of Reger’s works, lists op. 59/7–9, the *Kyrie eleison*, *Gloria in excelsis* and *Benedictus*, as being of medium difficulty in a scale of easy, medium, rather difficult, difficult and very difficult.¹⁰ And the Reger player, Walter Fischer, wrote in 1910 that ‘above all op. 59 should be recommended to the organist as an introduction to Reger...[here] may be found the most easily approachable pieces, for example, in Book I nos. 2, 5 and 6 and in Book II the charming *Kyrie eleison* and the no less beautiful *Benedictus*, to which the worthy *Gloria* and *Te Deum* may be added’.¹¹

According to Straube’s pupil, Johannes Piersig, who studied with him from 1926 to 1932, Reger’s op. 59/7–9 was part of a hierarchy of pieces studied by all Straube’s pupils in a more or less standard order. Along with Franck’s A minor Chorale the Reger pieces came after ‘the Reimann’ (op. 25, *Wie schön leucht’t der Morgenstern*¹²), pieces from the Peters Bach edition (volumes V, IV and III) and from Straube’s ‘*Alte Meister*’ edition; and before Bach II, and large-scale Reger pieces such as op. 46 or 60.¹³

By all accounts op. 59 was successful, and particularly the *Benedictus*, which was later printed separately (1910) and, on Hinrichsen’s request, arranged by Reger (1908) and by Sigfrid Karg-Elert (1916) for both normal harmonium and *Kunsthharmonium*.¹⁴ Op. 59 was published in two books, each in a run of 500. By 1903 a reprint (200) of Book I was necessary, followed by another (500) in 1905 along with the first reprint of Book II (200).¹⁵

Although Peters considered the introduction of new organ music so difficult as to be more an ‘*Affaire d’honneur*’,¹⁶ the publishers must have been encouraged by the sale of op. 59. Already in January 1902 they requested a set of new organ pieces ‘in just the same style as op. 59’¹⁷ on condition, once more, that they would be easily playable. A few months later, in reply to a suggestion by Reger to increase the number of pieces to 15 spread over three books, Peters emphasised the combination of brevity, playability and quality as the way forward.¹⁸ Thus, the

⁹ Ibid., footnote to 61, (Popp & Shigihara here referring to H.W., *Neue Kompositionen von Max Reger*, in *Blätter für Haus- und Kirchenmusik* 6. Jg. [1902], Nr. 1/16) ‘Gelobt wurde insbesondere, daß die Stücke, obschon gänzlich “echter Reger”, sich nicht ausschließlich an die virtuose Technik wenden, sondern schon von “besseren” Spielern bewältigt werden können.’

¹⁰ Keller 301 (95)

¹¹ ‘Vor allem ist dem Anfänger im Reger-Spiel zu Peters op. 59 zu raten. In diesem opus Regers findet er die meisten leicht zugänglichen Stücke...Im II. Heft von op. 59 findet man das entzückende *Kyrie eleison*, das nicht minder schöne *Benedictus*, dem sich das *Gloria* und *Te Deum* würdig anreihen.’ Fischer 5

¹² See under Chapter 2, section 4

¹³ Piersig 114

¹⁴ See footnote 2 to page 226 of Popp & Shigihara B, op. cit.

¹⁵ Wilske gives further information on print runs of these pieces up to 1918, by which time a total of 2,800 copies had been printed of Volume I and Volume 2, cited in Anderson 165.

¹⁶ In Popp & Shigihara B, op. cit., 62, in a letter from Peters to Reger of 9 May 1902

¹⁷ Ibid. 60

¹⁸ Ibid. 61/2

edition was confined to a further set of twelve pieces, the *Zwölf Stücke*, op. 65, published in August 1902.

By summer 1904, two more sets of comparable length and difficulty, *Zwölf Stücke*, op. 80, and *Vier Präludien und Fugen*, op. 85 (20 movements in total), had been published by Peters.

Selected pieces from these four sets, op. 59, 65, 80 and 85, were later to be edited by Karl Straube and published, again by Peters, in 1912 and 1919.¹⁹ These pieces are listed below.

Table 1.1 Straube's Reger editions of 1912 and 1919

1912	op. 59	7	<i>Kyrie eleison</i>
		8	<i>Gloria in excelsis</i>
		9	<i>Benedictus</i>
1919	op. 59	5 & 6	<i>Toccata und Fuge d-Moll/D-Dur</i>
	op. 65	5 & 6	<i>Improvisation und Fuge a-Moll</i>
		7 & 8	<i>Präludium und Fuge d-Moll/D-Dur</i>
		11 & 12	<i>Toccata und Fuge e-Moll/E-Dur</i>
	op. 80	1 & 2	<i>Präludium und Fughetta e-Moll</i>
		11 & 12	<i>Toccata und Fuge a-Moll</i>
	op. 85	1	<i>Präludium und Fuge cis-Moll</i>
		2	<i>Präludium und Fuge G-Dur</i>
		3	<i>Präludium und Fuge F-Dur</i>
		4	<i>Präludium und Fuge e-Moll</i>

As all these opus numbers belonged to the Peters catalogue, and no other Reger organ music was edited by Straube apart from these (excluding his 1938 edition of op. 27), it would seem likely that the suggestion for these editions derived from the publishers.²⁰ Had Straube himself had free choice in the selection of Reger organ works for edition, he surely would have chosen some of the large-scale works he frequently performed, for instance, op. 46 or 52/2. As it is, it seems that some of the pieces in the 1919 edition were only very rarely performed by Straube, if at all, as indicated by the currently available programmes of his

¹⁹ Straube's 1912 edition of op. 59/7–9 was published in relatively small numbers, three runs of 200 of which 587 were sold between the years 1912 and 1918, compared to 2688 of Reger's originals sold between 1901 and 1918 (see Anderson 165).

²⁰ See Hambraeus 52

concerts and the service listings of the *Thomaskirche* in Leipzig, where he was organist and later cantor.²¹

Nevertheless, the 1912 and 1919 Reger editions are perhaps Straube's greatest achievement, and arguably his only artistic legacy of lasting value. For us they are not only windows into historical performance practice but also into a very particular world of thought and sound. They are Straube's personal insight into early twentieth-century German musical and aesthetic experience.

3 Publications on the Straube editions

Previous to Christopher Anderson's important book *Max Reger and Karl Straube: Perspectives on an Organ Performing Tradition* (2003), which presents a significant amount of information relevant to this study in Chapters 2 and 3, pages 47–184, the only studies known to this author that deal with Straube's Reger editions in any real detail are in the form of unpublished dissertations. These are as follows, in chronological order:

a) Chapter III (20 pages) of Benn Gibson's research project *The Organ Works of Max Reger: Problems involved in their performance*, in partial fulfilment of a doctoral degree for the Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois (1966).

b) Thoralf Roick's fascinating comparison of Straube's 1919 edition of Reger's 'Ten Preludes and Fugues' with the originals as published by Reger, entitled *Urtext und praktische Edition: Ein Vergleich zwischen Max Regers Erstdrucken und Karl Straubes Ausgabe von zehn "Präludien und Fugen für die Orgel"*. This was a *Diplomarbeit* for the 'A' Church music examination of the *Hochschule für Musik und Theater* in Leipzig (1993), and was presented largely in graphic form.

c) Anderson's own doctoral dissertation for Duke University entitled *Reger, Straube, and the Leipzig School's Tradition of Organ Pedagogy: 1898–1948* (1999).

Other relatively few references in articles or books usually confine themselves to such issues as tempo,²² the justification or denigration of the editions,²³ or the use of the editions in Straube's organ lessons.²⁴ It is surprising that, although so few, the main sources on the Straube editions are in English, despite the fact that the vast majority of writings on Reger and Straube are, as one

²¹ See Appendix 3 of this work, and also Appendix 3 in Anderson.

²² e.g., Busch F 60

²³ e.g., Wolfgang Stockmeier (1974, 1975), Friedrich Högner (1974), Bengt Hambraeus (1987), etc. The denigration of Straube's editions stems ubiquitously from a single case of blatant reinterpretation, Straube's interventionist approach to the performance indications in Reger's Toccata in D minor, op. 59/5. The fact that this untypical and extreme example of Straube's approach to editing is cited so frequently is some indication of the lack of real understanding of Straube's work, and the partisan nature of the criticism levelled at him.

²⁴ Wunderlich 10

would expect, in German. Reasons for this are unclear, although the heated and partisan nature of support for and invective against Straube in Germany would perhaps mitigate against a true appreciation of the underlying ambitions of his editions.²⁵

4 'Practical' editions or the codification of 'modern' organ style

This study attempts to understand the musical, technical and conceptual aims of Straube's Reger editions, and identify an essentially German approach to making music on the organ that may be termed 'modern', or post-Wagnerian.²⁶

The 'modern' approach is rich and varied in texture, fluid in tempo, flexible and unforced in dynamics, detailed in its application of phrasing and articulation, and highly sophisticated in its manipulation of all the parameters of performance.

Straube's 1912 and 1919 Reger editions cannot be considered 'practical' in the normal sense of the term, as 'practical' suggests a level of ease not at all reflected in Straube's approach. How could an edition whose registration indications are so closely bound to a specific instrument, that of the *Thomaskirche* in Leipzig, be of 'practical' value to organists faced with instruments varying hugely in size, range of colour, numbers of manuals and aids to registration? Even the prohibitive level of detail in performance indications applied by Straube to Reger's works (despite Straube's later protest at Reger's own 'confusing abundance' of detail)²⁷ would preclude a view of these editions as 'practical'. And despite the extremely detailed performance indications the editions are bereft of both fingering and pedalling, (except for the pedalling supplied for a single piece, op. 59/8 *Gloria in excelsis*).

The editions may be termed practical only in the sense of providing a myriad of often hidden solutions to problems of performance – presented, however, not in an easily understandable and user-friendly format, but as a by-product of an essentially conceptual design.

Straube's Reger editions of 1912 and 1919 are the codification of an aesthetic approach, themselves relying on the skill of the interpreter to meet the specific conditions of a given performance. They are both the embodiment and fulfillment of 'modern' organ style.

²⁵ As witness the writings of Straube pupils such as Friedrich Höpner and Heinz Wunderlich on the one hand, and critics like Johannes Piersig and Günther Hartmann on the other. As Christopher Anderson put it (Anderson 98), 'Straube's supporters and detractors have tended to cast the circumstances of his involvement in extreme terms, some of which have evolved into stereotypical notions (the careful, critical intellect of the performer as counterbalance to the essentially impulsive mind of the composer), others of which have digressed into inapplicable hypotheticals (if Straube had not brought his influence to bear, a particular work would have looked thus and so, which in turn would have been more faithful to Reger's own intentions).'

²⁶ Important to a complete picture of early Reger performance practice, but largely outside the scope of this study, lie a number of as yet inadequately explored issues and areas. Among these are the thorny question of the personal relationship between Reger and Straube, the practice of double autographs for Reger's organ works from op. 27–52 and Straube's role in the genesis of these works, the notion of a Straube school, early Reger performances by organists unconnected to Straube, and the organs used for early Reger performances.

²⁷ '...die Vortragszeichen vom Komponisten in fast verwirrender Fülle eingetragen ...' See a letter from Straube to O. Söhngen of 15.11.1946 in KSB 211

CHAPTER 2

THE WALZE

1.1 Inherent lack of dynamic flexibility in organ sound

Numerous descriptions of the organ in the nineteenth century refer to its inexpressiveness, its ‘rigid, static sound’,²⁸ its ‘inflexibility’,²⁹ its ‘immobility of tone’,³⁰ its ‘majestic impassiveness’,³¹ or its ‘embalmed restfulness.’³² According to Winfred Ellerhorst, ‘organ sound is inexpressive [*starr*] by nature’.³³

Expressiveness in the nineteenth century was virtually synonymous with dynamic flexibility, as witness the term *orgue expressif* for the harmonium, an instrument capable of dynamic gradation. Often ‘expression’ was identified specifically with the Swell, as in Straube’s translation ‘*sempre con espressione*’ of Reger’s heading ‘*immer mit Schweller*’ for the Prelude of op. 85/3, but it could also refer to the total dynamic potential of an instrument. The lack of expression on the organ was felt keenly by organists and composers alike, as well as their audiences.³⁴ ‘In a word, the organ required a **Crescendo** and **Decrescendo** if it were to be considered the most complete instrument’ (J.J. Seidel).³⁵

1.2 Attempts to remedy the situation

Throughout the nineteenth century virtuosity in the handling of stops by German organists was reported from time to time, as in an undated account by a Mr. Chorley of the playing of the Dresden organist, J.G. Schneider (1789–1864): ‘...the artful and unexpected management of the stops, so as to produce every variety of crescendo and diminuendo...Though I stood close by, I was unable, from a want of familiarity with the manipulations of the instrument and the rapidity

²⁸ Töpfer/Allihn 716, ‘einen festen, stetigen Ton’

²⁹ Hasse C 857, ‘von dem...starren Ton der Orgel’

³⁰ Ebenezer Prout, *Applied Forms* (London 1895), 264, ‘...this immobility of tone is one of the most striking characteristics of the organ, and one that especially fits it for the service of the church, in which the personal element occupies only a subordinate position.’

³¹ Riemann B 198, ‘seine majestätische Leidenschaftslosigkeit’

³² Riemann B, op. cit. 703, ‘eine starre Ruhe’

³³ Ellerhorst 569, ‘Der Orgelklang ist seiner Natur nach starr.’

³⁴ Dienel 59, ‘Der in Bezug auf Tonschattirungen naturgemäss auch bei dem Laienpublikum verfeinerte musikalische Sinn findet die auf unseren alten Orgelwerken in monotoner Weise vorgetragene Compositionen trotz ihres gediegenen musikalischen Werthes unschön.’

³⁵ Seidel 14, ‘es fehlte mit einem Wort der Orgel ein **Crescendo** und **Decrescendo**, wenn sie als das vollkommenste Instrument betrachtet werden sollte.’

with which the changes were executed, to take any note of the successions and mixtures of stops employed.’³⁶

Shortly before Reger studied with Hugo Riemann in Sondershausen a new entry on ‘crescendo’ appeared in the *Riemann Musik-Lexikon* (3/1887), containing the following sentence:

[Whereas] previously only a jolting crescendo by means of the gradual addition of stops was possible on the organ, an attempt to remedy this unsatisfactory situation has now been made in two ways: by placing one or two soft stops in a box with a moving cover controlled by a foot lever (*Schweller*, *Dachsweller*, *Jalousieschweller*), and by the use of an ingenious mechanical apparatus which when activated by a foot lever brings on stops in a particular order.³⁷

The Swell was probably introduced into Germany in the 1730s,³⁸ and is treated in Chapter 3. The ‘ingenious mechanical apparatus’, called *Rollschweller*, *Registerschweller*, *Collectivschweller*, *Register-Rad*, *General-Crescendo*, *Sforzato*, *pneumatischer Schweller* or *Walze* entailed the addition of stops either singly or in groups. According to Otto Dienel, it was activated by a pedal roller (or *Walze*), a foot lever, or a stop-knob which could be secured at different ‘stations’.³⁹

2.1 The Walze

Although stop crescendo mechanisms were apparently present in organs from at least 1839 (Walcker instruments in the *St. Petrikirche* in St. Petersburg⁴⁰ and the *Stiftskirche* in Stuttgart⁴¹), it appears it was not until well into the 1890s that they featured in the vast majority of new organs by major builders in Germany.⁴² Generally this concerned organs of over 25 stops, but even much smaller organs⁴³ were sometimes supplied with a *Registerschweller*. Even at this late date the stop crescendo mechanism was not yet invariably controlled by a *Walze* roller, as shown, for example, by the Weigle organ of 1894/5 built for the *Festsäle der Liederhalle* in Stuttgart. Here stops 112 and 113 were both balanced pedals for the control of Swell and stop crescendo, and were situated above the pedal on the right-hand side. It appears from the specifications of Walcker organs in the *Petrikirche* in Hamburg and the *Münster* in Ulm that the

³⁶ See H. Lahee, *The Organ and its Masters* (London 1909)

³⁷ Riemann B, op. cit. 198, ‘Auch der Orgel fehlte früher das C. ganz und konnte nur durch Anziehung von immer mehr Registern bewerkstelligt werden, was natürlich eine ruckweise Verstärkung ergibt. Diesem Übelstand hat man in neuerer Zeit auf zweierlei Weise abzuhelpen gesucht: 1) hat man eine oder ein paar zarte Stimmen in einen Kasten mit beweglichem Deckel eingeschlossen, der durch einen Pedaltritt regiert wird (*Schweller*, *Dachsweller*, *Jalousieschweller*); 2) eine sinnreiche mechanische Vorrichtung, welche durch einen Pedaltritt in Funktion gesetzt wird, bewirkt in einer bestimmten Reihenfolge den allmählichen Eintritt der Stimmen.’

³⁸ See Chapter 3, section 1.1

³⁹ Dienel, op. cit. 39

⁴⁰ See *Festschrift zum zweihundertjährigen Bestehen des Hauses Walcker* (Murrhardt-Hausen 1980), 211

⁴¹ See Walcker-Mayer 35

⁴² e.g. according to Fischer & Wohnhaas 83, it seems probable that the important organ building firm of Steinmeyer first offered a *Registerschweller* in the 1899 proposal for the organ of the *Gedächtniskirche* in Speyer (1902).

⁴³ See, for example, the Dinse catalogue of 1897

halting of the Walze at the required point without recourse to a further aid to registration, the ‘anchor’, was only developed in the mid to late 1880s.

To this day confusion reigns on the subject of the Walze, and, apart from descriptions of its construction (in Töpfer/Allihn, Wangemann, etc.) little documentation exists. Keller (1923) and Albrecht (1981) incorrectly date the introduction of the stop crescendo mechanism in organ building to ‘around the end of the nineteenth century’⁴⁴ and ‘around 1900’.⁴⁵ In 1906 Max Richter still considered the *Registerschweller* controversial, ‘as some speak for it and some against it, some favour a Walze and others a foot lever’.⁴⁶ Organ builders concealed information about improved forms of the Walze from rival organ builders, and in 1895 Wangemann wrote that he ‘could not hold it against the organ builders, Walcker and Sauer, when they refused to allow the publication of drawings of their tremendous and much improved crescendo systems’.⁴⁷ Therefore, although widespread at the turn of the century, it seems the construction of the Walze and its means of operation were far from standard.

A relatively smooth stop crescendo can only be achieved in the context of stops voiced specifically for this purpose, and indeed blend and non-conspicuousness were essentially German priorities in the voicing of late-nineteenth-century organs. These prerequisites of a successful Walze are discussed in section 3.16 of this chapter and also in Chapter 4.

Initially the Walze found an outlet only in improvisation and in ‘modern’ performances of J.S. Bach’s organ works.⁴⁸ In the words of Töpfer/Allihn, ‘A crescendo mechanism of this type has a very limited application...Where in the repertoire is this sort of seething crescendo required?...In practice only in *Phantasiespiel!*’⁴⁹ Taking the lead from Heinrich Reimann, Reger’s organ works were soon to form a body of literature that would demand the use of some of the recent advances in organ building, especially the Walze.

⁴⁴ Keller 213, ‘Erst gegen Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts, im Wohlstand der Jahrzehnte nach dem Krieg von 1870, bekommen die meisten Kirchgemeinden den Ehrgeiz wieder, den sie früher alle gehabt hatten...Nun setzen sich auch entscheidende Verbesserungen in rascher Folge durch...eine Crescendo-Walze (oder -Tritt) ermöglicht durch automatisches Einstellen der Register vom schwächsten bis zum stärksten ein An- und Abschwollen der Tonmassen...’

⁴⁵ Albrecht 259, ‘...der Registerschweller, der erst um das Jahr 1900 erfunden wurde...’ Albrecht also reasserted the mistaken view that the Walze was unknown to Reger (and Liszt), a point conclusively disproved in relevant literature (especially Rudolf Walter) in the 1970s.

⁴⁶ In Richter, M. 30, ‘Über die Zweckmäßigkeit der Einrichtung dieses Schwellers als Walze ist vielfach gestritten worden. Der eine will die Walze überhaupt nicht, sondern lieber einen Tritt, der andere gibt der Walze den Vorzug.’

⁴⁷ Wangemann 249, ‘...so weisen die großen wirksamen Walcker- und Sauer’schen Crescendozüge eine ganz andere Einrichtung auf: ich kann es aber den Herren nicht verdenken, wenn sie die Zeichnungen dieser großartigen Anlage nicht hergeben.’

⁴⁸ Reimann 136, 138, etc.

⁴⁹ op. cit. 685, ‘Von sehr beschränkter Brauchbarkeit ist das Crescendowerk...Wo in der Musik wird ein solches aufbrausendes Crescendo verlangt, wie es dies Werk bietet? In der That wird es wohl auch nur beim Phantasiespiel benutzt.’

2.2 Reger and the Walze

Rudolf Walter furnished three ‘proofs’ of Reger’s early knowledge of the Walze:⁵⁰ his first-hand knowledge of the organ of the *Marktkirche* in Wiesbaden (Walcker 1862/3, III/53); his adoption of the chorale fantasy form derived from Reimann’s op. 25 containing indications for the Walze; and his closeness to Karl Straube, whose new Sauer organ in Wesel (1895, III/80) included a Walze, the generous acoustic⁵¹ of the church favouring a crescendo from ‘*zartesten pianissimo*’ to ‘*mächtigsten fortissimo*’.⁵²

Thoralf Roick points out that ‘the use of the *Crescendo-Walze*, commonly spoken of as the characteristic of Reger’s organ style, is truly vague in Reger’s indications.’⁵³ He refutes the generalisation that hairpins refer to the Swell and written-out crescendo and decrescendo indications to the Walze. Roick quotes a clear example of the synonymous use of sign and word in Reger in the Toccata, op. 65/11, bars 14 and 37, and in the Prelude, op. 85/3, headed ‘*immer mit Schweller*’, the word crescendo appears in bar 16.

There is only one explicit reference to the use of Walze in Reger’s compositions.⁵⁴ This occurs in the Prelude and Fugue in G sharp minor, a work without opus number published by a minor publisher in 1906 (that is, postdating all works later to be edited by Straube), where it is written that ‘Crescendo and decrescendo...refer to the use of the *Rollschweller* (the *Crescendowalze*) for the entire organ’.

The use of the Walze in Reger’s organ works at a much earlier date may, however, be deduced from internal evidence, as in the *Kyrie eleison* op. 59/7, composed in 1901. Here the indications manual III - 4’ in bar 5 and + 4’ in bar 41 imply the use of Walze. Reger assumes that the registration of manual III is left untouched between these bars; it would have been necessary in bar 35 to indicate 8’ pitch only had he wished to leave open the option of stop crescendos and decrescendos produced by hand. Therefore Walze is intended. Thoralf Roick considers that the use of Walze is generally dictated by the musical context, and concerns in particular large-scale dynamic alterations, especially above the *mf* level.⁵⁵

Astonishingly, until 5 March 1901, when he attended a concert of his own works performed by Straube in the *Kaimaal* in Munich (Walcker 1896, III/50), Reger had almost certainly only ever played or heard a single organ with Walze. This occurred during the years 1892 and 1893 when, according to fellow students, Reger tried out some of his own compositions on the 1863 Walcker organ of the *Marktkirche* in Wiesbaden (See Appendix 2). It may be assumed from the early date of construction that the Walze of this organ was relatively primitive compared to those being built in the 1890s, and probably possessed the disadvantages of the Haas system as

⁵⁰ Walter B 3–20

⁵¹ See Gerard Bunk in Falkenberg B 266

⁵² *Gutachten* in Falkenberg B, op. cit. 264

⁵³ Roick 65, ‘Die Benutzung der Crescendo-Walze, gemeinhin als das Charakteristikum von Regers Orgelstil angesprochen, bleibt in der Bezeichnung bei Reger recht vage.’ See also Gibson 46

⁵⁴ C.f. Walter B, op. cit. This despite the statement of many authors, including most recently Anderson 94, that Reger never specifically suggested the use of Walze.

⁵⁵ op. cit. 65

described by Töpfer/Allihn (1855/1888).⁵⁶ The pieces tried out by Reger were possibly later discarded, but are more likely to have been the three pieces that constitute op. 7, composed in 1892 and 1893. None of these pieces bears indications for the use of *Walze*, or contains hairpins or any trace of crescendo/decrescendo markings.

From the *Suite op. 16* (1894/5) onwards Reger's organ music does contain indications for gradual dynamics. This was composed shortly before Reimann's op. 25 (1895). Rudolf Walter comments that it is impossible to deny the similarity between Reimann's markings in his op. 25 and those in Reger's organ music from op. 27 onwards.⁵⁷ It would indeed seem that Reger was more influenced by compositional models than by particular instruments or 'modern' advances in organ building.

2.3 Reger and the organs of Wilhelm Sauer

In *Max Regers Orgelwerke auf Wilhelm Sauers Orgeln*, H. Busch demonstrates the 'close relationship between the organs of Wilhelm Sauer, Karl Straube as the most important German organist and Max Reger as the greatest organ composer of that time'⁵⁸. Not only were almost all of Reger's sizeable organ works first performed on Sauer organs, but all of Straube's Reger editions were supplied with indications for Sauer organs. Despite this close association it appears that Reger had no first-hand knowledge of any Sauer organ before the composition of any of the works edited by Straube. The first documented instance of Reger's contact with a Sauer organ dates from 1907, when he improvised on the three-manual, 45-stop organ of Kolberg cathedral (1890).⁵⁹ Nevertheless, given his almost total lack of experience of the 'modern' organ, and despite his brief acquaintance with Walcker organs that contained *Walzes*, in Wiesbaden in 1892 and the *Kaimsaal* in Munich in 1901, Sauer organs must assume an unparalleled importance in any attempt to gauge Reger's understanding of the *Walze*.

2.4 The 'staged' *Walze*

In the light of Hugo Riemann's comments (section 1.2), it is somewhat disappointing to discover that the first published *Walze* indications (in Straube's teacher Heinrich Reimann's *Toccata* op. 23 and *Wie schön leucht't uns der Morgenstern* op. 25 of 1895) referred to a '*12-theilige Zifferblatt*', implying a grouping of the total number of stops in the *Walze* in twelve stages, or stations. These indications presumably refer to Reimann's newly built Sauer organ in the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche in Berlin-Charlottenburg (1895, IV/80), where a total number of 79 stops in the *Walze* (excluding *voix céleste* and *Fernwerk* by analogy with the Sauer organs in Bad Homburg and Görlitz) would suggest an average of between six and seven stops added per

⁵⁶ See also Leupold, Chapter XVIII, where he states that the staged crescendo mechanisms between the 1850s and the 1880s contained between four and seven stages, those of the 1880s and early 1890s between six and twelve. Wangemann 248 describes a *Walze* with five stages and states that this was similar to the apparatus built by Ladegast for the organ in Schwerin (1871).

⁵⁷ Walter A 284

⁵⁸ Busch H., '...durch die vielfältige engen Beziehungen zwischen den Orgeln Wilhelm Sauers, Karl Straube als dem bedeutendsten deutschen Organisten und Max Reger als dem größten deutschen Orgelkomponisten dieser Zeit.'

⁵⁹ Busch H 40

station. In *Die moderne Orgel* Straube's other organ teacher, Otto Dienel, wrote that a Walze crescendo arranged in groups or stations excludes the possibility of a seamless, very gradual crescendo or decrescendo, and is more suitable for *sforzato* effects.⁶⁰

2.5 The 'staged' Walze and the organs of Wilhelm Sauer

It appears that by contrast with many other builders at the turn of the century, who preferred a successive addition of stops in dynamic order, Sauer consistently built 'staged' Walzes. In this he was supported by the main theoretical work on organ building of the nineteenth century, J.G. Töpfer's *Die Theorie und Praxis des Orgelbaues*, (2nd edition, Max Allihn Weimar 1888), which states that 'although the original intention of the *Rollschweller* was to compensate for the lack of crescendo on the organ and thereby increase its expressive capabilities, it may be thought of rather as a series of fixed combinations (*Gruppenzüge*), for a musically valid crescendo is unattainable with this apparatus'.⁶¹

In 1891, however, Reimann wrote of the new Sauer organ in Mühlhausen in Thüringen that 'the effect of the *Rollschweller* is excellent, despite the addition of stops in groups (of two to three, at the end even four) instead of singly. The couplers are not included in the [mechanical] *Rollschweller*. Therefore it requires a little more practice to overcome the slight interruptions caused naturally by the entry of each lever'.⁶² Ironically, the construction principles of the Walze itself contained the seeds of the later rift in Reger organ performance, which set gradual against terraced dynamics.

Although the vast majority of Walzes have been destroyed or altered beyond recognition, extant Sauer organs in Görlitz, Bad Homburg and Berlin Cathedral, along with the display dial of the Walze in Dortmund-Dorstfeld, all testify to 'staged' Walzes of between 15 and 24 stations.

H.-J. Falkenberg has put forward three considerations which perhaps underlie Sauer's preference for 'staged' Walzes, and which give an insight into the background to Straube's handling of the Walze.⁶³

1) The recognition that a perfectly smooth crescendo is unattainable even on a large organ in a favourable acoustic.

⁶⁰ op. cit. 39

⁶¹ op. cit. 662, 'Ursprünglich haben diese Züge die Absicht gehabt, der Orgel das ihr mangelnde Crescendo zu geben und dadurch die Ausdrucksfähigkeit der Orgel zu vermehren. Wir betrachten den Rollschweller besser unter dem Gesichtspunkte einer Reihe von Gruppenzügen. Denn ein musikalisch wertvolles Crescendo ist mit Hilfe dieser Vorrichtung auch nicht zu erzielen...' This usage of the Walze gained support especially in the context of the Organ Reform Movement. See, for example, Artur Kalkoff in Kalkoff A 50, or indeed the foreword to Straube's 1938 edition of Reger's op. 27.

⁶² Quoted in Falkenberg B, op. cit. 161, ['Der Rollschweller wirkt vortrefflich, trotzdem die Register nicht einzeln, sondern gruppenweise (von 2 bis 3, zuletzt auch 4) eintreten. Die Koppeln sind in dem Rollschweller... nicht mit einbegriffen. Es erfordert daher etwas längere Uebung, die kleinen Stockungen zu überwinden, welche naturgemäß bei dem jedesmaligen Hebelansatz erfolgen.']

⁶³ In a letter to the author dated 27.3.1995

2) The capacity of the ‘staged’ Walze for placement of accents by means of precise toe movements. A whole chorus can be added by a ‘staged’ Walze with precision, whereas a ‘correct’ entry of flutes or mixtures, for example, would be ragged in a Walze with successive stop additions. [Sauer perhaps anticipated the criticism, put forward by Schweitzer⁶⁴ and others, that the Walze could not make additions at the precise moment required.]

3) The ‘staged’ principle is less detrimental to a smooth crescendo than one might imagine. The stages in the Walze can be masked by skilful combination with *Handregistrierung* (HR).⁶⁵ This ‘registration by hand’ refers to the stops drawn manually, either by the player or by an assistant, as distinct from those in the Walze or in a combination.

2.6 Criticism of the Walze

Although respected organists from the Reger and Straube circles (e.g. Walter Fischer in 1910 or Karl Matthaer in 1936) championed the use of Walze, Helmut Walcha described it in 1938 as the greatest offence of German organ building against culture,⁶⁶ Christoph Albrecht wrote that ‘with good reason the Walze has been called the most senseless invention in organ building...and should be used as little as possible’⁶⁷, and W.L. Sumner, that ‘...[for] a Walze which sounds good in crescendo and diminuendo, conditions [are] found only rarely throughout the length and breadth of Europe’.

While generally recommending and recognising the indispensability of the Walze for Reger’s organ music, writers from the end of the nineteenth century to the present day have regarded it with suspicion. These include not only such influential organists and theorists as Allihn, Max Richter, Schweitzer, Rupp, Widor, Ellerhorst and others, but also pupils of Reger or Straube themselves, such as Wolfrum, Hasse,⁶⁸ Kalkoff, Ramin, Klotz, Walcha and Högner. In 1925 Gustav Ramin wrote that ‘with limited use of the Walze (as in Reger) high artistic standards can be met...[but] even Reger’s music often rejects the exaggerated prominence of the modern organ crescendo.’⁶⁹

⁶⁴ Schweitzer 5

⁶⁵ The descriptions in Riemann’s *Orgellehre* (1888) and Rupp’s *Entwicklungsgeschichte...* (1929) of special features in the Walcker organs in Agram (1855) and Ulm (1856) appear to suggest the same procedure. ‘...ein Forte und Piano, vermittelt dessen auf eine großartige Weise der Ton von der zartesten Stimme dieser Disposition in den feinsten Nuancen bis zur vollen Kraft des ganzen Werkes willkürlich an- und abgeschwellt werden kann, während sich der Spieler durch die Registrierung mit der Hand jede beliebige Tonfarbe wählen und in diesen Fortepiano-Zug hinein lavieren kann.’ (Rupp 139) The supplementation of the Walze with registration by hand is also mentioned by Winfried Ellerhorst in his *Handbuch der Orgelkunde*, and in Leupold 385.

⁶⁶ Walcha A

⁶⁷ Op. cit. 259, ‘Doch sollte man die “Walze” so selten wie möglich einsetzen. Mit Recht hat man sie “die geistloseste Erfindung im Orgelbau” genannt...’

⁶⁸ In Hasse B 129 it reads, ‘Whether a Walze is really necessary for Reger’s works or the majority of them seems to me far from certain – it was rejected even by Wolfrum, the devotee of Liszt and Wagner and the pioneer of electric action.’ [‘Ob ein Rollschweller, den übrigens schon Wolfrum, der doch Liszt- und Wagneranhänger und vorkämpfer der elektrischen Traktur war, ablehnte, für Regers Werke oder wenigstens für den größten Teil derselben durchaus notwendig ist, erscheint mir z.B. noch gar nicht sicher.’]

⁶⁹ Ramin 22, ‘Dabei sei...zugegeben, daß [die Walze] in *beschränkter* Anwendung (etwa bei Reger) hohen künstlerischen Anforderungen gerecht werden kann...[aber] selbst der Kunst Max Regers hat vielfach die überwuchernde Bedeutung des modernen Orgel-Crescendos Abbruch getan.’

Apart from criticisms of the more or less primitive types, certain criticisms of the Walze recur and may be summarised as follows: the habitual and inartistic use of Walze to the exclusion of other means of registration; the predictability of the crescendo, which always provides the same tone colour at a given dynamic level and which prompted many writers (for example, Kalkoff and Ellerhorst) to advocate a ‘freely adjustable Walze’; the sacrifice of colour to dynamics; the imprecision of the Walze, which leads to the arbitrary addition of stops at random points of entry; the tendency towards exaggerated dynamics prompted by the ease of dynamic alteration allowed by the Walze; overuse; and the negation of the inner nature of the organ itself in the guise of an orchestral surrogate. Many of these criticisms are addressed by the use of Walze in Straube’s Reger editions.

3.1 Straube and the Walze

Wesel

Straube gave the first performances of Reger’s op. 27, 29, 30, 40/I, 46, 52/I and op. 52/II in St. Willibrordi’s Cathedral in Wesel (For the disposition of the organ see Appendix 2), where he was organist from 1897 to 1903. The report of the committee which approved the new Sauer organ (1895) reads ‘...the crescendo is immense, from softest *pianissimo* to mightiest *fortissimo* at the entry of the three incredibly low bass stops and the glittering mixtures as well as the 11 free [sic!] reeds. Every single one of the nine stations of this crescendo is superior and finished in sound, and each represents a complete ensemble (*Werk*), whether small or great’.⁷⁰

The ‘nine stations’ covered 79 stops (excluding *voix céleste*), and therefore the Walze progressed in giant steps of about nine stops on average per station. Although Sauer had recently begun building free combinations,⁷¹ none was included in the specification of the Wesel organ, and this would suggest a heavier reliance on the Walze than indicated in Straube’s Reger editions of 1912 and 1919. Karl Hasse informs us that ‘Straube made particular use of the Walze for registration without assistance, sometimes improvisatory...as free combinations, except perhaps for a single one, were rarely built at that time’.⁷²

⁷⁰ Dreimüller 59, ‘Gewaltig ist das Crescendo vom zartesten Pianissimo an bis zum mächtigsten Fortissimo beim Hinzutritt der unheimlich tiefen drei 32füßigen Bässe und der glänzenden Mixturen sowie der 11 durchschlagenden Rohrwerke. Jede einzelne der 9 Stationen dieses Crescendos ist edel und abgerundet im Klange, jede ein vollständiges kleineres oder größeres Werk repräsentierend.’

⁷¹ The first Sauer organs furnished with pneumatic free combinations were in Bremen Cathedral (1894) and in the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche in Berlin (1895). However, mechanical free combinations named *Combinationspedal* were included in Sauer organs by at least the beginning of the 1880s (see Falkenberg B 133).

⁷² Hasse F 157, ‘Straube verwandte ihn, zumal die Vorrichtungen für “freie Kombinationen”, außer vielleicht für nur eine, noch wenig gebaut wurden, auch besonders zum Zwecke des selbständigen, von einem Registrierhelfer unabhängigen, manchmal geradezu improvisatorischen Registrierens.’

Leipzig

Straube was appointed to the *Thomaskirche* in Leipzig in January 1903 (See Appendix 2 for the disposition). Due to alterations to the Sauer organ in 1902 and 1908 little is known about the Walze which Straube then had at his disposal. The following report by Straube's predecessor Carl Piutti in the Leipzig paper *Musikalischen Wochenblatt* of 16 May 1889 suggests, contrary to expectations, that the Walze may have been of the type containing successive additions of stops:

The *Crescendo-Walze* covers all the stops of manuals I and II and Pedal, and by simple foot movements, either in the shortest possible space of time or with interruptions according to the choice of the player, all stops are drawn in a particular order beginning with the softest. The number of stops drawn is indicated exactly on a number dial with a pointer. Apart from this *General-Crescendo-Walze* there is a smaller one with 18 stations for the pedal...Manual III is not affected by the Walze, and this holds certain advantages for the use of the organ.⁷³

As the pedal department in the *Thomaskirche* then contained 18 stops, the (pedal) Walze described by Piutti also implied a successive addition of single stops. However, perhaps Piutti's report reflects his own understanding of the general idea of the Walze, and that he misunderstood the function of Sauer's crescendo dial and the 'staged' principle behind Sauer's manner of Walze construction. Straube's 1903 Liszt edition and his *Alte Meister des Orgelspiels* (1904) call for a Walze of twelve stations, but these may have merely followed the standard set in Reimann's publications (op. 23 and op. 25), taking twelve as a round number. There is no trace of the pedal Walze in the console that apparently dates from 1908 (or 1902?) and is still in use today, although certain passages in Straube's Reger editions demand a pedal Walze (see below under 2.19). It seems certain that, at least after 1908, the Walze in the *Thomaskirche* could not be operated by an assistant, and this has consequences for the many difficult or double pedal passages in Reger's organ music. Not only is the original type (staged or gradual) and layout of the Walze in the *Thomaskirche* unknown, but the history and dates of changes made to the Walze have not been established with any degree of certainty, nor are they likely to be.

3.2 Walze indications in Straube's editions

Extraordinary as it may seem, and similar to Reger's own practice, there is little explicit reference to the Walze in Straube's Reger editions of 1912 and 1919. In the light of Schweitzer's criticism of the Walze in *Deutsche und Französische Orgelbaukunst und Orgelkunst* published in Leipzig in 1906, Straube possibly wished his scores not to seem to rely too heavily on the use of Walze for large-scale dynamic alterations.⁷⁴ The use of the numbers W1–W12 for the Walze

⁷³ Printed in Böhme 17, 'Unter den mechanischen Vorrichtungen der Thomaskirchen-Orgel ist schließlich noch die Crescendo-Walze zu erwähnen, welche sich auf alle Register des 1. und 2. Manuals, sowie des Pedals erstreckt und es ermöglicht, durch einfache Fussbewegung in kürzester Zeit, oder ganz nach dem Ermessen des Spielers, mit Unterbrechungen, alle Register nacheinander, vom schwächsten beginnend, in bestimmter Reihenfolge anzuziehen. Wie viele Register hinzutreten, ist auf einem Zifferblatt mit Zeiger genau angegeben. Außer dieser General-Crescendo-Walze ist noch eine kleinere, mit 18 Stationen, für das Pedal allein angebracht...Das 3. Clavier wird vom Crescendo-Zug nicht berührt, was seine besonderen Vortheile für den Gebrauch der Orgel hat.'

⁷⁴ Other composers restricted the use of Walze by means of cautionary qualifications, for example, Paul Gerhardt, in his *Improvisation* dedicated to O. Ghdt. (1913), where he recommends that 'crescendo and

in Straube's Liszt and *Alte Meister* editions had already disappeared in his 1907 collection, *45 Choralvorspiele alter Meister*, and the convention of using hairpins for Swell and written out crescendo and decrescendo indications (usually accompanied by dotted lines) for Walze was by this time firmly established.

This had already been made explicit in his foreword to the 1903 Liszt edition where Straube acknowledges his debt to Reimann's op. 25, *Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern*, for the use of Walze numbers in the musical text. Whereas Reimann used only numbers, Straube added that he 'indicates the use of the stop wheel [*Register-Rad*] with the letter "W" (Crescendo-Walze), and that the written out indications of crescendo or decrescendo always apply to the turning of the [Walze] wheel, the hairpins exclusively to the use of the Swell of manual III.'⁷⁵

In Straube's Reger editions this convention is consistently applied. The clear differentiation between Swell and Walze, which defines the type and to some extent amount of dynamic alteration, led to numerous changes of Reger's dynamic markings, for example, in op. 65/5, from bar 21 where Reger's markings '*pp un poco cresc.*' and '*mp sempre dim. ppp*' are replaced in Straube's edition by hairpins. That Reger did not subscribe systematically to this convention has already been noted under section 2.2.

In general, Straube uses Walze for louder music, and *HR*, (free) combinations and Swell for softer music (see, also, Straube's edition of op. 65/5). This system was adopted partly because of the clear differentiation of duties between Swell and Walze, which naturally allocates the Walze to the heavy end of the dynamic scale, and partly because of the obvious practical advantage of having the registrations involving most stops handled by an automatic system.

Straube also exploits the Walze as a series of fixed combinations for terraced dynamics. Here the use of Walze is either indicated by a new dynamic level unconnected to a previous level by crescendo or decrescendo markings (see under 3.17), or inferred by a comparison of dynamic levels with their given registrations. For example, at the opening of op. 65/5 and later at bar 6 and bar 13 the dynamic levels *f*, *più f* and *mf* are obviously louder than the indicated *HR* registration of six soft manual 8' stops coupled to a few pedal stops. The Walze realises the louder dynamic whereas intermediate bars with dynamic levels of *pp* and *ppp* are handled by *HR* (in bar 5 and bar 11) and *I.Komb.* respectively.

There is no mention in Straube's score of a return to *HR* in these bars, and were it not for additions to manual III in bar 21 which imply a previous use of manual III without Walze (i.e. in bar 5 and bar 11), the organist might be inclined to play these bars using the Walze set at the same dynamic level as for the preceding sections, but now on manual III with the Swell box closed. The indications *Walze ab* and *Walze an* are sometimes included in Straube's free combinations (e.g., in op. 65/5) but more often left out, even in cases where logic would require their inclusion. In the musical text itself these indications are totally ignored by Straube, although presumably their use is intended, and the player is required to work out his intentions

diminuendo refer to the (discreet) employment of the Walze (if well laid out)'.⁷⁵

⁷⁵ From the Foreword (*Vorbemerkung*) to Straube's 1903 Liszt edition, 'Hinzugefügt muss werden, dass ich den Eintritt zur Benutzung des Register-Rades mit dem Buchstaben "W" (Crescendo-Walze) andeute, dass die ausgeschriebenen Bezeichnungen: *crescendo* oder *decrescendo* stets auf die anwendung des Rades, das Zeichen <> ausschliesslich auf den Gebrauch des Jalousie-Schwellers für das III. Manual sich beziehen.'

retrospectively (see, for example, op. 59/8, bar three). In other passages it is very often left to the player to decide whether to temporarily disconnect the Walze using the above aids so it can be wound back under the level of *HR*, or to wind it on to a new dynamic level.⁷⁶

In general, Straube assumes a degree of familiarity with Walze usage that can only apply to organists already initiated into the ‘modern’ style of organ playing. Even for an experienced Reger player the type of non-information supplied by Straube can lead to uncertainty, as witness Benn Gibson, who considers the 3. *Komb.* ‘*préparé*’ move in op. 85/2, Prelude, bar 63 as ‘an almost certain case of the use of crescendo pedal’.⁷⁷ Günter Hartmann points to a passage in Straube’s edition of Reger’s op. 59/5 where he considered Straube to have forgotten to stipulate the use of Walze, or else neglected to try out his own indications.⁷⁸ However, some pages earlier⁷⁹ he had recognised that dynamic indications imply the use of Walze in Straube’s 1913 Bach edition, so it is difficult to understand why Hartmann chose not to view the indications in Straube’s later Reger edition in the same light.

3.3 ‘Base’ registrations

Only two movements in Straube’s 1912 and 1919 Reger editions lack written out crescendo and decrescendo indications, and therefore are intended for performance without Walze; the Preludes from op. 85/1 and op. 85/3. The latter is similarly designated by Reger ‘*immer mit Schweller*’. In the remaining 21 movements the Walze functions in combination with 33 different ‘base’ registrations.

Base registrations are registrations that differ from, and are superimposed on, the Walze combinations. They sound together with the stops drawn by the Walze, and therefore alter the colour and dynamic of the Walze crescendo or decrescendo until the point in the Walze is reached where every stop of the base registration has been absorbed. Apart from the addition and subtraction of pedal couplers for reasons of balance, base registrations are never altered and therefore do not function in tandem with the Walze in the way suggested by Falkenberg under 2.5. The stops of base registrations sound regardless of the position of the Walze, and therefore, for example, the retreat of the Walze to zero will not carry the dynamic level below that of the base registration. Often base registrations are identical to those listed at the head of a piece, but sometimes they contain alterations that have been made in the course of the piece before being used in combination with the Walze. In practice they often act as the starting points of crescendos or end points of decrescendos in the Walze, and are either set up by hand (*HR*) or preset on one of three ‘free’ combinations (*1.Komb.*, *2.Komb.*, *3.Komb.*, hereafter *1K*, *2K*, *3K*). In Straube’s editions the Walze is never permitted to dictate the entire crescendo or decrescendo in the way suggested by many contemporary accounts of Walzes, as the softer dynamic areas are claimed by hand registrations, or pre-set combinations or base registrations and shaped by means of the Swell, manual changes, and additions and subtractions of stops by hand.

⁷⁶ See, for example, op. 67/7, bars 13–23, or op. 59/8, bar 3

⁷⁷ Gibson, op. cit. 47

⁷⁸ Hartmann 175

⁷⁹ Ibid. 168

All base registrations in Straube's editions are coupled through to manual I. Pedal couplers are added or subtracted to balance the manuals. In the following list of base registrations employed by Straube in his Reger editions of 1912 and 1919, the indications 'soft (*weich*) 8' and 4' stops in all manuals' in op. 59/9, bar 25, and 'all 8', 4', 2' foundation stops, mixtures and mutations' in op. 80/12 have been written out in full according to the 1908 specification of the *Thomaskirche*.

Table 2.1 Base registrations (registrations used in conjunction with the Walze)

(N.B., for the sake of clarity pitches only of stops are given)

Base registrations with manual 16' and 8' stops only:

1. op. 59/7 bar 20 *IK* III 16'8'8'8' II 8' I 8'8'8' P 32'16'16'8'8'
2. op. 59/9 bar 48 *IK* III 16'8'8' II 8' I 8'8' P 16'16'8'
3. op. 59/7 bar 28 *HR* III 16'8'8'8' II 8'8' I 8'8'8'

Base registrations with manual 8' stops only:

4. op. 80/1 bar 32 *HR* III 8'8'8' II 8'8' I 8'8'8' P 32'16'8'8'
5. op. 59/6 *HR* III 8'8'8'8'8' II 8'8'8' I 8'8'8' P 16'16'8'8'
6. op. 85/1 Fugue *HR* III 8'8'8' II 8'8' I 8'8' P 16'16'8'
7. op. 85/3 Fugue *HR* III 8'8'8' II 8'8' I 8'8' P 16'16'8'
8. op. 85/4 Fugue *HR* III 8'8'8'8' II 8'8'8'8' I 8'8'8' P 16'16'8'8'
9. op. 65/6 *HR* III 8'8'8'8'8' II 8'8'8'8' I 8'8'8' P 16'16'16'8'8'
10. op. 65/7 bar 40 *HR* III 8'8'8'8' II 8'8'8' I 8'8'8' P 16'16'8'8'
11. op. 80/2 *HR* III 8'8'8'8' II 8'8'8' I 8'8'8' P 16'16'16'8'8'

Base registrations with manual 8' and 4' stops only:

12. op. 85/1 Prel. (end) *IK* III 8'8'4' II 8' I 8' P 16'16'8'

13. op. 65/12 *HR III 8'8'8'8'8'4' II 8'8' I 8'8'8'8'8'8'*
P 16'16'16'16'16'8'8'8'8'
14. op. 65/11 *HR III 8'8'8'8'4' II 8'8'8' I 8'8'8' P 16'16'16'8'8'*
15. op. 80/2 bar 25 *HR III 8'8'8'8'4' II 8'8'8' I 8'8'8' P 16'16'16'8'8'*
16. op. 65/6 bar 27 *HR III 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4' II 8'8'8'8' I 8'8'8' P 16'16'16'8'8'*
17. op. 65/12 bar 51 *HR III 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4' II 8'8'8' I 8'8'8'8'8'8'*
P 16'16'16'16'16'8'8'8'8'
18. op. 85/4 Prel. *IK III 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4' II 8'8'8'8' I 8'8'8'8'8'8' P 16'16'16'16'8'8'8'*
19. op. 59/9 *HR III 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4' II 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'*
I 8'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'4' P 16'16'16'16'16'8'8'8'8'
20. op. 59/8 *HR III 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4' II 8'8'8'8'8'8'4' I 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'*
P 16'16'16'16'16'8'8'8'8'

Base registrations with manual 8', 4' and 2' stops only:

21. op. 85/2 Fugue *HR III 8'8'8'4'2' II 8'4' I 8'8'4'4' P 16'16'8'8'4'*
22. op. 85/2 Prel. *HR III 8'4'2' II 8'8'4' I 8'8'8'4'4' P 16'16'16'16'8'8'4'*
23. op. 65/8 *HR III 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'2' II 8'8'4' I 8'8'4'4' P 16'16'16'8'8'4'*
24. op. 80/11 *HR III 8'8'8'8'8'4'4'2' II 8'8'8'4' I 8'8'8'4'4' P 16'16'16'16'8'8'8'*
25. op. 59/5 *IK III 8'8'8'8'8'4'2' II 8'8'4'2' I 8'8'4'4' P 16'16'16'8'8'8'*

Base registrations including manual mutations, mixtures and/or reeds

26. op. 59/7 *IK III 16'8'8'8'2 $\frac{2}{3}$ ' II 8' I 8'8'8' P 32'16'16'8'8'*
27. op. 59/5 *3K III 16'8'8'4'X II 8' P 32'16'16'8'*
28. op. 85/2 Prel. *3K III 16'16'8'8'8'8'4'2 $\frac{2}{3}$ '2'X8' II 8'8'8'8'8' I 8'8'*
P 16'16'16'8'8'

29. op. 65/11 bar 42 **2K III 16'16'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'X II 8'8'8'8' I 8'8'8'
P 32'16'16'16'16'8'8'8'**
30. op. 80/12 **HR III 8'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'4'2²/₃'2'X8'8' II 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'8'
I 8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'4' P 16'16'16'16'16'16'8'8'8'8'4'**
31. op. 80/11 **IK III 16'16'8'8'4'4'2'2²/₃'8' II 16'8'8'4'2²/₃' I 8'8'4'4'X
P 32'32'16'16'16'16'16'8'8'8'**
32. op. 85/4 Prel. **HR III 8'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'2²/₃'X II 8'8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'2²/₃'8'
I 8'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'4'4' P 16'16'16'16'8'8'8'**

33. Only one base registration does not fall into the above categories. This is a ‘gapped’ registration – III *Aeoline* 8', *Voix céleste* 8', 2'; II *Gedackt* 8'; Pedal 16'8' – which occurs at the end of op. 80/2, where manuals II and III are coupled through to an empty (*leerlaufend*)⁸⁰ manual I.

Excluding this latter registration Straube’s base registrations cover a pitch range from 16' to low mixtures, of which three registrations contain 16' and 8' stops only; nine contain 8' stops only; nine contain 8' and 4' stops only; five contain 8', 4' and 2' stops only; and seven are more complex registrations that display a variety of combinations of *Grundstimmen* with mutations, mixtures and reeds.

3.4 Base registrations in combination with Walze

Despite the variety of base registrations the general principle is clear. In his Reger editions Straube never allows the Walze to dictate the expression below certain dynamic levels, which vary from piece to piece. At its lowest this dynamic level is represented by nine soft stops (base registration no. 12). Often the area over which the Walze has absolute dynamic control was restricted much more considerably, as base registrations contained up to 48 stops (no. 30). Some of these stops (for example, the *Groß-Cymbal IV* of manual I in base registration no. 31) almost certainly appeared only in the closing stages of the Walze’s journey, and so in these cases only a very slight proportion of the dynamic spectrum was exclusively controlled by the Walze.

Reports of the effect of Walzes in Wesel, Leipzig and elsewhere, and criticism of contemporary practice,⁸¹ which regard the Walze as a means of covering the entire dynamic range of the organ from *ppp* to *fff*, are therefore not appropriate to Straube’s handling of the Walze as demonstrated in his Reger editions. In soft or very soft passages, or sometimes even in considerably louder passages (depending on the dynamic level of the base registration itself), the Walze is simply

⁸⁰ According to Rupp the French ‘*Leerlauf*’ idea was almost unknown in German organ building until the onset of the Reform(s). The Walcker organ for Boston (1863) provides an interesting exception to this in its inclusion of an aid to registration, ‘*I. Man. z. Pneumatik*’.

⁸¹ e.g., Rupp 161, ‘It was the domain of the period of the “orchestral organ” around the turn of the century and certain “virtuosos” to begin a Bach fugue or a *Ciaccona* of Buxtehude with the *Äoline* and by means of the sacred Walze to roll right up to the full organ sound...’ [‘Es blieb dem Zeitalter der “orchestralen Orgel” um die Jahrhundertwende und gewissen “Virtuosos” vorbehalten, eine “Bach-Fuge” oder die “Ciaccona” von Buxtehude mit der *Äoline* anzuheben und mittels der alleinseligmachenden “Walze” ins volle Werk hineingeschaukelt zu hören...’]

wound back to zero to allow other, more controlled means of expression free rein.⁸² In this area expression is handled by the Swell, assisted by discreet manual changes and carefully planned additions or subtractions of stops. One example of how this works is given under section 3.7 below.

3.5 Speculative reconstruction of the Walze in the *Thomaskirche*

As the order of stops in the Walze of the *Thomaskirche* organ after 1908 is unknown, it is difficult to estimate with any degree of accuracy the effect Straube's base registrations may have had on the Walze. However, the following attempt at a reconstruction of the Walze Straube had at his disposal throws some light on the probable result of combining Walze and base registrations in Straube's Reger editions. (Manual couplers are assumed to be drawn from the start, as is III/P: II/P and I/P are drawn respectively one third and two thirds of the way along the Walze's journey):⁸³

⁸² Although the re-setting of the Walze at zero level was never indicated by Straube in his Reger editions, this practice may be assumed as the only possible course in many cases, and in accordance with Straube's usage in the *Alte Meister* edition of 1904.

⁸³ The speculative reconstruction of the Walze in the *Thomaskirche* was approached from two angles. Firstly, the compositions of the Sauer Walzes in Görlitz (1910) and Berliner Dom (1904) were compared (Görlitz was provided by H.-J. Falkenberg in a letter to this author of 27.3.95, Berlin was published by Busch in *Ars Organi* 1993/4, see Busch L). These listings are not only peppered with mistakes, but are also radically different from one another (for instance, Görlitz adds in the order all 8' flue stops, all 4' stops, all 2½'s, and 2's, all 16's and mixtures, all reeds, whereas Berlin aims at a more balanced sound for every station, freely mixing 8' and 4' stops in the early stages; within the 8' flue stops Görlitz adds roughly in the order strings, covered or half-covered flutes, open flutes, principals, whereas Berlin mixes stops of different character from the start).

Despite this unpromising start it was found that the two Walzes did agree on a number of principles: both tended to concentrate the stops of the softest manual(s) into the early stages, and those of manual I in the late stages, while the stops of manual II are spread more evenly throughout; manual 16' pitch enters only in the last third of the Walze's journey just before or just after mixtures; mixtures enter before reeds on respective manuals; the largest additions both in numbers and volume of stops come in the last few stations; the additions of Principal 8' stops and mixtures in the manuals are 'staggered'; the first stops to enter in manual III and in the Pedal are respectively *Aeoline 8'* and *Lieblich Gedackt 16'*.

Furthermore, in Busch F 51 it appears that the layout of the stops on the consoles of Sauer organs was ordered dynamically, and corresponded to the order of stops in the Walze. In keeping with this, the order of stops in Straube's registrations for his Reger editions of 1912 and 1919 is always the same within the 8' and 4' stop areas, and is presumably also the order of the console in the *Thomaskirche*. This does not hold true for stops of all pitches; for example, stops of 16' pitch are sometimes listed before (as in op. 80/11) sometimes after (as in op. 65/11) the 8' stops. In addition, the *Oboe 8'* is usually listed in Straube's editions immediately after the 8' stops, whereas this was almost certainly not its position in the Walze. The ordering of 8' and 4' stops however, which presumably reflects the order in the Walze, was adhered to by Straube in stop crescendos by hand in op. 59/6 and op. 65/12, which would seem to confirm a dynamic hierarchy. By following this order of stops given by Straube in his editions it is hoped that a reasonable degree of accuracy has been attained in the reconstruction of the first eight to ten stops of each manual in the Walze of the *Thomaskirche*.

Unfortunately many questions remain open, for instance why Straube chose always to ignore the *Schalmei 8'* of manual II and the *Doppelfloete 8'* of manual I in his base registrations, stops which were almost certainly contained in the Walze. Perhaps these stops were regarded as having too much solo character or too little blending capacity. Nor is it even certain whether after 1908 the Walze was constructed in stages or with consecutive additions of stops. The present organist of the *Thomaskirche*, Ullrich Böhme, has drawn my attention to the similarity in many respects between the Leipzig organ and the Sauer organ in Mühlhausen (1891), which had a staged Walze (see section 2.5). It would seem from this organ, close in date and design to the Leipzig organ, that the original Walze of the *Thomaskirche* was almost certainly built up in stations, but whether this remained so after 1908 has not yet been established.

Table 2.2 Speculative reconstruction of the Walze in the Thomaskirche

	III	II	I	Pedal
(ppp)				
1.	<i>Aeoline 8'</i>	<i>Dolce 8'</i>	<i>Dulciana 8'</i>	<i>Lieblich Ged. 16'</i>
2.	<i>Gedackt 8'</i>	<i>Gedackt 8'</i>	<i>Gedackt 8'</i>	
(pp)				
3.	<i>Gemshorn 8'</i>	<i>Salicional 8'</i>	<i>Flauto dolce 8'</i>	<i>Salicetbass 16'</i>
4.	<i>Flûte d'amour 8'</i>		<i>Gemshorn 8'</i>	<i>Subbass 16'</i>
(p)				
5.	<i>Quintatön 8'</i>	<i>Rohrfl. 8'</i>	<i>Quintatön 8'</i>	<i>Gemshorn 16'</i>
6.	<i>Spitzfl. 8'</i>	<i>Harmonica 8'</i>	<i>Flöte 8'</i>	<i>Bassflöte 8''</i>
(mp)				
7.	<i>Viola 8'</i>	<i>Konzertfl. 8'</i>	<i>Rohrfl. 4'</i>	<i>Contrabass 16'</i>
8.	<i>Principal 8'</i>	<i>Flûte harm. 8'</i>	<i>Geigenprinc. 8'</i>	<i>Dulciana 8'</i>
(mf)				
9.	<i>Traversfl. 4'</i>	<i>Salicional 4'</i>		<i>Violon 16''</i>
10.	<i>Fugara 4'</i>	<i>Schalmei 8'</i>	<i>Gamba 8'</i>	<i>Offenbass 8'</i>
(poco f)				
11.	<i>Praestant 4'</i>	<i>Principal 8'</i>	<i>Doppelfl. 8'</i>	<i>Principal 8'</i>
12.	<i>Flautino 2'</i>	<i>Fl. dolce 4'</i>	<i>Gemshorn 4'</i>	<i>Fl. dolce 4'</i>
(f)				
13.	<i>Quinte 2½'</i>	<i>Octave 4'</i>	<i>Principal 8'</i>	<i>Principal 16'</i>

14.		<i>Piccolo 2'</i>	<i>Violini 4'</i>	
	<i>(più f)</i>			
15.	<i>Gamba 16'</i>	<i>Quinte 2²/₃'</i>	<i>Octave 4'</i>	<i>Principal 8'</i>
16.	<i>Harm. aeth. III</i>		<i>Rauschq. 2²/₃'/2'</i> <i>Octave 2'</i>	<i>Quintbass 10²/₃'</i>
	<i>(più f)</i>			
17.	<i>Liebl. Ged. 16</i>		<i>Quinte 5¹/₃'</i>	<i>Octave 4'</i>
18.		<i>Salicional 16'</i> <i>Cornett III</i>		<i>Untersatz 32'</i>
	<i>(ff)</i>			
19.	<i>Oboe 8'</i>	<i>Cymbel III</i>	<i>Bordun 16'</i>	
20.		<i>Mixtur IV</i>	<i>Cornett II–IV</i>	<i>Posaune 16'</i>
	<i>(più ff)</i>			
21.		<i>Gedackt 16'</i>	<i>Groß-Cymbal IV</i>	<i>Trompete 8'</i>
22.		<i>Clarinete 8'</i>	<i>Mixtur III</i>	<i>Majorbass 32'</i>
	<i>(fff)</i>			
23.	<i>Tromp. harm. 8'</i>		<i>Principal 16'</i> <i>Scharf V</i>	<i>Contraposaune 32'</i>
24.		<i>Tuba 8'</i>	<i>Trompete 16'</i> <i>Trompete 8'</i>	<i>Fagott 16'</i> <i>Clarine 4'</i>

3.6 The two categories of base registrations in Straube's editions

Referring back to the base registrations, two categories may be distinguished:

1. Sixteen base registrations (nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 30, 32) close to combinations found in the *Walze*.
2. Sixteen base registrations (nos. 1, 2, 3, 12, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31) that differ significantly from combinations found in the *Walze*.

1. Base registrations close to Walze combinations

Of the registrations in the first category it is highly unlikely that even one registration exactly reproduces the Walze sequence. Not only does the omission of stops differ from registration to registration in all manuals, but also the numerical balance of stops between the manuals is often unlikely. Nevertheless, it seems that the registrations in this category were selected not primarily for their difference in timbre from the Walze combinations, but rather to provide tighter dynamic control in the area given over to the base registration. Minor differences may reflect Straube's sensitivity to the varied blending of (8') stops, as well as the desire for a numerical bias of stops in favour of manual III, which increases the swell potential of the whole ensemble.

In the varying gaps created by the omission of stops certain patterns emerge. For instance, the *Salicional* of manual II and the *Gedackt* of manual I, which was probably the second stop to be drawn on that manual by the Walze, are almost never drawn in the base registrations. The *Gedackt* of manual II and/or manual III is present in virtually every registration, however, and therefore the omission of this stop on manual I suggests a preference for the combination of stops of different type rather than duplication of colour and harmonic spectra.

2. Base registrations clearly at variance with Walze combinations

Radically different are the registrations in the second category, which do not correspond closely to combinations found in the Walze. In view of the dogmatism of many theoretical works on organ playing from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards it is perhaps surprising that some of these 'impossible' registrations could exist at all in the mind of an organist schooled in this climate.⁸⁴ However, the gulf between theory and practice in organ playing around the turn of the century was even at that time acknowledged to be wide, given the non-standardised nature of organ building in Germany and the many new inventions still to be absorbed by players and theorists alike.

Base registrations nos. 1–3 include 16' manual pitch, which does not enter until the fifty-first stop (stage 15) in the projected reconstruction of the Walze in the *Thomaskirche*, when the *Gamba 16'* of manual III is added. The first two-thirds of the Walze journey, which would almost certainly not normally include 16' pitch, is therefore darkened by the base registrations in these cases.

Base registration no. 12 contains the stops *Aeoline 8'*, *Voix céleste 8'* and *Fugara 4'* on manual III. Apart from the first ten stages, which are abnormally lightened by 4' pitch, the colour of the entire range of Walze combinations is theoretically altered, as the *Voix céleste* would normally be excluded, because of its slightly different tuning. As the *Voix céleste* is rich in overtones, it is not only advantageous for its Swell potential, but also valuable as a bridging agent between the natural and artificial overtones, as prescribed by one of Straube's teachers, Otto Dienel, and

⁸⁴ For example, both Seidel in 1843 and Riemann in 1888 considered the combination of 8' and 2' stops 'impossible'. However, in the registration indications of Karg-Elert and contemporary French composers (for example, Eugène Gigout) 'gapped' registrations also became commonplace, indeed at times employed not solely for particular sonorous effects as in Straube's editions, but also for entire movements.

quoted below under section 3.21. It may be maintained that as the Walze adds stops to this base registration the *Voix céleste* soon becomes inaudible. However, the sensitivity of the human ear should not be underestimated, and even a very soft stop designed to be out-of-tune with the rest of the organ is likely to be conspicuous. Base registration no. 33 would have a similar effect in combination with the Walze, except that the ‘gapped’ effect of 8' and 2' pitch would lend an eeriness to the first stages compared to the normal massed 8' and 4' stops.

Base registrations nos. 14 and 15 both omit the *Salicional* 8' on manual II, and the *Gedackt* 8' on manual I as mentioned under 2.12. Furthermore, a 4' stop is added to manual III after only four 8' stops, which signifies a lightening of the opening stages when these base registrations are combined with the Walze.

In the category ‘8', 4' and 2' stops only’ at least two manuals in each base registration are thinned out in comparison with probable Walze combinations, and therefore approximately the first third of the Walze’s journey is lightened by the avoidance of massed 8' sound. The 2' appears almost always on manual III accompanied by 4' stops on all manuals, and this probably corresponds to the Walze layout.

Base registrations nos. 26–29 and 31 range in pitch from 16' to mixtures, and have little in common with combinations found in the Walze. In these combinations Straube includes the *Voix céleste* fairly consistently, perhaps as a bridging agent in the manner suggested above. Straube consistently avoids massed 8' sound, and concentrates on combinations that favour high harmonics. In no. 31 (op. 80/11) for example, nine of the 20 manual stops are string imitations and, in fact, only two 8' manual stops are not strings. Furthermore, the other stops, which range from two 16' string stops to the mixture on manual I, encompass a broad pitch area which is filled in by the Walze in crescendo, and thinned out in decrescendo. Some of these combinations clearly function as special effects and range from the unconventional to the bizarre (for example, op. 59/5, *3.Komb.*, where Straube’s imagination led to a particularly subjective interpretation of the closing passage, also discussed under section 3.19).

Other combinations in this category, for instance no. 28 (op. 85/2, *3.Komb.*), attempt to match the pitch and colour spectrum of the full organ sound in miniature, and therefore preserve an intensity of sound and a similarity of timbre in the context of large-scale dynamic alteration. Paradoxically, this special case in the handling of the Walze has sometimes been presented as the norm, as in *Performance Practice: Music after 1600*, where Wayne Leupold concludes that Reger’s music as performed by Straube used ‘expression pedal (Swell) for small crescendos, while for bigger dynamic changes he used the *Rollschweller*. Thus Reger’s music was basically played on one sound with the employment of the *Rollschweller* for dynamic changes.’⁸⁵ Normal usage of Swell and Walze certainly did not, and could not, maintain ‘one sound’ while making large-scale crescendos and diminuendos.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ op. cit. 385, where it is also erroneously stated that ‘Straube always performed Reger’s music with all unison manual and pedal couplers on’

⁸⁶ This was clearly recognised by Schweitzer (op. cit. 3), who complained that every increase in volume in German organs also entailed an alteration of timbre. (Schweitzer had the French model in mind, which typically maintained an intense reedy sound throughout the dynamic spectrum.) Possibly this misunderstanding derives from certain somewhat casual references to a clear division between dynamics and registration made from time to time. For instance, Straube himself in KSB 9 states that ‘The second step towards the rehabilitation of the organ as a *Bach-Instrument* was to apply the variety in the handling of the organ that Reimann had previously confined to the

The base registrations provide almost unlimited variety within the Walze crescendo, and this is increased greatly by the extremely varied handling of the manuals. In no sense can the Walze crescendos in Straube's editions be considered predictable. Straube's use of base registrations in combination with Walze are akin to the descriptions of Falkenberg (see point 3 under 2.5) and of the Walcker organs in Agram and Ulm (see footnote 37) where the Walze is combined with registrations by hand to mask the 'staged' nature of the Walze. However, in Straube's system it is the progress of the Walze that alters the existing base registrations, rather than the alteration of Walze combinations by the addition or subtraction of stops by hand. The use of base registrations with Walze also allows the type of flexibility required by Reger in places where dynamic levels are to be presented with specific timbres (e.g. dark/light) in mind.⁸⁷

3.7 An example of Straube's (1919) use of Walze from op. 65/12

Due to the bewildering variety of ways in which Straube effected large-scale crescendos and decrescendos in his Reger editions, no single case may be considered typical. Nonetheless, certain patterns emerge, and a brief discussion of the means of dynamic alteration in the first 50 bars of Straube's edition of Reger's op. 65/12 serves to illustrate the interaction between Walze and base registrations.

This fugue begins *ppp* with manual III coupled through to manual II, sounding a total of five 8' stops of differing timbre. To these five stops are gradually added four more 8' stops and one 4' stop, all from manual III. After the first ten bars no more stop additions are made by hand, with the exception of two pedal stops in bar 20. Between bars 13 and 22 hairpins indicate the use of Swell for expressive purposes and to highlight entries of the fugue subject, after which the Swell box is left open. During these bars, also, the third, fifth and sixth entries of the fugue subject are marked successively *pp*, *p* and *mp*. These entries are indeed successively louder as they coincide with stop additions, or the entry of the pedal in bar 16. In bar 23 the Walze takes over the dynamic alteration and increases the volume between bars 23–28 to *mf*, between bars 35–36 to *f*, between bars 39–40 to *più f*, between bars 43–44 to *ff*, and between bars 50–51 to *più ff*. Although it is unclear where Straube intends the top voice to move to manual I, a part-by-part transference of both hands from II to I takes place between bars 36–40, and this represents a further increase in volume.

3.8 The gradual operation of the Walze over long stretches

A reduction in the number of cases where the use of Walze is indicated over many consecutive bars may be observed in Straube's Reger edition of 1919 as compared to his 1912 edition of Reger's op. 59, *Kyrie*, *Gloria* and *Benedictus*. Perhaps this represents more the differing demands of Reger's music than a conscious development in the handling of the Walze.

area of dynamics (i.e. with the use of Swell and Walze) to the character of the sound also, and to maximise the colour (value) of individual stops and particular groups of stops.' ['Die von Reimann bei Bachs Werken nur an der Lautstärke geübte Differenzierungskunst auch auf den Klangcharakter anzuwenden und die Farbe des einzelnen Registers und besonderer Registergruppen als Stimmungswert einzusetzen, war der zweite Schritt zur Rehabilitierung der Orgel als Bach-Instrument.']

⁸⁷ See Bernhard Haas in Busch F 40

Nevertheless, the following statistics show that, for example, in 1912 the number of cases in which the Walze was used over three consecutive bars or more outnumbered the cases of Walze use over two and a half bars or less. In 1919 only a quarter of the cases of Walze use stretched over three bars or more. The three movements of op. 59 that form the 1912 edition contain two instances of Walze use over seven and a half or eight bars, whereas the 20 movements of the 1919 edition supply only one instance of a comparable length. A clear preference for sporadic use of Walze, or ‘staggering’, is expressed by the 1919 figure for Walze use over two and a half bars or less. Most of these cases, in fact, stretch over only one or one and a half bars.

Table 2.3 Numbers of bars over which the gradual employment of the Walze is indicated in Straube’s Reger editions

	<u>1912</u>	<u>1919</u>
seven and a half or eight	2	1
four and a half or five	2	5
three and a half or four	3	10
three	2	11
two and a half or under	8	101

In Reger’s scores large-scale crescendos and decrescendos between *ppp* and *Organo Pleno* are generally mapped out by the sporadic indication of dynamic levels. It is unclear whether the *sempre poco a poco crescendo* markings are intended to apply continuously to entire movements, or whether they cease to function in the few bars after each indicated dynamic level and before the *sempre poco a poco crescendo* marking is restated. In any case, no Walze could be turned slowly and steadily enough to function over the number of bars indicated by Reger, and no disposition could make this possible. Therefore, Straube almost invariably prescribes the use of Walze in fits and starts, or ‘staggered’, choosing carefully the placing of Walze passages within Reger’s crescendos and decrescendos, according to musical appropriateness and technical feasibility.

3.9 The staggering of ‘gradual’ crescendos and decrescendos

In the example of a base registration combined with Walze quoted above in section 3.7 (op. 65/12, bars 1–51) Reger indicates both hands on manual II, and builds up as follows: *ppp*; bar 7, *pp*; bar 13, *sempre un poco crescendo*; bar 16, *p*; bar 17, *crescendo*; bar 20, *mp*; bar 25, *sempre crescendo*; bar 28, *mf*; bar 29, *sempre poco a poco crescendo*; bar 36, *f*; bar 40, *sempre crescendo*; bar 44, *ff e sempre poco a poco crescendo*; bar 51, *fff*. In this section Reger indicates crescendo over at least 27 bars (if the crescendo is intended to halt between indications of dynamic levels and the new crescendo marking), while remaining on manual II and thus

restricting the number of stops drawn by the Walze. Clearly, not even the illusion of a gradual crescendo could be achieved in this way, and not enough options are available to the player to make practical sense of these markings.

Straube, however, indicates the use of Walze for, at most, ten bars within this 51-bar section, and the full complement of Walze stops are at his disposal as he changes both hands to manual I. After the initial five-bar Walze drive from *mp* to *mf*, the Walze is used only in bursts of one or one and a half bars. Therefore, the overall approach to the handling of the Walze is very definitely ‘staggered’, regardless of whether or not the Walze is of the ‘staged’ type. This method of Walze operation may be considered typical of Straube’s editions, although the speed with which the Walze is turned varies greatly (as a contrasting example to the slow build-up given above, the exceptionally swift decrescendo from *fff* to *pp* over one bar in bar 34 of the *Kyrie op. 59/7* may be cited). The speed of the Walze at a given tempo depends on the number of bars over which the Walze passage is spread, as well as the dynamic range covered. Here in *Op. 65/12*, then, Straube reduces the number of bars over which the Walze is expected to function, and in so doing presents a practicable solution to the technical problem of realising large-scale dynamic alterations on the organ. In *op. 59/6*, to cite a further example, a steady build-up over 93 bars from *ppp* to *fff* employs Walze for only 13 bars in Straube’s edition. This staggered method, which represents a practical realisation of what is, strictly speaking, unattainable, is certainly not intended to negate the gradual nature of Reger’s dynamics. On the contrary, the intellect, and perhaps also the ear, can accept such ‘staggered’ dynamics as an approximation of true gradual dynamics.

3.10 The Walze staggered according to the freedom of the right foot

As stated under section 3.8, the Walze can hardly be expected to turn slowly enough for some of the extended dynamic alterations indicated in Reger’s music. Another example of the use of Walze, in the last 15 bars of the fugue of *op. 85/2*, this time in decrescendo, offers a further practical reason for the staggering of Walze crescendos. Here Straube’s three diminuendo markings in bars 57–59, 64–65 and 68–70, are placed over all bars in which the right foot is free. Here physical restrictions prescribe the points at which the Walze is employed. Often the placing of the crescendo and decrescendo markings in Straube’s editions are determined by practical and not musical factors. In *op. 80/11*, bar 31, to cite a further example, Reger’s crescendo coincides with a difficult pedal part, and Straube is forced to anticipate Reger’s crescendo by one and a half bars and complete it when the difficult pedal passage has passed.

3.11 The Walze in difficult pedal passages

However, for one reason or another the use of Walze is occasionally indicated by Straube in difficult pedal passages and even during pedal solos where the right foot would not normally be free. These cases may be listed as follows:

Table 2.4 The use of Walze in difficult pedal passages

1.	op. 59/5	bar 14, last beat
2.	op. 59/7	bars 16–20
3.	op. 59/8	bars 3–4
4.	op. 59/8	bar 67 ff.
5.	op. 65/5	bars 18–21
6.	op. 65/5	bar 39
7.	op. 65/11	bar 5
8.	op. 80/1	bar 32
9.	op. 85/2 Prelude	bar 27 ff.
10.	ditto	bar 55

Assuming that these indications refer to the Walze (and not to the addition of stops by an assistant) it seems that mostly the left foot takes over the performance of these passages despite their difficulty, which frees up the right foot for the operation of the Walze. In some cases this is even suggested by Straube's phrasing, for instance in no. 8. This technique, where the left foot plays all the notes, including leaps, is also required for pedal solos – for example, no. 7 – and it is likely that this manner of pedalling was second nature to the skilled organist of Straube's time, as indeed the technique was also important for the manipulation of the Swell box.⁸⁸ In other cases it seems the right foot is intended to make short stabs at the Walze wherever a break of a few semiquavers permits. In no. 7 the pedal solo lies high on the pedalboard and it seems likely that here, exceptionally, the left foot would have been called upon to operate the Walze, or, in this case possibly, the addition of stops by hand could have been intended. No. 9 is a difficult pedal passage where the use of Walze could easily have been avoided without damaging the build-up unduly, simply by delaying the crescendo by two bars. The fact that this possibility is ignored seems inconsistent with Straube's normal practice.

3.12 The operation of the Walze by an assistant

W. Walcker-Mayer implies that an extension of the Walze wheel (through the side of the console) for operation by a registrant was a common feature of the 'modern' organ, and he maintains that this is essential for the performance of Reger's music.⁸⁹ Also, Martin Weyer wrote that 'not seldom' a wide roller covering the entire range of the pedals or a *Registerrad* could easily enable an assistant to operate the Walze. However, in 1906 Max Richter reported that on some organs the axis of the *Rollschweller* continued through the outside of the console, so that it could be operated by an assistant, but he did not consider this an essential feature of the

⁸⁸ Here a clash of priorities forces the organist to choose between a true legato in the pedal and a fluent use of Swell or Walze. The left-foot-only technique can often quite adequately simulate a true legato, allowing freedom of Swell and Walze manipulation by the right foot to great advantage, c.f. the opening pages of Reger's op. 52/2 where the importance of this technique can hardly be denied.

⁸⁹ op. cit. The suggestion that the general crescendo mechanism could be 'either operated by the player himself or by a second person' is included in the disposition of the Walcker organ for the Concert Hall in Boston (1863). In addition, see Hambræus 44, footnote 7

‘modern’ organ.⁹⁰ The fact that Straube largely avoids the use of Walze where the right foot is not free would appear to indicate that Straube intended to operate the Walze himself, and indeed this is confirmed by the present console in the *Thomaskirche*, dating from 1908, which does not include an extension to the Walze wheel for the use of a registrant. However, in the examples taken from op. 59/8, that is, nos. 3 and 4 of the above list, the pedalling indicated by Straube for these passages excludes the operation of the Walze by the player. Therefore an assistant is required in these cases to realise Straube’s indications, although it is unclear how this was to be done on the organ in the *Thomaskirche*, for which the indications in Straube’s editions were intended.

3.13 The Pedal Walze

Furthermore, in op. 59/6, bars 50 and 77, in op. 80/12, bars 45 and 48, and in op. 59/8, bar 70, the dynamics of manuals and pedal in Straube’s editions do not run parallel. Especially in op. 59/6, bar 50, where the crescendo in the manuals overlaps with a diminuendo in the pedal part, it would seem that a second Walze for the pedal alone is required.⁹¹ This feature of the original organ in Leipzig had also apparently disappeared by 1908, four years before the first of Straube’s Reger editions. However, other organs known to Straube such as the Sauer organs in the *St. Marienkirche* in Mühlhausen and the *Petrikirche* in Leipzig may have prompted him to retain this possibility in registration.⁹²

3.14 The ‘abrupt’ use of Walze within gradual dynamic alterations

In *Urania* (1905) Hugo Riemann translated an article by Widor in protest against the Walze:

Unfortunately, from time to time in the development of a Bach fugue, one hears stops entering according to their order in the Walze without having any relation to the structure of the work. The stops enter one after another in such a way that sometimes, completely at variance with the composer’s ideas, a Piccolo enters in the middle of the subject, or a Cornet at the end of its answer or a Trumpet in the middle of a *stretto*.⁹³

And in 1950 Artur Kalkoff considered the Walze redundant even in Reger playing because of the contrapuntal nature of the music, in which, he maintained, additions should be made at the starts of themes, etc., and not just arbitrarily.

⁹⁰ Richter, M. 30, ‘An manchen Orgeln findet man die Achse des Rollschweller bis über die Außenseite des Spieltisches verlängert vor. An dieser Verlängerung befindet sich wieder eine Walze, die von einem Registrierhelfer bedient wird. Ich halte diese Vorrichtung nicht für absolut notwendig, weil ich von dem Grundsatz ausgehe, daß der Organist sich alles selbst registrieren soll.’

⁹¹ Also unclear is the reason why Straube should have written his crescendo and decrescendo markings sometimes between manual staves, sometimes between left-hand and pedal staves, and sometimes both between manual staves and between left-hand and pedal staves. This may have been a decision of the engraver, as seems to have been the case, for example, with Straube’s hairpins in op. 59/9, bar 7–8 and 14–15, some of which are written between the staves where there is enough space, and otherwise over the staves.

⁹² In this connection it is interesting to note that the enclosure of pedal stops in Swell boxes from time to time was a peculiarly German phenomenon. From the middle of the nineteenth century onwards examples may be cited that include the Walcker instruments in Boston (1862), Riga (1882–83) and the *St. Reinoldikirche* Dortmund (1909).

⁹³ *Urania* 62 (1905) 56

A further technique in Straube's handling of the *Walze* reflects Widor's and Kalkoff's concern. In addition to the gradual and staggered use of the *Walze*, he applied an 'abrupt' use in the context of gradual dynamic alterations. This is the immediate skip from one dynamic level to another by means of a short, sharp but controlled toe movement that jerks the *Walze* along its journey. The placement of this toe movement is always chosen carefully, usually where a rest occurs in the manuals or where the top voices momentarily drop out of the texture.

A good example of this may be found in Straube's edition of op. 59/5, bars 8–11 where the 'abrupt' and 'staggered' methods appear side by side. Here the *Walze* gradually builds from *p* to *f* over one and a half bars, then maintains *f* for one bar, after which a sudden *più f* is achieved during a rest in all parts. A gradual crescendo from *più f* to *ff* leads to another jump to the dynamic level *fff*, which again occurs during a rest in all parts. In op. 59/8, bar 74, the jump occurs in a rest in the right hand only; in op. 65/11, bar 17, during a rest in the manuals but not in the pedal.

The 'abruptness' refers more to the manner of performance than to the musical effect, and the jerking of the *Walze* in rests and textural gaps disguises the stop additions made by the *Walze*. Very occasionally the *Walze* progresses immediately from one dynamic level to another at a thematic entry, for instance in op. 59/8, bar 45, where the jump from *f* to *ff* coincides with a restatement of the main theme. Thus the *Walze* also contributes occasionally to the highlighting of thematic material that would normally be realised by the distribution of the hands on the manuals.

It must be stressed that this use of the *Walze* is relatively uncommon in Straube's editions, and as a general rule the *Walze* progresses from one dynamic level to another over the space of half a bar, a bar or a few bars, on rare occasions over many bars. However, despite Widor and Schweitzer's previously noted complaint that the *Walze* could never be accurate in its addition of stops⁹⁴ the 'abrupt' method gained currency. Hermann Keller advised in 1923, 'never simply let the *Walze* roll, but always bring the *Crescendostationen* [!] on in small, exactly measured steps at motivic entries'.⁹⁵ In *Gedanken zur Interpretation der Orgelwerke Max Regers* Rudolf Walter mentions in passing that 'crescendo and decrescendo with the *Walze* is to be realised only at breaks in the phrasing'.⁹⁶ This instruction is echoed by other writers such as Klinda in his *Orgelregistrierung*, and hence a special case in Straube's handling of the *Walze* is presented by many writers as a general rule. An interesting echo of this idea may be found in Heinz Wunderlich's article *Zur Interpretation von Regers Symphonischer Phantasie und Fuge op. 57*,⁹⁷ where he advises not to start the fourth part of the fugue too loud, to leave room for a *terrassendynamische* continuation. Whatever Wunderlich meant by this, it is clear from Straube's editions that this 'abrupt' technique within large-scale build-ups is not intended to result in a 'terraced' effect, but is used to advance the *Walze* discreetly in the space of a quick breath. The use of *Walze* for true terraced dynamics is discussed below under 3.17.

⁹⁴ Schweitzer, op. cit. 5, see section 2.5 of this chapter.

⁹⁵ Keller 82 (288), 'drehe nie gedankenlos an der *Walze*, um ein "gleichmäßiges" Crescendo zu erreichen, sondern bringe in kleinen, aber genau gemessenen Stücken auf die motivischen Einschnitte die einzelnen Crescendostationen, in die eben doch auch die bestzusammengesetzte *Walze* schließlich zerfällt.'

⁹⁶ Walter B 10, 'daß Crescendi und Diminuendi mit *Walze* nur in Phraseneinschnitten verwirklicht werden, sei am Rande vermerkt.'

⁹⁷ Wunderlich C 38-50

3.15 Parallel passages registered differently as a result of Walze use

Occasionally, a chosen registration is unsuitable for Walze use, either due to its texture, perhaps a solo with accompaniment, or because the manuals are uncoupled. When the passage is repeated and leads to a Walze build-up, then a clash of priorities results and the principle of ‘like sections, like registrations’ (Heinz Lohmann) is sacrificed to a smooth transition between the Swell area and the Walze. The most obvious instance of this may be found in Straube’s edition of op. 65/7, where the main theme recapitulates in bar 40, and can no longer be cast in its original form as an *Oboe 8'* and *Gedackt 8'* solo on manual III, accompanied by an uncoupled *Gedackt 8'* on manual II, as the Walze crescendo has to be prepared with a more suitable registration.

3.16 The Walze and pliancy of sound

In his editions, Straube worked on the creation of an environment in which the Walze can function with the maximum of discretion. This environment depends largely on abundance of dynamic detail other than that supplied by the Walze; the addition of stops by hand and the use of Swell in non-Walze passages, the addition of pedal couplers, dynamic cutbacks and a constant flow in the distribution of hands over the three available manuals. Within this fluctuating scene the dynamic changes wrought by the Walze are less likely to be conspicuous than in a context where the texture and balance of parts remain uniform and the dynamics are shaped solely by the Walze on manual I. An illusion of gradual dynamics, a musical *trompe l'oeil*, is achieved. The greater the number of dynamic events that occur within a single movement, the less noticeable the individual alterations become.

Significantly, Straube praised the 1908 revision and extension of the *Thomaskirche* organ in the following terms: ‘The new instrument has the same unity in sound as the smaller organ, but the overall sound is freer and more expansive’.⁹⁸ ‘Freedom’ of sound is surely what Gatscher (1924) intended when he wrote that ‘especially in Reger’s organ music, extreme pliancy of sound should be the goal in all circumstances. This does not mean the hideous oscillations of the Walze or the see-saw use of Swell to which Reger’s indications could inadvertently lead, but rather the loosening of the sound, and the cantabile performance of the tremendously soaring melodic lines’.⁹⁹ This loosening of sound promotes the environment in which the Walze and other ‘modern’ means of dynamic alteration can best function.

⁹⁸ Falkenberg, op. cit. 150, ‘Das neue Instrument besitzt die gleiche Geschlossenheit im Ensemble wie die kleinere Orgel, aber der Gesamtton ist freier, größer geworden...’

⁹⁹ Gatscher 6, ‘Die äußerste Biegsamkeit des Orgelklanges ist gerade bei Reger unter allen Umständen zu erstreben. Gemeint ist aber nicht das grauenhafte Hervor- und Zurückwälzen der Klangmassen, das beständige Auf und Nieder des Jalousieschwellers, zu dem Angaben Regers verleiten, sondern die Auflockerung der Klangmassen, die kantabile Führung der ungeheuer weitgeschwungenen melodischen Linien.’ C.f. chapter 4, sections 2.3 and 3 for more about the ‘loosening’ of organ sound.

It seems that Straube created this Walze-friendly environment largely within the confines of performance without assistance, which precludes the use of Walze with hand registration in the way suggested above under 2.5. Therefore his treatment of manuals played an important role in the area of dynamic subtlety. An overall crescendo in op. 59/6, bars 50–60 provides a good example of this system in operation. At bar 50 the dynamic increase in the manuals coincides with a decrease in the pedals,¹⁰⁰ and therefore the purity of the crescendo is blurred. In bar 54 the right hand cuts back in dynamic by changing from manual I to II (in mid-chord for maximum discretion), and the Walze drive to *più f* and entry of the pedal is masked by a similar cutback in the left hand.

The coincidence of the transference of the left hand to manual I and the subtraction of a pedal coupler in bar 60, where statements of the fugue theme begin and end, prompts the observation that in many cases in Straube's editions local dynamic alterations serve to highlight the thematic structure of the music. Often enough these local alterations contribute to large-scale dynamic alterations and therefore fulfill a double function. In a sense this is the beauty of Straube's system of registration, as it serves not only the dynamic shape but also the thematic. The constant highlighting of thematic material lends depth of expression to the music while adding to the means of dynamic alteration.¹⁰¹

3.17 Terraced dynamics realised by the Walze

Terraced dynamics (not functioning within large-scale gradual dynamic alterations) are frequently realised by the Walze, and normally occur at the ends of sections. One example of this is the Prelude op. 85/2, bar 32, where the Walze is obviously wound back from *f* to zero level before the next section begins in a *pp* dynamic. Other examples of winding back to zero may be found in op. 65/11, bar 23, the Prelude op. 85/2, bar 64, the Fugue op. 84/5, bar 45, and probably in op. 65/8, bar 54. The player can perform this operation with relative ease, as the Walze is simply wound back to its endpoint. Where several dynamic levels are passed over without reaching an endpoint, considerable skill is required to stop the Walze at exactly the right point. The player must keep one eye on the Walze dial without detracting from the performance. An example of this is op. 65/7, bar 57, where the terraced dynamic alteration *ff–mf* is realised by the Walze in the middle of the bar.

This use of Walze is that recommended by Allihn in 1888 as quoted above under 2.5, when he says that 'we can think of [the Walze] rather as a series of *Gruppenzüge* [fixed combinations], for a musically valuable crescendo is unattainable with this apparatus'. Here truly gradual dynamics are recognised as being impossible on an organ, and therefore gradual dynamics are rejected altogether and the Walze is fostered only as a series of fixed combinations. If this could have been controlled adequately Allihn would have been satisfied with a 30-stage Walze in

¹⁰⁰ This diminuendo signals the end of a presentation of the fugue subject in inversion in the pedals. It is unclear, however, how this is to be achieved.

¹⁰¹ This attitude to texture finds resonance in the ideas of other leading composers of Reger's time, for instance, Strauss or Schönberg. In the foreword to his 1904 edition of Berlioz's *Instrumentationslehre* Strauss advocated the symphonic/polyphonic composition style of Wagner (as against that of Liszt) for the quality of its inner parts, which allows the players of these parts to partake spiritually in the expression of the music. The intensiveness of the inner parts lends fullness of texture (*Klangfülle*) to the whole. Straube's concern for the highlighting of inner parts is discussed in Chapter 5, section 4.1.

conjunction with a coupling system and a ‘*Prolongement*’,¹⁰² which, he said, would render all other aids to registration redundant.

3.18 The presetting and resetting of the Walze, and the alternation of the Walze with the *Handregistrierung* and free combinations

Issues of a technical rather than a musical nature related to the use of Walze as a series of fixed combinations are the presetting of the Walze (i.e. before a piece begins, for instance, in op. 65/5 and op. 65/7 both at *f* and in op. 80/11 at *fff*) and the resetting of the Walze at a new dynamic level in preparation for a section to come (for instance, in op. 65/11, where, following an *fff* Walze build-up, the Walze is reset at an unspecified dynamic below *mp* during bars 39–41 while *1.Komb.* is sounding).

A further technical advantage of the Walze concerns the freedom it allows for re-registration of *HR* or free combinations (for instance, op. 59/7, bar 20). Not only can the Walze be reset while the *HR* and the free combinations are sounding (usually with the help of the *Walze ab* lever), but also the *HR* and the free combinations can be altered while the Walze is in use once the dynamic level of the *HR* or free combination in question has been superseded by the Walze. Therefore these two systems of registration are used in tandem, and the use of Walze permits alteration to the *HR* and the combinations, and *vice versa*. The re-registration of *HR* or combinations under cover of the Walze makes use of the Walze again as a form of *Prolongement*.¹⁰³ In op. 59/9 the *Vorbereitung* markings in bars 40–44 call to mind the French *préparé* practice to which this *Prolongement* procedure is directly related.

3.19 The avoidance of predictability in Straube’s handling of the Walze

Variety or the avoidance of predictability seems to have been one of the main priorities in Straube’s handling of the Walze. Many of the techniques used by Straube to this end have already been discussed above: the gradual (over a maximum of seven and a half or eight bars), ‘staggered’ (usually sporadic over one or two bars), ‘abrupt’ and terraced operation of the Walze roller, and the use of Walze with ‘base’ registrations, changes of manual, pedal couplers and Swell.

The fact that pedal couplers entered rather late in Sauer’s Walze layouts was calculated to allow free interplay between manuals, contrary to the impression given, for example, by Schweitzer when he writes ‘we create a crescendo by allowing the total number of stops follow one another in seamless succession, so that they affect the main manual indiscriminately’.¹⁰⁴ Straube seems to take his lead from this remark, so unceasingly varied is his use of manuals in combination

¹⁰² Not to be confused with the *Prolongement harmonique*, which also rarely appears in German organs (e.g. in the 1872 Ladegast organ built for the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* in Vienna). The *Prolongement* in Germany mostly seems to have been a device that froze the registration already sounding while alterations were being made.

¹⁰³ In fact, the free combinations were sometimes named *Combinations-Prolongement*, as in the organ of the *Gewandhaus* in Leipzig (Walcker 1884), and organs by G.F. Steinmeyer (d. 1901).

¹⁰⁴ Schweitzer 3, ‘... wir schwellen, indem wir sämtliche Register lückenlos aufeinander folgen lassen, so daß sie unterschiedslos auf das Hauptklavier wirken...’

with Walze throughout his Reger editions. A good example of the use of Walze together with interplay of manuals is the Fugue of op. 85/2, where the starting point of the Walze is III *pp* for the right hand and II *p* for the left hand.

Another method of avoiding dynamic predictability in Straube's Reger editions, which encroaches more on the music and is therefore controversial, is the deliberate alteration of the composer's dynamic conception. This results in an individual and subjective interpretation of a very small number of passages in Reger's music. The most notorious example of this is in the closing section of op. 59/5, where the composer's (Walze) indication *meno ff e sempre diminuendo* in bar 33 is altered in Straube's edition to a *pp* 'special effect' registration where the left hand chords are played on III *Äoline 8', Voix céleste 8', Fugara 4', Harmonia aethera 3 fach, Gedackt 16'* and the right hand solo on II *Gedackt 8'*, with a 32'16'16'8' pedal registration. Here the use of Walze is eliminated, and monotony in the handling of the organ is avoided in a relatively extreme manner. Straube's pupil, Friedrich Högner suggested in his article *Karl Straube und die mißbrauchte Musikphilologie*¹⁰⁵ that Straube chose to bring on a free combination here in order to avoid the use of Walze, and that his *pp* registration was culled from Reger's piano playing (Reger was famed for his *pianissimo* on the piano).

A further avoidance of the monotonous use of the Walze is discussed above under 3.4, 3.6 and 3.7. This concerns the elimination of the Walze altogether at the soft end of its journey, and as a result the control of dynamic alteration in this area is greatly increased. This area is claimed in Straube's editions by base registrations, and is inflected by stop additions by hand and the use of the Swell.

3.20 The frequent avoidance in Straube's editions of full organ, and the scaling down of Reger's dynamic indications

The *plenum* end of the Walze scale was also avoided or used in a restricted manner on many occasions by Straube, possibly for a combination of reasons. Straube excludes the Walze in this area simply by scaling down the dynamics notated by Reger, which prevents the Walze from completing its journey. This not only avoids the inevitability of the drive towards full organ sound, but also in many cases helps solve the problem of bridging foundation stops and the heavier mixtures and reeds. A fine example of this is the first 23 bars of op. 65/6, where Reger's crescendo III *pp* to I *fff* becomes III *pp* to I *più f* in Straube's score. Often, as in the Fugue of op. 85/3, Straube calls a halt only at the *ff* stage, withholding the final stages, *più ff* and *fff*. However, as many of the heaviest stops are added very late in the Sauer Walzes, the problem of bridging is even in this case significantly reduced. Possibly Straube had organs other than the noble instrument in the *Thomaskirche* in mind when he prescribed this procedure, as in a letter to Klotz of 25 February 1944 he encourages temperance in registration to avoid the 'high pressure wail of sirens'.¹⁰⁶ Whatever the motivation, the gain to discretion in the use of Walze can hardly be denied.

¹⁰⁵ In Muk 44/6 (1974) 280–285

¹⁰⁶ KSB 174, '...Hochdruck von Sirenengeheul...'. Interestingly, Karg-Elert recognised this problem in his organ compositions when he sometimes provided an alternative, less massive texture for use with high-pressure stops. Straube's reluctance at times to transfer the right hand to manual I may be due to a similar sensibility.

The scaling down of Reger's dynamics has led to much criticism.¹⁰⁷ This is perhaps because the many different practical as well as musical reasons behind Straube's decisions have been left unrecognised, ignored or found to be unacceptable in the light of the prevailing musicological and musico-philological climate. Furthermore, as Straube's scaling down avoided the *aufbrausendes Crescendo* (Töpfer/Allihn),¹⁰⁸ the *auf und nieder* (Gatscher, also Ramin)¹⁰⁹ or *Hervor- und Zurückwälzen der Klangmassen* (Gatscher)¹¹⁰ of the *Walze* (c.f. Straube's own infamous edition of Muffat's *Toccata in F* in his 1904 *Alte Meister*), it follows that had Straube not scaled down certain dynamic markings, Reger's music and his performance of it would have met with equal criticism for the opposite reason.

In fact, the question of Straube's scaling down of Reger's dynamics is elusive, as neither the composer nor the editor adopted absolute or consistent values in their dynamic indications. Reger's *ff* climax in the Prelude of op. 85/3, bar 39, is realised on manual III, and therefore the dynamic in this case refers to one part of the organ only. His dynamics in the first section of op. 65/7, which range from *pp* to *f* in a context where (extensive) stop additions are unlikely, are at best misleading, and must be scaled down to provide notational clarity and a musically satisfactory result. Straube's position is equally complex, and is discussed below under 3.23.

3.21 The bridging of foundation stops and *plenum* area

Writers on the matter have approached the problem of bridging from two different angles. Otto Dienel seems to have reflected most deeply on the matter, and recommends as bridging agents powerful Swells, strong reedy 4' strings, soft mixtures, and the use of couplers and Swell in the service of the *Walze*. Furthermore, he suggests that organ builders revert to old-style (Italian) mixtures whose overtones are built up separately. He stresses the importance of the 8' and 4' *Charakterstimmen* for the bridging of foundation stops and mixtures, so that the artificial overtones, which are prepared by the natural ones, do not enter abruptly.¹¹¹ Hans Klotz, who represents another pole and era, and felt anyway that Reger's music 'did not belong on the *Walzenorgeln* of 1910', claimed in the light of the *Orgelbewegung* that Reger's music was to be played either in the foundation or *Plenum* sound area, as the bridging of these areas presumably proved too difficult on neo-Baroque instruments. It is interesting that the seeds of Klotz's rather drastic approach are contained in the procedure adopted by Straube and described in the previous paragraph.

Straube uses further bridging techniques not mentioned by Dienel or Klotz. Base registrations used in combination with the *Walze* often contain high stops and even mixtures, and therefore the problem of bridging has been reduced considerably even before the *Walze* begins its journey. Often, as in the *Kyrie eleison* op. 59/7, the right hand is not transferred to manual I, and this also favours the bridging of stops, as the loudest mixtures of manual I are sounded only in a low register. The many discreet manual changes introduced by Straube contribute greatly to the bridging process, as suggested in section 3.16.

¹⁰⁷ Compare Stockmeier A, op. cit., Hambraeus, op. cit., and Susanne Popp in Popp B 16

¹⁰⁸ See footnote 22

¹⁰⁹ See footnote 72

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Dienel 24

3.22 The Walze and the Swell

Although the Swell was primarily used to inflect the soft area claimed from the Walze by the base registrations, Straube also makes skilful use of the Swell for the bridging of foundation and *plenum* areas in his large-scale dynamic alterations. This is achieved by means of base registrations that favour manual III, the Swell manual. In Straube's scheme the Swell is almost invariably opened (fully) before the Walze begins its journey. There is only one true exception to this rule, the Fugue of op. 85/2, bar 38, where dialogue on manuals II and III is inflected by the Swell after the Walze has built up to *mf* (op. 80/11, bars 19–27 seems to be a mistake, and the use of Walze with a closed Swell in op. 65/11, bar 5, concerns a pedal solo where the use of Swell would anyway have little effect).

Interestingly, this rule rejects the procedure recommended by Reger's friend Philip Wolfrum,¹¹² and by Dienel, who favoured the French method of introducing the first mixture(s) in crescendo with the Swell box closed.¹¹³ (Many of Dienel's comments, however, seem to refer to some Utopian, non-existent organ that would combine the best qualities of French and German instruments. In this connection I am grateful to H.J. Busch for drawing to my attention Dienel's fascination for the English organs of the time, many of which pointed in this direction).

3.23 The relative nature of dynamic markings in Straube's editions

In general, one dynamic level separates adjacent manuals in Straube's scores, as in the opening of op. 59/5 or op. 85/1,¹¹⁴ and therefore any given registration actually ranges over three dynamic levels corresponding to manuals I, II and III. This rule of thumb permits a tentative deduction of dynamic values for any single manual (in the following list, manual III), which enables comparisons of registrations within a given dynamic category to be made. Exceptions to this rule of thumb in Straube's Reger editions cast a shadow of doubt on the accuracy of such comparisons. However, the following classification of the base registrations (see Table 2.1 on page 18) according to dynamic levels gives at least a rough idea of the very different types of registrations that represent a single dynamic level in Straube's Reger editions.

¹¹² In the organ chapter in Strauss, op. cit.

¹¹³ Dienel, op. cit. 40

¹¹⁴ It seems to have been a generally held assumption that the manuals were dynamically ordered in this way, as witness Piutti in the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, Leipzig 16 May 1889. 'The strength of manual III with the Swell box opened is so great that it can relate to the other manuals, as *mf* can to *f* and *ff*...' ['Die Macht dieses 3. Claviers, bei geöffnetem Schweller, ist so gross, dass es den beiden anderen ebenbürdig zur Seite steht, wie dem *ff* und *f* das *mf*...']

This rule of thumb seems to have been widespread and, for instance, appears in the disposition of the Weigle organ (1894–5) in the *Liederhalle* in Stuttgart given in Riemann's *Handbuch der Orgel* (4th. ed. 1919), where the pneumatic pistons nos. 88–90 similarly arranged the manuals with adjacent dynamic levels on the scale *pp* – *p* – *mf* – *f* – *ff*.

Table 2.5 The relationship in Straube's scores between dynamic levels and stops drawn

Dynamic of manual III	No. of base registration:
<i>ppp</i>	1, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 26
<i>pp</i>	2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29
<i>p</i>	10, 11, 18, 19, 25, 30
<i>mp</i>	20, 25, 31
<i>mf</i>	32

In op. 59/5, op. 59/8 and op. 85/1 base registrations represent different dynamic levels within the same movement (nos. 6, 20 and 25 listed twice above). In addition, within a single movement the same dynamic level can be represented by widely divergent registrations; in the prelude of op. 85/2 (no. 22), for instance, where the opening *pp* registration of soft flutes contrasts starkly with the closing registration on 3K which includes a mixture and a soft reed, also marked *pp*. In a case like this, therefore, Straube's dynamic markings correspond neither to absolute nor to relative values, and at most govern local dynamic alterations.

In view of the above it is unlikely that dynamic levels in Straube's Reger editions correspond precisely to positions of the Walze as indicated by association of dynamic levels with Walze numbers on the scale 1–12 in Straube's *Alte Meister des Orgelspiels* (1904). In the *Alte Meister* collection the dynamic level *mp* was represented by the Walze no. 4 which would imply a similar number of stops to that given in Straube's *ppp* (*IIpp*, *I_p*) registration (no. 13) for op. 65/12.

Nevertheless, as Roick points out,¹¹⁵ the 11 stages consistently applied to dynamic alterations by Straube, *ppp* – *pp* – *p* – *mp* – *mf* – *poco f* – *f* – *più f* – *ff* – *più ff* – *fff*, are reminiscent of the standard 1–12 Walze scale introduced in published organ music by H. Reimann. Occasionally in Straube's 1919 edition this eleven-point scale is expanded to twelve (or even 13) by the indication of the same level twice, i.e., *più f* and/or *più ff* (see op. 65/7, bar 66, op. 59/6, bar 66, op. 80/12, bar 32, the Fugue of op. 85/2, bar 55, the Prelude of op. 85/4, bar 45, and op. 59/6, bar 86).

¹¹⁵ op. cit. 65

3.24 Criticisms of the Walze answered by Straube's Reger editions

Straube's Reger editions answer virtually all of the criticisms levelled at the Walze, and deal firmly with Schweitzer's negative view of the Walze as a (bad) habit.¹¹⁶ He answers specific charges levelled at the Walze by Allihn,¹¹⁷ Schweitzer,¹¹⁸ Wolfrum¹¹⁹ and many others. Dependence on the Walze alone for dynamic shape is rejected by Straube. Instead, a combined use of Walze with other methods of dynamic control produces a rich variety of crescendo and decrescendo possibilities. This variety avoids the danger of the 'levelling out' of timbre against which Karl Hasse warned,¹²⁰ and makes redundant the calls for a 'freely adjustable Walze'.¹²¹ The alleged imprecision of the Walze is abolished in that most critical dynamic area, *ppp* to *p*, where, for example, in the 'staged' Walze a move from stage one to stage two could more than double the number of stops drawn in one fell swoop. Here, the elimination of the Walze altogether claims a high degree of dynamic control where most needed. Straube's Reger editions take on the function of a veiled counterattack against opponents of the Walze, and in so doing assert Straube's superiority in this largely uncharted area of musical dexterity. That Straube's efforts seem to have passed almost unnoticed may have contributed to the bitterness evident in some of his letters from the 1940s,¹²² which show his lack of faith in the transmission of artistic ideas through the medium of editions. In the matter of the Walze, therefore, it is inappropriate to associate Straube's priorities as expressed in his Reger editions with those of many of his pupils, who either failed to recognise Straube's comprehensive control of the Walze, focussed on one particular aspect of its use, or rejected the Walze altogether in the light of the *Orgelbewegung*.

3.25 Conclusions

As already noted in the Preface, Albert Schweitzer maintained that the artistic being of an organ, and more especially the essence of organ music, is defined by the way in which you proceed from *piano* to *forte*, from *forte* to *fortissimo* and back again.¹²³ His Reger editions show that in this important area Straube recognised not only the great advantages but also the deficiencies of the Walze. Straube exhibits an almost unimaginable variety in the use of the Walze and exerts the maximum degree of control permitted by its mechanism. Gradual large-scale dynamic alterations are realised by gradual (especially in the edition of 1912), 'staggered' (especially in the edition of 1919) and 'abrupt' (relatively uncommon) methods of operating the Walze, and

¹¹⁶ op. cit. 7

¹¹⁷ In Töpfer/Allihn 662

¹¹⁸ op. cit. 12

¹¹⁹ In Strauss (Wolfrum), op. cit. 261 where it reads, 'Some organists are happy with the crescendo in stages as provided by the Walze. The order in which the stops follow one another in the Walze never changes. Even if this increase or decrease of volume is handled in a musical manner, i.e. taking the phrasing into account (which is only seldom the case), the effect is still monotonous.' ['Es gibt Organisten, die sich an einem crescendo, das in der "ruckweisen" Vereinigung von Orgelstimmen durch den Rollschweller besteht, genügen lassen. Der Rollschweller läßt nämlich in einer sich stets gleichbleibenden Skala die Stimmen oder Register nacheinander eintreten. Geschieht dieses Verstärken oder Vermindern auch immerhin in musikalischem Sinne, d.h. wird hierbei die musikalische Phrase berücksichtigt (was aber leider nur selten der Fall ist), so wird das auf die Dauer doch monoton.']

¹²⁰ Hasse F, op. cit. 157, '...daß er die Klangfarben nivellierte und sie durch neutrale Stärkegrade ersetzte.'

¹²¹ Kalkoff, op. cit. 50, 'Zu empfehlen wäre der Bau einer frei einstellbaren Walze...'

¹²² c.f. Chapter 7, section 7

¹²³ op. cit. 3

jolting effects are minimised within the limits of practicability. The use of Swell and Walze is dovetailed and the points of takeover carefully chosen. Manual couplers are drawn from the start in the Walze, whereas pedal couplers are used thematically and permit free interplay between manuals. Transitional dynamics demand an environment in which the Walze can function discreetly, with the help of manual and stop changes, Swell, couplers, (free) combinations and base registrations.

Karl Hasse reported that Straube 'set aside days or even a week to prepare for concerts on organs unknown to him...Each time he shaped the piece to be performed anew...and this extremely detailed work on every organ was also applied to the Walze'.¹²⁴ The description by Greß and Krieger in relation to the revision of the *Thomaskirche* organ in 1908 is appropriate: '...Straube desired the greatest possible nuance in dynamics and timbre...with the aim of a quasi-seamless stop crescendo (Crescendo-Walze!).'¹²⁵ With the help of the Walze organ builders, composers and players could finally approach some of the grandiose effects that had previously been solely the domain of the orchestra.

¹²⁴ Hasse F, op. cit. 156 & 157 'Straube hatte die Gewohnheit, bei auswärtigen Orgelkonzerten mehrere Tage, oft eine ganze Woche lang an der betreffenden Orgel sich einzuarbeiten, um allen ihren Möglichkeiten wie auch der Akustik des Raumes gerecht zu werden. An jeder Orgel gestaltete er die vorzutragenden Werke wieder ganz neu...Das letzte Ausarbeiten an jeder Orgel mußte sich auch auf der Rollschweller beziehen.'

¹²⁵ Greß and Krieger 156 '...wobei...größtmöglicher dynamischer und farblicher nuancenreichtum angestrebt wurde, u.a. mit dem Ziel eines quasi lückenlosen Registercrescendos (Crescendo-Walze!')

CHAPTER 3

THE SWELL

1 Introduction

1.1 The status of the Swell in nineteenth-century Germany

In the third edition of *Die Orgel, ihre Geschichte und ihr Bau* (1886), published in Leipzig shortly before the Sauer organ of the *Thomaskirche* was built, Otto Wangemann declared the *Walze* to be more a novelty than an essential feature of the ‘modern’ organ, and, after discussion of various nineteenth-century attempts to make the organ ‘expressive’ (of which there were many)¹²⁶, stated that ‘one returned...to the lid, flap and Venetian Swell (*Dach-, Thür- und Jalousieschweller*)...to obtain a crescendo on the organ.’¹²⁷ Two years later, Töpfer¹²⁸ found the Swell to be ‘still the best means of nuance for flue pipes’.

Although Seidel, Audsley and Ellerhorst credit the concept of the Swell in organ building to Gréniè (1811), Mace (1676) and Praetorius (1615), respectively, and Heinz Lohmann dates its introduction in Germany back to 1730,¹²⁹ it seems that the Swell met with much resistance in nineteenth-century Germany and many rejected it as an ‘irreligious plaything’.¹³⁰ Conservatives such as E.F. Richter, Rheinberger (whose organ sonatas were published between 1869 and 1901!), Haupt, Merkel and Hesse considered Swell effects unimportant.¹³¹ According to Audsley,¹³² by 1882 (the time of Reger’s youth) few instruments in Germany apart from larger ones of recent date possessed the ‘great improvement’ of a Swell. In 1906 Max Richter felt the need for a section on the ‘Justification of the Swell’ in his *Moderne Orgelspielanlagen*,¹³³ and even in 1929 Emile Rupp spoke of the Swell as having been a general feature of German and

¹²⁶ Other aids to ‘expression’ fostered in the nineteenth century, apart from the *Walze*, Swell and *Fernwerke*, were: *schwebende* or wavering stops; tremulants; free reeds (e.g. *Phsyharmonika*), whose dynamic was controlled by their wind supply; the enclosure of a single solo stop in a mini-Swell box (in the case of the *Vox humana* this practice went back at least to the Wagner organ of 1725 in the Garnisonkirche in Berlin, described by J.F. Walther in 1727); free and fixed combinations; sophisticated coupling systems; *Ventile* or valves which shut off entire manuals for ease of registration; double pedal boards and automatic pedal systems that matched the dynamic of the pedals to the manual(s), etc.

¹²⁷ Wangemann 104, ‘...man ging wieder...um ein Crescendo für die Orgel zu gewinnen, zum Dach-, Thür- und Jalousieschweller zurück.’

¹²⁸ Töpfer/Allihn 720, ‘Der beste Art den Ton der Labialstimmen zu nüancieren, bleibt immer, dieselben in einem Kasten aufzustellen, dessen bewegliche Thüren durch einen einfachen Mechanismus willkürlich geöffnet oder geschlossen werden können.’

¹²⁹ Lohmann A 227, Here the provision of early dates for Swell divisions revokes the view of the Swell as a product of nineteenth-century decadence.

¹³⁰ Falkenberg A 2073, ‘unkirchliche Spielerei’

¹³¹ Leopold 384

¹³² Audsley 38

¹³³ Richter, M. 29. ‘*Die Berechtigung der Schweller und Tremulanten*’

Austrian organ building but for a short time.¹³⁴ Rupp found that in Germany Swells with lids and flaps were occasionally employed, but were not generally adopted, and he cited a three-manual organ of 45 stops built in Karlsruhe in 1900 that did not include a Swell.

Wherever the Swell did find acceptance in Germany before 1900, its importance was variously judged. Wangemann¹³⁵ considered the Swell ‘indispensable to the dynamics of organ playing’ whereas Hugo Riemann dubbed the Swell ‘the seasoning (*Salz*) of the organ’, suggesting an inconsequential role. In *Die Registrierkunst des Orgelspiels in ihren grundlegenden Formen*¹³⁶ Rudolf Rudolz maintained that because of its continuity of sound the Swell represents a significant extension of the expressive possibilities of the organ and, as it does not involve a numerical addition of stops, may be considered the primary agent of expression. Only the Swell could overcome the constancy (*Beharrlichkeit*) and rigidity (*Stetigkeit*) of organ sound.

1.2 The ‘primitive’ operation of the Swell

Most nineteenth-century German Swells were operated by an ‘unbalanced hitch-down mechanism that, unless left open, would return to the closed position once the player’s foot was removed.’¹³⁷ Töpfer/Allihn explained that the pedal lever (*Tritt*) must be furnished with a slot, or indeed many slots, to hold the box open (so that the player can take his foot away again at a given moment¹³⁸); or, if the box stays open by itself, then two pedal levers are needed, to open and to close the Swell.¹³⁹

The French balanced pedal greatly improved the control of the Swell, but its introduction in Germany was apparently not widespread until a surprisingly late date.¹⁴⁰ In 1906 Max Richter still wrote only of a Swell operated by a pedal lever in a vertical slot, with horizontal slots for holding positions.¹⁴¹ It is often difficult to deduce from organ dispositions whether a Swell was operated by a balanced pedal or by a foot lever which returned to its point of departure, and the word *Swelltritt* continued to be used indiscriminately for both types long into the twentieth century, when the term *Schweller* became more popular for the balanced Swell. In Riemann’s *Handbuch der Orgel* (Berlin, 2nd. and 3rd. editions 1911) the word *Swelltritt* is replaced by *Balanziertritt* only in the dispositions dating from the mid-1890s and onwards. In the 1894–95 Weigle organ in the Stuttgart Liederhalle,¹⁴² the *Balanziertritt* was uncomfortably situated on the right-hand side (like most nineteenth-century German Swell pedals,¹⁴³ including that of the original instrument in the *Thomaskirche* in Leipzig) and was operated pneumatically.

¹³⁴ Rupp 115

¹³⁵ Wangemann, op. cit. 250. ‘für die Dynamik des Orgelspiels also unentbehrlich’

¹³⁶ Rudolz 48 ff.

¹³⁷ Leupold, op. cit. 384

¹³⁸ Wangemann, op. cit. 250

¹³⁹ Töpfer/Allihn, op. cit. 715

¹⁴⁰ See footnote 37 of this chapter for references to the early introduction of balanced pedals in Walcker instruments.

¹⁴¹ Richter, M., op. cit., 31. ‘

¹⁴² As in most German and Cavaille-Coll organs, for instance, in St. Sulpice

¹⁴³ This seems to have been a common position for the Swell pedal at least up to the turn of the century, as witness, for example, Sauer organs in Leipzig-Plagwitz (1888) and in the Marienkirche in Mühlhausen (1891). Of

Regarding pneumatic Swells, Audsley writes that ‘with a mechanical balanced pedal...every motion of the foot or the lever is faithfully conveyed to the Swell shutters...This can hardly be claimed for the most ingenious pneumatic or electro-pneumatic actions’¹⁴⁴. Ellerhorst reports that ‘the pneumatic [Swell] can only produce about ten dynamic levels [and these are] easily distinguishable by the ear’; therefore he also prefers the mechanical Swell to the pneumatic (or electrically) operated.¹⁴⁵

Thus, the ideal conditions for the operation of the Swell were met by a combination of old (mechanical) and more recent (balanced, centered, Venetian) attributes, and must have been scarce at any stage in the nineteenth or early-twentieth centuries.

2 German forms of the Swell

2.1 Slight Swells and *Fernwerke*

Emile Rupp wrote that ‘the more advanced... Venetian Swell met with bitter opposition well into the second half of the nineteenth century’,¹⁴⁶ and furthermore, that in all of nineteenth-century Germany, Austria and German-speaking Switzerland manuals I and II were heavily favoured at the expense of the Swell manual. By way of example he cited Sauer’s organ in Fulda (1877) which enclosed only eight stops in a Swell box, out of a total of 54.

Writing from the perspective of the ‘New-German Alsatian [Organ] Reform’ movement Rupp was able to pronounce such ‘inadequate’ Swells primitive and redundant. Although chronologically speaking this may be the case, the typically slight German Swell manual of the second half of the nineteenth century was related to a (sometimes) enclosed Echo division (usually situated at the rear of the organ and not necessarily capable of being opened) that provided ‘the semblance of tones emanating from outside the church’¹⁴⁷ or ‘sounds of incense’ (Högner),¹⁴⁸ effects highly cherished by composers and players alike throughout the nineteenth century, and easily discovered in organ music from Mendelssohn to Liszt and beyond. Hugo Riemann found that the *pianissimo* dynamic gives rise to ‘the strange, the extraordinary, the

this latter organ Heinrich Reimann complained that ‘if one were not completely used to this layout, the great distance to the pedal lever for the operation of the Swell could cause difficulties, and could even cause it to be mistaken for the adjacent lever corresponding to the reed stops’ (see Falkenberg B, op. cit. 161, ‘*Auch die weite Entfernung des Hebels für den Jalousieschweller kann, so lange man sich an diese Einrichtung noch nicht vollständig gewöhnt hat, bisweilen Schwierigkeiten, auch Verwechslungen (mit dem Rohrwerktritt) herbeiführen*’).

¹⁴⁴ op. cit., Chapter XLIII

¹⁴⁵ Ellerhorst 584. ‘...bei der pneumatischen Steuerungsart das Oeffnen der Jalousien nur auf etwa 10 mit dem Ohre wohl unterscheidbare Stärkegrade einzustellen ist’

¹⁴⁶ Rupp 170. ‘Auch die vollkommeneren, dem französischen Orgelbau verdankte Ausführung als “Jalousieschweller” begegnete bis tief in den II. Teil des XIX. Jahrhunderts der erbitterten Gegnerschaft der musikalischen Zionswächter und Sonntagsorganisten.’

¹⁴⁷ Seidel 71. ‘...die Töne außerhalb der Kirche herzukommen scheinen.’

¹⁴⁸ Högner B 1154. ‘Weihrauchklänge’

fantastic, the unearthly, etc.’¹⁴⁹ and with this in mind it is easy to understand why many church authorities dismissed the Swell as an ‘irreligious plaything’. Furthermore, allusions to the abuse and overuse of echo effects may be traced back at least as far as the humorous (?) epithet ‘*Echos für die Ignoranten*’ in the registration suggestions for the Riepp organ of 1766 in Ottobeuren.

Nonetheless, relatively slight and often miniature Swell divisions were perpetuated for the sake of their peculiar characteristics, and they survived into the twentieth century in the guise of *Fernwerk*, *Kronwerk*, *Echowerk*, etc. Indeed, certain passages in organ music from the beginning of this century seem to cry out for such ‘romantic’ treatment as only they can provide. For instance, the *Von Himmel hoch* chorale melody at the end of the second movement of Reger’s *Zweite Sonate*, op. 60, can be made to appear literally ‘from heaven on high’. The effect of this passage played on an organ such as the Christuskirche in Mannheim, where the *Fernwerk* is situated high up in the cupola, is truly a revelation. In 1906, however, Schweitzer wrote that he ‘didn’t wish to speak of our *Echo-Fernwerken*. They really have nothing to do with the organ and are dangerous playthings that ruin the taste of the public, and, even worse, that of organists’.¹⁵⁰

The *Fernwerk* in the Christuskirche, however, is actually representative of a newer and more substantial type of *Fernwerk* where a significant division of the organ (sometimes with independent pedal stops) is geographically separated from the rest of the organ, usually immediately under the roof. The sound is fed into the main body of the church indirectly, either due to the architectural positioning of the *Fernwerk*, or through a sound channel (*Schallkanal*) that opens into the church at some surprising or strategic point, often above the altar or, as in the case of the Sauer organ in the Stadthalle in Wuppertal, through a specially constructed rosette in the middle of the ceiling. Arno Landmann, the organist of the Christuskirche in Mannheim from 1911 to 1942, reportedly played the B flat *fortissimo* chorale melody from Reger’s op. 27 on the *Fernwerk*, with the express approval of the composer.¹⁵¹

2.2 Powerful Swells

Long before the turn of the century the case for a stronger Swell division was being voiced, for instance by E.F. Richter in 1896:

If one wished to transfer the expressive capability of the Swell to the entire organ, then the Swell should be deployed in the English [!] manner, not only with a large number of stops but also with strong stops; it is a decisive mistake in German organ building to enclose the very weakest manual in the Swell box. If one does not want to give up the ‘whispering’ effect then one should build two Swells according to old (Hamburg) and recent (Berlin) examples, with a loud Swell manual as *Mittelwerk* and a soft one as *Oberwerk*. Sometimes the entire pipework of smaller organs has been enclosed in a Swell.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹ Riemann B 57 under *Ausdruck*. ‘der erzielte Eindruck wird dann der des Fremdartigen, Sonderbaren, Märchenhaften, Unheimlichen sein’

¹⁵⁰ Schweitzer 15. ‘Von unseren Echo-Fernwerken mag ich nicht reden. Sie haben mit der Orgel an sich nichts zu tun und sind eine gefährliche Spielerei, die den Geschmack des Publikums und, was noch schlimmer, des Organisten verdirbt.’

¹⁵¹ Müller 18

¹⁵² Richter, E.F. 113 & 114. ‘Will man diese Ausdruckfähigkeit auf die Gesamtwirkung der ganzen Orgel übertragen, so muß das Schwellwerk nach englischer Weise nicht allein mit vielen, sondern auch starken Stimmen besetzt werden; es ist ein entschiedener Fehler des deutschen Orgelbaues, daß er gerade das am schwächsten

This is the solution recommended by the Reger friend, Philipp Wolfrum, in 1904:

In large organs [the Swell] is found mostly only on manual III or IV, the gentlest or, more to the point, weakest manual of the organ, where perhaps as few as one sixth or one eighth of the stops – and again those most weakly voiced – are gathered together. The effect of such a Swell is hardly worthy of consideration. Rather, it is to be recommended that all the stops of the organ should be enclosed in these Swell boxes and supplied with Venetian shutters, so that one could bring either a single stop or the entire organ sound from *p* to *f* and back again.¹⁵³

Although generally frowned upon, this idea had been put into practice by Vogler at the beginning of the nineteenth century and was revived from time to time, one instance being the large Voit concert organ in the Stadthalle in Heidelberg (1903), another the *Welte-Philharmonie-Orgel* on which Reger made his organ recordings in 1913.

The same aim of increasing Swell potential was pursued along a more moderate track concerned with increasing the swell potential of a single Swell manual. H.-J. Falkenberg¹⁵⁴ drew attention to an early Sauer organ of 1854 that was to establish a pattern for future Sauer instruments. This was the organ in the Marienkirche in Friedland, where a 30-stop, two-manual organ included a Swell of ten stops. Although it contained neither mutations, mixtures nor reeds, it may be considered progressive in the numerical balance of stops.

At the end of the 1860s, under the influence of Cavaillé-Coll, Sauer included 16' and 8' reeds (*Fagott 16'* and *Oboe 8'*) in the Swell divisions of the Nikolaikirche in Frankfurt, the St. Thomaskirche in Berlin and the St. Johanniskirche in Magdeburg; later, however, he preferred to replace the 16' reed and the 4' *Principal* with strings, to form a chorus with the 8' string stop(s). The preference for strings and flute stops above reeds and diapasons in the Swells of the late nineteenth and early-twentieth century Sauer organs reaffirmed the essentially German assignment of the Swell division to the lower dynamic levels.¹⁵⁵

It was not until shortly before the turn of the century that more significant Swell divisions began to anticipate the Alsatian Reform instruments built from 1909 onwards, in which an increase in the number of heavier and higher stops was designed to boost dynamic sophistication and potential. Such a Swell division was that of the Walcker Kaimsaal organ in Munich (1896). Here, manuals I, II and III contained 15, 11 and 14 stops respectively, and the Swell manual III included a soft mixture, an *Oboe 8'* and a *Trompette harmonique 8'* (see below under section 3.2).

intonierte Manual im Schwellkasten aufstellt. Glaubt man auf den damit verbundenen Effekt "säuselnder" Wirkung nicht verzichten zu können, so baue man nach älterem (Hamburg) und neuerem (Berlin) Vorbilde zwei Schwellwerke, nämlich ein stärkeres als Mittelwerk, ein schwächeres als Oberwerk.–Bisweilen hat man auch das gesamte Pfeifenwerk kleinerer Orgeln in einem Schwellkasten vereinigt.'

¹⁵³ In Strauss 261. 'Man findet meist in größeren Orgeln diese Einrichtung nur auf dem III. oder IV. Manual, dem zartesten, ohnehin am schwächsten klingenden Klaviere der Orgel, wo etwa 1/6 oder 1/8 der Orgelregister und wiederum die zartest intonierten vereinigt sind. Hier den Jalousieschweller anzuwenden, ergibt eine sehr wenig in Betracht kommende Wirkung. Vielmehr empfiehlt es sich, sämtliche Orgelregister, also den ganzen Pfeifenkörper in diesen Kasten einzubauen und mit Jalousieschweller zu versehen, dann kann man das einzelne Register, wie den ganzen Orgelgesamtton aus dem "p" ins "f" und umgekehrt aus dem "f" ins "p" führen.'

¹⁵⁴ Falkenberg B 18

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 119

However, Otto Dienel's claim in the 1903 edition of his *Die moderne Orgel* (and presumably in the first edition of 1891) that the 'modern' organ often has more and louder stops on the Swell manual than on the *Hauptwerk* seems to be grossly exaggerated, and could not have applied to the large Sauer and Dinse organs to which he was accustomed in Berlin. Possibly Dienel hoped to persuade German organists that this organ type was desirable, progressive but not revolutionary, and already common in German organ building; and that whereas 'previously the effect [of the Swell] was mostly non-existent...now it influences the full organ sound: it encloses a group of stops that provide high swell potential'.¹⁵⁶

Later, Max Richter (Leipzig: 1906) and Rudolf Rudolz (Leipzig: 1913) wrote in similar vein that 'it cannot be doubted...that it is rather the stronger stops (*Tuba mirabilis*, *Seraphonregister*, *Trompete*) that make possible a reasonable Swell effect',¹⁵⁷ and that 'if one considers the modern Swell, then a different light is shed on the matter. Its strength lies in its ability to command an expansive crescendo...that can influence the development of a composition...and can even swell beyond a definite *forte*.'¹⁵⁸

It was not until the Viennese *Regulativ* of 1909 that the preference for a heavily deployed Swell manual containing mutations, mixtures and heavy reeds was codified. This official statement of the Alsatian Reform movement led to instruments such as that in the St. Reinoldikirche in Dortmund (1909), which did include a Swell manual whose stops outnumbered those of the *Hauptwerk*, not to mention two further enclosed divisions, the *Solowerk* and the *Echowerk* that brought the number of enclosed stops up to 47, compared to 33 unenclosed. Extraordinarily, and quite coincidentally, Reger came into contact with at least three of these Alsatian Reform instruments in his final years, in Dortmund, Hamburg and Meiningen, and his op. 127 was composed for the inauguration of a fourth, the giant organ in the Breslau Jahrhunderthalle.

3 Reger and the Swell

3.1 Before 1901

¹⁵⁶ Dienel 25. 'Die moderne Orgel hat oft mehr und stärkere Stimmen im Schwellwerke als im Hauptwerke, während bei alten Orgeln, wenn sie überhaupt mit einem solchen versehen sind, nur die schwächsten Stimmen darin stehen. Jetzt wirkt dasselbe sogar bei vollem Werke: man hat eben etwas darin, was man an- und abschwellen lassen kann.'

¹⁵⁷ Richter, M., op. cit. 32. '...das vielmehr starke Stimmen (*Tuba mirabilis*, *Seraphonregister*, *Trompete*) einen ordentlichen Schwelleffekt möglich machen.'

¹⁵⁸ Rudolz 49 & 50. '...sobald man den "modernen" Jalousiebau in Betracht zieht. Hier ruht das Hauptgewicht in der Möglichkeit eines breit angelegten Crescendo, das in seiner Großzügigkeit die Entwicklung einer Komposition zu beeinflussen vermag, indem es den Vortrag größerer Phrasenpartien reliefgebend hebt und selbst einem markigen Forte noch Steigerung verleiht.'

Reger experienced a great variety of organs in his short lifetime. The German Swell was then marked by a lack of uniformity not only in its external features (even though the ultimately ‘preferred’ form of the Swell already existed in some organs, i.e. a mechanical Venetian Swell for manual III operated by a centrally placed balanced pedal), but also in the number and identity of the enclosed manual(s), whose composition varied enormously. Even a detail such as whether the up or down position of the balanced pedal referred to the open or closed position of the Swell was not standard, and to this day many organs in former East Germany retain the down position for open in the manner of the old hitch-down Swells. It would seem highly unlikely that, before 1901, Reger would have known a Swell in its ‘preferred’ form, and the ‘primitive’ form of most Swells known to him must have influenced his understanding of the level of ease and refinement attainable in its employment.

Few of the organs associated with Reger prior to 1901 were provided with Swells at all, which emphasises how central the organs of the Marktkirche in Wiesbaden (played by Reger in 1892/93) and the Paulskirche in Frankfurt (heard by Reger on 29 March and 1 April 1898) were to Reger’s first-hand knowledge of the Swell before the composition of his op. 59 edited by Straube (composed between 17 June and 1 July 1901), by which time many of his most important organ works had been completed.¹⁵⁹ At a much earlier date, in the first half of 1890, Reger may also have played on the organ in the Stadtkirche in Sondershausen, where he began his studies with Hugo Riemann. This instrument (II/32) was built by Strobel in 1875, and contained a ten-stop mechanical Swell (16’ – 2’, Oboe). Stop indications for op. 7 and op. 16 may have been inspired by this instrument.¹⁶⁰

The 30-year old Walcker organ in Wiesbaden was, in fact, the most ‘modern’ instrument Reger encountered in his early years.¹⁶¹ In the 1920s this organ still featured in high-profile concerts by visiting organists such as Widor, Dupré and Vierne, albeit in modernised form but with unaltered disposition. It seems that long before its date of construction, 1863, Walcker had built Venetian Swells operated by balanced pedals,¹⁶² although for the organ in Wiesbaden these features cannot now be established with certainty. Despite reports to the contrary, the enclosed manual appears to have been manual III,¹⁶³ with the further provision of a special wind-pressure Swell for the *Fagott-Oboe* 8’. This manual was situated typically at the back of the organ, and was shaded in front by manuals I and II and the larger pedal stops, and covered above by the

¹⁵⁹ Even though Anderson feels, however, that ‘writers have tended to overemphasize the importance of the Wiesbaden Marktkirche organ’. See Anderson 36, endnote 21

¹⁶⁰ See Busch F 8

¹⁶¹ Although Anderson 36, footnote 21, effectively dismisses this organ as a major influence on Reger

¹⁶² See Williams/Owen 333, where the Walcker organ (1827 *sic*) heard by Reger in Frankfurt in 1898, presumably in the Paulskirche, is cited as having had a balanced Swell. In addition, a picture of the console of the Walcker *St. Petri* organ in St. Petersburg (1839) shows what appears to be a balanced pedal (called *Schwelltritt!*), and the Swell pedal of the concert organ in Boston (Walcker 1863) even seems to have been situated in the middle of the console (see *Orgelwissenschaft und Orgelpraxis: Festschrift zum zweihundertjährigen Bestehen des Hauses Walcker*, ed. H.H. Eggebrecht, Murrhardt-Hausen: 1980) p. 210 & 216.

¹⁶³ Walter A 284 and Weyer asserted manual II to be the Swell manual, on the basis of information received from the Walcker firm and the disposition given in Walcker-Mayer. However, in *Die Orgelwelt Max Regers* (Busch F, and also earlier in a communication to R. Walter in 1973 see Walter B), H.J. Busch places manual III in the Swell box, and this agrees with reports of the organ in *Urania* in 1864 and 1900, and with drawings of the windchests based on the originals to be found in H.U. Hielscher’s monography, *Die Oberlinger-Orgel in der Marktkirche Wiesbaden*.

remainder of the pedal division. The disposition of manual III was extremely slight in relation to the two main manuals, which together numbered 30 (unenclosed) stops, although the expressive possibilities of this Swell manual within a modest dynamic range cannot be denied. A report in *Urania* in 1900 reads, ‘The Swell manual III, even though it includes relatively few stops, sounds extremely charming and characterful under the sensitive handling of Herr [Adolf] Wald’.¹⁶⁴ Its disposition was as follows:

Table 3.1 The Swell of the Wiesbaden Marktkirche (Walcker)

III Manual

Geigenprincipal 8'

Gedackt 8'

Dolce 8'

Aeoline 8'

Traversflöte 4'

Spitzflöte 4'

Waldflöte 2'

Fagott/Oboe 8' (free reeds)

The earlier Walcker organ of the Paulskirche in Frankfurt (1829/33), heavily influenced by the principles of Abbé Vogler, had ushered in the ‘dynamic period’ in organ building,¹⁶⁵ and contained a ‘lyrical zone’ of 14 stops on the Swell manual (III) which, however, was again dwarfed by a massive *Hauptwerk* of 23 stops and a second manual of 15 stops. The free reed, *Physharmonika 8'*, was also furnished with a ‘*Crescendo*’ in the manner of the *Fagott-Oboe* of the Wiesbaden instrument. At the time of the concerts given by Karl Straube in Reger’s presence in the Spring of 1898, not only was Reger in poor health but the organ itself was also in very poor condition,¹⁶⁶ so it is hard to imagine that, at that time, the Paulskirche instrument can have added much to Reger’s understanding of the ‘modern’ organ.

3.2 1901 and after

Even when Reger moved to Munich in September 1901 the situation can hardly have altered a great deal, as in the mid-1890s, according to Rupp, most organs in Munich lacked Swells, even

¹⁶⁴ Quoted in Hielscher 17, ‘Das 3. Schweller-Manual, wengleich nur relativ wenige Register umfassend, erklingt unter Herrn Walds kunstverständiger Verwerthung der Stimmen höchst reizend und charakteristisch.’

¹⁶⁵ See Quoika A

¹⁶⁶ Straube’s concerts exposed the deficiencies of the organ, which led to calls for a rebuild (see Busch F 11).

larger instruments like the 30-stop ‘concert’ organ in the Odeon;¹⁶⁷ and, in any case, Reger’s organ style and his approach to performance indications were by now firmly established.

One notable exception to these instruments without Swell, however, was the organ of the Kaimsaal in Munich, built by Walcker in 1896, apparently shortly after Rupp’s visit to that city. Here Straube performed Heinrich Reimann’s op. 25 and Reger’s op. 29 on 8 March 1899, and in February and March 1901 gave a series of five ‘historic’ organ recitals presenting repertoire ‘from Frescobaldi to Reger’, which included a mammoth concert on 5 March 1901 attended by Reger and devoted entirely to his music (op. 33, 40/2, 27, 46, 40/1).¹⁶⁸ Hermann Wilske estimated that the concerts in Munich and Berlin in early 1901 were of much greater importance to public recognition of Reger than all of the premières of his works in Wesel. ‘Even the fact that five large organ works of a single contemporary composer were included in the programme is without parallel around 1900, and ensures more than regional interest for the Munich concert’.¹⁶⁹

The organ of the Kaimsaal was the first really advanced ‘modern’ instrument to be heard by Reger, and, given its early date and size (III/50), it was indeed remarkable in the composition of its Swell:

Table 3.2 The Swell of the Kaimsaal in Munich (Walcker 1896)

III Manual (C – g^{'''})

Lieblich Gedackt 16'

Geigenprincipal 8'

Lieblich Gedackt 8'

Spitzflöte 8'

Viola 8'

Aeoline 8'

Voix céleste 8'

Fugara 4'

Flauto dolce 4'

Harmonia aethera $\frac{2}{3}$ III

Oboë 8'

Trompette harmonique 8'

(Unenclosed)

Stentor Gamba 8'

Stentorflöte 8'

¹⁶⁷ See Rupp, op. cit. 162

¹⁶⁸ Dates for these concerts vary in the sources. Guido Bagier gives 27.2. and 2/8/15/20.3.1901 as the dates of the five historic concerts in the *Kaimsaal*, whereas in *Max Reger in seinen Konzerten II*, Schreiber B/2, the date 5.3.1901 is given for the concert attended by Reger.

¹⁶⁹ Wilske Chapter III, section 2.1. ‘*Allein schon die Tatsache, daß fünf große Orgelwerke eines einzigen zeitgenössischen Komponisten auf dem Programm stehen, ist um 1900 ohne Beispiel und sichert dem Münchener Konzert überregionales Interesse.*’

In scope and weight, this Swell ranked with those known by Straube in Berlin. However, it did not compare to the gigantic Swells of the Alsatian Reform instruments Reger heard almost a decade later in 1910 (Dortmund St. Reinoldikirche, Walcker, V/105) and 1912 (Hamburg St. Michaeliskirche, Walcker, V/164), or even to the Swells of very much slighter instruments built in the spirit of the Reform movement. Reger was allegedly involved in the planning of two such organs. These are the organs of the Odeon in Munich (Walcker 1906), whose Swell contained a *Zymbel 2' III*, a *Sesquialtera*, and three 8' reeds, and the Schützenhaus in Meiningen (now in somewhat altered state in the Weihnachtskirche in Berlin-Haselhorst). The Swell of the Schützenhaus instrument, which contained exactly the same number of stops as that of the Kaimssaal, offers an interesting comparison:

Table 3.3 The Swell of the Schützenhaus in Meiningen (Steinmeyer 1913)

III Manual (C – c''''!)

Stillgedackt 16'

Hornprinzipal 8'

Jubalflöte 8'

Nachthorn 8'

Echogamba 8'

Salizional 8'

Vox coelestis 8'

Praestant 4'

Fernflöte 4'

Nazard 2 $\frac{2}{3}$ '

Blockflöte 2'

Terz 13/5'

Prog. harm. III/IV 2 $\frac{2}{3}$ '

Tuba 8'

In his description of this organ, Hermann Busch points to the *décomposé* Cornet on the Swell and the provision of every manual with mixture and reeds as being typical of Alsatian Reform instruments.¹⁷⁰ However, Reger's involvement in the detailed planning of this instrument appears to have been negligible,¹⁷¹ and this is even truer of the Odeon organ¹⁷². And as Hans Geffert concludes:

Even if Reger, along with Oskar Walcker, did prepare the disposition of the large Odeon organ in Munich (1906) [which is almost certainly not the case], was present at the inauguration of the Michaeliskirche in Hamburg (1912), wrote his op. 127 for the inauguration of the Sauer organ in the Jahrhunderthalle in

¹⁷⁰ Busch F, op. cit. 24

¹⁷¹ See Hartmann 147 & 148

¹⁷² See Walcker-Mayer 32 & 34

Breslau, and was influential in the building of the Steinmeyer organ in the Schützenhaus in Meiningen, these facts do not prove that Reger was caught up in the issues of the Alsatian Reform movement'.¹⁷³

3.3 Reger's indications for the use of Swell, and the parallelism of dynamics and agogics

As noted in Chapter 2 section 2.2, and despite claims to the contrary,¹⁷⁴ Reger's indications for the use of Swell are inconsistent, and a clear notational distinction between Swell and Walze is not a priority. The situation is further complicated by Reger's suggestions that hairpins may also refer to agogic nuance. The teachings of Hugo Riemann proposed a 'partnership' of dynamics and agogics,¹⁷⁵ where both parameters of performance served merely to heighten the musical presentation of inner intensification and relaxation. As the same function was shared by both parameters, the one could reinforce the other, or the one could be abandoned in favour of the other. Both parameters act as means to a common end, and may be freely mixed or isolated from one another as fits the occasion. Reger's footnotes to *Komm, süßer Tod* (1894), and to op. 30, bars 53-62, may be readily understood in this light.

In *Komm, süßer Tod* Reger wrote that 'the hairpins have dynamic and agogic significance' [*< und > haben 'dynamische' (Schweller) und 'agogische' Bedeutung*], and in op. 30 the note perhaps implies an agogic alternative to the use of Swell: 'The hairpins refer to the use of the Venetian Swell, but one could also slightly increase in pace (*stringendo*) where the hairpin opens, and slightly relax in pace (*ritardando*) where the hairpin closes (*Tempo rubato*)'.¹⁷⁶ Hermann Busch has suggested¹⁷⁷ that Reger presumably offered these alternatives in the light of the many German organs of the second half of the nineteenth century that did not possess Swell divisions. It should also be noted that, even where a Swell box was available, Reger sometimes replaced his own indications for Swell with agogic freedom; for instance, in his own Welte recording of *O Welt, ich muß dich lassen*, op. 67/34.¹⁷⁸ This interchangeability of performance parameters was perhaps a peculiarity of 'modern' performance style, although it remains one of its most elusive facets. Significantly, Hugo Riemann, in an account of the parallelism of melodic movement, agogic nuance and dynamics in his *Die Elemente der Musikalischen Aesthetik* (1900),¹⁷⁹ allowed that the abandonment of one of these parameters of performance need not result in too great a loss.

Hugo Riemann also wrote that, in general, increase in tempo and dynamic goes hand in hand with rising melodies, and *vice versa*, and that any departure from this parallelism of parameters

¹⁷³ Geffert A 2. 'Wenn Reger auch mit Oskar Walcker zusammen die große Münchner Odeon-Orgel disponierte (1906), bei der Einweihung der Orgel der Hamburger Michaeliskirche zugegen war (1912), für die Einweihung der Sauer-Orgel der Breslauer Jahrhunderthalle sein op. 127 schrieb (1913) und am Bau der Steinmeyer Orgel im Schützenhaussaal in Meiningen (1914) maßgeblich beteiligt war, so können diese Tatsachen nicht beweisen, daß Reger sich mit dem Problem der elsässischen Reform auseinandergesetzt hätte.'

¹⁷⁴ For example, in Keller Chapter IX

¹⁷⁵ The linking of dynamics and agogics was made explicit, for instance, in Riemann's *Die Elemente der Musikalischen Aesthetik*, Riemann D 76

¹⁷⁶ 'Die <> beziehen sich auf den Gebrauch des Jalousieschwellers; doch kann man auch im Tempo bei < etwas string und bei > etwas ritard (*Tempo rubato*).'

¹⁷⁷ Busch, op. cit. 51

¹⁷⁸ See Gibson 16

¹⁷⁹ Riemann D, op. cit. 72 and 73

should be indicated by the composer.¹⁸⁰ Perhaps to exclude the otherwise assumed concurrence of agogics and dynamics (and despite the difficulty in the handling of the Swell due to a double pedal part) Reger stipulated in a footnote to the second page of *Wachet auf, ruft uns die Stimme*, op. 52/2, where the chorale melody is introduced: ‘Here, the hairpins refer to the use of the Venetian Swell of manual III’¹⁸¹ (i.e. by way of exception, not also to agogic treatment, or not to be replaced by agogics). This interpretation is confirmed by the nature of the music, which alternates lines of luminous chorale melody in E major with dark uneasy episodes that anticipate the approaching vivification of the corpses in the graveyard scene. It would therefore seem appropriate to perform the chorale sections in a peaceful and rhythmically static manner as suggested by Reger’s footnote, even though these sections are inflected by hairpins. In this case, the footnote would appear to indicate an exception to the general rule of parallelism in the treatment of dynamics and agogics.

That Reger’s footnote is intended merely to exclude the possibility of a stop crescendo is also a strong possibility. However, as hairpins had two distinct meanings, agogic and dynamic,¹⁸² the above dynamic, and non-agogic interpretation of the footnote to op. 52/2 would seem appropriate in this case.

A similar situation in Straube’s edition of Reger’s op. 59/7, bars 35 to 40, clearly illustrates the parallelism of dynamics and agogics. Here, *Agitato* sections accompanied by dynamic markings alternate with static *Adagio* sections completely free of expression marks. Straube seems also to have recognised the shared function of agogics and dynamics in the many cases where these parameters are uncoupled from one another in the context of large-scale build-ups. Instances of this may be found in op. 65/8, bars 28ff. and 56ff., where the *poco a poco più energico* markings alternate with crescendo markings in order to promote smoothness in the intensification of the music by isolating and spreading resources of agogics and dynamics. In the light of the above examples, where both dynamics and agogics were carefully notated by Straube, the extent to which he assumed the performance convention regarding the parallelism of these parameters cannot be ascertained.

Frequently, Reger placed the amplification ‘*molto*’ (or, at times, *quasi f* or *f*) between opening and closing hairpins. If these hairpins refer to the use of Swell at all, then this would suggest that only in certain cases did Reger envisage the full opening of the Swell shutters, partial opening being the rule. No other notational practice was developed in organ literature to indicate the degree to which the Swell should be opened (c.f. below under section 4.13), so this may reveal an unusual subtlety in Reger’s notation. However, the general notational clarity is so often confused by the lack of distinction between the use of Swell and *Walze* that this amplification of the hairpins may also be taken at times to refer to the *Walze*.

In *Bemerkungen zur Interpretation der Orgelwerke von Max Reger*,¹⁸³ Heinz Lohmann (incompletely¹⁸⁴) lists instances of Reger’s verbal instructions for the use of Swell as follows:

¹⁸⁰ Under *Ausdruck* in Riemann B 56 & 57

¹⁸¹ ‘Die < > beziehen sich hier auf den Jalousieschweller des III. Manuals.’

¹⁸² In the exercises in expressive playing in the Riemann-Armbrust *Technische Studien für Orgel* (Peters Edition, exercises 71 to 80), for instance, the hairpins refer exclusively to agogic, and not to dynamic inflection).

¹⁸³ In *MuK/43* (1973/5) 222–233

¹⁸⁴ For instance, Lohmann does not include such references as those in the composer’s own arrangement of the

op. 30, 52/2, 67/3, 80/5, 7, 8, 10, 85/3, *Präludium* in G sharp minor, the chorale prelude *O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden*, in the chorale cantatas, and in the sacred song ‘*Wohl denen, die ohne Tadel leben*’ (1903). In the sacred song ‘*Schönster Herr Jesu*’ (1905) Reger wrote, ‘If a “Swell box” is available, then follow the directions for its use “exactly”; perhaps playing everything on manual III’.¹⁸⁵

In *Überlegungen zur Interpretation der Orgelwerke von Max Reger*¹⁸⁶, Lohmann further states that with Reger, manual II and manual III are Swell manuals. Bernhard Haas has drawn attention to one instance where Reger appears to demand this, in the second movement of Reger’s *Zweite Sonate*, op. 60. Here the coupled through system is excluded by diverging pitch indications.¹⁸⁷ Again, in the context of the early Reger instruments and the uncoupled system often adopted by Reger, this requirement was unrealistic.

Interestingly, Haas traces the growth in dynamic demands which Reger placed on the Swell manual from an upper limit of *più f* in op. 27 to *fff* in op. 29, and eventually to a dynamic range from *pppp* to *fff* in most of Reger’s works around 1900. Commonly in build-ups, for instance in op. 52/3 (or op. 60), Reger coupled manual III to I after II to I, and this would seem to imply a louder manual III, or a differentiation in colour between manuals II and III, both uncharacteristic of the late-nineteenth-century German organ (but requirements of the later Alsatian Reform movement). Haas concludes that Reger’s music demanded more power from the Swell manual, and that the relatively weak German Swells of around 1900 were unsuitable for Reger.

As this statement effectively excludes the validity of all organ types known to Reger before 1910 (i.e. for most of his life) for the performance of his works, and in no way corresponds to Straube’s approach to Reger’s music or to the 1908 extension of the *Thomaskirche* organ, the position of the dedicatee of Reger’s op. 52/3, F.L. Schnackenberg, should be borne in mind. In his review of Reger’s op. 59, which appeared in the *Neue Zeitung für Musik* in 1902, he discussed a passage in op. 52/2 where Reger demands an 8' and 4' accompaniment to an 8' solo line within an overall *pppp* dynamic, which he considers a practical impossibility. He felt that we need have no scruples if a literal realisation of Reger’s indications is not possible; by way of justification called on Reger’s frequent use of the qualification *quasi*; and suggested that, often enough, the crescendos and decrescendos only existed in Reger’s imagination. There is no spoken or written objection on record to suggest that Reger disagreed with this assessment. In the same vein is the frequently quoted passage from one of Straube’s letters to Hans Klotz; ‘what Reger hoped to achieve with his *Adagissimi, Vivacissimi, molto agitato, più molto agitato, Andante (quasi Allegro vivace), stets nie hervortretend*, with the complete gamut from *pppp* to

Largo from op. 93 for violin and organ, where the accompaniment is headed ‘always with Swell’ [immer mit Schweller], or in the songs *Wenn in banger trüben Stunden* and *Heimweh* (both dating from 1900 and to be found in volume 34 of the complete Reger edition), where Reger indicates that ‘in organs with three manuals the accompaniment is to be played entirely on manual III (*Jalousieschweller!*)’. As Reger assumed a two-manual instrument in his score and notated the entire accompaniment on manual II, this note simply ensures that the accompaniment is to be performed on the Swell manual, by definition also the softest manual, regardless of the number of available manuals.

¹⁸⁵ ‘Wenn ein “Schweller” vorhanden, dann ist derselbe “genauestens” nach Angabe zu benutzen; eventuell alles auf dem 3. Manual spielen.’

¹⁸⁶ In *Musica Sacra*, 93 Jg. (1973/2), p. 93–97.

¹⁸⁷ Bernhard Haas in Busch F, op. cit. 37 ff.

ffff was a spiritually moving performance'.¹⁸⁸ These observations agree with the view put forward by Hugo Riemann that individual performance parameters are essentially interchangeable and can even be disregarded at times.¹⁸⁹

4 Straube and the Swell

4.1 Organs in Berlin and Wesel

Berlin

From an early age Karl Straube was familiar with the large Dinse and Sauer organs in Berlin, and premiered three Reger works there, op. 16 in 1897 in the Dreifaltigkeitskirche, and op. 52/2 and op. 57 in 1901 and 1902 in the Alte Garnisonkirche (Sauer 1891, III/70)¹⁹⁰, where the important Reger player, Walter Fischer, was organist from 1903–1910. Straube also deputised for his teacher, Heinrich Reimann, in the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche (Sauer 1895, IV/80) from 1895 onwards, and his father was organist in the Heilig-Kreuz-Kirche (Dinse 1888, III/47).

All of these instruments contained substantial Swell divisions, and the Swell of the Garnisonkirche even included a *Trompette 8'* and a four-rank mixture. The Gedächtniskirche was furnished with a very strongly voiced (pneumatic) *Fernwerk* in addition to a (mechanical) Swell that contained a *Trompette harmonique 8'* and a three-rank *Cornett* as well as the more usual string mixture. The disposition of the Swell in the Heilig-Kreuz-Kirche, complete with an *Oboe 8'* as a soft solo reed and a *Harmonia aetherea* string mixture, suggests a somewhat smaller version of the original Swell of the *Thomaskirche* in Leipzig, before the extension demanded by Straube in 1908.

Wesel, St. Willibrordi

This instrument, 'the largest and most beautiful organ in the whole of West Germany',¹⁹¹ on which many Reger works were premiered (see Chapter 2, section 2.7), contained an amazing number of mutations and mixture ranks,¹⁹² and indeed it may well be maintained that the Frenchness of Sauer instruments anticipated to a considerable extent the organ reforms of Schweitzer and Rupp. However, the vast majority of these ranks in the Wesel organ, as well as all the heavy reeds, were distributed over manuals I and II, and the weaker stops allocated to the seemingly enormous Swell of 17 stops. Therefore, although the opening and closing of the (mechanical) Swell may have had a telling effect on the stops it enclosed, it cannot have made

¹⁸⁸ Dated 25 February, 1944, KSB 174. 'Das was er erreichen wollte mit seinen Adagissimi, Vivacissimi, molto agitato, più molto agitato, Andante (quasi Allegro vivace), stets nie hervortretend, mit der ganzen Skala vom pppp bis ffff, ist ein seelisch bewegter Vortrag.'

¹⁸⁹ See this chapter, section 3.3, also Chapter 7, section 4

¹⁹⁰ See the note on this organ in Appendix 2

¹⁹¹ Wilhelm Köhler, quoted in Dreimüller 59. '...die größte und schönste in ganz Westdeutschland.'

¹⁹² Ibid. 62

much impression on the organ as a whole in the upper dynamic range, and in function as well as disposition it is clearly linked to the traditional German *Echowerk*.

4.2 The organ of the *Thomaskirche* in Leipzig

In the Leipzig journal *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* of 16 May 1889, Carl Piutti, organist of the *Thomaskirche* from 1880 to 1902, praised the comprehensive nature of the original Swell in Leipzig that contained 13 stops. This division included a solo *Oboe 8'* as the only reed, and a string mixture which provided 'extremely ethereal penetration and intensification of sound'.¹⁹³ The Venetian shutters were situated at the front, and the foot lever on the far right over the pedal high *f*. 'The strength of manual III with the Swell box opened is so great that it can relate to the other manuals, as *mf* can to *f* and *ff*; with the box closed, however, the *Fernwerk* [i.e. Swell] appears so muted in sound that, when coupled to a single 8' stop from one of the other manuals, this latter stop is decisive in the definition of the character of the sound'.¹⁹⁴

The epithet 'so great' must be understood in terms of the underdeveloped German Swell of the nineteenth century, and cannot be interpreted as indicating that manual III was of great significance within the context of full organ. In fact, Piutti completed Sauer's proposals of 27 November 1885 with a number of recommendations, the first of which reads 'the *Harmonia aetherea* (2–3 *fach*) to be voiced very softly (*ganz schwach*)'.¹⁹⁵ Relative to the loud manual I, as Piutti indicated above, the (full) Swell sound represented a middle dynamic range. The exclusion of the Swell manual from the *Walze* in the original form of the organ and the fact 'that...no stop of manual III is included in the *Forte-Combinationstritt*' confirm the modest and specific function of the German Swell manual as understood by Sauer and Piutti.

In the 1908 extension of the *Thomaskirche* organ the Swell pedal was moved from its original position on the far right, above the pedal board, to the centre. Straube's statement in his report of the examination of the rebuild that 'the effect of the Venetian Swell of manual III is of great intensity' must also be viewed in the light of the expectations a German organist of that time would have had of a Swell division, and there is no reason to believe that Straube referred to anything like a dynamic equality of manuals. The intensity was due perhaps more to the thickness of the Swell box than to its contents. An analysis of the *plenum* registrations of individual manuals of the *Thomaskirche* organ by Greß and Krieger¹⁹⁶ in 1969 suggest that, due to insufficient development of upper partials, the registration chosen by them for manual III (16'8'4'4'2²/₃'2'X) could not have exhibited a powerful Swell effect. That the Swell was not

¹⁹³ Böhme 16

¹⁹⁴ Ibid. 'Die Macht dieses 3. Claviers, bei geöffnetem Schweller, ist so gross, dass es den beiden anderen ebenbüdig zur Seite steht, wie dem *ff* und *f* das *mf*; bei geschlossenen Jalousien aber erscheint das Fernwerk so abgedämpft im Klang, dass es, in Verbindung mit einer einfachen 8'-Stimme aus einem der beiden anderen Claviere, dieser Letzteren noch den Vorrang einräumt für die Bestimmung des Klangcharakters.'

¹⁹⁵ This prescription is confirmed by Straube in his designation 'sehr schwach intoniert', referring to the *Harmonia aetherea* of manual III in a registration which heads his edition of Reger's op. 65/5.

¹⁹⁶ Greß & Krieger, especially p. 108

decisive in the context of a full organ sound can easily be verified today on the organ itself, or on currently available recordings of the instrument.¹⁹⁷

Also in 1908, on Straube's insistence, seven stops were added to the Swell manual, of which five were soft 8' stops: *Spitzflöte*, *Viola*, *Gemshorn*, *Quintatön* and *Flûte d'amour* (the *Spitzflöte* replaced the earlier *Concertflöte*). These five stops brought the total of soft 8' flue stops on the Swell manual up to nine. The remaining two stops, *Trompette harmonique 8'* and *Principal 4'*, which were added in 1908, were not exploited for their Swell potential in Straube's Reger editions, nor did they address the question of the balance of manuals, as additions to the other already far more substantial manuals (I: *Gr. Cymbel IV*, II: *Tuba 8'* and *Cymbel III*) more than outweighed any additions made to the Swell manual. Therefore, in his extension of the organ in 1908, it may be concluded that Straube made little attempt to increase the power or Swell potential of manual III, but rather concentrated his efforts on the selection of an array of 8' stops of varying construction that could blend and enrich the spectrum of soft colours considerably.

Like Straube's insistence on the extension of the compass upwards by four notes, the *Trompette harmonique 8'*, a stop more typical of Walcker organs, may have been included to 'make possible the performance of 'works of the modern French school...important names such as Caesar [sic] Franck and Charles Marie Widor...';¹⁹⁸ however, it is more likely that its inclusion was inspired by stops of the same name in such German organs closely associated with Straube as the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche in Berlin and the Kaimsaal in Munich.

Had Straube known of the principles of the Alsatian Reform movement, first formulated at around the same time that the plans for the rebuild of the *Thomaskirche* were settled, he would perhaps have approached the extension of the organ, and in particular the redistribution of the Swell manual, with a vastly altered historical perspective. If so, then it was indeed ill-timed for Straube to show his hand so irrevocably in 1908, and commit himself to an organ aesthetic that he later felt obliged to renounce. Soon after 1908 the 'modern' extension of the *Thomaskirche* organ was to appear antediluvian in the light of the Reform movements. Nevertheless, Straube's later Reger editions of 1912 and 1919 confirm the essentially German attitude to the Swell as a means of inflection of a limited dynamic range at the soft end of the spectrum.

4.3 Straube's Reger editions and the Swell

In his Reger editions Straube consistently notated the use of Swell with hairpins (c.f. Chapter 2, section 3.2) and, as might be expected in a system where Swell and Walze share the dynamic spectrum, the Swell mostly serves to inflect the softer dynamic levels and to partake in the first stages of large-scale build-ups before handing over to the Walze. The Swell is almost invariably opened before the Walze is activated (see Chapter 2, section 3.22), usually in combination with manual changes part by part, or hand by hand, from manual III to II (and/or to I) before the Walze is brought into play, as in the *Präludium*, op. 85/2, bars 22 to 32. Occasionally this causes parallel passages to be registered differently, as in bars seven and eight of op. 59/5, where the

¹⁹⁷ e.g., Michael Pohl's recording of the Widor Toccata on the *Ars Vivendi* label, MRC 024

¹⁹⁸ In a letter of Straube to the church council of the *Thomaskirche* dated 31.8.1906, cited in Falkenberg B 149. '...Compositionen der modernen französischen Schule, ich nenne bedeutende Namen wie Caesar Franck und Charles Marie Widor...'

box is opened to prepare for the *Walze*, compared to the corresponding passage in bar four, where this is unnecessary.

Straube assumed a three-manual organ with manual III as the only Swell division. Presumably for practical reasons, he ignored the phenomenon of multiple Swells, which found its full flowering in Sauer's last great organ in the Garnisonkirche in Berlin (1909), and in such Alsatian-Reform instruments as the Reinoldikirche in Dortmund (1909), the Michaeliskirche in Hamburg (1912) and the Jahrhunderthalle in Breslau (1913), all of which possessed three Swell divisions. What occasionally appear to be Swell indications for two manuals, for example, the markings in the *Benedictus*, op. 59/9, bars 7 - 8 and 14 - 15, are more probably indications for a single manual notated above and between the staves for reasons of space.

4.4 The partial exploitation of the Swell

In general, Swell potential is not fully exploited by Straube, as, almost without exception (c.f. Chapter 2, section 3.21), the Swell is already fully opened before the *Walze* begins to add the louder stops of the Swell manual. Very occasionally the *Handregistrierung* or free combinations include the Swell mixture and/or reeds, and these are practically identical to 'base registrations' nos. 26-32 in Chapter 2, section 3.3. In only one case, no. 30 (a *Handregistrierung* from op. 80/12) is the Swell registered to maximum power, with the inclusion of a mutation, a mixture and the *Trompette harmonique* (manual III of op. 59/5 2. *Komb.* is also richly deployed, complete with mixture and both reeds).

Straube's procedure, in general however, is far removed from the ultra-smooth, powerful Swell effects of the French organ which, in large-scale build-ups, add reeds and mixtures at a relatively low dynamic level with the Swell box closed in order to provide '*etwas zum Schwellen*'¹⁹⁹. The beauty of the French system as advocated, for instance, by Schweitzer, is that 'as all sound characteristics are represented in manual III, the full organ sound [*volle Werk*] is set into motion from the moment the mixtures and reeds, which are subdued by the [closed] Swell box, enter...The following additions of mixtures and reeds from manuals II and I...do not in any way alter the colour of the sound: they merely intensify it'.²⁰⁰ This French solution to the problem of bridging the foundation stops and the *plenum* area frequently resulted in the adoption of an intense, reedy, full-Swell sound for soft *cantabile* passages, a registration choice that Straube was not inclined to make.

This full-Swell sound, dominated by reeds and perhaps mixtures, is a striking characteristic of late-nineteenth-century French organ music, but was foreign to German ears, accustomed to the gradual build-up of pitch levels in tandem with dynamic levels and the addition of reeds (even soft reeds such as *Oboe* or *Klarinette*) after mixtures. Furthermore, from analyses of the order of stops drawn in a number of *Walzes* in German organs (c.f. Chapter 2, section 3.5, footnote 56) it

¹⁹⁹ Rupp, op. cit. 169, an echo of Schweitzer, op. cit. 5

²⁰⁰ Schweitzer, op. cit. 6. 'Weil auf dem III. Klavier alle Klangcharaktere vertreten sind, ist das volle Werk vom Moment jener ersten Einführung der Mixturen und Zungen des im Schwellkasten gebändigten III. Klaviers an in Kraft getreten. Es kommt nur noch auf die Entfaltung an. Die nun folgenden Einführungen der Mixturen und Zungen des II., des I. Klaviers und des Pedals, und die Einführung der Sub- und Superoktavkoppeln (Octave grave und Octave aigue) ändern an dieser Klangfarbe nichts: sie machen sie nur intensiver.'

would appear that in a typical crescendo even the Swell mixture did not enter until about two-thirds of the Walze journey had been completed, by which stage the vast majority of German Swell divisions could have had little effect on the overall sound.

The fact that Straube did not even exploit the swell potential of the *Trompette harmonique* 8²⁰¹ in his Reger editions indicates a clear preference, in any case, for a crescendo system based on stop additions rather than on the manipulation of the Swell box, as far as the middle dynamic range is concerned. With the emphasis on the blending of stops and the provision of the Walze in the German organ, the logic of Straube's system is indisputable. Furthermore, in Leipzig and on most German organs a simulation of the French crescendo would have involved a complicated alternation between the Swell and the Walze (or possibly fixed combinations). The simplicity of Straube's system is described by Hermann Keller: '...in crescendo first the Swell is opened, then the Walze, in diminuendo first the Walze is returned, then the Swell is closed'.²⁰²

In this respect, therefore, Straube mostly chose not to follow the logic of the French teachings of the Alsatian Reform movement or, indeed, those of his own organ teacher, Otto Dienel, but held instead to a system in which the sound remained more open and relaxed, characterised by fundamental sound for longer than in the French models,²⁰³ a difference especially noticeable in the middle dynamic range. Indeed, it is likely that Straube was left with little option in this matter, given the disposition and voicing of the Swell even of his own relatively well-balanced instrument in Leipzig, let alone those of the numerous more characteristically German organs known to him. In Schweitzer's words, 'it must not be forgotten that the French Swell boxes exerted a considerable influence on the entire organ, which on our organs can only be achieved by *Registrierung* (the addition and subtraction of stops)'.²⁰⁴

4.5 The coupled-through system

In his Reger editions Straube generally adopted a system whereby the manuals were coupled through to 'louder' manuals and pedal, which entailed a rejection of certain indications of pitch and manual usage in Reger's scores. This system guarantees unity and continuity of sound and avoids juxtaposition of disparate groups of stops. As a result of the coupled-through system, the manuals are dynamically ordered, and therefore questions of balance between manuals are simplified. The dynamic potential of the Swell is automatically coupled through, which makes for ease and refinement of dynamic control of all (three) manuals.

Notable exceptions in Straube's editions to this system are as follows:

²⁰¹ See above under section 4.2.

²⁰² Keller 82 (288), quoted in Geffert A, op. cit. '...beim Crescendo erst Jalousie auf, dann Walze, beim Diminuendo erst Walze zurück, dann Jalousie zu...'

²⁰³ Models of build-ups in French organ music may be found in Schweitzer, op. cit. 5–6, and R. Smith, *Toward an authentic interpretation of the organ works of César Franck*, Juilliard Performance Guides I (Pendragon Press, 1983), 51.

²⁰⁴ Schweitzer, op. cit. 41

Op. 59/5, 3. *Komb.*, where manuals III and II are used separately for special effect in a *pianissimo* section and then combined on manual I in the normal way.

Op. 65/5, 3. *Komb.*; Op. 80/1, *HR*, 1. *Komb.*, 2. *Komb.*, 3. *Komb.*; Op. 85/1 *Präludium*, *HR*; Op. 85/2, *Präludium*, 1. *Komb.*; Op. 85/2, *Präludium*, 3. *Komb.*, all of which are concerned with contrast rather than unity of sound for the presentation of consecutive phrases in varying colours, or the enhancement of free or canonic contrapuntal interplay between the hands

Op. 65/7, 1. *Komb.*, where Straube was forced by his choice of a solo *Oboe 8'* stop from manual III to uncouple the accompanying manual II.

Op. 85/4, *Präludium*, 3. *Komb.*, uncoupled for practical reasons of overlapping sections. In these cases manual II is sometimes used as an accompaniment manual, and, as a consequence, is untypically softer than manual III, as at the beginning of op. 80/1. Here, manual II is not 'expressive', as it is uncoupled from the Swell.

4.6 Registrations with a numerical bias in favour of the Swell manual

The manuals of all other registrations in Straube's Reger editions are coupled through. As the weaker stops are usually allocated to the Swell manual in German organ building, and in order to influence the expression of the (unenclosed) stops of manual II and sometimes even manual I, Straube almost always registered numerically in favour of the Swell manual (III) within the coupled-through system.²⁰⁵ The relative numerical strengths in terms of stops of manuals III, II and I in Straube's Reger registrations may be listed as follows (the numbers in brackets refer to the original number of stops plus any additions made before coupled manuals are brought into play, or to calculations based on verbal instructions, as distinct from stop names, contained in Straube's registrations):

Table 3.4 Numerical distribution of stops over the manuals in Straube's registrations

²⁰⁵ The coupled-through system and the relatively heavy deployment of the Swell manual are procedures rarely discussed in organ literature, and perhaps often assumed. In connection with Straube editions a brief mention of these procedures may be found in Busch F, op. cit. 51, and in the same author's *Max Regers Orgelwerke auf Wilhelm Sauers Orgeln* in the Festschrift of 1993 for the inauguration of the restored Sauer organ in Bad Homburg (Busch H).

MANUALS	III	II	I
op. 59/5, <i>HR</i>	4	4	3
op. 59/5, 1. <i>Komb.</i>	7	4	4
op. 59/5, 2. <i>Komb.</i>	13	8	5
op. 59/6, <i>HR</i>	(5)	3	3
op. 59/7, <i>HR</i>	(2 and 4)	1	3
op. 59/7, 1. <i>Komb.</i>	5	1	3
op. 59/8, <i>HR</i>	9	7	9
op. 59/9, 1. <i>Komb.</i>	4	1	2
op. 65/5, <i>HR</i>	(4)	2	3
op. 65/6, <i>HR</i>	5	4	3
op. 65/7, <i>HR</i>	(4)	3	3
op. 65/8, <i>HR</i>	9	3	4
op. 65/11, <i>HR</i>	5	3	3
op. 65/11, 2. <i>Komb.</i>	13	4	3
op. 65/12, <i>HR</i>	(8)	(4)	(6)
op. 80/2, <i>HR</i>	4	3	3
op. 80/2, 1. <i>Komb.</i>	3	1	0
op. 80/11, <i>HR</i>	8	4	5
op. 80/11, 1. <i>Komb.</i>	10	5	5
op. 80/11, 2. <i>Komb.</i>	13	10	12
op. 80/12, <i>HR</i>	(16)	9	10
op. 85/1, <i>Präludium</i> , 1. <i>Komb.</i>	3	1	1
op. 85/2, <i>Präludium</i> , <i>HR</i>	3	3	5

op. 85/2, <i>Präludium</i> , 2. <i>Komb.</i>	5	2	3
op. 85/2, <i>Fuge</i> , <i>HR</i>	5	2	4
op. 85/3, <i>Präludium</i> , <i>HR</i>	3	1	1
op. 85/3, 1. <i>Komb.</i>	4	2	2
op. 85/3, <i>Fuge</i> , <i>HR</i>	(8)	(4)	(4)
op. 85/4, <i>Präludium</i> , <i>HR</i> bar 5ff.	13	11	13
op. 85/4, 1. <i>Komb.</i>	8	4	6
op. 85/4, 2. <i>Komb.</i>	9	3	5
op. 85/4, <i>Fuge</i> , <i>HR</i>	(4)	4	3

Not included in the above list of Straube's coupled-through registrations are the few cases where a full sound is called for, or all (*weiche*) 8' and 4' stops are registered in all manuals, in which case the stops of manual III are inferior both in number and in volume. It is clear, however, that at a relatively low dynamic level the Swell manual was generally registered with more stops than the unenclosed manuals. An extreme example of this is furnished by the registration of 2. *Komb.* for the Prelude of op. 85/4, where the registration III 16'8'8'8'8'8'4'2²/₃'X, II 8'8'8', I 8'8'8'8'4' clearly favours manual III in number and weight of stops. In louder music the *Walze* assumes command of the dynamic shape, and the dynamic balance between the manuals at a given dynamic level is dictated by the layout of the *Walze* and by the disposition and voicing of the instrument itself.²⁰⁶ In favouring the Swell manual over manuals II and I at a relatively low dynamic level, Straube's registrations adopted one of the principals of the French and Alsatian Reform procedures while preserving a sound ideal that exhibited a great variety of combinations but generally rejected reeds, mutations and mixtures.

4.7 The colouristic use of the Swell

The only case in the above list where manual III is shown to numerical disadvantage is the *Handregistrierung* for the Prelude of op. 85/2, where manual III, although numerically weak,

²⁰⁶ In this connection it is interesting to note that some *Walze* layouts followed a similar scheme in concentrating the stops of manual III in the first part of the *Walze*'s journey, those of manual II in the second, and the stops of manual I in the final part, e.g. in the Sauer organ of the *Stadthalle* in Görlitz (1910, see Chapter 2, footnote 56). In this way, a certain parity between the manuals was preserved for as long as possible, and Straube's registration procedure exhibited above was approximated in the first third of the *Walze*'s journey.

displays the greatest pitch spectrum. An interesting pattern emerges through which the coupled manuals III 8'4'2', II 8'8'4' and I 8'8'8'4'4' provide a continually shifting balance of artificial overtones and contrast in colour, which is increasingly based on fundamental sound as the hands move from manual III to I. The differentiation in pitch between the manuals is enhanced by the use of the Swell, which can provide an almost limitless variety in the relative strength of the overtones, and thus in the quality of sound and timbre.

This is a fine example of the effect described by Rudolf Rudolz²⁰⁷ (Leipzig 1913), when he maintains that 'when the Swell affects only one manual, then the effect is purely dynamic...if, however, the Swell is coupled through to another manual the effect is also one of an alteration in colour, in which case the colour can change entirely in favour of one manual or another, especially if strongly contrasting registrations are chosen'. In Piutti's account of the *Thomaskirche* organ cited above under section 4.2, it was precisely this quality of the Swell that was singled out for comment, that 'the power of the Swell with the box open is so great...With the box closed, however, the Swell appears so muted in sound that, when coupled to a single 8' stop from one of the other manuals, this latter stop is decisive in the definition of the character of the sound'.²⁰⁸

The colouristic potential of the Swell was frequently exploited by Straube in a bewildering variety of registrations for manual III, many of which took advantage of the natural overtones contained in string stops, and some of which, indeed, included the artificial overtones represented by 2's, mutations and mixtures as well. These registrations are rich in pitches that lie in and around the range of the ear's greatest sensitivity to dynamic alteration.²⁰⁹ The dynamic range of these stops is further enhanced by the fact that the short wavelengths of their many upper partials are easily obstructed by the Swell shutters.

4.8 The value of strings as Swell stops

That orchestral strings are dynamic instruments *par excellence* can hardly be doubted, as any performance of the crescendo made by the violins compared to that of the flutes, oboes and clarinets in bars 14 and 15 of the *Tristan* prelude will testify. For the *Ring* Wagner required sixteen first violins, sixteen seconds, twelve violas, twelve cellos and eight double basses, a glorious massed sound that Strauss described as a 'deep velvet carpet'. The dynamic potential of such a string section is immense. Reger also preferred a rich string sound, as is evident in his criticism of the first performance of his *Sinfonietta*, op. 90, where he complained of the weakness of the string sound.²¹⁰

²⁰⁷ Rudolz, op. cit. 53. '...solange sich der Vortrag nur auf dem Solomanual bewegt, bleibt die Wirkung freilich stets rein dynamisch; sobald aber neben Registern des dritten Manuals gleichzeitig auch Stimmen des zweiten oder ersten Manuals in Verwendung kommen, gewinnt die Jalousieschwellung ein "koloristisches" Moment, unter begünstigenden Verhältnissen sogar in ziemlich hervorstechendem Maße.'

²⁰⁸ See above under section 4.2.

²⁰⁹ According to Harold Geer in *Organ Registration in Theory and Practice*, Chapters I and III, the greatest sensitivity of the ear to dynamic change is in the range of the top octave of the *Principal 4'*.

²¹⁰ See Reger's letter to Straube of 11 October 1905 in Popp B 100

In the organ, also, string imitation stops added greatly to blend and swell potential. However, as the ability of stops of different character to blend was a primary concern in the construction and disposition of German organs of the late-nineteenth century,²¹¹ Straube seems not to have been drawn to the use of 16', 8' and 4' string-imitation stops as a chorus, a feature of manual III on the *Thomaskirche* and other large Sauer organs at the turn of the century.²¹² However, these stops were rarely absent in Straube's registrations, and, given the low priority allotted to reeds in the registration of the Swell, they added greatly to the swell potential of manual III in a limited dynamic range. In the registration suggested for *I. Komb.* of op. 80/11, a total of nine string stops spread over the three manuals represents almost half of the total number of manual stops drawn, and indeed the high bias in manual III towards stops rich in overtones (apart from reeds and upper work) reveals Straube's awareness of the physical necessity of these stops in the context of a Swell manual. Furthermore, strings acted as bridging stops to the upper work of the Swell manual, in the sense formulated by Straube's teacher, Otto Dienel: 'the 8' and 4' *Characterstimmen*...fulfill a bridging function...in that the artificial overtones are anticipated by the natural, and thus do not appear unprepared'.²¹³ Thus, the *Characterstimmen* lend a vertical blend of sorts within different pitch levels to the horizontal blend promoted among stops of the same pitch.

Straube's unorthodox use of that 'Romantic' stop *par excellence*, the *Voix céleste* 8' is worth noting. Rupp writes that this 'acoustic tremulo stop which was timidly reintroduced in the course of the 1880s, had [previously] been placed on the forbidden list of the conservative organ advisors (*strenge Fachmänner*)...in Germany for at least 70 to 80 years'.²¹⁴ It involved the creation of acoustical beats by tuning the stop slightly higher than normal pitch to produce a shimmer on the sound. According to Karl Locher (Bern: 1887) a good and 'dynamically mobile'²¹⁵ *Voix céleste* and characteristic strings give more expressive capability, especially in small organs where no reeds are present. C. Sattler wrote in his *Orgelschule* (1913) that 'the *Voix céleste* lends the organ an orchestral effect and should always be present, even in small organs...It sounds best when played alone [sic!], at least when it is enclosed in a Swell box. As more stops are added, its special effect is lost, and it gives the impression of an out-of-tune manual.'²¹⁶

²¹¹ For a comparative discussion of German organ-building techniques that favour the blending of stops, see Aebischer. See also Fidom B, Part 1, Chapter 1, and the present work, Chapter 4, section 3.

²¹² Unfortunately, the original (swellable) 16', 8' and 4' string chorus on manual III of the *Thomaskirche* organ disappeared in the new disposition of the instrument under Ramin in the 1940s.

²¹³ Dienel, op. cit. 24, 'Die acht- und vierfüßigen Characterstimmen haben noch einen anderen wichtigen Dienst zu leisten...Vermöge ihrer Obertönigkeit können sie dies; die künstlichen Obertöne, durch die natürlichen vorbereitet, treten dann nicht unvermittelt auf.' In fact, a prevalent viewpoint represented by many important writers and theorists regarded the string stops as a replacement for upper work, as illustrated by the following quote from C. Sattler's *Orgelschule* of 1913: 'Organs from earlier times contained hardly any *Charakterstimmen* (such as *Gamba*, *Salicional*, *Violine*) and therefore had but few overtones. To make up for this the organ builders built artificial ranks of overtones in the form of octaves, fifths and mixtures.' [*Die Orgelwerke der früheren Zeit hatten fast gar keine Charakterstimmen (wie Gamba, Salicional, Violine) und waren daher obertonarm. Um diesen Mangel zu ersetzen, bauten die Orgelbauer künstliche Obertonreihen in Gestalt von Oktaven, Quinten und gemischten Stimmen.*]

²¹⁴ Rupp, op. cit. 169, '...akustische Tremolostimme, die ein ganzes Jahrhundert oder zum mindesten 70–80 Jahre von den bekannten "strengen Fachmännern" in Deutschland auf den Index gesetzt gewesen war.'

²¹⁵ 'an- und abschwelbare', Cited by Ferdinand Klinda in his *Orgelregistrierung*, p.202

²¹⁶ Sattler 9, 'Das Register sollte auch in kleineren Orgelwerken nie fehlen, weil es als Solo- und Begleitstimme gleich wertvoll ist und der Orgel orchestrale Wirkungen ermöglicht. Am schönsten klingt *Vox coelestis* allein gespielt, zumal, wenn sie im Schwellwerk steht. Je mehr Register hinzugezogen werden, desto

Although this viewpoint is confirmed by the almost universal exclusion of the *Voix céleste* in Walze layouts, Straube made extensive use of this stop in all kinds of combinations and circumstances, perhaps both for its swell potential and for its ability, given its high harmonics, to ‘shadow’ artificially created overtones (mutations and mixtures) and to fill in the pitch spectrum. Theoretically, a stop which is ‘tuned’ out-of-tune can only frustrate blend, but in practice well-tuned upper work in an organ is a rarity, and it may well be that Straube’s frequent inclusion of the *Voix céleste* in combination with the three-rank string mixture, *Harmonia aethera*, was designed to equalise impurities in the tuning. It is also possible that Straube wished to cloud the vertical clarity of the texture, in which case his handling of the *Voix céleste* is related to other late-Romantic idiosyncracies such as the increase in the use of vibrato and *portamento*, and the dislocation of melody from accompaniment.²¹⁷

In ‘modern’ organ music the *Voix céleste* was frequently accompanied by such markings as ‘*mystisch*’, ‘*sphärisch*’ or ‘*verklärt*’ (see, for example, Karg-Elert’s op. 78), and it is possible that the very inclusion of such a stop in organ registrations may have suggested an appropriate performance style to the player. In the 1920s the muted-strings effect on the organ was once again abhorred for its ‘cheap mystique’.²¹⁸ Certainly, whether employed for reasons of swell potential, absorption of the pitch spectrum, blend or romantic sentiment, Straube must have been well aware of the unorthodox nature of his use of the *Voix céleste* in many of the following combinations:

Table 3.5 The inclusion of the *Voix céleste* in Straube’s registrations

op. 59/5 2. <i>Komb.</i>	III 16'16'8'8'8'8'8'8'4'2'X8'8'
op. 59/5 3. <i>Komb.</i>	III 16'8'8'4'X
op. 59/7 1. <i>Komb.</i>	III 16'8'8'8'2 $\frac{2}{3}$ '
op. 59/7 <i>HR</i> (bar 24ff.)	III 8'8'8' (where the <i>V.c.</i> is added and subtracted perhaps in imitation of the orchestral alternation of muted and unmuted strings so loved by Reger)
op. 59/8 2. <i>Komb.</i>	III 8'4' (<i>V.c.</i> , <i>Fugara!</i>)
op. 59/9 1. <i>Komb.</i>	III 16'8'8' (<i>Ged.</i> , <i>V.c.</i> , <i>Quintatön</i>)
op. 59/9 <i>HR</i> (end)	III 8'8', and completely alone for the final bar

mehr verliert sich die schöne Wirkung, und man gewinnt den Eindruck eines verstimmtten Manuals.’

²¹⁷ The dislocation of melody (or bass) from the rest of the texture was widespread in late-Romantic performance practice, as witness numerous early recordings. That Reger subscribed to this convention is demonstrated, for instance, in his Welte organ recording of *Wer nur den lieben Gott läßt walten*, op. 67/47.

²¹⁸ Harburger 42, ‘billige Mystik’

op. 65/5 1. <i>Komb.</i>	III 8'8'X (<i>Äoline, V.c., Harm. aeth.</i>)
op. 65/5 2. <i>Komb.</i>	III 8'8'8'
op. 65/11 1. <i>Komb.</i>	III 8'8'8'8'8'
op. 65/11 2. <i>Komb.</i>	III 16'16'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'X8'
op. 80/1 1. <i>Komb.</i>	III 8'8'2' (<i>Äoline, V.c., Flautino</i>)
op. 80/1 2. <i>Komb.</i>	III 8'8'8'8'
op. 80/1 3. <i>Komb.</i>	III 16'16'8'8'8'4'X8'
op. 80/11 1. <i>Komb.</i>	III 16'16'8'8'4'4'2 ² / ₃ 'X8' (!)
op. 85/1 1. <i>Komb.</i>	III 8'8'4' (<i>Äoline, V.c., Fugara</i>)
op. 85/2 2. <i>Komb.</i>	III 8'8'8'8'4'
op. 85/2 3. <i>Komb.</i>	III 16'16'8'8'8'8'8'4'2 ² / ₃ 'X8'
op. 85/3 <i>HR</i>	III 8'8'8'
op. 85/4 2. (&3) <i>Komb.</i>	III 16'8'8'8'8'8'4'2 ² / ₃ 'X

It is interesting to note that in op. 127, dating from 1913 (i.e. one year after Straube's edition of op. 59/7, 8 and 9) the string registration *Aeoline 8'*, *Céleste 8'* and *Fugara 4'* was prescribed by Reger. Hermann Busch writes that 'this luminous string registration on the Swell manual, which is so characteristic of Sauer organs, was surely derived from Straube'²¹⁹, and although this is very likely it should also be noted that a similar registration, *Aeoline 8'* and *Fugara 4'*, was stipulated by Reger many years previously in op. 27 (1898).

4.9 The increased use of the Swell in Straube's editions

As skilful handling of the Swell can add greatly to flow and expressiveness of the music, Straube made much more use of the Swell in his Reger editions than indicated by Reger. For instance, in the *Kyrie* op. 59/7 Straube added a further eight sets of hairpins to the six already in Reger's score. At times, Straube's Swell indications fulfil specific functions: to inflect melodic contours (op. 85/3, *Präludium*, bars 19 and 20); to highlight harmonic detail (op. 85/2, *Präludium*, bars 32–34); to articulate dialogue (op. 65/8, bar 54 ff.); or to smooth over sudden changes in texture or pitch level (op. 59/7, bars 8 and 9).

²¹⁹ Busch H, op. cit. 40. 'Diese auf Sauer-Organen so charakteristische helle Streicherregistrierung im Schwellwerk geht sicher auf Straube zurück.'

The problem of bridging between soft 8' (and 4') stops and louder and higher stops is occasionally solved in Straube's editions by the dynamic scaling down of an entire section, where the implied use of Walze (or stop additions) could only lead to a musically unsatisfactory result. This automatically entails a much greater use of the Swell than would otherwise be assumed, as in the opening section of op. 65/7. This practice corresponds to Reger's own treatment of such works as the *Benedictus*, op. 59/9 or op. 69/4 in his Welte organ recordings, where large-scale build-ups in the score are ignored and replaced by a liberal application of the Swell. In Straube's editions, the heightened use of Swell is very often combined with additional changes of manual (e.g. op. 65/5, bars 21–27), which can often add to the dynamic shape more discreetly than stop additions.

4.10 The occasional reduction in the use of Swell

On very few occasions – for instance in op. 65/7, bar 35 ff., where the difficulty of the pedal line precludes the use of Swell until a very late stage – Straube uses less Swell than Reger. Apart from cases of free reinterpretation such as to be found in the *Präludium*, op. 85/1, this may also be caused by the graphic impossibility of notating very long hairpins over many bars, a problem bypassed by Reger in the imprecision of his notational distinction between Swell and Walze. Straube could not accept that a dynamic rise and fall from *pp* to *mp* and back to *ppp* could satisfactorily be handled by the Walze, for example in op. 65/5, bars 23–28. Therefore, in accordance with Straube's notational clarity, Reger's written instructions *un poco crescendo* and *sempre diminuendo* are replaced in Straube's edition by hairpins. This action caused Straube to reduce the 'rise' from three bars to one bar, and the 'fall' from one and a half bars to half a bar.

4.11 The later placing of hairpins in Straube's editions

Many of Straube's alterations to Reger's placing of the Swell hairpins are complex and may be attributed to various factors, including (as in the use of the Walze) the practical necessity of a free foot, usually the right one.²²⁰ However, it is noticeable that many hairpins in Straube's scores are notated slightly or even considerably later than in the originals, which often delays the climax of a phrase significantly. In the *Präludium* of op. 85/1 the opening and closing hairpins of at least five sets are late. This practice may stem from Hans van Bülow's famous maxim 'crescendo means *p*, diminuendo means *f*', formulated to discourage performers from reacting too much and too suddenly to composers' dynamic indications.

4.12 The rhetorical reinterpretation of melodic lines as a result of additional and displaced hairpins

As a result of Straube's increased use of the Swell and routinely late hairpins, Reger's melodic shapes are very often lent an altered dynamic-rhetorical form, and they assume a 'meaning'

²²⁰ In this connection it should be noted that, in his Welte recordings, Reger occasionally displaced pedal notes by an octave, apparently in order to ease the difficulty of handling the Swell pedal, for instance, in bar 12 of op. 59/9 (See Gibson, op. cit., 12).

other than that notated by Reger. Straube's Swell indications often follow the rise and fall of melodic contours, e.g., op. 59/7, bars five to eight. However, there are many cases where Straube contradicts the direction of Reger's dynamic intent. One instance of this is in op. 59/7, bars 27 and 28, where one set of hairpins is replaced by two in Straube's edition. This affects the musical sense particularly in bar 28, as in Straube's score the opening of the Swell on a descending line to the six-five chord on E emphasises the isolation of this chord, already realised in the score by the halting of the semiquaver movement.

The opening of the Swell on a descending line as Straube here indicates represents a departure from a musical norm, as explained by Hugo Riemann in his entry on Expression (*Ausdruck*) in the third edition of his *Musik-Lexikon* (Leipzig: 1887). Riemann assumed that a rising melody should naturally be accompanied by crescendo and stringendo, and *vice versa*, and if the composer did not indicate intentions that run contrary to this general rule, he would be guilty of a sin of omission. However, there is much contemporary evidence (including Riemann's own teaching mentioned in section 3.3 above, and Reger's recorded organ and piano performances) to suggest that performance parameters of this nature were subject to variation. Indeed, the whole nature of Reger's notational procedure, with the actual notes written in black, and the performance indications later in red ink, raises many questions as to the absoluteness of Reger's own markings. Straube's increased and altered use of the Swell may therefore be welcomed as providing alternative and often illuminating perspectives on the music.²²¹

4.13 The omission of Reger's indication 'molto' between hairpins

In 1913 Rudolz maintained²²² that whereas previously players were obliged to open the Swell completely in order to achieve a moderate Swell effect, the 'modern' Swell often required partial manipulation (*teilweise Behandlung*) due to its greater strength. Perhaps for this reason and due to the bias towards manual III in his registrations, Straube often omitted Reger's supplementary indication 'molto' (or 'quasi f') within a set of hairpins, for instance, in op. 80/1, bars 20 and 29, or in op. 85/1, bars 8, 11, 13 and 30. In a case like op. 59/7, bars 24–27, where each of Reger's three sets of hairpins is reinforced by the *molto* marking, it is easy to imagine that a literal adherence to the score in the context of an efficient Swell could result in a caricature of the composer's intentions.

4.14 The closing of the Swell before changes of manual in crescendo fugues

An idiosyncrasy of Straube's Reger editions noted by Thoralf Roick concerns the closing of the Swell box in the early part of crescendo fugues (*Steigerungsfugen*) just before a new entry of the fugue subject on a louder manual (manual II), or in the pedals, is introduced.²²³ This complex

²²¹ This flexible attitude to performance parameters is represented by many leading composers of the last century: for instance, by Schoenberg (in *Style and Idea*) in his disapproval of a Bayreuth tradition holding a monopoly on performances of *Parsifal* ('*Parsifal* and copyright', 1912), or in his attitude to phrasing ('Phrasing', 1931); or by Stravinsky in his disapproval of the limitations placed on twentieth-century works by a single recording, even those involving the participation of the composer. A variety of presentations of a single work was highly valued in these and many other cases. See also Chapter 7

²²² Rudolz 50

²²³ Roick 66

operation results in a decrease in dynamic immediately followed by an increase, which, to some degree, cancel each other out. Only when all voices transfer to manual II is the Swell box finally opened for good. This procedure, which occurs eleven times in the fugues and three times in the free movements, not only prepares the listener for the impending re-entry of the subject, but also softens the accompanying manual in favour of the 'solo' manual of the subject. It also allows the Swell to be (re)opened from the fully closed position, thereby increasing the number of bars over which the Swell can function, and thus its expressive potential. Furthermore, as an extra stage is added to the crescendo (i.e. the possibility of opening the Swell twice instead of just once) and a sort of dynamic exchange between the Swell and manual changes is effected, the number of dynamic 'events' is increased and each individual event is less isolated, and therefore less obtrusive. The illusion of a smoother crescendo is the logical outcome.

This procedure is apparently related to, and perhaps inspired by, the French crescendo technique (see section 4.4), in which the Swell could be opened with a *Fonds* registration, then closed shortly before the entry of the *Anches Récit*. Admittedly, the disappearance of the Swell in the French system was masked by the stops of the other manuals. Nevertheless, the notion of a complex operation involving dynamic give and take and the possibility of opening the Swell box twice are inherent in both systems.

Instances in Straube's Reger editions of this procedure of closing the Swell just before the transferral of one voice to a louder manual are as follows: op. 59/6, bars 20/21; op. 65/6, bar 8 (although here Straube omitted to indicate manual II for the left hand, which is later assumed, and the closing of the box begins after the start of the theme); in the fugues op. 65/8, bar 2; op. 65/12, bars 15, 19, 54 and 57; op. 80/2, bars 27 and 40; op. 80/12, bars 8 and 9 (although Straube omits to reopen the Swell at a later point); and the *Fuge*, op. 85/3, bar 15. Furthermore, in the *Improvisation*, op. 65/5, bar 22, the *Toccata*, op. 65/11, bar 24, and the *Präludium* of op. 85/5, bar 25, the same procedure prepares the left hand entries of thematic material on manual II in fugato sections. It should also be noted that in a number of fugues the occasional closing of the Swell is unrelated to manual changes, e.g. op. 85/4, *Fuge*, bars 47 and 48, where a similar closing of the Swell anticipates the second thematic entry on the same manual, or op. 80/2, bar 9, where the Swell fulfils an expressive function in emphasising the falling contours of the melody.

4.15 Conclusions

Just as the success of the use of the *Walze* in 'modern' organ style depends to a large extent on the creation of an environment in which it can function unobtrusively, so also the optimal effect of the Swell is dependent on many factors, including registration, coupling systems and performance techniques. Reger's use of the Swell is difficult to assess, due to his lack of notational differentiation between the *Walze* and Swell. His rampant dynamic indications for manual III can only be understood in relative or psychological terms, as an expression of inner

motivation, and can have no absolute value. Before the composition of the pieces selected by Straube for his editions, the vast majority of Swells known to Reger were slight in relation to the other manuals, the only known exception to this being the Swell of the Kaimsaal in Munich, which Reger heard for the first time in March 1901, a few months before the composition of op. 59. By this time Reger's organ style and his approach to dynamics and performance indications on the organ were unquestionably already fully developed, and there is no evidence to suggest that the more substantial Swell of the Kaimsaal organ influenced Reger in subsequent works.

In Straube's Reger editions the Swell played an essential part in the dynamic control of the organ, albeit mostly in the lower dynamic range. This corresponds to Reger's own early experience of the Swell in the instruments in Wiesbaden and Frankfurt. In his handling of the Swell, and the distribution of dynamic duties between the Swell and Walze, Straube could not (given the non-standardisation of German organs and the dearth of 'modern' playing techniques in Germany) follow an already established tradition. Straube rejected the reliance of his teacher, H. Reimann, on the exclusive use of the Walze in favour of a combined system of Swell and Walze. The combined system proposed by Straube's other Berlin teacher, Otto Dienel, in which the Swell mixture(s) are introduced with the Swell box closed in a crescendo, was ignored in favour of a more 'German' solution, which relied on manual changes and the skill in voicing and disposition of the organ builder, focussing on a freer, more cantabile sound in soft music.

Although Dienel's 'French' proposals were not considered appropriate to the German organ, certain elements of French practice were incorporated by Straube in his Reger editions: registrations favouring the Swell manual, and the closing of the Swell in the early part of build-ups to allow a subsequent reopening of the Swell. Indeed, Straube's extensive use of the *Voix céleste* would doubtless have been considered French in some quarters, as the conservative organ-building advisor, A.W. Bach, set himself against this and other stops on the grounds that they were evidence of *Französelei*. However, it must be recognised that Straube's blend of many different facets of Swell performance practice was as original as it was practical. The detail, integrity and musicality of Straube's system, along with his non-acceptance of the French Swell procedure, suggests an affirmation of the German Romantic organ in the face of Schweitzer's anti-German pronouncements published in *Deutsche und Französische Orgelbaukunst und Orgelkunst* in 1906.

CHAPTER 4

SOUND AND REGISTRATION

1 Wagner and the organ

1.1 The Wagnerian ‘shadow’

‘Sound (*Klang*), in which “chord” and “timbre” meet, is the word that is most exactly applicable to the facts of Wagnerian composition, precisely because the outlines of the conceptual elements are blurred (and “sound” is the central category of the music of the turn of the century, which lay in Wagner’s shadow) – Carl Dahlhaus.²²⁴

The ‘finest and most profound’ manifestation of Wagner’s art, in which the ‘categories of orchestration, harmony and counterpoint blend into one another’²²⁵ (Wagner to T. Uhlig, 31 May 1852) is the art of transition: *die Kunst des Überganges*.²²⁶ In a letter to Mathilde Wesendonck of 29 October 1859,²²⁷ Wagner wrote that his masterpiece in the art of subtle, gradual transition is the great scene in the Act II of *Tristan und Isolde*. Here, the themes of night and day, love and death, impatience and fulfilment, pain and ecstasy, expectancy and apprehension are seamlessly interwoven, and the ‘communication and inner connection of every shade of extreme emotion’ is miraculously achieved.²²⁸

Wagner’s judgement predates the composition of *Parsifal* (1877–82), of which Robert Craft wrote, ‘Wagner’s language continued to evolve...still discovering new, more liquescent chord sequences and intensifications of sound colours, fulfilling his promise that the instruments would be like “layers of clouds which part and then re-form”...The orchestral blends and separations are without precedent.’²²⁹ Max Reger’s youthful experiences of *Parsifal* and *Meistersinger* at Bayreuth prompted him to dedicate his life to music.²³⁰

Karl Straube wrote in 1950 that in his student days (the last decade of the nineteenth century) ‘the music of Liszt and Wagner represented the dominant artistic influence on the up-to-date musician and music lover...Wagner was seen as the composer whose works embodied the greatest creative fulfilment of the precepts of Romantic theories of art. The magic of the

²²⁴ In Dahlhaus B 123

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ Cited in Gurlitt B 201 ‘...“feinste und tiefste Kunst”...’, see below under section 2.3

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ Gurlitt B, op. cit. 201 ‘[die] Vermittlung und innige Verbindung aller Momente des Überganges der äußersten Stimmungen ineinander...’

²²⁹ In Craft 82

²³⁰ See Lindner A 35

Wagnerian orchestral sound was such that one tended to measure the greatness of earlier masters in terms of their echo in Wagner's creative works.'²³¹

Some of the resources of the 'modern' organ may have derived directly from a perception of Wagnerian sound. H.-J. Falkenberg, for instance, traced the proliferation of *Fernwerke* in late-nineteenth-century German organ building (whose sound was commonly emitted through a vent high above the altar) to the barely audible high notes at the close of *Parsifal*.²³² Direct references to the influence of Wagner in organ playing are rife. For instance, in a letter to M. Schneider of 10 April 1941,²³³ Straube reported that Albert Heintz, the organist of the *Petrikirche* in Berlin was, like Straube's teacher Reimann, a well-known Wagnerian in the 1880s and 1890s, and that because of his contact with Bayreuth he yearned for richness and variety of colour on the organ. Organ transcriptions of Wagner excerpts were extremely popular, and were performed even on medium-sized instruments such as the *Heilig-Geist-Kirche* in Heidelberg (Sauer 1901, III/42), where the *Vorspiel zu 'Parsifal'* featured in the inaugural concert of the organ on 3 November 1901.²³⁴

The intensity of Wagner's compositional style, which was steeped in psychological inuendo, demanded a correspondingly sophisticated performance style that recognised the textural as well as structural ambitions of the music. Elements of this performance style, such as increased attention to detail or dynamic and rhythmic mobility, survived into the late 1920s in performances of Wagner's and others' works,²³⁵ and in printed editions of earlier, even Baroque, works prepared by notable exponents of 'modern' performance practice, such as d'Albert (the '48'), Bülow and Joachim (Bach's *Chaconne*), the latter two based in Berlin in Straube's youth²³⁶. The prototype for these editions appears to have been Wagner's own edition of Palestrina's *Stabat Mater*, which Liszt considered exemplary as a new, instructive and practical edition in its indication of the dynamic nuances.²³⁷ Once articulated, these 'modern' elements of performance style, discussed below, achieved a measure of independence and could be freely applied in isolation or combination to music of any type or period.

²³¹ In *Rückblick und Bekenntnis (Bach-Gedenkschrift 1950, and MuK 1950/3)*, reprinted in KSB, 7 & 8. '...war die Musik Wagners und Liszts das beherrschende Kunsterlebnis des Up-to-date-Musikers und – Musikliebhabers... Wagner galt als der Komponist, in dessen Schaffen sich die Forderungen der romantischen Kunsttheorie zu höchster schöpferischer Erfüllung vereinigten. Die Magie des Wagnerschen Orchesterklanges ging so weit, daß man geneigt war, die Größe früherer Meister an der Stärke ihres Nachhalls in Wagners Kunstschaffen abzumessen.'

²³² Falkenberg B 219. Of course, the intimate and fantastic nature of soft music is well documented in German Romantic music. Compare Schumann's 'Inside us is something immense and powerful, which no tongue can express because it is not of this world; but we feel it on high mountains, or at sunset or in soft music.' (*Tagebücher*, Vol.1, ed. G. Eismann, Leipzig: 1971, p. 99), or pieces like Schumann's 'Wie aus der Ferne' (*Davidsbündler Tänzen*), or the many magical *pianissimo* endings in Liszt's music.

²³³ KSB 124–6

²³⁴ Falkenberg B, op. cit. 227

²³⁵ For instance, in R. Strauss's 1928 recording of the *Tristan-Vorspiel* (Koch Legacy 3-7119-2H1, 1991)

²³⁶ These three musicians are cited in Reimann 134 & 137, as among the best representatives of 'modern' performance style.

²³⁷ *Franz Liszt: Briefe*, collected and edited by La Mara (Leipzig: 1893ff.), Vol.VIII, p. 330

1.2 The Wagnerisation of Bach

Taking the lead from his precursors in the fields of piano and violin and from Heinrich Reimann's revealing article on the performance of Bach's organ works,²³⁸ Straube also adopted earlier works for 'modern' treatment – in his case music by J.S. Bach, W.F. Bach, Böhm, Buxtehude, Kellner, Krebs, Kerll, Muffat, Pachelbel, Scheidt, Strungk, Walther, etc. – in a series of editions starting with his influential *Alte Meister* edition of 1904, and continuing with the *Choralvorspiele alter Meister* (1907) and the second volume of the Peters Bach edition (1913).

The old 'dry' and 'monotonous' manner of organ performance had already been loosened in the Liszt camp²³⁹, and towards the end of the century the focus had shifted rapidly from Weimar to Berlin, where a number of progressive organists, including Straube's teachers O. Dienel and H. Reimann, sought to exploit the resources²⁴⁰ of the many sophisticated instruments at their disposal, to present contemporary music of Liszt, Reubke and others in a colourful manner (*differenzierten Klang von orchestraler Farbigkeit*) acceptable to the taste of that time, and to enliven the conservatism and rigidity of the *Berliner Bach-Stil*.²⁴¹ Reger considered the organs available to Bach inadequate, and wrote that he himself played Bach on the organ in an extremely colourful way (*farbenreich*).²⁴²

As late as 1928, in *Max Reger und die moderne Orgel* W. Harburger could claim that 'to "modernise" Bach on modern organs is to "Wagnerise" it'.²⁴³ In the 1940s, however, and somewhat unconvincingly, Straube claimed that he did not Wagnerise Bach's music in the last decade of the nineteenth century, although he did Romanticise it; he merely 'recreated Bach's music within a Wagnerian conception of sound',²⁴⁴ an attitude still evident in his plea for the 'brilliance and magnificence of the *Meistersinger* orchestra'²⁴⁵ in his 1913 Peters edition of Bach's Prelude and Fugue in C major (*BWV 545*). Straube's blatant ambiguity in this matter can only be explained in terms of degrees of 'modernisation' or 'Wagnerisation' of Bach's music, on the one hand in terms of general Romanticising tendencies and the application of a sound conception loosely derived from the Wagnerian *Klangwelt*, and which imply the virtual synonymy of the words 'Wagnerian' and 'Romantic', on the other hand relating to more specific and complete approaches to the Wagner model.

The works of Bach and Wagner both exhibit a richly polyphonic texture, a quality that R. Strauss identified as the secret of the unprecedented poetry in sound of the *Tristan* and *Meistersinger* scores²⁴⁶. Apart from the stature of Bach, this shared textural aspect made the works of Bach a prime target for the transference of certain aspects of Wagner's performance art to the organ. Strauss traced the objective contrapuntal nature of Wagner's music back to Bach

²³⁸ Reimann, *Über den Vortrag der Orgelkompositionen J.S. Bachs*

²³⁹ See Kooiman A

²⁴⁰ Some of these aids to registration are listed under footnote one in Chapter III.

²⁴¹ See Straube in *Rückblick und Bekenntnis* in KSB, op. cit. 9

²⁴² In a letter to G. Beckmann, February 1900, in Beckmann B 330

²⁴³ See Harburger 41. '...Bach in dieser Weise zu modernisieren, heißt ihn wagnerisieren...'

²⁴⁴ KSB, op. cit. 8 '...mit Wagnerscher Klangsinnlichkeit Bach nachschuf.'

²⁴⁵ 'Der Spieler versuche in der Registrierung den Glanz und die Pracht des *Meistersinger*-Orchesters wiederzugeben.'

²⁴⁶ In the foreword to his 1904–5 edition of Berlioz's *Grand traité...*, see Strauss

through Beethoven's last quartets, and through the symphonies of Haydn and Mozart. Reciprocally, the subjective nature of Bach's music was echoed in Wagner's works, and Reger himself termed Bach's organ chorales 'symphonic poems in miniature' and likened them to Wagner's 'grandiose style'.²⁴⁷ In a letter of 20 July 1891 he urged Lindner to examine Bach's chorale preludes, and 'see if they are not the finest, most objective, and therefore most subjective, music. For what I myself cannot feel, I cannot objectivise.'²⁴⁸

As the organ at first did not possess a 'modern' repertoire that could approach the textural complexity of Wagner's music, in performance Wagner's shadow fell first and foremost on the music of J.S. Bach. The imposition of a specific and highly detailed performance style on music whose compositional priorities lay elsewhere caused a set of distinct artistic values to be overlaid on what was then assumed to be a texturally less potent original. In *Musikalische Rückblicke* (Berlin, 1900) H. Reimann wrote: 'musicality has become more sensitive through the ages, and one has learned to recognise that this sensitivity is best served if the performer (without destroying the historic nature of a style belonging to an earlier period) can present the emotional content of a work from that time in the accustomed manner adopted by the best musicians of our time'.²⁴⁹

1.3 Straube and Reger in the shadow of Wagner

The imitation of certain Wagnerian stylistic elements in the decades after the composer's death contributed to a turn-of-the-century 'modern' performance style which may be measured against its models, but which exists as an entity in its own right; a set of values, a form of expression, even, which may be defined in terms of its deviation from the original notation of the music upon which it is imposed, whether by Bach, Reger, or any other composer.

A clear distinction between compositional and performance style emerged. In his essay *Stil und Manier* (1937), the Straube pupil and colleague Günther Ramin reflected *Orgelbewegung* ideology when he wrote that, in his view, 'only the "creative" artist has the right to an unmistakable personal style, not the performer'. But a decade earlier, E. Gatscher, a pupil of both Reger and Straube, wrote that 'artistic intuition is the highest law in the shaping of the music. Straube's artistic autonomy does not shrink from sharp opposition to the composer's indications, because Straube himself brings a totality, a unity to the music, in which, despite all apparent disrespect, the wishes and intention of the composer are realised.'²⁵⁰

²⁴⁷ See Reger's foreword to his early arrangement of 13 Bach organ chorales, or Taube under the year 1915.

²⁴⁸ MRB 27 'ob das nicht die feinste, objektivste und doch deshalb wieder subjektivste Musik ist. Denn, was ich nicht selbst fühle, kann ich nicht objektivieren...'

²⁴⁹ Reimann 135 'Der musikalische Sinn ist mit der Zeit feinfühlicher geworden, und man hat das unabweisbare Bedürfnis empfinden gelernt, daß dieser Feinfühligkeit in der Weise Genüge geleistet werde, daß der Vortragende – ohne die historische Eigenart eines einer früheren Periode angehörigen Stiles zu zerstören – den Empfindungsgehalt eines Werkes aus jener Zeit in der uns geläufigen und durch die besten Künstler angenommenen Vortragsweise zur Darstellung bringe.'

²⁵⁰ In Gatscher 4. 'Die künstlerische Autonomie scheut die scharfe Opposition zu bestimmten Angaben des Komponisten nicht, weil er selbst ein Ganzes, Geschlossenes hinsetzt, in dem trotz aller scheinbaren Pietätlosigkeit doch der Wille und die Intention des Komponisten zur Geltung kommt.'

In his *Nachwort* to the Straube letters,²⁵¹ published in 1952, W. Gurlitt wrote that, prior to Straube, the organ lacked an interpretative art that could be set beside the orchestral standards of Wagner, Debussy and Strauss, or beside the piano and violin performances of Liszt, Busoni and Joachim. He asserted that Straube emulated these expressive levels in his subtlety of phrasing and articulation, and in his flexibility of dynamics and timbre. According to Gurlitt, this accorded the performance of a given work increased relevance to its period.

In connection with the identification of an expressive performance style in Reger's organ works, Heinz Lohmann noted the difficulty in performance of a transitional, or 'sliding' (*gleitend*), work such as Reger's *Capriccio*, op. 129/5, on our organs today. From the second page onwards, he says, the music winds down from *fff Poco vivace* to *ppp Largo*. 'Here sound, dynamics and the modification of tempo are all essential elements of the composition. If the performance indications are ignored one would completely miss the point of the music.'²⁵² Such a transitional piece is by no means isolated in Reger's organ oeuvre, and a body of such pieces stressing transitional dynamics and variation of tempo can easily be identified.

The association of such pieces with Wagnerian prototypes such as the *Lohengrin* or *Tristan* preludes is almost inescapable. It was indeed this transitional repertoire within Reger's organ oeuvre that derived from Wagner's *Kunst des Übergangs*. It broke new ground in its establishment of a 'modern' compositional style for the organ that demanded a 'modern' performance style, and it introduced unprecedented technical difficulties in its performance, and particularly in the execution of the registration.

2 Straube's registration practice

2.1 The rejection of 'accidental' sound in organ registration

In *Rückblick und Bekenntnis* (1950) Straube wrote that he 'sought to reveal the subjective origins of Bach's objective musical language through the exploitation of all the resources of sound in the modern organ...The second step in the restoration of the organ as a Bach instrument was to extend the subtlety that Reimann had applied in the area of dynamics alone to the character of sound'.²⁵³

Every dynamic alteration on the organ entails a change in colour, however slight, and, therefore, the isolation of dynamics from colour on the organ may be considered a practical

²⁵¹ KSB 249

²⁵² Lohmann A 231. 'In den folgenden Takten bis zum Schluß vollzieht sich ein weiterer Abbau an Dynamik und Tempo bis hin zum "Largo" mit *ppp* am Schluß,– Dynamik und Tempomodifikationen gehören hier vollkommen zur Komposition. Bei Außerachtlassen der Spielanweisung würde man absolut am Stück vorbei musizieren.'

²⁵³ In KSB, Op. cit., p. 9 & 10. 'Ich bemühte mich, durch die Ausnutzung aller Klangmöglichkeiten der modernen Orgel in der objektivierten Tonsprache Bachscher Polyphonie den subjektiven Ursprung mittönen zu lassen...Die von Reimann bei Bachs Werken nur an der lautstärke geübte Differenzierungskunst auch auf den Klangcharakter anzuwenden und die Farbe des einzelnen Registers und besonderer Registergruppen als Stimmungswert einzusetzen, war der zweite Schritt zur Rehabilitierung der Orgel als Bach-Instrument.'

impossibility.²⁵⁴ Nevertheless, like Wagner who abhorred the ‘accidental’ Classical wind sound that resulted from scoring in the descending order of flutes, oboes, clarinets and bassoons,²⁵⁵ Straube rejected the largely accidental and preordained nature of Reimann’s organ sound, which was mainly due to a primitive handling of the *Walze*. In his conscious exploitation of the resources of colour provided by the late-Romantic organ, Straube followed a specific and detailed course. His own editions show a marked evolution from the rather crude effects indicated in the 1904 *Alte Meister* edition to the sophistication of his 1919 Reger edition.

The demand for heightened expression through sophistication of organ sound is also inherent in Schweitzer’s statement cited previously,²⁵⁶ that ‘the artistic essence of an organ...depends on the manner in which the progression from *piano* to *forte*, from *forte* to *fortissimo*, and back again to the opening registration may be achieved’. Schweitzer recognised that dynamic shape can be enhanced by skilful manipulation of timbre. As this varies from organ to organ it is consequently almost always elusive of notation. In this area the Straube editions, which are bound to a single organ, are invaluable and exemplary in their specificity and detail, though by definition limited in their literal and practical application.

2.2 Colour

According to Strauss,²⁵⁷ Wagner’s handling of the orchestra represented a synthesis of the two main directions in the development of the orchestra, the symphonic (polyphonic) and the dramatic (homophonic). The richly expressive language of this latter dramatic direction emphasised technical virtuosity and effects of colour, in contrast to the harmonic and motivic purity of the symphonic direction. Colour and logic were fused. Similarly, the Wagnerian organist was faced with a textural problem, the solution of which suggested a dualistic approach that both embraced a colouristic registration practice and viewed it with suspicion. Although Straube’s Reger editions provide the most comprehensive presentation of the blended, non-colouristic conception of sound in organ literature, they also exploit the soloistic and colourful side of organ registration alongside and within the more neutral, blended texture.

This dichotomy was no less evident in Reger’s own approach to organ registration that, at times, calls for quite specific colours. For instance, the dark/light registrations indicated in the opening pages of *Wachet auf*, op. 52/2, contrast opposite ends of the harmonic spectrum. It has already been noted that Reger performed Bach in an extremely colourful manner (section 1.2), and Rudolf Walter²⁵⁸ pointed to the increase in colouristic tendencies in Reger’s later organ works, which he put down to the influence of Impressionism. This especially concerned the differentiation of the manuals, and he traces this development through op. 67, 79b, 127, 129, 135a and 145.

²⁵⁴ C.f. Busch J 9, where the difference between the colouristic registrations of G. Silbermann and the dynamic suggestions of J.C. Kuhnau are minimised. See also footnote 140 of this chapter.

²⁵⁵ Adorno 89 ff.

²⁵⁶ In the Preface to this study

²⁵⁷ Strauss, op. cit.

²⁵⁸ In Walter C 52 & 53

However, Reger has made it clear that colour is not a priority in composition, but an added extra. He held the view that ‘a composition is good if it can be played without colour. One must first be able to draw before one can paint’.²⁵⁹ For this reason, Reger disapproved of English and French organ music, and despised Guilmant’s Fifth Sonata, op. 80, for its orchestral *Koloristik* and its hollow pathos.²⁶⁰ Reger expressed himself to H. Unger in the following terms: ‘Many modern composers are unable to compose in a true style (*reinen Satz*) and have to resort to colour in order to create sound, whereas Wagner’s true compositional style yields the sound’.²⁶¹ Reger’s view is confirmed by Walter Fischer’s maxim for registration presented at the 1910 Reger festival in Dortmund ‘first plasticity, then colour and not the other way round’.²⁶²

Examples of colour in Straube’s registrations are numerous. The brief registration of *Voix céleste 8’* and *Viola 8’* for the ‘*quasi Violino solo*’ passage in bars eight and nine of the *Benedictus*, op. 59/9, corresponds to the intense orchestral sound of a single solo violin, a Romantic orchestral device *par excellence*. In his chapter on orchestration in *The Wagner Compendium*,²⁶³ J. Burton wrote that Wagner reserved this effect for special moments of intimacy, and that, in his edition of Berlioz’s orchestration manual, Strauss quoted only one instance of this in Wagner, which refers to the accompaniment of Fricka in *Das Rheingold*, where the ‘innermost secrets of a woman’s heart’ are revealed.²⁶⁴

Straube’s ‘*quasi Violino solo*’ passage in op. 59/9 necessitates a departure from the coupled-through system in order to register a solo and accompaniment texture. This is also the case in the *Präludium*, op. 65/7, where a right-hand solo *Oboe 8’* and *Gedackt 8’* registration on manual III is supported by the *Gedackt 8’* of manual II. Interestingly, where the texture of the accompaniment thins out to a single voice in bars 4–8, 16–17 and 20–22, the left hand transfers to the more soloistic *Quintatön 8’* of manual I, and the highly detailed phrasing further emphasises the *bicinium* character of the music.

The importance assigned by Straube to colour is revealed in this latter example from op. 65/7. The choice of a colourful registration for the opening sections of the movement forced Straube to compromise in his registration for the reprise at bar 40 (c.f. Chapter 2, section 3.15). Here, the solo-and-accompaniment texture had to be abandoned in favour of a blended, coupled-through registration that could satisfactorily increase the dynamic gradually from *p* to *ff*. The clash of priorities at this point (the solo/accompaniment registration *versus* a registration suitable for the

²⁵⁹ Reported by Hermann Grabner in Spemann 55. ‘Jede Komposition ist gut, die vollkommen farblos gespielt werden kann. Man muß zuerst zeichnen können, um zu malen.’

²⁶⁰ See Reger’s letter to Beckmann of 15 January 1900, also Huesgen 8.

²⁶¹ See Würz 129, Spemann 48. ‘Viele Moderne schreiben keinen reinen Satz und müssen farben aufkleben, um einen Klang zu erhalten, wo bei Wagner noch der reine Satz den Klang herbeiführte.’

²⁶² Fischer 8, ‘Erst die Plastik, dann die Klangfarbe – nicht umgekehrt’. The word ‘plasticity’ normally refers to tempo or phrasing, but can also be applied to registration where it implies a blend of stops of varying construction. This is the sense intended, for instance, by Karg-Elert in his chorale prelude *Nun sich der Tag geendet hat*, op. 78/15, where he calls for a ‘plastische, doch dunkelfarbene Kombination’ (c.f. footnote 72 of this chapter). In his harmonium treatise, Karg-Elert wrote in terms strikingly similar to Reger’s, that ‘one should not overestimate colour (*die Koloristik*) [in registration]. Without doubt, it is a means of expression, but it does not influence the spiritual (*geistig*), that is, absolute-musical content of a work’, Karg-Elert 320.

²⁶³ Wagner-Comp. 336

²⁶⁴ Strauss himself used this scoring with telling effect, for instance, in the third of his *Vier letzte Lieder*, ‘Beim Schlafengehen’, to symbolise the passing of the senses into the realm of the subconscious.

launching of a large-scale crescendo) did not persuade Straube to sacrifice his choice of a colourful registration at the opening of the piece for the sake of uniformity and structural clarity.

Many of the registrations that emphasise colourful string imitations are listed in chapter III, section 4.8. These are evidence of Straube's frequent bias towards the bright side of the harmonic spectrum, although they may have been favoured more for their dynamic potential than for their timbre. These combinations are rich in overtones, and therefore highly expressive in the Swell. The registration for *1.Komb.* of op. 65/5, *Aeoline 8'*, *Voix céleste 8'* and *Harmonia aethera 3 fach (sehr schwach intoniert)*, is one of the most extreme examples in Straube's editions of a combination of stops that concentrates exclusively on organ colour rich in overtones and lacking in fundamental.

The one and a half bars in op. 65/5 for which this extraordinary registration is employed appear to be detached from the main thrust of the music, and so Straube's registration exhibits a certain logic in its textural isolation of these bars from the musical argument. *1.Komb.* in the *Toccata*, op. 80/11 is also heavily biased towards the bright side of the colour spectrum, and is weak in fundamental. This is all the more noticeable by contrast with the registration for *2.Komb.*, which amasses 26 8's, seven 4's and one 2'. Ten of the 20 manual stops selected by Straube for *1.Komb.* are strings, and many of the other stops are pitched as artificial overtones. None of the other 8' stops – the *Harmonika* of manual II (according to Sattler an open flute, soft and delicate, often slightly stringy), the *Quintatön* of manual I, or the *Oboe* of manual III – can supply a satisfactory Romantic foundation to a combination which includes the *Groß-Cymbel* of manual I. Straube's use of the above registration in combination with *Walze* (from bar 19 onwards) creates a crescendo whose colour is almost the reverse of that contained in the *Walze* itself, which sets out from a rich base of fundamental stops.

Similar, softer combinations biased towards the bright side of the harmonic spectrum are indicated on manual III for running left-hand solo passages in the *Präludium* of op. 85/2, bars 14–18 (*1.Komb.*) and bars 37–39 (*3.Komb.*). However, such a marked emphasis on the light side of the spectrum is limited to a relatively small number of examples in Straube's registration practice.

There is no case of an exclusive emphasis on dark-sounding stops in Straube's Reger editions, as the flute-only registrations are invariably brightened by 4's and 2's.

Perhaps the most interesting use of colour in Straube's editions is for the differentiation of the manuals, which is superficially related to the Baroque *Werkprinzip*.²⁶⁵ In its simplest form, a selection of varying colours for the three uncoupled manuals is presented, as at the start of the *Praeludium*, op. 85/1. Here, play on the respective manuals in descending order not only realises the dynamic levels *ppp*, *pp* and *p*, but also differentiates in colour between the manuals by means of a registration that opposes stops of differing construction. The three single 8' stops of this registration could hardly be more different from one another within the given dynamic range: III *Quintatön*, which emphasises the twelfth; II *Gedackt*, which concentrates almost

²⁶⁵ Although, in fact, the North German *Werkprinzip* has as much to do with spatial as colour differentiation. Karg-Elert more frequently opposed manuals according to colour than Straube did, as in his op. 65/1 (c. 1906), or his op. 145 (c. 1932) which is headed, 'Die Manuale in gleicher Stärke aber in deutlich unterschiedener Farbe'.

exclusively on fundamental sound; and I *Gemshorn*, soft and reedy, halfway between flute and string, and emphasising the *tierce*, *larigot* and (flat) *septime*.

At a louder dynamic level and in more complex form, the opening of the *Toccata*, op. 59/5, is similar in its allocation of three different colours to three different manuals at the dynamic levels *mp*, *mf* and *poco forte*. The first six phrases of the piece alternate an *mp* 8', 4' and 2' flue combination on manual III, an *mf* plenum dominated by reeds and Cornet on the coupled manuals II and III, and a *poco forte* full, mixture-dominated plenum on manual I. The musical dialogue is enhanced by this rhetorical use of registration.

Similar in concept, but within the context of a coupled-through combination of flue stops, the manual registrations for the opening of the *Präludium*, op. 85/2 show a differentiation in colour achieved by an adjustment in the balance of the artificial overtones:

Table 4.1 Straube's manual registrations for the opening of the *Präludium*, op. 85/2

Manual III	Manual II	Manual I
Flûte d'amour 8'	Gedackt 8'	Dulciana 8'
<i>Flauto dolce 4'</i>	<i>Rohrflöte 8'</i>	<i>Gemshorn 8'</i>
<i>Flautino 2'</i>	<i>Salicional 4'</i>	<i>Quintatön 8'</i>
		<i>Gemshorn 4'</i>
		<i>Violini 4'</i>

This registration becomes progressively louder and darker, moving from manual III (8'4'2) via manual II (8'8'8'4'4'2) to manual I (8'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'4'4'2). Although the number of 4' stops remains proportionally constant, the number of 8's increases from a third to a half of the total number of stops, and the 2', which starts out as a third of the stops drawn, becomes a mere eleventh of the total number.

Another form of the 'Werk' principle, identical to that in Rudolz's explanation of the *Farbenakkord* quoted below under section 2.3, is contained in Straube's suggestion for the registration of the *Präludium* of op. 85/4, where manuals II (including *Klarinette* 8') and III (including mixture and *Oboe* 8') are both coupled to all the 8' and 4' flue stops of manual I, but are not coupled to each other. This provides three highly individual full-sounding registrations that alternate in dialogue. Unlike the example of op. 65/7 quoted above, where the opening registration could not be used to define the structure of the piece because it was unsuitable as the starting registration for a large-scale crescendo, the *Klarinette* combination on manual II is used to signal the reprise in bar 31, and so, in this case, registral colour supports the overall structure of the music.

Structural registration of this nature is as natural as it is practical, and need not be interpreted as a superimposition of the performer's structural priorities on an unsuspecting original. The addition of stops at entries of fugue subjects in Straube's editions of op. 59/6 or op. 65/12 also falls into this category, and this practice was well established in late-nineteenth-century

Germany (Winterberger's performances of Liszt's BACH, Schweitzer, etc.). Apart from a small number of obvious cases of total re-interpretation (c.f. Chapter 2, section 3.19 on page 35), Straube rarely allows his registral ambitions to impinge on the flow of Reger's music.

Even the showcase of soft 8' registrations in his edition of Reger's *Präludium*, op. 80/1 is largely derived from the clearly sectionalised nature of the music, and it is unlikely that Reger would have objected to these subtle contrasts. On manual III alone, eight different registrations of between one and three stops are chosen for this short movement. Especially between bars 46 and 51, where many solo stops are contrasted, it is obvious that their function is colouristic, and blended sound is not a priority.

'Gapped' combinations, forbidden in certain circles, form a further, curious body of experimental colouristic registrations in Straube's editions. These are discussed in section 4.2 of this chapter. It is obvious from the great variety of the above examples that Straube followed an imaginative, unconventional and highly individualistic path in his expressive use of organ colour. Whether the application of colour to texture is implied by or imposed on the music does not detract from the discretion and integrity with which Straube approached this important aspect of organ registration. However, the exploration of colour should be viewed in the context of the more general registration practice adopted by Straube, which derives from his concept of a unified *Farbenakkord*. This was based on flexible, non-colouristic but varied registrations that valued above all blend of sound.

2.3 Straube's *Farbenakkord*

Wilibald Gurlitt wrote of unity of sound and blend in Straube's 70th. birthday tribute, *Gaben der Freunde*:

The shaping of the new [Sauer] organ should be measured against the attitude to sound of the Wagnerian orchestra, in itself hostile to the organ. This attitude includes the all-pervasive string sound that provides the central colour, the novel swell effects capable of the most sensitive shading, the multifarious blending and interchange of colour, the merging and coalescing of sounds, and all that R. Wagner indicated in his well-known letter of 29 October 1859 to Mathilde Wesendonck as his "finest and most profound Art", which "owed its existence to the extremely sensitive feelings that led to the communication and inner connection of every shade of extreme emotion: *die Kunst des Überganges*".²⁶⁶

The Straube 'sound', as exemplified by Straube's Reger editions, incorporates many of these attributes: the technical realisation of a transitional registration style; the creation of a central ensemble of stops from which the entire range of dynamics and colour can emanate; and sophistication in the handling of the Swell. Indeed, in the context of his Reger editions,

²⁶⁶ KS 200 & 201. 'Für die Gestaltung der neuen Orgel sollte der Klangwille des an sich orgelfremden Wagner-Orchesters maßgebend werden, sein hintergründiger Streicherklang als Farbkern, seine neuartigen Schwellwirkungen bis in die zartesten dynamischen Schattierungen hinein, seine mannigfaltigen Mischungen und Kreuzungen von Farbwerten, sein Ineinandergleiten und Verfließen von Klängen und alles das, was Richard Wagner in dem bekannten Brief vom 29. October 1859 an Mathilde Wesendonck als seine "feinste und tiefste Kunst" bezeichnet hat, die er "dem äußerst empfindlichen Gefühle verdankt, welches ihn auf Vermittlung und innige Verbindung aller Momente des Überganges der äußersten Stimmungen ineinander hinweist": "die Kunst des Überganges".'

Straube's term *Farbenakkord*,²⁶⁷ which he defined as being opposed to strong contrasts, is strikingly close to Wagner's description of his transitional art, in which 'the categories of orchestration, harmony and counterpoint blend into one another', and to Dahlhaus's definition of the turn-of-the-century conception of sound (*Klang*), in which 'chord' and 'timbre' meet.²⁶⁸ In this context, the sense of Straube's *Farbenakkord* is readily understandable as a central, characteristic ensemble of stops designed to allow of gradual alterations in colour and dynamic. As such, the term is far removed from Schoenberg's *Klangfarbenmelodie*, which implied the organisation of progressions of 'tone-colours' according to an inner logic.²⁶⁹

In the foreword to his 1904 *Alte Meister* edition Straube pointed out that the *Thomaskirche* organ itself implied a specific performance style, regardless of repertoire. He wrote that 'only on the rarest occasions are the effects of registration intended to produce screaming contrasts. They should rather, as the resources of the *Thomaskirche*-organ in Leipzig permit, grow out of a unified *Farbenakkord*'.²⁷⁰ This essentially German conception of organ sound implies transitional dynamics, and the gradual alteration of colour that results from the blended ideal in registration as set forth by Max Allihn under section 3.5 below.

As such, Straube's use of the term *Farbenakkord* is close but not identical to the concept presented by Rudolz in *Die Registrierkunst des Orgelspiels in ihren grundlegenden Formen* (Leipzig, 1913) under the heading, 'The formation of a *Farbenakkord*':

Without changing manuals or altering stops the registral expression may be modified if the colours of manuals II and III are added to manual I, which transforms the sound of manual I into a *Farbenakkord* consisting of manuals I + II + III. This *Farbenakkord* can be split up into its component parts by uncoupling either or both of the manuals II and III from manual I, so that, apart from I + II + III, the combinations available on manual I are I + II, I + III, and manual I alone. This latter manual is the common denominator in colour, which can unite the most varied colours in a well-rounded ensemble, even if manuals II and III differ significantly in colour from one another, and from manual I.²⁷¹

²⁶⁷ The term *Farbenakkord* was introduced by Straube in the foreword to his 1904 *Alte Meister* edition. See below.

²⁶⁸ See section 1.1 of this chapter

²⁶⁹ In Hambraeus 42 Bengt Hambraeus attempted to draw a parallel between Straube's term *Farbenakkord* and Schoenberg's *Klangfarbenmelodie*.

²⁷⁰ 'Die Wirkungen der angegebenen Registrierung sind in den seltensten Fällen als schreiende Kontrasteffekte gedacht. Sie sollen vielmehr, wie es das Klangmaterial der Thomasorgel in Leipzig z.B. zuläßt, aus einem einheitlichen Farbenakkord herauswachsen...' This excerpt is quoted a number of times in Straube literature, for instance, by Karl Hasse in KS 163/4.

²⁷¹ Rudolz 19. 'Zerlegungen eines Farbenakkordes... Ohne daß ein Manualwechsel stattfindet und die Handregistratur irgendwelchen Veränderungen unterzogen wird, läßt sich der registrative Ausdruck insofern modifizieren, als zur Farbe A die farbe B und C hinzutritt, wodurch sich das Klanggebiet des ersten Manuals zu einem Farbenakkord, bestehend aus den Summanden A+B+C, erweitert. Dieser Farbenakkord kann durch Abkopplung je eines, beziehungsweise beider Manuale zerlegt werden, so daß man auf dem ersten Manual neben A+B+C die Mischungen A+B und A+C sowie die selbstbestehende Farbe A gewinnt. Letztere ist das den Mischungen gemeinsame Farbdifferential, welches – selbst wenn B und C voneinander und im Vergleich mit A noch so sehr Koloristisch abweichen – als einigendes Element auch die verschiedenartigsten Farben zu einem abgerundeten Klangkomplex zusammenzieht.'

Despite the unifying function of manual I, Rudolz's explanation concerns a more overtly colouristic registration practice than can have been intended by Straube's use of the term, and the corresponding oppositional use of the manuals in Straube's Reger editions has already been discussed under section 2.2. Where differing tone colours are consciously opposed to one another in Straube's Reger editions, the registrations are generally inspired by the rhetorical nature of the music, or by formal concerns, and may be classified as a departure from the norm of blended sound. It is clear from the foreword to the *Alte Meister* edition, however, that Straube's *Farbenakkord* refers purely to unity and not to opposition of sound. This corresponds to Rudolz's second analysis of colour in organ registration, which deals with transitions between coupled manuals, whereby 'within a phrase it is a precondition that the manual whose sound is added or subtracted by a change of manual should be subordinate to the manual immediately above or below it, both in dynamic and in colour'.²⁷²

Paradoxically, Straube's term *Farbenakkord* has more to do with the subjection of colour than the soloistic exploitation of the resources of the 'modern' organ. Registrations are based on the combination of stops of equal pitch but varied scaling within the coupled-through system, and ease of movement between manuals is a priority. Straube's *Farbenakkord* and the blended ideal represent an attitude to organ registration far removed from the flamboyant effects (*Effekthascherei*) so abhorred by Reger and many commentators on the Romantic organ.²⁷³

3 Blended sound

3.1 Organ registration and orchestral texture

In a plea for sonority in organ registration, J.J. Seidel (1843)²⁷⁴ justified the combination of stops of the same pitch by analogy with (Classical) orchestral texture in which four-part string writing is doubled by wind instruments. He suggested that for soft registrations all 8' manual stops should be combined.²⁷⁵ Widor wrote similarly in 1904 that standard organ sound results from the combination of 8' stops that corresponds to the body of strings in the orchestra.²⁷⁶

However, the similarity of this blended sound to orchestral texture was rejected by Karg-Elert. Like Seidel, he was obviously referring to a Classical conception of orchestration when he commented on the nature of organ sound:

The polychromaticism of the organ is of a completely different nature, although it possesses stops which are most excellent imitations of orchestral instruments...But a four-part texture played on the stops flute,

²⁷² Ibid. 20. 'Ein solcher Übergang in geschlossener Phrase setzt voraus, daß das Manual, dessen Klang durch einen Wechsel addiert oder subtrahiert wird, dynamisch sowohl wie koloristisch untergeordnet registriert ist....'

²⁷³ See, e.g., a letter from Reger to Hugo Riemann in Gurlitt A 83, cited in Chapter 7, section 3.

²⁷⁴ Seidel 98 & 99

²⁷⁵ That even in the 1840s some held fast to the early and high-Baroque principle forbidding the duplication of stops of the same pitch is undoubtedly due to inadequate wind systems that could not supply enough wind for fuller registrations.

²⁷⁶ In a new supplement to Berlioz's standard work on orchestration (1843) by Widor (1904). Widor's contribution was translated into German by Hugo Riemann (1905).

oboe, clarinet and bassoon would result in quadruple parallelism: four flutes (down to the impossible bass register), four oboes [...etc]. In order to imitate a simple wind quartet on the organ with any degree of realism, one would have to spread these four instruments over four separate manuals...It is clear that a literal transference of orchestral texture to the organ is quite impossible...Although the imitation of orchestral instruments can be so deceptive in single lines, the fuller the texture...the more the typical, characteristic [organ] sound gains the upper hand.²⁷⁷

In Classical orchestral works strings are indeed frequently doubled from treble to bass respectively by flutes, oboes, clarinets and bassoons.²⁷⁸ However, as already noted under section 1.3, this unbalanced and ‘accidental’ orchestral sound was abhorrent to Wagner, especially as oboes were usually assigned higher parts than clarinets. Altogether different is the manner in which Wagnerian orchestration unfolds a texture in which Wagner’s ‘deepest art’, the *Kunst des Übergangs*, can flourish. It divides its attention between the exploitation of the rich resources of colour available to the composer and the subjugation of colour in order to create a unified texture, both vertically (harmonically) and horizontally (melodically), within a total orchestral sound. The flexibility of texture in Wagner’s orchestral thought approached an ideal in organ sound which evolved over two centuries (from at least G. Silbermann²⁷⁹ to the advent of the

²⁷⁷ In his harmonium treatise *Die Kunst des Registrierens*, Karg-Elert 45/46. *Gänzlich anderer Natur ist die Polychromie der Orgel. Wohl besitzt sie die Stimmen des Orchesters in meist ausgezeichneter Imitation: ...Aber ein vierstimmiges Spiel bei eingestellten Registern: Flöte, Hoboe, Klarinette, Fagott würde stets vierfache Parallelismen ergeben: 4 Flöten (bis in die unmögliche Baßlage), 4 Hoboen (ebenfalls bis in die Baßlagen reichend), 4 Klarinetten, 4 Fagotte (bis in unmögliche Diskantlage hinaufsteigend!). Um ein einfaches Holzblasquartettsätzchen auf der Orgel nur einigermaßen täuschend zu imitieren, bedürfte es einer Verteilung dieser 4 Instrumente auf 4 isolierte Klaviaturen...Man ersieht, daß jede “wörtliche” Orchesterübertragung für Orgel durchaus unmöglich ist...So täuschend die Orchesterinstrumente auch in Einzelspiel nachgeahmt werden, je voller gespielt wird...um so mehr tritt der wirkliche Orchesterklang zurück, um so mehr gewinnt der typische, individuelle “Harmonium/[Orgel]klang” die Oberhand.*

²⁷⁸ As Strauss put it in the foreword to his 1904 edition of Berlioz’s orchestration manual, ‘(Apart from in Bach’s organ fugues) the origin of the symphony orchestra lies mainly in the string quartets of Haydn and Mozart. Every symphonic utterance of both these masters exhibits the character of the polyphonic possibilities of the string quartet to such an extent that in style, thematic material, melodic voice-leading and figuration, one could (with a grain of salt, of course) almost call them string quartets with obligato wind and reinforcing tutti instruments.’ (*Der Ursprung des symphonischen Orchesters liegt (außer in Bachs Orgelfugen) hauptsächlich in den Streichquartetten Haydns und Mozarts. Alle symphonischen Äußerungen dieser beiden Meister tragen in Stil, Thematik, melodischer Linienführung und Figuration so sehr den Charakter aller polyphonen Möglichkeiten des Streichquartetts, daß man sie (stets cum grano salis natürlich) fast als Streichquartette mit obligaten Holzbläsern und tuttiverstärkenden Lärminstrumenten (Hörnern, Trompeten, Pauken) bezeichnen kann.*)

²⁷⁹ The blended principle in organ building and playing goes back at least to the *ars combinatoria* (Frotscher) of the late Baroque. Thomas Harmon, in *The registration of J.S. Bach’s Organ Works*, listed the following qualities, many of which promote blend, as being found by G. Silbermann when he returned to Saxony in 1710.

1. disappearance of extremes of scaling
2. opposition of manuals according to their scaling and strength rather than sound characteristics
3. mixing of stops and manuals
4. loss of spatial divisions of Werk
5. upperwork replaced by 8' stops
6. decrease in the number of reeds, especially 4' and 2'
7. decline of the *Rückpositiv*
8. cultivation of fusion of sound and gradual dynamics

Interest in blended sound gathered impetus in the nineteenth century, particularly as pneumatic systems could provide adequate wind for multiple 8' registrations.

Orgelbewegung), in which homophonic fusion superseded the horizontal isolation of a single line, and the search for a total blend replaced contrast of space and colour.

3.2 Wagner's assimilation of organ sound

Richard Strauss, in the foreword to his 1904 revised edition of Berlioz's 1843/1855 orchestration manual, and Theodor Adorno in his *Versuch über Wagner* (1952), have both drawn attention to the problem faced by Wagner in *Lohengrin*, Act I, Scene II: the simulation of 'banal' (Adorno) organ sound within an orchestral context. Adorno wrote that Wagner wished to evoke allegorically the poetic idea of a wedding by an imitation of organ sound, but that this idea had to fit in with the continuity of form (*bruchlosen Formtotalität*) that was the essence of Wagner's polemic against traditional opera. For this reason, the woodwind had to blend as closely as possible with the strings while evoking the rigidity of organ sound.²⁸⁰

In order to achieve a total blend and to approach organ sound, Wagner introduced triple wind into his scores, which necessitated the addition of a bass clarinet and cor anglais, instruments hitherto used mainly for solo purposes in the orchestra. By this means a triadic and harmonic unity of sound was formed within families of wind instruments.²⁸¹ This vertical, chordal blend within a single instrumental family was complemented by a horizontal linear blend between wind families. Great care was taken in the blending of the instruments. Adorno wrote that in the antecedent of the *Lohengrin* example (Act I/Scene II, bars 9–13) the doubling of flutes and clarinets is not merely intended to bolster the flutes, but, more importantly, to alter the colour of the sound. In this way the specific character of both the flute and the clarinet is subjugated, and one cannot tell how the sound has been formed. Individuality of sound was sacrificed to greater flexibility of the whole and the ability of these wind units to blend into the total orchestral sound. Adorno went on to explain how the character of the oboe lies between that of the flute (lonely and innocent) and the clarinet (social and worldly), and therefore is perfectly suited to taking over the preceding sounds unnoticeably. Blend, therefore, was not cultivated for its own sake, but for structural finesse, in this case the smooth transition from one phrase to another.

According to Adorno, it is precisely in this quality of blend that Wagner approached organ sound. Strauss, commenting on *Lohengrin*, wrote that 'Wagner understood how to elicit effects from the orchestra in such a virtuoso fashion that he could defeat the organ on its own terms!'²⁸²

The horizontal and vertical nature of blend in Wagnerian sound, as exemplified in the *Lohengrin* example, was not only a precondition of the *Kunst des Übergangs*, but provided a point of contact between organ and orchestral sound worlds, and in this important respect put the lie to Karg-Elert's assertion that the organ was non-orchestral by nature. The properties of the organ were assimilated by the Wagnerian orchestra. Wagner achieved a vertical and horizontal fusion of sound which gave rise to an orchestral texture in which 'each successive moment blends into

²⁸⁰ Adorno, op. cit. 89

²⁸¹ In organ building this finds a parallel in the introduction (for reasons of technical efficiency, see footnote 69) of stop chests that provide wind for any given stop from a single source, thereby promoting harmonic blend within stops, as opposed to slider chests, which foster a blend between stops for a given note.

²⁸² Berlioz/Strauss Foreword 3, '...wo die Orgelklänge, die Wagner so virtuos dem Orchester zu entlocken versteht, die "Königin der Instrumente" selbst besiegen.'

the next' (Boulez),²⁸³ 'form as "architecture" is replaced by form as a "web"' (Dahlhaus),²⁸⁴ and in which 'the categories of orchestration, harmony and counterpoint blend into one another' (Wagner).²⁸⁵

It is true that Wagner's music, and Reger's too, abounds in violent contrasts of dynamic and colour. This is well illustrated by the opening pages of Reger's *Wachet auf*, op. 52/2, possibly inspired by *Parsifal*.²⁸⁶ Here, loud and soft dynamics and 'very bright' (*sehr licht*) and 'very dark' (*sehr dunkel*) registrations are opposed. Nevertheless, these colouristic devices coexist with a more subtle attitude to scoring and registration that values transitional effects rather than oppositions in sound. In this connection Dahlhaus referred to Wagner's 'paradoxical combination of an "art of transition"...and the shock effect'.²⁸⁷

Much of Reger's organ music values gradual dynamic alterations and non-conspicuousness in the addition of stops. It would be difficult, for instance, to interpret Reger's ubiquitous *sempre poco a poco crescendo* markings in any other light. Reger demands an approach which corresponds in some measure to the attitude to sound represented by Wagner's *Kunst des Übergangs*, for which the ideal of blend is an important prerequisite.

3.3 Blend in organ building

The art of organ building and organ playing in late-nineteenth-century Germany was founded on the principle of blend achieved by means of the combination of stops of differing construction. As early as 1843 Seidel formulated two rules for the combination of stops, the first of which declared that:

...in registering, stops of opposing character should be combined. One stop combines sympathetically with the other, whereby the duller sounding stops are enhanced by the brighter ones, and the brighter ones are toned down by the duller ones...In soft performances, where maybe two or three stops are combined, one must be careful never to combine stops of similar voicing, as otherwise the extremes of brightness and dullness will not be bridged. It is just like two pictures, one of which has too much light, the other too much shadow: both have an unfavourable effect on the eye. The same unpleasantness is true of the ear when one of the two incorrect principles in organ registration is perceived.²⁸⁸

Seidel's declaration attests to the goal of blend in organ sound. In combination the differing characteristics of the various organ stops complement and compensate for one another in the interest of a balanced and sonorous texture. The shortcomings of one stop are overcome by the

²⁸³ Boulez Preface

²⁸⁴ Dahlhaus B 126

²⁸⁵ Quoted under section 1.1

²⁸⁶ According to Wolfgang Stockmeier the opening pages of *Wachet auf* probably derived from *Parsifal*, see Stockmeier A 24.

²⁸⁷ Dahlhaus A 342

²⁸⁸ Seidel, op. cit. 104. 'Es müssen also Stimmen von entgegengesetztem Character mit einander verbunden werden, diese treten dann einander helfend entgegen, indem die schneidende Stimme die dumpf klingende hebt und die dumpf klingende das Schneidende der andern mildert...Bei sanften Vorträgen, wo man vielleicht 2 oder 3 Register mit einander verbindet, muß man stets darauf sehen, daß man nie Stimmen von gleicher Intonation zusammenstellt, weil sonst keine Vermittelung des entweder zu schneidend oder zu dumpf klingenden Orgeltons eintritt.'

strengths of another, and *vice versa*. This principle was widely recognised in the second half of the nineteenth century. Töpfer wrote that ‘all reeds...must have stops of contrasting character drawn along with them, as only in combination is a beautiful tone produced’,²⁸⁹ and T. Mann wrote of the organ in the *Christuskirche* in Berlin (Sauer 1864, II/18) that ‘the character of each stop is clearly differentiated from the others, which is surely the reason for the clarity and radiance of the full sound’.²⁹⁰

E.F. Richter applied this principle specifically to 8' pitch in his *Katechismus der Orgel* (Leipzig, 1896):

The majority [of registrations] and the most beautiful *Klangfarben* result from the combination of two, three or four 8' stops. With two stops one should choose stops of different construction (*Intonation*) as a basic rule, that is, with a *Gamba* not a *Salicet* or *Fugara* but a *Gedackt*, *Hohlflöte*, *Rohrflöte* or a fluty *Gemshorn*...There may be cases, however, where it is desirable for whole movements or isolated passages to be registered with many or all of the string stops, just as, by contrast, all the soft gedackts and rounded (*volle*) stops may be used.²⁹¹

The system of wind distribution by means of stop chests that gradually superseded the old slider system, however, favoured harmonic (vertical) blend within single stops, as distinct from a blend between stops for single notes.²⁹² It became all the more important, therefore, that the creation of a good (horizontal) blend between stops was a priority of organ builder and voicer. The views of the experienced voicer, Rudolf Aebischer, on the voicing of Romantic organs are strikingly similar to Adorno's analysis of Wagner's simulation of organ sound:

In the choice of ever more foundation stops it is all-important that not only an accumulation of stops but a new colour is called into being...The organist should be prompted by the characteristic voicing of the individual stops to mix consciously those colours that blend together successfully, and not just draw a few 8' stops at random. A prerequisite for this is, of course, perfectly constructed and voiced pipework.²⁹³

²⁸⁹ Töpfer/Allihn 757. ‘...fast alle Zungenstimmen, vornehmlich diejenigen, welche durchschlagende Zungen oder kurze Aufsätze habe, müssen Stimmen von entgegengesetztem Charakter neben sich...z.B. Hohlflöte, Bordun u.s.w., weil erst durch eine solche Verbindung ein schöner Ton hervorgebracht wird.’

²⁹⁰ Cited in Falkenberg B, op. cit. 20. ‘Jedes Register prägt sich in dem Charakter von dem anderen scharf aus, weshalb auch das volle Werk diese Klarheit und den Glanz haben muß.’

²⁹¹ Richter, E.F. 223. ‘Die meisten und schönsten Klangfarben entstehen aber durch Zusammenstellung von zwei, drei, vier achtfüßigen Stimmen. Bei zwei Stimmen wird der Grundsatz gelten, Stimmen gleicher Tonhöhe von verschiedener Intonation zu wählen, also zu *Gamba* nicht *Salicet*, *Fugara*, sondern *Gedackt*, *Hohlflöte*, *Rohrflöte* oder ein flötendes *Gemshorn*...Doch dürften Fälle vorkommen, wo man ganze Sätze oder einzelne Stellen mit vielen oder allen schneidenden Stimmen auszuführen wünscht, wie man im Gegensatz bisweilen alle oder mehrere sanfte, gedeckte und volle Stimmen verwendet.’

²⁹² The introduction of *Kegel*-chests in German organ building seems not to have been motivated by considerations of sound (See Busch D, and H.G. Klais in ‘War die Kegellade ein Irrtum?’, both in *Mundus Organorum: Festschrift Walter Supper zum 70. Geburtstag* (Berlin 1978), 74 and 176. *Kegel*-chests were favoured for their prevention of ciphers; their improved supply of wind to each individual pipe, which remained unaltered in full organ; their advantage for the construction of fixed combinations; and for the greater dimensions of the wind chests, and hence the increased number of stops they allow. Klais wrote that ‘nowhere in the literature of the nineteenth century is there a reference to the mutual effect (*kommunizierende Wirkung*) within single stops of the stop chest, a quality which, not only in early forms with hanging valves, had a beneficial effect on the blend of homophonic organ tone.’

²⁹³ Aebischer 14. ‘Bij de keuze van steeds meer grondregisters is het immers belangrijk dat er niet slechts een cumulatie van registers, maar ook een nieuwe registerkleur ontstaat. Een goed romantisch klankbeeld onderscheidt zich niet alleen door een plenum met een bepaalde Gravität, maar vooral ook door een groot, dynamisch bereik; verder door interessante, fraai afgeronde pianissimo-, piano-, en mezzoforteklanken. De intonatie moet op de

Harmonic unity, or vertical blend, was fostered in stop-chest organs by a communal wind supply for each stop, as it was in *Lohengrin* by the scoring for triple wind. The art of horizontal blend between stops or instruments was raised to new heights in organ voicing and registration practices, and in orchestration. As in *Lohengrin*, where the individuality of single instruments was sacrificed to the flexibility of the whole, the organist selected combinations of stops of differing character whose interlocking series of overtones formed a full and blended sound that permitted subtlety and flexibility of registration.

The principle of variety in construction led to the presentation of a wide spectrum of overtones even within 8' sound,²⁹⁴ which ensured that the total blend was neither too heavily biased towards fundamental sound nor too weak in fundamental and too rich in overtones. This was important for relative inconspicuousness in the addition of further stops. For instance, depending on dynamics, the addition of a string stop to a combination composed solely of 8' gedeckts would obviously be much more noticeable than the addition of, say, a Gemshorn to a combination that included gedeckts and strings. Blended combinations based on the principle of variety in construction are therefore more flexible, and essential to the creation of a transitional art in organ registration.²⁹⁵

3.4 Qualities of blend in Sauer organs

Sauer organs excelled in the achievement of a balanced and blended sound. T. Mann described the sound of the Nikolaikirche in Frankfurt a.d.Oder in the following terms: 'the mixtures and mutations are voiced in such a way that they give the whole sound less brilliance than fullness. The reeds do not dominate the full organ sound, but blend into the total sound and lend it radiance and dignity'.²⁹⁶ And O. Wangemann wrote of the organ of the Peterskirche in Leipzig that 'the sound of the full organ is a round ensemble, an impressive mass of sound, a powerful tone: no mixture sticks out...'.²⁹⁷

That Reger valued these qualities is evident from his criticism of the organ in the cathedral in Basel, where Karl Straube performed op. 27 and op. 57 on 14 June 1903. Reger wrote to T. Kroyer on 25 June that 'the disposition is such that the 8' and 4' stops have no tonal character,

organist de uitwerking hebben, dat hij wat de klank betreft niet eenvoudigweg een paar willekeurige achtvoets registers trekt, maar juist vanwege het specifieke karakter van de afzonderlijke registers heel bewust bij elkaar passende klankkleuren kiest. Voorwaarde hiervoor is natuurlijk perfect gemaakt en gemensureerd pijpwerk.'

²⁹⁴ To some extent, the artificial series of overtones in Classical organs was replaced by the density and complexity of natural overtones in the 'modern' organ (see also Chapter 3, section 4.8 on page 63). A prevalent viewpoint regarded mixtures and mutations as archaic relics of the Classical organ, as witness C. Sattler in his *Orgelschule* (1913): 'Organs of earlier times possessed hardly any *Charakterstimmen* (e.g. *Gamba*, *Salicional*, *Violine*) and were therefore poor in upper partials. To compensate for this failing, the organ builders built artificial ranks of overtones in the form of octaves, quints, mutations and mixtures.'

²⁹⁵ In this sense, Karg-Elert's indication for registration in *Nun sich der Tag geendet hat*, op. 78/15, 'flexible, but dark in colour', suggests a balanced ensemble somewhat biased towards fundamental sound.

²⁹⁶ Mann 157 ff., also Falkenberg 124. 'Die gemischten Stimmen sind so intoniert, daß sie dem Werke weniger Glanz als mächtige Fülle geben. Die Rohrwerke herrschen im vollen Werke nicht vor, sondern sie vereinigen sich zum Ganzen und verleihen demselben Glanz und Würde.'

²⁹⁷ Wangemann, op. cit. 160, cited in Falkenberg B, op. cit. 141. 'Der Ton der vollen Orgel ist ein rundes Ensemble, eine gewaltige Tonmasse, ein mächtiger Ton: keine Mixtur tritt hervor.'

and as soon as the 2' stops and mixtures are added the effect is exaggerated and screams in a coarse fashion...²⁹⁸

The following excerpt from a description by Straube's predecessor, Carl Piutti, of the Sauer organ in the *Thomaskirche* leaves no doubt as to the blended nature of the sound of Straube's own organ in Leipzig:

This restraint in the interests of a general harmonic effect, the absorption of the individual voices into the whole, despite their sharply pronounced individuality, is a general characteristic of the artistic integrity of the Sauer organ. Like the orchestral musician, the violinist or flautist, whose chief task is to adapt the sound of his instrument in order to blend with that of another, here this has likewise been our master's chief concern: and he has succeeded! One might say that Sauer has taken a step forward along the way paved by Silbermann. Here the voicing of the *Mixtur*, *Cornett*, *Trompete* and *Posaune* – thorough bombasts in many an otherwise well-disposed organ – is as refined as it is brilliant; the *Trompete* 8', for instance, is rendered so full and yet so mild that it needs just a few strong 8' stops to disguise it, that is, to make it serviceable as a solo stop, yet in combination with all the other stops on the organ it still dominates... It is difficult to single out particular stops from among the great number on this organ, none of which has the same sound as another, yet all of which blend so easily in smaller groups, quite regardless of their affiliation to the wider families of principals, strings, reeds, or the flute or gedeckt choruses...²⁹⁹

3.5 Blend as an essentially German preference in organ sound

It is ironic that precisely this quality of blend once imitated and conquered by Wagner, now became a preoccupation of turn-of-the-century organ building and of vital importance to the transitional nature of Straube's 'modern' organ style. Although the concern for horizontal and vertical blend in organ texture was partly a logical extension of registration practices dating back as least as far as the early-eighteenth century, the influence of Wagner's textural sophistication cannot be denied. Where Wagner once adopted blended sound to evoke rigid organ sound, organ sound now concentrated on a heightened form of the blended ideal in the interest of a truly Wagnerian flexibility of sound and registration.

²⁹⁸ '...die Disposition derart ist, daß die Orgel in den 8' u. 4' Registern ohne Klangcharakter ist, plötzlich nach Hinzunahme der 2' u. Mixturen übermässig u. nicht edel "schreit" Unpublished postcard, which may be found in the Staatliche Bibliothek, Regensburg

²⁹⁹ Reprinted in Böhme 16ff. 'Dieses Zurücktreten im Interesse einer harmonischen Gesamtwirkung, das Aufgehen der einzelnen Stimmen im Ganzen, unbeschadet ihrer scharf ausgeprägten Individualität, ist überhaupt ein Merkmal für die künstlerische Vollendung der Sauer'schen Orgel. Was dem Künstler im Orchester, Geiger oder Flötist, bei der Intonation Hauptaufgabe ist; den Ton seines Instruments elastisch zu machen zur Verbindung mit dem eines anderen, das ist auch hier unserem Meister die Hauptsache gewesen: und es ist ihm gelungen! Man kann wohl sagen, dass auf dem Wege, den ein Silbermann betrat, Sauer einen Schritt vorwärts gethan hat. Mixtur, Cornett, Trompete, Posaune - wahre Grossmäuler in so mancher gut disponirten Orgel, sind hier ebenso vornehm wie glänzend intonirt; die Trompete 8' z.B. im Hauptclavier ist so voll und verhältnissmässig weich gehalten, dass sie durch einige kräftige 8'-Stimmen bereits gedeckt, d.h. als Solostimme brauchbar gemacht wird, während sie doch im Verein mit allen übrigen Stimmen der Orgel noch dominirt...Es ist schwer, Einzelne hervorzuheben aus der Zahl der Stimmen dieser Orgel, deren keine mit der anderen den gleichen Klang hat, und die doch wieder sich zu engeren Gruppen so willig vereinigen, ganz abgesehen von ihrer Zugehörigkeit zu den grossen Familien der Principale, Streicher, Zungenstimmen, des Flöten oder Gedactchores...'

This essentially German preference for blended sound may be amplified by statements made by Max Allihn in *Zeitschrift für Instrumentenbau* (April 1901)³⁰⁰ in defence of the German organ aesthetic.³⁰¹ According to Allihn, many 8's together form a sound that does not have the characteristic hallmark of single stops, organs that emphasise fundamental sound do not cultivate strong oppositions of sound, and in changing manuals the unity of the musical line should be maintained.

That fusion was an essentially German characteristic in organ sound is demonstrated by Allihn's citation of the organ of Notre Dame in Paris as having five manuals that are as five strangers to one another, instead of five different expressions of the same person. It was this characteristic, along with a rich polyphonic style that provided points of contact between the German organ aesthetic and Wagnerian orchestral style and lent a degree of legitimacy to an organ style based on the dominant, Wagnerian conception of sound around the turn of the century. By way of confirmation of the validity of 'orchestral' organ style, P. Wolfrum³⁰² wrote in Strauss's 1904/5 edition of Berlioz's orchestration manual that 'without doubt certain aspects of organ style had been adopted by the orchestra'.³⁰³

3.6 Straube's blended registrations

Within a blended conception of sound, the coupled-through system was essential for variety of dynamic and colour, as already suggested above in Rudolz's explanation of the *Farbenakkord*. E.F. Richter wrote³⁰⁴ that 'the manual couplers allow, firstly, the combination of all stops, which displays the entire strength of the organ, and, secondly, [selective] blending between manuals of the various types of stops, which can elicit a variety of *Klangfarben*'.

To a large extent, successful blend in the 'modern' organ depended on disposition and voicing. In louder music particularly the selection of stops was often predetermined by the *Walze*, even if the actual sound was dependent on the use of manuals, which varies a great deal in Straube's Reger editions. Therefore, Straube's listed registrations mostly concern the lower dynamic levels, for which Straube provided a whole range of further soft 'colours' in his proposals for the extension of the *Thomaskirche* organ in 1908 (for a list of the soft 8' stops of the *Thomaskirche* organ see Table 4.2 below).

In these softer dynamic areas Straube's system of base registrations³⁰⁵ relieved the *Walze* of its responsibilities. Indeed, the great variety of his soft registrations shows that in these Straube rarely adopted the exact order of stops in the *Walze*. Even excluding the many registrations that may be termed unusual or extraordinary, an enormous variety of combinations of contrasting 8'

³⁰⁰ 514 and 541/542

³⁰¹ These were put forward in the context of the German/French controversy provoked by E. Rupp in the pages of the same journal (See also Chapter 7, section 2).

³⁰² Strauss called on Reger's friend, Philipp Wolfrum, to rewrite the chapter on the organ.

³⁰³ Strauss, op. cit. 261. 'Es ist zweifellos auch vom Orgelstil manches in den Orchesterstil übergegangen.'

³⁰⁴ Richter, E.F., op. cit. 54. 'Die Manuskoppel gewährt erstens die Möglichkeit, alle Stimmen, also die ganze Kraft und Stärke der Orgel, zu benutzen, zweitens, die auf verschiedene Manuale verteilten Stimmengattungen in mannigfaltiger Weise zu vermischen und auf diese Weise verschiedene Klangfarben hervorzubringen.'

³⁰⁵ For an explanation of base registrations see under Chapter 2, section 3.3

stops is exhibited. Within this variety a number of patterns emerge: the exclusion of the 8' principal stops on all three manuals (even in combinations with 4' stops); the frequent or total omission of certain stops; the recurrence of certain combinations (on manual III *Aeoline*, *Gedackt*, *Gemshorn*, *Flûte d'amour*, on manual II *Dolce* and *Gedackt*, or *Dolce*, *Gedackt*, (*Salicional*), *Rohrflöte*, and on manual I *Dulciana*, *Flauto dolce*, *Gemshorn*).

The *Doppelflöte* of manual I, a stop almost certainly detrimental to blend,³⁰⁶ and the *Schalmei* of manual II are never listed in Straube's registrations. These stops would only be included above a certain dynamic level when introduced by the *Walze* or where blanket descriptions would indicate their inclusion, for instance, 'soft (*weich*) 8' and 4' stops on all manuals' (*Benedictus*, op. 59/9), and 'all 8' and 4' flue stops of manual I' (*Praeludium*, op. 85/4). The *Salicional* of manual II is often passed over, at least in combinations of three stops, and the *Gedackt* of manual I almost always avoided (also in registrations with 4' and 2' stops).

The omission of this latter stop is perhaps due to the usual inclusion of two other similarly constructed stops in the ensemble, the *gedecks* of manuals II and III. Whatever the reason, it is obvious in these and other cases where stops are omitted³⁰⁷ that Straube consciously blended the resources available to him in a very specific way, and did not merely follow the pattern set by the *Walze* in the *Thomaskirche* organ, the order of which could presumably be read off at the console, at least within each pitch level.³⁰⁸ Interestingly, none of the four soft 8' stops omitted totally or commonly in Straube's registrations was introduced by him in the 1908 extension of the organ: the *Gedackt* of manual I and *Salicional* of manual II were part of the original 1888 specification, and the *Doppelflöte* of manual I and the *Schalmei* of manual II were introduced in the 1902 rebuild.³⁰⁹

Only on manual III, in combinations of four or more stops, was the probable *Walze* order adopted as a matter of course in Straube's soft 8' registrations. Here, the order *Aeoline*, *Gedackt*, *Gemshorn*, *Flûte d'amour*, *Quintatön*, etc. well illustrates the principle of the combination of stops of varied construction. The first two of these stops in combination may be considered a miniature prototype for the registration of Reger's organ music within the blended ideal. This registral paradigm combines a stop rich in upper partials but almost totally lacking in fundamental sound with a stop that places almost exclusive emphasis on fundamental sound.

In Straube's edition of Reger's *Fuge*, op. 59/6, the bright/dark pairing of *Aeoline* and *Gedackt* is followed by the successive addition of the remaining three stops listed above, before the build-up is continued in bar 22 when the left hand moves to manual II. In the pedal too, a bright/dark pairing is evident both at 16' pitch (*Salicetbaß* and *Lieblich Gedackt*) and at 8' pitch (*Dulciana* and *Baßflöte*). In Walter Fischer's lecture on the performance of Reger's organ music at the

³⁰⁶ Of this stop J.I. Wedgwood, in his *Dictionary of Organ Stops* (London 1905), wrote that 'the tone is full, liquid, and weighty, but inclined to be somewhat dull and devoid of distinctive quality'. Schweitzer 26 states, 'I know modern organs on which even the combined 8' foundation stops of manual I are unbearable, not to mention our *Doppelflöten*...in some organs I can still hear the *Doppelflöte* in the full organ sound'. And in *Zeitschrift für Instrumentenbau* (1900) 436 ff. Rupp complained of the *Doppelflöte* in a discussion of forced sound in modern organ building.

³⁰⁷ In combinations of 8' and 16' stops the *Gemshorn* and *Flûte d'amour* of manual III, and the *Gedackt* and *Gemshorn* of manual I tended to be omitted.

³⁰⁸ See Chapter 2, section 3.5 for a projected reconstruction of the *Walze* in the *Thomaskirche*

³⁰⁹ Scheffler 36 & 37

1910 *Reger-Fest* in Dortmund he reduced the principles of Reger registration to their simplest form. His ‘*zart streichende*’ *pp* registration consisted of a *Viola 4'* and the familiar, archetypal blend of *Aeoline 8'* and *Gedackt 8'*, a registration which Karg-Elert may well have termed a ‘flexible, but bright-sounding combination’.³¹⁰

Rudolf Rudolz wrote in 1913 that ‘the third guideline for the drafting of a disposition requires variety of sound within the stops of one family. Not only should stops that clearly define the typical family characteristic be present, but also those that inflect these stops in order to provide smooth transitions to other families of stops’.³¹¹

Predating this guideline, the distinct pairing of bright and dark stops³¹² in the layout of the foundation stops in the original Sauer organ of the *Thomaskirche*, to which Thoralf Roick drew attention in the context of the realisation of a successful stop crescendo,³¹³ was already clouded in Sauer’s and Straube’s 1908 extension of the organ. Significantly, the extension to the original instrument mainly concerned the addition of a series of soft 8' stops that supplied a variety of intermediary colours extending the palette of the instrument beyond the mere provision of stops of opposing colour. Thus, although the principle of uniting stops of varied construction was omnipresent in Straube’s registrations, the oppositions in timbre were often mollified by the inclusion of the many forms of intermediary 8's. This gave rise to a heightened form of expressive registration based on minute variations in colour and dynamic, which favoured transitional dynamics.

Töpfer stated that ‘when strengthening organ sound by the addition of stops of the same pitch, it is usual to give them different scalings, as this difference in colour makes the increase in volume more noticeable’.³¹⁴ An inverse reading of this maxim shows how important it is for inconspicuousness in registration that the initial registration is a composite sound, preferably including, as in the above examples, both stops biased towards fundamental sound and those rich in upper partials. The creation of a broad spectrum of blended sound consisting of differently constructed unison stops as a point of departure (Rinck, 1819) relegates the addition of further unison stops to a filling-in function in terms of their overtones, which by Töpfer’s definition renders their appearances and disappearances relatively inconspicuous. It has previously been noted that Sauer organs were prized for this quality of their sound, in which no stop obtrudes, be it of 8' pitch, a reed or a mixture.

This non-conspicuousness, the ability of stops of any volume or pitch to blend into the total sound was an essential requirement of transitional style, and could only be realised in the context of a massed sound, an ensemble of stops that complemented, compensated for and covered one another. Straube subscribed to this principle of ensemble in registration wholeheartedly, and in

³¹⁰ C.f. footnote 72 above

³¹¹ Rudolz, op. cit. 10 & 11. ‘Die dritte Dispositionsbedingung verlangt die Klangunterschiede der Register gemeinsamer Familie. Es sollen Vertreter da sein, die den betreffenden typischen Charakter ganz klar ausprägen, aber auch solche, die ihn flektieren, um schließlich direkt Übergangsglieder nach anderen Familien zu bilden.’

³¹² Presumably Roick was here referring to the 8' pairs, *Principal/Concertflöte* and *Aeoline/Gedackt*, of the original 1888 Sauer organ in the *Thomaskirche*.

³¹³ In Roick Appendix 67

³¹⁴ Töpfer/Allihn, op. cit. 755. ‘Es ist üblich bei Verstärkung eines Tones durch Stimmen gleichen Fusses den verstärkenden Stimmen anderer Mensur zu geben als dem Haupttone. Es findet dann zugleich eine Änderung der Klangfarbe statt, wodurch die Verstärkung merklicher wird.’

his Reger editions only rarely prescribed registrations employing single stops.³¹⁵ The limited number of colouristic registrations in Straube's editions that concentrate exclusively on the bright side of the spectrum serve only to highlight the general practice from which they deviate. As noted in section 2.2, these mostly concern shimmering, ethereal effects employing the *Voix céleste* in a variety of combinations that emphasise upper partials at the expense of fundamental sound.

3.7 8' registrations

Rudolf Rudolz wrote that '8' rules as standard pitch, to which 4' and 16' relate in such a way that the 4' acts as a reinforcement of its first overtone (second partial), and the 16' as a counterpart to this. Therefore, the stops of these supplementary pitches should never be too numerous, in order that the primacy of the 8' pitch cannot be endangered.'³¹⁶ Max Allihn explained that the difference between French and German taste was that in Germany 8' tone was reinforced in the interest of a nobler, admittedly less dramatic sound.³¹⁷ And Straube wrote similarly to Hans Klotz that '8' sound predominated in [Reger's] conception of sound.'³¹⁸

As neither the principal stops, nor the *Doppelflöte* of manual I nor the *Schalmei* of manual II were ever used by Straube in soft combinations, his working resources in the soft 8' range of the *Thomaskirche* organ after 1908 (excluding also the *Voix céleste*) comprised 22 manual stops:

Table 4.2 Resources in the soft 8' range of the *Thomaskirche* organ after 1908 (excluding *Doppelflöte*, *Schalmei* and *Voix céleste*)

Manual III	Manual II	Manual I
<i>Aeoline</i>	<i>Dolce</i>	<i>Dulciana</i>
<i>Gedackt</i>	<i>Gedackt</i>	<i>Gedackt</i>
Gemshorn	Salicional	Flauto dolce
<i>Flûte d'amour</i>	<i>Rohrflöte</i>	<i>Gemshorn</i>
<i>Quintatön</i>	<i>Harmonica</i>	<i>Quintatön</i>
<i>Spitzflöte</i>	<i>Concertflöte</i>	<i>Flûte harmonique</i>
<i>Viola</i>	<i>Flûte harmonique</i>	<i>Geigenprincipal</i>
		<i>Gamba</i>

³¹⁵ These are discussed in section 2.2

³¹⁶ Rudolz, op. cit. 9 'Auf den Manualen herrscht der 8' als Normalton, dem sich der 4' und 16' so anreicht, daß der 4' als Verstärkung des ersten Obertons, der 16' als Pol zu diesem zu betrachten ist, daher Register dieser Nebenfußtöne nie so zahlreich sein dürfen, daß sie den Normalfußton gefährden könnten.'

³¹⁷ In NZfM (1901), 541

³¹⁸ In a letter dated 25 February 1944, KSB 173. 'der Achtfuß-Klang herrschte in dem Klangbewußtsein des Komponisten vor, [auch als sein Geist mit dem Schaffen der Orgelvariationen (op. 73) beschäftigt war.]'

According to a simple mathematical formula presented by E.F. Richter in 1896, $(2^n - 1) = S$,³¹⁹ where ‘n’ is the number of stops and ‘S’ the sum of the combinations, it can easily be calculated that the number of soft 8' registrations available to Straube from the 22 stops listed above (that is, excluding principals, *Doppelflöte*, *Schalmei* and *Voix céleste*) was 4,194,303. This figure gives some idea of the array of combinations available in a relatively small dynamic range, each with its own individual colour. It is interesting to note that the original 1888 disposition included only eleven soft 8' stops (excluding principals and *Voix céleste*, the *Doppelflöte* and *Schalmei* not yet having been introduced into the disposition), yielding a mere 2,047 theoretical registrations, which bears no comparison to the possibilities made available after Straube's 1908 extension. This figure is all the more staggering in view of the fact that it refers only to selected soft 8' stops and does not take into account the other 8' stops listed in this paragraph, the 8' and 4' registrations, the 8',4' and 2' registrations, the fuller registrations, the gapped registrations, any of the more unusual registrations, or the Walze registrations that abound in Straube's Reger editions.

In connection with the overestimation of the value of free as compared to fixed combinations, however, Dienel wrote that ‘enticing as the great number of mathematically calculable permutations of stops may be, the number of really usable combinations of stops on even the richest of manuals is relatively small’.³²⁰ Although Töpfer/Allihn erroneously reckoned the number of possible permutations provided by three 8' stops, one 4' and one 2' to be 120, they considered only about 10 to be worthwhile, as combinations such as 8'4'2', 8'2' and 4'2' were adjudged ‘impossible’.³²¹ (See below under sections 4.2 and 4.3)

With these reservations in mind, many of the 4,194,303 registrations produced by the 22 8' stops of the *Thomaskirche* were bound to have been more of theoretical than practical value to Straube due to a number of factors: the avoidance of one-sidedness in the balance of the overtone structure, the ‘French’ bias towards manual III in Straube's registrations, the undesirable sound of certain combinations and the unlikelihood of many combinations in view of the spread of stops over three manuals.

3.8 Extreme bias towards fundamental sound avoided by Straube

Quite apart from the elimination of certain combinations on these grounds, it was due to two far more crucial factors that only a tiny fraction of the total number of possible 8' combinations was employed in Straube's Reger editions. Firstly, Straube did not favour registrations that were extremely biased towards 8' pitch, and therefore all 22 8' stops were never drawn together without higher stops. In fact, a maximum of twelve 8' stops are listed together in Straube's

³¹⁹ Richter, E.F., op. cit. 225. ‘Die Berechnung der Summe aller Mischungen (Kombinationen) sämtlicher vorhandenen Stimmen mit einander, seien diese nun brauchbar oder nicht, erfolgt nach der Formel $(2^n - 1) = S$, wobei “n” die Zahl der Stimmen, “S” die Summe der Mischungen bedeutet.’ From this formula Richter deduces the number of possible combinations up to 12 stops; for 3 a total of 7, for 8 a total of 255, and for 12 stops a total of 4,095 combinations.

³²⁰ Dienel 36. ‘So verlockend die grosse Zahl mathematisch gegebener Umordnungen der Stimmen auch scheint, so verhältnismässig klein ist doch die Zahl wirklich brauchbarer Registermischungen auch des stimmenreichsten Manuals.’

³²¹ Töpfer, op. cit. 662

Reger editions (in op. 65/6 *HR*)³²² in registrations where the combined manual stops are exclusively of 8' pitch. The other '8' only' listings within the coupled-through system, in op. 59/5 *HR*, op. 59/6 *HR*, op. 59/7 *HR*, op. 65/5 *HR*, op. 65/7 *HR*, op. 65/12 *HR*, op. 80/2 *HR*, op. 85/1 *Fuge HR*, op. 85/3 *Präludium HR* and *IK*, and op. 85/4 *Fuge HR*, combine eleven, eight, five, six, eight, eleven, ten, seven, five, eight and five stops respectively. Thus, a heavy emphasis on fundamental sound was avoided by Straube, not only in the combination of stops of differing harmonic spectrums, but also in the moderation practised in the amassing of 8' stops.

A second essential factor further contributed to the avoidance of massed 8' sound. In none of the above cases are all stops combined in all voices simultaneously before the listed registration is altered. Either play is confined to manual III, or manual II and III, and the remaining stops are merely 'prepared' (op. 59/5); or a 4' stop is added to manual III before manual II or I is brought into play (op. 65/12); or the *Walze* begins its journey before play on manual I begins (op. 65/5, 65/6, 65/7, 85/4), or a single voice only is transferred to manual I before the *Walze* is introduced (op. 59/7, 80/2, 85/1 *Fuge*, 85/3 *Präludium*).

In Straube's registration system, therefore, virtually all soft sections are allocated to manuals II and III. The listing of up to twelve 8' stops alone within the coupled-through system is deceptive, as they are never all heard in ensemble before the introduction of higher stops. In fact, the highest number of '8'-only' manual stops that actually sound together (briefly) in Straube's Reger editions is nine (op. 65/6, shortly before the *poco a poco crescendo* in bar 12), followed by eight (op. 59/6, shortly before the *crescendo* in bar 29).

The question then arises as to the function of the massed 8' stops within the disposition of the *Thomaskirche* organ, within Straube's system of registration, and indeed in Romantic registration practice in general. More primitive registration practices, referring of course to pre-'modern' instruments and represented, for instance, by Seidel's four main types (*Hauptarten*) of registration, combined all the 8' stops together in a build-up before a 4' was added, and indeed this pattern was adopted in the order of certain *Walze* layouts, even in some Sauer instruments.³²³

However, it is obvious that Straube's 'modern' registrations are balanced and selective in their choice of stops. The large increase in the number of 8' stops in the 1908 extension of the *Thomaskirche* organ was not intended to provide a thick and indigestible heaviness of sound. Indeed, a comparison of the registrations in the 1904 *Alte Meister* edition and the later Reger editions reveals a lightening and refinement in the development of Straube's registration practice, a process that in some measure corresponds to the increased transparency of texture and registration in Reger's later organ works. The function of the massed 8' stops was rather to provide a great variety and subtlety of colour in soft registrations, and a registral ballast that

³²² In op. 65/12, bar 6, 13 8' manual stops are drawn for one bar only.

³²³ For instance, in the *Stadhalle* in Görlitz (see footnote 56 in chapter 2). It is fascinating to note that even in *Walze* layouts of different Sauer organs disparity in registration practices may be observed. In the Sauer organ of the *Berliner Dom* (see also footnote 56 in chapter 2), for example, a more balanced distribution of the 'artificial' overtones was achieved with a free mix of 8' and 4' stops through the higher pitches. This disparity is surely a reflection of more and less primitive registration practices co-existing in Germany at the turn of the century, on the one hand traditional practice as represented by Seidel, on the other hand more sophisticated models represented by Dienel or Straube.

could keep the full sound 'earthbound' and cover the addition of upper work (see under section 4.3).

3.9 8' and 4' registrations

Within the context of 8' sound, Otto Dienel considered the addition of 4' pitch important to the simulation of an orchestral sound, as 'mostly it is the addition of the 4' flute to the 8' flute of the organ that makes it really sound like an orchestral flute, and the addition of a 4' string to an 8' that makes it sound like the tone of a violin. For this reason the wealth of differentiation in sound of an organ depends to a large extent on the number and voicing of the 4' stops'.³²⁴ A footnote explains that this is confirmed by the fact that orchestral instruments are much richer in upper partials than one would normally assume. Dienel touches further on the tendency towards a total blend and a preference for non-conspicuousness in registration:

The 8' and 4' *Charakterstimmen*...help to bridge the gap between the dull-sounding foundation stops and the mixtures. They are able to achieve this as a result of their high content of upper partials...The artificial overtones, prepared by the natural ones, do not seem disconnected. It is also important, of course, that the mixtures blend in with the foundation stops: besides powerful mutations and mixtures weakly voiced ones should also be included. For the disposition of a good general crescendo mechanism, which demands a gradual transition from the foundation stops to the mixtures, this is especially important.³²⁵

As 4' stops were voiced in such a way as to blend closely with the 8' sound, at least in Sauer organs, these could be mixed freely with the 8's without altering the impression of an 8' ensemble. According to the report of the 1888 *Thomaskirche* organ prepared by Drs. Rost and Langer, for instance:

The *Rohrflöte 4'* [of manual I] functions as a soft enhancement of stops like *Gedackt* and *Gamba*...it is surprising how soft 8' stops can be enhanced by stops such as the *Flauto dolce 4'* [of manual II]...the *Fugara 4'* [of manual III] is intrinsic to the enhancement of the latter [?] group of 8' stops³²⁶...[and] the *Traversflöte 4'* [of manual III] contributes significantly to the enhancement of all the 8' stops.³²⁷

These 'enhancements' of 8' sound imply that the 4' stops could and did function in exactly the same way as the 8' stops, merely as an inflection of 8' timbre, in this case attained by an artificial adjustment in the balance of the overtones. According to Dienel, the 8' and 4' registrations were

³²⁴ Dienel, op. cit. 23 & 24. 'Meist erhält die Flöte 8' der Orgel erst durch Flöte 4' den Klang der Orchester-Flöte, und die achtfüssigen Streicher werden erst durch die entsprechenden vierfüßigen dem Violinton recht ähnlich. Deshalb beruht der Reichthum einer Orgel an Klangschattirungen zum grossen Theile auf der Anzahl und Intonation der vierfüßigen Stimmen.'

³²⁵ Ibid. 24. 'Die acht- und vierfüßigen Characterstimmen...müssen die Brücke schlagen helfen von dem dumpfen Klange der Grundstimmen zu den Mixturen. Vermöge ihrer Obertönigkeit können sie dies: die künstlichen Obertöne, durch die natürlichen vorbereitet, treten dann nicht unvermittelt auf. Wichtig dabei ist freilich, dass auch die Mixturen-Register den Grundstimmen entgegenkommen: Es müssen neben käftigen gemischten Stimmen auch schwach intonirte vorhanden sein. Für Einrichtung eines guten Rollschwellers, der allmählichen Uebergang von den Grundstimmen zu den Mixturen fordert, ist dies besonders wichtig.'

³²⁶ Perhaps a reference to the *Aeoline*, *Voix céleste* and *Oboe*

³²⁷ Falkenberg B 145-5 'Rohrflöte 4'...wirkt als sanfte Hebung für Achtfüsse wie Gedackt und Gambe in vortrefflicher Art...Es ist überraschend, wie durch eine sogeartete Stimme [Flauto dolce 4'] sanftere Achtfüsse gehoben werden...Fugara 4'... gehört zur Hebung der letzten Gruppe von Achtfüssen unbedingt an diesen Platz...Traversflöte 4'...trägt wesentlich zur Hebung sämmtlicher Achtfüsse bei.'

perceived to approximate the sound of orchestral instruments of normal 8' pitch. In this way, the 4' stops were not only of paramount importance in the vertical bridging of fundamental sound and upper work, but also promoted horizontal blend between 8' stops.

Straube also preferred the more balanced approach that favoured a free mix of 8' and 4' stops. It was noted that in his Reger editions a definite cut-off point of eight or nine stops was set for the amassing of 8'-only manual stops. In dynamic build-ups starting from an 8'-only platform, a 4' stop would normally enter at an early stage. For instance, in Straube's edition of the *Fuge*, op. 65/12 the opening registration on manual III, *Aeoline* and *Gedackt*, is added to in the order *Gemshorn* 8', *Flûte d'amour* 8', *Quintatön* 8', *Traversflöte* 4',³²⁸ *Spitzflöte* 8'; thus a 4' is included as the sixth stop in the crescendo.

The six soft 4' stops of the *Thomaskirche* organ were allocated two to each manual as follows:

Table 4.3 The soft 4' stops of the *Thomaskirche* organ

Manual III	Manual II	Manual I
<i>Fugara</i>	<i>Flauto dolce</i>	<i>Rohrflöte</i>
<i>Traversflöte</i>	<i>Salicional</i>	<i>Gemshorn</i>

According to Richter's formula given above under 3.2 above, the extra six soft 4' stops theoretically increased the number of available soft registrations from 4,194,303 to 268,435,455. Of course, for reasons given above, only a relatively small number of these was employed by Straube. Nevertheless, the inclusion of soft 4' stops in what remain essentially 8' registrations represented an enormous enrichment of registrational possibilities. Even on manual III alone, the seven 8' stops and two 4' stops (that is, excluding *Principal* and *Voix céleste*) supplied a choice of 511 different registrations, compared to the 31 supplied by the original manual III.

4 Density in organ sound

4.1 Mixtures

In 1900 Rupp criticised the crusade against quints, tierces and mixtures which he traced back to Berlioz and the early nineteenth-century acousticians, G. Weber and E. Chladni, and on which he blamed the forcing of organ sound by increased wind pressure.³²⁹ According to Schweitzer (1906), the few mixtures that survived in organ dispositions did not blend with the foundation

³²⁸ Straube mistakenly gives this stop the name of its counterpart on manual II, *Flauto dolce* 4'. However, it is clear from the *HR* listing at the head of the *Toccata*, op. 65/11, that the 4' flute of manual III was intended.

³²⁹ Rupp, op. cit. 27ff.

stops, but screamed in a brutal fashion.³³⁰ J.I. Wedgewood (1905) blamed this on the lack of a ‘middle’ in many dispositions,³³¹ and Dienel agreed that the art of voicing small pipes was lost.³³²

In fact, the whole function of mixture stops had been challenged by the Romantic organ aesthetic, which favoured fundamental sound. Mixtures were problematic in a cantabile style, partly because of their breaking back or repetition, and so the *Cornet* and the *Progressio harmonica* were popular for their non-repetition.³³³ Töpfer/Allihn wrote that ‘the repetition of mixtures, which is so damaging to any good part-writing, should be restricted and avoided where possible’.³³⁴ And Hugo Riemann grudgingly conceded that ‘it cannot be denied that the repetition of mixtures is a necessary evil...Admittedly, the mixture is drawn mostly in *forte*, especially for full chords, where the effect of the harmony is more important than the melodic line.’³³⁵

The viewpoint put forward by C. Sattler in his *Orgelschule* (1913), that artificial ranks of overtones in the form of octaves, quints, mutations and mixtures were included in organs of earlier times by way of compensation for the lack of *Charakterstimmen*, was by no means untypical. And at the turn of the century Max Allihn almost apologetically gave the fact of inadequate wind supplies as one of the reasons for the construction of mixtures in earlier organs, as mixtures consume little wind relative to the sensation of volume they produce. With the onset of pneumatic systems that could provide adequate wind for many foundation stops and enable the player to overcome the weight of touch that coupled manuals then demanded, mixtures could be replaced to a certain degree by an emphasis on fundamental sound, and artificial overtones could be replaced by the natural overtones of 8' stops.³³⁶

Despite this antipathy towards them, mixtures and mutations were fiercely defended in some quarters, even by Töpfer/Allihn,³³⁷ and Rupp could write: ‘It is to Sauer’s everlasting credit that he was able, with the clear vision of genius, to weigh up correctly the relationship between natural and artificial overtones and erect an insurmountable defence against the South German mania for fundamental sound [*Grundtönigkeit*] and other destructive tendencies (high pressure). Throughout his career he transformed into a liberating process his theoretical grasp of the gapless nature of physical sound once revealed to him on the demonstration apparatus in Cavallé-Coll’s study, regardless of the fashion of the day and the Americanising excesses of certain “physicists” and literary hacks. Undaunted by the increasing distaste for mixtures among

³³⁰ Schweitzer 27/9

³³¹ Wedgewood 104

³³² Dienel, op. cit. 13

³³³ On the advantage of the *Cornet* see, for instance, Dienel, op. cit. 17, or Riemann C 67. The *Progressio harmonica* did not break back, but increased in the number of ranks towards the treble. According to Greß & Krieger, the *Großzimmel 4fach*, added to the Sauer organ of the *Thomaskirche* in the 1908 extension, was non-repeating.

³³⁴ Töpfer/Allihn, op. cit. 756. ‘Das aller guten Stimmführung so schädliche Repetieren der Mixturen muss möglichst beschränkt und vermieden werden.’

³³⁵ Riemann C 64. ‘Überhaupt läßt sich nicht leugnen, daß das Repetieren ein notwendiges Übel ist ...Nun zieht man ja freilich Mixtur nur bei forte-Spiel besonders für volle Akkorde, bei denen es weniger auf die melodische Bedeutung der Tonhöhe als auf die Wirkung der Harmonie ankommt.’

³³⁶ See Max Allihn in *Zeitschrift für Instrumentenbau*, 1900/01

³³⁷ Töpfer/Allihn, op. cit. 756

professional and amateur “experts”, Sauer built both repeating mixtures and *Zimbeln* in the Silbermann style. Like Ladegast, he furnished even the *Nebenklaviere* with independent *Quint* and *Terz* stops, and some of his instruments, (for instance, the cathedral organ in Fulda) even include the *septime* first employed by Cavaillé-Coll. For Sauer, as for Ladegast and Eberhard Friedrich Walcker, the harmonic structure of organ disposition rested on a historical basis.³³⁸

Under section 3.4 it was noted as a virtue that no mixture obtruded in the Sauer organ of the Peterskirche in Leipzig, and that the mixtures and mutations of the Sauer organ in the Nikolaikirche in Frankfurt were voiced to give less brilliance than fullness. These comments touch paradoxically both on one of the main reasons why a crusade against mixtures was preached, and on one of the main reasons why the Romantic organ could not afford to dispense with mixtures: that is, the brashness and conspicuousness of mixtures (in lesser organs), and their textural fullness.

Mixtures were at once diametrically opposed to the lyrical ambitions of the nineteenth century and the requirements of a transitional style of registration, but essential to the turn-of-the-century craving for fullness of texture and the absorption of the pitch spectrum (see below under section 5). Conflicting desires demanded both the inclusion and the exclusion of mixture stops. This may perhaps shed light on a curious story related by Karl Hasse, in which Reger included a mixture in a registration on a ‘completely inadequate’ practice organ in Munich. Reger’s intentions on that occasion, which Hasse then dismissed as *Spielerei* and the search for strange effects, and indeed Hasse’s own disapproval, may well have stemmed from the above paradoxical situation, in which mixtures were both cherished and shunned.³³⁹

The defect of conspicuousness had to be remedied before mixtures could successfully be integrated into a transitional style of registration. Dienel suggested two approaches:³⁴⁰ the splitting up of mixtures into single ranks in the old Italian manner; and the inclusion of sweetly voiced as well as powerful mixtures in the disposition – the first mixtures in a build-up could then be introduced with the Swell box closed. While the first approach was largely ignored, delicate mixtures, especially the string mixture, *Harmonia aethera*, were increasingly employed on manual III. These, along with the *Voix céleste* stop when employed in a high pitch range, may have simulated the typically late-Romantic orchestral shimmer of muted high *divisi*

³³⁸ Rupp 150. ‘Es muß Sauer als unsterbliche Ruhmestat zugerechnet werden, daß er mit dem klaren Blick des Genies das Verhältnis der natürlichen und künstlichen Obertöne richtig abzuwägen und der von Süddeutschland ausgehenden Grundtönigkeitsmanie und anderen destruktiven Tendenzen (Hochdruck) einen unübersteigbaren Schutzdamm entgegenzusetzen wußte. Die theoretische Erkenntnis von der Lückenlosigkeit des synoptischen Klangbildes, die ihm einst der Demonstrationsapparat im Studierzimmer Cavaillé-Colls vermittelte, hat er gleich vom Beginn bis zum letzten Tage seiner Praxis in die befreiende Tat umgesetzt, unbekümmert um Tagesmode und amerikanisierende Entgleisungen gewisser “Physiker” und ihres schriftstellernden Vorspanns. Sauer baute, unbekümmert um die im letzten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts grassierende Mixturenscheu der berufenen und unberufenen “Sachverständigen” repetierende Mixturen und Zimbeln im Silbermann-Stil, er stattete ebenso wie Ladegast auch die Nebenklaviere mit selbständig registrierbaren Quinten- und Terzenregistern aus, einige seiner Werke (z.B. Domorgel in Fulda) enthalten auch die von Cavaillé-Coll zuerst angewandte Septime. Für Sauer wie für Ladegast und Eberhard Friedrich Walcker war der harmonische Aufbau der Orgeldisposition etwas Historischgewordenes...’

³³⁹ This story is related in Hasse D 14. Hasse later somewhat fancifully ascribed Reger’s mixture registration to a premonition of a future organ type in the sense of the *Orgelbewegung*.

³⁴⁰ Dienel, op. cit. 41

strings,³⁴¹ which was one manifestation in soft music of the tendency towards the absorption of the pitch spectrum.

It is possible that Straube had this special effect in mind when he proposed a number of registrations, ranging from the unusual to the bizarre, for his Reger editions of 1912 and 1919, which include both mixture and *Voix céleste* stops. These are listed in chapter 3, section 4.8. In op. 65/5, *1. Komb.*, Straube qualified one of these registrations, *Aeoline 8'*, *Voix céleste 8'* and *Harmonia aethera 3 fach*, by noting that the mixture should be voiced very gently (*sehr schwach intoniert*). In fact, in his remarks on Sauer's proposals for the original *Thomaskirche* organ of 1888, Straube's predecessor, Carl Piutti, had requested that the Swell mixture be voiced very gently.³⁴² Almost certainly, the *Harmonia aethera* – and indeed the other gently voiced artificial overtones of manual III at 4', $2\frac{2}{3}$ ' and 2' pitch – were also intended to act as a bridge to the louder mixtures in the manner suggested by Dienel, and thereby to help fuse the upper work of the entire organ into the total texture.

In this connection Hasse quoted from Straube's edition of the second volume of Bach's organ works published by Peters in 1913.³⁴³ Although the following instructions refer specifically to the performance of Bach's A major Prelude, the language and imagery is indicative of a gentle and refined conception of organ sound that avoids extreme emphasis on fundamental sound:

Almost all organs are too earthbound...Like the aeolian harp [a stringed instrument that produces a musical sound when wind passes over the strings], the harmonic series should be elicited without causing the instrument to be belied...Again it should be emphasised that the musical lines should be etched only in the finest silverpoint, obtrusive colours should be avoided. Consequently, the *Fugara 4'*, *Flautino 2'* and *Quinte 2 $\frac{2}{3}$ '* [of manual III] should be voiced softly and gently.³⁴⁴

4.2 Fullness of texture and 'gapped' registrations

Related to the integration of mixtures into the total texture was the principle of 'gapless' registration dating back to at least the time of G. Silbermann, in which no break in the sequence of overtones was permitted. A density of texture was achieved by the inclusion of every member of the harmonic series within the pitch gamut of a particular registration. Seidel's 'second important rule'³⁴⁵ for registration was that 'in the progression of stops no discontinuity or gaps are permitted...it would be wrong, for instance, to combine one or more 8' stops with one or more 2' stops, as the intermediary 4' stops (and the *Quinte 2 $\frac{2}{3}$ '* in louder registrations) would be

³⁴¹ W. Harburger hinted at the imitation of this orchestral effect in his *Max Reger und die moderne Orgel*, op. cit. 42, where he refers to the 'cheap mystique of muted strings in x number of parts'

³⁴² See chapter 4, section 4.2

³⁴³ Peters II, p. 23

³⁴⁴ In 'Karl Straube als Orgelkünstler', KS 177. '...fast allen Orgeln haftet im Klang allzuviel Erdschwere an...Wie die Töne der Äeolsharfe müssen die harmonischen Folgen da sein, ohne die Veranlassung, ohne ihr Instrument zu verraten...Wieder ist zu betonen, daß die Register nur in der zarten Art des Silberstiftes die Linien des Tonbildes nachzeichnen sollen, aufdringliche Farbenwirkungen sind zu vermeiden. Demnach müßten *Fugara 4'*, *Flautino 2'*, *Quinte 2 $\frac{2}{3}$ '* in der Intonation zart und weich getönt sein...'

³⁴⁵ See above under section 3.3 and below under section 4.3 for references to his first rule.

missing.³⁴⁶ This principle was echoed by many writers, including Hugo Riemann in his *Handbuch der Orgel* (of which there were five editions between 1888 and 1922).³⁴⁷

However, in the knowledge that gapped registrations were commonplace, Riemann recommended them for special effects, and gave the example of a 16' and 4' registration from Volckmar's *Phantasie*, op. 215. Indeed, most gapped registrations in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century German organ repertoire appear to have been intended as special effects, for example, the 8' and 2' ('ohne 4'') registration in Karg-Elert's *Es ist das Heil uns kommen her*, op. 78/8, which is accompanied by the heading *Sehr ruhig und mystisch*.

At least one work known to Reger, Guilman's Fifth Sonata, contained an 8' and 2' registration, and Straube's Reger edition of 1912 also contained gapped registrations. Therefore, Reger's own gapped registrations for op. 127 and op. 135b need not be viewed as anticipating the *Orgelbewegung*, despite his knowledge of a number of Alsatian Reform instruments and the possible connection between one of these organs (Meiningen Schützenhaus, Steinmeyer III/46, 1914) and the composition of op. 135b.

In Straube's Reger editions, gapped registrations are employed strategically. The registration of *I. Komb.* in op. 80/1, for instance, is obviously inspired by the gapped nature of the music itself. Here, in bars 11 to 13, the high manual parts are emphasised by the registration for manual III (*Aeoline 8'*, *Voix céleste 8'* and *Flautino 2'*), and the depth of the bass is strengthened by the addition of the *Untersatz 32'*, which also affirms the ostinato character of the bass line throughout the movement. A few bars later, a single 8' *gedeckt* in the right hand is enveloped by the 8' and 2' gapped registration in the left hand in the manner of Reger's beloved 'veiled' registration (see under section 4.3), in which an 8' stop would normally be surrounded by an 8' and 4' accompaniment.

The gapped registration, 16,8,8,8,2 $\frac{2}{3}$, for manual III of *I. Komb.* in the *Kyrie*, op. 59/7 certainly contributes to the intensity and colourfulness of the sound, but may also have been chosen for its dynamic potential within the Swell box, for its transitional flexibility in the context of the ensuing *Walze crescendo*, or, more likely perhaps, for a combination of these factors. Reasons for the gapped registration and for the concentration on the third harmonic in the registration indicated by Straube for the *Gloria*, op. 59/8, bars 49 to 60 (*Aeoline 8'*, *Gedackt 8'*, *Quintatön 8'*, *Quinte 2 $\frac{2}{3}$ '*) are more difficult to find. Nevertheless, it is clear that these colouristic registrations are exceptional in Straube's Reger editions, and are consciously employed for a variety of textural reasons.

4.3 'Covered' and indirect sound

In their support of gapless registrations Töpfer/Allihn went one step further in pronouncing combinations of single stops such as 4' and 2', 8' and 2' and even 8', 4' and 2' 'impossible'.³⁴⁸ This latter combination was excluded because the single 8' stop could not provide enough

³⁴⁶ Seidel 99

³⁴⁷ Riemann C 77

³⁴⁸ Töpfer/Allihn, op. cit. 662

‘cover’ for the higher stops. For every one stop of a higher pitch that was added, many more 8's were required to provide cover, so that normal pitch could not be endangered, as Rudolz put it. H. Riemann wrote in a similar vein that the progression of stops according to pitch in a build-up was to be supplemented where possible by the interspersing of more 8' and even 4' stops.³⁴⁹ As already noted, the layout of the stops in the Walze of the Sauer organ in the *Berliner Dom* and Straube's own registration practice also illustrate this approach.³⁵⁰

That Straube subscribed to this ‘covering’ of higher stops is demonstrated by the great increase in the number of 8' stops in 8' and 4', and 8', 4' and 2' registrations. It was noted in section 3.8 that, in 8'-only registrations, a cut-off point of eight or nine (8') stops which actually sound together (as opposed to being merely listed together) was not exceeded by Straube. In 8' and 4' registrations, however, the figure for 8's could more than double, as in his edition of Reger's *Gloria in excelsis*, op. 59/8, bars 60–66, where 20 soft 8' stops are sounded together with five soft 4' stops. As many as 26 8' stops were amassed to provide cover for seven 4' stops and one 2' in op. 80/11, 2. *Komb.*

The registration given below for 2. *Komb.* in op. 59/5 is unusual, however, in that a wide pitch spectrum is indeed covered by a concentration of stops at fundamental pitch, and mixtures are offset by the inclusion of 16' stops, but the distribution of the pitches 4', 2²/₃' and 2' is sparse. For example, no stops at these pitches are included on manual I. Quite possibly, the natural overtones of the Swell reeds made the inclusion of these stops redundant, or perhaps their inclusion along with the high number of mixtures and mutation ranks would have resulted in a top-heavy texture.

Table 4.4 Pitches of stops in Straube's registration for 2. *Komb.*, op. 59/5

Manual I	8'8'8'8'X
Manual II	8'8'8'8'8'4'2 ² / ₃ 'Cornet
Manual III	16'16'8'8'8'8'8'8'8'4'2'X8'8'

Allihn remarked that not enough was known about the relationship of fundamental sound to its artificial overtones, and that registration practice should be guided by the sensitivity of the ear.³⁵¹ Again, exceptions to the principle of covering, mostly discussed above in section 2.2, do not obscure the wide application of the practice in Straube's editions, and presumably in the layout of the Walze in the *Thomaskirche* organ.

Seidel's first rule included the statement that lower stops should cover higher stops. This principle was extended in the continuation of Seidel's second rule to state that a gedackt should not be combined with an open stop of higher pitch. For instance, a combination of a few 8' stops, a gedackt 4' and an open 2' would be faulty, as would a gedackt 8' and an open 4'. That this rule

³⁴⁹ Riemann C, op. cit. 77, ‘...alles womöglich im Anschluß an noch weitere zwischen eingefügte 8' und auch 4' Flötenstimmen.’

³⁵⁰ See Peeters/van Wageningen 302

³⁵¹ Töpfer/Allihn 755ff

remained more theoretical than practical was due to a whole range of considerations: the variety and voicing of the disposition; the construction of mixtures, at least in the bottom octaves, with open octaves and covered quints and tierces;³⁵² and the progression towards the treble from covered to open in mixtures ranks, for instance, in the Sauer organ of the *Nicolaaskerk* in Amsterdam (1889).³⁵³ Nonetheless, the rule is of interest for its promotion of a rounded ensemble, focussed on 8' sound and with all sharp edges removed.

It is clear from the above discussion that a covered, restrained and indirect sound was sought after in German registration practices from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards. The increasing popularity of the Swell, or Echo division, was not only evidence of the desire for 'expression', but also a further indication of the affinity to covered sound, as was the proliferation of covered stops – *Gedackt*, *Quintatön*, *Rohrflöte*, *Doppelflöte*, etc. The aesthetic on which this priority was based has not always been appreciated. Greß and Krieger³⁵⁴ referred to the 'disadvantageous' positioning of the Swell manual in the *Thomaskirche* in Leipzig in terms of the problem being compounded by the shading (*Abschattung*) of the Swell shutters. And Piutti maintained that here the (full) Swell with the box closed was so muted in sound that, coupled to a single 8' stop from one of the other manuals, this latter stop was decisive in the definition of the character of the sound.³⁵⁵ With this in mind, it is easy to imagine Straube's mixture registrations gradually emerging from a position of cover. Allihn wrote that, compared to the strong accentuation of French instruments, the tone of the German organ was soft and dark, peaceful and contemplative, and less variable. This whole attitude to sound was emphasised by more general trends in nineteenth-century Germany, such as the preference for blended sound and the virtual disappearance of the direct-sounding *Rückpositiv*.³⁵⁶

Reger's frequently indicated registration of an 8' solo voice accompanied by 8' and 4' stops 'so that the accompaniment always surrounds and covers the solo voice like a veil' (*wie ein Schleier um und über die Solostimme*)³⁵⁷ is a further manifestation of covered sound. While Straube largely rejected this idiosyncrasy, presumably on practical grounds (as it implies uncoupled manuals, and therefore 'expression' for only one of the manuals), his whole registration system based on coupled-through manuals was, in fact, a 'covered' system in which inconspicuousness was the aim. Furthermore, his common deployment of the right hand on a softer manual than that of the left, for instance, in the *Kyrie*, op. 59/9, also gives rise to a form of covered sound. That this practice most probably arose in order to bring the inner voices into prominence does not detract from its bearing on the actual sound, which it inflects and mollifies.

³⁵² See, for instance, the specification of the *Rauschpfeife* in the Sauer organ at Burg (*bei Magdeburg*, 1882), or of the *Terzmixtur* in the Sauer organ in Flonheim (1892) where the quints and tierces in the bottom octaves were covered (gedackt pipes).

³⁵³ The progression from covered to open was also common in registration practice, as in Reimann, op. cit. 138, where he suggested a *gedämpft* registration that should grow continuously brighter and stronger for Bach's 'little' C minor fugue BWV 549/2.

³⁵⁴ In Greß & Krieger, op. cit. 108

³⁵⁵ Previously quoted in Chapter 3, section 4.2

³⁵⁶ The occasional retention or even new construction of a *Rückpositiv* in Sauer organs had little in common with the old *Werkprinzip*. The *Rückpositiv* in the cathedral in Berlin, for instance, consisted of four soft 8' stops and a *Zartflöte 4'* and was designed 'mainly for the accompaniment of solo singing' (see Falkenberg B, op. cit. 273).

³⁵⁷ This characterisation was furnished by Reger in a footnote to the first publication of the chorale prelude 'Wer weiß, wie nahe mir mein Ende' in *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst* 5 (1900), 344

In Wagner's orchestral texture similar concerns prevailed. Quite apart from his *Kunst des Übergangs*, in which the art of covering is raised to a principle of composition, the famous *Schalldeckel* in Bayreuth was a physical covering, of which Brian Magee wrote in *Aspects of Wagner* that 'it promoted a soft orchestral sound from an unidentifiable source, warm and diffused in quality, every sharp edge removed'.³⁵⁸ Wagner forbade his singers to sing straight into the auditorium, but had them sing across the stage to allow the sound to reach the listener indirectly and already blended. Overlapping phrases and subtlety of scoring could cover the joins of the music, as in the scoring of the *Lohengrin* example discussed in section 3.2, where the entry of the oboe was covered by flutes and clarinets at the end of the previous phrase. The goal of total orchestral blend led to the central position of the horns in Wagner's orchestra and their increase to eight in number. For the *Ring* Wagner required 16 first violins, 16 seconds, 12 violas, 12 cellos and 8 double basses, a glorious massed sound that could mask the entrance and exit of the wind instruments, and which Strauss dubbed a 'deep velvet carpet'.

Like Wagner, Reger demanded a rich string sound in his orchestral works, and complained of the weakness of the string section after the first performance of his *Sinfonietta*, op. 90. And, just as the conspicuousness of upper work was a problem to be solved in organ registration, Reger spoke out against the dominance of the brass in orchestral music ('Why not just stick to military music?').³⁵⁹

5 Conclusions

One of the most important aspects of Reger's organ style, *Vollgriffigkeit*,³⁶⁰ resulting in fullness of texture, is attributed by his teacher, Adalbert Lindner, to the composer's fascination with the works of Wagner:

After [Reger] had immersed himself in the sound world of Richard Wagner his harmonic sophistication and rigorousness reached its peak. His [organ] improvisations became ever more chromatic, spiced with dissonances and often so rich in tone, or full-textured, that my poor old bellows pumper, despite great efforts with the four large and partly defective reservoir bellows, could not produce the necessary amount of wind, and sometimes it looked as if he would give up and abscond in the middle of this gargantuan task.³⁶¹

This contrasts markedly with the usual apology for what has often been presented as an unidiomatic organ style: that Reger sought compensation for the poor quality of late-nineteenth-century organs and their lack of mutations and mixtures in a texture that doubled at the octave, thereby producing its own surrogate, artificial harmonic series of sorts.³⁶²

³⁵⁸ Magee 96

³⁵⁹ Lindner, op. cit. 269

³⁶⁰ See Chapter 5, section 1.4

³⁶¹ Ibid. 37 & 38. 'Den Gipfel aber erreichte diese harmonische Rigorosität, nachdem sich mein Organist auch tief in die Tonwelt Richard Wagners versenkt hatte. Seine Improvisationen wurden da immer chromatischer, dissonanzengespickter und oft dermaßen tonreich, beziehungsweise vollgriffig, daß mein armer alter Balgtreter trotz größter Anstrengung mittels der vier großen, teilweise schon defekten Schöpfbälge nicht mehr das nötige Windquantum herbeizubringen vermochte und manchmal nicht übel Lust zeigte, inmitten dieser grausamen Sisyphusarbeit auf und davon zu laufen.'

³⁶² Compare Riemann E 55, where Widor blamed crude chordal texture on the ideals of the modern (French)

The ‘gapless’, ‘covered’ and full-textured density of sound in late-Romantic German organ registration exuded a luxuriance that was no doubt inspired by orchestral models. No chink of light was permitted to shine through the close-knit texture. The dogmatic inclusion of every partial in the pyramid of overtones was indicative of a general nineteenth-century tendency in music towards the absorption of the entire pitch spectrum. This was intensified by a compositional style that sought to range over the total available space on the keyboard. The whole process of chromatic saturation was later to reach its zenith in Schoenberg’s monodrama *Erwartung* (1909). Reger himself contributed significantly to this final stage of chromatic evolution in his *Gesang der Verklärten*, op. 71, for choir and orchestra (1903), where extreme density of musical expression prevails.

Like blend itself, which aimed at a total fusion of unison stops and *Hilfstimmen*, density in organ sound was pursued from opposing angles, as fullness of texture was cultivated both on a horizontal and vertical level. The seemingly incompatible marriage of a wide pitch spectrum and an emphasis on fundamental sound was achieved by means of gapless and covered registration, which was promoted by the gentle voicing of upperwork, a judicious and generous disposition of 8' stops, and the Swell. In soft registrations this was realised by the presentation of a blended ensemble including unison stops rich in natural overtones, loosely termed *Charakterstimmen*; in louder music, by the inclusion of the artificial overtones (the higher octaves, mutations and mixtures).

These considerations of blend, fullness of texture and covered sound were of vital importance to an organ counterpart of Wagnerian orchestral sound held by Straube to be a musical touchstone at the turn of the century. And yet, the colouristic registrations discussed in section 2.2 have little to do with these concerns. Thus, Straube’s Reger editions reveal a dichotomous approach to organ registration, which both denies and embraces the overt application of colour.

This dichotomy is typified by the clear division into two groups of Straube’s base registrations presented in chapter 2, sections 3.3–3.6. One of these groups contains registrations that more or less duplicate a probable order of stops in the *Walze*; the other is composed of colouristic registrations that obviously deviate significantly from any likely *Walze* layout.³⁶³ The *Walze* itself was non-colouristic in that it sought to smooth over the addition of stops in the interest of transitional dynamics. However, colouristic tendencies flourished in German organ building, and instruments such as the Weigle organ in the *Liedhalle* in Stuttgart or the giant Sauer organ in Breslau (1913) even supplied pedal levers that activated families of stops, or the *Hauptklangfarben* of the organ.³⁶⁴

Even this strange mix of opposites, the cultivation and subjugation of colour, is shared by Wagner’s music, which embraced the expressive exuberance of the homophonic style and the textural richness of the polyphonic style, as identified by Richard Strauss in his 1904 account of

plenum sound, whose heaped 16', 8' and 4' reeds caused congestion in mid-range and led to the exploitation of the upper end of the keyboard.

³⁶³ It was clear to a number of writers that the success of the *Walze* depended on the subjugation of colour. For instance, Töpfer/Allihn, op. cit. 685 wrote that ‘the *Crescendowerk* should be arranged so that the colour changes gradually. In this way the most beautiful colours are impaired, and the contrast of the same disappears.’

³⁶⁴ In Stuttgart the aids to registration nos. 93–100 activated ‘the *Hauptklangfarben* der Orgel’: the flute, string, principal and reed choruses. In Breslau the various families of stops could be activated per manual.

the derivation of Wagnerian orchestral style.³⁶⁵ These opposing styles are intimately linked to the qualities of clarity and ambiguity that coexist in Wagner's music, as, for instance, in the clear delineation of the Death Motive and the Day Motive within the general ambiguity of the *Tristan* score.³⁶⁶

Nevertheless, it was the *Kunst des Übergangs* that represented Wagner's 'finest and most profound art' and overcame the 'accidental' nature of Classical orchestration, an art ultimately derived from blended organ texture, one that contradicts Karg-Elert's claim that an organ can never imitate an orchestra because of 'physical attributes of sound and practicalities of playing technique'.³⁶⁷

An art of transition on the organ was only possible in the context of German organs that favoured blended sound. By contrast, according to Allihn,³⁶⁸ the wind-chest system in French organs only allowed of 'harsh alterations of colour' (*harte Klangwechsel*), and so even the character of organ sound defined German-French rivalry in organ building.

Straube's registration practices are a summation of essentially German principles and preferences, many of which fell under the Wagnerian shadow, coupled to his own brand of individuality and inventiveness in the face of musical material of unprecedented difficulty in organ literature. Whatever the extent of the link between Straube's performance style and Wagner's compositional style, it is clear that, in the area of flexible dynamics and timbre, Straube worked hard to emulate the expressive levels of orchestral models and earn the title bestowed on him by Reger himself, the 'Bülów of the organ'.³⁶⁹

³⁶⁵ Strauss, Foreword, op. cit.

³⁶⁶ See Dahlhaus A 203

³⁶⁷ Karg-Elert 46, 'klangphysicalischen und spieltechnischen Gründen'

³⁶⁸ NZfM/20 (April 1901) 514

³⁶⁹ Hans v. Bülow was a devoted Wagnerian, the first conductor of Wagner's *Tristan* and a predecessor of Reger as conductor of the Meiningen court orchestra.

CHAPTER 5

TOUCH, TEXTURE AND TEMPO

1 Introduction

1.1 Notational ambiguity and interpretative uncertainty

Great uncertainty prevails on the subject of touch and phrasing in nineteenth-century organ playing, due partly to the infinitesimal nature of the subject itself, and to a general lack of clarity and consistency in the notation and interpretation of late-nineteenth-century phrasing and articulation indications.

Confusion of terminology is mentioned in Riemann's *Musik-Lexicon* of 1888.³⁷⁰ In particular Riemann feels that it is often difficult to know exactly what is meant by the use of the word 'phrasing', and whether it refers to the physical punctuation of a legato playing style, or the conceptual separation of ideas one from another.

In similar vein, and basing his conclusions on the performance practice of leading musicians of the time (including Straube's exemplar, Hans von Bülow), Mathis Lussy wrote in *Der musikalische Ausdruck* (Hamburg 1886) that a slur could just as easily imply a general legato as signify how notes are to be grouped.³⁷¹

In 1884 Riemann strove to avoid ambiguity by replacing 'unplanned, or at least inconsistent' legato slurs with phrasing slurs, which he maintained had been introduced only 'very recently'.³⁷² And in 1910 Walter Fischer could still claim that organists had not been phrasing for very long, citing the lack of phrasing in Rheinberger's recent works as proof of this.³⁷³

In the case of Reger it is similarly difficult to distinguish between slurs that refer to physical breaks in the musical line, and those that vaguely imply a general legato or fulfill an analytical function.³⁷⁴

³⁷⁰ Riemann B, under the heading *Phrasierung*.

³⁷¹ See Lohmann, L. 256. This work was originally published in Paris in 1874 as *Traité de l'expression musicale*.

³⁷² In *Lehrbuch der musikalischen Phrasierung auf Grund einer Revision der Lehre von der musikalischen Metrik und Rhythmik* (Hamburg/Leipzig/St. Petersburg: 1884), p. 242 (See Lohmann, L. op. cit. 260)

³⁷³ Fischer 14. 'Wir Organisten phrasieren ja noch nicht so lange. Denken wir daran, dass die mangelhaften Phrasierungsvorschriften eines so bedeutenden Orgelkomponisten wie Joseph Rheinberger aus jüngster Zeit stammen!'

³⁷⁴ It is even possible that Reger's slurs signify the dynamic and agogic treatment required by Riemann's theories on phrasing. Some idea of what this might entail may be found in Lohmann, L. op. cit., especially 265ff. See also Riemann C under *Phrasierung*, or Sievers 500ff, Sievers reports that the term 'agogic' was introduced by Riemann in 1884, and that every phrase requires agogic treatment rising to a climax and falling away, analogous to human breath. Reger had made the connection between dynamics and agogics in a footnote to op. 30, and in *Komm, süßer*

1.2 What is legato?

What exactly nineteenth-century and early-twentieth-century composers, editors and theorists understood by legato and *legatissimo* is also uncertain. Did *legatissimo* simply mean as smooth as possible, or may it also at times imply an over-legato blurring effect? Documentation is lacking. Legato style on the organ may be viewed physically as the joining of consecutive keys so precisely that no break in the touch occurs (Volckmar),³⁷⁵ or aurally as the progression from one note to another in such a way that the ear cannot register even the slightest gap between the notes (Rinck).³⁷⁶ Here, a physical or technical definition derived from touch is set against a musical or acoustical definition based on aural perception. Thus, legato can refer to avoidance of a break in touch or in sound, and these are not necessarily one and the same.

1.3 The pre-eminence of legato in nineteenth-century organ playing

It may safely be maintained, however, that a legato playing style of some kind was highly valued throughout the nineteenth century, and was pre-eminent towards the end of the century. Even where no slurs or legato indications are present in nineteenth-century organ music, a predominantly legato playing style may be assumed.

In *Die Orgelspieltechnik des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland, dargestellt an den Orgelschulen der Zeit*, Michael Schneider writes that in the first half of the nineteenth century ‘legato is generally indicated by slurs; where nothing is indicated, a continuous legato is tacitly understood’.³⁷⁷ He writes further that ‘all the organ tutors agree on one point, that legato playing is the most important, if not the only manner of organ performance’.³⁷⁸

Concern for legato style is reflected in the proliferation of exercises in legato playing in organ tutors throughout the nineteenth century.³⁷⁹ These include exercises in finger substitutions, sliding of the thumb, alternation between toe and heel, use of the side of the foot and sliding from a black to a white pedal note. E.F. Richter’s statement in his *Katechismus der Orgel* (1896) may be regarded as typical of Reger’s time: ‘The organ demands the most exact and painstaking legato touch’.³⁸⁰ And Reger’s friend, Philipp Wolfrum, wrote in the chapter on the organ in

Tod (1894). W. Gurlitt points to the close connections between phrasing, dynamics and agogics, in Gurlitt B 195–225.

³⁷⁵ Volckmar 55

³⁷⁶ Rinck Vol. I 43

³⁷⁷ Schneider, op. cit. 45, quoting Drechsler’s *Kleine Orgelschule* (Vienna 1820) Chapter 7. ‘Die Bezeichnung der Legato-Spielart erfolgt im allgemeinen durch den Bogen; wo nichts angezeigt ist, wird stillschweigend “allezeit legato” vorausgesetzt.’

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.* ‘In einer Hinsicht aber stimmen alle Orgelschulen überein, daß das gebundene Spiel wenn nicht überhaupt die, so doch die wesensmäßigste Spielart der Orgel ist.’ Some of the organ tutors included in Schneider’s survey are Knecht 1795–98, Kittel 1800, Werner 1807, Drechsler 1820, Schütze 1838 and Rinck 1819, 1839.

³⁷⁹ E.g., Guthmann 1805, Rinck 1819/1820 etc., F. Schneider 1830, Volckmar 1863, Merkel early 1880s, Riemann-Armbrust undated, etc.

³⁸⁰ Richter, E.F. 227. ‘Die Orgel fordert also das genaueste und sorgfältigste Legatospiel’

Richard Strauss's edition of Berlioz's orchestration manual (1904) that 'strict legato is the basis of organ playing'.³⁸¹

The organ may be considered the legato keyboard instrument *par excellence*,³⁸² and legato playing was strongly associated with religious feeling.³⁸³ Karl Hasse writes that church style implied a legato performance style, and gives this as the reason for so much legato in Reger's organ works.³⁸⁴

1.4 Harmonic comprehensibility

The less legato a chord progression becomes, the more independence each chord achieves within that progression. This may be destructive within a harmonic style that pushes tonality to its limits. As Emmanuel Gatscher wrote in 1924:

A particular pianistic problem in Reger's organ music is the legato performance of dense chordal passages. If a completely smooth chordal legato is not achieved, then Reger's great melodic arcs will be destroyed, the expansiveness of the melodic lines broken up over unconnected chords, and the series of interconnected chord progressions which form the artistic essence of Reger's organ music will become incomprehensible.³⁸⁵

Christopher Anderson writes that 'the singularly appropriate German term is *Vollgriffigkeit*, for which no English translation exists but which well expresses Reger's aim for sonorous effects via a succession of thick chords... There can be little doubt that Reger developed the style from the piano... but its transference to the organ presents almost insurmountable difficulties for legato performance'.³⁸⁶

1.5 Piano and organ

³⁸¹ See Strauss 260. '...das strenge Legatospiel wird die Grundlage für das der Orgel angemessene Spiel sein.'

³⁸² Reger's biographer Guido Bagier noted this when he wrote somewhat cryptically that an examination of op. 7, Reger's first organ work, 'shows complete freedom from piano texture, and a total commitment to a legato only possible on the organ' ('*die vollständige Loslösung vom Klaviersatz und die völlige Hingabe an das nur der Orgel mögliche Legatospiel*'). Bagier B 117

³⁸³ Schneider 20. M. Schneider perceived the predominance of legato in nineteenth-century German organ playing as having originated as a defence against non-organistic, *galant* influences. Legato was particularly associated with hymn playing and, thus, religious feeling (see, for instance, the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung VII*, Leipzig 1805, 693 cited by Schneider, op. cit. 32), and was fostered in the theoretical works of the early nineteenth century. These tutors shunned the placement of the same finger or toe on two consecutive notes (*Fortsetzungsverbot*), and recommended toe/heel and finger substitutions, sliding of the thumb, use of the side of the foot, and sliding from a black to a white pedal note, all intended to achieve a perfect legato.

³⁸⁴ Hasse C 857

³⁸⁵ Gatscher 5. 'Ein besonderes pianistisches Problem liegt bei Reger in dem Legato der Akkordmassive. Ist ein vollkommenes, glattes Akkordlegato nicht erreicht, so wird der große Regersche Melodiebogen vernichtet, die ungeheure Expansion der melodischen Linie zerbröckelt in nebeneinander stehende Akkorde, die Regersche Orgelmusik wird zu einer Addition von Akkordverbindungen und als künstlerische Emanation unverständlich.'

³⁸⁶ Anderson 45, note 76

The relationship between piano and organ is illuminated by Reger's remark to Hermann Unger that 'No [pianist] can play legato any more. That can be learnt very well by a lot of harmonium or organ playing.'³⁸⁷ The reason for this recommendation is presumably that given in the introduction to the Riemann-Armbrust *Technische-Studien*,³⁸⁸ where it is stated that, 'No aid similar to that rendered by the piano-pedal in difficult legato passages is found in organ-playing, and the hands are thus obliged to play everything that is to sound legato in a really smooth and connected manner'.³⁸⁹ Here the challenge of legato playing on the organ is recommended as an antidote to what Reger perceived as the general pianistic malaise of a haphazard or consistently non-legato playing style. Thus, Reger's conception of piano playing embraces a true finger legato, in conjunction with but independent of the sustaining pedal. Conversely, Gatscher could later insist on mastery of piano technique in order to achieve smoothness in the playing of chord progressions in Reger's organ music. He identified lack of pianistic skill as one of the main factors in the low level of Reger organ performances.³⁹⁰

However, it was apparently the importance Straube placed on articulation in his organ teaching that led to his insistence that a refined touch first be developed on the piano. Gurlitt quotes Straube as follows: 'Just as the pianist articulates with touch, and the violinist with the bow, the organist has to be able to speak on his instrument with a subtle awareness of the finest differentiation between legato and non legato. This challenging goal can only be achieved by a pedagogical diversion through the broad spectrum of piano technique.'³⁹¹

Thus, Straube's insistence on a thorough grounding in piano playing for organists was apparently motivated by the desire for differentiation of touch more than for a smooth legato. F. Högner reports that students of the Leipzig Conservatory were often required to devote themselves to piano study for between one term and two years before he would accept them as organ pupils. Högner himself studied with Hans Beltz, who allegedly taught him how to breathe life into every note. According to Högner there was little difference between the pianistic standard of Straube's top-level organ diploma students and that of the full-time pianists.³⁹²

1.6 Non-legato touch

³⁸⁷ Spemann 59. 'Heute kann keiner mehr legato spielen. Sehr gut lernt man das durch vieles Harmonium- oder Orgelspielen.'

³⁸⁸ Undated, published by Peters in Leipzig. Armbrust was a virtuoso organist prominent in early performances of Reger and Karg-Elert.

³⁸⁹ Peters, undated, *Einleitung*. 'Jede der durch das Klavierpedal bewirkten ähnliche Hülfe für die schwierigeren Bindungen fällt auf der Orgel gänzlich weg und die Hände sind darauf angewiesen, was gebunden klingen soll, wirklich streng zu binden.'

³⁹⁰ Presumably, Gatscher is here calling arm and shoulder technique into organ playing, unless he intended that knowledge of the sustaining effect provided by the piano pedal was to educate organists' ears to the point of emulation.

³⁹¹ In Gurlitt B, op. cit. 210. 'Wie der Pianist mit dem Anschlag, der Geiger durch die Bogenführung die Töne artikuliert, so muß der Organist, mit subtilem Gefühl für die feinsten Möglichkeiten im Wechsel zwischen legato und non legato, auf seinem Instrument sprechen können. Nur der erzieherische Umweg durch die weiten Gebiete der Klaviertechnik führt zu diesem schwer erreichbaren Ziel.'

³⁹² See Högner E, 27, 39 & 40

Non-legato touch was cultivated alongside the legato that predominated in German organ playing throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. As late as 1880, the conservative A. Haupt advocated a differentiated touch for the sake of clarity, perhaps an anachronistic affirmation of Marpurg's 'ordinary' touch (1755).³⁹³ But progressive theorists also advocated non-legato touch. In protesting against the dismissal as pianistic of the organ music of Mendelssohn, Thiele, Hesse and Brosig, for example, one of Straube's organ teachers, Otto Dienel, insisted that 'it would be a poor organist who could only play legato. One can play staccato, trills, rhythmic accents and arpeggios on the organ just as on the piano, but of course in an organistic manner. And the better the organ is, the easier it is to produce variety of touch.'³⁹⁴

Here non-legato touch is favoured for its colour or effect. This is presumably the motivation for the few non-legato passages indicated in Reger's early works, for instance, the staccato notes in the C major fugue of op. 7, or the staccato and *leggiero* accompanying parts to the seventh statement of the theme in the *Passacaglia* from op. 16.

But reasons of colour and clarity alone are not enough to explain the levels of detail of non-legato touch in some of Reger's later scores (signified by the staccato dot, its combination with tenuto dash or wedge, and the *mezzo legato* pedal markings in op. 67/4 and op. 60/1) and more particularly the unprecedented level of detail in Straube's Reger editions. A deeper motivation must be sought. This may be uncovered in a demonstrably Wagnerian attitude to musical texture, as discussed below in section 5.4.

2 Reger and touch

2.1 Reger's confirmation of legato organ style and his use of the term *legatissimo*

Reger's early organ music contains hardly any slurs or verbal indications of legato. It may safely be assumed, however, that, in line with nineteenth-century practice, a legato playing style was generally intended, as is confirmed by occasional *ben legato* markings, for instance in the *Passacaglia*, op. 16, which normalise the texture immediately after passages that utilise non-legato markings.

On the evidence of his later organ works (see below under section 2.5) it would appear that Reger greatly valued a legato playing style, indicated in his scores by slurs, and by frequent use of the terms *legato*, *ben legato*, *sempre ben legato*, *marcato ma ben legato*, *sempre assai legato* (in op. 67/2), *legatissimo* and *sempre legatissimo*.

³⁹³ In *Anleitung zum Clavierspielen* (1755, 2/1765, i/7, 29). The 'ordinary' or 'normal' touch was advocated in treatises popular in the nineteenth century, for instance, in Türk's *Clavierschule* (1789, English translation 1804).

³⁹⁴ Dienel 57. 'Es wäre ein schlechter Orgelspieler, der nur das gebundene Spiel versteht. Wie auf dem Clavier kann man auch auf der Orgel—natürlich orgelmässig—Staccato spielen, trillern, rhythmisch accentuieren und arpeggieren, und je vollkommener das Orgelwerk ist, desto leichter werden sich auf demselben die verschiedenen Anschlagsarten ausführen lassen.'

At times Reger's plea for legato performance could be obsessive, as in the *Fuge*, op. 59/6. Here the *sempre ben legato* is repeated no less than eleven times, in bars 4/5, 7/8, 13/14, 20, 25, 40, 46/47, 57, 60/61, 74 and 81.³⁹⁵

Reger's occasional *sempre legatissimo* appears to fulfill a variety of functions. Apart from its literal meaning as an extreme of legato, it acts as a reminder that legato playing is assumed despite a diverging indication in another voice, as in the Chorale Fantasy, *Hallelujah! Gott zu loben*, op. 52/3, bars 10–13. It encourages the player to play as legato as possible where the extreme difficulty of the passage so marked excludes a true legato, as in bar 14 of *Alle Menschen müssen sterben*, op. 52/1, or in the last three pages of op. 52/3. In the middle section of the *Capriccio*, op. 59/10, the *sempre legatissimo* marking perhaps hints at a textural blurring of the chords in contrast to the more articulated framing sections, although it would be difficult to maintain with certainty that Reger ever envisaged over-legato performance on the organ.

2.2 Technical difficulties

Often enough in Reger's music a true legato is technically extremely difficult to achieve. In *Die neuere deutsche Orgelbewegung* (1931) Karl Hasse recognised that in Reger's organ music a true legato in all voices is often a technical impossibility, and suggested the joining of melodic lines (i.e. a true legato performance of one or more parts at the expense of the others, a technique suggested by Schütze as early as 1838³⁹⁶), and the occasional use of the right foot to help out in the tenor region, for instance, in bars 27/28 of *Straf mich nicht in deinem Zorn*, op. 40/2.

Reger's own performances dealt with the problem similarly. In his analysis of Reger's 1913 Welte recording of his *Benedictus*, op. 59/9,³⁹⁷ for example, Benn Gibson describes how the composer negotiated the legato problem. In bars 4 and 52, he writes, Reger concentrated on a legato performance of the outer or moving parts, at the expense of the inner or static parts. In a slow tempo, particularly, the ear will most easily be drawn to the outer and moving parts.³⁹⁸ In other Reger recordings, for instance in the progression of seven-note chords at the end of the *Melodia*, op. 59/11, 'it is impossible to hear whether or not [the fine legato effect] is achieved by the judicious omission of inner notes'.³⁹⁹

2.3 Reger's rejection of gratuitous phrasing indications

In *Der junge Max Reger und seine Orgelwerke*⁴⁰⁰ Rudolf Huesgen describes Reger's initial adoption of Hugo Riemann's theory of phrasing, in which he had been schooled by his mentor

³⁹⁵ Other pieces containing obsessive verbal indications of legato are op. 52/3, 56/1, 56/3, 59/8, 60/3 (between bars 26 and 43) and 92/2. These pieces contain eleven, seven, nine, six, seven and eight markings, respectively.

³⁹⁶ In his *Praktische Orgelschule* 41, cited by Schneider, op. cit. 31, see below under section 5.6

³⁹⁷ Gibson 12

³⁹⁸ See also the article on 'Dynamik' by M. Thiemel in *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, where he maintains that our perception favours the soprano and bass of a musical texture.

³⁹⁹ Gibson, op. cit. 13

⁴⁰⁰ Huesgen 13ff, 18ff & 47ff.

Adalbert Lindner through the study of Riemann editions of Bach, Mozart and Beethoven.⁴⁰¹ However, although Reger incorporated Riemann's notational symbols (^ and double ^) in his transcriptions of Bach organ works for piano (1892–95) and in the organ chorale prelude *Komm, süßer Tod* (presumed to have been composed in early 1894), he did not employ them in either of his early large-scale organ works, op. 7 (1892/3) or op. 16 (1894/5), or in any of his ensuing organ works. In fact, in a letter to Lindner of 26 November 1888, Riemann had advised Reger not to become too bogged down in detail.⁴⁰² Huesgen wrote that Reger was soon able to free himself from Riemann's 'extreme dissection'.⁴⁰³

Reger believed that a too liberal application of phrasing indications could disguise the inadequacies of a composer and the emptiness of his music. This realisation possibly lay behind the conscious rejection of phrasing indications in Reger's early organ works. As early as 29 September 1890, shortly after his first term under Riemann in Sondershausen, Reger wrote to Lindner that 'the world of phrasing, meaningless pretence, is abhorrent to me'.⁴⁰⁴ He added that 'the beauty of structure, the melodic and imitative magic must always be evident, otherwise it is worthless'.

A previous letter to Lindner of 11 April 1890, which refers to Riemann's class as a '*ganz internationales Phrasierungsbureau*' shows that Reger's fellow students had been caught up in the whirlwind of the *Phrasierungsbewegung*⁴⁰⁵ initiated by Riemann. Reger's refusal to comply with the dictates of fashion and his insistence on compositional purity perhaps led to the primitive level of phrasing in the notation of his early organ works, which, indeed, is not much more advanced than that of the Rheinberger sonatas.

2.4 Slurring as an analytical tool

Even a decade and more later, Reger's phrasing indications were sparse. However, the slurring was often crystal clear in its sketching of the overall structure and thematic material, as well as the contrapuntal events of a piece. The analytical character of the phrasing is especially evident in his fugues, where it is commonly confined to the indication of the length and recurrence of the fugue subject and its transformations. Phrasing indications are closely bound to compositional priorities and are not primarily concerned with performance.

As phrasing in this sense is a form of analysis, it is not surprising that Reger restricts this aspect of his notation to a minimal level. Reger once remarked to Hermann Unger that he was 'against musical analysis because, if it were to be thoroughly undertaken, whole volumes would have to be written about a single large-scale work'.⁴⁰⁶

⁴⁰¹ See Lindner A 44

⁴⁰² Cited in Lindner A, op. cit. 45

⁴⁰³ Huesgen, op. cit. 19 '... von der starken Zergliederung...'

⁴⁰⁴ MRB 21. 'Phrasentum, inhaltloses Getue ist mir ein Greuel: immer muß die architektonische Schönheit, der melodische und imitatorische Zauber da sein.'

⁴⁰⁵ MRB, op. cit. 18. Huesgen, op. cit. 13 ascribes the use of this widely used term to Hugo Riemann in a misquotation of a letter from Riemann to Lindner of 26.11.1888. Riemann actually wrote of a *Phrasierungslehre*, not a *Phrasierungsbewegung*.

⁴⁰⁶ In Spemann, op. cit. 55. 'Ich bin gegen musikalische Analysen; denn: will man sie gründlich betreiben, so

A good example of this is the *Fuge*, op. 59/6, where almost every entry of the subject is marked out by slurs. The fact that Reger neglected the alto entry in bar 25 and the tenor entry in bar 71 would suggest that the phrasing was added hastily. Nevertheless, it presents a useful guide to the contrapuntal ambitions of the piece, and the inversion of the subject at bar 48 and the various strettos from bar 77 onwards are immediately obvious on a casual examination of the score.

This very unprogressive approach to phrasing is by no means restricted to the traditional form of fugue. In the extremely 'modern' *Kyrie*, op. 59/7, for example, one of the first Reger works edited by Straube, a similar attitude prevails. Apart from markings in the pedal part and those covering the two descents from the climactic high f^ms,⁴⁰⁷ slurs in the *Kyrie* are reserved almost exclusively for thematic and contrapuntal elucidation, and follow the main and subsidiary themes throughout the piece, clearly documenting the rampant contrapuntal virtuosity that culminates in the two stretto sections.

The phrasing of the *Fughetta*, op. 80/2 (1904) suggests a strict legato performance throughout, overriding the slurs. The usual analytical exposition of the thematic and formal structure by means of phrasing is extremely cursory. Reger slurs the subject only on its first appearance in the alto voice, the continuation of which is unphrased and marked *sempre ben legato*. Subsequent statements of the subject in the alto are ignored. The soprano, tenor and bass parts are slurred in huge sections lasting up to 30 bars each. In the soprano the slurring recommences only twice, in bars 25 and 43, clearly marking out the formal structure of a loose double fugue: Fugue I, Episode (Fugue II), Combination of thematic material. Clearly, the scanty phrasing indications relate to the delineation of the fugue subject itself and the large-scale compositional events, and not to the performance of the piece.

Here again, Reger's slurring obviously fulfills an analytical function and bears no relation to the 'modern' editions, or *Phrasierungsausgaben*, introduced by Riemann in 1883. In this light, W. Fischer's comments at the 1910 organists' convention in Dortmund are surprising, if not ludicrous. Having identified phrasing as one of the most important aspects of Reger performance (after technical ease, gripping rhythm and appropriate registration) he claimed that the effect of a Reger piece often depends on the care with which the performer treats the composer's (indications of) phrasing.⁴⁰⁸ As Reger's indications are often minimal, their careful realisation could hardly result in a performance well shaped by phrasing.

2.5 Development in Reger's notation of phrasing and articulation

Around 1900 Reger's *Notenbild* became increasingly complex. Despite the initial adoption and conscious rejection of Riemann's notational symbols noted above,⁴⁰⁹ several writers have

müßte man über ein größeres Werk ganze Bände schreiben.'

⁴⁰⁷ One of these is notated as an E sharp.

⁴⁰⁸ Fischer, op. cit. 14, see also section 5.1

⁴⁰⁹ In section 2.3

pointed to a marked increase in Reger's use of slurs and indications for articulation around the turn of the century.

Gerd Sievers notes that not until op. 33 (1899) did Reger make extensive use of phrasing marks, and states that the first to be phrased throughout was op. 46 (1900), perhaps on Straube's suggestion.⁴¹⁰ Heinz Lohmann writes that 'in the works up to op. 59 [1901] Reger articulated less and his phrases are more expansive. In these works the player is at liberty to add appropriate articulation.'⁴¹¹

Hermann Busch gives 1902 as the watershed after which Reger displays a richer application of articulation in the notation of his motoric fugue themes (op. 56/2, 65/8, 80/4, 80/12, 85/2, 92/7, 127, 135b second theme), and also suggests that a retrospective application of this level of differentiation of touch to similar themes from earlier works (op. 29 or 40/1) may be appropriate.⁴¹²

Heinz Wunderlich suggests that in a 'practical' edition of Reger's organ works phrasing would have to be modelled on the Straube editions and on Reger's later works, especially op. 127.⁴¹³ And Ludger Lohmann writes that 'Reger's early fondness for legato articulation, well in the spirit of Riemann...gives way to a much lighter style of articulation in his later works as a consequence of his experience as conductor of the Meiningen court orchestra, which also influenced his way of writing for the organ.'⁴¹⁴

These statements loosely define the following stages of development, in which the widely diverging levels of phrasing and articulation indications in Reger's music may roughly be classified:

1. 1892–1898

Op. 7, op. 16, op. 27, op. 29, op. 30 and the chorale preludes *Komm, süßer Tod* and *O Traurigkeit, o Herzeleid*

Apart from *Komm, süßer Tod* organ pieces composed during this period contain hardly any indications of phrasing or articulation, or *ben legato* markings. The op. 29 *Phantasie und Fuge*

⁴¹⁰ Sievers, op. cit. 534

⁴¹¹ Lohmann A 232. 'In den Werken bis op. 59 artikuliert Reger weniger, seine Phrasierungen sind großbözig. Dem Spieler bleibt es unbenommen, hier auch eine sinngemäße Artikulation durchzuführen.'

⁴¹² Busch F 59. Although Heinz Lohmann's and Hermann Busch's suggested retrospective application of a higher level of articulation than notated in early organ works by Reger would appear to fly in the face of authenticity, this may be due to our own conditioning. The relationship of notation to actual sound was clearly not what we would now commonly imagine. Karl Hasse, in *Die neuere deutsche Orgelbewegung* (1931), points to Reger's later transcriptions of two major organ works for piano duet that contain staccato dots not notated in the originals, and this perhaps also favours a retrospective application of a higher level of articulation than notated in the early organ works.

⁴¹³ Wunderlich A 7–16

⁴¹⁴ Lohmann, L., op. cit. 278

contains none at all. The short chorale prelude *Es kommt ein Schiff geladen*, published much later in the October 1905 issue of the *Monatschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst* also falls into this category.

Apart from some staccato dots, and accents which probably do not refer to articulation, instances of phrasing and articulation marks are as follows:

- (a) The Riemann-influenced indications for the chorale prelude *Komm, süßer Tod* (early 1894?), which contains complex sub-phrasing, and combines slurs with dynamic markings, circumflex signs and double circumflex signs that indicate the lengthening of notes.
- (b) Three slurs in bar 42 of op. 7/1.
- (c) Nine bars of slurs with wedges for the ‘devil music’ in op. 27 starting at bar 100.
- (d) Seven bars of slurs in the *Passacaglia* of op. 16. starting at bar 176, and in the same movement several *ben legato* markings that normalise the texture after sections that contain *leggiero*, staccato and *martellato* (wedges) markings.

2. 1899–1900

Op. 33, op. 40/1, op. 40/2, op. 47, *Präludium in c-Moll* and *Introduktion und Passacaglia in d-Moll*

1899–1900 were transition years in which Reger partly phrased his organ music. Op. 40/1 is typical, where 31 out of 121 bars in the *Fantasie* are slurred, as well as the first three statements only of the fugue subject.⁴¹⁵ In this year Reger made increasing use of (*sempre*) *ben legato* markings (two each in op. 33, 40/2 and the *Passacaglia*, and three in the op. 47 collection of six trios).

Properly speaking, the six trios that form op. 47 (1900) belong in a category of their own, as these short pieces are either phrased throughout or not at all. Nevertheless, this peculiarity lends the set a transitional character in keeping with the other pieces in this category. Movements one, three and five contain no slurs, but instead are marked *sempre ben legato* in their first bars. This marking was inappropriate to movements two, four and six, however, as they contain staccato dots, and therefore, for the sake of clarity, Reger felt compelled to fully furnish these movements with phrasing and articulation markings. Here the function of Reger’s slurs was apparently to cancel previous staccato markings and indicate legato, rather than delineate separate phrases.

⁴¹⁵ This incomplete phrasing was obviously often a shorthand in the sense suggested much earlier by Werner in his *Orgelschule* (1807), 17, who writes that ‘[often] only the first notes of a piece are furnished with slurs or dashes, and this usually means that the piece should be continued in the same way’ (*[oft] nur die ersten Noten eines Stückes mit Strichen oder Bogen bezeichnet sind, welches gemeiniglich andeutet, daß man so zu spielen fortfahren soll*). Schneider, op. cit. 47

3. 1900–1916

In these years, with very few exceptions, Reger phrased through entire movements, at least in one voice. In contrast to op. 47, slurring was not confined to pieces that contain staccato dots or other indications of non-legato articulation.

This large group may be subdivided into three categories (a), (b) and (c), revealing a concentration of (*sempre*) *ben legato* indications in the years 1900–02. As Reger also included more indications of articulation after 1902, at least in music of a motoric character,⁴¹⁶ it is possible that after this time the circumstances that led to Reger's obsessive insistence on a predominantly legato performance no longer obtained, or that he now favoured a more differentiated performance style. The fugue subject of op. 92/7 is typical of this period, furnished with slurs, tenuto dashes and staccato dots.

(a) 1900–1916

op. 46, op. 56/4 & 5, op. 57, op. 67/6, 8, 10–13, 15, 20–27, 29–34, 36–52, op. 73, op. 79b, op. 85, op. 127, op. 129, op. 135a, op. 135b, op. 145, *Romanze, Präludien und Fuge gis-Moll* (1906) and *fis-Moll* (1912), and the chorale prelude *Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern* (without opus no.)

These works are phrased throughout, but contain no (*sempre*) *ben legato* indications.

(b) 1900–1905

op. 52/1, op. 63, op. 65, op. 67/1–5, 7, 9, 14, 16–19, 28 and 35, op. 69, op. 80, op. 92/1 and 3–7, *Präludium und Fuge d-Moll*, and the chorale preludes *Christ ist erstanden von dem Tod* and *O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden*

These works are phrased throughout, and contain some verbal indications for legato. These (*sempre*) *ben legato* indications were introduced in the *Passacaglia* from op. 16 (1895, almost entirely unphrased) and were finally phased out after op. 92 (1905).

(c) 1900–1902

op. 52/2 & 3, op. 56/1, 2 & 3, op. 59, op. 60, *Variationen und Fuge über 'Heil, unserm König, Heil'*

These works are phrased throughout, and contain many, sometimes excessive verbal indications for legato.

⁴¹⁶ See Busch F 59

The dating of a work is occasionally suggested or even brought into question by discrepancies, as in the case of the unslurred op. 92/2, which contains eight (*sempre*) *ben legato* indications, although supposedly composed at a time when this notational alternative to slurring was fast becoming extinct in Reger's organ works; or the chorale prelude *Es kommt ein Schiff geladen*, presumed to have been composed in 1905, but totally bereft of phrasing and articulation indications.

The preponderance of verbal legato markings in the first three 'easy' preludes and fugues of the op. 56 collection, and their absence in the last two, would also perhaps suggest a split dating for this opus, which could explain the somewhat ambiguous statements made by Reger and Lindner in connection with this work.⁴¹⁷

However, the level of phrasing and articulation indications alone is not a reliable guide to the dating of Reger's organ works. The occasional non-conformity of a particular piece to the level of slurring or verbal legato indications of other pieces composed in the same period could reflect the preference or even whim of the composer, the haste with which a composition was notated, the stage of composition, or even its publication status (preparation for mainstream publishers, minor publishers, music journals, church publications, private use, etc.).

Disregarding the small number of minor deviations from the norm in the above categorisation, the data clearly shows a development in Reger's organ notation from few or no indications of phrasing or articulation to a fully slurred texture enlivened by a limited application of non-legato indications.

The initial rather haphazard approach to slurring was probably more concerned with compositional design and a general legato style, and this was gradually replaced by a more complete and 'modern' system that presumably applies more to actual performance.

As far as verbal indications of legato are concerned, the situation may be summarised as follows: organ works containing none were composed throughout the period 1892–1916; a number of works composed between 1899 and 1905 contain some verbal legato indications; and a group of pieces composed between 1900 and 1902 is peppered with them. Here, the level of insistency on legato verges on obsessiveness. Thus, a reduction of (*sempre*) *ben legato* indications on either side of the peak period between 1900–1902 is easily identifiable. Reasons for this remain conjectural, as does its significance for performance.

2.6 Highlighting: Accents, tenuto dashes and *marcato*

With the enormous increase in Reger's use of slurs from 1900 onwards, their efficiency as visual aids to compositional structure and as a means of drawing attention to particular musical lines was drastically reduced. As a result, Reger's early use of slurring for the purpose of highlighting musical lines was largely superseded by alternative signs and terms.

⁴¹⁷ See H.J. Busch in *Zur Interpretation der Orgelmusik Max Regers* (Kassel 1988), 82, where conflict between chronology according to opus number and statements of Reger and Lindner is noted.

Along with accents and tenuto dashes, this function of slurring was largely replaced by the ubiquitous terms *marcato*, *poco marcato*, *ben marcato*, *sempre ben marcato*, *assai marcato*, *marcatissimo*, *hier hervortretend*, *nicht zu stark hervortretend*, *etwas hervortretend*, *weniger hervortretend*, *sehr zart hervortretend* and *nur äusserst zart hervortretend*, all referring to the highlighting of melodic material to a greater or lesser degree.

It might be expected that in Reger's organ music accents, tenuto dashes and *marcato* indications would all demand non-legato touch, but this is not the case. Indeed, the phrase *marcato ma ben legato* would seem to confirm that Reger feared that some organists might interpret the *marcato* marking as an indication of articulation. In fact, all these indications are frequently accompanied by slurs or the ubiquitous [*sempre*] *ben legato* marking. They are employed in a legato context where prominence is given to a musical line perhaps by means of colour, volume or rubato, but not by touch. A classic example of this is the *sempre legatissimo* presentations of the chorale theme in *Hallelujah! Gott zu loben*, op. 52/3, where the chorale notes are supplied variously with accents and tenutos. Hermann Busch finds that the combination of *marcato* and *ben legato* in op. 59/12 implies that '*marcato* is not an articulation but a means of highlighting a particular line (*eine klangliche Hervorhebung*)'. Walter Fischer further confirms this understanding of the term '*marcato*' when he refers somewhat cryptically to 'a few *marcato* stops in *fortissimo*'⁴¹⁸ as being essential to the performance of Reger. Reger's indication *pp* (*ma un poco marcato*) in bar 49 of *Variationen und Fuge über 'Heil dir im Siegerkranz'* could also perhaps refer to colour or volume, and not touch.

In the case of tenuto dashes there are many examples over notes (e.g. op. 63/1, bar 46) or chords (e.g. *Präludium*, op. 56/2, bar 28 or *Präludium*, op. 56/3, bar 26) that sound between rests, where there can be no question of non-legato touch. It seems obvious in these cases that the tenutos either refer to a lengthening of the notated time values, or at least imply the prevention of a reduction in the length of the notes or chords.

Indeed, it would seem that tenuto dashes most often suggest a slight lengthening of notes, in order to draw attention to particular notes or musical lines. Hermann Busch gives an example from Reger's op. 63/9, from bar 10 forward,⁴¹⁹ where tenutos under a slur almost certainly call for this treatment. And, in a rushing demisemiquaver passage, bar 9 from the same movement is a further example of tenutos under a slur adding weight to the first of every eight notes, thereby supporting a progression in crotchet thirds with the bass. Again, this appears to have more to do with time (*rubato*) than touch.

On the other hand, there are cases where tenuto dashes almost certainly imply a shortening of the notes and a non-legato performance. One such case is in the variation beginning at bar 131 of the *Introduktion, Variationen und Fuge über ein Originalthema*, op. 73, where the unslurred pedal semiquavers are furnished with tenuto dashes throughout. In the next variation (bar 146ff.) the pedal continues in semiquavers, this time slurred and with the marking *sempre ben legato*. A *portato* touch for the tenuto variation would seem appropriate.⁴²⁰

⁴¹⁸ Fischer 7

⁴¹⁹ Busch F 56 & 57

⁴²⁰ In *Dreißig kleine Choralvorspiele*, op. 135a, Reger uses the tenuto dashes to signify a lift where a note repeats in the chorale theme. This is a special case where tenuto dashes unequivocally signify separation of notes. However,

The fact that tenuto dashes appear to be ambiguous in their meaning and can signify both the shortening and the lengthening of notes is not necessarily problematic, if it is recognised that the main function of tenutos is to draw attention to notes or musical lines within a specific textural situation. The manner of execution depends on context.

A further function of tenutos is an analytical one. Similar to the way in which slurring can mark out melodic and contrapuntal structure (see section 2.4 above), tenuto dashes can effectively elucidate compositional details. This avoids the inelegance of annotation, as in the BACH fugue of op. 46, where the thematic inversion in bar 55 is labelled '*Thema in rückläufiger Bewegung*'.

A striking example of the analytical use of tenutos is in the *Tokkata*, op. 63/9, where tenutos in the opening flourish draw attention to the notes (E), D sharp and C, B, A, G. These notes outline the initial shapes of both fugue subjects from the ensuing double fugue, at the pitches of the simultaneous presentation of the two subjects starting in bar 80. It seems, therefore, that this significant moment in the *Fuge* was foreshadowed in the opening flourish of the *Tokkata*, and that the tenuto dashes underline this compositional device, not primarily indicating the manner of performance.

3 Straube and touch

3.1 The problematic nature of Straube's phrasing and articulation indications in performance

As with Reger the literal application of Straube's phrasing and articulation indications in performance is problematic. Hugo Riemann distinguishes between the mechanical and technical function of articulation indications compared to the idealistic or conceptual nature of slurs, and Maria Hübner suggests that Straube's long (umbrella) slurs could also perhaps be interpreted in this light.⁴²¹ A footnote to the Prelude in C, BWV 545, in Straube's 1913 Bach edition⁴²² requires the long phrases to be 'felt' (*empfunden*), while detail is pointed out by subsidiary slurring.

Furthermore, Hübner points out that the complex stratification of the phrasing and articulation in Straube's 1909 edition of Bach's *Magnificat* is not reflected in the performing material. The individual instrumental parts are mainly furnished with dots, tenuto dashes and accents (*Punkt, Strich und Keil*), which, according to Hübner, signify light separation (not staccato), light emphasis and strong emphasis respectively.

in his 1913 Welte recordings of *Lobt Gott, ihr Christen alle gleich*, op. 67/23 and *Wie sohl ist mir, O Freund der Seelen*, op. 67/58, Reger is careless in his repetition of chorale notes. He also fails to restrike identical notes where voices overlap, as Volckmar insisted in his *Orgelschule* (1863). Hermann Busch recalled to me that in the 1950s he heard some 'old organists' tell him that 'on the organ repeated notes are not allowed, they are to be slurred'.

⁴²¹ Hübner, M. 325, after Keller (in *Phrasierung und Artikulation*, Kassel 1955, 49)

⁴²² Peters Bach Edition, Volume II, 'Der größere Bogen deutet den über ein Teilungsstrich hinausgehenden inneren Zusammenhang mehrerer Takte an. Diese weiter gespannte musikalische Phrase muß als Einheit empfunden und als solche dargestellt werden. Kie kleineren zeichnen das Detail.'

These parts contain no slurring. They were given to musicians known to and rehearsed by Straube and were not intended for the public eye. This suggests an analytical or cosmetic function for Straube's phrasing in the full score of the *Magnificat*, and confirms the difficulty of attaching a single meaning to any particular indication of phrasing or articulation.

A further illustration of this is the tenuto dash under a slur, which Straube explained in a footnote to his 1913 Bach edition as signifying a 'heavily emphasised non legato',⁴²³ and this interpretation is confirmed in the pedal part of op. 80/11, bar 31, where three notes a fourth apart are to be played by the left foot alone (the other foot is operating the Swell at the time). In the *Toccat*a, op. 59/5, however, the same indication cannot imply non legato, as some of the notes marked in this way are tied over.

3.2 Straube and legato

Despite confusion as to the exact meaning of Straube's indications of phrasing and articulation, it seems that a legato performance of many passages was also encouraged by Straube, especially of full-textured chordal music. This was indicated by a much more complete and detailed application of slurs than in Reger's originals, in some works compensating for the composer's lack of slurs, in others replacing the ubiquitous (*sempre*) *ben legato* markings and the inordinate slurs that appear to be synonymous with verbal indications of legato.

A fine example of this is in the *Kyrie*, op. 59/7, where Reger indicated *sempre ben legato* in bars 3, 7 and 18. Straube's more extensive use of slurs renders these verbal indications superfluous except in bar 18 where the verbal indication is retained, and where the technical difficulty of the music might easily give rise to a non-legato performance of this passage, the first climax of the piece.

As in this passage, Straube always reduces the tempo in loud chordal passages, which is perhaps intended to avoid cacophony, but also facilitates legato playing by allowing the hands to reposition by means of finger substitutions. A further example of this is in the *Toccat*a, op. 59/5, where all the full chordal passages are accompanied by *rallentandos*.

In order to produce the best possible legato effect, Straube occasionally imposed a phrasing pattern on an awkward chordal passage, where an attempt at total legato might well result in a disjointed effect. This allows the hands to reposition for a completely smooth performance of the chords within the new (small) slurs, often indicated as sub-phrasing under a long slur. Straube appears to have preferred this in some instances to the original phrasing that could only result in a pseudo-legato succession of chords.

An example of this technique is the series of slurred pairs that descend from the second climax in the *Kyrie*, op. 59/9, bars 32–34. The pairing of the full chords that contain up to ten notes each is indicated by sub-phrasing beneath Reger's original long slur, which stretches across the whole passage, and Straube's desire for overall legato is further confirmed by his choice of tempo indication, *Sostenuto*. In fact, the sub-phrasing implies finger substitutions under the slurs, with

⁴²³ '...ein schwer betontes non-legato...', in a footnote to Prelude in C from Peters 1913 Bach Edition, Vol.

(‘legato’) leaps between them. This pattern sets up a rhythmic regularity that is a surrogate for complete smoothness of line. This technique also serves to highlight details in the music, as in bars 13/14 of the *Kyrie* (see Appendix 5), where the phrasing not only facilitates legato, but also underlines the sequential writing.

However, despite the encouragement of legato in Straube’s scores, it is possible that a gap existed between his teaching and the principles put forward in his editions on the one hand, and his own performance practice on the other. The awkward fingerings (marked in blue) in a section of Straube’s personal manuscript of op. 52/2⁴²⁴ would arouse the suspicion that, in this difficult passage at least, a legato performance was not forthcoming. Unfortunately, the lack of fingerings in Straube’s editions precludes a meaningful discussion of this most important area of performance.

3.3 Over-legato and sliding between manuals

Straube may have made limited use of over-legato,⁴²⁵ mostly in a *piano* or *pianissimo* context. Wayne Leupold cites Straube’s overlapping touch as simulating the *glissando* and *portamento* of singing and string playing. He mentions Straube’s application of over-legato to entire chords for *sotto voce* or *misterioso* effects.⁴²⁶

A further case where an extreme position was taken in relation to legato is treated in Heinz Wunderlich’s exposition of Straube’s teaching of op. 57, in *Zur Interpretation von Regers Symphonischer Phantasie und Fuge op. 57*.⁴²⁷ Here, Straube’s method of sliding from manual to manual is described in detail. Wunderlich claims that manual changes were never executed in all voices simultaneously, although there are countless instances in Straube’s Reger editions where this is disproved. Unfortunately, this method cannot be gleaned from Straube’s notation, apart from two occurrences in the *Präludium* of op. 85/3, where Straube changes manuals from II to I (bar 36) and II to III (bar 60) in both hands simultaneously, but in mid-chord, so that no gap in the texture occurs. The practice of one hand on two manuals was also used to highlight material on a louder manual (see section 4.1 and footnote 81 in this chapter).

3.4 The perception of Straube as innovator

For Straube, a strong emphasis on a legato playing style was just a starting point. In a letter to Michael Schneider dated 10 April 1941, Straube emphasised the importance of touch for organ colour. He wrote: ‘Ritter’s remark of 1846 that “light and shadow comes from the sounding and prolonging of the notes, not from the alternation between *forte* and *piano*” is none other than

⁴²⁴ For a reproduction of bars 59–62, see H. J. Busch, ‘Karl Straube spielt Max Regers Choralphantasie ‘Wachet Auf’ op. 52/2’ in Busch G

⁴²⁵ This effect of prolonging one note over the start of the next is mostly frowned upon in organ playing as smudging.

⁴²⁶ Leupold 376, no source is given.

⁴²⁷ In Wunderlich C 23, see the second part of Chapter 6

what I have been preaching to my pupils for decades, that is, that articulation and phrasing provide the colour of the organ, and registration is a subordinate and lesser concern.⁴²⁸

Despite Straube's recognition of the historical basis for differentiation of touch, there can be little doubt that he was considered innovative by his contemporaries, to which the words of Gustav Knak bear witness:⁴²⁹

Straube's really great achievement is that he was the first to show what perfection of speech and declamation can be attained on the organ by painstaking precision of phrasing of each voice...he is also the first to have thought of awakening to real musical life the rigid contrapuntal lines imposed on the music by the instrument itself, aided by the use of agogics. I heard it said continually from all sides that the miracle of Straube's playing was that the organ began to sing'.⁴³⁰

Straube's pre-eminence in this area was affirmed by Walter Fischer when he addressed the Max-Reger Festival in Dortmund in 1910:

The main requirements for good Reger playing are a technically impeccable realisation, captivating rhythm and suitable registration. Concern for good phrasing may be added to these main requirements. We organists have not yet been phrasing for very long...In this respect, the incomparable Karl Straube has paved the way...⁴³¹

Nowhere in Straube's Reger editions of 1912 and 1919 is attention to detail so marked as in the indications of phrasing and articulation. The extremity of Straube's position can only be appreciated in the context of the predominance of legato playing, the lack of notational clarity and the low level of textual detail that characterised the nineteenth-century German organ world. His obsession with notational detail led to extreme complexity in the general appearance of his Reger editions, in which as many details of performance as would reasonably fit on the page are

⁴²⁸ KSB 125. 'Ritters Bemerkung von 1846, "die Licht- und Schattenpunkte bestehen im Angeben und Festhalten solcher Töne, nicht im Wechsel von Forte und Piano", ist nichts anderes, als was ich meinen Schülern seit Jahrzehnten predige, daß Artikulation und Phrasierung die Farbigkeit der Orgel herbeiführen, der Registerwechsel jedoch eine nebensächliche Angelegenheit minderen Grades ist.' C.f. also Hasse F 156, where it states that Straube often practised into the night on soft stops, trying out phrasing, fingerings, touché and agogics.

⁴²⁹ There may well have been an overlap in time between the differentiated touch of organists such as Knecht, Mendelssohn, Vogler, Rinck and Haupt (derived partly from late-Baroque playing styles, partly from the desire for expressiveness and the imitation of orchestral models) and the innovations, as they were then perceived, of Dienel, Reimann, Straube and others, which appear to have been based mainly on the extreme orchestral and pianistic refinement of the last decade of the nineteenth century. That Straube could later imply connections between his differentiation of touch and that of late-Baroque theorists was fortuitous in the light of his undoubted wish to be seen as having anticipated the *Orgelbewegung* in this most important respect.

⁴³⁰ Cited in Hasse F, op. cit. 159. 'Das ganze große Verdienst Straubes ist es doch wohl, daß er als erster gezeigt hat, welche Vervollkommnung der Deklamation, der Sprache der Orgel durch ein peinlich genaues Phrasieren jeder einzelnen Stimme erreicht werden kann...Er ist auch der erste gewesen, der auf den Gedanken gekommen ist, mit Hilfe der agogischen Mittel die-durch das Instrument bedingten-starren Linien des Kontrapunktes zu wirklichem musikalischem leben zu erwecken. Ich habe es immer wieder von allen möglichen Zuhörern gehört, daß ihnen das größte Wunder bei Straubes Spiel schien, daß bei ihm die Orgel anfangs zu singen.'

⁴³¹ Fischer, op. cit. 14. 'Zu diesen Hauptforderungen gesellt sich die Sorge um eine gute Phrasierung. Wir Organisten phrasieren ja noch nicht so lange...Bahnbrechend hat in dieser Beziehung der unvergleichliche Karl Straube gewirkt.'

specified with a rigour and thoroughness never attempted before or perhaps even since in any organ publication.⁴³²

3.5 The five ‘touches’

Wayne Leupold writes that Straube worked with ‘a detailed system of five different touches to achieve clarity and phrasing when working with the opaque sound of the large, late-Romantic German organ’.⁴³³ This reduction of the ‘touch’ in Straube’s editions to five basic forms appears to be derived from Ludwig Doorman’s article *Das Vermächtnis Karl Straubes als Bachspieler*,⁴³⁴ which lists accents, (filled-in) wedges, dots, slurs and tenuto dashes (*Winkel, Keil, Punkt, Bogen, Querstrich*).

However, these same five signs, along with their combinations (slur with dot, slur with tenuto dash, slur with accent, tenuto dash with dot, wedge with dot), are listed by Hermann Busch as those used already by Reger in his organ music.⁴³⁵ The five ‘touches’ in themselves amount to very little. Straube’s contribution was in the application of these signs, and in the level of consistency in their employment, rather than in the evolution and development of an original system.

3.6 The completion of a phrasing system in Reger’s scores

In *Über den Vortrag der Orgelkompositionen J.S. Bachs* (1889) Straube’s teacher, Heinrich Reimann, wrote that ‘only the most important tempo and performance indications were supplied by Bach – the rest should be filled in or completed by the interpretative artist’.⁴³⁶ The current view was that the addition of light and shade was the domain of the performer. This is precisely Straube’s attitude in the vast majority of the Reger movements edited by him. The task of the performer was thought to be largely one of completion, of fleshing out the bones, and Straube chose to follow the same route in his editorial practice. This is clearly the case in pieces like op. 59/7 & 9, op. 80/2 or the *Präludium* of op. 85/2, where a relatively primitive original gives way to more detailed and sophisticated notation.

Even in a movement heavily phrased by Reger, like the *Fugue*, op. 65/8, Straube’s refinement has more to do with the level of articulation, emphasis by touch (indicated by accents and wedges), and completion of a system of phrasing largely deduced from Reger’s score, than with a deliberate alteration of the composer’s conception. Many details in Reger’s original are faithfully reproduced.

⁴³² With the possible exception of Straube’s own edition of Bach Organ Works, Vol. 2

⁴³³ See Leupold 374

⁴³⁴ First presented as a paper at the *Karl-Straube-Tage* in Wesel on 6/7 January 1973

⁴³⁵ Busch F 56

⁴³⁶ Published in *Musikalische Rückblicke II* (Berlin 1900), see Reimann 133. ‘Die Werke des Altmeisters weisen zum größten Theil in den Handschriften nur die allerwesentlichsten Vortrags- und Tempobezeichnungen auf... Nach dem Gebrauch seiner Zeit überlies es Bach... zumeist dem guten Geschmacke der ausführenden Künstler, jene Bezeichnungen selbst zu ergänzen.’

Mostly Straube did not alter Reger's original phrasing and articulation indications gratuitously. He often retains the sweep of Reger's long phrases, and detail is pointed out under Reger's slurs by articulation indications (as in the opening pages of the *Improvisation*, op. 65/5) and by sub-phrasing à la Riemann. Very occasionally Reger's phrasing forms the smaller unit within the 'big Romantic line' indicated by Straube.

In a significant number of cases, especially where Reger's notation is very specific, Straube adheres to the original indications precisely, for instance, in op. 59/5, bars 1–8, or op. 65/7, bars 30–39. In the *Fuge* of op. 85/2 Reger's very detailed phrasing is virtually reproduced by Straube. Only a few details are added, for example, in bars 68/69, or the braking effect of the slurring of the last two pedal notes.

3.7 Indications of phrasing and articulation in Straube's Reger editions as multi-functional aids to performance

a) Phrasing and articulation indications as a braking force

Frequently, Straube's phrasing assists in arresting the flow of the music at cadence points, acting as a kind of brake. This is achieved by an increase in the amount of phrasing (the *Fuge* of op. 85/4, bar 44), by the sudden introduction of tenutos or staccato dots, often in the lowest active part (the *Fuge* of op. 85/3, second last bar), or by a combination of these (the *Präludium* of op. 85/2, bars 31/32).

Most interesting of all are the cases where wedges and tenuto strokes combine with *rallentando* to add sound and weight to a climax. A classic example of this is in Straube's edition of the famous *Toccata*, op. 59/5, bars 32/33. There is no question of non-legato, as some of the wedges and tenutos are tied over. They add length to the notes, and therefore more sound.

b) Harmonic phrasing

In the *Kyrie*, op. 59/7 (see Appendix 5), Straube mostly retains Reger's basic phrasing, but adds a wealth of detail to all parts, often slurring across beats and bars. At the start of bar nine, dynamics, agogics and enharmonic textural beauty combine in a melting moment. Straube's phrasing shows the first soprano note of bar nine to be both the end of one phrase and the beginning of the next, which in the Riemann system would be the moment of maximum relaxation, both in tempo and dynamics. The delayed diminuendo in Straube's score minimises the dynamic difference between the single high G and the ensuing chord, and therefore bridges the barline in a more transitional manner.

Other examples of 'harmonic' phrasing are in the *Präludium* of op. 85/4, bar 4, where the Neapolitan twist is thrown into relief; in op. 65/7, bar 11, where the sequences of preparation, suspension and resolution are 'analysed' by the phrasing; or in the *Präludium* of op. 85/2, bars 14 to 16, where the descending mediant harmonies are clearly brought out by the phrasing.

c) Rhythmic phrasing

Similar to the above harmonic 'analysis' of Reger's original is Straube's imposition by phrasing of particular rhythmic patterns on certain passages. Such a case occurs at the end of the *Präludium* of op. 85/2, from the upbeat to bar 64 onwards, where the original flow of semiquavers in 6/8 time is phrased with three slurs per bar. This imposes a sort of 3/4 feeling which may or may not have been the composers's intention, a performance option that may be adopted or rejected by the player at will.

d) Sequential phrasing

Again Straube's tendency to point out sequences by touch is analytical. Examples may be found in the *Kyrie*, op. 59/7, or in the *Fuge*, op. 80/12, bars 37/38, where the sequential nature of the ascending thirds is revealed by a three-plus-one semiquaver shape which characterises the whole passage.

e) Thematic characterisation

This is perhaps the most obvious function of phrasing and articulation, giving life and character to the musical material, and is one of the main areas in which the more differentiated touch indications of Reger's later organ works may be categorised. Straube developed this further and with more consistency than Reger. One example of thematic characterisation in Straube's Reger editions is the phrasing of the ostinato-like bass of op. 80/1.

f) Acoustical awareness

As an active performer Straube knew the limitations of his instrument and could build this knowledge into the performing indications in his editions. He was aware, for instance, that low pedal notes sometimes take longer to sound than notation allows. This is surely the reason for the tenuto markings on the low pedal E's at the start of op. 80/11 (and in the corresponding passage from bar 22 onwards). The problem here is compounded by the natural urge to increase tempo throughout the passage, inadvertently causing each semiquaver (including the low E's) to shorten as the music progresses. Shortening, in turn, causes loss of sound, and Straube's tenutos are obviously intended to counter this.

The above categories give a brief idea of the great variety of function that phrasing and articulation can fulfill. The enormous complexity of Straube's indications renders analysis inadequate and discussion all but meaningless.

3.8 Reinterpretation

Occasionally Straube wilfully altered Reger's intentions to a greater extent than the mere addition of detail. The deliberate alteration of the phrasing in bars 12 and 13 of the *Toccata*, op. 59/5, for instance, binds six semiquavers together across the beat, where Reger phrased three within the half-beat. Straube's version is more continuous and pushes the music forward irresistibly. It is likely that the slurs refer to agogic treatment, to a surge to the middle of the phrase à la Riemann, especially in view of the tenuto marking on the first semiquaver of each beat. It remains uncertain whether the slurs refer to the physical or conceptual separation of phrases.

4 Texture

4.1 The textural significance of inner voices

In the foreword to his first edition of the seminal first volume of *Peters Bach Ausgabe* (1844), F.K. Griepenkerl gives four means of attaining optimum clarity on the organ, the first of which was 'the segregation of musical ideas by judicious phrasing and the careful connection of notes that belong together, especially in the inner voices'⁴³⁷ (c.f. section 6.5 in this chapter)

Here Griepenkerl touches on an issue in organ playing that gathered momentum in the second half of the nineteenth century, namely the audibility of the inner voices. This concern continued well into the twentieth century. Fischer's comment that 'the charm of the music of the old masters often depends on a well-carried performance of the inner voices'⁴³⁸ is typical.

This recalls that aspect of Wagner's compositional style identified by R. Strauss as being of vital importance to beauty of sound and fullness of texture:

Only true and meaningful polyphony can unlock the highest magic in the sound of the orchestra. An orchestral texture in which middle and lower voices are handled unskillfully or without care will seldom avoid a certain hardness of sound and will never produce the fullness of texture of a score in which all the instruments are emotionally involved in breathing life into beautifully pliable melodic lines. That is the secret of the unprecedented poetry of the *Tristan* and *Meistersinger* scores, unequalled by Weber or

⁴³⁷ Die richtige Sonderung der einzelnen Sätze durch Einschnitte an den rechten Stellen und sorgfältige Verbindung alles dessen, was in engerem Zusammenhang steht; beides in allen Stimmen, besonders aber in den mittleren. See also below under section 6.5

⁴³⁸ Fischer 8. 'Wie überaus wichtig ist ein klares Herausarbeiten der Mittelstimmen... Wie wichtig überhaupt für die Reproduktion alter Meister. In der gesättigten und gut tragenden Ausführung der Mittelstimmen liegt oft der Hauptreiz des Stückes.'

Liszt because the material that accompanies and fills out the texture was not rated highly by the composers and therefore does not lead to active participation in the expression.⁴³⁹

Fritz Stein, who often turned pages for Reger, could witness to this quality of spatial depth in Reger's piano playing. He describes Reger's unconscious mastery of weight in piano playing in terms of 'the elasticity of his staccato and leggiero playing...[and] the way in which he could present the remotest ramifications of the main and subsidiary lines of the polyphonic web of a Bach fugue.'⁴⁴⁰ And Reger's complaint about female pianists (!), that 'they have a thin sound that doesn't project well, no legato and no sense of the inner voices'⁴⁴¹ confirms this concern of Reger's, as does his frequently suggested registration of 8' pitch for the right hand and 8' and 4' for the left.⁴⁴²

There seems little doubt that Straube too was fully aware of the textural significance of the inner voices. The painstaking phrasing of both main and subsidiary material in a contrapuntal texture was characteristic of the Straube sound. W. Gurlitt quotes Straube as follows: 'Bach unfolds a musical argument in the contrapuntal elaboration of his themes. Such motivic construction must be brought home to the listener, because often the real key to the mysterious secrecy of this musical wonder world may be found in the subsidiary thoughts.'⁴⁴³ And his pupil, Hermann Keller, writes of the importance in the performance of Reger's organ works of 'the technical ability to allow inner voices emerge and retreat at any moment',⁴⁴⁴ reminiscent of Wagner's own promise that his instruments would be like 'layers of clouds that part and then re-form'.⁴⁴⁵

That Straube shared this late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century concern for inner voices is further confirmed in a footnote to his edition of Bach's Prelude in C major (BWV 545, 1913)⁴⁴⁶ where he wrote, 'if the balance of the stops in the manuals permits, the indicated layout for the first six bars should be followed [i.e. with the left-hand inner voice on the coupled-through manual I, the upper voices on manual II]. However, the imitation of the middle voice should not play a solo role, but should merely be sensed in the overall texture'.⁴⁴⁷

⁴³⁹ In Strauss, Foreword

⁴⁴⁰ In Stein A 38. 'Geradezu unvergleichlich war Regers federndes Stakkato- und Leggierospiel und vor allem seine Kunst, das vielfältige polyphone Gewebe etwa einer Bachschen Fuge nach Haupt- und Nebenlinien bis in die entlegensten Verzweigungen aufzuhellen...'

⁴⁴¹ Cited in Spemann, op. cit. 58, as reported by Hermann Unger. '...über klavierspielende Frauen: sie haben einen spitzen, nicht in die Ferne tragenden Ton, kein Legato und keinen Sinn für Mittelstimmen.'

⁴⁴² See Busch F, op. cit. 55

⁴⁴³ Gurlitt B 210. 'In der Kontrapunktierung seiner Themen treibt Bach musikalische Exegese. Solche motivische Ausdeutungen müssen dem Zuhörer nahegebracht werden; denn oft findet man in den Nebengedanken die eigentliche Lösung für die geheimnisvollen Rätsel dieser musikalischen Wunderwelt.'

⁴⁴⁴ Keller 83 (289). '...die technische Fähigkeit haben, jederzeit Mittelstimmen vor- oder zurücktreten zu lassen...'

⁴⁴⁵ See Chapter 4, section 1.1

⁴⁴⁶ Peters Edition no. 3331. 'Wenn der Ausgleich der Stimmenbesetzung in den Manualen es zuläßt, so ist für die ersten sechs Takte die angegebene Manualverteilung anzuwenden. Die imitatorische Führung der Mittelstimme soll hierbei nicht solistisch hervortreten, sondern nur im Gesamtklang fühlbar werden.'

⁴⁴⁷ This is similar to the orchestral situation where second violins often have to play out more strongly than the firsts in order to balance successfully.

There are numerous examples of the technique of highlighting thematic material in Straube's Reger editions, and this often goes hand in hand with a crescendo or decrescendo, for instance in op. 65/6, bars 72/73, where the transition from manual II to manual I is achieved part by part within the context of a smooth build-up. The tendency for Straube to register the left hand louder than the right hand in his Reger editions, for instance in the *Kyrie*, op. 59/7 (e.g. bars 17–19 from the excerpt given in Appendix 5), is further evidence of this textural preference, as is his use of the *marcato* indication.

However, the motivation for revealing the expressive content of the inner voices is usually presented in a negative context. In connection with the inner relationship between Reger and Bach Fischer points to Schweitzer, who fostered 'an intensive projection of the inner voices, which seem to him to sound too dull and inflexible'.⁴⁴⁸ Typical also is Winfred Ellerhorst's account in his *Handbuch der Orgelkunde* (1936), where he claims that in order to make the inner voices audible on the 'modern' orchestral organ, suitable only for chordal playing, two hands on three manuals are required.⁴⁴⁹

Whatever the motivation, this technique was pioneered by Straube and is well documented by his pupils. The technique was obviously a source of pride to him, as in a 1904 photograph at the console of the *Thomaskirche* organ, Straube demonstrates with his right thumb picking out an inner voice on the middle manual, while the rest of his right hand plays on the top manual and his left hand on the bottom manual.⁴⁵⁰

Like Schweitzer and Ellerhorst, F. Högner believed that, as the voicing of the organs [of Straube's youth] was unsuitable for clarity in the presentation of the lines of a polyphonic texture, it was necessary for Straube to develop a special technique that stretched a finger of one hand from one manual to another. In this way he could play thematic passages of a fugue on a louder manual.⁴⁵¹

4.2 *Marcato*

As noted in section 2.6 Reger uses a variety of terms in his organ music to highlight particular voices, for instance, in op. 63 alone: (*nur*) *äußerst zart hervortretend* (op. 63/1), *marcato* and *poco marcato* (op. 63/2), *sehr stark hervortretend*, *ben marcato* and *assai marcato* (op. 63/10). Mostly these concern thematic entries, usually in the left hand or pedal.

In Straube's editions also, *marcato* indications mostly concern the inner voices or pedal and almost never the top voice, for instance, in the fugues, op. 65/8 and 80/2, where *marcato* indications are reserved exclusively for the inner and lowest voices. In op. 59/6, the only *marcato* marking in the soprano voice is at the less obvious entry of the fugue subject in inversion in bar 34, and in the *Fuge*, op. 65/12, the *marc.* indications in the soprano and bass serve to signal the arrival of the combination of the double-fugue subjects.

⁴⁴⁸ Fischer, op. cit. 7. '...dass Schweitzer u.a. ein intensiveres Heraustreten der Mittelstimmen, die ihm jetzt zu dumpf und unplastisch klingen, wünscht.'

⁴⁴⁹ 667ff.

⁴⁵⁰ See Anderson 66, and Anderson, note 56 on page 113.

⁴⁵¹ Högner E, op. cit. 29

It was previously noted that as *marcato* and *ben legato* indications can occur simultaneously in Reger's scores, for instance together with tenuto dashes in the pedal *cantus firmus* in op. 59/12, H.J. Busch concludes that *marcato* is not an indication of articulation but an 'emphasis of sound'.⁴⁵² And in bar 15 of op. 80/11 Reger's 'not too prominent' (*nicht zu stark hervortretend*) is translated by Straube as *un poco marcato*, which perhaps suggests synonymity for these terms.

However, in Straube's edition of movements such as the *Fuge*, op. 65/12, or the *Fuge*, op. 59/6 (which abounds in *un poco marc.*, *marc.*, *più f marc.*, *assai marc.*, and even *non marc.* indications), it would seem impossible that these markings could refer to dynamic balance, as the registration and layout of manuals are set by Straube. It would be difficult, for instance, to imagine how the *non marc.* in the pedal of bar 83 could refer to registration. If these markings are not merely conceptual they could refer either to agogic treatment, or differentiation of touch.

5 Conclusions

5.1 Fischer, Straube and Reger

Considering the incomplete nature of Reger's phrasing, the following observations of Walter Fischer at the 1910 Reger festival in Dortmund (attended by both Reger and Straube) are suspect (see also section 2.4), and cannot refer to the bulk of Reger's organ music: 'The incomparable Karl Straube has paved the way in his approach to phrasing. He has given us all we need in his Liszt arrangements and his *Alter Meister* collection. Reger's phrasing indications are no less exemplary. The effect of an organ work by Reger depends in great measure on the care with which the interpreter sticks to the phrasing given by the composer...organ playing which gives the impression of inflexibility is often the result of insufficient phrasing.'⁴⁵³

These remarks are perhaps politically motivated as they disregard the total lack or scant indications of phrasing in many Reger works. Nevertheless, they are indicative of a 'modern' attitude to organ playing that balked at unrelieved legato touch, and sought to develop a higher degree of sophistication in this area. Straube's Reger editions of 1912 (only two years later) and 1919 treated Fischer's comments almost disdainfully, so completely did they outdate the levels of phrasing in organ notation up to that time.

In fact, as discussed in section 2.4, Reger's indications of phrasing and articulation often appear to be more concerned with structural elucidation than performance. It may be safely assumed

⁴⁵² Busch F 57. 'klangliche Hervorhebung'

⁴⁵³ Fischer, op. cit. 14. 'Bahnbrechend hat in dieser Beziehung der unvergleichliche Karl Straube gewirkt. In seinen Liszt-Bearbeitungen und in seinen Sammlungen der Werke alter Meister gab er uns alles, was wir brauchen. Regers Phrasierungsbezeichnungen sind nicht minder vorzüglich. Die Wirkung eines Regerschen Orgelstückes hängt wesentlich von der Sorgfalt ab, mit der der Interpret sich nach den Phrasierungsvorschriften des Komponisten gerichtet hat...Wir werden dann bald merken, wie oft unplastisch wirkendes Spiel seinen Grund in ungenügender Phrasierung hat.' Straube's Liszt edition of 1917 was preceded by an earlier edition, which appears mysteriously difficult to trace. Hambraeus 45 (footnote 10) dates this to 'around 1900' and Hartmann 173 to 1904, although neither has actually seen a copy.

that ‘authentic’ conditions for much of Reger’s organ music demand a legato playing style relieved to a greater or lesser extent by judicious differentiation of touch.

5.2 Levels of phrasing

It should be noted, also, that where touch is concerned, Reger recognised a performance level that went beyond his own notation. This standpoint is inherent in the composer’s agreement to Straube’s 1912 edition. The well-known story of Reger’s approval of Straube’s articulation of the fugue subject from op. 52/2 is a further illustration of this. Instead of a loud, smooth performance as notated in the original, Reger proclaimed that the theme should be played à la Straube ‘like an angel dancing through heaven’.⁴⁵⁴

In *Karl Straube spielt Regers Choralfantasie ‘Wachet auf’ op. 52 Nr. 2*,⁴⁵⁵ Hermann Busch aligns the original printed phrasing of this same fugue subject, Straube’s indications from his personal manuscript used for the first performance in the *Garnisonkirche* in Berlin, and Straube’s conception of the phrasing and articulation in later years, as transmitted by Heinz Wunderlich. Although the two Straube versions differ significantly from one another (the later version is more detailed, more hierarchical, more crusic) it is obvious that the level of legato suggested by Reger’s notation was not observed, and that differentiation of touch contributed greatly to the characterisation of the theme in Straube’s performances.

Curiously, in his preparation of the Meiningen *Hofkapelle* concerts, Reger was engaged in similar enhancement of the score. He marked up scores according to dynamics and phrasing with painstaking care, and began rehearsals by clarifying the ‘importance and non-importance’ of all the parts.⁴⁵⁶

In 1913 Reger defended his revisions of other composers’ works in the following words: ‘I have only added dynamics, *marcato*, *espressivo*, *agitato*, etc...I do not of course change anything in the music itself, except in minor cases where a modern instrument could bring out a motif more clearly...I would be most grateful if an important composer would present *my* works more effectively...’⁴⁵⁷

It would be absurd to insist on the particular level of phrasing and articulation presented by Straube, or that of any other editor, in the performance of Reger. However, despite Reger’s obsessive insistence on legato playing around the turn of the century, it would be even more incongruous to maintain that players should restrict themselves to the indications given in Reger’s scores, which are often extremely scanty and often bound more to compositional priorities than performance.

5.3 The function of phrasing and articulation

⁴⁵⁴ Quoted in Högner C 305. ‘...als wenn ein Englein durch den Himmel hüpf.’

⁴⁵⁵ In Busch G 99

⁴⁵⁶ C.f. Busch, Fr. 2. ‘Reger “dozierte” zunächst in den Proben, indem er den einzelnen Instrumenten ihre Bedeutung und, was bei seinen Werken oft noch wichtiger ist, ihre “Nichtbedeutung” klar machte...’

⁴⁵⁷ In a letter to the Duke of Meiningen of 15 February 1913

The motivation for phrasing and articulation practices current in Reger's and Straube's lifetimes is manifold and ambiguous: differentiation of touch appears to have been favoured for clarity, and for wealth of detail; legato was demanded for religious feeling, and for the continuous effect essential to a transitional style; the detailed enunciation of inner voices was fostered in the interests of clarity, structural elucidation and textural richness.

Crystal clear, however, is the irrelevance of the fiction that has been propagated over the years, which states that differentiation of touch was introduced by way of compensation for the lack of clarity and character inherent in the 'modern' organ. Schweitzer gave credence to this much-echoed view that the 'modern' treatment of Bach's organ works, varied in touch and dynamics, was forced upon organists due to the miserable quality of the plenum sound, and because on 'modern' organs 'only the soprano and the bass can be heard - it is impossible to follow the inner voices'.⁴⁵⁸

Even initiates of the Reger/Straube circles supported this view, for instance, K. Hasse in Straube's 70th. birthday tribute *Gaben der Freunde* (1943): 'What Straube continually sought after in his artistic, finely balanced registrations and differentiation and pliancy of touch was the surmounting of the heavy, viscous, dull and lifeless sound of the "modern" organ'.⁴⁵⁹

How could Hasse forget or disregard the quality of the instruments in Wesel and Leipzig, and the nature of that blended, 'covered' and indirect sound that Straube once valued so highly, which is dependent on this organ type? Did the passage of time and the weight of *Orgelbewegung* ideology stifle the significance of the Reger editions, which abound in detail in every aspect of performance, including touch, or did Straube's Reger editions never seriously register in the minds and performances of even his own pupils?

5.4 A post-Wagnerian attitude to texture

Rather than compensating for poor instruments it seems much more likely, at least in the Reger editions of 1912 and 1919, that Straube was aiming at a grand design such as that advanced by Bryan Magee in *Aspects of Wagner*. In discussing the enormity of Wagnerian structures he writes that 'The great Wagner conductor is like the builder of bridges who makes a single soaring arc out of three huge spans over an ebb and flow which has a life of its own down to the last glancing fleck of spray'.⁴⁶⁰

Wagner coined the term 'unending' or 'infinite' melody in his *Zukunftsmusik* of 1860. In *Max Reger und die moderne Orgel* (1928) W. Harburger opines that 'the formal construction of Reger's music has something in common with Wagner's infinite melody, but in a completely

⁴⁵⁸ In Schweitzer 28 '...denn auf unseren Orgeln hört man nur Diskant und Baß: die Figuren der Mittelstimmen darauf zu verfolgen, ist unmöglich.'

⁴⁵⁹ Hasse F 186 & 187. 'Was Straube in seinen kunstvollen, aufs feinste abgewogenen Registermischungen und in der Differenzierung und Lockerung des Anschlags stets gesucht hat, die Überwindung des Schweren, Dickflüssigen, Dumpfen, Ungeistigen am Klange der "modernen" Orgel...' Hans Klotz wrote in his ubiquitous *Das Buch von der Orgel* (5/Kassel 1955, 140) that Reger's dynamics were not to be taken too literally, as 'Reger had to make do with an organ type that was, artistically speaking, far below the level of his organ compositions'.

⁴⁶⁰ Magee 92

different, non-psychological sense'. Carl Dahlhaus also writes that this term admits of a technical, as well as a philosophical, definition: that is, a melody that avoids or bridges caesuras and cadences. But, he writes, cadences are avoided less because they are caesuras than because they are formulae and therefore of no significance. Wagner wanted 'unbroken musical continuity and significance in every detail, and both postulates are bound into the concept of "infinite melody"'.⁴⁶¹

These 'postulates' find strong parallels not only in the dense flow of Reger's organ music and in nineteenth-century playing techniques, but particularly in Straube's treatment of Reger's organ music. It was undoubtedly a post-Wagnerian emphasis on continuity of sound, avoidance of formulae as well as textural detail, that led Straube to increased differentiation of touch within a legato context in his notation of Reger's organ works.

'Continuity' implies unbroken sound, or legato, whereas 'significance in every detail' suggests a high level of differentiation of touch, agogics and dynamic shading as means of expression. In *Karl Straube als Vorkämpfer der neuen Orgelbewegung* W. Gurlitt points to the close connection between these parameters.⁴⁶² Paradoxically, as in Wagner's music, both continuity and significance in every detail are important in Reger performance, and sophistication of phrasing and articulation as well as a true legato style were valued by both Reger and Straube.⁴⁶³ To some extent, the balance struck between the poles of unbroken legato and a highly differentiated style that employs both legato and non-legato touches determines the level of 'modernity' of a Reger performance, and therefore it is not surprising that Straube's more 'modern' notation favoured an extremely detailed application of phrasing and articulation indications.

In *Karl Straube als Bachinterpret*,⁴⁶⁴ Maria Hübner comments on how the strong association between differentiation of touch and 'modern' Romantic organ playing caused the total rejection of variety of touch in so-called 'authentic' early music performances influenced by *Orgelbewegung* ideology. In throwing out the baby with the bath water these organists condemned early music to a mechanical and lifeless existence from which, in some quarters, it is still recovering.

⁴⁶¹ Dahlhaus B 114

⁴⁶² KS 195–225

⁴⁶³ While Straube developed great complexity in phrasing and differentiation of touch, a general legato playing style appears to have been adopted by both Reger and Straube. As discussed above, this reflects the general eighteenth and nineteenth-century shift away from Marpurg's normal, non-legato touch (*das ordentliche Fortgehen*, 1750) towards a predominantly legato style in organ playing. Wagner himself highly valued a legato playing style and regretted the loss of a smooth legato in the new valve horns introduced for ease of modulation (see the chapter on orchestration by J. Burton in *The Wagner Compendium*, ed. B. Millington, London 1992). And Hugo Riemann adopted a negative attitude towards staccato articulation because it disrupted flow, its succession of individual accents excluding smooth dynamic lines (Riemann C, op. cit. 149 cited by Lohmann, L., op. cit. 272). Similarly, the *New Grove Dictionary* (1980) defines articulation as 'the manner in which successive notes are joined to one another by a performer. In the simplest terms, opposite kinds of articulation are staccato (detached, prominent articulation) and legato (smooth, "invisible" articulation)'. Quite apart from the strong leaning of nineteenth-century organ practice towards a legato playing style, this definition points to the likelihood that legato would have been favoured not only for its cantabile but above all for its continuous, 'invisible' quality, which reveals the supportive role touch can play in a "transitional" musical style.

⁴⁶⁴ Hübner, M., op. cit.

Despite claims of such Straube pupils as K. Hasse, F. Högner and H. Wunderlich to the contrary, it would appear that in later years Straube may have withdrawn from extreme levels of performance detail. In connection with a proposed 'practical' edition of Reger's organ works, for example, Straube wrote to Oskar Söhngen on 15 November 1946 that 'The problems that arise are in the performance indications, with which Reger presented his musical text. He attempted to clarify his inner concept by means of an overabundance of dynamic and agogic markings.'⁴⁶⁵

The superabundance of notational detail in Straube's 1912 and 1919 Reger editions far exceeds the composer's, and reflects a truly post-Wagnerian density of compositional and interpretative thought. Herein lies the value of Straube's work, which as a musical key to 'modern' organ style can perhaps indeed 'unlock the highest magic' not in orchestral sound, but in organ sound!⁴⁶⁶

5.5 Upbeat phrasing

A decisive element in the search for continuity of sound, so important in the Wagnerian aesthetic, was the nineteenth-century tendency towards upbeat phrasing or feeling. In the interests of a smooth line it was necessary to move away from the old accentuation theory, which required a hierarchical and dynamic differentiation of the various beats within a bar.⁴⁶⁷ Phrasing across beats and bars avoids accents on strong beats and creates a more fluid and continuous musical line.

Hugo Riemann constantly attacked the Baroque accentuation system, which even in the late nineteenth century was still used by many performers. Riemann's most important goal was to show that music (certainly since Beethoven) needs a continuous dynamic flow instead of the 'jagged' dynamic line resulting from the application of accentuation theory.⁴⁶⁸

In this connection, a comment from Straube's teacher, Heinrich Reimann, is significant. In *Über den Vortrag der Orgelkompositionen J.S. Bachs* he wrote that the dynamic shading (*Abtönungen*) of a melody was the first concern in the modernisation of performance practice.⁴⁶⁹ This implies a gradual dynamic connection of notes in opposition to a hierarchical interpretation of metre, and therefore a non-accentuated approach to the bar-line.

W. Gurlitt traces the upbeat nature of Straube's phrasing to the Riemann system⁴⁷⁰ as A. Lindner does Reger's.⁴⁷¹ Reger's phrasing of the subject in the *Fuge*, op. 59/6 is revealing. Here the joining of downbeat entries of the fugue subject to the previous crotchet (bar 50) or quaver (bars 60 and 87) lends the phrases an upbeat character even at the expense of thematic clarity or

⁴⁶⁵ KSB 211. 'Die Schwierigkeiten, die sich eröffnen, beruhen in den Vortragszeichen, die Reger dem Notenbilde seiner Werke mit auf dem Weg in die Öffentlichkeit aufpackte. Durch eine Überfülle von dynamischen und agogischen Bezeichnungen versuchte er seine eigene Auffassung klar darzulegen'.

⁴⁶⁶ R. Strauss on Wagner's orchestral sound, quoted in section 4.1

⁴⁶⁷ See Lohmann, L., op. cit. 252 & 253

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid. 259

⁴⁶⁹ Reimann 135

⁴⁷⁰ Gurlitt B 210

⁴⁷¹ Lindner A, op. cit. 44

literalness. Other similar examples may be found in the fugue of op. 46, bars 133 and 139, and in the fugue of op. 57, bars 81 and 136. And Rudolf Huesgen⁴⁷² demonstrates the upbeat emphasis in Reger's Bach transcriptions by comparing the phrasing of certain passages with that of Heinrich Reimann.

It is very possible that Straube played across the beat or bar more than Reger as a more 'modern' approach might suggest, but this is very difficult to ascertain due to the incomplete nature of Reger's phrasing. Interestingly, the move towards a more emphatic approach to phrasing, with less movement across the barline, in Straube's 1938 edition of op. 27, and in the later articulation of the fugue subject of op. 52/2 handed down by H. Wunderlich, retrospectively confirms the role of upbeat phrasing as an integral part of 'modern' organ style.

Like legato playing, upbeat tendencies may be viewed in terms of a general nineteenth-century shift; from trochaic to iambic and from crusic to anacrustic, which can be observed in late nineteenth-century Germany in the writings of Lussy (1874/1883/1903), Westphal (1872/1880) and Riemann (1884/1886/1903).⁴⁷³ Because the connection of upbeat figures to the downbeat contributes to continuity and flow, it is important to the successful realisation of a transitional style.

5.6 Staggered phrasing

In a discussion of F.W. Schütze's *Orgelschule* (1838), one of the few early-nineteenth-century sources to treat the subject of phrasing in any depth, Michael Schneider notes the tendency to avoid the discontinuous effect of gaps (*akustische Löcher*) between phrases by means of the continuation of the sound in the other voices.⁴⁷⁴

Seventy years later in his Reger editions Straube exploited this kind of 'staggered' phrasing, which promoted continuity of sound.⁴⁷⁵ In bars 10–16 of his edition of Reger's op. 65/11, for instance, he divided the original single phrasing mark over the soprano and tenor parts (the alto was ignored by Reger, and the pedal only enters in bar 15) into six phrases in the soprano, four in the alto, and six in the tenor. Despite the greatly increased number of phrase endings and restarts, however, the continuous legato impression remains undisturbed, as no two parts ever breathe at the same moment.⁴⁷⁶

The smoothness of these separations could be enhanced by the manner in which the phrasing was executed. According to Schütze, the final note of a phrase should be released before its time in order to separate it from the first note of the following phrase, and the term '*Abschleifen*' denoted a gentle, rounded release (*ein feiner Absatz*).⁴⁷⁷

⁴⁷² See Huesgen

⁴⁷³ Leupold 380

⁴⁷⁴ Schneider, op. cit. 51 & 52

⁴⁷⁵ Assuming that audible separations between phrases were intended by Straube at all (see section 3.1)

⁴⁷⁶ See also the fugue of op. 85/2, bar 71

⁴⁷⁷ C.f. Schneider 47 & 48

5.7 The value of Straube's phrasing and articulation

As to the absolute value in practical terms of Straube's detailed and complex phrasing system, Hasse wrote cryptically that Straube's articulations and phrasing in the 1929 edition '*Alte Meister' Neue Folge* 'may be reproduced exactly, and impersonally, but the difference between this and a personally motivated performance is a very small step and is indeed almost unavoidable'.⁴⁷⁸

Indeed, despite the fact that phrasing and articulation is perhaps the most personal and most important aspect of organ performance it will always remain a grey area; partly because of the difficulty of accurate notation, inconsistency in its usage and lack of uniformity in interpretation; and partly because of the very personal nature of touch, and the scale of refinement possible.

Perhaps no mediator should come between composer and interpreter. In the *Präludium* of op. 85/2, bars 14 to 16, Straube's phrasing immediately draws the eye to the descending mediant harmonies. Even if no physical separations are introduced by the performer, the knowledge of this harmonic shape must influence the result for better or for worse. Straube's choice of phrasings excludes other equally valid ones, and the performer who uses Straube's editions should be aware of this.

Strict adherence to Straube's markings can only result in a second-hand performance. Hambraeus reports that 'Reger's well balanced phrasing in the fugue [of op. 57] has at least once been remarkably changed [by Straube, in his teaching of the piece] into a new pattern, which Wunderlich maintained obediently in his 1979 performance and recording'.⁴⁷⁹

This suggests a dictatorial insistence by Straube on a single manner of performance emanating from himself. This impression is supported by the denigration of Karl Straube's teaching practice in Leipzig by Johannes Piersig,⁴⁸⁰ who claimed that phrasing, articulation, fingering and pedalling were regimental in Straube's teaching, and remained unchanged from one generation of pupils to the next. Straube may have been publicly latitudinarian, but privately dogmatic.

In print at least, however, Straube insisted that his editions were to be used alongside the originals, and that his performance indications were in the nature of suggestions, and not binding. He was at pains to emphasise, for instance, in the foreword to *Alte Meister des Orgelspiels* (1904) that his editions were to serve as a 'stimulus' and a 'suggested approach' for performance, and not as an irrefutable 'canon'. In *Rückblick and Bekenntnis* Straube states that '[in my editions] I did not want organists to follow my suggestions blindly, but rather to be free to express their own opinions and feelings'.⁴⁸¹

Variety and sensitivity of touch can never be successfully calculated or notated, as intuition would be defeated by dogmatism. Straube's own words can best sum up the situation: 'Musical

⁴⁷⁸ In Hasse F 193. 'Der Schritt von einer rein formalen Befolgung dieser Artikulationsvorschriften zu einer solchen, die sie gefühlsmäßig motiviert, ist nicht sehr groß und tatsächlich fast unvermeidbar.'

⁴⁷⁹ Hambraeus 62

⁴⁸⁰ In 'So ging es allenfalls' VI, see Piersig

⁴⁸¹ KSB 10 'Ich wollte diese Andeutungen von dem Orgelspieler auch nicht mit sklavischer Buchstabentreue befolgt sehen. Sie sollten ihm immer noch die Freiheit lassen, sein eigenes musikalisches Empfinden zu äußern.'

analysis may be taught – but the infusion of organic life into an entire work must be left to the intuitive strength of the interpreter'.⁴⁸²

6 Tempo and tempo modification

6.1 Tempo modification as an important aspect of Wagnerian performance practice

Much of the present study has equated 'modern' parameters of performance to the trappings of post-Wagnerian performance practice. It has shown that aspects of performance in Straube's Reger editions, such as touch, dynamic inflection and registration, may clearly be related to post-Wagnerian concerns. These derived from a perhaps superficial but nevertheless genuine attempt to attain on the organ the expressive levels inherent in Wagner's 'finest and deepest Art...*die Kunst des Überganges*'.⁴⁸³

The flexible treatment of the above parameters of expression was supported and enhanced by an equally flexible approach to tempo and the modification of tempo in Straube's Reger editions. This crucial aspect of performance was also closely allied to a perhaps errant understanding of Wagnerian performance practice. Straube's reduction of Wagner's ideas to stereotypical formulae would seem, in fact, at variance with the composer's original intent, which was to enhance the emotional Affect of his music through tempo modification.

In 1852 Wagner wrote an essay on how to perform *Tannhäuser*, in which he documented a new type of rhythmic flexibility, amounting to 'an almost entire abandonment of the rigour of the beat'.⁴⁸⁴ In his *Essay on Conducting* of 1869⁴⁸⁵ Wagner insisted that a correct tempo, which may be determined by a true conception of the music, is only part of the question; even more important is the modification of the tempo.⁴⁸⁶ With reference to the performance of Beethoven and 'all romantic music' he proposed fluidity of tempo, expanding and contracting, pushing forward and relaxing, with ritardandos, clearly audible but strictly controlled, as transitions between contrasting passages.

6.2 Reger and rhythmic freedom

⁴⁸² Cited in Gurlitt B 211. 'Musikalische Analyse kann gelehrt werden – einem ganzen Werke organisches Leben einzuhauchen, muß der intuitiven Kraft des Nachschaffenden überlassen bleiben.'

⁴⁸³ From a letter to Mathilde Wesendonck of 29 October 1859, cited in Gurlitt B 201, c.f. Chapter 4, section 1.1

⁴⁸⁴ In 'Über die Aufführung des Tannhäuser: eine Mitteilung an die Dirigenten und Darsteller dieser Oper' in *Richard Wagner's Prose Works, trans. William Ashton Ellis*, iii, 174–5 (London, 1894; repr., New York: Broude Bros., 1966)

⁴⁸⁵ In *Richard Wagner's Prose Works*, op. cit., iv

⁴⁸⁶ As an example of how this works Wagner discussed a passage from the *Meistersingers* overture. When the E major theme is reached the 'tempo must be held back a little...to assert the character of sweetness. To do this unnoticeably (and without destroying the main character of the basic tempo) a few bars of *poco rall.* serve to introduce the phrase...with the increasing restlessness of the theme it was easy to lead the tempo back to its original more moving direction', trans. Hudson 314.

Wagner's ideas led to a widespread and systematic application of a rubato playing style. By 1884 the critic Hanslick admitted that 'metronomic evenness of tempo...[had] been disavowed by all modern conductors', and in 1895 Felix Weingartner complained bitterly about a host of 'little Bülow's' who indulged in a tempo-rubato conducting style.⁴⁸⁷ Hermann Wilske considers in his *Max Reger: Zur Rezeption in seiner Zeit* that a 'determining factor' at the turn of the century was what G. Schünemann in 1913 identified as the main requirement of Wagner in the matter of tempo, that is, 'the modification of the tempo according to the spirit of the expressive intention (*Affekte*)'.⁴⁸⁸

Reger's influential teacher, Hugo Riemann, considered rhythmic shaping an essential aspect of phrasing, and developed a theory whereby dynamics, rhythmic flexibility and phrasing work together to shape the give and take of musical flow. As Ludger Lohmann put it in his groundbreaking essay *Hugo Riemann and the Development of Musical Performance Practice*: 'extremely important...[is] the connection of dynamic and agogic flexibility: *crescendo* is connected with or implies *accelerando*, *diminuendo* implies *ritardando*. As there is a constant dynamic flow, a metronomically precise and steady performance is consequently regarded by Riemann as unmusical.⁴⁸⁹ It is interesting to note that Reger paraphrased Riemann's words in his performance indication in the printed score of his op. 30, *Fantasie über den Choral 'Freu dich sehr, o meine Seele'* ('The hairpins refer to the use of the Venetian Swell, but one could also slightly increase in pace [*stringendo*] where the hairpin opens, and slightly relax in pace [*ritardando*] where the hairpin closes [*Tempo rubato*]').⁴⁹⁰

Reger also followed Riemann in his connection of rhythmic shaping with dynamics in an early work *Komm, süßer Tod* (1904), where a footnote reads: 'The symbol ^ signifies a slight lengthening of the note or rest above which it is placed; < and > have "dynamic" (swell-box) and "agogic" significance.'⁴⁹¹

For Reger, rhythmic shaping could at times be so supportive of dynamics that the lack of a Swell box for certain expressive passages was not considered too serious. If necessary, the emotional effect desired by the composer could be achieved with rhythmic flexibility alone, as indicated in the footnote to op. 30 mentioned above.

Reger's own organ performances recorded at the Welte factory in July 1913 display a great deal of freedom, for instance, in the *Melodia*, op. 59/11, or the *Canzone*, op. 65/9. Even

⁴⁸⁷ As mentioned earlier, Reger is known to have referred to Straube as the 'Bülow' of the organ!

⁴⁸⁸ Wilske Section 1.6, here quoting from Schünemann's *Geschichte des Dirigierens* (Leipzig, 1913).

'Schließlich hat man sich zu vergegenwärtigen, daß um die Jahrhundertwende häufig maßgeblich ist, was Georg Schünemann 1913 als Hauptforderung Wagners bezüglich der Temponahme herausstellt, nämlich "die Modifikation des Tempos nach dem Geist der ausgedrückten Affekte". Dieser "...steht noch heute [1913] im Mittelpunkt unserer Musikübung".'

⁴⁸⁹ Lohmann, L. 270

⁴⁹⁰ The original German is given in Chapter 3, footnote 51. For a fuller discussion of the parallelism between agogics and dynamics see Chapter 3, section 3.3

⁴⁹¹ Das Zeichen ^ bedeutet eine gelinde Dehnung der Note oder Pause, über der es steht; < und > haben "dynamische" (Schweller) und "agogische" Bedeutung.

though the faithfulness to the original recording has been questioned (given that neither of the instruments that were available for subsequent playback is the one on which Reger played)⁴⁹² it would be difficult to understand how a rubato style of such cogency could have resulted from a playback system radically deficient in this respect.

The use of a tempo-rubato is also well supported by countless others who had direct contact to Reger. In his exposition on the performance of Reger's organ music at the Max Reger Festival in Dortmund in 1910, for instance, Walter Fischer drew attention to indications in Reger's scores such as *sempre quasi improvisatione*, or *sempre stringendo* in support of a non-metrical performance style.⁴⁹³ And Emmanuel Gatscher, a Reger pupil, wrote in 1924 that:

Reger's tempo indications could lead to misunderstandings, the catastrophic consequences of which can hardly be imagined. Reger's markings *vivacissimo* and *adagissimo* are...less indications of speed than expression, in the sense of a strong inner intensification or release of tension...Likewise, the ubiquitous indications, *cresc.*, *string.*, *dim.* and *rall.* are neither a sudden swelling and contraction of sound nor a rapid increase and decrease of tempo, but rather the establishment of a generous rubato that pervades the musical space.⁴⁹⁴

6.3 Structural and melodic rubato, and the non-alignment of parts

In post-Wagnerian performance practice two different types of rubato were extensively employed; a structural rubato that affects the entire texture simultaneously, and a melodic rubato that is applied to one or more strands within a texture causing a vertical non-alignment of parts. Both types had existed for centuries, and it is the consistency, intensity and deliberateness with which they were applied that associates them with Wagnerian performance style.⁴⁹⁵

An important and almost miraculous example of how both types of rubato were put into practice in a Wagnerian setting survives in a 1928 recording of Richard Strauss conducting the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra playing the *Tristan* Prelude.⁴⁹⁶ Strauss's first appointment was in Meiningen (where Reger was later employed as director of the famous ducal orchestra) as

⁴⁹² See Busch E 27, or Hagmann 98ff. &177ff.

⁴⁹³ Fischer 11

⁴⁹⁴ Gatscher, op. cit. 7. 'Die Regerschen Tempobezeichnungen konnten zu Mißverständnissen führen, die in ihrer katastrophalen Auswirkung kaum auszudenken sind...Die Tempobezeichnungen Regers, "vivacissimo" und "adagissimo", sind zum Beispiel weniger eine Angabe der "Schnelligkeit", sondern mehr Ausdrucksbezeichnungen im Sinne einer starken inneren Erregung oder einer starken Entspannung...Ebensowenig sind die immer wiederkehrenden Angaben *cresc.*, *string.*, *dim.*, und *rall.* weder ein plötzliches Herausschleudern und Einsaugen der Klangmassen, noch eine rapide Tempobeschleunigung und –verminderung, sondern vielmehr die Fixierung eines großen, musikalische Räume durchsetzenden Rubato...'

⁴⁹⁵ Many different historical examples of structural rubato may be cited, from the innocuous *avec discretion* in a Froberger suite to the extremes of *Stylus Fantasticus* where time 'goes on holiday'. The non-alignment of right and left hands was evident in such practices as the Baroque (unnotated) and Romantic (notated) spreading of chords and the French ornament, *Suspension*, not to mention the well-documented melodic rubato practised by C.P.E. Bach, Mozart, Chopin, and others.

⁴⁹⁶ Koch Legacy 3–7119–2 H1

assistant to the famous Wagner conductor, Hans von Bülow, who had conducted the first performance of Wagner's *Tristan und Isolde*.

In Strauss's performance the tempo changes nearly every bar in a natural and hardly noticeable manner. Only a check with a metronome reveals the extreme extent of the tempo fluctuations, which vary from about quaver = 60 to quaver = 108.⁴⁹⁷ Even in complex passages themes are characterised by their own tempos, e.g., the Glance motif in the cellos, bars 17–22, and here this results in an extraordinarily expressive non-alignment of the parts.

A further rhythmic idiosyncrasy may be heard in early piano recordings of pianists such as Paderewski, Bauer, Hofmann and Rosenthal, etc. This practice is well documented as 'a special characteristic of the period...the breaking of hands...[whereby] the left hand often sounds first, causing a delay in the melody'.⁴⁹⁸ Obviously, a texture that is 'spread' will be both less accented and more continuous, two vital ingredients in a transitional style.

Reger, too, appears to have indulged in these late-Romantic forms of melodic rubato. The early Riemann-inspired signs mentioned above imply the rhythmic nuance of individual lines within a complex texture. And Christopher Anderson writes of Reger's organ recording for the Welte factory made in July 1913 that, 'also noticeable...is a perceived asynchronisation between manual and pedal voices, a practice which may or may not result from the mechanics of recording and reproduction'.⁴⁹⁹

6.4 Straube and tempo modification

A quick glance at the opening of Straube's 1919 edition of Reger's *Präludium*, op. 85/1 will immediately call to mind Wagner's words quoted above at the end of section 6.1, and Strauss's performance of the *Tristan* Prelude. In this 32-bar piece Straube proposes ten ritardandos followed by 'a tempos' where Reger notates but one. Furthermore, Straube replaces Reger's single *Andante* with four basic tempos; *Andante*, *Un poco più tranquillo*, *Tranquillo* and *Lento*, each with its own metronome marking varying from 36 to 66 quavers per minute. Similar to the way in which the primitive forms of Walze were improved by the provision of numerous in-between stages, now basic tempos were supplemented with a multiplicity of intermediate tempo levels.⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁷ A very approximate allocation of metronome values for the quaver from bar 9 to bar 30 reveals the extent of the rubato: bar 9 = 92, 10 = 108, 16 = 80, 18 = 90, 20 = 80, 22 = 70, 24 = 60, 26 = 70, 29 = 66, 30 = 92. Amazingly, Weingartner, who strongly attacked the "Bayreuth rubato" in his pamphlet *Bayreuth (1876 – 1896)* considered Strauss along with himself, Muck, Toscanini and Knappertsbusch as representing a purist style in opposition to the rubato style of Bülow, Mottl, Seidl, Nikisch and Mahler. According to Weingartner Strauss had been converted from the excesses of his earlier more Romantic days!

⁴⁹⁸ Hudson 334

⁴⁹⁹ One example of this is Reger's recording of *Lob't Gott, ihr Christen alle gleich*, op. 67/23. But these organ recordings do not match the subtlety and elegance of the non-alignment in the Welte piano recordings (1905) of selected pieces from op. 20, 45 and 82 (reissued by the Max-Reger-Institut in 1973 on the DA CAMERA label, Nr.99016)

⁵⁰⁰ This process of multiplication of tempo levels was ongoing in the nineteenth century. Widor thought the reason why Bach and his contemporaries neglected to indicate tempos and registration was because they only required the same two tempos over and over: *Andante* and *Allegro* (if they occasionally wanted *Adagio* then they indicated it!), Riemann E 55. In 1817 Beethoven wrote to Hofrat von Mosel that he wished to discard the four

The flexible tempo demanded by Wagner is further suggested in Straube's scores by the indications *flessibile* and *espressione*, and by the use of tempo gamuts for certain sections. These gamuts indicate that the tempo of the music may fluctuate within certain limits. Examples are as follows:

Table 5.1 Flexible tempos in Straube's Reger editions

<i>Benedictus</i> op. 59/9, b.24	<i>Un poco mosso</i> (crotchet = 72–92)
<i>Fuge</i> op. 65/6	<i>Molto tranquillo</i> (semiquaver = 76–84)
<i>Fuge</i> op. 65/8	<i>Allegretto grazioso</i> (quaver = 72–84)
<i>Toccata</i> op. 65/11	<i>Flessibile, ma tranquillo</i> (crotchet = 76)
<i>Fuge</i> op. 80/12	<i>Energico molto (ma non allegro)</i> (quaver = 84–92)
<i>Präludium</i> op. 85/2	<i>Grazioso e flessibile</i>
<i>Präludium</i> op. 85/3	<i>Adagio (sempre con espressione)</i> (quaver = 60–66) (b.21, quaver = 58–63)

These tempo gamuts are strikingly similar to those performed by Reger himself on the Welte recordings mentioned above. See, for example, the gamuts noted by Hermann Busch for the *Benedictus*, op. 59/9,⁵⁰¹ which range over as many as thirteen counts on the metronome for certain sections.

The close relationship between phrasing, dynamics and tempo modification discussed above in relation to Hugo Riemann and Reger was also a feature of Straube's performance style. Wilibald Gurlitt wrote in *Karl Straube als Vorkämpfer der neueren Orgelbewegung* that 'every *crescendo* went hand-in-hand with a *stringendo*, and every *diminuendo* with a *ritardando*...Dynamic and agogic treatment was closely allied to phrasing.'⁵⁰²

principal tempos, *Allegro*, *Andante*, *Adagio* and *Presto* and set tempos according to metronome markings.

⁵⁰¹ Busch F 60

⁵⁰² Gurlitt B 211. 'Aufs engste verknüpft mit der Phrasierung spielen die dynamischen und agogischen

6.5 Reduction in tempo

In 1844, in the introduction to the first volume of *Peters Bach Ausgabe*, F.K. Griepenkerl suggested four means of achieving clarity on the organ (c.f. section 4.1), summarised as follows:

1. Correct phrasing, separating what does not belong together and joining what does.
2. A flexible touch to prevent smudging and the disintegration of lines.
3. Great care in registration.
4. A moderate tempo that suits the piece and the registration. After a short explanation Griepenkerl closes with the advice, ‘if *Organo pleno* is indicated, then the piece should be played even slower’.

Emotional intensification in Reger’s organ music leads to the simultaneous increase in volume and tempo indicated by the ubiquitous combination of *sempre crescendo* and *sempre stringendo*. Taken to its logical conclusion this produces climaxes both extremely loud and fast. Often the acoustic surrounding an organ is such that the result is muddled, dissonant and unpleasant. As a heated commentator wrote in the *Musical Times* in August 1937 ‘The real problem in Reger...how can his furious speeds be reconciled with his chromaticism, and with his demands for excessive power? Did he not realise that either pace or power must be modified if sheer cacophony is to be avoided?’

The above situation led to a further important routine in Straube’s editing of Reger’s organ music that became almost formulaic in its consistency of application, the relaxation of tempo and metronome markings. This was noted above in section 3.2 in relation to legato playing. Already, in 1910, Walter Fischer had insisted on caution in the realisation of Reger’s tempo indications. In a passage marked *sehr lebhaft* by Reger ‘better too slow than too fast’, and ‘a good rule is to play a shade slower than feeling dictates’.⁵⁰³ This advice recurs frequently in writings on Reger performance.⁵⁰⁴ Hermann Wilske has put forward the theory that Reger’s extreme tempo markings, whether extremely fast or extremely slow (as at the end of Reger’s op. 96, for example, where the music grinds to a pace of crotchet = 24), were intended merely as indications of the final tempo to be arrived at within a particular section, or as general pointers (*Eckwerte*) which do not necessarily hold for the entire section.⁵⁰⁵

Vorgänge im Orgelspiel eine bestimmende Rolle. So gesellt sich jedem Crescendo ein Stringendo, jedem Diminuendo ein Ritardando.’

⁵⁰³ Fischer, op. cit. 12 & 13. ‘...da heisst die Regel: lieber zu langsam als zu schnell...Im allgemeinen geht man nicht fehl, wenn man immer eine Nuance langsamer spielt, als das musikalische Gefühl uns eingibt.’

⁵⁰⁴ Some have claimed that Reger’s metronome was inaccurate. In conversation and by letter (to this author, dated 16.8.95) Heinz Wunderlich insisted that Reger’s metronome scale was completely wrong and gave a comparative list of metronome values intended to correct the original markings. No explanation was offered as to how these conclusions were made.

⁵⁰⁵ See Wilske, Section II, 1.6

Fischer defended Straube's alteration of Reger's scores including the downward scaling of tempo indications by claiming that 'even the composer was not objective in the treatment of his own works...Therefore, metronome markings are only hints, and not binding'.⁵⁰⁶ Fischer also warned about playing too slowly, and drew attention to Reger's frequent indication '*aber nicht schleppend*'.⁵⁰⁷ Heinz Lohmann felt that 'decisions on tempo and dynamics should be made from the middle out'.⁵⁰⁸ And Straube himself was able to find some justification for the slowing down of Reger's music in a performance of Reger's C major violin sonata, op. 72, given by the composer with Henri Marteau at the Frankfurt Tonkünstlerversammlung in 1904. Straube claimed that 'above all transitional dynamics were applied to the music, and despite the exaggerated metronome marks, the tempos were moderate and smoothed over'.⁵⁰⁹

Hermann Busch presents a fascinating comparison of tempos for Reger's *Benedictus*, op. 59/9; from the original edition, Straube's 1912 edition, Reger's own (Welte) recording and Reger's arrangement for harmonium.⁵¹⁰ The metronome values deviate drastically from one another, and in almost all cases the original markings are far in excess of the later values. A particularly extreme example of this is the *Vivace assai* at bar 24, marked by Reger in the original as *minim* = 96, which later becomes *crotchet* = 72–92 in Straube's edition, a projected *crotchet* = 63–76 in Reger's Welte recording,⁵¹¹ and *crotchet* = 96 in Reger's edition for harmonium.

Reduction in tempo was practised for acoustical, technical and musical reasons, and partly by way of correction. Fischer wrote that 'a slight reduction in tempo is always advantageous to flexibility on the organ'.⁵¹² The obsession with detail, clarity, legato style and the careful playing out of every thematic snippet in the texture often dictates a slower tempo than suggested by Reger's indications. For Reger's *Allegro con brio* in the *Toccata*, op. 65/11, for instance, Straube gives *Flessibile, ma tranquillo* (76 crotchets per minute) and, in bar six, *Allegro moderato* (60 crotchets per minute). The detail in bars 11 and 12, where new phrases begin within a semiquaver of each other, and where the alto voice is played between the hands on a different manual from the soprano voice, would have been impractical at a faster tempo. Also, the control of the ensuing *Swell* and *Walze* crescendo, and the part-by-part transference from manual II to I is facilitated by a slower tempo.⁵¹³

⁵⁰⁶ Fischer, op. cit. 13. 'Auch der Komponist steht seinem Werke nicht objektiv gegenüber...Wir bleiben also dabei: Metronomisierungen sind nur allgemeine Hinweise auf das rechte Tempo, aber nicht verbindlich für den Spieler.'

⁵⁰⁷ Fischer, op. cit. 13. Fischer also admitted that some passages couldn't be played fast enough, and gives as an example the scales in the B-A-C-H *Phantasie*.

⁵⁰⁸ In Lohmann B 95. 'Die Entscheidung für Tempo und Dynamik nach allen Seiten hin muss aus der Mitte heraus getroffen werden.'

⁵⁰⁹ In a letter to Oskar Söhngen dated 15 November 1946, in KSB 211 & 212. 'Vor allem war es eine Übergangsdynamik, die zur Anwendung kam, ferner wurden die Zeitmaße im Gegensatz zu den übertriebenen Metronom-Angaben überraschend gemäßigt und ausgeglichen durchgehalten.'

⁵¹⁰ Busch F 60. See also Hambraeus 58ff.

⁵¹¹ See above for a reference to the unreliability of the Welte recordings.

⁵¹² Fischer, op. cit. 12. 'Ein Zurückhalten – nicht um wesentliches – ist im Interesse der Plastik auf der Orgel immer von Vorteil.'

⁵¹³ The importance of taking time for manual changes is obvious and is recognised by Karg-Elert, for instance, in his footnote to *Sempre semplice*, op. 86/7, where he writes 'Tempo really flowing, changes of manual without haste or gaps' ('Tempo recht fließend, Manualwechsel ohne Hast und ohne Luecken')

6.6 Summary

The treatment of tempo and its modification in Straube's Reger editions, therefore, continues general late-nineteenth-century trends (including those favoured by Reger himself), conforms to acoustical imperatives and adopts the trappings of Post-Wagnerian performance practice. The main issues concern a significant reduction in tempo, the introduction of subsidiary tempo levels, the insertion of numerous linking *ritardandos* and the adoption of an overall rhythmic flexibility, or tempo-rubato.

Straube would also, perhaps, have practised the melodic rubato style discussed above, which results in the non-alignment of parts; and he was undoubtedly well aware of the close relationship, on a local as well as a structural level, between dynamics, phrasing and tempo modification.

CHAPTER 6

THE SURVIVAL OF ‘MODERN’ ORGAN STYLE: STRAUBE AND REGER PERFORMANCE IN THE 1930s AND 1940s

- 1 Straube’s 1938 Edition of Reger’s *Phantasie für Orgel über den Choral «Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott»*, op. 27: a ‘modern’ work in classical garb?

The decades that followed the publication of Straube’s 1912 and 1919 Reger editions saw radical changes in the appreciation of organ building, organ music and organ performance. An examination of Straube’s remaining Reger edition, that of op. 27 made in 1938, serves to highlight the truly ‘modern’ elements of his earlier editions. However, this chapter challenges the commonly held belief that Straube turned his back on ‘modern’ organ style, despite the hostility towards it from many quarters, and despite ambiguous statements concerning it made by Straube himself.

1.1 The Preface to Straube’s op. 27 edition

In his address at the opening of the *Max-Reger-Archiv* in Meiningen on 9 May 1948, Artur Kalkoff pointed to Straube’s preface to his op. 27 edition of ten years earlier as the way forward in the performance of Reger’s organ music. Kalkoff considered transitional dynamics to be inconsistent with authentic (*stilecht*) organ music, as contrapuntal lines are blurred, and he recommended terraced dynamics that reinforce the structure of the music. By way of conclusion and in support of his views, he quoted from Straube’s preface:

‘This edition of the *Phantasie für Orgel über den Choral «Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott»* is justified in its departure from the performance indications of the original version by the fact that the composer heard a performance of this early work based on the same principles. This was during the German-Swiss *Tonkünstlerversammlung* in 1903, and was played on the old organ of the cathedral in Basel, which had not yet been rebuilt. The composer’s consent to this interpretation of the performance indications and to the few textual alterations was not only repeatedly given in conversation, but was also documented in the dedication of his F sharp minor *Variationen über ein eigenes Thema*, op. 73, to the interpreter [that is, Straube himself] on that occasion.⁵¹⁴

The new edition sets out to prove that Reger’s organ oeuvre can be played on an instrument that belongs to the tradition of Classical organ building, even though this is completely unsuited to the imitation of the sounds of the Romantic orchestra and the multitude of dynamic possibilities this can provide. To reach the chosen objective, the transitional dynamic alterations notated by the composer had to be translated into terraced dynamics, which result in the opposition of dynamic levels. Such a

⁵¹⁴ The dedication reads, ‘Karl Straube zur Erinnerung an den 14. Juni 1903’.

simplification strengthens the structure of the *Phantasie*, and the overall impression – uncomplicated and self-contained – reveals the inner relationship between Reger’s art and the works of the masters of the past great eras of German organ playing.’⁵¹⁵

1.2 The timing of the edition

In the light of the extreme position epitomised by Helmut Walcha’s article *Das Gesetz der Orgel: ihre Begrenzung*, published in 1938 in *Musik und Kirche*,⁵¹⁶ Straube’s ‘Classical’ edition of Reger’s Fantasia on the chorale *Ein’ feste Burg ist unser Gott*, op. 27, published in the same year, was an opportune if dubious publication. Walcha was a pupil of Günther Ramin and deputy organist in the *Thomaskirche* during the years 1926–29, and was therefore at least on the fringe of the Straube circle. He considered the German-Nordic temperament to be far removed from the uninhibited display of emotion and he therefore shunned organ interpretations of an overly subjective nature. He rejected the Swell and the Walze in organ playing and pronounced transitional dynamics incompatible with the organ.

Similarly, the preface to Straube’s op. 27 edition presents a Reger purged of Romantic excess, purporting to render an organ work by Reger playable on an instrument belonging to the tradition of the Classical period of organ building, by omitting transitional dynamics and colours inspired by the Romantic orchestra. Straube claimed Reger’s agreement to the principles underlying this edition on the basis of his performance of the work played according to the same principles in the Münster in Basel on 14 June 1903, which Reger allegedly approved both repeatedly in conversation, and in the dedication of his op. 73, which refers to that occasion. Therefore, a certain authenticity sanctioned by the composer himself was claimed for this edition, despite any disparity between the composer’s original concept and the restrictions imposed on the edition by the choice of organ type.

The blanket term ‘Classical’ in Straube’s edition is never explained, but may be taken to refer to high and late-Baroque North German instruments. Although Straube was well aware that ‘at

⁵¹⁵ Kalkoff B 51& 52. ‘Diese Ausgabe der Phantasie für Orgel über den Choral “Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott” von Max Reger findet für ihre von der Originalfassung abweichenden Vortragsbezeichnungen Rechtfertigung in der Tatsache, daß der Komponist dieses frühe Werk seines Schaffens in einer nach gleichen Grundsätzen gestalteten Wiedergabe gelegentlich der deutsch-schweizerischen Tonkünstlerversammlung im Jahre 1903 im Münster zu Basel auf der noch nicht umgebauten älteren Orgel der Kirche gehört hat. Regers Zustimmung zu dieser Auslegung der Vortragsangaben und den wenigen Änderungen in der Fassung des Notentextes hat er nicht nur wiederholt im Gespräch, vielmehr auch dokumentarisch niedergelegt durch die Widmung der fis-moll-Variationen über ein eigenes Thema (opus 73) an den damaligen Interpreten seines opus 27. Die Neuausgabe will den Nachweis dafür erbringen, wie Regers Schaffen für die Orgel darstellbar sein kann auf einem Instrument, das der Überlieferung aus der klassischen Zeit des Orgelbaues angehört, das aber keinerlei Eignung besitzt für ein Nachbilden von Klängen, entnommen dem Orchester der musikalischen Romantik und beeinflusst durch die Fülle der dynamischen Möglichkeiten, die diesem Klangkörper innewohnen. Um das gesetzte Ziel zu erreichen, mußten die von dem Komponisten eingezeichneten ineinander übergehenden Veränderungen in der Tonstärke durch eine in Gegensätzen sich auswirkende Terrassendynamik umgedeutet werden. Solche Vereinfachung gibt dem Formenbau der Phantasie stärkere Fügung, und der erzielte Gesamteindruck – schlicht und in sich geschlossen – läßt die inneren Beziehungen der Reger’schen Kunst zu dem Schaffen der Meister aus den vergangenen großen Zeiten der deutschen Orgelkunst offenbar werden.’

⁵¹⁶ MuK X (1938)

some future date the *Orgelbewegung* may be rejected as historicist',⁵¹⁷ he confessed to Fritz Stein

in 1946 that Sauer organs meant nothing to him any more, and he valued only the sound of Schnitger or Silbermann organs.⁵¹⁸ These comments postdated the op. 27 edition by eight years. The earlier editions of *Alte Meister des Orgelspiels: Neue Folge* (1929) and Bach's eight short Preludes and Fugues (1934), with registrations for organs by Schnitger and G. Silbermann, respectively, confirm that Straube was, to all appearances, a fervent adherent of the *Orgelbewegung*, despite the ultra 'modern' playing style associated with his name.⁵¹⁹

1.3 The organs associated with Straube's op. 27 edition

Surprisingly, and contrary to the impression given in the preface to Straube's edition of op. 27, neither what he terms the 'old organ, not yet rebuilt' in the *Münster* in Basel, where he claimed he played op. 27 on 14 June 1903 according to 'Classical' principles, nor the organ of the *Landeskonservatorium* in Leipzig, on whose specification the 1938 edition of op. 27 is based, were built in the spirit of Classical or Classically inspired organs as regards their basic sound material and aids to registration.

1.3.1 Basel

The Basel organ was damned in the strongest terms by Reger in a letter to Theodor Kroyer two weeks after the concert (for the disposition see Appendix 2): 'The fact is that the organ is obsolete in every way. The action makes playing on full organ a truly physical exertion. The disposition is such that the 8' and 4' stops have no tonal character, and as soon as the 2' stops and mixtures are added the effect is exaggerated and screams in a coarse fashion, so that anyone who knows anything about organs could deduce even from the disposition that the age of the organ is very advanced. In short, it was decided to undertake an immediate rebuild of the organ in the *Münster*, with Karl Straube and Max Reger as advisers...'⁵²⁰

It would appear from this account that Reger was unaware of the age of the organ and presumed it to be a relic of a much earlier (possibly Classical) era. Perhaps later Straube also remembered

⁵¹⁷ In a letter of 29 November 1946, KSB 215. 'Wir können nicht wissen, ob nicht im Jahre 1986 die deutsche Orgelbewegung als Historismus abgelehnt wird ...'

⁵¹⁸ This despite a reference to the 'beautiful Sauer organ' in Wesel, in a letter to M. Kunze of 22.9.1948 (see KSB 238)

⁵¹⁹ See Kalkoff's remark below under Section 1.6

⁵²⁰ 'Thatsache ist, daß die Orgel in jeglicher Beziehung gründlichst veraltet ist, eine Mechanik besitzt, welche das Spiel mit Org. Pl. zu einer wahren physischen Anstrengung macht, die Disposition derart ist, daß die Orgel in den 8' u. 4' Registern ohne Klangcharakter ist, plötzlich nach Hinzunahme der 2' u. Mixturen übermässig u. nicht edel "schreit", sodass der einigermaßen Sachverständige allein schon aus der Disposition auf ein sehr hohes Alter der Orgel schliessen kann! Kurzum: man hat in Basel einen umgehenden Umbau der Münsterorgel beschlossen, bei dem Herr Straube und ich als Sachverständige dabei sein sollen.' The postcard to Kroyer dated 25.6.1903 (unpublished, to be found in the Staatliche Bibliothek Regensburg) was probably provoked by the extremely negative critique of the concert by Louis in the *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten*, where it stated that 'even for a Karl Straube it was not possible to play op. 27 and op. 57 with clarity'

the old organ in Basel as having been of a Classical type, as certain phrases in his preface which are connected by association would indicate: ‘The new edition sets out to prove that Reger’s organ works can be played on an instrument that belongs to the tradition of Classical organ building...a performance based on the same principles...on the old organ of the *Münster* in Basel, not yet rebuilt’. In view of the disposition discussed below, however, it would have been impossible at the time for Straube not to have realised the vintage of the organ he was playing.

The specific nature of Reger’s complaints and the fact that he was able to comment on the physical strength required to play full organ, would lead one to suspect that the complaints about the organ were fed to Reger by Straube. In any case, it may be assumed that the organ was not in a good state of repair and that conditions were far from ideal for the performance of Reger’s music. Reger’s approval of the performance in Basel, as claimed in the preface of the 1938 edition, was based, therefore, on a substandard performance.

In fact the organ of the *Münster* in Basel dated from 1855 (only eight years earlier than the *Marktkirche* organ in Wiesbaden, which was the most ‘modern’ instrument known to Reger until after the composition of op. 52⁵²¹). It was neither a Baroque nor post-Baroque instrument, but was built by one of the better organ builders of the nineteenth century, Friedrich Haas, a pupil of E.F. Walcker. As Christopher Anderson puts it, ‘Haas’s 1855 instrument...was [not] exactly “an instrument which belongs to the tradition of the classical period of organ-building”’.⁵²²

The impression given by Ernst Schiess in *Die Orgel im Basler Münster* is certainly not that of a Classically inspired organ:

Corresponding to the taste of that time, the disposition placed great emphasis on fundamental sound. The sound was unusually substantial, even a bit thick, as there were not enough mixtures to brighten the large number of foundation stops. The various manuals were not independent divisions as in Classical organs, but were arranged in progressive dynamic stages from the very loud and heavy main manual to the fourth manual which was supplied only with soft stops. An exemplary mechanical action was aided by Barker levers...the chests were *Kegellade*...[and] a special reservoir system was invented by Haas for the wind distribution.⁵²³

⁵²¹ That is, until Reger heard the Walcker organ (1896, III/50) of the *Kaimsaal* in Munich on 5 March 1901, where Straube played a programme consisting entirely of Reger works.

⁵²² Anderson 153

⁵²³ Schiess 5 & 6. ‘Entsprechend dem Geschmack der damaligen Zeit war die Registerdisposition sehr grundtönig und der Klang des Werkes von außergewöhnlicher Breite, sogar etwas massig, weil zu dem überreichen Grundstimmenbestand viel zu wenig aufhellende Mixturen vorhanden waren. Die verschiedenen Manuale erschienen nicht wie bei der klassischen Orgel als selbständige Werke, sondern in progressiver dynamischer Abstufung vom sehr stark- und breitklingenden Hauptwerk bis zum nur mit zarten Stimmen besetzten 4. Manual. Für sämtliche Manuale und das Pedal besaß die Basler Orgel die von Haas wesentlich verbesserten Kegelladen und eine mustergültig ausgearbeitete mechanische Traktur, welche vermittelt Barkerhebel das Spiel des vollen Werkes erleichterte. Für die Windbeschaffung des großen Instruments erfand Haas besondere Windschöpfmaschinen und unterteilte den Wind im Werke selbst durch zahlreiche Regulatoren.’

The disposition of the organ is given in Töpfer/Allihn and Anderson⁵²⁴ and shows a three-manual organ of 60 stops. Apart from the lack of couplers from the third manual to other manuals or to pedal, it was advanced for its time, in the spirit of Walcker, with a liberal sprinkling of progressive elements. It featured a number of free reeds (five of the six manual reeds were free); a swell mechanism for the *Physharmonika*; a Swell for manual III; one *piano* fixed combination each for the Pedal and manuals I and II; and the means of isolating a part of the third manual for performance on a fourth.⁵²⁵ Such Romantic stops as *Dolcissimo 4'* or *Physharmonika* obviously belong to the nineteenth-century organ, and even a listing of pitches shows clearly that the organ could not have been of a 'very advanced' age at the time of Reger's comments:

Table 6.1 Basel (Münster)

I 16'16'8'8'8'8'8'5½'4'4'4'2'2⅔'CornetX16'8'
 II 16'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'4'4'2'2⅔'CornetX8'
 III 16'8'8'8'8'8'4'4'4'2'2⅔'16'8'8'
 Pedal 32'16'16'16'16'10⅔'8'8'8'5½'4'16'8'4'

1.3.2 Leipzig

The organ of the Leipzig *Landeskonservatorium* at the time of Straube's op. 27 edition was of a completely different ilk (for the disposition see Appendix 2). By 1938 about one quarter of the total number of stops did indeed stem from the ideals of the *Orgelbewegung*. The original Walcker organ of 1887 was extended by Sauer in 1909 to 53 stops, and in 1927 to 74 stops by the same firm according to a plan worked out by Straube.⁵²⁶

Günther Ramin wrote of the 1927 instrument that the new organ was intended to allow satisfactory performances of old as well as modern organ compositions. The three manuals corresponded to the *Hauptwerk*, *Rückpositiv* and *Oberwerk* of Baroque organs, and alterations to this end particularly affected manual II.⁵²⁷ However, the 8', 4' and 2' foundation stops of the entire organ remained substantially unaltered, and apart from a few serious losses such as the *Harmonia aethera* and the *Clarinette 8'* of manual III, the main changes were in the addition of a score of stops, mostly reeds and high mixtures (many with Baroque-sounding names such as *Krummhorn*, *Rankett*, *Regal*, *Cymbal*, etc.) to brighten the overall sound of the organ. This would have affected the sound of the organ mostly in the louder dynamic range.

⁵²⁴ Töpfer/Allihn 760–63, Anderson 91/2

⁵²⁵ In Wiesbaden also there was no III/P coupler.

⁵²⁶ Anderson presents comparative stoplists for this organ from 1887, 1909, 1927 and 1940 in Anderson, Appendix 6 385–87

⁵²⁷ In the accompanying leaflet to the *Dritte Tagung für deutsche Orgelkunst* (Freiberg in Sachsen, 2–7 Oktober 1927), edited by Ernst Flade (Kassel: 1927)

Apart from these additions, however, the original Romantic conception of the conservatory organ remained more or less intact, with its rich resources of 8' stops, a Swell, a Walze, and numerous aids to registration. This could still provide such Romantic sounds as the registration for 3. *Komb* in Straube's op. 27 edition, which combined the 8' and 4' foundation stops of manuals I and II together with the 8', 4' and 2' foundation stops and the *Oboe 8'* of manual III, or the *HR* registration on manual III, composed entirely of stops from the 1909 instrument, which Straube indicated for the passage commencing at bar 48: *Gemshorn 8'*, *Lieblich Gedackt 8'*, *Quintatön 8'* and *Fernflöte 4'*.

Straube's edition was an 'arrangement' for a curious hybrid organ that may have sounded more Romantic in soft music, more Classical in plenum combinations. Although many organs were subjected to this brightening process, which involved the incongruous addition of a number of neo-Baroque stops to an existing disposition, such organs could never claim to have been Classically inspired. According to Kalkoff, some just tried adding overtones to get round the main fault of the Romantic organ, that is, the overemphasis on fundamental sound.⁵²⁸

1.4 How 'modern' is Reger's op. 27?

The extent to which Reger's op. 27, may be considered a 'modern', or, more specifically, a 'transitional'⁵²⁹ work abounding in smooth dynamic alterations, determines the validity of Straube's choice of this piece as a model for the imposition of classical principles on Reger's organ works as a whole, as is suggested in the preface to Straube's edition. If op. 27 is not truly representative of Reger's 'modern' organ repertoire, then it can hardly be considered a fitting model upon which to base a system for the purging of Romantic attributes.

1.4.1 Textural considerations

The dynamic and textural contrasts in Reger's op. 27 are partly derived from the chorale text. The *fortissimo* representation of the power of God is set off against the *piano* representation of the weakness of humanity, and the unadorned B flat chordal tutti statements of the chorale melody, representing an immovable God, interrupt the dynamic and textural flow, just as the restless chaos of the devil music commencing in bar 100 forms a textural block.

A cursory glance at the first 100 odd bars of Reger's op. 27, in which the *cantus firmus* is set between two, and later three, outer parts for much of the time, will immediately reveal how untypical of the bulk of Reger's organ music this texture is. Straube felt that in his 1938 edition of op. 27 the abandonment of transitional dynamics 'reveals the inner relationship between Reger's art and the works of the masters of past great eras of German organ playing'.⁵³⁰ However, the widely spaced, strict trio writing in *fortissimo* of the first 50 bars of the piece, played on Reger's registration that isolates the parts by means of colour and pitch, would surely

⁵²⁸ Kalkoff A, Chapter 3

⁵²⁹ The term 'gleitend' (transitional) was applied by Heinz Lohmann in his article *Bemerkungen zur Interpretation der Orgelwerke von Max Reger* (Lohmann A 231) to fluidity of sound, tempo and dynamics in Reger's organ music.

⁵³⁰ The original German may be found in this chapter at the end of footnote 2.

be enough to remind any organist of Baroque models, unaided by Straube. Op. 27 cannot be considered a particularly ‘modern’ composition, and certainly not within Reger’s organ oeuvre.

1.4.2 Straube’s own judgement

On 20 November 1944 Straube wrote to Hans Klotz that op. 27, op. 52/2 and op. 52/3 are the most important Chorale Fantasies, as op. 30, op. 40/2 and op. 52/1 are too subjective. He considered op. 27 to have been a great step forward. ‘The sureness of instinct with which the tremendous [chorale] melody is interpreted in expansive blocks in a sort of black-and-white fashion is admirable, and the feelings of the composer are always under control’.⁵³¹

If this is an attempt on Straube’s part to justify his edition by suggesting lack of colour and emotion as positive attributes in Reger’s original, or by ascribing a purely ‘terraced’ nature to this piece, then it mitigates against the validity of op. 27 as a model for the purging of subjective elements and orchestral colour in Reger’s organ music as a whole. Furthermore, in a letter of 29 November 1946 Straube admits that he considered all of Reger’s organ works up to op. 33 to have been influenced by the sound of the old organs, after which, and only then, the picture altered in favour of the ‘modern’ organ. In Straube’s own view, then, Reger’s op. 27 is not representative of ‘real’ Reger, and, therefore, is not a reasonable model on which to base a general system of Reger interpretation.

1.4.3 Transitional dynamics in op. 27?

The first indication by Reger for the transitional dynamics to which Straube referred in the preface to his op. 27 edition appears in bar 52, in a diminuendo from *p* to *pp* over four bars, a very local dynamic alteration in view of the registration indicated by the composer: *III Äoline 8'*, *Fugara 4' usw* for the right hand, a pedal *cantus firmus* in the middle of the texture played on a solo *Waldhorn 8'*, and 16' and 8' pitch on manual II for the bass left hand. A stop decrescendo would be inappropriate to the situation, and the use of the Swell box, which would have to be inconveniently closed by the left foot, would affect only one division, presumably manual III where the top two parts are played. The volume of the other parts would remain unaltered. Clearly, this texture does not allow of transitional dynamics.

The original crescendo over three quarters of a bar in bars 57 and 58 cannot refer to transitional dynamics, as the dynamic range from *pp* to *fff* is too great to be bridged in such a short space of time. Even if this could be achieved technically, the effect would be very crass and could hardly be termed ‘transitional’. It is far more likely that Reger intended a very localised crescendo and *stringendo* effect before the terraced, tutti interruption of the chorale melody. Again, the use of Swell for this local dynamic alteration would not affect the whole texture.

A similar argument applies to the *poco a poco* crescendo over six and a half bars starting at bar 64, where, although a transitional crescendo would be feasible in a coupled-through context, the

⁵³¹ KSB 236. ‘Bewundernswert der sichere Instinkt, mit dem die gewaltige Melodie in breiten Flächen in einer Art musikalischer Schwarz-Weiß-Kunst interpretiert wird und die Sensibilität des eigenen Empfindens immer beherrscht bleibt.’

independent registration of the parts would virtually preclude the possibility of any solution gradual enough to meet the requirement '*poco a poco*'. Similarly, in bars 68, 76, 82 and 93, where crescendo or *sempre* crescendo is indicated, the absence of a blended conception of sound based on the coupled-through system renders these indications of transitional dynamics impractical.

The crescendo over two and a quarter bars to *fff* in bar 100 presumably refers to the use of Walze, although played on an uncoupled manual I. However, this would have to be operated by an assistant, as a double pedal part at the extremes of the pedal board prevents the player from operating the Walze. To avoid this difficulty Straube brought forward the *fff* to a suitable moment before the pedal entry, in bar 97, and this procedure would also have been typical of his earlier Reger editions of 1912 and 1919.

After the coupled *Organo Pleno* passage from bar 109 to bar 117 (coupled according to Reger's own definition of *Org Pl*, which he reiterated at the beginning of this piece), it may be assumed that Reger intended to revert to an uncoupled system (as Straube did in his edition from bar 120ff.) in view of the similarity of the texture to that of earlier passages, and the addition and subtraction of 16' pitch to the accompaniment in bars 131 and 133, in the middle of a chorale line. In this case, transitional dynamics indicated in bars 120, 130 and 134 would be beset by the same problem of texture discussed above in relation to earlier passages.

From bar 135 onwards the piece builds up over 42 bars from *f* to full organ, with only one drop in dynamic (II *meno f*) in bar 148, although interplay between manuals I and II would inevitably cause dynamic fluctuation. For much of this time, however, the organist's feet are kept busy with quaver and semiquaver figuration of great diversity, and while the use of Walze is not entirely precluded, it could only be applied in short bursts on a few occasions. In these circumstances, the replacement of transitional dynamics with terraced dynamics would have been a reasonable option even at the time of Straube's ultra-'modern' editions of 1912 and 1919. Perhaps Straube could have introduced a few 'terraced' additions of stops in this section in his 1938 edition – for instance, on the second beat of bar 168, to increase the effectiveness of the build-up. However, Straube's decision simply to begin the entire section at a louder dynamic (*ff*) was a procedure typical of his earlier 'modern' editions, although not usually applied to passages of such length.

Only one further transitional dynamic is called for in Reger's original. This is a very local diminuendo from *più pp* to *ppp* over one and a half bars starting at bar 185, indicated by a hairpin. This is perhaps Reger's only indication of transitional dynamics in op. 27 that is satisfactorily manageable on an organ, provided there is a Swell. In his edition Straube omitted the diminuendo indicated by Reger. However, at the point immediately following Reger's gradual diminuendo, Straube unexpectedly introduced a single closing hairpin and a rest in the left hand and pedals just before the final very soft F major chord settles.

It was common in Straube's earlier Reger editions to delay the indication of hairpins both in crescendo and diminuendo, and this adjustment to Reger's performance indications would, therefore, have been typical of Straube's 'modern' editions. However, it remains a mystery, in the light of the aims stated in the preface of the op. 27 edition, why Straube should suddenly have found the use of Swell irresistible. For the sake of a tiny variation in dynamics over only one and a half beats, Straube momentarily abandoned his avowed intent to replace 'gradually

merging dynamics' with 'terraced' effects.⁵³² A letter of 12 May 1944 from Straube to Hans Klotz discusses this moment:

The decisive point for the understanding of the whole [piece] is to be found on the last page...where *pp* sinks to an F major chord in *ppp* [here Straube gives the altered dynamics of his own edition]...These bars symbolically represent the bowing down of the entire world before the power and greatness of God (Reger's own words after the performance of the work in the *Münster* in Basel during the Swiss-German musicians' conference in 1903).⁵³³

At this juncture Straube perhaps felt the need for something out of the ordinary, a subjective recognition of the programmatic intent of the music, and so overstepped the boundaries he had fixed for himself in his Preface. Interestingly, the dynamic 'revelation' in this bar was reinforced by one of Straube's few significant alterations to the original tempo indications. Whereas Reger indicates a gradual *ritardando* from *Maestoso* over the passage in question (bars 184–186), Straube begins the passage *Adagio* for one bar, after which a *ritardando* leads to *Lento* just before the symbolic F major chord, which itself is lengthened by the indication *lunga* over the final fermata.

1.4.4 Straube's op. 27 edition at variance with the wording of its preface

From the above discussion there can be little doubt that op. 27 was not representative of Reger's 'modern' organ works. For one reason or another the vast majority of cases of transitional dynamics indicated by Reger could not have been realised satisfactorily on any organ known to Reger or Straube, regardless of type. The choice of op. 27 as a model for the application of Classical principles to Reger's organ oeuvre is therefore inappropriate, and the claim made in Straube's Preface that his edition translates Reger's indications for the purpose of performance on Classical instruments is, at best, misleading.

In its textural exclusion of the blended ideal in the early stages of the piece, and in the technical difficulty of achieving transitional dynamics in the latter part, op. 27 falls between two stools. Reger's performance indications and compositional elements are mismatched. Even if his indications could somehow have been reconciled with the resources of the multi-Swell organs of the Alsatian Reform movement by employing assistants, the textural problems would still have remained.

Technical inconsistency between Reger's musical text and performance indications was not unusual, however, and in his Reger editions of 1912 and 1919 Straube had invented a host of solutions for dealing with the particular problem of realising Reger's transitional dynamics on

⁵³² See footnote 2

⁵³³ KSB 237. 'Der entscheidende Punkt zum Verständnis des Ganzen ist allerdings auf der letzten Seite zu finden, dort, wo das Pianissimo eintritt und hinabsinkt zum F-dur-Akkord in ppp. Diese Takte geben symbolisch wieder: Das Zusammensinken des ganzen Weltalls vor der Allmacht und Größe Gottes.' This device was common in Romantic music, one of the most striking examples coming at the end of Liszt's *Praeludium und Fuge über B.A.C.H.* In his *Reger und die Orgel* (see Keller 27) Hermann Keller likens it to an 'infinitely distant mirror of thoughts', and points to two further examples in early Reger works: the end of the Fugue of op. 16, and the end of the Passacaglia from the *fis-moll Sonate*, op. 33.

the organ. In these earlier Reger editions, transitional dynamics could be achieved by means of *Walze*, *Swell* or subtle changes of manual, or by a combination of these. They were occasionally introduced earlier or later due to difficult pedal passages, and often enough they were omitted altogether, or replaced by terraced dynamics where no satisfactory solution could be found.

It is therefore reasonable to argue that Straube's treatment of transitional dynamics in his 1938 edition of op. 27 was little different from that in his earlier Reger editions, whether he recognised this himself or not.⁵³⁴ The adoption of a 'terraced' approach in the 1938 edition was dictated by the piece itself. This somewhat contentious view finds a measure of confirmation in Straube's extraordinary inclusion of a hairpin in the revelatory fifth-last bar of the piece, perhaps a cryptic clue for those willing to read between the lines as to the true intentions of this edition.

1.5 The status of the new edition

Many organists would undoubtedly have viewed Straube's edition of Reger's op. 27 in the light of his 1929 *Alte Meister des Orgelspiels: Neue Folge*, published eight years earlier. Here the subjective principles underlying the original 1904 *Alte Meister* publication were rejected, and 'transitional dynamics [were] completely avoided...Only in the discarding of [subjective interpretation could] the organist hope that the deeper sense and eternal significance embodied in those early works of art may be revealed'.⁵³⁵

In view of the conclusions on organ playing reached by Straube in the neo-Classical 1929 *Alte Meister* edition (and in editions of 1928 and 1934⁵³⁶), it would perhaps have been logical to assume that a similar rejection of 'emotional output', 'sensuous indulgence' and 'transitional dynamics' would serve Reger's music also, and 'convey the serenity and grandeur of works that have their roots in religious belief'.⁵³⁷ By this reckoning, a purged version of op. 27 would be preferable, and this is also strongly suggested (but not made explicit) in Straube's preface, which states that 'such a simplification [i.e. the abandonment of transitional dynamics] strengthens the structure of the *Phantasie*, and the overall impression – uncomplicated and self-contained – reveals the inner relationship between Reger's art and the works of the masters of the past great eras of German organ playing'.

⁵³⁴ Compare Anderson 220 '...it would be obviously misguided to suggest that the thinking behind Straube's so-called "classical" edition of op. 27 in 1938 is identical to that behind his *Bearbeitung* of pieces from op. 59 in 1912. It is less obviously misguided (but misguided nevertheless) to maintain their diametrical opposition.'

⁵³⁵ 'Alte Meister: Neue Folge, Vorwort'. '...die Bezeichnungen einer ausgleichenden Übergangsdynamik fehlen gänzlich...Nicht mehr darum kann es sich handeln, das Geheimnis des Kunstwerkes durch das Temperament einer subjektiven Auslegung entschleiern zu wollen, sondern Aufgabe der Wiedergabe wird es sein, die sachlichen Gegebenheiten...in objektiv klarer Darstellung lebendig werden zu lassen, hoffend, daß so den bereiten Herzen auch der im Überzeitlichen und Übermenschlichen liegende tiefere Sinn des Kunstwerkes sich offenbaren werde.'

⁵³⁶ Karl Matthaei's 1928 Pachelbel edition (Bärenreiter Edition 238) included registrations 'partly outlined' by Straube for the 1921 Praetorius organ in Freiburg, and the 1934 edition by Straube of Bach's Eight Short Preludes and Fugues contained registrations for the Silbermann organ at Rötha (1721). The registrations for the 1929 *Alte Meister* edition were for the Schnitger organ in the *St. Jakobikirche* in Hamburg (c.1690)

⁵³⁷ Phrases taken from the Preface to the 1929 *Alte Meister* edition.

Christopher Anderson cites a three-part article in *Musik und Kirche* (1941) in which Oskar Söhngen argued that ‘the interpretation of Reger according to the objective standards of the *Orgelbewegung* was the only possible way to get at the essence of the music’.⁵³⁸ Anderson writes that ‘Söhngen used Straube’s edition of three years past to lend legitimacy to its arguments and claimed that [Straube] had wholly embraced a new way of teaching’.⁵³⁹

The conviction that an *orgelbewegt* approach to Reger is the ideal was held by a number of other writers, notably Artur Kalkoff, whose doctoral dissertation *Das Orgelschaffen Max Regers im Lichte der deutschen Orgelerneuerungsbewegung* (Kassel, 1950) argued that as the ‘heightened expression’ applied by Reger and others to Bach’s music in order to make it acceptable to turn-of-the-century audiences was now recognised to be a passing fashion, so also the garb in which Reger had dressed his own creations could be viewed as temporary clothing that could now be cast off to advantage. Representatives of this viewpoint would no doubt have been well pleased by Straube’s edition of op. 27 or, more particularly, by the wording of the preface to this edition.

Similarly, in ‘The Organ Works of Max Reger: an Interpretation’,⁵⁴⁰ Hans Klotz claimed wildly that in his own recordings Reger preferred architectural over emotional dynamics, and that Reger was probably influenced by Straube’s *Alte Meister* editions when he covered his own scores with dynamic markings, despite the fact that Reger’s mature organ style had long since existed before these. He quoted Reger’s approval of the Basel concert of 1903, along with the fact that expression marks were supplied in red ink as the second (and therefore inconsequential) stage in Reger’s compositional process, to make a case for performance purged of emotional dynamics. His dogma was based on the argument that ‘since architectural rather than primarily emotional dynamics are appropriate to the organ’, Reger’s markings must not be taken literally.⁵⁴¹

According to Straube’s preface, the new edition of op. 27 was to serve as a model for the performance of further organ works by Reger on Classical organs. That Straube was seriously contemplating the publication of a practical edition of Reger’s entire organ oeuvre⁵⁴² based on non-‘modern’ principles is established by a letter of 29 November 1946 to Fritz Stein,⁵⁴³ in which Straube expresses doubts about this project. In the letter he wondered how Stein viewed his arrangement (*Einrichtung*) of op. 27, and asked what would become of his ‘practical’ Reger editions if the Romantic organ were to come into vogue again 40 years later. He came to the conclusion that their only worth would be as papers for lighting cigarettes!

Nevertheless, although Straube did ask Stein if it was right to eliminate turn-of-the-century Romantic organ sound, his decision not to proceed with the complete edition of Reger’s organ works was not determined by purely musical or musico-practical considerations. Disregarding the false modesty expressed in a letter to the instigator of the project, Oskar Söhngen, two weeks earlier, what most concerned Straube was the fate his editions would suffer at the hands of posterity, and the technicalities of the copyright laws that would protect Reger’s music until

⁵³⁸ Anderson 160

⁵³⁹ Ibid. 161

⁵⁴⁰ In the *Organ Yearbook* (1974)

⁵⁴¹ See Klotz B

⁵⁴² A letter from Straube to Oskar Söhngen of 15 November 1946 (KSB 211) shows that this project was originally the suggestion of Söhngen.

⁵⁴³ KSB 214–216.

1966. One further consideration, of course, must have been the fact that Straube could not hope to complete a project of this magnitude, given his advanced years.

In the same letter to Stein, Straube explained that he had wished to keep op. 27 alive for the Classical organ. The ‘rescue’ of Reger’s works for the Classical organ must have seemed a logical and necessary step in the context of popular support for *Orgelbewegung* thinking. The history of the dilemma goes back at least as far as Karl Hasse’s seminal article *Max Regers Orgelmusik und die neuere Orgelbewegung* (1932), written in the aftermath of the discussions at the 1926 *Freiburger Orgeltagung*:⁵⁴⁴

Reger’s organ music...depends on the Swell and Walze, and at least partly on sound which strongly emphasises 8' pitch. Furthermore, it concentrates on dynamic differentiation and transitional dynamics, rather than on contrasts based primarily on variation in sound. If the new organ type, mainly derived from seventeenth-century models, were to rule, [Reger’s music] would have to be declared obsolete. Either it could be discarded completely, as certain proponents of the new persuasion held to be the right course, or an attempt must be made to save it on the basis of certain lines of approach comparable with the new outlook. Apart from purely technical details of organ building it was taken for granted that the ‘new age’ could lead only to a rejection or a reinterpretation of Reger’s music.⁵⁴⁵

Hasse’s article was quite possibly the catalyst that prompted Straube’s op. 27 edition. However, this edition served only to intensify the polarisation of Reger performance, which led eventually to the prohibition of his organ works by Helmut Walcha at the Frankfurt Conservatory in 1952. Many were won over to a Classical performance style for Reger’s organ works, including a number of Straube’s former pupils, as shown by the sentiments expressed by Erna Handke in an article on Reger performance published in 1960.⁵⁴⁶ She wrote that although she had previously believed that Reger’s works should be played only on Romantic organs, she now preferred organs of the Baroque type. A measure of the times was Heinz Lohmann’s indignant reaction to a critic of his first Reger recording in 1973, H.-R. Drengemann.⁵⁴⁷ He demanded that Drengemann declare whether he considered the generally accepted black-and-white registration of Reger organ works to be the only possible manner of performance.

1.6 Summary: incongruity in the op. 27 edition, and ambiguity in its preface

⁵⁴⁴ Even in the earlier *Tagung* in Hamburg-Lübeck (1925) the choice for Bach, and for a Bach organ was seen to be mutually exclusive of Reger’s music. See Wunderlich A 15

⁵⁴⁵ Hasse D 13. ‘Regers Orgelmusik...rechnet auf eine Orgel mit Roll- und Jalousieschweller und wenigstens stellenweise auf starke Grundtönigkeit und auf Vorwalten der dynamischen Unterschiede und dynamischen Übergängigkeit vor den primär klanglichen Kontrastebenen. Bei vollem Durchdringen des neuen, vorwiegend am 17. Jahrhundert orientierten Orgeltypus mußte sie als überholt gelten und entweder ganz fallen gelassen werden, was von manchem Vorkämpfer der “neuen Gesinnung” zeitweilig durchaus für richtig angesehen wurde, oder man mußte versuchen, sie durch Hinweis auf so mancherlei Ansätze, die auch bei ihr zu der neuen Einstellung sich finden sollten, zu retten. Abgesehen vom rein Orgelbautechnischen traf man sich hier auch mit einer schon fast ganz allgemeinen Vorstellung von der “neuen Zeit”, die zu einer Ablehnung oder einer Umdeutung der gesamten Musik Regers gelangen mußte.’

⁵⁴⁶ See Handke 35

⁵⁴⁷ MuK 10/1973, 172, in response to an article by Drengemann published in *Kirchenmusiker* 5/1973, 138ff

A superficial reading of the preface to Straube's op. 27 edition could satisfy partisans on all sides of the controversy in Reger organ performance, as the language was ambiguous enough on many counts to allow of almost any interpretation. The preface could be cited to support the view that the edition represents an improvement on the original, or that the opposite is the case, or simply that it met the needs of its day, claiming to be a Classical 'arrangement' of a piece intended for a Romantic instrument. Some were no doubt appeased by the idea of 'saving' Reger for a future bereft of 'modern' organs, others would have taken the many alterations made by Straube, Reger's arch-interpreter, as proof that Reger's music was unsuited to the organ.

In the 1950s and '60s Hans Klotz held the organ aesthetic of the *Orgelbewegung* to be the ideal for Reger performance; in the 1960s H.M. Hoffmann, while recognising criticism of the 'modern' organ, regretted that Reger's emotional dynamics were no longer possible, and, therefore, always performed Reger with two registrants;⁵⁴⁸ and in the 1970s Heinz Wunderlich believed that the perfect organ for Reger had not yet arrived, and recommended the use of Walze and multiple aids to registration. Each of these writers has supported his respective point of view with statements by Karl Straube.

The claims of the preface, which at first seem reasonable enough, appear ludicrous on closer inspection. As op. 27 was one of the Reger pieces most performed by Straube over the years,⁵⁴⁹ it is highly unlikely that in 1938, 35 years later, Straube could have remembered with any precision the manner in which he played op. 27 on one particular occasion in Basel in 1903. This assertion is confirmed by his very hazy description of the Basel organ as 'old, and not yet rebuilt' in the preface. Reger's enthusiastic judgement of Straube's interpretation on that occasion is of dubious value, in view of Reger's criticism of the organ after the concert, and considering that Reger's enthusiasm was reported by Straube himself.

The fact that Straube felt it necessary to call on the dedication of op. 73, which simply reads 'Karl Straube in memory of 14 June 1903', as proof of Reger's 'consent to his interpretation of the performance indications and to the few textual alterations',⁵⁵⁰ would suggest that Straube himself may have recognised the weakness of his claim. Such a dedication could just as easily have been motivated by gratitude or friendship, and need not refer to the details of performance on the occasion to which it refers.

As concluded above, the reference to 'an instrument which belongs to the tradition of Classical organ building' may be applied neither to the Basel organ nor to the instrument chosen for the 1938 edition, which was furnished with free combinations, a Swell and Walze, and a large number of foundation stops that emphasised fundamental sound. Furthermore, the choice of op. 27 as being representative of Reger's output for the organ is clearly inappropriate, as, even by Straube's own admission, it is only moderately 'modern' in conception,⁵⁵¹ and the spacing and

⁵⁴⁸ Hoffmann 162 & 163

⁵⁴⁹ Records in the Thomaskirche show that Straube performed op. 27 there at least once every year on 29 or 30 October for the Reformation Festival. This can be verified up until 1909 after which time records are incomplete. From 1914 records refer mostly to Ramin, or to guest organists.

⁵⁵⁰ These textual alterations concern octave doublings and transpositions, a very few additions and lengthenings of notes, and the rests in the left hand and pedals in bar 186.

⁵⁵¹ This view is self-evident on inspection of Reger's scores, and is supported by many writers, including H.E.

clarity of texture of much of the piece is clearly related to Baroque models. Neither can Straube's claim that his 'simplification...reveals the inner relationship between Reger's art and the works of the masters of past great eras of German organ playing' be substantiated.

The sheer number of incongruities brought to light by the edition, and the seemingly deliberate ambiguity of its preface would lead one to suspect that not all are inadvertent. Straube's motivation for this publication should not be overlooked. According to Karl Hasse, '[Straube] was recognised as a leader and faithful advocate of the organ world in Germany at the Organ Reform Days in Hamburg, Freiburg and Freiberg, although he himself did not appear as organist, or take part in the discussions'.⁵⁵² He had been in the forefront of German, if not European organ playing in the early part of the century, and even with the onset of the *Orgelbewegung* in the 1920s his status as the leading German organist was still preserved, if only through his pupils, despite being regarded with suspicion due to his Romantic background.

The stigma of this background did not prove easy to shake off, despite his publication of editions using specifications for organs built by the Baroque masters, Schnitger, Silbermann and Hildebrandt. Even in the mid-1930s, according to Kalkoff, the term 'Straube school' referred to proponents of the ultra-'modern' playing techniques evolved at the beginning of the century. The following extract from Hans Henny Jahnn's *Frühe Begegnung mit Günther Ramin*⁵⁵³ illustrates how a prime mover in the *Orgelbewegung* rated one of Straube's star pupils, as compared to his master:

'Even the first highly acclaimed concerts by Ramin included compositions of Vincent Lübeck. Such a daring use of stops and such a relaxed manner of playing on a mechanical organ had not previously been heard in Hamburg...This old organ [in the *St. Jakobi* church] provided justification for a new art of playing and registering, which even Karl Straube did not later repudiate'.

Very clearly, Straube assumed the role of an appendage to the *Orgelbewegung*; not to be ignored due to his important position as *Cantor* of the *Thomaskirche*, and for the illustrious lineage which stemmed from his teaching practice, but regarded as a late starter in this great movement of reform. The inconsequential nature of his role in the *Orgelbewegung* must have appeared less than gratifying, if not embarrassing, to Straube.

With his edition of op. 27 Straube provided a practical edition of one of his most-performed Reger pieces that does not differ significantly from the original. He could nevertheless claim a pioneering role in the development of a 'Classical' performance style for Reger works that would match the mood of the day, and perhaps help rid himself of his post-Romantic, 'modern' ethos, his 'Wagnerian shadow', the characteristic mantle that he had so willingly assumed in the first decades of the century, which had now become an embarrassment to him. Straube was even

Rahner in his *Max Regers Choralfantasien für die Orgel* (Kassel 1936), Chapter III, where he wrote, 'in op. 27 dynamics reinforce the structure...and after op. 40 dynamics are used more and more for expression...Although in op. 27 and op. 30 crescendo and diminuendo are employed, from op. 40 onwards certain episodes seem to be inserted merely to effect crescendos, or more especially diminuendos'.

⁵⁵² In Hasse F 188. 'Aus den Orgeltagungen in Hamburg, Freiburg und Freiberg ging er als anerkannter Führer und "getreuer Ekkart" der deutschen Orgelkunst hervor, obwohl er selbst als Orgelspieler dabei nicht mehr in Erscheinung trat und auch an den Vorträgen sich nicht beteiligte.'

⁵⁵³ His contribution to the *Gedenkschrift* compiled for the 75th. birthday of Günther Ramin (Wiesbaden 1973)

able to imply that, far from being outdated, he had been 35 years ahead of his time in applying a Classical style to Reger's organ music, and, moreover, could claim a measure of authenticity for his edition by referring to a performance witnessed by the composer himself in 1903.

With these motives in mind, it is not surprising that precisely those same paragraphs from the preface quoted by Kalkoff in 1948 (see the beginning of this chapter) had previously appeared in the 70th. birthday tribute to Straube, *Gaben der Freunde* (1943),⁵⁵⁴ in an article by Wilibald Gurlitt entitled *Karl Straube als Vorkämpfer der neueren Orgelbewegung* which profiles Straube as a protagonist of the organ reform movement. Thus, Straube's op. 27 preface achieved a wide degree of publicity and circulation.

Whether Straube remained satisfied with the fruits of his labours is open to doubt. The extreme position taken by the likes of Klotz, Kalkoff, Handke and Walcha must have haunted Straube in the context of his presentation of a Classical Reger edition that could be perceived as being an improvement on the original. The doubts that he expressed to Stein on the elimination of the Romantic sound were not shared by the proponents of the new order. In a letter of 15 February 1940 to his brother-in-law, Otto Grüters, an extremely resigned and gloomy Straube remarked in connection with a planned edition of Bach that 'unfortunately, performance indications are always misunderstood, and, in my opinion, these can only be expounded on a personal, one-to-one basis'.⁵⁵⁵

It is likely that this regret refers to his most recent publication, the edition of Reger's op. 27, which may be said to have fallen between two stools. It was neither simply a practical edition translating Reger's instructions into organistic terms, nor a conceptual edition in the sense of the earlier Reger editions, nor was it an arrangement of a representative 'modern' Reger work for a Classical or Classically-inspired organ.

The question of how Straube himself played Reger at the time of his 1938 edition is largely theoretical, as by this time he virtually never performed in public. However, there is good reason to believe that Straube never relinquished his 'modern' treatment of Reger, although he perhaps mixed 'modern' and 'Classical' performance elements to fit the occasion. This is confirmed by Straube's treatment of tempo in op. 27. Although Straube's indications do not deviate significantly from the original – even Reger's wording is largely retained – the addition of five short ritardandos (bars 58, 70, 84, 109 and 135) and the occasional slower tempo (between bars 109–17 and 184–6) are typical of Straube's 'modern' style.

Evidence of a 'mixed' style with a strong bias towards the 'modern' direction is also supported in spectacular fashion by Heinz Wunderlich's exposition of Straube's teaching circa 1940 of Reger's *Symphonische Fantasie und Fuge*, op. 57, which is discussed in the following section.

2 Reger's *Symphonische Fantasie und Fuge*, op. 57, as taught by Straube in 1940/41

⁵⁵⁴ KS 112.

⁵⁵⁵ KSB 112, 'Unglücklicherweise wird alles mißverstanden, was an Vortragszeichen angegeben ist, denn wie ich es eigentlich meine, das kann nur im persönlichen Verkehr übertragen werden.'

2.1 Wunderlich's article on Straube's teaching of Reger's op. 57

In his article *Zur Interpretation von Regers Symphonischer Phantasie und Fuge op. 57 (Karl Straubes Vortragbezeichnungen)* (1973) Heinz Wunderlich laid claim to 'a continuous and authentic transmission of the interpretation of [Reger's op. 57]' on the basis of letters from Reger to Straube (11 October 1905), and from Straube to Wunderlich (9 April 1941), in which the writers expressed thanks to the addressees for their 'incomparable' (Straube) and 'excellent' (Wunderlich) performances of this work.⁵⁵⁶ Wunderlich studied op. 57 under Straube in 1940 and 1941, and published his article on the alterations made by Straube to the original performance indications in 1973.

Although this elaborate certification of authenticity calls to mind Widor's outrageous claim to a direct line through a chain of teachers that linked his playing to Bach's performance practice⁵⁵⁷ (not to mention Straube's own authentication of his op. 27 edition) there is no reason to doubt that the bulk of the alterations and additions to Reger's performance indications, as presented in Wunderlich's article, do indeed derive from Straube.

If Wunderlich had not been taught this piece by Straube according to the principles set out in the second part of his article, then he would almost certainly have had to have made a detailed study of Straube's Reger editions of 1912 and 1919 in order to arrive at comparable results, so close are they to the codification of 'modern' organ style in these editions. If this had been the case, Wunderlich would surely not have wished to hide the extent of his labours, and would have published his findings.⁵⁵⁸

2.2 Part I of Wunderlich's article

The article divides naturally into two parts, the first of which comprises Wunderlich's introduction to the details of Straube's alterations to the original performance indications, which are presented in the second part. The somewhat inaccurate nature of certain statements made by Wunderlich⁵⁵⁹ casts doubt on the views expressed in this first part of the article. Indeed, it is not

⁵⁵⁶ Wunderlich C 17. 'Damit dürfte die lückenlose und authentische Überlieferung der Interpretation dieses Werkes, so wie ich es heute noch spiele, durch Reger selbst bestätigt sein.'

⁵⁵⁷ See Kooiman B and Kooiman C

⁵⁵⁸ As mentioned in the Preface, Wunderlich lists Reger pieces 'from op. 59, 65, 80 and 85' in his article *Zur Bedeutung und Interpretation von Regers Orgelwerken* (Wunderlich A, 1973) as having been edited by Straube in the composer's lifetime. This was the case only with the *Kyrie*, *Gloria* and *Benedictus* from op. 59. It seems perfectly obvious that Wunderlich had not made a detailed study of the early Reger editions of Straube, at least in the 1970s when his op. 57 article was published, as such a mistake would not have been made in that case.

⁵⁵⁹ For instance, that 'in his teaching, Straube followed the wishes of contemporary composers with the greatest of precision', or that 'the differences between Straube's interpretation of...op. 57 and the composer's indications were particularly pronounced', both of which statements are refuted by Straube's own Reger editions. Also, Wunderlich presents in his article copies of a number of musical extracts with original indications crossed out, and new ones marked in, presumably by Straube or on his instruction. The details in these copies do not always tally with the bar-by-bar account of Straube's instructions given in the second part of the article – for instance, the metronome markings in the first bar of the *Fuge*, or the heading *Allegretto, quasi Scherzo* in bar 72 of the *Fuge*. It is unclear, therefore, whether all the points listed in the bar-by-bar account of the altered performance indications derive from Straube, and, if so, why, in certain cases, they differ slightly from the handwritten alterations in the musical extracts.

always clear when Wunderlich is airing his own views, as opposed to merely relaying the teaching of Straube.

A good deal of the language in this first part of the article has a neo-Baroque flavour, of which the following phrases are typical: ‘clarity of structure’, ‘crisp *leggiero*’, ‘a transparent *mf* sound-level which doesn’t go beyond that of a Bach trio sonata (only with changes of manual, no crescendo!)’, ‘choose a bright registration’, ‘clarity of articulation and phrasing...to lighten the thick texture’, ‘a continuation in terraced dynamics’ and ‘extreme transparency of registration and in the playing’.⁵⁶⁰

However, Wunderlich’s call for careful preparation so that the most difficult passages are faultless, and even the most widely spread chords sound legato, and his quotation of Straube’s description of the last chord of the *Adagissimo* of the *Phantasie* in terms of Dante’s *Inferno* as ‘the disappearance of the transfigured, on which the rejected must gaze’⁵⁶¹ are indicative of a Romantic outlook.

In the light of Straube’s then recent ‘Classical’ op. 27 edition, it is very possible that the *orgelbewegt* phrases were applied to op. 57 by Straube in his teaching, although concern for clarity of articulation and phrasing, and the analytical approach that led to the four-part division of the work into ‘symphonic’ movements (First movement, Adagio, Scherzo and Finale), were also typical of Straube’s earlier Reger editions.⁵⁶²

2.3 Part II of Wunderlich’s article

The authenticity of Straube’s alterations to the original text presented in the second part of Wunderlich’s article is undeniable, as their proximity to the thinking behind indications in the ‘modern’ editions of 1912 and 1919 can be established on many counts. It may therefore be assumed that Straube’s teaching of this work throughout his career was consistently ‘modern’, even in the years following his avowed ‘Classical’ edition of op. 27. This is perhaps surprising in view of the fact that over 20 years separated these earlier editions from Wunderlich’s period of study with Straube, and over 30 years elapsed between Wunderlich’s study period and the exposition of Straube’s performance indications in his article on op. 57.

Furthermore, Wunderlich ‘corrected’ Reger’s text by the addition of an extra bar in the answer of the fugue subject between bars four and five of the *Fuge*. He did this without comment as to the author of this ‘correction’, but possibly felt it to be so self-evident that it did not merit special mention.

⁵⁶⁰ Wunderlich C, 18–22. ‘...Äußerste Deutlichkeit... in einem spritzigen Leggiero...nie über die durchsichtige mf-Klangstärke einer Bach’schen Triosonate hinausgehen (nur Manualwechsel, keine Crescendi!)...eine helle Registrierung wählen...Artikulation und Phrasierung sollten übertrieben klar sein, um dem dicken Satz Durchsichtigkeit zu verleihen...eine terrassendynamische Weiterentwicklung...Der kompakte Satz verlangt äußerste Durchsichtigkeit in Registrierung und Spiel.’

⁵⁶¹ Wunderlich C, 22. ‘das Entschwinden der Verklärten, das der Verworfene mit ansehen muß’

⁵⁶² Karg-Elert’s organ piece, *Aphorismus*, op. 86/10, represents a curious parallel to this division of a single movement into the usual four symphonic movements, albeit with the order of the middle movements swapped. A footnote to *Aphorismus* reads as follows: ‘The piece should be played with rhythmic freedom *quasi improvisierend*. However, the four disguised, small-scale movements (*Allegro – Scherzo – Andante – Allegro*) should be differentiated as much as possible’.

This part of the article gives a bar-by-bar account of the alterations to Reger's performance indications made by Straube in Wunderlich's lessons. The various 'modern' features shared by Straube's approach to Reger's performance indications in his editions of 1912 and 1919, and in his teaching of op. 57, may be summarised as follows:

Tempo

a) Slower tempos: according to Wunderlich, Straube demanded slower tempos in the *Phantasie* at bars 1, 11, 19, 21 and 57; and in the *Fuge*, at bars 1, 57, 72, 100 and 139. Sometimes, for instance in the *Phantasie* at bars 19 and 57, an extremely fast section was started at a moderate pace and gradually increased in tempo

b) Fast tempos were especially avoided in very loud music: shortly before the close of the *Phantasie*, for instance, Reger's *Molto più vivace* and *sempre vivacissimo assai e non ritardando* was replaced by Straube's *erregt, aber breit ausspielen*, and similar markings at the end of the *Fuge* were treated likewise; in the *Fuge*, at bars 48 and 124, Straube wrote into Wunderlich's score *ff, [dynamisch weiter steigern] und breiter werden*.⁵⁶³ Although this appears to be primarily for acoustical reasons, the big climaxes can better make their effect in the slower tempos, and, in passages such as bars 7/8 and 21/22, this would seem to be the decisive factor in the choice of tempo.

c) Ritardandos were added freely by Straube: in the *Phantasie* in bars 5, 22 and 31; and in the *Fuge* in bars 70/71 (instead of *poco a poco stringendo*), 135 and 138/139. Already existing ritardandos were often intensified, for instance in bar 141 of the *Fuge* where the ritardando is indicated earlier, or in bar 56 of the *Fuge* where Reger's *poco a poco un poco ritardando* was replaced by *großes rit.* in Wunderlich's score.

Straube called for *Tempo rubato* in the slow, soft middle section of the *Phantasie*, an important aspect of 'modern' performance style.⁵⁶⁴

Use of manuals

a) The coupled-through system was assumed in soft as well as loud music. Related to this is the occurrence in Straube's teaching of the *Phantasie* in bars 9–11 and 32–44 of the practice of sliding from manual to manual within a musical phrase, also a feature of Straube's earlier Reger editions.⁵⁶⁵ Often it requires the hands to be transferred part by part onto adjacent manuals, which makes for a very gradual alteration of both dynamic

⁵⁶³ An interesting exception to this rule of thumb is in the *Fuge*, bar 136, where a section marked *fff* by Straube is played with a *starkes stringendo*. This special treatment obviously derives from the nature of the music itself, which at this point has settled on a pedal point in the form of a pedal trill. Significantly, also, the texture is not particularly dense, and Straube even thinned it out with the addition of quaver rests in the right hand. As soon as the dense chordal writing returns, Straube indicated a *rit.*

⁵⁶⁴ For examples of Straube's use of rubato in his 1912/1919 editions, see Chapter 5 section 6.4.

⁵⁶⁵ See Chapter 5, section 3.3

and colour.⁵⁶⁶ In Wunderlich's article the coupled-through system is specifically called for only in these two sections, to preclude the possibility of a contrast of manuals.

b) Changes of manual occupy a mid-position between the use of Swell and Walze in large-scale dynamic alterations. This can be seen in bar 57 of the *Phantasie*, and at the beginning of the 'scherzo' in the *Fuge* where Straube's hairpin indicates the Swell as the first agent of crescendo. Also, in a soft decrescendo, the Swell was activated only after the manual changes had been effected, for instance, in the section between bars 9 and 11 of the *Phantasie*.

c) A characteristic of Straube's earlier Reger editions is the prominence given to the lower middle voices by the deployment of the left hand on a louder manual than that of the right hand. This occurred twice in Straube's teaching of the *Phantasie*, from bar 27 ff. and in bar 53, on both occasions in passages where the original indication of manual I for both hands was changed to manual I for the left hand, manual II for the right hand.

Legato playing and articulation

Apart from the generally slower tempos adopted throughout, a number of details that favour legato playing, especially in chordal passages, are given in Wunderlich's exposition of Karl Straube's teaching.

a) From the last quaver of bar four to the third crotchet of bar five in the *Phantasie*, the omission of the octave doubling in the right foot allows a legato performance of this pedal passage.

b) In bar 44, the very difficult stretching necessary in both hands for a legato performance of these full chords was urged by Straube's marking *sehr breit und molto legato*.

c) In bar 85 of the *Fuge*, the deliberate three-plus-one grouping avoids the awkwardness of a legato performance of the semiquaver sixths. With skill and practice this passage can be successfully mastered by the use of thumb legato. However, the imposition of a deliberate pattern of articulation on a difficult passage in order to accommodate a true legato style for the phrased notes was a device commonly and successfully employed by Straube in his earlier Reger editions. In these cases the choice of a method that would give a true and technically undemanding legato for the majority of notes was preferred to the much more difficult task of achieving a thumb legato performance of all the notes.

d) The texture was enriched by the detailed addition of indications of phrasing and articulation. Wunderlich does not furnish many examples of this. However, the somewhat mannered phrasing of the fugue subject may be considered typical of Straube's earlier Reger editions.

⁵⁶⁶ In the words of Rudolf Rudolz (Leipzig, 1913) 'this practice can only be employed effectively within the coupled-through system, where the registration of the manual that is added or subtracted is subordinate both in terms of dynamics and colour', Rudolz 20. 'Übergänge bei gekoppelten Manualen...Ein solcher Übergang in geschlossener Phrase setzt voraus, daß das Manual, dessen Klang durch einen Wechsel addiert oder subtrahiert wird, dynamisch sowohl wie koloristisch untergeordnet registriert ist...'

The moderation of exaggerated dynamic markings

- a) Not only extremely fast tempo markings, but also exaggerated dynamic markings were moderated by Straube in Wunderlich's score. There are numerous examples of this: in the *Phantasie* in bars 24, 27, 30, 50, 53, 57, etc., and in the *Fuge* in bars 55, 100, etc. Straube's alteration of Reger's marking *più fff e sempre poco a poco crescendo* to a simple *ff*, in bar 53 of the *Phantasie*, is typical.
- b) Part of the problem is touched on by Wunderlich on page 19 of his article, where he discusses the inappropriateness of an *fff* marking when applied to manual III. Extremely loud markings applied to manuals II and III can hardly represent even a relative, let alone an absolute dynamic value, and, therefore, were automatically moderated by Straube.
- c) Huge increases in volume are obviously inappropriate in cases where the dynamic alterations can only be effected in a musically satisfactory manner by Swell or subtle changes of manual, as indicated by Straube for the section between bars 32 and 44. Consequently, Reger's dynamic indications for this section, which range from *pppp* to *ff* for manual III, are exaggerated and were not included in Straube's scheme.
- d) The problem of executing a huge dynamic decrease in a short space of time, which occurs in bars 8 and 56, was solved in two different ways. In bar 8, the difficulty of the (double) pedal part precludes the use of *Walze*, and so Straube ignored the hairpin from *Org pl* to *p*, and simply indicated a *subito p* immediately following the full organ sound. In bar 56, Reger's enormous reduction in volume from *Org pl* to *ppp* within half a bar was moderated by Straube to a reduction from *Tutti* to *p*, with an intermediate (subito) *mf* indicated where the change to manual III is effected. This latter addition was simply a clarification of the dynamic level when the move to manual III indicated by Reger takes place, and did not alter the composer's instruction. The reluctance of Straube to fade away to *ppp* stemmed from the inappropriateness of a stop decrescendo on the final held chord. Straube obviously did not feel that the Swell alone could cover the five dynamic levels, *mf – mp – p – pp – ppp*.

2.4 Conclusions

If the testimony of Wunderlich's article on op. 57 in its entirety is representative of Straube's teaching around 1940, then it shows that, at that time, Straube favoured a 'mixed' style of Reger performance which incorporated neo-Classical elements within a basically Romantic conception. Details of Straube's approach to the performance indications of op. 57, as presented in the second part of Wunderlich's article, show that his methods in 1940 were, in fact, typical of the 'modern' approach found in his earlier Reger editions of 1912 and 1919. The above list has established this on at least 15 counts that cover many of the basic aspects of organ interpretation: tempo, dynamics and their manipulation, the use of manuals and touch. The neo-Classical language cited in the first part of the article may indicate Straube's uncertainty at that time as to the future direction of Reger performance, or perhaps reflect Wunderlich's own priorities.

Both in conversation and in writing⁵⁶⁷, Wunderlich has insisted that, between 1900 and 1945, with the exception of op. 27, Straube did not alter his interpretation of Reger works, and that his revised ideas on interpretation under the influence of the *Orgelbewegung* applied only to Bach and Baroque music.⁵⁶⁸ The details of the alterations to the performance indications of op. 57 as presented in his article would largely support this statement, and the conclusions of the previous section on Straube's edition of op. 27 would suggest that, even in that piece, Straube did not abandon 'modern' organ style, despite the Classical ambitions proclaimed in its preface. Whatever the motives behind the preface, the confidence of recent assertions on the rejection of the 'modern' style by Straube should not remain unchallenged.⁵⁶⁹

⁵⁶⁷ In a letter to the present author of 29 March 1995

⁵⁶⁸ Wunderlich wrote that Karl Straube never completely condemned the Romantic organ but that he conceded that it had absolute qualities of its own, even if not suitable for all purposes and in every case. Wunderlich B

⁵⁶⁹ In recent writings it seems to be generally accepted that Straube moved away from a 'modern' to a neo-Baroque performance style for Reger in the course of the first half of the twentieth century. See, for instance, Popp & Shigihara A 171, or 37–73

CHAPTER 7

IDEALISM AND RESIGNATION

1 'Modern' organ style in the face of German conservatism

This study has attempted to define and explore 'modern' organ performance style as an essentially German phenomenon closely allied to post-Wagnerian performance practice, the full flowering of which is codified in Karl Straube's Reger editions of 1912 and 1919.

If Albert Schweitzer is correct in his assertion that the 'artistic being of an organ, and...the true essence of organ music is defined by the manner in which one proceeds...from *piano*...to *fortissimo* and back again',⁵⁷⁰ then Straube's Reger editions place German Romantic organ culture in a lofty position. Chapters 2 and 3 on the Walze and the Swell describe an approach to dynamic control that is incredibly sophisticated in its detail and variety. A dynamically potent performance style was supported by the latest developments in organ building, which included many aids to registration.

As Max Reger wrote, however, 'an interpretation that restricts itself to the observance of *f.* and *p.*, and < and > is spiritless...'⁵⁷¹ This study has also shown that dynamics are only part of a 'total system' developed by Straube that covers all aspects of performance, including phrasing, touch, texture, registration, tempo and the modification of tempo.

At the end of the nineteenth century any attempt at modernisation in German organ circles met with stiff opposition. Otto Dienel reported that 'modern' aids to registration had to be smuggled into Berlin organs,⁵⁷² and even the introduction of the swell box was still fiercely opposed as *Spielerei* in some parts of Germany. As the organ builder, Friedrich Ladegast, put it, 'According to Professor Haupt from Berlin...there is only one sort of organ music worth playing, and that is the fugues of Bach. Anything in an organ not required for these is superfluous rubbish'.⁵⁷³ Yet, in Germany at the turn of the twentieth century mobility of sound was of vital importance in the search for a style of 'modern' organ composition and playing that would be comparable to mainstream music-making.

Much of the process of 'modernisation' was then concerned with the performance of earlier music in a new manner. Töpfer's words, '*Das ist ja etwas ganz Anderes!*' (That's a completely

⁵⁷⁰ Schweitzer 3. See the Preface of this study, also Chapter 2, section 3.25 and Chapter 4, section 2.1

⁵⁷¹ In a letter to Duke Georg II of 7.1.1912, Mueller von Asow 92

⁵⁷² Dienel 68. 'Durch solche Hinterthüren schmuggelte sich die moderne Orgel auch in die Berliner Kirchen, wengleich in bescheidenster Weise, ein.'

⁵⁷³ Cited by H.J. Busch in Busch D 82. '...Professor Haupt aus Berlin war Revisor. Nach diesem Herren gibt es nur eine Orgelmusik und das sind Bachsche Fugen. Was nicht dazu gebraucht wird, ist in Orgeln überflüssiger Kram!'

different story!)⁵⁷⁴ on hearing from A.W. Gottschalg how Liszt registered Bach's Passacaglia and the *Dorian* Toccata and Fugue, encapsulate the revolutionary mood sparked by this new attitude to organ performance. Gottschalg himself reported that the tendency of every serious composer for 'the Queen of Instruments' was gradually to leave behind the old monotony of the organ, and to bring the instrument closer to the modern orchestra.⁵⁷⁵ H.J. Busch connected the new outlook in organ culture to the Liszt-Wagner direction when he wrote that '...the contrast between the classical and the modern direction in organ culture may be seen as part of the general struggle between conservatism and the New-German School'.⁵⁷⁶

Both of Straube's organ teachers in Berlin, Heinrich Reimann and Otto Diemel, were keenly aware of this struggle, and in their teaching and writings promoted organ performance that embraced the latest inventions in organ building. Diemel's important book, *Die moderne Orgel* (1891), was far ahead of its time in its 'modern' slant on organ-building issues and performance; and Reimann believed that 'musical sensibility had become more sophisticated with the passing of time', and therefore all music, regardless of period, should be performed in 'modern' garb.⁵⁷⁷ Straube fully subscribed to this view, as witness his 1904 *Alte Meister des Orgelspiels* edition, 'not intended to serve history...but born out of musical practice', and his highly subjective 1913 volume of Bach edited for Peters publishing house. Reger also agreed that Bach would have used all the latest aids to registration if he had had them at his disposal, and wrote enthusiastically to Wilibald Gurlitt concerning organ composition: 'certainly we should make use of all the advances of the modern organ...'⁵⁷⁸

What was lacking, however, was a specific repertoire intended for the 'modern' organ. The more complex the 'modern' organ became, the less likely that mainstream composers could compose satisfactorily for it. As the Reger friend Philip Wolfrum wrote in his additional chapter on the organ in Strauss's edition of Berlioz's orchestration manual, 'it is our opinion that no composer can be at home with the bewildering variety of aids to registration on an organ, unless he is a proficient organist himself'.⁵⁷⁹

Considering that Reger was one of the most important German composers of his time – only the works of Richard Strauss were performed more frequently⁵⁸⁰ – it was fortunate, indeed, that his early enthusiasm for organ composition, fired by Adalbert Lindner and fuelled by Karl Straube's performances, resulted in the creation of a large body of significant and exciting works intended for the 'modern' organ. Harburger wrote of Reger's organ music that 'it was almost as if a new

⁵⁷⁴ The title of an article on the early history of 'modern' organ culture by Ewald Kooiman in *Het Orgel* (1983). Gottschalg's own articles about Liszt's organ performances in *NZfM* (30.7.1886) and *Urania* (44Jg., 1887) are entitled *Die moderne Orgel in orchestraler Behandlung*.

⁵⁷⁵ *NZfM* 30.7.1886

⁵⁷⁶ Busch D, op. cit. 83. '...der Gegensatz zwischen der klassischen und der modernen Richtung in der Orgelkunst erweist sich als ein Teilaspekt der Auseinandersetzung zwischen musikalischem Konservativismus und Neudeutscher Schule überhaupt...'

⁵⁷⁷ Reimann 135. See Chapter 4, section 1.2 and footnote 26 on page 74 for the full German text and English translation of the relevant passage.

⁵⁷⁸ In Gurlitt A 83. See also the extract from a letter of 31 February 1900 to Gustav Beckmann published in Spemann 55.

⁵⁷⁹ Strauss 262. 'Aber kein Komponist, falls er nicht selbst ein tüchtiger Organist ist, wird unserer Meinung nach mit diesen so vielseitigen und zahlreichen Hilfsmitteln genügend vertraut sein.'

⁵⁸⁰ See, for example, Popp & Shigihara A 26

instrument had called forth a new musical style'.⁵⁸¹ And Keller wrote that 'it was a strange state of affairs when the first of these new instruments were built: there were neither players nor repertoire! Only with Reger as composer, and Straube... as player was the existing framework filled in subsequently with content – a truly unique case in the history of music!'⁵⁸²

2 The mission to re-establish the pre-eminence of German organ culture

Both Reger and Straube were very conscious that their joint mission was to forge a new identity for German organ culture. They were determined to regain the ground lost since the death of J.S. Bach, and surpass the achievements of other nations. Straube's teacher, Heinrich Reimann, raged against the 'unworthy farcical playing of certain foreigners' and 'the murmuring flutes and whimpering *Aeolinen* of the fashionable French and Italian *Orgelklingklangs*!'.⁵⁸³ Rivalry in organ-building matters between France and Germany was rife. This is particularly well documented in the acrimonious exchange between Emile Rupp and Max Allihn in the pages of the *Zeitschrift für Instrumentenbau* 1900/01.⁵⁸⁴

In a letter to Gustav Beckmann of 15 January 1900 Reger wrote, 'Above all it has to be made clear to the German public, and unfortunately also to many organists, that the salvation of our organ music may not be expected in foreign, French and English composition...never can the salvation of our organ music be found in the way the French and English treat the organ.'⁵⁸⁵ And a letter to Joseph Renner congratulates him on 'the unadulterated German character' of his work, as 'one must often witness how German organ composers imitate the French and English style.'⁵⁸⁶ Typically, the Max-Reger-Fest in Dortmund in May 1910 was described by Walther Fischer as *eine echt deutsche Kulturtat*, and he called on Richard Wagner's commendation *Ehrt eure deutschen Meister, dann bannt ihr gute Geister*.⁵⁸⁷

The ominous undertones of a letter of 8 February 1933 from Straube to Ramin, cited by Christopher Anderson, give further insight into the missionary obsessiveness with which Reger and Straube fought, in order to raise German organ culture:

⁵⁸¹ Harburger 41. 'Und es ist fast so, als ob ein neues Instrument einen neuen musikalischen Stil mit sich heraufbeschwören würde...'

⁵⁸² Keller 8. 'Als die ersten dieser neuen Instrumente erstanden, war das Seltsame: es gab für sie weder Spieler noch Musik! Erst Reger als Komponist und Straube... als Spieler haben...dem fertigen Rahmen nachträglich den Inhalt gegeben, – eine wirklich einzigartiger Fall in der Musikgeschichte!'

⁵⁸³ In *Noch einmal über den Vortrag der Orgelkomposition J.S.Bachs*, 1891, 142ff, quoted by Huesgen (1935), 49. '...unwürdige Possenspiel so mancher Ausländer...', '...das Flötengesäusel und Aeolinenengewimmer des franz. und ital. à la mode Orgelklingklangs...'. See also Chapter IV, section 2.2.

⁵⁸⁴ Pages 436/7, 461–3, 514/5, 540–2 and 624–6.

⁵⁸⁵ Beckmann B, 329/330. 'Vor **allem** muß dem deutschen Publikum und leider auch vielen Organisten erst wieder **klar** gemacht werden, daß das Heil unserer Orgelmusik nicht in ausländischen (französischen und englischen) Erzeugnissen erwartet werden darf, sondern nur aus **deutschen** Organistenkreisen...aber nie und nimmer kann ich das Heil unserer Orgelmusik in der Art finden, wie die Franzosen und Engländer die Orgel behandeln.'

⁵⁸⁶ English trans. by Anderson in Anderson 201. '...unverfälschten Deutschtums...', '...da man leider zu oft sehen muß, wie deutsche Orgelkomponisten den französischen und englischen Stil nachäffen.'

⁵⁸⁷ Fischer 1

Your journey to the USA is a German undertaking... We cannot thank you enough that you have won such a victory for German art, a victory the end result of which will be the more significant in that you did not wish to give yourself an international image, nor did you in fact do so, but rather as a German master presented your art to the willing and the unwilling. The success justifiably accorded you is a success of German spirituality, and you have stood up for the dignity of our spiritual culture. You were a pioneer for it, and we have very few like you. For all this Germany cannot thank you enough. At issue is nothing other than the diffusion of German superiority in areas of English and French influence... the whole undertaking will be a magnificent thing which no one predicted, but which at once places one area of German art in the foreground, presenting it at a level of accomplishment unexpected by our western neighbors on the European continent.⁵⁸⁸

Together, Reger and Straube consciously sought an essentially German solution to the problem of the nineteenth-century demise of the organ in Germany. They succeeded in establishing a repertoire and a performance style comparable to mainstream musical practice, and to the best of French organ production. In the words of the Straube pupil, Hermann Keller (1923), 'Thanks to both [Reger and Straube] Germany has regained a position of pre-eminence in the organ world, after lying second to France, with Franck and his school, for over a century'.⁵⁸⁹

In his Reger editions of 1912 and 1919 Straube developed a tangibly German approach to details of performance and to sound (treated in Chapter 4). Ultimately, French organ building, composition and performance was more colourful and bombastic, concentrating more on melodic forms and overt virtuosity than the German direction, which preferred dynamic sophistication and blend, and polyphonic forms (see also the final paragraphs of Chapters 3 and 4).

⁵⁸⁸ English trans. Anderson 200. '...Ihre Reise nach U.S.A. ist eine deutsche Angelegenheit... Wir können Ihnen überhaupt nicht genug dafür danken, daß Sie der deutschen Kunst einen solchen Sieg errungen haben, dessen Endergebnisse um so tiefer gehen werden, als Sie nicht international sich geben wollten, auch nicht gegeben haben, sondern als ein deutscher Meister Ihre Kunst den Wollenden oder Nicht-Wollenden darboten. Der Erfolg, der Ihnen mit Recht erblühte, ist ein Erfolg der deutschen Geistigkeit und für die Würde unserer geistigen Kultur haben Sie sich eingesetzt, sind ihr ein Vorkämpfer gewesen, wie wir nur wenige besitzen, für dies Alles kann Ihnen Deutschland nicht genug danken. Es handelt sich um nicht anderes, als um die Durchsetzung der deutschen Superiorität auf englischen und französischen Einflußgebieten... Dann wird das Ganze eine großartige Sache, die kein Mensch voraus gehant hat, die aber auf ein Mal die deutsche Kunst auf einem Gebiete in den Vordergrund stellt, in einer Leistungshöhe zeigt, von der unsere westlichen Nachbarn auf dem europäischen Kontinent keine Ahnung gehabt haben.' Straube, himself, did perform certain French organ pieces, and the wish to accommodate this repertoire seems to have been behind the extension of the manual compass upwards from f3 to a3 in the 1908 enlargement of the *Thomaskirche* organ. He also made use of certain French techniques, particularly the employment in soft music of registrations favouring manual III in order to increase the Swell potential of a given combination (Chapter 3, section 4.6), the use of the *voix celeste* (Chapter 3, sections 4.8 and 4.15), and the closing of the Swell in the early part of a build-up to allow a second Swell opportunity (Chapter 3, section 4.15). Against this, Straube did not adopt the French practice outlined in *Die moderne Orgel* by his teacher, Dienel, whereby the Swell mixtures are first introduced with the box closed, nor did he include the reeds on the Swell manual in an early stage of a build-up. Straube preferred the less intense flue-based sound in softer music. It is clear that the few French influences in registration were adapted into a thoroughly German system, which in many ways was diametrically opposed to the French.

⁵⁸⁹ Keller 3

3 Duality as a problematic key to Reger performance.

Zwei Seelen wohnen, ach! in meiner Brust (Goethe):⁵⁹⁰

The reception of Reger's music often fell between two stools, and he was at times disowned by both the conservative and the New-German camps, held by the former as being too revolutionary in his harmony and by the latter as too conservative in his use of outmoded forms. Some admirers, however, such as Philipp Wolfrum viewed Reger as 'a synthesis of the spirits of Wagner-Liszt [that is, the New-Germans] and of Brahms.'⁵⁹¹

The struggle between conservatism and the New-German School, and the antipathy between French and German organ culture are by no means the only examples of opposing concepts and practices relevant to a study of Max Reger. The final section of *Der junge Max Reger und seine Orgelwerke*⁵⁹² by Rudolf Huesgen is headed 'Contradictions and Duality in Reger's Nature'. Huesgen considers the discrepancy between man and artist, the positive and negative character traits that characterised Reger's crisis in Wiesbaden, the struggle in his works between logic and freedom, between Romanticism and objectivism, the preference for Protestant forms imbued with a Catholic spirit, the balance of horizontal linear writing and vertical harmony, of conservative and progressive elements, the mix of new and old. He concludes that Reger, the *Januskopf*, faces in two directions: backwards towards the past, and outwards to new and distant musical pastures.

In a similar vein, the foreword to Richard Strauss's edition (1904/5) of Berlioz's orchestration manual differentiated between two main paths that led to the orchestra of Wagner, that is, the symphonic/polyphonic and the dramatic/homophonic. The latter was preferred by the public and concentrated on melodic development, technical demands and colour, whereas the former originated in Bach's organ fugues and may be traced through the string quartets of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven. According to Strauss, Wagner's music achieved a synthesis of these two directions. (See Chapter 4, section 2.2)

How close the formulation of this differentiation is to the characterisation of French and German organ culture described above, and to the identification by Walter Fischer of two classes of listeners in his *Über die Wiedergabe der Orgel-Kompositionen Max Regers*.⁵⁹³ Here Fischer divides those who listen to organ music into two groups: those who want to hear real organ music, and those who just want to enjoy the various colours of the organ and certain stops (by far the largest group, he says, and here he is in agreement with Strauss). He concludes that

⁵⁹⁰ A famous quote from *Vor dem Thor* quoted in Huesgen 106

⁵⁹¹ '...von der Synthese, die Max Reger für Wolfrum bedeutet habe, nämlich der Zusammenfassung des Wagner-Lisztschen und des Brahms'schen Geistes.' This is according to Karl Hasse in his obituary for Wolfrum (1919). Wolfrum was director of music at Heidelberg University, and a good friend and duet partner of Max Reger.

⁵⁹² See Huesgen. Other writers on Reger who discuss contradictions in his nature, are Max Hehemann, Adalbert Lindner and M. Friedland.

⁵⁹³ Fischer 6 & 7. 'Wir wissen es: alle Hörer von Orgelmusik kann man in 2 Gruppen einteilen, in solche, welche wirklich Musik hören wollen und solche, welche nur Klangfarben und bestimmte Charakterstimmen zu geniessen wünschen. Die zweite Gruppe von Hörern ist die bei weitem grössere. Sie ist geradezu "kirchenfüllend" gross...Aber nur der Organist, der allen klanglichen Zauber seines Instruments unterordnet unter den höheren Gesichtspunkt des musikalischen Gedankens, nur der ist imstande, Reger zu spielen...'

‘...only the organist who subordinates the magic of sound of his instrument to the higher realms of musical thought is in a position to perform Reger...’ (c.f. Chapter 4, section 2.2)

Reger would undoubtedly have agreed with this viewpoint, as expressed in the maxim attributed to him by Hermann Grabner, ‘any composition is good that can be played completely without colour. In order to paint, you first have to be able to draw’.⁵⁹⁴ And in a letter to Hugo Riemann Reger wrote, ‘Of course we should exploit the achievements of our modern organs...what we have to preserve is unrelenting textural logic, solidity in part writing, deliberate avoidance of all so-called lyrical (that is, usually sentimental) moments, never toying with the sound effects of various stops, but rather striving after a methodical, true composition style for the organ.’⁵⁹⁵

Organists are divided in their application of colour and dynamics to Reger. Some, notably Helmut Walcha, have been unable to accept dynamic mobility in organ playing and have rejected Reger’s organ music altogether,⁵⁹⁶ claiming that it negates the true and historical character of the organ. Others, like Artur Kalkoff or Oskar Söhngen, have spoken for a purged Reger, preferably bereft of colour and dynamic shading. Still others, for example Manfred Hoffmann, insist that, despite the difficulties of notation and interpretation, Reger’s music depends on the dynamic and registral possibilities of the Romantic organ, without which it is invalid.

Perhaps the largest group, however, is made up of those who adopt a mid-position, a group that recognises the limitations that particular organs place, and always have placed, on Reger’s music, and see the notation both as a starting point and a destination towards which the organist may progress. Typical among this group are Hermann Keller (1923), Benn Gibson (1966), Rudolf Walter (1973), Hans Geffert (1973), and Heinz Lohmann⁵⁹⁷ (1973), to mention but a few.

Often a particular preference or choice in performance detail will exclude another, as in the abandonment or postponement of a crescendo in the interest of pedal legato. Regarding colour in registration, it is even possible to support opposing views simultaneously. Straube himself adopted a dichotomous approach in his Reger editions, an approach that, in registration both denies and embraces the overt application of colour (see Chapter 4, section 5). In similar vein, Christopher Anderson describes how differing priorities in performance can be mutually exclusive, when he sets Straube’s ‘motivic integrity’ against ‘dynamic drive’ in his editions.⁵⁹⁸ For this reason Hans Klotz, H.M. Hoffmann and Heinz Wunderlich were all able to cite Karl Straube in support of their radically different views on the perfect organ for Reger.⁵⁹⁹

⁵⁹⁴ In Spemann 55. ‘Jede Komposition ist gut, die vollkommen farblos gespielt werden kann. Man muß zuerst zeichnen können, um zu malen.’

⁵⁹⁵ In Gurlitt A 83

⁵⁹⁶ Walcha rejected transitional dynamics on the organ in 1938 (see Chapter 6, section 1.2) and publicly announced the deletion of Reger organ works from the curriculum of the Frankfurt am Main Conservatory in 1952 (see Walcha B and Chapter 6, section 1.5)

⁵⁹⁷ See, for example, Lohmann B

⁵⁹⁸ Anderson 78

⁵⁹⁹ See Högner B, also Chapter 6 section 1.6 of this work

Added to this is the complication that Reger organ works vary significantly in compositional style, and in the demands they place on the organ and the player. The styles of the *Benedictus*, op. 59/9 or of the op. 52 Chorale Fantasies, for instance, are more overtly sophisticated and more expressive than those of such early works as op. 7 or op. 16, or than the style of any chorale from the op. 67 collection, not to mention deliberate attempts at textural simplicity represented, for example, by the op. 135a chorales.

Reger himself fully recognised this inequality within his oeuvre, and wrote to Straube on 1 April 1904 that ‘...op. 56 [Five easily performable Preludes and Fugues] may be understood as a **bridge** which will help certain organists prepare the way for real Reger.’⁶⁰⁰ These pieces are far from easy to perform and are dynamically mobile. Nevertheless, their scale and expressive levels do not compare with the very next opus, the momentous *Symphonische Fantasie und Fuge*, op. 57.

It is quite clear that there never was, and never can be, a single authentic code of performance practice that covers the interpretation of Reger’s organ works. Neither the organs, nor contemporary practice, nor traditions of performance, nor compositional style nor Reger’s own attitude to performance allow exclusiveness in performance. At most, certain works require large organs for their performance indications to be realised in a reasonably satisfactory manner.

Latitude in Reger performance is reflected in early performances of his organ works, when ‘modern’ instruments accounted for only a very small percentage of organs in Germany. The organs of Wesel or Merseburg, for instance, both used for premières of significant Reger organ works, do not compare favourably in dynamic sophistication to the Thomaskirche in Leipzig used for Straube’s Reger editions.⁶⁰¹

4 Latitude in the treatment of Reger’s performance indications

Despite Reger’s emphasis on logic rather than colour in his compositions he was not uninterested in the performance of his works. On the contrary, as a pianist he subjected himself to a hectic schedule, and strove to establish a performance tradition for his works. This pianistic evangelism is evident in a frequently cited letter to Hinrichsen of 26 December 1906, where he writes, ‘Not only do I have to make publicity for myself, but I also **have to** create a **tradition**, so that everyone knows **how I want** the pieces to be played! And this tradition is **absolutely essential**’.⁶⁰² In Chapter 2, section 1.4 of his important book on Reger reception, Hermann Wilske gives a contemporary view of Reger as the concert pianist. The picture he paints is of Reger the ‘*Nachschaffender*’, the creative interpreter, who performed his own music and others’ as if improvised for the first time. The relationship between musical score and performance allowed for a significant degree of latitude in interpretation.

⁶⁰⁰ In Popp B 54. ‘Apropos: Op 56 ist als **Brücke** zu verstehen, die so manchem Organisten wohl den Weg zum wirklichen Reger erleichtern wird.’

⁶⁰¹ For dispositions of Wesel and Leipzig see Appendix 2

⁶⁰² In Popp & Shigihara B 136. ‘Denn: ich muß nicht nur eigene Propaganda machen, sondern ich **muß** eine **Tradition** schaffen, damit man weiß, **wie** ich die Werke gespielt haben **will!** Und diese Tradition ist **absolut nötig!**’ See also a letter to Duke George II of 12.6.1911, and Popp & Shigihara A 123.

It seems, indeed, that the actual performance of Reger's music may have been a separate issue in the composer's mind, independent of the compositional concept. This is suggested by the dual compositional process commonly adopted by Reger, whereby the bare musical text (made up of purely 'compositional' elements: themes, harmonic progressions, counterpoints, figuration, etc.) was notated in black ink; and at a later stage, the performance indications (dynamics, tempo indications, phrasing, etc.) added in red. The *Phantasie und Fuge über B-A-C-H*, op. 46, for example, bears the inscription 'begun 10 Feb., completed 17 Feb. 1900', but Reger's correspondence indicates that he was busy for at least another week filling in the performance indications with red ink.⁶⁰³

Reger appears to have considered the notation of the performance indications a less taxing operation, an almost therapeutic chore, between bouts of actual composition. This is not to say that the notation of the performance indications was not taken seriously by him. On the contrary, the extremely high standard of his proofs, containing very few mistakes, belies this view. The segregation of the two processes, black and red, however, does suggest a degree of independence for the performance indications, and perhaps that they are not necessarily integral to the compositional concept.⁶⁰⁴

This reflects the sentiment behind numerous writings on performance around the end of the nineteenth century. As mentioned above, Heinrich Reimann's 1889 essay on Bach performance *Über den Vortrag der Orgelkompositionen J.S. Bachs*, for instance, assumes that, as musical sensibility has become more sophisticated over the years, it is incumbent on contemporary performers to present music from an earlier period in 'modern' garb.⁶⁰⁵ The music was thought to require a new dimension in performance, a fashionable gloss, in order to be acceptable to a new era.

For reasons of a more practical nature, perhaps, a similarly relaxed attitude was applied by some commentators to performance indications in Reger's organ works. The following extract is from a review of Reger's op. 59 in the NZfM in 1902 by F.L. Schnackenberg (the dedicatee of Reger's *Hallelujah, Gott zu loben*, op. 52/3, published in 1901):⁶⁰⁶ 'by the way, whoever cannot follow [Reger's] incredibly detailed dynamic indications on the organ need not worry. Reger

⁶⁰³ See Susanne Popp in Popp B 14

⁶⁰⁴ This was suggested in Klotz D, where Hans Klotz writes that 'in the manuscript sent to the publisher the dynamics are in red, as if Reger wished to show by this that they do not form an integral part of his music'. See also Chapter 6 section 1.5 of this work. The most thorough discussion of the black/red process to date is by Susanne Popp in Popp D.

⁶⁰⁵ Reimann 133 and 135. See also this chapter, footnote 7.

⁶⁰⁶ January 1902, 52. 'Im übrigen soll sich keine Skrupel machen, der die bis in's Kleinste gehende dynamische Bezeichnung auf seiner Orgel nicht buchstäblich befolgen kann. R[eger] selbst giebt uns einen dankenswerten Wink, wenn er hie und da schreibt: quasi ff, und quasi pp. Und auch die Crescendi und Decrescendi liegen wahrlich oft genug – wie irgend ein alter Orgel-Meister es verlangt hat – auch bei R[eger] im Gedanken selbst.' Schnackenberg's comments follow on a discussion of a passage from *Wachet auf*, where he quotes Reger's indications, 'in the middle "extremely gently brought out", above three or four accompanying voices with the registration, 8' and 4', all with the general indication: *sempre pppp* (I'm not exaggerating!)'. ['...in Mittellage 'äußerst zart hervortretend', darüber, hochgelegen drei, man könnte auch sagen vier Begleitstimmen, Registrierung: C.f. [Cantus firmus] 8', Begleitstimmen 8' und 4', Generalvorschrift: *sempre pppp* (ich übertreibe nicht!).']

himself gives us a pointer, thankfully, when, here and there, he writes *quasi ff*, and *quasi pp*. Truly, the crescendos and decrescendos are often enough, even with Reger, just in his head.'

Schnackenberg intends no disrespect to Reger or his music, which he reviews glowingly, and nowhere in his correspondence does Reger contradict Schnackenberg's assertions. On the contrary, Schnackenberg recognises an aspect of Reger's notation that is, to some extent, subjective, the realisation of which requires a common-sense attitude on the part of the performer. It is self-evident that a composer's notation cannot control exact dynamic shape on an organ, the exact phrasing in all its detail, the exact tempo and its modification, the exact registration, and so on. A degree of latitude is integral to the composer's notation.

Quite apart from these issues of common sense and the solution of problems peculiar to the organ, and to particular organ types, it would seem that something more than a literal realisation of the notation was expected. The thrust of Heinrich Reimann's argument for Bach performance is that the score requires completion by the performing artist (*reproduzierenden Künstler*), in order to bring out the light and the shade of the music.

Reger, we know, thought along the same lines, as in a letter he wrote to Peters on 8 September 1904: 'I will add performance indications [to the Brandenburg concertos], which are almost completely absent from the score, in order to approach our "modern" (this word is horrible, and its meaning also) dynamic urge.'⁶⁰⁷ To Duke Georg II of Meiningen he explained how the success of his performances with the Meiningen orchestra was based on the observance of the extra indications in the parts supplied by him. Reger then asserted that he would be grateful if an important composer would present [his] works in a more effective form.⁶⁰⁸ (See also Chapter 5, section 5.2)

The concept of the illumination of a score by an interpreter appears to have been widespread. In the *Neue Zeitung für Musik* of 22 November 1899, for example, A.W. Gottschalg spoke of having performed Bach's D minor Toccata *nach Liszt'scher Beleuchtung*, that is, in the way that Liszt would have illuminated it. And in a letter to Duke Georg II of Saxony-Meiningen Reger wrote that 'in [his] opinion the art of performance only *begins* when the player learns to read "between the lines", when the "unsspoken" comes to light'.⁶⁰⁹

Despite the fact that Straube was not a composer, Reger may well have thought of his friend as a master lighting designer and technician who had the skill and ability to illuminate his organ works and present them 'in a better light'. Straube wrote that he wasn't in a position to publish a musicological edition of Reger's organ works, because one existed already (the original, sanctioned by the composer). However, he also felt that it would be possible 'to present clearly in a practical edition the artistic intentions of this great master, and thereby achieve a greater impact for the works on public musical life'.⁶¹⁰ It is generally agreed among organists and

⁶⁰⁷ Popp B 67, note 77. 'Vortragszeichen, die da in der Partitur fast gänzlich fehlen, werde ich hinzusetzen, um die Bearbeitungen unserem "modernen" (dieses Wort ist scheußlich u. ebenso seine Bedeutung) dynamischen Gefühl näherzurücken.'

⁶⁰⁸ In a letter to the Duke of 15.2.1913, *Herzog-Briefe* 415

⁶⁰⁹ Dated 7.1.1912, in *Herzog-Briefe* 92

⁶¹⁰ In a letter to Oskar Söhngen dated 15.11.1946, in KSB 213. 'Von den Orgelwerken kann ich eine musikwissenschaftliche Ausgabe nicht veröffentlichen, da eine solche schon vorliegt. Wohl wäre es möglich, in

writers on Reger organ performance that a literal realisation of his notation is often unsatisfactory, if not impossible,⁶¹¹ and a certain degree of creative interpretation was desirable and expected.

5 Karl Straube's contribution

'In some way, [Straube] has become a culprit because he wanted to reveal in detail what was more or less a common practice' (Bengt Hambraeus)⁶¹²

What Straube had to offer Reger's organ music was a definite and independent approach to music making, a 'total system' of performance, a German solution to registration and dynamic control, and a post-Wagnerian conception of textural fluidity and unanimity of design. In his Reger editions he created a fascinating world of his own, a performance system complete in itself, hyper-modern, independent of the music upon which it was superimposed, and yet seemingly winning the approval of the composer. It is clear that Straube presented Reger's works in a garb not wholly envisaged by the composer, but nevertheless fully attuned to the dominant performance style of the era, which lay under the shadow of Richard Wagner. In the words of Emanuel Gatscher, a pupil of both Reger and Straube, '[Straube's] artistic autonomy ensured that he did not shy away from opposition to certain indications by the composer, as he himself brought [to Reger's music] something that was whole and complete within itself...'⁶¹³

In Reger's organ works Straube created an environment in which blend and flexibility of sound were of primary importance. This was characterised by multiple tempo levels, gradual tempo alteration, *rubato*, 'orchestral' colour, sophistication in phrasing and articulation, the careful handling of inner voices and subsidiary material, *Übergangsdynamik* and transitional playing techniques. Detail in performance became an obsession, strongly reflected in Straube's own editions of Reger despite his complaint about the density of performance indications in Reger's originals.⁶¹⁴

Although much of Straube's vision was in the spirit of illumination and the completion of Reger's performance indications, he appears in a very few cases to have deliberately altered the composer's conception of a passage. As previously discussed, the most famous and heavily criticised example of this is in the *Toccata d-Moll*, op. 59/5, where, especially near the end of the piece, Straube's indications of dynamics and tempo are diametrically opposed to Reger's. This 'almost criminal'⁶¹⁵ act was committed during the composer's lifetime, and published under the heading, 'with the composer's approval'. In striking contrast to the later invective

einer praktischen Ausgabe den künstlerischen Willen dieses großen Meisters klar darzulegen, und es könnte dadurch eine stärkere Auswirkung dieser Werke auf die musikalische Öffentlichkeit erreicht werden.'

⁶¹¹ See, for example, Roick, Wunderlich C, Schnackenberg or Walter B

⁶¹² Hambraeus 69

⁶¹³ Gatscher 4. '...seine künstlerische Autonomie scheut die scharfe Opposition zu bestimmten Angaben des Komponisten nicht, weil er selbst ein Ganzes, Geschlossenes hinsetzt, in dem trotz aller scheinbaren Pietätlosigkeit doch der Wille und die Intention des Komponisten zur Geltung kommt.'

⁶¹⁴ See a letter to Hans Klotz of 25.2.1944, KSB 174

⁶¹⁵ Stockmeier A 24. '...fast kriminell...'

provoked by this ‘misjudgement’ of Straube, neither Reger nor Straube commented on the matter.

Did the delicacy of Reger and Straube’s relationship preclude discussion? Was there a conspiracy of silence in operation? Or did Reger actually approve the change as the piece’s inscription states? Did Reger perhaps have no right to comment at all, given that the music actually belonged to the publishers, as Hambraeus has suggested?⁶¹⁶ Or was the wilful alteration of dynamic shape in a work composed over a decade earlier simply an issue of little importance or interest to Reger, unworthy of comment?

There is good reason to suppose that Reger may have lost interest in many of his less significant compositions after a period. An incredible speed of composition resulted in a proliferation of works in a variety of genres. The density of composition must have made even recent works appear distant. His wife Elsa wrote that, ‘Once his offspring were on their feet, he lost interest in many of them’.⁶¹⁷ In 1912, the year of Straube’s first Reger edition, Reger was incredibly busy, conducting and performing in over 100 concerts that involved an enormous amount of travel, as well as maintaining a high level of composition both in terms of quality and quantity. It is hard to imagine that the alteration of performance indications in a relatively minor work for a solo instrument from eleven years earlier would have held anything more than passing interest for Reger.

6 Straube and transitional style

Transitional style as transferred from orchestral practice to the organ, derived from Wagner’s ‘most profound art’,⁶¹⁸ is undoubtedly one in which a multitude of musical events form a continuum, and in which one moment passes almost imperceptibly into the next. Whether a change in tempo, registration, touch or dynamics, any alteration to the texture may be considered an event, a disturbance of that ‘rigid composure’ for which the organ was renowned.⁶¹⁹ In order to seem unobtrusive these events should ideally be introduced gradually and not in isolation.

A proliferation of events, or textural alterations, is necessary to an environment in which a transitional style can function. Without a multiplicity of events a single event will stand out and appear in isolation. This is anathema to a transitional style. Only within a constantly changing texture will individual alterations of tempo, colour, dynamics and touch be subsumed into an overall sequence of events that form a network within the substance of the music. Each individual event is then heard as a mild and wholly acceptable textural alteration within the musical flow, rather than a disturbing intrusion.

⁶¹⁶ Hambraeus 66

⁶¹⁷ Elsa 52. ‘Für viele seiner Kinder hatte er, konnten sie erst mal laufen, kein Interesse mehr’. See also G. Bunk and Arno Landmann among many others who report on Reger’s seeming indifference to performances of his works.

⁶¹⁸ See Chapter 4 section 1.1

⁶¹⁹ See Riemann B, op. cit., under *Orgel*. ‘...starre Ruhe...’, also Chapter 2 section 1.1 of this work

It was in the creation of a ‘total system’, involving all the parameters of performance necessary to an organ parallel of Wagner’s transitional style, that Karl Straube excelled. His Reger editions construct a textural web involving every parameter of performance, within which Reger’s music appears both quintessentially German and ‘modern’ to a high degree. The large number of ‘events’ in the Reger editions gives credence to a simulation of transitional style.

In technical terms, Straube devised an approach to the ‘modern’ organ that allowed all the aids of registration to function together and harmoniously. Great variety was achieved in the handling of Swell and Walze, especially in conjunction with ‘base’ registrations. A number of playing techniques, gradual, staggered and abrupt, was developed for varied use of the Walze.⁶²⁰ The manual couplers were included in the Walze from the start to promote blend and interplay between manuals. Voice-by-voice changes of manuals were introduced to facilitate gradual build-ups and diminuendos. The use of Swell and Walze was dovetailed (the Swell used for small-scale, the Walze for large-scale dynamics),⁶²¹ and the Walze was carefully controlled. By these means, grandiose orchestral effects could for the first time be simulated on the organ.

Specifically Wagnerian aspects of Straube’s system may be clearly recognised in his attitude to sound, touch and the treatment of tempo. His preferred sound was blended, ‘gapless’, ‘covered’ and full-textured, and aimed at a total fusion of unison stops and upper work (this despite the frequent overt application of colouristic registrations).⁶²² Indications for touch presented the twin priorities of continuity and ‘significance in every detail’, that is, the application of a detailed system of phrasing and articulation within an overall legato style.⁶²³ Great pains were taken to ensure prominence for the middle voices.⁶²⁴ Tempo indications included many more subsidiary levels of tempo than in Reger’s originals, and many ritardandos were added, all within an overall tempo rubato style.⁶²⁵

Without doubt, the Reger editions represent Straube’s most important work from the standpoint of a later generation. By comparison, his work with the choir of the Thomaskirche, his early recordings of Bach Cantatas, his editions of Early Music and his work as an organ advisor should surely hold less interest for us now. An understanding of how Straube treated Reger’s scores, why the Reger editions were made, where Straube’s aesthetic ideas derived from and how technical means were harnessed for musical ends contributes greatly to our overall picture of organ culture in Germany at the turn of the twentieth century. Straube’s special significance as the first important interpreter of Reger’s organ works makes a study of these editions indispensable.

Straube’s Reger editions are a deliberate codification of an ideal, a detailed and idealised approach to Reger performance that grew out of an understanding of contemporary performance practices. This despite the view of Bengt Hambraeus, who wrote that Straube ‘makes every effort to modify and suppress...the truly new and contemporary elements in Reger’s music’.⁶²⁶

⁶²⁰ C.f. Chapter 2 sections 3.8, 3.9 and 3.14

⁶²¹ C.f. Chapter 2 section 3.22

⁶²² C.f. Chapter 4 section 2

⁶²³ C.f. Chapter 5 section 5

⁶²⁴ C.f. Chapter 5 section 4.1

⁶²⁵ C.f. Chapter 5 section 6

⁶²⁶ Hambraeus, *op. cit.* 66

A large question mark still hangs over Straube's own personal performance practice, as distinct from that represented in his editions. It is by no means certain that Straube ever performed Reger organ works in the manner presented in his editions of 1912 and 1919. It appears that, from the time of his appointment as *Thomascantor* in 1918, Straube only rarely performed in public.⁶²⁷ Furthermore, the small but significant number of registration mistakes in the 1919 edition suggest that actual hands-on trying out was perhaps limited.⁶²⁸

It is certain, also, that Straube's earlier performance practice in Wesel, where many of Reger's most important works were premièred, did not reflect the sophistication of his later editions, as the organ was relatively primitive in terms of aids to registration. It seems too that Straube often performed without registrants, which, in less sophisticated organs, must have restricted the possibilities of registration enormously.⁶²⁹ Both of Straube's organ teachers in Berlin, Diemel and Reimann, also stressed the importance of the ability to register alone.⁶³⁰

7 Epilogue: Resignation as a law of life

'To admit a mistake...is the duty of an honest man' (Straube, 13 November 1930)⁶³¹

'It is the spirit of the times, and not criticism, that makes or breaks art and artists' (von Bülow)⁶³²

Despite the deprivations of the war years, Karl Straube's friends, colleagues and former pupils managed to produce a handsome volume, *Gaben der Freunde* (Gifts from Friends), on the occasion of Straube's seventieth birthday in 1943.⁶³³ This included contributions from Siegmund von Hausegger, J.N. David, G. Ramin, F. Stein, K. Matthaei, W. Furtwängler, K.

⁶²⁷ See Maria Hübner

⁶²⁸ Also, see Anderson 170 and 174, notes 28 and 50, for minor discrepancies between the Thomaskirche organ and Straube's 1912 and 1919 editions.

⁶²⁹ See Anderson 61. It seems to have been widely assumed in turn-of-the-century Germany that organists should be able to register for themselves, as in Richter, M. 30, where, referring to the extension of the Walze axis out through the side of the organ console, Max Richter writes, 'I don't consider this device absolutely essential, as I would hold to the principle that the organist should register everything himself.' ('Ich halte diese Vorrichtung nicht für absolut notwendig, weil ich von dem Grundsatz ausgehe, daß der Organist sich alles selbst registrieren soll.') In Hasse F 157 also, Karl Hasse writes that 'Especially as free combinations, apart from maybe just one, were only seldom built, Straube used [the Walze] particularly for independent, sometimes even improvisatory registration, unaided by a registrant.' ('Straube verwandte ihn, zumal die Vorrichtungen für "freie Kombinationen", außer vielleicht für nur eine, noch wenig gebaut wurden, auch besonders zum Zwecke des selbständigen, von einem Registrierhelfer unabhängigen, manchmal geradezu improvisatorischen Registrierens.')

⁶³⁰ Diemel 31, Reimann in 'Französische Orgelkomponisten', *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung*, 26.6.1896, 361, cited by Anderson 109

⁶³¹ To Karl Hasse, KSB 92. 'Einen Fehler offen zu bekennen, ist für mein Gefühl die Pflicht eines ehrlichen Mannes.'

⁶³² In NZfM, vol.45/6, August 1856 'Nicht die Kritik, sondern der Weltgeist zeugt und begräbt Kunst und Künstler.'

⁶³³ *Karl Straube zu seinem 70. Geburtstag: Gaben der Freunde* (Leipzig 1943)

Hasse, W. Gurlitt, and a host of others, and covered many areas of Straube's life, including his relationship with Reger, his position regarding the *Orgelbewegung*, his support for young composers, his activities as an organist and teacher, and as *Thomascantor*, and his relationship to the world around him, spiritual, political and artistic.

Although 'literature on Straube has been largely panegyric as a matter of tradition, most of it written by students who knew and studied with him at Leipzig',⁶³⁴ it is curious that Straube's most enduring legacy is almost certainly the realisation and codification of the full flowering of 'modern' organ style in his Reger editions of 1912 and 1919, an achievement of his early manhood. It is a bitter irony that the 'modern' direction in organ-building and performance, championed so brilliantly by Straube in his early career, was to fall prematurely from grace in the face of the *Orgelbewegung* and other pressures. The 'modern' style, with which Straube was so readily associated, became an embarrassment to him.

This was the 'modern' manner of performance castigated by Albert Schweitzer in his support of the early Viennese and Alsatian attempts at organ reform. Undoubtedly, many shared Karl Hasse's viewpoint that 'although Schweitzer did not mention Straube by name, when he spoke of "the hyper-modern interpretations of Bach's organ music" he was thinking, above all, of Straube'.⁶³⁵

Even as Straube was planning the very 'modern' extension of the Thomaskirche organ in 1908, let alone the later Reger editions, the tide was turning. Soon Straube was considered *passé* by many of his younger colleagues and pupils. The practice of editing had reached an impasse, and editions of Early Music such as those prepared by Straube were frowned upon for the liberties they took. The Romantic editor was an anachronism, of no further interest to serious musicians.

Straube adjusted to these changes in editorial form, and in his 1929 Peters edition, *Alte Meister des Orgelspiels: Neue Folge*, retracted the editorial basis of his original 1904 *Alte Meister* publication. This was one of a series of milestones that marked Straube's decline in his own self-esteem. A progression led from the time of his youth when he was 'young and self-confident and lived under the happy illusion that his work was worth something',⁶³⁶ to a point of disillusionment and despair in the years of the Second World War.

To some, Straube kept up the pretence of belief in himself and his work, as in the rather patronising reply of 10 April 1941 to Michael Schneider on receipt of the latter's *Die Entwicklung der Orgelspieltechnik des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland*.⁶³⁷ With others, he occasionally dropped his guard, and revealed the extent of his inner loss of confidence in himself, his work and life itself. In a letter to Fritz Stein of 4 September 1938 Straube identified

⁶³⁴ Anderson 5

⁶³⁵ Hasse F 168. 'Den Namen Straubes erwähnt Schweitzer nicht, aber wenn er von "der hypermodernen Interpretation der Bachschen Orgelkompositionen" spricht, so denkt er ohne Zweifel in erster Linie an Karl Straube.'

⁶³⁶ From a letter to his brother-in-law, Otto Grüters, dated 15.2.1940, in KSB 110. 'Ach, mein Lieber, damals war ich noch jung und hatte Vertrauen zu mir selber und lebte der glückhaften Einbildung, meine Arbeit bedeute einen Wert.'

⁶³⁷ KSB 124–126.

‘the first and most painful sacrifice...Max Reger [himself], after [whose death] the world became quieter and lonelier, unreal and foreign...’.⁶³⁸

The false modesty evident at times in Straube’s earlier years was replaced in great measure by a deep humility and ‘resignation as a law of life’. His faith in the worth of his editions plummeted, and he identified the possible usefulness of planned Bach editions as spanning, at most, 10 to 15 years.⁶³⁹ Similarly, in correspondence with O. Söhngen and Fritz Stein from 1946,⁶⁴⁰ Straube doubted that a planned practical edition of Reger organ works would be worthwhile, due to their limited useful lifespan. A letter to his brother-in-law, Otto, of 15 February 1940 makes it clear that Straube had come to the conclusion, anyway, that performance indications could easily be misunderstood in notated form, and should be transmitted in person rather than on the page.⁶⁴¹

In this same extraordinary letter, Straube confessed himself to be ungifted as a musician – he felt that, at best, he was gifted as a teacher, and even then only to a limited degree. Straube’s long line of notable pupils attests to his gifts in this area, and many of these appear to have regarded him with affection. However, they were children of their time, and few, if any, would have shared in Straube’s evangelism for ‘modern’ organ style. The school of organists that emanated from Straube was not one wellversed in ‘modern’ organ style, but a series of individuals, each of them conditioned by the fast-changing world around them. Although a certain number of Reger organ works were taught to most of Straube’s advanced pupils, there is little evidence for the existence of a specific tradition of Reger playing.

The words of one of Straube’s most important pupils, Günther Ramin, could easily have been intended to apply to his teacher: ‘In my opinion, the right to an unmistakably personal style belongs only to the “creative” artist, not the “interpretative”.’⁶⁴² This sentiment is echoed poignantly in an unpublished wartime letter of 10 July 1942 from Straube to his former pupil, Heinz Wunderlich, when he writes that ‘a musician is only a real musician if he is involved in expressing himself with his own compositions...all interpretative work is second-class art and, as such, transient and ephemeral...the conquest of public musical life by interpretative art should be seen as a negative thing. Knaves cannot be kings!’⁶⁴³

Changing fashions and a lack of tolerance for the work of a previous age consigned Straube’s Reger editions and ‘modern’ organ style to oblivion. The wholesale destruction of the German Romantic organ during World War II all but wiped out the environment necessary to the re-creation of Straube’s work. However, re-creation of the details of his editions in performance was almost certainly never Straube’s aim. As Reger and Straube clearly recognised, it is simply unnecessary to restrict Reger’s music to one particular set of performance options. How else

⁶³⁸ In KSB 103. ‘...das erste und schmerzenreichste Opfer war Max Reger, und seitdem wird es immer stiller und immer einsamer um uns.’

⁶³⁹ In the letter of 15.2.1940, KSB 110

⁶⁴⁰ See letters of 15 and 29 November, KSB 211 & 214

⁶⁴¹ KSB 112, see also Chapter 6, section 1.6

⁶⁴² In ‘Stil und Manier’ (1925), Ramin 26. ‘Das Recht eines unbeirrbaren Eigenstiles hat für mein Gefühl nur der **schaffende** Künstler, nicht der reproduzierende.’

⁶⁴³ Heinz Wunderlich sent a copy of this letter to the present author in 1995. ‘Nur der ist ein wirklicher Musiker, der befähigt ist in einem eigenen Werk sich zu äußern...Alles reproduktives Bemühen ist eine Kunst zweiten Ranges und als solche vorübergehend und vergänglich. Die Überwuchung des öffentlichen Musiklebens durch die wiedergebende Kunst ist is als ein Unglück anzusehen. Die Kärner können nicht Könige sein!’

could performances of Reger organ works have been tolerated on organs as different as the instruments in Frankfurt, Wesel and Leipzig (see Appendix 2); or Essen (Sauer 1896, III/38), Brünn and Merseburg, where op. 33, 40/2 and 60, respectively, were premièred?⁶⁴⁴ Despite the collapse of Straube's confidence in his Reger editions in later years, they are invaluable to us today as a set of aesthetic priorities, an imaginative approach to music-making and a contemporaneous and truly German interpretation of quintessentially German compositions.

The words of Arnold Schoenberg, one of the greatest thinkers on music in the twentieth century and an important admirer of Reger, put Straube's work in perspective:

Style is not what people usually imagine. It is not something faithfully guarded, expanding only inwards with no further outward development; it is the opposite – something constantly changing, inwards and outwards. That pleasurable feeling of equilibrium, of poise, which we call style – how is it to develop, if one of its hosts remains the same while the other alters? How is it to exist, if the work of art behaves as people behaved in 1890, whereas the listeners' sensations are the sensations of people in 1912? Nobody can deny that times have changed – not even the people who regret the change...tradition is the opposite of style, although the two are often confused.⁶⁴⁵

⁶⁴⁴ See Appendix 3 for a list of early performances of Reger

⁶⁴⁵ In the 1912 essay *'Parsifal' and Copyright*, see Schoenberg 494.

Appendix 1

CHRONOLOGY

- 1873 6 January in Berlin, birth of Karl Straube
19 March in Brand, birth of Max Reger
- 1874 Reger's family moved to Weiden.
- 1884 Reger commenced piano lessons with Adalbert Lindner in Weiden.
- 1888 Straube commenced organ lessons with Heinrich Reimann (1850–1906, organist to the Berlin Philharmonie [Schlag & Söhne, 1888]). Straube's father was organist in the *Hl. Kreuzkirche* in Berlin (Dinse III/47 electro-pneumatic!, 1888).
Reger attended *Parsifal* and *Meistersinger* at Bayreuth, which influenced his decision to pursue music as a career.
- 1889 Reimann's *Über den Vortrag der Orgelkompositionen J.S.Bachs*
Reger's first compositions (songs and chamber works)
- 1890 Reger commenced studies with Hugo Riemann in Sondershausen, and then Wiesbaden.
- 1892 Reger works published by Augener in London
- 1895 Straube as deputy in *K.W.Gedächtniskirche* (Sauer op.660 IV/89, 1895)
Reger's Suite in E minor Op. 16 composed (published 1896)
- 1896 Reger conscripted into the army
- 1897 4 March, Straube gave 1st performance of Reger's Op. 16 in *Dreifaltigkeitskirche*, Berlin.
1 June, Straube appointed as organist of *Willibrordikirche* in Wesel (Sauer op.650 III/80, 1895)
- 1898 Reger returns to Weiden to recover following an alcohol-induced physical and mental breakdown.
Composition of Op. 27 for organ, "*Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott*"
29 March and 1 April, Reger and Straube met for the first time in Frankfurt am Main.
13 September, Straube gave 1st performance of Op. 27.
- 1899 Sonata Nr. 1 in F sharp minor, the Chorale Fantasies Op. 40/1 & 2 and the Introduction and Passacaglia (without Op. no.)
- 1900-2 BACH Fantasy and Fugue Op. 46, 6 Trios Op. 47, Chorale Fantasies Op. 52/1-3, 5 Easy (!) Preludes and Fugues Op. 56, Symphonic Fantasy and Fugue Op. 57, 12 Pieces Op. 59, Second Sonata in D minor Op. 60, Monologues 12 Pieces Op. 63, 12 Pieces Op. 67, 52 Chorale Preludes Op. 67, 10 Pieces Op. 69, and part of 13 Chorale Preludes, all of the above organ pieces composed in this period, also arrangements of Liszt and Bach for organ
Straube wrote first sizeable articles about Reger in "Monatschrift...", and "Gesellschaft".
Straube named as organist of *Thomaskirche*
Reger moved to Munich with his family, and married Elsa von Bercken, née von Bagenski, a divorced Protestant.
- 1903 6 January, Straube started in *Thomaskirche* on his birthday, aged 30, also takes over Leipzig Bachverein. 4/5 May, Straube married Hertha.
- Reger composed chamber works and songs, also Variations and Fugue on an Original Theme Op. 73 for organ, and published a book on the theory of modulation.
- 14 June, concert in Basel for *39. Tonkünstlerversammlung des allgemeinen deutschen Musikvereins*, incl. Reger's Op. 27 and 57
'*Schule des Triospiels*', a little-documented collaboration between Reger and Straube, driven more by Reger than Straube (see Anderson 130)

- 1904 Reger's 12 Pieces, Op. 80 and 4 Preludes and Fugues Op. 85
Straube's edition of *Alte Meister des Orgelspiels*, use of W0 to W 12 for Walze!
Straube's Liszt edition for Peters. Straube directed Brandenburg 4 with 14 players in the *Gewandhaus* in Leipzig! Straube was a participator in the Leipzig Bach Festival (also in 1908, 1911, 1914, 1920, 1923).
- 1905 19 March, Reger promised Straube a new big organ work in exchange for an article on Reger by Straube!
Reger began teaching composition and organ (!) at the Academy in Munich. Second Suite in G minor Op. 92 composed
11 October, Reger thanks Straube for "incomparable" performances of op.52/2 and 57.
- 1906 26 August, Straube writes a letter to Pfarrer Pank as Chairman of board of St. Thomas, demanding 1. rebuild and extension of organ, 2. guaranteed participation of *Thomaner* in *Bachverein* concerts, 3. increase of salary and 4. title of royal Professor (not for vanity(!) but to affirm authority, he wrote. N.B. Straube organist but not yet cantor!).
- 1907 1 April, Reger moved to Leipzig as university music director and conservatory lecturer.
Straube's edition of *45 Choralvorspiele alter Meister*
Straube began teaching organ at Leipzig Conservatory (Professor in 1908).
G.Robert-Tornow's book *Max Reger und Karl Straube* published
- 1908 Rebuild of Sauer organ in *Thomaskirche*
Straube's performance of Matthew Passion during which G. Schumann and S. Ochs left in protest (see Maria Hübner)
Reger conferred with the title, Royal Saxon Professor, also with an honorary doctorate from the University of Jena
- 1909 Foreword to Straube's edition of Bach's *Magnificat* speaks of a longing for purer, more transparent colours (*Sehnsucht nach reineren, durchsichtigeren Farben*).
Reger undertook a successful tour to London.
Picture of Reger playing the new Sauer organ (III/53) in the Conservatory in Leipzig (extended to 74 stops in 1927)
- 1910 Max Reger Festival held in Dortmund, Reger awarded an honorary doctorate from the medical faculty of the University of Berlin
- 1911 1 December, Reger appointment as Court Music Director to the famous *Hofkapelle* at Meiningen
- 1912 Straube's edition of Reger's op.59/7-9
- 1913 Reger's Introduction, Passacaglia and Fugue, Op. 127 and 9 Pieces, Op. 129
Straube's editions of Bach, Peters Vol. II, and Handel *Dettinger Te Deum*
July, Reger's Welte organ recording
- 1914 Reger has a physical breakdown due to overworking, four weeks recuperation
- 1915 Reger moved to Jena.
Reger's Fantasy and Fugue in D minor Op. 135b
- 1916 Reger's 7 Organ Pieces Op. 145
11 May, Reger died of a heart attack.
- 1918 Appointed *Thomaskantor* (11th after Bach), after which time, according to various writers, Straube hardly performed in public as an organist
- 1919 Straube's editions of selected pieces from Reger's Op.59, 65, 80, 85
Institute for Church Music (Ev.-Luth. Landeskirche Sachsen) founded by K.S. at Leipzig Conservatory
- 1920's Straube's Welte recordings, incl. Reger's Op. 67/23, Op. 92/4 and Fugue in G.
Straube merged *Bachverein* and *Gewandhaus* choirs, which he directed until 1932.
- 1921 4 December, Prätorius organ in Freiburg inaugurated by Straube
- 1922 Schnitger organ in Hamburg 'discovered'
- 1923 Keller's (pupil of both Reger and Straube) book *Max Reger und die Orgel*

- 1924/28 Straube awarded an honorary Dr. Phil. in Leipzig
 1923/36 Straube as advisor for Passau Dom (IX/208!)
- 1925 Straube's edition of Selected Anthems of Leipzig St. Thomas church choir
- 1925 Straube founded the German Handel Festival in Leipzig
- 1926 Straube's edition of Handel's *Salomo*
 18 May, concert in Michaelskirche, Leipzig, to mark the 10th anniversary of Reger's death, organised by Church Music Institute 'in honour of Karl Straube, Reger's friend and supporter of Reger's art' (*zu Ehren von Karl Straube, dem Freund Regers, dem Förderer Regerscher Kunst*)
 K.Matthaei's edition of "*Ausgewählte Orgelstücke des 17. Jahrhunderts*"
 Straube's edition of Bach's harpsichord concerto in D minor, also a Telemann cantata?
- 1927 Straube directed the 1st performance (!) of the Art of Fugue in an arrangement by Graeser.
- 1928 Straube awarded an honorary Dr. Theol. in Leipzig,
 Reger letters (Hase-Koehler) published
 J.Wolgast's book *Karl Straube* published
- 1929 *Neue Folge der Alter Meister des Orgelspiels* rejects principles underlying 1904 ed., furnished with registrations for the Schnitger organ in the *Jakobikirche* in Hamburg
- 1931/37 Weekly broadcasts of the entire cycle of Bach cantatas from Leipzig under Straube's direction
- 1933 1 May, Straube joined NSDAP
- 1934 Straube's edition of Bach's 8 *Kleine Präludien und Fugen*, registrations for Rötha (1721)
 Opposition to Straube on political grounds - some call for his resignation from *Thomaskantorat* and from headship of the Church Music Institute
- 1935 Straube performed the Matthew Passion with the *Thomaner* alone!
- 1937 (End of the year) *Thomaner* join Hitler Youth
- 1938 Straube's edition of Reger's Op. 27
- 1940 Church Music Institute dissolved due to anti-church opposition
- 1943 Festschrift *Karl Straube zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*
 15 December, letter to Furtwängler tells that since 4 December Straube and his family belong to the group of 'Totalgeschädigten' (only some of their clothes were left, see letter of 7.1.1944)
- 1945 Straube's *Rehabilitationsgesuch*, his justification of wartime activities
- 1948 Letter from Straube to W. Kunze of 22.9 speaks of the '*schöne Sauer-Orgel*' of the *Willibrordi-Kirche* in Wesel (in connection with 75th birthday broadcast)
- 1950 Straube's *Rückblick und Bekenntnis* in *Bach Gedenkschrift*, Zürich, also in MuK
 Straube's editions of Bach, Peters Vol. IV
 27 April, Straube died.
- 1952 *Karl Straube: Briefe eines Thomaskantors* published

Appendix 2

DISPOSITIONS

Dispositions are included from the churches where Straube held posts as organist: the St. Willibrordi in **Wesel** (Sauer 1895, III/80) where premières of op. 27, 29, 30, 40/1, 46 and 52/1 were given, and the

Thomaskirche in **Leipzig** (Sauer 1908, III/86), the organ on which the registrations for Straube's 1912 and 1919 editions are based. Also included are dispositions of the **Leipzig** Conservatory organ on which the 1938 edition of op. 27 is based and where Straube taught from 1907 onwards; the Marktkirche in **Wiesbaden** (Walcker 1863/53), possibly an early influence on Reger; the Münster in **Basel** (Haas 1855, see Chapter 6); the **Frankfurt** Paulskirche (Walcker 1833, III/74) where Reger first heard Straube; and the Alte Garnisonkirche in **Berlin** (Sauer 1891, III/70) where the important Reger player, Walter Fischer, was organist from 1903–1910, where Straube premièred Reger's op. 52/2 and op. 57 and where Fischer himself premièred op. 73 (although Falkenberg B gives the [Neue Evangelische] Garnisonkirche, see below). Sources for these dispositions are Falkenberg B, Busch E, Anderson, Hübner W. and Schiess.

Wesel, St. Willibrordi (Sauer 1895, III/80)

<p>I Manual Principal 16' Bourdon 16' Gamba 16' Principal 8' Hohlflöte 8' Viola di gamba 8' Doppelflöte 8' Gemshorn 8' Traversflöte 8' Quintatön 8' Geigenprincipal 8' Gedackt 8' Quinte 5$\frac{1}{3}$' Octave 4' Spitzflöte 4' Fugara 4' Rohrflöte 4' Piccolo 2' Rauschquinte II Groß-Cymbel III Mixture V Scharf V Cornet III-V Trompete 16' Trompete 8'</p>	<p>II Manual Geigenprincipal 16' Bordon 16' Principal 8' Rohrflöte 8' Salicional 8' Flüte harmonique 8' Spitzflöte 8' Harmonica 8' Gedackt 8' Dolce 8' Octave 4' Flöte 4' Gemshorn 4' Flauto dolce 4' Rauschquinte II Mixture IV Cornett IV Fagott 16' Tuba 8' Oboe 8'</p>	<p>III Manual Salicional 16' Lieblich Gedackt 16' Principal 8' Konzertflöte 8' Schalmei 8' Lieblich Gedackt 8' Aeoline 8' Voix céleste 8' Dulciana 8' Praestant 4' Traversflöte 4' Violine 4' Gemshornquinte 2$\frac{2}{3}$' Flautino 2' Harm. aetheria III Clarinete 8' Vox humana 8'</p>
<p>Pedal Contrabaß 32' Untersatz 32' Principal 16' Violon 16' Subbaß 16' Gemshorn 16' Baßflöte 16' Quintbaß 10$\frac{1}{3}$' Oktavbaß 8' Violoncello 8' Gedackt 8' Viola d'amour 8' Flöte 4' Cornett III Contraposaune 32' Posaune 16' Trompete 8' Clarion 4'</p>		<p>Aids to registration 6 normal couplers; 1 octave coupler; <i>mf</i>, <i>f</i>, and <i>ff</i> fixed combinations for each manual, also a fixed combination for reeds, Walze, Swell for III</p>

Leipzig, Thomaskirche (Sauer [1888]/1908, III/86)

<p>I Manual Principal 16' Bordun 16' Principal 8' Geigenprincipal 8' Gedackt 8' Doppelflöte 8' Flauto dolce 8' Flûte 8' Quintatön 8' Gemshorn 8' Gamba 8' Dulciana 8' Gedacktquinte 5$\frac{1}{3}$' Oktave 4' Rohrflöte 4' Gemshorn 4' Violini 4' Oktave 2' Rauschquinte II, 2$\frac{2}{3}$' + 2' Mixtur III, 2' Scharf V, 2' Cornet II-IV, 5$\frac{1}{3}$'/2$\frac{2}{3}$' Großcymbel IV, 31/5' Trompete 16' Trompete 8'</p>	<p>II Manual Salicional 16' Gedackt 16' Principal 8' Gedackt 8' Rohrflöte 8' Concertflöte 8' Flöte 8' Schalmei 8' Salicional 8' Harmonica 8' Dolce 8' Oktave 4' Flauto dolce 4' Salicional 4' Quinte 2$\frac{2}{3}$' Piccolo 2' Mixtur IV, 2$\frac{2}{3}$'/2' Cymbel III, 2' Cornett III, 4' Tuba 8' Clarinete 8'</p>	<p>III Manual Lieblich Gedackt 16' Gambe 16' Principal 8' Bordun 8' Quintatön 8' Spitzflöte 8' Flûte d'amour 8' Gemshorn 8' Viola 8' Aeoline 8' Voix céleste 8' Praestant 4' Fugara 4' Traversflöte 4' Quinte 2$\frac{2}{3}$' Flautino 2' Harm. aethera III, 2$\frac{2}{3}$' Trompette harm. 8' Oboe 8'</p>
<p>Pedal Majorbaß 32' Untersatz 32' Principal 16' Contrabaß 16' Violon 16' Gemshorn 16' Subbaß 16' Salizetbaß 16' Lieblich Gedackt 16' Quintbaß 10$\frac{2}{3}$' Principalbaß 8' Offenbaß 8' Baßflöte 8' Gemshorn 8' Dulciana 8' Violoncello 8' Octave 4' Flauto dolce 4' Posaune 32' Posaune 16' Fagott 16' Trompete 8' Clarine 4'</p>		<p>Aids to registration 6 normal couplers, sub octave coupler II/I, super octave coupler for pedal, tutti coupler, <i>mf</i> and tutti fixed combinations and <i>mf</i>, <i>f</i> and tutti fixed combinations for pedal, 3 free combinations, Walze, Swell for III</p>

Leipzig, Conservatory Concert Hall Organ as available to Straube for his 1938 edition of Reger's op. 27 (Sauer 1887/1909/1927, III/86)

<p>I Manual Prinzpal 16' Prinzpal 8' Flûte harmonique 8' Bordun 8' Gamba 8' Gemshorn 8' Dolce 8' Octave 4' Rohrflöte 4' Dolzett 4' Quinte 2²/₃' Oktave 2' Flachflöte 2' Cornett III-IV Zimbel II Mixtur V Trompete 8'</p>	<p>II Manual Nachthorn 16' Prinzpal 8' Gedackt 8' Konzertflöte 8' Salicional 8' Quintatön 8' Prästant 4' Nachthorn 4' Piccolo 2' Sesquialtera II Zimbel III Scharff III-IV Krummhorn 8'</p>	<p>III Manual Lieblich Gedackt 16' Nachthorn 8' Geigenprinzpal 8' Soloflöte 8' Lieblich Gedackt 8' Gemshorn 8' Quintatön 8' Viola 8' Aeoline 8' Vox celestis 8' Prinzpal 4' Blockflöte 4' Fernflöte 4' Violine 4' Zartquinte 2²/₃' Flautino 2' Terz 13/5' Septime 11/7' Sifflöte 1' Cornett II-IV Mixtur VI-VII Trompette harm. 8' Clairon 4' Rankett 16'</p>
<p>Pedal Untersatz 32' Prinzpal 16' Subbaß 16' Lieblich Gedackt 16' Quinte 10²/₃' Oktavbass 8' Violoncello 8' Lieblichh Gedackt 8' Choralbass 4' Nachthorn 4' Rauschpfeife III Mixtur VI Posaune 16' Rankett 16' Trompete 8' Clarine 4' Sing. Kornett 2'</p>		<p>Aids to registration 6 normal couplers, super octave coupler for pedal, tutti coupler, 6 free combinations, Walze, Swell for III, Pianopedal, Tuttipedal on and off, Tutti for the entire instrument, Pedal 'off', Walze 'off', HR 'off', HR/free combination, pedal couplers 'off', reeds 'on', reeds 'off', manual 16' 'off'</p>

Wiesbaden, Marktkirche (Walcker 1863/53)

<p>I Manual Prinzipal 16' Bourdon 16' Prinzipal 8' Doppelflöte 8' Gemshorn 8' Gamba 8' Quint 5½' Oktav 4' Flöte 4' Salizional 4' Quint 2¾' Oktav 2' Mixtur 2' V Scharf 1½' III Fagott 16' Trompete 8' Clarinette 8' (free reed) Clarine 4'</p>	<p>II Manual Gedackt 16' Prinzipal 8' Flöte 8' Salizional 8' Oktav 4' Fl. d'amour 4" Rohrflöte 4' Quint 2¾' Oktav 2' Mixtur 2' IV Corno 8' Vox humana 8' (free reed)</p>	<p>III Manual Geigenprinzipal 8' Gedackt 8' Dolce 8' Aeoline 8' Traversflöte 8' Spitzflöte 4' Waldflöte 2' Fagott 8'</p>
<p>Pedal Grand Bourdon 32' Prinzipal 16' Violinbaß 16' Subbaß 16' Aeoline 16' Quintbaß 10½' Oktavbaß 8' Violoncello 8' Gedacktbaß 8' Flötenbaß 4' Posaune 16' Trompete 8' Cornettino 4'</p>		<p>Aids to registration 4 Kollektivzüge (fixed combinations) Walze</p>

Basel, Münster (Haas 1855, III/74)

<p>I Manual Prinzipal 16' Bordun 16' Oktave 8' Viola di gamba 8' Gemshorn 8' Bordun 8' Flauto 8' Quinte 5½' Oktave 4' Gemshorn 4' Hohlflöte 4' Quinte 2½' Waldflöte 2' Cornet V Mixtur V Fagotto 16' Trompete 8'</p>	<p>II Manual Quintaden 16' Prinzipal 8' Viola d'amore 8' Salicional 8' Dolce 8' Bordun 8' Oktave 4' Fugara 4' Flauto traverso 4' Kleingedackt 4' Quinte 2⅔' Oktave 2' Cornet V Mixtur IV Fagott-Klarinette 8'</p>	<p>III Manual I Lieblichgedackt 16' Spitzflöte 8' Harmonika 8' Vox humana 8' Spitzflöte 4' Dolcissimo 4' Quinte 2⅔' Flautino 2' Physharmonika 16' Physharmonika 8' II (also playable from a fourth manual) Flauto traverso 8' Stillgedackt 8' Vox humana 8' Flöte d'amour 4'</p>
<p>Pedal Untersatz 32' Oktavbaß 16' Violonbaß 16' Subbaß 16' Quinte 10⅔' Oktavbaß 8' Violoncello 8' Flöte 8' Quintflöte 5⅓' Oktave 4' Posaune 16' Trompete 8' Clarine 4'</p>		<p>Aids to registration: (Foot) couplers II/I, II/Ped and I/Ped, Calcant, Swell for III, Swell for Physharmonika, Collective pistons (fixed combinations) for I, II and Pedal, whereby the strongest stops may be silenced when a soft tone is required, Tremulants for II and III</p>

Frankfurt am Main, Paulskirche (Walcker 1833, III/74)

<p>I Manual Prinzpal 16' Untersatz 32' Flauto major 16' Viola major 16' Oktav 8' Viola da gamba 8' Gemshorn 8' Jubal-Flöte 8' Quint 5$\frac{1}{3}$' Oktav 4' Hohlpfeife 4' Fugara 4' Terz 31/5' Quint 2$\frac{2}{3}$' Waldflöte 2' Oktav 2' Terz 13/5' Oktav 1' Cornet 10$\frac{2}{3}$' V Mixture 2' V Scharf 1' IV Tuba 16' Trompete 8'</p>	<p>II Manual Bourdon 16' Prinzpal 8' Salicional 8' Dolce 8' Gedeckt 8' Quintatön 8' Quintflöte 5$\frac{2}{3}$" Oktav 4' Rohrflöte 4' Flöte traversière 4' Quint 2$\frac{2}{3}$' Oktav 2' Mixture 2' V Vox humana 8' Posaune 8'</p>	<p>III Manual Quintatön 16' Prinzpal 8' Lieblich Gedeckt 8' Nachthorn 8' Hohlflöte 8' Harmonika 8' Bifara 8' Spitzflöte 4' Flöte d'amour 4' Gedeckt 4' Dolcissimo 4' Nasard 2$\frac{2}{3}$' Flautino 2' Physharmonika 8' Hautbois 8'</p>
<p>I Pedal (lower pedal board) Prinzpal 16' Subbaß 32' Kontrabaß 32' Violon 16' Oktav 16' Quint 10$\frac{2}{3}$' Oktav 8' Violoncello 8' Quint 5$\frac{1}{3}$' Terz 62/5' Oktav 4' Posaune 16' Trompete 8' Clarino 4' Cornettino 2'</p>	<p>II Pedal (upper pedal board) Gedeckt 16' Violon 16' Prinzpal 8' Flöte 8' Flöte 4' Waldflöte 2' Fagott 16'</p>	<p>Aids to registration: 5 Sperrventile (valves) for each manual and pedal division Tremulant Couplers II/I, III/II, II Ped/I Ped, II/II Ped Kalkantenwecker (for bellows blower!) Manualwindtrennung (to ensure even distribution of wind over the manuals) (Valve) crescendos for II and III Jalousie crescendo for III Crescendo for <i>Physharmonika</i></p>

Berlin, Alte Garnisonkirche (Sauer 1891, III/71)

(N.B. Busch K 81, 83 and 89 simply give Berlin Garnisonkirche as the place of the first performances of op. 52/2, 57 and 73. However, Falkenberg B 177 and 275 give the (Neue Evangelische) Garnisonkirche (Sauer 1897, II/40) for the première of the Introduction, Variations and Fugue on an original theme, op. 73 (1905), and (erroneously) the Alte Garnisonkirche in its state after 1909 (IV/80) for the première of op. 52/2 (1901), with no mention of op. 57. The present author assumes the Alte Garnisonkirche in its 1891 state for all three premières, as it seems unlikely that a work on the scale of op. 73 would have been premiered on a two-manual instrument. The variation beginning in bar 131 of op. 73, for example, requires three manuals.)

I Manual	II Manual	III Manual
Prinzipal 16' Bordon 16' Prinzipal 8' Doppelflöte 8' Flûte harmonique 8' Gedackt 8' Quintatön 8' Gemshorn 8' Gambe 8' Oktave 4' Rohrflöte 4' Spitzflöte 4' Oktave 2' Rauschquinte II Mixtur III Scharf V Cornet III-IV Bombarde 16' Trompete 8' Clarine 4'	Geigenprinzipal 16' Bordon 16' Prinzipal 8' Rohrflöte 8' Traversflöte 8' Salizional 8' Viola d'amour 8' Oktave 4' Gemshorn 4' Flauto dolce 4' Pikkolo 2' Rauschquinte II Mixtur III Cornett IV Tuba 8' Cor anglais 8'	Lieblich Gedackt 16' Prinzipal 8' Spitzflöte 8' Konzertflöte 8' Lieblich Gedackt 8' Quintatön 8' Aeoline 8' Voix céleste 8' Schalmey 8' Praestant 4' Traversflöte 4' Viola 4' Nasard 2 ² / ₃ ' Flautino 2' Mixtur IV Trompete 8'
Pedal Kontrabaß 32' Prinzipal 16' Violon 16' Subbaß 16' Lieblich Gedackt 16' Quintbaß 10 ² / ₃ ' Violoncello 8' Oktavbaß 8' Dulciana 8' Baßflöte 8' Quinte 5 ¹ / ₃ ' Octave 4' Terz 31/5' Groß-Cymbale III Kontraposaune 32' Posaune 16' Trompete 8' Clarine 4'		Aids to registration 6 normal couplers, <i>mf</i> , <i>f</i> and <i>ff</i> fixed combinations for each manual, <i>pp</i> , <i>p</i> , <i>mf</i> , <i>f</i> and <i>ff</i> fixed combinations for pedal, tutti, piano pedal, Walze, reeds 'off', Swell for III

Appendix 3

Early Performances of Max Reger's Organ Music 1897 – 1916

This is a list of concert performances of Reger's organ music, and performances of Reger included at the Motetten of the *Thomaskirche* in Leipzig. Single small chorale preludes are mostly omitted. Sources for this list are mainly Schreiber, *Max Reger in seinen Konzerten*, Teil II; additional pages from Schreiber supplied by the Max Reger Institut that show entries not included in the book; the author's own list copied from the *Thomaskirche* archives checked against Anderson Appendix 3; a list of Straube organ performances given in Anderson Appendix 5; and a list of student performances at the Leipzig Conservatory given in Anderson Appendix 2. Although this list is doubtless incomplete, it nevertheless gives a very good idea of how Reger organ performance was dominated by Karl Straube in the early years critical to the formation of Reger's mature organ style. This was the case well into the new century, at least until 1905, when the steady stream of significant Reger organ pieces came to a halt.

(N.B. where Karl Straube plays in Leipzig, the *Thomaskirche* may be assumed unless otherwise stated.)

1897

4.3 Karl Straube Berlin (*Dreifaltigkeitskirche*), op. 16 première

1898

1.4 Karl Straube Frankfurt (*Paulskirche*), op. 16
 13.9 Karl Straube Wesel, op. 27 première, op. 30 première,
 op. 16/2&4, (op. 27 repeated)
 Autumn Karl Straube Wesel, op. 29 première

1899

8.3 Karl Straube Munich (*Kaimsaal*), Reimann op. 25, Reger op. 29, etc.
 14.6 Karl Straube Essen (*Kreuzkirche*), op. 33 première (*1. Rhein/Westfalen Organistentag*)
 11.7 Karl Straube Wesel, op. 30
 25.7 Karl Straube Wesel, op. 33
 24.10 Karl Straube Wesel, op. 40/1 première

1900

15.5 W. Petri Utrecht, op. 29
 24.6, not 24.5 Otto Burkert Brünn, op. 40/2 première
 Summer Karl Straube Wesel, op. 40/1, op. 46 première
 14.10 Paul Gerhardt Zwickau (*Marienkirche*), op. 27
 16.10 W. Petri Utrecht, op. 47/3
 25.12 H. Dettmer Hildesheim, op.40/1

1901

Early 1901 24.2	P. Gerhardt Egon Petri	Zwickau, Fugue of op. 46 Dresden, op. 29
3.3 op. 63?)	Paul Gerhardt	Leipzig (<i>Nordkirche</i>), op. 46, <i>Canzone</i> (possibly from
5.3	Karl Straube	München (<i>Kaimsaal</i>), (Reger present), op. 33, 40/2,
27, 46, op. 40/1	28.4 Karl Straube	Wesel, op. 52/2 première (not 12.5)
12.5	Karl Straube	Berlin (<i>Garnisonkirche</i>), op. 52/2, 27, 46
4.6	Karl Straube	Heidelberg (<i>Peterskirche</i>), <i>Tonkünstlerversammlung</i> , op. 46
1.7	K. Beringer	Reger programme, from op. 33 & op. 47, op. 46, op. 40/1
Summer	Karl Straube	Wesel, op. 52/1 première
28.8	K. Beringer	Ulm (<i>Münster</i>), from op. 33, etc.
Autumn	P. Gerhardt	Zwickau, op. 40/1
8.10	W. Petri	Utrecht, op. 27
31.10	P. Gerhardt	Zwickau, op. 59/2 première, op. 27, op. 47/3, R. Jung <i>Introduktion & Passacaglia in d-Moll</i> , op. 40/1
3.11	H. Grunen A. Hänlein	op. 67/15, op. 46 Heidelberg (<i>Heilig-Geist-Kirche</i>) Choralvorspiel zu <i>Ein' feste Burg</i> (inauguration of the new Sauer organ)
9.11	Karl Straube	Munich (<i>Kaimsaal</i>), op. 52/1, 2 and 3 (3 is a première), op. 59, 7 and 9 première, op. 46
10.11	Otto Burkert	Brünn, op. 27
12.11	W. Petri	Utrecht, op. 27
15.12	H. Dettmer	Quakenbrück, op. 52/2
26.12	O. Burkert	Brünn, op. 59/9

1902

Early 1902 p.60/I&II	H. Dettmer? Karl Straube Karl Straube	Quakenbrück?, op. 59/5,6,7&9, op. 46, op. 40/2, Orsfeld?, op. 46 Schwerin, op. 59/5,6&9
26.1	Reger	Munich (<i>Erlöserkirche</i> in Schwabing), accomp. of 1 Reger song
12.2	Karl Straube	Middelburg (NL) op. 59/9
20.2	Karl Straube	Berlin, op. 52/1&2, op. 57 première
23.2	Felix Ritter	Koblenz, op. 59/9
11.4	Karl Straube	Herne, op. 59/7 and 9 (<i>Rh/W. Organistentage</i>)
11.5	H. Dettmer	Merseburg (<i>Dom</i>), op. 60, op. 59/7&9, op. 40/1, op. 52/2, etc.
19/20.5	G. Stolz	Chemnitz, op. 57, op. 60, op. 59/3&5
7.6	Karl Straube	Krefeld (<i>Stadthalle</i>) Reger programme
3 - 7.8	K. Beringer	Ulm, op. 40/1, op. 33, op. 47/2&3, op. 52/3, op. 46, op. 47/1&6
21.9	R. Frenzel	Schneeberg (<i>St. Wolfgangskirche</i>), op. 9/4,5,8&11, op. 67/15
Autumn	P. Meder	Hamburg (<i>Petrikirche</i>), <i>Intermezzo</i> from op. 33
15.11	O. Burkert	Brünn, op. 63/6
27.12	P. Hoffmann	Solingen, op. 27

1903

Winter season	Karl Straube	Köln, op. 46
17.1	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 63/1 & 2
9.2	W. Scholz	Vienna (<i>Saal des Kaufm. Vereins</i>), op. 65/4&9, op. 59/5
14.2	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 59/9
15.2	B. Irrgang	Dresden, op. 60
4.3	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 60, <i>Introduktion & Passacaglia</i> from op. 63, op. 52/2, op. 27, 69/3 and 8, 46, (Reger present)
March	Karl Straube	Bremen, and Königsberg, Reger pieces performed
11&29.3	P. Gerhardt	Zwickau, op. 63/5&6
April	Karl Straube	Halle
5.4	P. Gerhardt	Lichtenstein, op. 63/5&6
10.4	P. Gerhardt	Plauen
8.5	H. Lindquist?	Berlin, op. 46
14.6	Karl Straube	Basel (<i>Münster</i>), op. 27, op. 57, (<i>39. Tonkünstlerversammlung des Allgemeinen Deutschen Musikvereins</i>), (Reger present)
25.7	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 46
27.9	O. Burkert	Brünn, P and F from op. 63
11.10	O. Burkert	Brünn, op. 40/1
18.10	Karl Heyse	Dresden, op. 63/6
30.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op.27
1.11	P. Hoffmann	Solingen, op. 7/1&5
1.11	O. Burkert	Brünn, P and F from op. 63, op.63/7
15.11	O. Burkert	Brünn, op.27
15.11	P. Gerhardt	Zwickau, from op. 67
22.11	H. Dettmer	rebuilt organ in Lübecker Dom, op. 57, op. 60, op. 59/9, 65/4
28.11	Karl Straube?	Leipzig, op. 59/9
8.12	O. Burkert?	Brünn, op.27, <i>Ave Maria</i> from op. 63, op. 67/14&24
12.12	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 60/II
20.12	Otto Becker	Berlin (<i>Garnisonkirche</i>) " <i>Vom Himmel hoch</i> " cantata première, conducted by W. Fischer

1904

2.1	O. Burkert	Brünn, from op. 67, op. 63/3
16.1	Albert Kranz	Dresden, op. 63/6
March/April	Students of Stuttgart	cons. (S. de Lange pupils), op. 27, Wolf arrs.
1.3	W. Fischer	Berlin (<i>Garnisonkirche</i>), op. 69/6 - 10 première, (ded. to W.F.)
4.3	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 33, 27, 57, 59/7, 65/4, from op. 67
13.3	R. Schmidt	Dresden (<i>Jakobikirche</i>), op. 65/4&5
16.4	A. Kranz	Dresden (<i>Frauenkirche</i>), op. 69/3
24.4	K. Beringer	Nördlingen, <i>Intermezzo</i> from op. 33, from op. 67
24.4	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 59/6
29.4	Karl Straube	Munich (<i>Kaimsaal</i>), op.57, from op. 63 and op. 67
9.5	Ludwig Maier	Munich (<i>Lukaskirche</i>), op. 27, (In same concert Reger accomp. his arr. of Wolf songs on the organ)
9.5	Arthur Kraft	Berlin (<i>Lutherkirche</i>) op. 46, op. 47/1, op. 67/14, op. 27
14.5	Karl Straube	Leipzig, Fugue only from op. 46
21.5	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 46
2.6	B. Irrgang	Berlin, op. 63/6
11.6	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 69/9&10
5.7	W. Petri	Utrecht, <i>Introduktion & Passacaglia in d-Moll</i>

16.7	?	Dresden, op. 60/I&II
27.7	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 69/6&7
27.8	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 59/5&6
18.9	R. Frenzel	Schneeberg, arr. of Bach P and F in B flat, op. 65/9
13.10	H. Reimann	Berlin (<i>Gedächtniskirche</i>) op.80/1,4,5,6,8 (or 10), 11&12
15.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 63/6
29/10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 27
31.10	?	Dresden (<i>Kreuzkirche</i>), op. 27
6.11	P. Gerhardt	Zwickau, op. 27, op. 80/3, op. 40/2
16.11(crit.)	H. Reimann	Berlin, op. 46
16.11	P. Gerhardt	Zwickau, op. 40/2, op. 80/5
18.11	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 69/1&2
19.11	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 67/37,48&33
26.11	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 63/9&10
11.12	R. Jung	Greiz? op.27, <i>Intermezzo</i> (op. 59/3 or op. 80/6?)
11.12	Karl Schwarz?	Lübeck, op. 63/6
18.12	W. Fischer	Berlin, cantata " <i>Vom Himmel hoch</i> "
18.12	L. Maier	Munich (<i>Lukaskirche</i>), op. 67/11&17, Reger cantata " <i>Vom Himmel hoch</i> "
20.12	W. Lamping	Bielefeld (<i>Neustädterkirche</i>), op. 27
21.12	O. Becker	Berlin (<i>Andreaskirche</i>) " <i>Vom Himmel hoch</i> " cantata
28.12	G. Beckmann	Bielefeld, (<i>5 Rh/W. Orgeltagen</i>)
	F. Meyer	op. 65/11, op. 57
		K. Schlingmann
End of 1904	O. Burkert	Brünn?, op. 80/6&9

1905

1st. half 1905	Schlegel	Stuttgart, op. 59/5&6
	Karl Straube	Heidelberg, op. 40/2, op. 57
3.1	Reger	Essen, accomp. cantata " <i>Vom Himmel hoch</i> "
10.1	Paul Meder	Hamburg (<i>Petrikirche</i>), op. 69/4-6
30.1	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 46
13.2	W. Armbrust	Berlin (<i>Hochschule</i>), op. 60
14.2	Karl Straube	Straßburg (<i>Wilhelmskirche</i>), op. 52/2, op. 33, op. 57, from op.59, 65, 67 80
25.2	A. E. Kraft	Berlin, op. 46
1.3	W. Fischer	Berlin (<i>Garnisonkirche</i>), op. 73 première
3.3	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 73 twice (Reger present)
4.3	Karl Straube	Leipzig, cantata " <i>O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden</i> " première
28.3	W. Fischer	Berlin (<i>Heiligenkreuzkirche</i>) accomp. " <i>O Haupt...</i> "
1.4	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 56/3
8.4	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 56/5
2.4	O. Burkert	Brünn, " <i>Heil dir im Siegerkranz</i> " (probably not première)
6.5	?	Dresden (<i>Kreuzkirche</i>) from op. 69
13.5	Adolf Hamm	Leipzig, Op. 60/I
1.7	Gustav Knak	Leipzig, Op. 63/6
July	Karl Straube	Heidelberg (<i>Stadthalle</i>), programme included Reger
12.9	Arthur Egidi	Berlin (<i>Ap. Pauluskirche</i>), op. 73
20.9	W. Petri	Amsterdam, <i>Introduktion & Passacaglia in d-Moll</i>
October		G. Beckmann Essen, op. 57, op. 59/7&9
7.10	Karl Straube	Essen (<i>Stadgartensaal</i>) op. 52/2?, 57 (Reger present)

12.10	Ernst Eisler	Enge (CH), op. 46
30.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 27
12.11	Hugo Syvarth	Oldenburg, <i>Introduktion & Passacaglia in d-Moll</i> , op. 80/11&12, op. 80/5, 67/14&49
14.11	P. Meder	?, op. 80/11&12
15.11	W. Fischer	Berlin, cantata " <i>O Haupt...?</i> "
17.11	R. Jung	Greiz, Reger-Orgelabend
20.11	Karl Straube	Munich (<i>Odeon</i>) op. 46&52/2
25.11	Reger	Munich (<i>Tonhalle</i>) " <i>O Haupt...</i> " accomp.
26.11	G. Beckmann	Essen, cantata " <i>O wie selig</i> "
9.12	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 40/1? (Anderson gives Gustav Knak, Op. 40/2 Fugue)
28.12	?	Duisburg, op. 57, op. 59/9
Winter season	K. Heyse	Berlin, op. 29, op. 63/6
	A. Egidi	Berlin, op. 73
	A. Egidi	Leipzig, ?
	Karl Straube	Essen, ?

1906

14.1	A. Schlegel	Leipzig, op. 60
20.1	Karl Staube	Leipzig, Op. 60/III
5.2	Karl Straube	Heidelberg (<i>Stadthalle</i>), op. 60 (Reger present)
6.3	W. Eschenbach	Leipzig cons., op. 27 (Homeyer pupil)
17.3	Karl Straube	Leipzig, cantata " <i>O Haupt...</i> "
20.3	L. Maier	Munich (<i>Odeon</i>), cantata " <i>O Haupt...</i> " conducted by Reger
23.3	Fritz Stein	Leipzig conservatory exam, op. 40/1
30.3	Karl Straube	Innsbruck, op. 59/7&9
28.4	Karl Straube	Leipzig, Op. 46 Fugue only
8.5	Karl Straube	Berlin (<i>Garnisonkirche</i>), op. 46, op. 52/2
26.5	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 85/3
12.6	Ernst Rupp	London, op. 27
25.8	Alfred Sittard	Dresden, op. 27, op. 60, 69/3
12.9	Karl Lichtwark	Kiel, op. 69/6
1.10	Ritter	Koblenz (<i>Festhalle</i>), op. 33
7.10	Ernst Isler	Zürich, op. 73
13.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, Op. 85/2
20.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, Op. 85/4
30.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, Op. 27
21.11	Karl Straube	Frankfurt, op. 52/2
25.11	K. Gorn	Leipzig University choir, première of cantata " <i>Meinen Jesum...</i> "
29.11	Karl Straube	Darmstadt (<i>Johanniskirche</i>), op. 56/1, 59/1&8, 27, 63/6
3.12	Karl Straube	Göttingen (<i>Jakobikirche</i>), <i>Introduktion & Passacaglia in d-Moll?</i> , from op. 63/5&6?, 27, 59/7&9
4.12	Alois Kofler	Graz, from op. 67
8.12	T. Spiering	Leipzig, op. 42/1
10.12	Karl Straube	Jena (<i>Volkshaussaal</i> , dedication of a new organ by Voit & Söhne), op. 59/9, 27, 80/9
11.12	P. Meder	Hamburg, op. 59/5&6

1907

31.1	?	Breslau (<i>Lutherkirche</i>), op. 60, (Reger in Breslau for chamber music concert on same day)
24.2	E. Franz	Glogau??, from op. 63
26.2	K. Gorn	Leipzig (<i>St. Paulikirche</i>), "V.H.h." & "Meinen Jesum..." cantatas
9.3	Karl Straube	Leipzig, "O Haupt..."
10.3	L. Maier	Munich (<i>Lukaskirche</i>), op. 30
19.3	A. Egidi	Berlin (<i>Ap. Pauluskirche</i>), op.52/2, 73, 92, etc. (a similar programme with op. 52/3 in same season in Berlin-Charlottenburg)
23.3	Karl Straube	Leipzig, from op. 80?
6.4	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 65, 11 & 12
13.4	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 65, 7 & 8
10.5	Karl Straube	Königsberg (<i>Haberbergerkirche</i>), (new Sauer organ) op. 57, 52/2
4.5	Kurt Gorn	Leipzig, op. 52/2 Fugue only
14.5	P. Gerhardt	Dresden, (<i>Dreikönigskirche</i>), dedication of new Jehmlich organ, op. 40/
18.5	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 46 Fugue only
25.5	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 85/1
29.6	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 65, 5 & 6
20.7	Gustav Knak	Leipzig, op. 63/6
24.8	Kurt Gorn	Leipzig, op. 52/2 Fugue
21.9	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 52/3
30.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 27
16.11	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 46
7.12	Karl Straube	Leipzig, <i>Introduktion & Passacaglia in d-Moll</i>
21.11	?	Aachen Konzertsaal, op. 46

1908

11.1	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 40/1
January	Karl Straube	Aachen, op. 46
11.2	Paul Eiermann	Leipzig conservatory, op. 27
24.2	Karl Rezik	Leipzig conservatory, op. 46
End of Feb.	A. Hänlein	Mannheim (<i>Trinitatiskirche</i>), ?
14.3	Kurt Gorn	Leipzig, op. 52/2
6.6	Karl Straube	Leipzig, P and F in C, "Nun komm...", op. 67/29?
13.6	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 56/2
30.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 27
4.12	Carl Heyse	Frankfurt/Main (<i>Gr. Saal des Saalbaus</i>), op. 63/5&6

1909

23.1	G. Stolz	Chemnitz (<i>Lukaskirche</i>), 2 organ pieces? Reger conducted and played Beethoven Vars. in same concert
22.2	Karl Straube	Leipzig, from op. 65 & 80, op. 52/3
24.2	A. Hofmeier	Kiel, cantata "O Haupt..."
27.3	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op.52/3
April	Karl Straube	Leipzig, 3 rd Choral Fantasy? (op. 52/3?)
6.5	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 46
6.6	Karl Straube	Leipzig (Reger present), op. 46

12.6	A. Sittard	Dresden, from op. 59
3.7	Kurt Gorn	Leipzig, op. 57
18.9	Kurt Gorn	Leipzig, op. 46
16.10	Wilhelm Seidel	Leipzig, op. 46
22.10	Karl Hoyer	Leipzig conservatory, op. 60
26.10	Karl Straube	Mannheim, op. 46
30.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 27
11.12	Karl Hoyer	Leipzig, from op. 60 [Anderson suggests perhaps from op. 33]

1910

7.1	Karl Straube	Darmstadt (<i>Stadtkirche</i>), op. 60
21.2	W. Fischer	Berlin (<i>Blüthnersaal</i>), op. 52/2, 103a/1&3, Reger played piano
23.2	G. Stolz	Chemnitz (<i>Lukaskirche</i>), Reger conducted op. 106 première
1.4	O. Becker	Berlin (<i>Garnisonkirche</i>), op. 52/2, Largo from op. 93 (with Marteau), Abschiedskonzert before leaving for Potsdam
20.4	H.v.Ohlendorff	Hamburg (<i>St. Petrikirche</i>), op. 63/5&6?, (Reger present)
3.5	Fritz Lubrich	Leipzig conservatory, op. 59/7-9
5.5	G. Bunk	Dortmund (<i>Reinoldikirche</i>), <i>Introduktion & Passacaglia in d-M</i> op. 59/12, In same concert Reger played organ accomps.
7.5	Karl Straube	Dortmund (<i>Reinoldikirche</i>), op. 46, 52/3
9.5	Karl Straube	Dortmund, op. 46, 52/3
9.5	W. Fischer	Lecture only!
17.6	Fritz Heitmann	Leipzig conservatory, op. 46
20.8	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 52/3
27.8	Karl Hoyer	Leipzig, from op. 60
3.9	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 52/2
28.9	F. Petersen	Wiesbaden, op. 46
8.10	O. Burkert	Brünn (<i>Gr. Festsaal des Deutschen Hauses</i>), op. 63/10, organ accomps. (Reger present)
22.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 33
31.10	Gruner	?
1.11	H. Meyer	Leipzig conservatory, op. 33/I&III
5.11	Karl Hoyer	Leipzig, op. 46
8.11	Karl Straube	Frankfurt, op. 60, op. 46 (Reger not present!)
16.11	B. Irrgang	Berlin (<i>Philharmonie</i>), op. 27 etc., (Reger present)
11.12	H. Poppen	Heidelberg (<i>Peterskirche</i>), incl. op. 106 (Reger conducting)
13.12	H.v.Ohlendorff	Hamburg (<i>St. Petrikirche</i>), op. 40
16.12	F.W. Franke	Koblenz (Mus.-Inst.), op. 106
December	Karl Straube	Wiesbaden, programme included Reger

1911

11.1	Karl Straube	Görlitz, programme included Reger
4.2	Q. Morvaren	Leipzig, op. 33
10.2	W. Lamping	Bielefeld (<i>Altstädterkirche</i>), op. 52/2 etc.
18.2	A. Sittard	Dresden (<i>Kreuzkirche</i>), op. 33 (Reger present)
24.2	Karl Rezik	Leipzig conservatory, op. 46
14.3	F. Michàlek	Köln (Gürzenich), op. 106 (Reger present)
16.3	E. Stahlhut	Aachen (<i>Kurhaus</i>), op. 106 (conducted by Reger)

23.4	K. Beringer	Ulm (<i>Garnisonkirche</i>), op. 57
24.2	Karl Rezik	Leipzig Conservatory, op. 46
27.5	Karl Hoyer	Leipzig, op. 57
15.7	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 46
30.9	Karl Straube	Leipzig, from op. 65
8.12	O. Anschütz	Meiningen (<i>Stadtkirche</i>), "V.H.h." (Reger present)

1912

22.2	Karl Straube	Leipzig (<i>Gewandhaus</i>), op. 46
24.2	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 60
9.4	Reger	Eisenach (St. Georgen), arrs. of <i>Largo</i> from op. 93, <i>Aria</i> from op. 103a
18.6	Georg Kugler	Leipzig Conservatory, op. 59/5&6
21.10	?	Frankfurt/Main, op. 59/8&9
26.10	A. Sittard	Hamburg (<i>St. Michaeliskirche</i>), dedication of new org., (Walcker IV/16) op. 46 etc.
30.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 27
5.12	W. Fischer	Berlin, op. 52/2
17.12	Ehrhard Eisemann	Leipzig Conservatory, op. 59/8&9

1913

15.2	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 63/5 & 6
18.4	Kurze	Leipzig Conservatory, <i>Introduktion u. Passacaglia in d</i>
25.4	Emanuel Gatscher	Leipzig Conservatory, op. 73
25.6	H. Poppen	Heidelberg (<i>Stadthalle</i>), op. 46 (Reger conducted and played in same concert)
29.6	K.Beringer?	Ulm (<i>Garnisonkirche</i>), op. 57, 59/5, from op. 67
24.9	Karl Straube	Breslau, op.127 première
30.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 127
8.11	Karl Straube	Berlin (<i>Garnisonkirche</i>), op. 127

1914

7.3	Karl Straube	Leipzig, op. 60/I & II
March	Karl Straube	Osnabrück (<i>Katharinenkirche</i>), op. 46, 60
19.4	Karl Straube	Meiningen (<i>Schützenhaus</i>) op. 46, 59/7&9
10.7	Peukert	Leipzig Conservatory, <i>Introduktion u. Passacaglia in d</i>
18.7	Reger	Meiningen (<i>Gr. Saal des Schützenhauses</i>) incl. <i>Largo</i> from op. 93
11.9	Otto Anschütz	Meiningen (<i>Stadtkirche</i>), op. 27
20.9	Reger	Hildburghausen (<i>Stadtkirche</i>), op.135a/5, from op. 137 première
25.9	O. Anschütz	Meiningen (<i>Stadtkirche</i>), op. 59/8
4.10	Paul Kröhne	Zwickau (<i>Lutherkirche</i>), op. 63/5&6
8.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig (<i>Gewandhaus</i>), op. 27
6.11	O. Anschütz	Meiningen (<i>Stadtkirche</i>), from op. 67, P and F in F sharp minor, from op. 137 UA
17.12		

1915

13.1	W. Fischer	Berlin (<i>Blüthnersaal</i>), op. 52/2, (Reger played piano in same concert)
20.3	K. Hoyer	Chemnitz (<i>Saal des Kaufm. Vereins</i>), op. 59/8, (Reger played and conducted in the same concert)
11.6	Otto Keller	Leipzig Conservatory, <i>Introduktion u. Passacaglia in d</i>
18.6	Walter Buchheim	Leipzig Conservatory, op. 59/7-9
17.12	Martin Petonke	Leipzig Conservatory, op. 60/I & III
26.12	O. Burkert	Warschau (<i>Ev. Kirche</i>), op. 145
Over the year	Leupold	Berlin, complete Reger organ works!

1916

3.3	Hermann Zillinger	Leipzig Conservatory, op. 46
20.5	Günther Ramin	Leipzig (<i>Thomaskirche</i>), op. 129/1 première, op. 59/9 etc.
30.5	Hermann Keller	Stuttgart Conservatory, op. 145 etc.
11.6	H. Dettmer	Hannover (<i>Stadthalle</i>), op. 135b UA
?	H. Keller	Stuttgart (<i>Markuskirche</i>), op. 135b
Winter season	W. Reimann	Berlin (<i>Jerusalemkirche</i>), op. 135b
11.10	Karl Straube	Programme included Reger
12.10	A. Sittard	Hamburg (<i>Michaeliskirche</i>), op. 46
12.10	Rudolf Levin	Limbach (Saxony), op. 40/1
18.10	R. Dittrich	Vienna, op. 65/7&8 (after which the organist suffered a heart attack!)
25.10	Franz Sauer	Vienna (<i>Konzertverein</i>), a toccata?
27.10	Karl Straube	Leipzig Conservatory, op. 33
28.10 or 2.11	Karl Straube	Leipzig (Gewandhaus), op. 40/1
??	Karl Straube	Leipzig Conservatory, op. 60?
November	Karl Straube	Barmen, op. 63/5&6, op. 59/7&9
Winter	Karl Straube	Gera, programme included Reger
Winter	Karl Straube	Köln, op. 46

Appendix 4

Reger's Organ Works Listed

(German letters used for key, i.e. h = B minor, B = B flat major, fis = F sharp minor, etc.)

- Op. 7 Drei Orgelstücke (1892/3)
Präludium und Fuge C-Dur, Te Deum, Fuge d-Moll
- Op. 16 Suite e-Moll (1895)
Introduktion und Fuge, Adagio assai, Intermezzo, Passacaglia
- Op. 27 Phantasie für Orgel über den Choral "Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott" (1898)
- Op. 29 Phantasie und Fuge c-Moll (1898)
- Op. 30 Phantasie für Orgel über den Choral "Freu dich sehr, o meine Seele!" (1898)
- Op. 33 Sonate fis-Moll (1899)
I. Phantasie, II. Intermezzo, III. Passacaglia
- Op. 40 Zwei Phantasien für Orgel über die Choräle "Wie schön leucht't uns der Morgenstern" und "Straf mich nicht in deinem Zorn" (1899)
- Op. 46 Phantasie und Fuge für Orgel über B-A-C-H (1900)
- Op. 47 Sechs Trios für Orgel (1900)
- Op. 52 Drei Phantasien für Orgel über die Choräle "Alle Menschen müssen sterben", "Wachet auf, ruft uns die Stimme", "Hallelujah, Gott zu loben bleibe meine Seelenfreud" (1900)
- Op. 56 Fünf leicht ausführbare Präludien und Fugen (in E, d, G, C, h), (1901/04?, see Chapter 5 section 2.5)
- Op. 57 Symphonische Phantasie und Fuge d-Moll (1901)
- Op. 59 Zwölf Stücke (1901)
Präludium in e, Pastorale in F, Intermezzo in a, Canon in E, Toccata in d, Fuge in D, Kyrie eleison in e, Gloria in excelsis in D, Benedictus in Des, Capriccio in fis, Melodia in B, Te Deum in a
- Op. 60 Zweite Sonate d-Moll (1901)
I. Improvisation, II. Invocation, III. Introduktion und Fuge
- Op. 63 Monologe, Zwölf Stücke (1901/02)
Präludium in c, Fuge in C, Kanzone in g, Capriccio in a, Introduktion in f, Passacaglia in f, Ave Maria in A, Fantasie in C, Toccata in e, Fuge in e, Kanon in D, Scherzo in d
- Op. 65 Zwölf Stücke (1902)
Rhapsodie in cis, Capriccio in G, Pastorale in A, Consolation in E, Improvisation in a, Fuge in a, Präludium in d, Fuge in D, Canzone in Es, Scherzo in d, Toccata in e, Fuge in E

- Op. 67 Zweiundfünfzig leicht ausführbare Vorspiele zu den gebräuchlichsten evangelischen Chorälen (1900/02)
- Op. 69 Zehn Stücke (1902)
Präludium in e, Fuge in e, Basso ostinato in e, Moment musical in D, Capriccio in d, Toccata in D, Fuge in D, Romanze in g, Präludium in a, Fuge in a
- Op. 73 Variationen und Fuge über ein Originalthema (1903)
- Op. 79b Dreizehn Choralvorspiele (1901/03)
- Op. 80 Zwölf Stücke (1902/04)
Präludium in e, Fughetta in e, Canzonetta in g, Gigue in d, Ave Maria in As, Intermezzo in g, Scherzo in fis, Romanze in a, Perpetuum mobile in f, Intermezzo in D, Toccata in a, Fuge in a
- Op. 85 Vier Präludien und Fugen (in cis, G, F, e), (1904)
- Op. 92 Zweite Suite g-Moll (1905)
Präludium in g, Fuge in g, Intermezzo in h, Basso ostinato in g, Romanze in As, Toccata in g, Fuge in g
- Op. 127 Introduction, Passacaglia und Fuge e-Moll (1913)
- Op. 129 Neun Stücke für die Orgel (1913)
Toccata in d, Fuge in d, Kanon in e, Melodia in B, Capriccio in g, Basso ostinato in g, Intermezzo in f, Präludium in h, Fuge in h
- Op. 135a Dreißeig kleine Choralvorspiele zu den gebräuchlichsten Chorälen (1914)
- Op. 135b Phantasie und Fuge d-Moll (1915)
- Op. 145 Sieben Orgelstücke
Trauerode in d/D, Dankpsalm in D, Weihnachten in d, Passion in g, Ostern in D, Pfingsten in F, Siegesfeier in G

Works without opus numbers:

- Choralvorspiel "O Traurigkeit, o Herzeleid" (1893)
 Vorspiel "Komm, süßer Tod" (1894)
 Introduction und Passacaglia d-Moll (1899)
 Präludium c-Moll (1900)
 Variationen und Fuge über "Heil, unserm König, Heil" (the English National Anthem), (1901)
 Choralvorspiel "Christ ist erstanden von dem Tod" (1901)
 Präludium und Fuge d-Moll (1902)
 Postludium d-Moll (1903)
 Choralvorspiel "O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden" (1904)
 Choralvorspiel "Es kommt ein Schiff geladen" (1905)
 Präludium und Fuge gis-Moll (1906)
 Choralvorspiel "Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern" (1908?)

Appendix 5

An extract from *Kyrie* op. 59/7: Reger's original and Straube's 1912 edition

1. Max Reger's original (1901)

2. An extract from Reger's *Kyrie* op. 59/7 in Karl Straube's edition of 1912

Bibliography

- Aebischer AEBISCHER, Rudolf, trans. Hans Fidom: 'De intonatie van pijpwerk op verschillende windladesystemen', *Het Orgel* (February 1996, 13–16)
- Adorno ADORNO, T.W.: *Versuch über Wagner* (Frankfurt 1952)
- Albrecht ALBRECHT, Christoph: *Interpretationsfragen: Probleme der kirchenmusikalischen Aufführungspraxis von Johann Walter bis Max Reger* (1524–1916), (Berlin 1981)
- Anderson ANDERSON, Christopher: *Max Reger and Karl Straube: Perspectives on an Organ Performing Tradition* (Aldershot ENG/Burlington USA 2003)
- Audsley AUDSLEY, G.A.: *The Art of Organ-Building* (New York 1905)
- Bagier A BAGIER, Guido: 'Max Reger und die Orgel', *Die Musik* 15/1 (1922/23), 321
- Bagier B BAGIER, Guido: *Max Reger* (Stuttgart/Berlin 1923)
- Beckmann A BECKMANN, Gustav: 'Max Reger als Orgelkomponist', *Die Musik*/4 (1904/5), 263–271
- Beckmann B BECKMANN, Gustav: 'Max Reger über Orgel, Orgelkomposition und Orgelspiel', *Neue Musikzeitung* (1925), 329ff
- Bittmann BITTMANN, Antonius: *Rediscovering Max Reger's 'Introduktion, Passacaglia und Fuge in e-moll, op. 127'*, lecture recital for doctoral degree at the Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester (1994)
- Blessinger BLESSINGER, Karl: *Max Reger und die Orgel*, MMRI/2 (1954), 7–11
- Böhme BÖHME, Ulrich: *Die Sauer-Orgel in der Thomaskirche zu Leipzig* (Leipzig 1991)
- Boulez BOULEZ, Pierre: in *Wagner: A Documentary Study* (1975)
- Bunk BUNK, Gerard: *Begegnung mit Max Reger*. MMRI/6 (1957), 26–30
- Busch, Fr. BUSCH, Fritz: *Max Reger als Dirigent*, MMRG/3 (Stuttgart 1923)
- Busch A BUSCH, H: *Ein Dokument zur Geschichte des Orgelbaus in der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, MuK/40 (1970), 330–341
- Busch B BUSCH, Hermann J.: *Max Reger und die Orgel seiner Zeit*, MuK (1973), 63–73
- Busch C BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Zur Situation des europäischen Orgelbaus am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts', *Ars Organ/ 23* (1975), 2080–2086
- Busch D BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Zwischen Tradition und Fortschritt: Zur Orgelbau, Orgelspiel und Orgelkomposition in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert', *Mundus Organorum: Festschrift Walter Supper zum 70. Geburtstag* (Berlin 1978), 63–91
- Busch E BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Max Regers Orgelwelt', *Zur Interpretation der Orgelmusik Max Regers*, ed. Hermann J. Busch (Kassel 1988), 6–28
- Busch F BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Einige Probleme des Regerspiels', *Zur Interpretation der Orgelmusik Max Regers*, ed. Hermann J. Busch (Kassel 1988), 51–63

- Busch G BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Karl Straube spielt Max Regers Choralphantasie "Wachet Auf" Op. 52/2', *Der Kirchenmusiker* 40 (1989), 97–100
- Busch H BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Max Regers Orgelwerke auf Wilhelm Sauers Orgeln', *Festschrift zur Einweihung der restaurierten und erweiterten Sauer-Orgel von 1908* (Bad Homburg 1993), 36–41
- Busch I BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Über Josef Rheinbergers Vorstellungen von Orgeldisposition und Orgelregistrierung' and 'Die Wilhelm-Sauer-Orgel des Berliner Domes', in *Rheinberger Festschrift* (1989), 133–142 and 231–238
- Busch J BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Een laat 18de-eeuwse bron voor de registratie', *Het Orgel* (September 1996), 8–10
- Busch K BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Zur Interpretation der Orgelmusik Max Regers', ed. Hermann J. Busch (Kassel 1988)
- Busch L BUSCH, Hermann J.: 'Die W. Sauer-Orgel des Berliner Domes', *Ars Organi* (1993/4), 231–238
- Craft CRAFT, Robert: *Current Convictions* (London 1974)
- Dahlhaus A DAHLHAUS, Carl: *Nineteenth-Century Music*, Eng. trans. J. Bradford Robinson (Wiesbaden 1980, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1989)
- Dahlhaus B DAHLHAUS, Carl: *The New Grove Wagner* (London 1984)
- Dienel DIENEL, Otto: *Die moderne Orgel, ihre Einrichtung, ihre Bedeutung für die Kirche, und ihre Stellung zu Sebastian Bach's Orgelmusik* (Berlin 1891, 2/1903)
- Dinse-Cat. *Catalog der Orgelbau-Anstalt Gebrüder Dinse* (Berlin 1897, reprinted Berlin 1980 in *Faksimile-Ausgaben zur Orgelbaugeschichte*, I)
- Doorman DOORMAN, Ludwig: *Das Vermächtnis Karl Straubes als Bachspieler*, first presented as a paper at the Karl-Straube-Tage in Wesel on 6/7.1.1973, *MuK* (1973), 73ff.
- Dorf Müller DORFMÜLLER, Joachim: *Heinrich Reimann-Zeitgenosse und Vorbild Max Regers*, *MuK*/51 (1981), 128ff.
- Dortmund-Fest 'Max-Reger-Fest Dortmund' *Festbuch* (Dortmund 1910)
- Dreimüller DREIMÜLLER, Karl: 'Karl Straubes Sauer-Orgel in Wesel', *Studien zur Musikgeschichte des Rheinlandes II. Karl Gustav Fellerer zum 60. Geburtstag*, edd. Herbert Drux, K.W. Niemöller & Walter Thoene (Cologne 1962), 55–70
- Eggebrecht EGGBRECHT, H.H. ed.: *Orgelwissenschaft und Orgelpraxis: Festschrift zum zweihundertjährigen Bestehen des Hauses Walcker* (Murrhardt-Hausen 1980)
- Ellerhorst ELLERHORST, Winfred: *Handbuch der Orgelkunde* (Einsiedeln 1936)
- Ellis ELLIS, William, trans.: *Richard Wagner's Prose Work* (London 1894, repr. New York 1966)
- Engländer ENGLÄNDER, Richard: *Max Reger und Karl Straube*, *MMRI*/1 (1954), 8–14
- Falkenberg A FALKENBERG, Hans-Joachim: 'Wilhelm Sauer (31. März 1831 - 9. April 1916)', *Ars Organi* (1976)
- Falkenberg B FALKENBERG, Hans-Joachim: *Der Orgelbauer Wilhelm Sauer 1831-1916: Leben und Werk* (Lauffen 1990)

- Fellerer FELLERER, Karl Gustav: *Orgel und Orgelmusik: ihre Geschichte* (Augsburg 1929)
- Fidom A FIDOM, Hans: *Orgelbouw in de voormalige DDR: Scheffler restaureert*, Het Orgel (April 1996)
- Fidom B FIDOM, Hans: *Diversity in Unity: Discussions in Organ Building in Germany between 1880 and 1918* (Amsterdam 2002)
- Fischer FISCHER, Walter: *Über die Wiedergabe der Orgelkompositionen Max Regers* (Cologne 1910)
- Fischer & Wohnhaas FISCHER, Hermann & WOHNHAAS, Theodor: *Georg Friedrich Steinmeyer (1819 - 1901) und sein Werk* (Frankfurt/Main 1978)
- Flade FLADE, Ernst. ed.: *Accompanying leaflet to the Dritte Tagung für deutsche Orgelkunst* (Freiberg in Sachsen 2 - 7 Oktober 1927), (Kassel 1927)
- Friedland FRIEDLAND, Martin: *Der Mensch Reger. Ein psychologischer Versuch*. MMRG 7/1928, 1–5
- Gatscher GATSCHER, Emanuel: *Einige Bemerkungen zum Studium Regerscher Orgelwerke*, MMRG/4 (1924), 2–8
- Geer GEER, Harold: *Organ Registration in Theory and Practice* (Washington 1957)
- Geffert A GEFFERT, Hans: *Zur Dynamik der Regerschen Orgelwerke*, MMRI/17 (1968), 1–6
- Geffert B GEFFERT, Hans: *Die Orgelwerke von Max Reger*, MMRI/Sonderheft (1973), 28–33
- Gibson GIBSON, Benn: *The Organ Works of Max Reger: Problems involved in their Performance*, Research Project Doctor of Music, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois (1966)
- Greß & Krieger GREß, Frank-Harald & KRIEGER, Dietmar: in 'Klanganalytische Untersuchungen der beiden Orgeln in der Thomaskirche zu Leipzig', *Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft II* (1969)
- Gurlitt A GURLITT, Wilibald: 'Aus den Briefen Max Regers an Hugo Riemann', *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters für 1936* (Leipzig 1937)
- Gurlitt B GURLITT, Wilibald: 'Karl Straube als Vorkämpfer der neuen Orgelbewegung', KS (1943) 195–225
- Gurlitt & Hudemann GURLITT, Wilibald & HUDEMANN, Hans-Olaf, edd.: *Karl Straube: Briefe eines Thomaskantors* (Stuttgart 1952)
- Guthmann GUTHMANN, Fr.: *Methodik des Klavier- und Pianofortespiels* (1805)
- Haas HAAS, Bernhard: 'Regers Werktexte als Interpretationsansatz', *Zur Interpretation der Orgelmusik Max Regers*, ed. Hermann J. Busch (Kassel 1988), 36–50
- Hagmann HAGMANN, Peter: 'Das Welte-Mignon-Klavier, die Welte-Philharmonie-Orgel und die Anfänge der Reproduktion von Musik', *Europäische Hochschulschriften* 36/10 (Bern 1984)
- Hambraeus HAMBRAEUS, Bengt: 'Karl Straube, Old Masters and Max Reger', *Reger-Studien V* (Wiesbaden 1993), 41-72, originally published in *Svensk tidskrift för musikforskning* 69 (1987)
- Handke HANDKE, Erna: *Vom Reger-Spiel auf unseren Orgeln*, MMRI/11 (1960), 32–35
- Harburger HARBURGER, Walter: *Max Reger und die moderne Orgel*, Organon 5/3 (1928), 41–44
- Harmon HARMON, Thomas: *The Registration of J.S. Bach's Organ Works* (Buren 1978)

- Hartmann HARTMANN, Günter: *Karl Straube und seine Schule: "Das Ganze ist ein Mythos"* (Bonn 1991)
- Hase-Koehler HASE-KOEHLER, Else von, ed.: *Max Reger: Briefe eines deutschen Meisters* (Leipzig 1928)
- Hasse A HASSE, Karl: 'Philipp Wolfrum', obituary, *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft*/2 (1919)
- Hasse B HASSE, Karl: 'Max Reger und die Deutsche Orgelkunst', *Freiburger Tagung für deutsche Orgelkunst, vom 27. bis 30. Juli 1926*, ed. W. Gurlitt (Augsburg 1926), 122–129
- Hasse C HASSE, Karl: *Die neuere deutsche Orgelbewegung*, *ZfM* 98/10 (1931), 857–863
- Hasse D HASSE, Karl: *Max Regers Orgelmusik und die neuere Orgelbewegung*, *MMRG*/8 (1932), 11–15
- Hasse E HASSE, Karl: *Zur Frage der Umarbeitung und Ergänzung Regerscher Werke*, *MMRG*/9 (1933), 11–18
- Hasse F HASSE, Karl: *Karl Straube als Orgelkünstler*, *KS* (1943), 153–194
- Hehemann HEHEMANN, Max: *Max Reger – Ein Leben in Musik* (Munich 1911)
- Held HELD, Christoph & Ingrid, edd.: *Karl Straube. Wirken und Wirkung* (Berlin [DDR] 1976)
- Hielscher HIELSCHER, H.U.: *Die Oberlinger-Orgel in der Marktkirche Wiesbaden* (Windesheim 1990).
- Hoffmann HOFFMANN, Herbert Manfred: *Zur Interpretation Regerscher Orgelmusik*, *MuK* 37/4 (1967), 162–163
- Högner A HÖGNER, Friedrich: *Das Gesetz der Orgel. Max Reger und der moderne Orgelbau*. *MuK* 23 (1953), 94–100
- Högner B HÖGNER, Friedrich: 'Max Reger und die deutsche Orgelbewegung', *Festvortrag Gesellschaft der Orgelfreunde, 25 Juli 1966*
- Högner C HÖGNER, Friedrich: *Zur Darstellung der Orgelwerke Max Regers*, *MuK* 41/6 (1971), 302–307
- Högner D HÖGNER, Friedrich: *Karl Straube und die mißbrauchte Musikphilologie*, *MuK* 44/6 (1974), 280–285
- Högner E HÖGNER, Friedrich: 'Karl Straube als Orgelvirtuose', in *Karl Straube: Wirken und Wirkung*, edd. C. & I. Held (Berlin 1976)
- Hudson HUDSON, Richard R.: *Stolen Time: The History of Tempo Rubato* (New York 1997)
- Hübner, M. HÜBNER, Maria: *Karl Straube als Bachinterpret*, *MuK* 4 (1994)
- Hübner, W. HÜBNER, Wolfgang: 'Die Registrierung der Orgelwerke Max Regers: Versuch einer Anleitung zur stilgerechten Interpretation nach der Orgelbewegung', *Wissenschaftliche Hausarbeit zum Staatlichen A-Examen für Kirchenmusiker*, PLACE?? Undated??
- Huesgen HUESGEN, Rudolf: *Der junge Max Reger und seine Orgelwerke* (Schramberg 1935)
- Jahn JAHNN, Hans Henny: 'Frühe Begegnung mit Günther Ramin', in *Johann Sebastian Bach: Ende und Anfang, Gedenkschrift zum 75. Geburtstag des Thomaskantors Günther Ramin*, ed. Diethard Hellmann (Wiesbaden 1973)

- Jinkertz JINKERTZ, Willi: *Mit Reger an zwei Flügeln* (Düsseldorf 1951)
- Kalkoff A KALKOFF, Artur: *Das Orgelschaffen Max Regers im Lichte der deutschen Orgelerneuerungsbewegung*, Diss. Jena 1944 (Kassel 1950)
- Kalkoff B KALKOFF, Artur: 'Die Orgelwerke Max Regers und die neue Orgelbewegung', *Beiträge zur Regererforschung. Festschrift aus Anlaß des 80. Geburtstages des Meisters am 19. März 1953*, ed. Max-Reger-Archiv Meiningen (Leipzig 1953), 35–52
- Karg-Elert KARG-ELERT, Sigfrid: *Die Kunst des Registrierens Op. 91. Ein Hand- und Nachschlagebuch für Spieler aller Harmoniumsysteme. 2 Theile* (Berlin 1911–14)
- Keller KELLER, Hermann: 'Reger und die Orgel', *Max Reger-eine Sammlung von Studien aus dem Kreise seiner persönlichen Schüler IV*, ed. Richard Würz (Munich 1923), 209–302 (= 3–96, two systems of page numbering included)
- Klais KLAIS, H.G.: 'War die Kegellade ein Irrtum?', *Mundus Organorum: Festschrift Walter Supper zum 70. Geburtstag* (Berlin 1978)
- Klinda KLINDA, Ferdinand: *Orgelregistrierung: Klanggestaltung der Orgelmusik* (Leipzig 1987)
- Klotz A KLOTZ, Hans: *Das Buch von der Orgel* (1937, 5/Kassel 1955)
- Klotz B KLOTZ, Hans: *Gedanken zur Orgelmusik Max Regers*, MMRI/7 (1958), 12–14
- Klotz C KLOTZ, Hans: *Max Reger – Complete Work* (a review, trans. Raymond Mawbry) *The Diapason* 63/9 (Chicago 1972), 8
- Klotz D KLOTZ, Hans: *The Organ Works of Max Reger: an Interpretation*, *The Organ Yearbook*/5 (Amsterdam 1974), 66–69
- Köhler KÖHLER, Johannes-Ernst: 'Max Regers Orgelschaffen in unserer Zeit', *Max Reger: Beiträge zur Regererforschung* (Meiningen 1966)
- Kooiman A KOOIMAN, Ewald: 'Das ist ja etwas ganz Anderes!' *Het Orgel* (October 1983) 306–317
- Kooiman B KOOIMAN, Ewald: *Jacques Lemmens, Charles-Marie Widor und die französische "Bach-Tradition"*, *Ars Organi* 37 (1989) 198–207, and 38 (1990) 3–15
- Kooiman C KOOIMAN, Ewald: *La Sainte Tradition: essai de démystification*, *Orgue Méridionales* 34, 65–90
- Kooiman D KOOIMAN, Ewald: 'Rinck, Schneider und das Legato', *De Arte Organistica, Festschrift Hans Haselböck zum 70. Geburtstag* (Vienna 1998), 105–117
- KS *Karl Straube zu seinem 70. Geburtstag. Gaben der Freunde* (Leipzig undated, a tribute for Straube's 70th birthday on 6.1.1943)
- KSB *Karl Straube: Briefe eines Thomaskantors* (Stuttgart 1952)
- Lahee LAHEE, Henry: *The Organ and its Masters* (London 1909)
- La Mara LA MARA, ed.: *Franz Liszt: Briefe* (Leipzig 1893ff.)
- Laukvik LAUKVIK, Jon: *Orgelschule zur historischen Aufführungspraxis (Teil 2: Romantik)*, (Stuttgart 2000)
- Leupold LEUPOLD, Wayne: Chapter XVII on the organ in *The New Grove Performance Practice: Music after 1600*, edd. Howard Mayer Brown and Stanley Sadie (London 1989)

- Lindner A LINDNER, Adalbert: *Max Reger. Ein Bild seines Jugendlebens und künstlerischen Werdens* (Stuttgart 1922)
- Lindner B LINDNER, Adalbert: *Max Regers Klavierspiel*, MMRG/11 (1933), 1–6
- Lohmann A LOHMANN, Heinz: *Bemerkungen zur Interpretation der Orgelwerke von Max Reger*, MuK 43/5 (1973), 222–233
- Lohmann B LOHMANN, Heinz: ‘Ueberlegungen zur Interpretation der Orgelwerke von Max Reger’, *Musica Sacra*, 93/2 (1973), 93–97
- Lohmann, L. LOHMANN, Ludger: *Hugo Riemann and the Development of Musical Performance Practice*, Proceedings of the Göteborg International Organ Academy 1994, ed. Hans Davidsson & Sverker Jullander, Göteborg University (1995), p. 256ff
- Lussy LUSSY, Mathis: *Traité de l’expression musicale* (Paris 1874)
- Mann MANN, T.: *Die Orgel, ihre Geschichte und ihr Bau* (Leipzig 1887)
- Manz MANZ, André: ‘Max Reger als Orgelkomponist – “Extremer Fortschrittmann”?’, *Reger Studien I. Festschrift für Ottmar Schreiber zum 70. Geburtstag am 16. Februar 1976*, edd. Günther Massenkeil & Susanne Popp (Wiesbaden 1978), 105–117
- Matthaei MATTHAEI, Karl: *Vom Orgelspiel*, (Leipzig 1936/1949)
- Millington MILLINGTON, Barry, ed.: *The Wagner Compendium* (London 1992)
- Müller MÜLLER, Walter: *In Memoriam Arno Landmann (23.10.1887 bis 10.5.1966)* *Ars Organi* 51, (Oct. 1976)
- Mueller van Asow MUELLER VAN ASOW, H. & E.H., edd.: *Max Reger. Briefwechsel mit Herzog Georg II. Von Sachsen-Meiningen* (Weimar 1949)
- New Grove *New Grove Wagner* (London 1984) by John Deathridge and Carl Dahlhaus
- Niemann NIEMANN, Walter: *Meister des Klaviers* (Berlin 1919)
- Osterheld OSTERHELD, Herta: ‘Karl Straubes Beziehungen zu Max Reger’, *Karl Straube, Wirken und Wirkung*, edd. Christoph & Ingrid Held (Berlin [DDR] 1976), 83–98
- Peeters/van Wageningen PEETERS, Paul & VAN WAGENINGEN, Cor: ‘Het Sauer-orgel in de Dom te Berlijn’, *Het Orgel* (1995)
- Piersig PIERSIG, Johannes: ‘So ging es allenfalls VI’, *Der Kirchenmusiker*/29 (1978), 112–119
- Popp A POPP, Susanne: *Max Reger: Briefe an Fritz Stein* [Veröffentlichungen des Max-Reger-Institutes Elsa-Reger-Stiftung Bonn VIII] (Bonn 1982)
- Popp B POPP, Susanne: *Max Reger: Briefe an Karl Straube* [Veröffentlichungen des Max-Reger-Institutes Elsa-Reger-Stiftung Bonn X] (Bonn 1986)
- Popp C POPP, Susanne: ‘Zur Quellenlage der Regerschen Orgelwerke’, *Zur Interpretation der Orgelmusik Max Regers*, ed. Hermann J. Busch (Kassel 1988), 29–35
- Popp D POPP, Susanne: ‘Rot und Schwarz. Untersuchungen zur Zweifarbigkeit der Autographen Max Regers’, *Reger-Studien 3: Schriftenreihe des Max-Reger-Instituts Bonn VI* (Wiesbaden 1988)
- Popp & Shigihara A POPP, Susanne & SHIGIHARA, Susanne: *Max Reger: at the turning point to modernism* (Bonn 1988)

- Popp E POPP, Susanne: *Max Reger: Briefe an die Verleger Lauterbach & Kuhn* [Veröffentlichungen des Max-Reger-Institutes Elsa-Reger-Stiftung Bonn XII] (Bonn 1993)
- Popp & Shigihara B POPP, Susanne & SHIGIHARA, Susanne, edd.: *Max Reger: Briefwechsel mit dem Verlag C.F. Peters* [Veröffentlichungen des Max-Reger-Institutes Elsa-Reger-Stiftung Bonn XIII] (Bonn 1995)
- Prout PROUT, Ebenezer: *Applied Forms* (London 1895)
- Quoika A QUOIKA, Rudolf: in *175 Jahre Walcker-Orgelbau*, Walcker Hausmitteilung/16 (June 1956)
- Quoika B QUOIKA, Rudolf: *Zur Aesthetik der Orgelwerke Max Regers*, *Ars Organi* 14/28 (1966), 937–948
- Rahner RAHNER, H.E.: *Max Regers Choralfantasien für die Orgel* (Kassel 1936)
- Ramin RAMIN, Günther: 'Über die Interpretation der Orgelwerke verschiedener Epochen' (1925), and 'Stil und Manier', published in *Gedanken zur Klärung des Orgelproblems: Aufsätze und Vorträge* (Kassel and Basel 1955, 2nd. edition)
- Reger REGER, Elsa: *Mein Leben mit und für Max Reger* (Leipzig 1930)
- Reimann REIMANN, Heinrich: 'Über den Vortrag der Orgelkompositionen J.S. Bachs' (1889), in *Musikalische Rückblicke II* (Berlin 1900) 131–141
- Richter, E.F. RICHTER, E.F.: *Katechismus der Orgel: Erklärung ihrer Struktur, besonders in Beziehung auf technische Behandlung beim Spiel* (Leipzig 1896, 4th. edition, edited and extended by Hans Menzel)
- Richter, M. RICHTER, Max: *Moderne Orgelspielanlagen in Wort und Bild* (Leipzig 1906)
- Riemann A RIEMANN, Hugo: *Lehrbuch der musikalischen Phrasierung auf Grund einer Revision der Lehre von der musikalischen Metrik und Rhythmik* (Hamburg/Leipzig/St. Petersburg: 1884)
- Riemann B RIEMANN, Hugo: *Musik-Lexikon*, 3rd edition (Leipzig 1887)
- Riemann C RIEMANN, Hugo: *Handbuch der Orgel (Orgellehre)*, (1888, 5/Berlin 1922)
- Riemann D RIEMANN, Hugo: *Die Elemente der Musikalischen Aesthetik* (Stuttgart 1900)
- Riemann E RIEMANN, Hugo: 'Wie Charles Widor, ein französischer Orgelmeister, über die Orgel, gegen Hector Berlioz (in dessen Instrumentationslehre) denkt' in *Urania* 62/8 (Erfurt 1905)
- Rinck RINCK, J.C.H.: *Praktische Orgelschule, Op. 55* (Bonn 1819–21, in six parts)
- Robert-Tornow ROBERT-TORNOW, Gustav: *Max Reger und Karl Straube* (Göttingen 1907)
- Roick ROICK, Thoralf: *Urtext und praktische Edition. Ein Vergleich zwischen Max Regers Erstdrucken und Karl Straubes Ausgabe von zehn "Präludien und Fugen für die Orgel"* (Leipzig, Diplomarbeit Hochschule für Musik und Theater "Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy", 1993)
- Rudolz RUDOLZ, Rudolf: *Die Registrirkunst des Orgelspiels in ihren grundlegenden Formen* (Leipzig 1913)
- Rupp RUPP, Emile: *Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Orgelbaukunst* (Einsiedeln 1929)

- Sattler SATTLER, C.: from *Orgelschule*, op.20 (1920), 'Die Orgelregister und ihre Klangmöglichkeiten bei Verwendung im Gottesdienst und Konzert von C. Sattler (Sonderabdruck aus dessen "Orgelschule")' (Cologne undated, published by Tonger Verlag)
- Scheffler SCHEFFLER, Christian: *Die Restaurierung der Sauer-Orgel in der Thomaskirche zu Leipzig* (Wiesbaden 1989)
- Schiess SCHIESS, Ernst: *Die Orgel im Basler Münster* (Basel 1956)
- Schnackenberg SCHNACKENBERG, F.L.: Reviews of Reger organ works in *ZfM* (1901–2), 41–2, 338, 51–53
- Schneider F SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: *Orgelschule* (Halberstadt 1830)
- Schneider SCHNEIDER, Michael: *Die Orgelspieltechnik des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland, dargestellt an den Orgelschulen der Zeit* (Regensburg 1941)
- Schoenberg SCHOENBERG, Arnold: *Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg* (London 1975)
- Schreiber A SCHREIBER, Ottmar: *Max Reger. Briefe zwischen der Arbeit: Neue Folge* [Veröffentlichungen des Max-Reger-Institutes Elsa-Reger-Stiftung Bonn VI] (Bonn 1973)
- Schreiber B SCHREIBER, Ottmar: *Max Reger in seinen Konzerten, Teil I. Reger konzertiert* (Bonn 1981), *Teil II. Programme der Konzerte Regers* (Bonn 1981), *Teil III. Rezensionen der Konzerte Regers* (Bonn 1981), [Veröffentlichungen des Max-Reger-Institutes Elsa-Reger-Stiftung Bonn VII]
- Schweitzer SCHWEITZER, Albert: *Deutsche und Französische Orgelbaukunst und Orgelkunst* (Leipzig 1906).
- Seidel SEIDEL, Johann J.: *Die Orgel und ihr Bau* (1843, reprint Amsterdam 1962)
- Sievers SIEVERS, Gerd: *Die Grundlagen Hugo Riemanns bei Max Reger* (Wiesbaden 1967)
- Smith SMITH, R.: 'Toward an authentic interpretation of the organ works of César Franck', *Julliard Performance Guides I* (1983)
- Spemann SPEMANN, Adolf, ed.: *Max Reger-Brevier* (Stuttgart 1923)
- Stein A STEIN, Fritz: *Max Reger* (Potsdam 1939)
- Stein B STEIN, Fritz: *Max Reger und Karl Straube*, KS 42–79
- Steinhaus STEINHAUS, Hans: 'Deutsche Orgeln im Urteil von Aristide Cavallé-Coll', *Ars Organi*/14 (1980), 215–225
- Stockmeier A STOCKMEIER, Wolfgang: 'Karl Straube als Reger-Interpret', *Max Reger 1873-1973. Ein Symposium*, ed. Klaus Röhrling (Wiesbaden 1974), 21–29
- Stockmeier B STOCKMEIER, Wolfgang: *Preußisch-Bayerisches*, MuK/45 (1975), 129
- Straube A STRAUBE, Karl: *Max Reger*, MMRG/4 (1924)
- Straube B STRAUBE, Karl: 'Rückblick und Bekenntnis', in *Bach-Gedenkschrift 1950*, ed. Karl Matthaei (Zürich 1950), later printed in KSB (1952), 7–16
- Strauss STRAUSS, Richard: *Instrumentationslehre* (a revised and enlarged translation of Berlioz's standard work on orchestration, the *Grand traité...* Paris 1843) for which Philipp Wolfrum supplied an entirely new chapter on the organ (Berlin 1904/5)

Taube	TAUBE, Lotte: <i>Max Regers Meisterjahre (1909 bis 1916)</i> (Berlin 1941)
Töpfer/Allihn	TÖPFER, Johann Gottlob: <i>Lehrbuch der Orgelbaukunst</i> (Weimar 1855), revised by Max Allihn as <i>Die Theorie und Praxis des Orgelbaues</i> (Weimar 1888)
Volckmar	VOLCKMAR, Wilhelm: <i>Orgelschule, Op. 50</i> (Leipzig 1859/61, 1863)
Wagner-Comp.	<i>The Wagner Compendium: A Guide to Wagner's Life and Music</i> , ed. B. Millington (New York 1992)
Walcha A	WALCHA, Helmut: <i>Das Gesetz der Orgel: ihre Begrenzung</i> , MuK 10 (1938)
Walcha B	WALCHA, Helmut: <i>Max Regers Orgelschaffen kritisch betrachtet</i> , MuK 22 (1952), 2–14
Walcker-Mayer	WALCKER-MAYER, Werner: 'Die Orgel der Reger-Zeit', <i>Max Reger 1873-1973. Ein Symposium</i> , ed. Klaus Röhrling (Wiesbaden 1974), 31–54
Walter A	WALTER, Rudolf: <i>Max Reger und die Orgel um 1900</i> , MuK 43/6 (1973), 282–289
Walter B	WALTER, Rudolf: 'Gedanken zur Interpretation der Orgelwerke Max Regers', <i>Kirchenmusikalische Mitteilungen</i> 12. Heft (1973), 3–20
Walter C	WALTER, Rudolf: <i>Entstehung, Uraufführung und Aufnahme von Max Regers Op. 127</i> , MMRI/20 (1974)
Wangemann	WANGEMANN, Otto: <i>Die Orgel, ihre Geschichte und ihr Bau</i> (3 rd ed., Leipzig 1886, revised 1895)
Wedgewood	WEDGEWOOD, J.I.: <i>Dictionary of Organ Stops</i> (London 1905)
Westphal	WESTPHAL, Kurt Erich: <i>Die Elemente des musikalischen Rhythmus</i> (Jena 1872)
Weyer	WEYER, Martin: <i>Die Orgelwerke Max Regers</i> (Wilhelmshaven 1989)
Widor	WIDOR, Charles-Marie: 'La technique de l'orchestre moderne' (Paris 1904, a supplement to Berlioz's standard <i>Grand traité d'instrumentation...</i> Paris 1843/1855) translated into English (London 1906) and into German by Hugo Riemann as 'Die Technik des modernen Orchesters' (Leipzig 1905)
Williams/Owen	WILLIAMS, Peter & OWEN, Barbara: <i>The (New Grove) Organ</i> (London 1980/88)
Wilske	WILSKE, Hermann: <i>Max Reger - Zur Rezeption in seiner Zeit</i> (Wiesbaden 1995)
Wirth	WIRTH, Helmut: <i>Max Reger</i> (Reinbek bei Hamburg 1973)
Wolgast	WOLGAST, Johannes: <i>Karl Straube: Eine Würdigung seiner Musikerpersönlichkeit anlässlich seiner 25 jährigen Tätigkeit in Leipzig</i> (Leipzig 1928)
Würz	WÜRZ, R. ed.: <i>Max Reger: Eine Sammlung von Studien aus dem Kreise seiner persönlichen Schüler</i> (München 1921, four volumes published 1920–1923)
Wunderlich A	WUNDERLICH, Heinz: <i>Zur Bedeutung und Interpretation von Regers Orgelwerken. Ein Beitrag zum Regerjahr 1973</i> , MuK 43/1 (1973), 7–16
Wunderlich B	WUNDERLICH, Heinz: <i>Karl Straube: Wirken und Wirkung</i> (Berlin 1976)
Wunderlich C	WUNDERLICH, Heinz: <i>Zur Interpretation von Regers Symphonischer Phantasie und Fuge op. 57</i> , MMRI/19 (1973)

Wunderlich D

WUNDERLICH, Heinz: 'Karl Straubes Vortragsbezeichnungen in der Symphonischen Phantasie und Fuge op. 57', *Zur Interpretation der Orgelmusik Max Regers*, ed. Hermann J. Busch (Kassel 1988), 64–71

Wyly

WYLY, J.: *Further Thoughts towards an Interpretation of Reger's Organ Music*, *The Diapason* 63/10 (Chicago 1972), 2

Samenvatting

‘Moderne’ orgelstijl in Karl Straube’s Reger-edities

Deze dissertatie analyseert Karl Straubes edities uit 1912, 1919 en 1938 van het orgelwerk van Max Reger. De analyse is gericht op de manier waarop de uitgaven van 1912 en 1919 de bloei van de ‘moderne’ orgelstijl representeren, en de wijze waarop deze door inherente tegenstellingen in de uitgave van 1938 met terugwerkende kracht wordt bevestigd. Straube (1873–1950) was een kind van zijn tijd, wiens artistieke visie voortvloeide uit zijn cultureel verfijnde Berlijnse achtergrond. Zoals alle Duitse musici rondom de eeuwwisseling leefde en werkte hij in de schaduw van Richard Wagner. Zijn houding ten opzichte van Reger (1873–1916) was soms eerbiedig, soms paternaliserend, tegelijk enthousiast en ongeduldig, vaderlijk en aanhankelijk. Uiteindelijk voerden de compositorische gaven van Reger en andere contemporaine componisten Straube tot een verregaande staat van vertwijfeling en zelfonderschatting; zijn twijfel werd versterkt door het feit dat zijn voorgangers als *Thomascantor* in Leipzig allen ook als componist actief waren geweest.

Straubes muzikale talenten lagen vooral op het gebied van interpretatie; hijzelf beschouwde deze talenten later in zijn leven als tweederangs. Zijn Reger-edities van 1912 en 1919 vormen een nauwgezette weergave van zijn post-Wagneriaanse artistieke visie op uitvoeringspraktijk, die de ‘moderne’ orgelstijl belichaamde. Deze edities vormen vrijwel zeker Straubes belangrijkste prestatie, en zijn van enorme waarde voor zowel de uitvoerder en onderzoeker van Regers werk alsmede voor het onderzoek van laat-Romantische uitvoeringspraktijken. Anders dan men wellicht zou verwachten karakteriseert de ‘moderne’ orgelstijl – vooral de Duitse en ultra-Romantische – zich niet door het zware en bombastische geluid dat vaak met Max Reger wordt geassocieerd, maar juist door balans, warmte, en een genuanceerde klankrijkdom.

Het overwicht van 8'-registers in het ‘moderne’ orgel zorgde voor een rijk geschakeerd palet van grondregisters dat de toegevoegde hogere registers en tongwerken complementeerde. De vele verschillende 8'- en 4'-registers vulden elkaar door hun verscheidenheid in harmonische structuur aan, zorgden voor een volle mengklank en functioneerden als schakel naar soortgelijke, naar hogere en naar luidere registers. Het uiteindelijke doel van de ‘moderne’ orgelklank was de imitatie van het naadloze crescendo van *ppp* tot *fff* van het Wagneriaanse orkest. In Straubes Reger-edities is voor dit doel een volledige systematisering van dynamische beheersing waarneembaar, die wordt bereikt door manipulatie van de Swell- en Walzeregisters (zie hoofdstuk 2 en 3) en handmatige registratie. Door zijn exemplarische benutting van de orgelklank kan Straube tegelijk als pionier en als moderne klassieker beschouwd worden.

De edities vormen een ultieme demonstratie van post-Wagneriaanse orgelstilistiek, die in hoofdstuk 5 verder zal worden toegelicht. Deze behelst onder meer een flexibele tempobehandeling, een niet gelijk op gaan van stemmen, een gedetailleerde frasering en articulatie, en een uitlichten van binnenstemmen; dit alles wordt gerealiseerd binnen een

elementaire legato-stijl [worden gerealiseerd]. De nauwe overeenstemming tussen Straubes uitvoeringspraktijk en het Wagneriaanse klankideaal zal in hoofdstuk 4 worden besproken.

De door de Eerste Wereldoorlog bespoedigde veranderingen in smaak- en stijlconventies en orgelbouwkunst leidden tot een vroegtijdig verdwijnen van de ‘moderne’ orgelstijl. Straube begon moeite te krijgen met het feit dat hij met deze stijl werd geassocieerd; zelfs zijn Reger-edities uit de jaren twintig verouderden snel. In de nieuwe esthetiek van de *Orgelbewegung* was geen plaats voor de ‘moderne’ orgelstijl, en Straube heeft geprobeerd - onder andere in het voorwoord bij zijn editie van Regers opus 27 (1938) - zich ervan te distantiëren. De uiterst ambivalente taal in deze uitgave is beïnvloed door de ideologie van de *Orgelbewegung* en mijdt de ‘moderne’ ultra-Romantiek. De editie zelf ondermijnt echter deze positionering door de uitgever, zoals in hoofdstuk 6 naar aanleiding van Straubes onderwijspraktijk in de jaren ‘40 (die dertig jaar later door Heinz Wunderlich is overgeleverd) zal worden betoogd. Beide zullen worden belicht in relatie tot de ‘moderne’ orgelstijl, en laten zien dat Straube deze stijl zelfs onder ongunstige omstandigheden beschermde.

Gebeurtenissen op muzikaal, politiek en persoonlijk vlak leidden ertoe dat Straube berustende gelatenheid als een “levenswet” accepteerde (hoofdstuk 7). Tegen het einde van zijn leven beschouwde hij zijn uitgaven als waardeloos. Zijn teleurstellingen in het leven brachten hem er toe de prestaties uit zijn jonge jaren als niet relevant te zien; zijn Reger-edities uit 1912 en 1919, met hun systematische vastlegging van de ‘moderne’ orgelstijl zijn daarvan het meest blijvende en tegelijk ook het minst gewaardeerde deel. Straubes uitgaven moedigen ons aan om “tussen de regels door te lezen” (hoofdstuk 7) en ons voorbij de noten te bewegen om zo ons eigen beeld van Regers muziek te vormen.

Abstract

‘Modern’ organ style in Karl Straube’s Reger editions

This dissertation examines Karl Straube’s Reger editions of 1912, 1919 and 1938, in the belief that the full flowering of ‘modern’ organ style is presented in the 1912 and 1919 editions and confirmed retrospectively by the inherent contradictions of the 1938 edition. Straube (1873–1950) was a child of his time, with an artistic vision conditioned by his sophisticated Berlin background. Like all German musicians at the turn of the twentieth century he lived under the shadow of Richard Wagner. His relationship to Max Reger (1873–1916) was one of reverence, but he was also at times patronising, enthusiastic and impatient, fatherly and filial. Ultimately, Reger’s compositional gifts and those of other contemporary composers led Straube to a point of self-doubt and despondency. This was especially the case as, previous to Straube’s tenure, compositional creativity had always been wedded to the position of Leipzig *Thomascantor*.

Straube’s own musical gifts were mainly interpretative, gifts he in later life considered second-class. His Reger editions of 1912 and 1919 codified in minute detail an artistic perspective based on post-Wagnerian performance practice, a philosophy of performance that embodied ‘modern’ organ style. These are almost certainly Straube’s greatest achievement and of enormous value not only to the Reger scholar and performer, but to any student of late-Romantic performance practice. Perhaps contrary to expectations, ‘modern’ organ style, specifically German and ultra-Romantic, is far removed from the heavy and bombastic image associated with the person of Max Reger, but favours balance, warmth, blend and fullness of sound.

The preponderance of 8' stops in the ‘modern’ organ provided a rich palette of foundation stops that could balance the addition of upperwork and reeds. The many different types of 8' and 4' stops complemented each other in their variety of harmonic structure, promoted blend and acted as bridges to other stops of their own pitch, and to higher and louder stops. The ultimate aim was to provide a seamless crescendo from *ppp* to *fff* in imitation of the Wagner orchestra. To this end Straube’s Reger editions demonstrate a comprehensive systemisation of dynamic control by means of the manipulation of Swell and Walze (see Chapters 2 and 3) together with registration by hand. In this Straube was both pioneering and classical in his exemplary use of the organ.

The editions furnish a veritable showcase of post-Wagnerian stylistic traits, more of which are discussed in Chapter 5. These include flexibility of tempo, the non-alignment of parts, detail in phrasing and articulation, and the highlighting of inner parts, all realised within a basic legato style. The close correspondence between Straube’s practice and a Wagnerian concept of sound is discussed in Chapter 4.

Hastened by World War I, changes in artistic taste and organ building fashions decreed that ‘modern’ organ style would be short-lived. Straube’s association with it soon became an embarrassment to him. Even as he edited in the second decade of the twentieth century, his

Reger editions were fast becoming obsolete. In the new organ aesthetic governed by the *Orgelbewegung* 'modern' organ style was an albatross about his neck. Attempts to dissociate himself from it include the Preface to Straube's final Reger edition, that of op. 27 (1938). Here the highly ambiguous language reflects *Orgelbewegung* ideology, and shuns 'modern' ultra-Romanticism. However, the edition itself belies this position. This is discussed in Chapter 6, as is an exposition of Straube's teaching in the early 1940s transmitted by Heinz Wunderlich thirty years later. Both are discussed in relation to 'modern' organ style and lead to the conclusion that Straube protected the style even under adverse conditions.

Musical, political and human events led to Straube's acceptance of 'resignation as a law of life' (Chapter 7). Towards the end of his life he considered his editions worthless. His disenchantment with life obliterated the achievements of his youth, of which the codification of 'modern' organ style in the Reger editions of 1912 and 1919 was his least recognised and most enduring. Straube's editions encourage us to 'read between the lines' (Reger) and go beyond the notation in order to shape our own vision of Reger's music.