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The purpose of this essay is to enhance the study and performance of Franz Schubert’s three major compositions for violin and piano: Duo in A Major, op. posth. 162, D. 574, Rondo in B minor, op. 70, D. 895, and Fantasia in C Major, op. posth. 159, D. 934. This study offers a description of the historical context and the circumstances of the composition of these pieces, presents an analysis of the form and harmonic language, and discusses recent research on aspects of Schubertian performance style that help the performer make educated interpretative decisions. This research was done prior to making a CD recording; that recording reflects the interpretative and musical understanding that has evolved from the research done for this essay. The recording has been the subject of seven reviews, which are included as appendices.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this essay is to enhance the study and performance of Franz Schubert’s three major compositions for violin and piano:

Rondo in B minor, Op. 70, D. 895, (1826)
Fantasia in C Major, Op. posth. 159, D. 934, (1827)

This study offers a description of the historical context and the circumstances of the composition of these pieces. It presents as well an analysis of the form and harmonic language and discusses how recent research on aspects of Schubertian performance style can help the performer in making informed interpretive decisions.

The idea for this doctoral essay originated while preparing for a recording of Schubert pieces for violin and piano. A performer should develop a deep understanding of a composer and his music in order to cultivate an accurate sense of the composer’s style and enhance one’s creative approach to the pieces during the preparation process. A single performance of a work occurs only in a fixed period of time, and its interpretation could therefore be considered for that occasion only. Making a recording urges us to attempt to transcend the present with an interpretation that will withstand the passing of time, with informed performance decisions. Decisions regarding interpretation must be based on pertinent background knowledge. The teacher and performer, both student and professional, often do not have the time or the resources to carry out the extensive research that is needed to have a well-informed approach to standard music literature,
which can enrich one’s knowledge and musical intuition. There is not much detailed information and discussion of Schubert’s violin music that is directed to the teacher or performer.

There are a variety of differing personal opinions held by performers and instrumental teachers on the performance of the music of classic and romantic composers. Not all artists and teachers have studied the musicological research or embarked on making a detailed analysis of the music in its precise historical context. Therefore, they make very personal decisions in specific areas that may or may not be historically correct: for example, how to begin and end a trill in a piece by a specific composer, what a specific pedal marking meant for the composer who wrote it, what the various tempo markings meant to the composer, or how much flexibility with the tempo is appropriate. The performer should at least be aware of historical context and historical performance practices in order to make informed decisions, whether or not those decisions conform to performance traditions.

The study of different printed scores and facsimiles of Schubert’s manuscripts and the sometimes-contradictory information available on historically informed interpretation from this period offer information on how to perform this music. In addition, to assist the preparation for a recording of these pieces, the goal of this document is to provide accessible material that could help performers and teachers.

The study of Schubert’s musical and historical background should enhance one’s understanding of his music and hopefully lead to a more historically aware performance of these pieces. This study examines the periods of Schubert’s life and the historical context in which these pieces were composed, point out hints on historically informed
performance practices found in treatises and musicological research, and examine the different editions and facsimiles of Schubert’s manuscripts for relevant interpretative clues. Letters and other primary sources from Schubert and his circle of friends can help provide a more complete perspective on the creative process, style, the interpretation, and performance of this repertoire.

The ultimate goal of this project is to offer a comprehensive background that will help colleagues and students to develop their own well-informed interpretation of these pieces. My own studio recording of these works with pianist Tao Lin is part of this project.¹ This recording reflects the interpretative and musical understandings that have evolved from the research done for this essay. The CD booklet notes give some information about interpretative decisions that were made. A forty-five minute documentary film about the recording process² is also a part of this doctoral project.

There is no scholarly research that has addressed the aforementioned questions about these pieces in this way. There have been a small number of analyses done with these pieces, but they do not speak to aspects of interpretation or performance practice. There are several general studies about Schubert life, work and performance practices, but only two discuss these pieces in particular. These are mentioned in the literary review, indicating how each contributes to this present study.

Method of Presentation

Altogether, Schubert wrote six works for violin and piano. His first three pieces for this instrumentation were called Sonatinas by the publisher and were written in 1816, one year before the Sonata in A. This research specifically addresses Schubert’s Duo in A Major, op. posth. 162, D. 574, Rondo in B minor, op. 70, D. 895, and Fantasia in C Major, op. posth. 159, D. 934 for violin and piano. These works were also recorded and released on the Centaur label.

The essay contains five chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 situates the three works in the context of Schubert’s life and work; this includes a description of the historical and political climate, as well as an account of life in Schubert’s Vienna. This description is followed by a table that summarizes Schubert’s life and indicates contemporary events, musical compositions, and art works in a year-by-year format. This is followed by a discussion of the circumstances of Schubert’s life during the time when each piece was composed. Chapter 2 also includes a list of other works that were composed during the same time period.

The third chapter includes a general description of musical form in these three works. Specific details and distinctive aspects are pointed out. The reader will need to have a score in order to follow and understand this section of the study.

The fourth chapter provides an analysis of the various aspects of interpretation that should be considered for the performance of these pieces; it synthetizes and summarizes information derived from the contemporaneous treatises that are useful for performance of these works. This study is based on the research several authors have completed on the original treatises. Existing studies on violin and piano performance
history, as, for example, those by David Boyden\textsuperscript{3} or Sandra Rosenblum,\textsuperscript{4} were taken into account. This chapter discusses historical instruments, pedals, slurs, rhythm and value meanings, assimilation and regrouping, dotting vs. over dotting, fermata, tuning, repeats, choosing the performance edition, tempo, tempo rubato and other means of tempo fluctuation, vibrato, accents, idealistic writing, dots and strokes, trills, appoggiaturas, ornamentation, and memorization.

The fifth chapter offers detailed information about the CD recording of these pieces. The recording was produced in Gusman Concert Hall with Pianist Tao Lin. The recording engineers were Paul Griffith and Kyle Marcolini. This recording was released by Centaur Records in 2012.\textsuperscript{5} This recording attempts, interpretatively and musically, to synthesize and reflect the findings of this essay. This chapter includes a CD booklet, where a summary of important aspects that were treated in the previous chapters is presented. A number of personal interpretation decisions for the recording are also pointed out. A documentary film about the recording process\textsuperscript{6} is also mentioned in this final part of the dissertation. This film captures moments, reflections, and scenes from the recording session; a discussion of the editing; and interviews with the artists. The last section of this chapter includes a number of professional reviews of this recording. These reviews offer external opinions about the recording and the interpretative and musical understandings that have evolved from the research done for this essay.

Literature Review

There are a number of resources that are important for the study of this music. They are discussed here for their significance in this document in four subtopics:

Historical Context
Analysis of Form
Aspects of Interpretation
Music Editions

Historical Context

Brian Newbould’s book, Schubert, The Music and the Man\textsuperscript{7} analyzes Schubert’s life and musical compositions by genre through the stages of his life and includes a list of his works. It is an important reference for understanding the music in the context of Schubert’s life. It also helps situate these pieces among other contemporary works by Schubert.

Maurice Brown’s Schubert: A Critical Biography\textsuperscript{8} tries to separate Schubert’s life from the myths and the romantic, distorted views that characterized most of the earlier biographies and were believed by critics and teachers. Some of the earlier works tended to describe Schubert as a gifted, naïve musician who led a bohemian life, spent the nights drinking and wrote a song on a napkin when he was suddenly inspired. This book tries to discover Schubert in his true nature, setting the facts straight, without sentimentality or psychoanalytical revelations. The book also includes recent discoveries, letters, musical fragments and sketches, as well as information regarding the historical context of the violin and piano compositions. The book is one of this writer’s primary

\textsuperscript{7} Brian Newbould, Schubert, the Music and the Man (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).
sources for a chronological list of Schubert’s works. Parts of that list are included in this study to offer the reader a detailed overview of the context of music in this study within Schubert’s work. Similarly, the entry on Schubert in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*\(^9\) was useful for gaining general information on Schubert’s life and for compiling a list of his works.

Otto Erich Deutsch’s *Schubert, Memoirs by his Friends*\(^10\) offers a valuable collection of testimonies by people who knew Schubert and his musical preferences. Several citations from this book are included in this study and offer the reader information told directly from the perspective of Schubert’s closest associates. This book was also a valuable resource for the information given below in Chapter 4, Aspects of Interpretation.

*Schubert's Vienna*\(^11\) offers valuable information on the culture, society, and politics in Vienna during Schubert’s lifetime. It describes the war that was taking place during Schubert’s youth and the police state that existed later in his life. The book includes different authors who write about history, politics, class structure, social conventions, private and public entertainment, dance, music, theatre, sculpture and architecture in Vienna. The chapters “Vienna in Its European Context”\(^12\) and “People, Class Structure, and Society”\(^13\) were the main sources from this book for the section that speaks about Vienna in context in Chapter 2 of this study.

---


The Schubert Chronology table that is included in this chapter was inspired and created based on five different online timetables\(^\text{14}\) that display Schubert’s life as well as other important contemporary events. The information from the online resources was expanded to include material from Brown’s\(^\text{15}\) and Newbould’s\(^\text{16}\) biographies, to create the table included in Chapter 2.

**Analysis of Form**

There are several books that provide brief analytical descriptions of the three large violin and piano works by Franz Schubert, and a very few essays that go into more detailed analysis, such as the ones from Elizabeth Norman McKay\(^\text{17}\) and Laurienne Joyce Depew.\(^\text{18}\) The analysis done by these authors was taken into consideration for this essay, and the charts in their books helped as a source for the tables included in this study. These books are also references as to the historical context of these pieces. McKay’s book explores the structure of each of Schubert’s seven duos for a string instrument and piano. The structure of each work is examined in relation to Schubert's early use of Classical period forms, his personal experiments and Romantic inclinations, the growing

virtuosic demands he placed on performers, and his progress towards writing more complex tonal and harmonic structures. This book attempts to clarify why and how these pieces were written and what their place is among Schubert’s other duos for strings and piano.

The author describes briefly the Viennese musical scene and the context of the composition of each of Schubert’s seven duos. She also offers an analytical description, charts and some harmonic features of the pieces. She also discusses some alterations that Schubert made while he was working on the Fantasy and which can be traced in the extant autograph. McKay’s research was useful for the section addressing the context of each piece within Schubert’s life and work as well as the section on Analysis of Form.

In her thesis “Franz Schubert’s Music for violin and piano,” Laurienne Joyce Depew describes the historical background of Schubert’s compositions for violin and piano, the premiere performances, and some of the criticism these pieces evoked. Following that, she describes each individual piece in six chapters. The musical elements that she considers in her analysis are melody, harmony, rhythm, form, and texture. She concludes that the criticism of Schubert sonatas and duos must be re-evaluated, stating that “he was not merely a composer of music that only displayed technical bravura, nor a composer of teaching pieces, as one would expect from the Sonatinas.”

In this study the author points out the aspects of Schubert’s life that he considers to be relevant to the performer. The analysis contained in this study addresses the form

---

(rather than motivic and melodic aspects), attempting to offer the reader a concise and clear view of each piece’s structure. It offers some differing opinions regarding the form in various sections of these pieces.

In “Schubert and the Fantasy”\textsuperscript{21} Brian Newbould analyzes the fantasy genres written by Schubert and discusses the evolution of differences in the fantasies. The author discusses Schubert’s tendency to borrow structural principles from other genres. Fresh interpretations of the structural outcomes are proposed, and the framework of the fantasia is seen to liberate Schubert's experimental urge in other ways. Newbould’s essay identifies the place of the Fantasia in C (D. 934) within the fantasy genre, as well as discusses some aspects of the form. Another analysis was written by Patrick McCreless in “A Candidate for the canon? A New Look at Schubert’s Fantasy in C Major for Violin and Piano.”\textsuperscript{22} This article discusses the complex compositional aspects of this work and considers the possibility of viewing this Fantasy in what the author calls the “canon,” or the group of Schubert’s most important compositions.

Gerald Abraham’s book, \textit{The Music of Schubert},\textsuperscript{23} is comprised of chapters written by different authors:

- “Schubert the man” by O. E. Deutsch
- “The orchestral music” by Mosco Carner
- “The chamber music” by J. A. Westrup
- “The piano music” by Kathleen Dale
- “The songs” by Alec Robertson
- “Music for the stage” by A. H. King
- “Church and choral music” by C. A. Rosenthal and Abram Loft
- “The Schubert idiom” by T. C. L. Pritchard
- “Chronology”
- “Bibliography” by A. H. King (p. 255-262)

“Chronological list of compositions”
“Musical examples”

The only chapter that was used as a reference for this document is the one by Westrup dedicated to chamber music. From that section, the excerpts concerned with the pieces for this study were of interest.

This study was made using the Henle Verlag\textsuperscript{24} edition as a principal source, but other editions will also be useful for this purpose. As mentioned previously in the method section, the reader will need to have a score in order to follow and understand this section of the study.

\textbf{Aspects of Interpretation}

Schubert’s life was relatively short and his works were not extensively published. The treatises that date from around Schubert’s time were not written in particular for Schubert’s music. Nevertheless, understanding the information in those treatises in combination with information from other sources, such as personal testimonies from Schubert and his circle of friends, can help the reader get a more accurate idea of adequate performance practices for this music.

One of the main sources of reference for this section is David Montgomery’s book, \textit{Franz Schubert’s Music in Performance}.\textsuperscript{25} Montgomery provides the most comprehensive analysis to date on the performance practices of Schubert’s music. The book presents information from the treatises that described or influenced the performance of music during Schubert’s lifetime. In six chapters the author offers information ranging

from aesthetics and acoustics to specifics regarding tempo and expression. The book also lists a large number of pedagogical sources that influenced the performance practices in Vienna around that time.

Montgomery also challenges many myths about Schubert, among them, the assumptions that Schubert could not notate his own musical wishes accurately, and that he was very intuitive and poorly trained. He criticizes performing musicians and believes they often presume to have the freedom to interpret music intuitively without having more knowledge of the intentions of the score. Montgomery opposes performer-generated embellishments in the style of the eighteenth-century. Chapter 4, Aspects of Interpretation, contains a discussion of the contents of this book and illustrates how Montgomery’s work can affect the decisions made for performances of these pieces.

While this book speaks in general about the interpretation of Schubert’s music, only those aspects that are pertinent to this specific repertoire appear in this document. As this is the first and primary book that discusses Schubertian interpretation, I have chosen to address these aspects in a similar order to that used in Montgomery’s study. In this study the information in Montgomery’s book and other books related to performance practice of the period is supplemented by information from other books about the performance history of the violin and piano. The opinions of performing musicians such as Robert Levin and conclusions drawn from the author’s own examination of the scores are also considered in Chapter 4.

Another important source of information about performance practice is Clive Brown’s *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice 1750-1900*.

---

very useful for finding specific information about historically informed performance practice of Schubert’s music. It discusses the relationship of composer’s notation to performing practices during their time, attempting to unveil the composer’s intentions. He endeavors to identify what the notation meant to the musicians of that period, which frequently differs from how modern performers would interpret similarly notated music.

Another useful source is the essay “Schubert’s tempo conventions” also by Clive Brown. 27 This is one of eleven essays by renowned Schubert scholars in the book Schubert Studies, which presents studies on Schubert’s music and biography. Among the topics are analyses of tempo conventions, transitional procedures, and rhythmic organization. Brown analyzes the rather few metronome markings given by Schubert (or someone assisting him). The author then tries to establish some conclusions regarding Schubert’s tempi for the pieces in which he did not specify a metronome marking. Brown cites several treatises and makes comparisons to Mozart’s and Beethoven’s tempi, trying to discern hints for Schubert’s written tempo markings.

Among the books that follow the development of playing in the context of the advances in the construction of the instruments themselves, the author drew from the books by Sandra P. Rosenblum (on piano) and David Boyden 28 (on violin). Sandra P. Rosenblum’s Performance Practices in Classic [sic] Piano Music: Compositional Ideals, Notational Intent, Historical Realities, Pedagogical Foundations 29 covers performance practices in Classic piano music. She cites autographs, early editions of the music, letters,

original instruments, and treatises in order to exemplify governing principles for the performance of the music of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, among other composers. She analyzes elements of interpretation such as dynamics, accentuation, pedaling, articulation and touch, technique and fingerings, ornaments and embellishments, choice of tempo, and tempo flexibility. She discusses the use of the pedals in Schubert’s time, as well as the meaning of legato markings and the original performance practices of repeat signs in the Scherzo and Trio movements.

David Boyden’s book presents a comprehensive history of violin performance and technique, set against the background of the violin’s evolution and the music written for it. He discusses bowings, the performance of staccato, the use of vibrato, the meaning of performing directions, the notation and performance of double stops, the rules of scordatura playing, and the sound of the violin in early times, before Schubert was born.

Johann Joachim Quantz’s treatise, *On Playing the Flute* (1752)\(^{30}\) is a primary source for research on historically informed interpretation. It is widely considered to be one of the most important and in-depth treatises on eighteenth-century music performance and style. While it primarily centers on flute methods, playing and ornaments, it includes information that is equally applicable to other instruments. The book consists of three essays that examine the education of the solo musician, the art of accompaniment, and style. The author writes about phrasing, ornamentation, accent, intensity, tuning, cadenzas, tempo, the role of the concertmaster, stage deportment, and techniques for playing dance movements. There is also a section for string players with detailed indications about the meaning of various markings such as legato, dots, and dashes. His indications are very clear and provide a valuable source for the understanding

of how classic articulations can be interpreted. This book not only describes the specific practices of its time, but it has also influenced the performance practices of the musicians that came afterwards. Many of his descriptions are still valid for the music of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert.

Other treatises that were taken into consideration for this document include Leopold Mozart’s, *A Treatise on the Fundamental Principles of Violin Playing*¹¹ and Francesco Geminiani’s *The Art of Playing the Violin* (1751).³² Geminiani, a student of Corelli, elevated violin playing to new heights. Geminiani’s book was the first instruction manual addressed to advanced players from a professional viewpoint. The book consists of printed text in the early pages, followed by music examples that illustrate the general topic of the text to which they correspond. Geminiani writes about several aspects of violin playing, including: sound, hand position, holding the violin, appogiaturas, vibrato, scales, shiftings, bowings, double stops, ornaments, elements such as ornaments and bow strokes that produce emotional expression, and his overall general view of music. Although Geminiani’s treatise was published in the eighteenth century, like Quantz’s and C.P.E Bach’s work,³³ it was still in use during the nineteenth century.

C. P. E. Bach’s *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments* is the earliest treatise that deals thoroughly and systematically with all aspects of keyboard technique and interpretation: fingering, touch, phrasing, ornamentation, etc. It was the model for all the instruction books that appeared later. The second part of the essay,

---

which appeared nine years later in 1762, treats the Doctrine of Accompaniment and Free Improvisation. The books help one not only to understand the technique of that era, but also the musical styles and the aesthetic ideals of that period and their influence on the classic style of composition and performance. Such composers as Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven are known to have held C.P.E. Bach’s work very highly.

David Montgomery, Robert Levin, and Malcolm Bilson have carried on a very interesting discussion through scholarly publications regarding whether or not it is appropriate in historical terms to employ any degree of freedom in tempi, the possibilities of improvisation, and the addition of ornaments or notes to the music written by Schubert. This debate has challenged Montgomery, Levin and Bilson to explain their views and cite different treatises. The following three publications and essays contain this exchange of ideas and information.

Montgomery’s article, “Modern Schubert Interpretation in the Light of the Pedagogical Sources of His Day,”[^34] is a very interesting document in the context of historically informed performance of Schubert’s music. He discusses his reaction to several recordings of Schubert’s music by artists within the historically informed performance movement and in particular, Levin’s fortepiano recording of the A minor Sonata D. 537. In this article he questions whether the use of ornamentation and additions to Schubert’s score by the performer is historically acceptable. He also addresses the discussion on tempo liberties and tempo fluctuation. While he is primarily against all of these alterations, he points to passages in several treatises written in Schubert’s time that seem to allow ornaments and or tempo fluctuations in the slow movements. Montgomery,

however, tells why these treatises do not apply to Schubert’s music. He ends with a lengthy list of treatises that could be examined further in order to address this topic even more in-depth. While this particular endeavor also seems very interesting, the scope of the present work does not allow for this depth of study.

Robert Levin’s article, “Performance Prerogatives in Schubert,” is a defense answering the critique of his Schubert interpretation by Montgomery in the article, “Modern Schubert Interpretation in the Light of the Pedagogical Sources of His Day.” The subjects are ornamentation and additions to Schubert’s score by the performer, as well as tempo fluctuations and liberties. He defends the use of improvisation, ornamentation, and tempo fluctuation, citing arguments by Walther Dürr, editor-in-chief of the Neue Schubert-Ausgabe, on how Johann Michael Vogl, a singer and friend of Schubert, used these interpretative liberties in his performances with the consent of Schubert.

Another article in support of Levin’s position is written by Malcolm Bilson. “The Future of Schubert Interpretation: What is really Needed?” shows an interesting disagreement with Montgomery’s article. Bilson supports Levin’s Schubert recording with its added ornamentation, personalized interpretation, dramatization of the text, slight additions to what was written by Schubert, and tempo fluctuations. He states, “Our principal goal should be to get into the passion and emotion of the music as deeply and

---

richly as possible.”

He contrasts this view with what he sees as Montgomery’s underlying statement of “Find out what was permitted, and don’t exceed those boundaries.”

Rather than follow the different sides of this discussion, in this study the author summarizes the conclusions in the sections about tempo fluctuation and ornamentation, and offers further testimonials from Schubert’s friends, who witnessed his performances and knew his interpretative preferences. Otto Erich Deutsch compiled these testimonials in his book, Schubert, Memoirs by his friends, mentioned earlier in this literature review for the chapter on historical context. This book contains memories of Schubert’s friends regarding Schubert’s own preferences and indications regarding the performance of his music. Clues from this book that hint at interpretative decisions in Schubert’s music are pointed out and should help one to discern which information from the treatises is actually valid for the interpretation of Schubert’s music in particular.

**Music Editions**

Schubert editions published by Bärenreiter and Henle are among the most respected for this repertoire. “Sonate Rondo Fantasie Klavier und Violine Opus 162, Opus 70, Opus 159” published in Munich by G.Henle Verlag in 1976, is the primary edition source used for this essay’s research and performance. In reviewing the various editions and manuscripts available for these pieces, this was the most useful edition for

---

37 Ibid., 715.
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practical research as well as for performance and recording. Reasons for this opinion and a comparison with the other sources are given in Chapter 4, Aspects of Interpretation.

The *Neue Schubert Gesamt Ausgabe* from Bärenreiter\(^ {43} \) was compared with the Henle Edition of the Rondo, especially concerning the *diminuendo* vs. accent markings, as well as some conflicting dynamic markings. Schubert’s autograph of the Fantasy\(^ {44} \) was helpful in making important decisions as to which music edition to use.

In addition to consulting scores published by Bärenreiter, Henle, and the autographs when available, previous scholarship was considered. Michael Griffel’s article, “A Reappraisal of Schubert’s Methods of Composition,”\(^ {45} \) analyzes how Schubert’s autographs reveal that he composed by perseverance and hard work rather than through spontaneous sheer inspiration.

**General Reference**

Other sources consulted for this study are comprehensively listed in the bibliography. Books and articles that were used as reference but not cited in this study include:

*“Schubert's Experiments with Sonata Form: Formal-Tonal Design versus Underlying Structure”*\(^ {46} \) by David Beach

*“Schubert’s transitions”* by Susan Wollenberg\(^ {47} \)

---


Franz Schubert’s Letters and other Writings by Otto Erich Deutsch
Classical Music: The Era of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven by Philip G. Downs
Returning Cycles: Contexts for the Interpretation of Schubert’s Impromptus and Last Sonatas by Charles Fisk
Schubert, Survey of his Symphonic, Piano, and Chamber Music by John Bell Young
“The Chamber-Music of Franz Schubert” by Samuel Lacier
“Recent Schubert Discoveries” from Music & Letters
“Schubert: Discoveries of the Last Decade” by Maurice Brown
Schubert in the European Imagination by Scott Messing
Schubert by Walter Dahms

These sources are of general use to readers interested in the life and music of Schubert, but make little mention of the works that are the subject of this study.

56 Walter G. Armando, Schubert (Berlin: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1918).
CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Vienna in Context

It is useful to understand the circumstances in Vienna at the time when Schubert lived in order to put the pieces he composed into context. Some biographies exclude mention of these historical circumstances, which were hardly comfortable and were far from enchanting. The chapter “Schubert’s illnesses and their background” from the book *Schubert Studies*\(^ {57}\) offers the following description regarding general health and sanitation issues at that time:

Living and surviving in Vienna, as in any large town in Europe at that time, had its many and special hazards. General standards of hygiene and sanitation during Schubert’s lifetime were poor. There was no piped running water – the first European town to introduce such a system was Munich in 1840, more than a decade after Schubert’s death. The supply of drinking water depended on polluted supplies from the Danube, water carts whose contents were often septic and the occasional spring. Sanitation depended on the bucket, termed the commode in better-class homes such as the Schubert’s, and disposal was wayward. Flush toilets and a sewerage system came later in the century.

Health care showed marked deficiencies in the first half of the eighteenth century. To enter hospital was to risk one’s life, as whole wards were wiped out by hospital fever. Nursing was carried out by untrained and unintelligent skivvies and little attention was paid to avoiding cross-infection.

Malnutrition was widespread in Schubert’s day, with little understanding of the principles of good health and no knowledge of proteins or vitamins.\(^ {58}\)


\(^{58}\) Ibid., 255.
Schubert's Vienna\textsuperscript{59} offers valuable information about the culture, society, and politics in Vienna when Schubert was alive. This historical context is described in the book’s chapters “Vienna in Its European Context”\textsuperscript{60} and “People, Class Structure, and Society.”\textsuperscript{61} Schubert lived in a time of war, bombardments and occupancy of Vienna by Napoleon’s army, the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire, and political oppression. The rich, artistic life of Vienna and the vitality of its musical life sometimes makes one forget those difficult circumstances. Music provided distraction at those times; as entertainment, it might have actually helped the general populace cope better with the repressive police state ruled by Emperor Francis, whose reign covered Schubert’s entire life. Music was also heard at church as well as in public concerts. There was music everywhere in Vienna.

Francis was the head of the House of Austria, which included approximately the area of today’s Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Croatia, Slovenia and bits of Poland, Belgium and Luxemburg. France declared war on Austria a few weeks into the beginning of Francis’ reign in 1792. This began a period of more than two decades of wars that spread though different continents. The first seventeen years of Schubert’s life (b. 1797) were marked by these wars and their consequences. Among these consequences were anxiety, poverty, and a confined cultural life.

Twice during the Napoleonic wars, in 1805 and 1809, Vienna suffered occupation by French troops, with their associated difficulties. Schubert was eight and twelve years old respectively. Life in Vienna was particularly difficult after the Treaty of

Schoenbrunn, from 1809, after Austria tried unsuccessfully to fight Napoleon. In 1812, Napoleon’s defeat was celebrated by Beethoven’s *Wellington’s Victory* and Schubert’s *Auf den Sieg der Deutschen* (On the Victory of the Germans), D. 81. On April 15, 1814, after Napoleon’s abdication, the allies entered Paris and Schubert wrote his song for bass, *Die Befreier Europas in Paris* (The liberators of Europe in Paris), D. 104. From September 1814 to June 1815, an International Congress convened in Vienna to restore peace and order in the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars.

There were no major European wars after the Congress of Vienna (1814-15), and this coincides with the period during which Schubert composed most of his works. “Tranquility and Order” was the motto of this period, and Austria was known for the omnipresence of police surveillance, political repression and suspicion of even the slightest unorthodox idea. The police state had actually started much earlier and also paralleled the war with France. Even Franz Schubert was arrested in 1820, with his former schoolmate Johann Senn, when they were suspected of being members of an outlawed student organization. Schubert’s dissatisfaction with the regime was evidenced by his involvement with the secret *Unsinn-Gesellschaft* (Society of Absurdity), which staged original plays and published members’ newsletters that ridiculed contemporary politics, scientific discoveries, drama, and literature. Raymond Erickson concludes in his chapter “Vienna in Its European Context” in *Schubert’s Vienna* that:

> Generally speaking, then, Viennese society was forced to turn inward, to home and family, to innocent and nonpolitical activities. The result was a quiet, bourgeois culture that later was looked back on ironically as the good old days…and was denominated by the term *Biedermeier*…

Erickson further explains the term *Biedermeier*:

Like many style terms used by historians and critics of the arts, *Biedermeier* was used initially in a pejorative fashion and was applied to a cultural milieu that was already over. For a native speaker of German, in fact, *Biedermeier* has inherently comical implications, being a compound of *bieder* (honest, upright, but also ordinary) and *Meier* (a family name so common as to lend itself to deprecation and jokes).

The introduction of the word bears this out. A collection of poems, riddles, games, and the like for all occasions written by a village schoolmaster came into the hands of the country physician Adolf Kussmaul, who found in the materials a potential for hilarious parody. From 1855 to 1875, Kussmaul, using the pseudonym Gottlieb Biedermaier, published in Munich’s *Fliegende Blätter* his own comical reworkings of the serious efforts of the schoolmaster.

From such precedents *Biedermeier* took on implications of lack of sophistication, of provincialism, of simple if well-meaning thinking, of pleasure taken in ordinary creature comforts. Only in the twentieth century did the term lose most of its pejorative connotations as a style-critical concept in the arts, being used to denote the culture, in all its facets, of German-speaking Europe (especially southern Germany and Austria) between the close of the Congress of Vienna (1815) and the Revolution of 1848.⁶³

At this time, *Hausmusik* (music in the home) was in ascendance. These gatherings were the most common venues for music at the time and were cultivated by the educated middle class. There were hardly families who would not appreciate being entertained by chamber music, which was mostly performed in gatherings of family and friends and in private salons. Elizabeth Norman McKay⁶⁴ describes a limited interest in including complete sonatas in programs during Schubert’s times:

---

Sonatas of any kind, like symphonies, were of very limited appeal in concerts, public or semi-public, in the Vienna of Schubert’s day. Indeed, the performance of a complete sonata in the programme of a *Musikverein* evening entertainment was almost unthinkable. (In 1813 the very first public performance of a complete piano sonata by Beethoven was not even in Europe, but in Boston, USA.) The content was considerably too intellectual and serious; the classical three-or-four-movement structure left little room for the now preferred freer Romantic expression and fantasy, with its associated virtuoso display. In salons or concerts of chamber music, if a sonata appeared in the programme then it was frequently represented by just one movement. Thus the second movement, theme and variations, of Schubert’s solo Piano Sonata in A minor, D845, played on its own, proved very popular during the composer’s 1825 summer tour of Upper Austria and the Salzkammergut. With such little demand for sonatas, one might wonder why Shubert expended so much energy in composing them. He completed eighteen in all, eleven for solo piano, two for piano duet, and five for string and piano duo.

Besides these house concerts, music could be heard at public concerts and the theater. Schubert, in contrast to Beethoven, lived mainly among the middle class and was the only true Viennese among the composers of the first Viennese School. His music was mostly performed in the intimate company of informal musical gatherings centered about him, which were called *Schubertiaden*. His circle of friends also held reading evenings, evenings of dancing, party games, and countryside trips. There was also a more serious side to this group, especially around 1820, a time when Schubert and some of his friends shared a nonconformist attitude toward life and art and considered the norms of their society hypocritical. Therefore, they celebrated egalitarianism and intellectual honesty.
A Schubert Chronology

It is useful for understanding the context of Schubert’s music to see an overview of the composer’s life. Expanded to include information from Newbould’s and Brown’s biographies, the Schubert Chronology table (See Table 1) below is inspired and created based on five different online timetables that display Schubert’s life, as well as other important contemporary events.

Table 1. A Schubert Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Schubert’s Life and Compositions</th>
<th>Contemporary Compositions and Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Franz Peter Schubert born on 31st of January, at the Himmelpfortgrund in Vienna, 12th child (but only 5 survived childhood) of Franz Theodor Schubert and Elisabeth, née Vietz.</td>
<td>Napoleon’s North Italian Campaign. Haydn 65, Goethe 48, Salieri 47, Clementi 45, Schiller 38, Beethoven 27, Paganini 15, Weber 11, Czerny and Meyerbeer 6, Rossini 5, Donizetti &amp; Heine born.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>First performance of Haydn’s Creation and Seven Last Words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Napoleon’s coup d’état, Consulate rules France (to 1804), Napoleon invades Syria. Five nations unite against France. Beethoven completes Pathétique Sonata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Battle of Marengo. Beethoven’s first public concert. He also completes 1st symphony &amp; string quartets Op. 18. Volta invents the electric battery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berlioz born.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Schubert sings in choir of <em>Liechtental</em> Church.</td>
<td>Napoleon occupies Vienna, battle of Austerlitz. Hanz Christian Anderson, Boccherini and Schiller die. First performance of <em>Fidelio</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Schubert studies under Holzer at <em>Liechtental</em> Church.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Schubert introduced to Salieri.</td>
<td>Slave trade abolished in the British Empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Schubert was accepted into the choir of the Imperial Court Chapel as soprano voice as well as the Royal Seminary.</td>
<td>Goethe publishes first part of <em>Faust</em>. First performance of Beethoven’s 5th &amp; 6th symphonies. Napoleon’s army invades Spain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Schubert plays second violin in the student’s orchestra at <em>Stadtkonvikt</em>, and is referred to as “a musical talent”. Orchestra plays works by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Cherubini, Weigl Mehul. Schubert is not interested in the music of Krommer and Abbe Vogler.</td>
<td>Austria’s insurrection against France fails. Mendelssohn born, Haydn dies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Earliest surviving complete songs.</td>
<td>Liszt born.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Schubert’s mother dies. His voice breaks and he studies counterpoint with Salieri.</td>
<td>Founding of <em>Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde</em> in Vienna. War of 1812 between the U.S. and Britain (ends 1814). The first defeat of Napoleon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>The “annus mirabilis”—Schubert working as primary teacher composes about 150 songs including <em>Erlkönig</em>, symphonies 2 &amp; 3, 4 operas, 2 masses and other works. Meets Franz von Schober.</td>
<td>Birth of Otto von Bismarck. The Hundred Days: Napoleon escapes from Elba, is defeated by Wellington at the Battle of Waterloo, banished again to St. Helena in South Atlantic. Congress of Vienna: victorious allies change the map of Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Schubert completes 4th &amp; 5th symphonies, over 100 songs, including <em>Seligkeit</em>. Goethe ignores dedication. In March/April, Schubert composes first three violin and piano pieces, posthumously published as “Sonatinas.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Schubert lives with Schober in Vienna for the summer and meets Vogl. Symphony No.6, overtures in “Italian Style”, <em>die Forelle</em>, first piano sonatas. August—Schubert writes his fourth violin sonata, the A Major (D. 574).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>First public performance of Schubert’s song (<em>Schäfers Klage</em>). Travels with Vogl in Upper Austria. <em>Trout</em> quintet &amp; piano sonata in A (D664) composed, completes <em>Die Zwillingssbrüder</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Enters Vienna General Hospital for treatment of syphilis. Composes <em>Sei mir geäussret</em> on a poem by Friedrich Rückert. <em>Fierabrax, Die Schöne Müllerin, Auf dem Wasser zu singen</em> and <em>Rosamunde</em> also composed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td><em>Alfonso und Estrella</em> completed. Symphony No.8 left unfinished, <em>Wanderer Fantasy</em>, <em>Du liebst mich nicht</em> and <em>Der Musensohn</em> composed. Dedicates piano variations to Beethoven. First signs of Schubert’s syphilis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td><em>Alfonso und Estrella</em> completed. Symphony No.8 left unfinished, <em>Wanderer Fantasy</em>, <em>Du liebst mich nicht</em> and <em>Der Musensohn</em> composed. Dedicates piano variations to Beethoven. First signs of Schubert’s syphilis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Enters Vienna General Hospital for treatment of syphilis. Composes <em>Sei mir gegrüssret</em> on a poem by Friedrich Rückert. <em>Fierabrax, Die Schöne Müllerin, Auf dem Wasser zu singen</em> and <em>Rosamunde</em> also composed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Publication of <em>Die Schöne Müllerin</em>. Composition of <em>Grand Duo</em>, the <em>Octet</em> and <em>Rosamunde</em> and <em>Death and the Maiden</em> quartets. Writes the <em>Rondo in B minor</em> for piano and violin in October. Second visit to Zseliz. Tutors Count Esterházy’s daughters again. First performance of <em>Sonata for Arpeggione and Piano</em> (D. 821).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Schubert public concert is a great success. Schubert composes last Mass, <em>Schwanengesang</em>, string quintet, String Quartet in C, 3 last piano sonatas, F minor Fantasy, completes 9th symphony, sketches for 10th symphony, last songs “Dir Hirt auf dem Felsen” and “Die Taubenpost”. January 20—First performance of <em>Fantasy in C</em> for Piano and Violin (D. 934) at a benefit concert at the <em>Landhausaal</em>, Vienna. March 23—only concert consisting only of Schubert’s own works held in the house <em>Zum roten Igel</em>. Schubert hears Paganini. Dies on November 19th in Vienna of “Nervenfieber” and is buried beside Beethoven.</td>
<td>Birth of Ibsen and Tolstoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rossini composes <em>Guillaume Tell</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chopin composes <em>Nocturne in E-flat Major</em>. Donizetti composes <em>L’elisir d’amore</em> and <em>Lucia di Lammermoor</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mendelssohn composes <em>Italian Symphony</em>. Clementi dies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historical Context

Schubert played both violin and piano. His father taught him the basics of the violin, and his brother Ignaz gave him piano lessons. At the age of seven, Schubert began receiving lessons from Michael Holzer, the local church organist and choirmaster.

Schubert’s brother, Ferdinand, wrote in his obituary notice:

In Franz his father, who earlier had given their first lessons in violin playing also to Ignaz and Ferdinand, and afterwards to Franz himself, perceived great talent for music from early childhood. Dear, good Franz now received lessons in pianoforte playing from his brother Ignaz. Later he was taught violin and pianoforte playing, as well as singing, by the choirmaster Michael Holzer, who several times asserted with tears in his eyes that he had never yet had such a pupil: “For,” said he, “whenever I wished to impart something new to him, he always knew it already. I often looked at him in silent wonder.” Schubert was then some 10 years old, and in his 11th year he was a first soprano in the Liechtental church. Already at that time he delivered everything with the most appropriate expression; in those days he also played a violin solo in the organ-loft of the church and already composed small songs, string quartets and pianoforte pieces.  

Josef von Spaun, a law student and friend of Schubert’s at the Stadtkonvikt, wrote, “Schubert, scarcely twelve years old, played second violin in the students orchestra. His extraordinary interest in the masterworks performed, however, soon drew the attention of those around him to his superior talent and the little boy was soon installed as leader at the head of the orchestra.”  

In his initial grade reports from the Imperial and Royal Seminary he received the highest mark for violin. During that time Schubert also attended choir practice with his fellow pupils and played the organ. Otto Erich Deutsch, described Schubert’s education during those years:
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Schubert had been choirboy of the Court Chapel and pupil at the City Seminary from 1808 to 1813. Salieri, the musical director of that Chapel, and his deputy, Josef Eybler, had superintended the musical education of the ten choirboys. The music teachers at the City Seminary were: singing master, Philipp Korner; violin master, Ferdinand Hofmann; pianoforte master, Wenzel Ruzicka. (In Liechtental the organist, Michael Holzer, had been Schubert’s music teacher.) Josef von Spaun was “musical director” of the pupil’s orchestra and led the second violins. Schubert soon moved up from the second to the first violins. Other violinists were Anton Hauer (later Justizsenats-Präsidet in Linz) and Leopold Ebner (Kammeralrat in Innsbruck)…

Schubert’s friend, Josef von Spaun (1788-1865), recalled:

Schubert was extremely well versed in the classical works of the great masters. For Handel, Gluck, Mozart, Haydn and Beethoven he felt an enthusiastic reverence. Zumsteeg’s songs, with which he became acquainted already as a boy and which specially appealed to him, may have had some influence on his predilection for German song, which began to develop so early. Only in a few of his earliest songs might it be possible, perhaps, to detect the influence of Zumsteeg’s songs, for very soon Schubert left this path to go his own.

Schubert also played the viola in his family’s string quartet with his father on cello and his brothers Ignaz and Ferdinand on violin. Ferdinand, who played first violin, wrote, “…it was an uncommon pleasure to play quartets with him….The youngest of them all was the most sensitive there.”

Anton Holapfel describes some of activities and musical influences that he and Schubert experienced at the Seminary:

In addition to this daily practice and the church performances of the choirboy scholars, little coteries, willingly condoned by the Director, were formed for the performance of string and vocal quartets; songs at the pianoforte, especially the ballads and songs of Zumsteeg, also became very popular with us. Altogether there was a relatively serious musical

---

70 Otto Erich Deutsch, Schubert; Memories by His Friends (New York: Macmillan, 1958), 1.
71 Ibid., 26-27.
72 Ibid., 35.
73 Anton Holapfel (1792-1868) was accepted as a choirboy at the court Kapelle in 1806 and was a boarder at the Stadtkonvikt from then until 1817. He played violin and later cello. He came to be friends with Schubert in 1811-1812 and their friendship grew more intimate when Schubert left the Konvikt.
endeavour among us at this time, in which in his early days Schubert already took a most active part, although it was only later that he made great strides in his piano playing; for, year in and year out, at our daily performances all the symphonies by Josef Haydn and Mozart, the first two symphonies by Beethoven, as well as all the Overtures we could tackle at that time, even “Coriolan” and “Leonore” (the grand Overture to Fidelio), were regularly performed and we also played through the greater part of the classical quartets of Haydn and Mozart; everything, of course, extremely roughly and inaccurately and on bad instruments, and I still clearly remember with what immense pleasure we scraped out the fugues in Albrechtsberger’s, Haydn’s and Mozart’s quartets, keeping strict time. ⁷⁴

At the beginning Schubert was obliged, first and foremost, to work through a large number of extremely dull old Italian scores and it was only later that he went through the whole of Gluck, from whose works Schubert often played things to us… ⁷⁵

In March and April of 1816, when he was 19 years old, Schubert composed his first three violin and piano pieces, which he entitledSonaten für’s Pianoforte mit Begleitung einer Violine, (pianoforte sonatas with violin accompaniment) posthumously published as "Sonatinas," possibly to attract amateur players. ⁷⁶ He may have written these pieces for Josef von Spaun, his friend and a frequent host of musical activities, who played the violin, although not too well. It is more probable, however, that these sonatas were composed for his brother, Ferdinand, a good amateur violinist, for whom he wrote in June 1816, the Rondo in A, D. 438, for violin and string orchestra.

At this time, Schubert was employed as an assistant teacher in his father’s school in Himmelspfortgrund (a suburb of Vienna). Schubert had already been studying with Salieri twice a week for 8 years and his teacher encouraged him to apply for a position as a musical director at a teachers’ training college in Laibach, now Lublyana. Schubert was

⁷⁴ Otto Erich Deutsch,Schubert; Memories by His Friends (New York: Macmillan, 1958), 58.
⁷⁵ Ibid., 59.
⁷⁶ The Sonata in D Major and the Sonata in A minor were composed in March 1816. The Sonata in G minor was composed in April 1816.
probably hoping this job would allow him to have more time to compose and would
better his income, in view of a possible marriage to Therese Grob, a soprano for whom he
composed several Lieder. In the end, he did not get the position and was not allowed to
marry Therese Grob, due to a law requiring men of Schubert’s class to prove they had the
financial means to support a family. In the following two quotes, Anselm Huettenbrenner
(1784-1868) first describes his relationship to Schubert and then remembers Schubert
telling him about his love for Therese Grob:

I made Schubert’s acquaintance in the year 1815 at the Imperial Court Kapellmeister Salieri’s, who had already given him instruction for several years in thorough-bass and in composition. As I also became a pupil of Salieri’s, through the intervention of Count Moritz von Fries, I had the opportunity of meeting Schubert two or three times a week over a period of several years. In addition to this we visited each other very frequently, grew fond of one another, and became intimate friends and brothers.\(^\text{77}\)

During a walk which I took with Schubert into the country, I asked him if he had never been in love. As he was so cold and unforthcoming towards the fair sex at parties, I was almost inclined to think he had a complete aversion for them. “Oh no!” he said, “I loved someone very dearly and she loved me too. She was a schoolmaster’s daughter, somewhat younger than myself and in a Mass, which I composed, she sang the soprano solos most beautifully and with deep feeling. She was not exactly pretty and her face had pock-marks; but she had a heart, a heart of gold. For three years she hoped I would marry her; but I could not find a position which would have provided for us both. She then bowed to her parents’ wishes and married someone else, which hurt me very much. I still love her and there has been no one else since who has appealed to me as much or more than she. She was just not meant for me.”\(^\text{78}\)

Schubert was nonetheless a very prolific composer around that time. By 1817, he
had already written five symphonies, over 300 solo songs, several dozen partsongs, four
Singspiele, four masses, and seven string quartets, among other pieces, but his music had
not yet been performed publicly in Vienna. “The spring and summer of 1817 were

\(^{78}\) Ibid., 182.
devoted to the composition of piano sonatas. The wide range of piano styles and the use of unusual keys show that Schubert was experimenting in both form and medium during his months of freedom."

In August of that year Schubert wrote his fourth violin and piano Sonata, the A Major, D. 574, published in 1851 by Anton Diabelli as Op. posth. 162, and entitled “Duo (en la) pour Piano et Violin...Oeuvre 162.” The original title of the work, however, could be “Sonate für Piano Forte et Violino,” as this is the title written in a handcopy from the Witteczek-Spaun collection, and the original autograph is not available. This sonata has a broader proportion than his earlier pieces for this instrumentation, which were more directly influenced by Mozart. The Sonata in A has a more virtuosic character and includes a presto Scherzo rather than a minuet movement, as is found in many of Beethoven’s works.

Shortly before the composition of this sonata, Schubert had made several momentous changes in his life, deciding not to go back to teach at his father’s school, and leaving his father’s home to move with his new friend Franz von Schober to the large lodging of Schober’s mother in the Tuchlauben. Schober was an Austrian poet, librettist, lithographer and actor who, in 1821, would write the libretto for Schubert's opera Alfonso und Estrella. Schober later said, “I shall always retain the eternally uplifting feeling of having freed this immortal master from the constraint of school, and of having led him on his predestined path of independent, spiritual creation.”

---
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Schubert to Michael Vogl, a prominent baritone twenty years his senior, for whom Schubert eventually wrote many songs. Michael Vogl would become one of Schubert's main proponents in Viennese musical circles.

It was not until October 1826, ten years after the composition of the Sonata in A, D. 574, that Schubert wrote his next work for piano and violin, the Rondo in B minor. The official censor had just turned down his application to write an opera on the libretto *The Count of Gleichen* by Eduard von Bauernfeld. This took away the possibility of a production in Vienna, however, Schubert was possibly still hoping for a production in Berlin, as he continued to work on it. His health had deteriorated again during 1826, due to further depression and a recurrence of syphilis. Probably due to financial uncertainty, in the summer of 1826 Schubert gave up his rooms in Fruhwirth’s house in the Wieden suburb, where he had been living for over a year. He spent most of the rest of the year with Schober at Währing, or in rooms on the Bäckerstrasse. A few months later Schubert would again get a room of his own, but only for a few months. In February of 1827 he moved again into Schober’s house where he remained until his death. It is an interesting curiosity that the three pieces for violin and piano analyzed in this study were all composed when Schubert was lodged by Schober. One may surmise that being lodged by Schober, or Schober’s mother (earlier, in 1816) provided Schubert the opportunity to concentrate on his compositions, with fewer financial worries. In a letter to his friend Eduard von Mauernfeld, written some months before, Schubert alluded to his strained financial circumstances:

I cannot possibly get to Gmuden or anywhere else, for I have no money at all and altogether things go very badly with me. I do not let it worry me and am cheerful. Anyhow, come to Vienna as soon as possible.
Duport wants an opera from me, … so it would be splendid if your libretto were favorably received. Then at least there would be money, maybe fame as well!\textsuperscript{82}

In October 1826, in addition to the Rondo in B minor, Schubert was working on the Piano Sonata in G, D. 894. The Rondo in B minor is one of the few works to appear in print during his lifetime. It was published in Vienna by Artaria & Co. in 1827, and numbered as Opus 70. Schubert had himself called it only “Rondo,” but the publisher added the adjective “brilliant,” most likely to make it more appealing to potential buyers. Schubert’s autograph is still available, but it is possible that there was a copy specifically addressed to the publisher, which is lost, as there are a number of differences between the autograph and the first print of the Rondo. The piece was premiered by the violinist Josek Slavik and the pianist Karl Maria von Bocklet, in the presence of Schubert, at the home of the publisher.\textsuperscript{83}

Between 1826 and 1828, Schubert resided continuously in Vienna, except for a brief visit to Graz in 1827. In January of 1827, the vacant position of Vice-Kapellmeister Schubert was hoping to receive went to Josef Weigl, which caused Schubert to become disillusioned. Also, negotiations with the Probst of Leipzig that had begun in August, came to an end. The following lines written by Schubert give some idea of his mood during this time. Schubert wrote in his diary on March 27: “All that I have created is born of my understanding of music and my own sorrow: that which is engendered by grief alone seems to please the world least of all.”\textsuperscript{84}

Schubert was also suffering the physical and psychological effects of a venereal disease, probably syphilis, which he had contracted in 1822. In a letter written on October 12, 1827, Schubert himself referred to “my usual headaches assailing me again.”

Schubert also suffered depressive states and unstable moods. There is a sharp contrast between Schubert’s illness, the extremely difficult circumstances of his life and the remarkably high level of his achievements (both in quality and quantity) of his musical compositional output during these last years. Schober wrote in his memoirs: “Schubert then let himself go to pieces; he frequented the city outskirts and roamed around in taverns, at the same time admittedly composing his most beautiful songs.”

His works, songs as well as instrumental compositions, were by now performed more often in Vienna, in private and semi-public concerts. (For example, at Spaun’s home near the Schottenkirche, at Hö nig’s, and at Witteczek’s). These years saw the composition of some of Schubert's greatest and most profound masterpieces, including the C Major Symphony, the song cycle Die Winterreise, the piano trios, the late string quartets, the string quintet, the Moments Musicaux for piano, the F minor Fantasie for Two Pianos, and the last three piano sonatas. During that time it was usual for professional musicians to supplement their income by organizing or performing in benefit concerts. The last work Schubert composed in 1827 was the Fantasy in C, published by Diabelli as Op. posth. 159, in 1850. In the same month Schubert had written Four Impromptus, D. 935 and had completed the Piano Trio in E flat, D. 929. Both the Fantasy and the Piano Trio were written for Bocklet to perform.

---
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The Fantasy for violin and piano was the closing piece in a benefit concert at the Landhaussaal, Vienna, on January 20, 1828, and is among the few works by Schubert to have been performed during his lifetime. The autograph of the piece is still available.\textsuperscript{87}

The heart of the Fantasy in C for violin and piano is a set of variations on \textit{Sei mir gegrüsst} (D. 741), a song he composed five years earlier, using a poem by Friedrich Rückert (1788-1866). The poem, which follows, speaks about love from a distance, with its associated mix of pain, beauty and longing. The ending of the poem suggests a reunited love, but does not clarify if that reunion is real or imaginary (See Table 2).\textsuperscript{88}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{German} & \textbf{English} \\
\hline
O du Entrißne mir und meinem Kusse, & O you, who have been snatched from me and my kiss[es], [might] I greet you, [might] I kiss you!  \\
Sei mir gegrüsst, sei mir geküsst! & You, attainable only to the greeting of my longing, [might] I greet you, [might] I kiss you!  \\
Erreichbar nur meinem Sehnsuchtgrüße, & \textcolor{white}{\textbf{German}} \\
Sei mir gegrüsst, sei mir geküsst! & \textcolor{white}{\textbf{English}}  \\
\hline
Du von der Hand der Liebe diesem Herzen Gegebne, & You, given to this heart by the hand of love, you,  \\
du von dieser Brust Genommne mir! Mit diesem Tränengusse sei mir gegrüsst, sei mir geküsst! & taken from my breast! With this flood of tears [might] I greet you, [might] I kiss you!  \\
\hline
Zum Trotz der Ferne, die sich feindlich, trennend, hat zwischen mich und dich gestellt; dem Neid der Schicksalmächte zum Verdrusse sei mir gegrüsst, sei mir geküsst! & In spite of the distance, which, separating us like an enemy, has placed itself between me and you, and in defiance of the powers of fate, [might] I greet you, [might] I kiss you!  \\
\hline
Wie du mir je im schönsten Lenz der Liebe mit Gruß und Kuß entgegenkamst, mit meiner Seele glühendstem Ergusse, sei mir gegrüsst, sei mir geküsst! & As you came to me once in the brightest springtime of love, with greetings and kisses, with the glowing warmth of my soul, [might] I greet you, [might] I kiss you!  \\
\hline
Ein Hauch der Liebe tilget Räum und Zeiten, ich bin bei dir, du bist bei mir, ich halte dich in dieses Arms Umschlusse, sei mir gegrüsst, sei mir geküsst! & A breath of love dissolves space and time, I am with you, you are with me, I hold you in these arms, embracing you; [might] I greet you, [might] I kiss you!  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\caption{\textit{Sei mir gegrüsst}, Original and Translation}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{88} Text and translation of the poem by Friedrich Rückert as it appears in \textit{A Candidate for the Canon? A New Look at Schubert’s Fantasie in C Major for Violin and Piano}, 218.
In addition to the lyricism and the graceful, idiomatic writing for both the violin and the piano, this piece presents unusual technical difficulties. Perhaps the knowledge that he was writing for virtuoso players encouraged Schubert to compose this very demanding and virtuosic music, which today, is considered to be among the most difficult works in the violin and piano repertoire. At this time, virtuosic music was in demand and appreciated. In April and in May of 1828, Paganini made appearances in Vienna which greatly impressed Schubert.

The Fantasy in C was Schubert’s last composition for violin and piano. On March 26, 1828, the only concert consisting only of Schubert’s own works, took place in the house Zum roten Igel (The Red Hedgehog), an Inn on Tuchlauben Street, where the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Wien (Society of Friends of Music, Vienna) gave their performances. The concert did not receive much attention from the press as it was eclipsed by the upcoming arrival of Paganini, whom Schubert heard in April and again in May of that year. On November 19,1828, Schubert died in Vienna, at age 31.

Both the Rondo in B minor and the Fantasy in C were composed for the Czech violinist Josef Slavik and his friend Carl Maria von Bocklet. It was though Carl Maria von Bocklet that Schubert met Slavik, who was one of the first great Czech violin virtuosi. Following his success in Prague, Slavic moved to Vienna in early 1826, to further his career. He impressed Paganini during his visit to Vienna in late 1828, and one year later he befriended Chopin, who described him as a second Paganini, mentioning that he could play 36 staccato notes on one bow.

Josef Slavik was instructed by his father, Antonin Slavik, a schoolteacher, musician and composer in the village of Jince. Later Slavik continued his training under
Pixis at the Prague Conservatory and worked shortly with the Prague Opera Orchestra before going to Vienna. He died in Budapest in 1833, at the age of 27. Carl Maria von Bocklet, probably the best pianist among Schubert’s friends, was a former violinist. He had been the dedicatee of the D minor Sonata (D. 850) and had premiered the “Wanderer” Fantasy, Op. 15 (D. 760). Both the Rondo and the Fantasy exhibit, at times, a hint of Czech character, and it is interesting to keep in mind that Schubert’s parents came from places that are currently in the Czech Republic. Schubert’s father, Franz Theodor Schubert, came to Vienna in 1783 from Neudorf near Mährisch-Schönberg (Sumperk) in Moravia, while his mother, Elisabeth Vietz Schubert, came from Zuckmantel (Zlate Hory) in Austrian Silesia.

Schubert’s Compositions in the Years 1817, 1826, and 1827

Maurice John Edwin Brown, in his book, Schubert: A Critical Biography, offers a detailed list of Schubert’s work ordered by their probable composition date. In this study we reproduce the list of pieces that preceded each of the three pieces of this study, with the goal of providing a more detailed context.

1817

Frohsinn (?) (January).
Jagdlied (Werner) (January).
Die Liebe (Leon) (January).
Trost (‘Nimmer lange weil ich hier’) (?) (January).
Der Alpenjäger (Mayrhofer) (January).
Wie Ulfru fischr (Mayrhofer) (January).
Fahrtzum Hades (Mayrhofer) (January).
Schlaflied (Mayrhofer) (January).

Augenlied (Mayrhofer) (? January).

Sehnsucht (Mayrhofer) (? January).

La pastorella al prato (Goldoni) (January).

La pastorella al prato (Goldoni), T.T.B.B., with PF. (? January).

Fischerweise (Schlechta) (? January).

Die Blumensprache (Platner) (? January).

Eight écossaises, PF. Solo (February).

Écossaise in E flat, PF. Solo.

An eine Quelle (Claudius) (February).

Der Tod und das Mädchen (Claudius) (February).

Das Lied vom Reifen (Claudius) (February).

Taglich zu singen (Claudius) (February).

Die Nacht (? , tr. Harold) (February).

Lied: Bruder, schrecklich brennt (?) (February).

Sonata in A minor, Op. 164 (March).

Gesang der Geister über den Wassern (Goethe), T.T.B.B. (March).

Der Schiffer (Mayrhofer) (? March).

Am Strome (Mayrhofer) (March).

Philoktet (Mayrhofer) (March).

Memnon (Mayrhofer) (March).

Antigone und Oedip (Mayrhofer) (March).

Auf dem See (Goethe) (March).

Mahomet Gsang (Goethe) (March).

Ganymed (Goethe) (March).

Der Jüngling an den Tod (Spaun) (March).

Tost im Liede (Schober) (March).

An die Musik (Schober) (March).

Orest auf Tauris (Mayrhofer) (March).

Der entsühnte Orest (Mayrhofer) (? March 1817).

Freiwilliges Versinken (Mayrhofer) (? March 1817).

Die Forelle (Schubart) (? April).

Pax vobiscum (Schober) (April).

Hänflings Liebeswerbung (Kindl) (April).

Auf der Donau (Mayrhofer) (April).

Uraniens Flucht (Mayrhofer) (April).

Song: no title, no words (? May).

Overture in D Major, Orchestra (May).

Sonata in A flat (May).

Liebhafer in allen Gestalten (Goethe) (May).

Schweizerlied (Goethe) (May).

Der Goldschmiedgesell (Goethe) (May).

Nach einem Gewitter (Mayrhofer) (May).

Fischersied (Salis), 2nd setting (May).

Die Einsiedelei (Salis), 2nd setting (May).

Gretchens Bitte (Goethe) (May).

Sonata in E minor (June).
Sonata in D flat (June).
Sonata in E flat, Op. 122 (revised and transposed version of previous sonata) (June).
*Der Strom* (?) (June).
*Das Grab* (Salis) (intended for male voices) (June).
*Die abgeblühte Linde* (Széchényi) (? 1817).
*Der Flug der Zeit* (Széchényi) (? 1817).
*Der Schäfer und der Reiter* (Foroqué).
*An den Tod* (Schubart).
Sonata in F sharp minor. (July).
*Lied im Freien* (Salis), T.T.B.B. (July).
*Iphigenia* (Mayrhofer) (July)

1826

*Tiefes Lied* (Schulze) (January).
*O Quell, was strömnst du* (Schulze) (January).
Four songs from ‘Wilhelm Meister’ (Goethe), Op. 62 (January):
   i. *Mignon und der Harfner* (*Nur wer die Sehnsucht*),
   ii. *Heiss mich nicht reden*,
   iii. *So lasst mich scheinen*,
   iv. *Nur wer die Sehnsucht keent*.
*Canon à sei* (January).
*Am Fenster* (Seidl) (March).
*Sehnsucht*:Die Scheibe friert (Seidl) (March).
*Im Freien* (Seidl) (March).
*Im Frühling* (Schulze) (March).
*Lebensmut* (Schulze) (March).
*Ueber Wildemann* (Schulze) (March).
Waltz in G Major, PF. Solo (? 1826).
Two waltzes (G Major, B minor), PF. Solo (? 1826).
Grande Marche heroïque (for the coronation of Nicholas I), in A minor, PF. Duet, Op. 66 (Spring).
Two ‘Marches caractéristiques’ in C Major, PF. Duet. Op. 121 (Spring)
*Come thou Monarch of the Vine* (Shakespeare) (July).
*Hark! Hark! the Lark!* (Shakespeare) (July).
*Who is Silvia?* (Shakespeare) (July).
*Hippolitis Lied* (Gerstenbergk) (July).
*Widerspruch* (Seidl), T.T.B.B., with PF. (? 1826).
‘Four refrain-songs’ (Seidl), Op. 95 (?) 1826.
   i. *Die Unterscheidung*,

---

ii. Bei dir allein,
iii. Die Männer sind méchant,
iv. Irdisches Glück

Wiegenlied (Seidl) (? 1826).
Der Wanderer an den Mond (Seidl).
Das Zügenglocklein (Seidl).
Totengräber-Weise (Schlechta).
Das Echo (Castelli).
Grab und Mond (Seidl), T.T.B.B. (September).
Sonata in G Major, Op. 78 (October).
Deutsche Messe (including ‘The Lord’s Prayer’) (Neumann), Chorus, wind band, Organ
(late Autumn).
PF. Trio in B flat, Op. 99 (end of 1826?).
Adagio in E flat, PF., vn., ‘cello (‘Notturno’), Op. 148 (end of 1826?)
Rondo in B minor, PF. And vn., Op. 70 (December).

1827

Zur guten Nacht (Rochlitz), Bar. Solo, Male voices with PF. (January)
Alinde (Rochlitz) (January).
An die Laute (Rochlitz) (January).
Der Vater mit dem Kind (Bauernfeld) (January).
Eight variations on a theme from Hérold’s ‘Marie’, in C Major, PF. Duet, Op. 82
(February).
Jägers Liebeslied (Schober) (February).
Schiffers Scheidelied (Schober) (February).
‘Winterreise’ (Müller), song-cycle (Book I, February: Book II, October).

Book I:

i. Gute Nacht,
ii. Die Wetterfahne,
iii. Gefror’ne Thränen,
iv. Erstarrung
v. Der Lindenbaum,
vi. Wasserflut,
vii. Auf dem Flusse
viii. Rüchblick,
ix. Irrlicht
x. Rast,
xi. Frühlingstraum,
 xii. Einsamkeit,
Book II:

xiii. *Die Post*,
xiv. *Der greise Kopf*,
v. *Die Krähe*,
vii. *Letzte Hoffnung*,
viii. *Im Dorfe*,
viii. *Der stürmische Morgen*,
ix. *Täuschung*,
xx. *Der Wegweiser*,
xxi. *Das Wirtshaus*,
xxii. *Mut*,
xxii. *Die Nebensonnen*,
xxiv. *Der Leiermann*

*Schlachtlied* (Klopstock), Double Male-voice Chorus, (28 February).

*Nachtgesang im Walde* (Seidl), T.T.B.B., 4 hn. (April).


*Frühlingslied* (the above arr. for voice and PF.) (April).

Allegretto in C minor, PF. Solo (27 April).

*Das Lied im Grünen* (Reil) (June).

‘Der Graf von Gleichen’ (Bauernfeld), 3 act Opera (sketches started mid- 1827).

*Ständchen* (Grillparzer) -

i. Contralto solo, T.T.B.B., with PF. (July).
ii. Contralto solo, S.S.A.A., with PF. (July).

*Gott im Ungewitter* (Uz), S.A.T.B., with PF. (? 1827).

*Gott der Weltschöpfer* (Uz), S.A.T.B., with PF. (? 1827).

*Wein und Liebe* (Haug), T.T.B.B.

Four Impromptus, Op. 90. PF. Solo (Summer ?).

Allegretto in C minor, PF. Solo (XXI, 16).


*Heimliches Lieben* (Klenke) (September).


Twelve ‘Grazer’ Waltzes, Op. 91, PF. Solo (September).

‘Grazer’ Galop, PF. Solo (September).

*Kindermarsch* in G Major, PF. Duet (11 October).

*Das Weinen*, (Leitner) (? October).

*Vor meiner Wiege*, (Leitner) (? October).

*Fröhliches Scheiden*, (Leitner) (? October).

PF. Trio in E flat, Op. 100 (November).

*Der Hochzeitsbraten* (Schober), S.T.B., with PF. (November).94

*Der Wallensteiner Lanzknecht* (Leitner) (November).

*Der Kreuzzeug* (Leitner) (November).

*Des Fischers Liebesglück* (Leitner) (November).

Moments musicaux, nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5, Op. 94 (? November).

Fantasia in C Major, PF. and vn., Op. 159 (December).95

---

95 Ibid., 396.
CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS OF FORM

This chapter includes a description of the form and harmonic language of the three pieces contained in this study. It is highly recommended that the reader follow this analysis with a score at hand.

Sonata in A major, Op. 162, D. 574

Sonata, First Movement: Allegro moderato

The first movement of the sonata, Allegro moderato, is in sonata form. The first theme extends from measure 1 to measure 20 and is in A major. While the first four measures have an introductory character, they cannot be considered an introduction as they appear again in the repeat of the exposition and in the recapitulation. This motif has not only an accompanying function throughout the piece, but also a syntactic purpose in many cases. For example, this theme’s character allows it to serve as an introduction, as a refrain and as endings in different sections of the movement, which brings to mind some of the treatments Schubert used in his lieder.

There is a bridge that begins in measure 20 at the cadence, with the introduction of a new triplet figure. The bridge continues to measure 28 and harmonically moves from A major to a perfect authentic cadence in E major. A harmonic surprise occurs at measure 29, with an abrupt change to E minor to begin the second subject. This second subject has three parts. The first part extends from measure 29 to measure 39 (E minor to G major), the second part from measure 40 to measure 56 (G major through B major to the
dominant E major), and the third part from measure 57 to measure 66. Beethoven did the same type of thing in his early works, for example, in the first movement of his Piano Sonata in C major, Op. 2, No. 3. The difference here, aside from scale and size, is that Schubert works his way back to E major via the two key changes, to G major and to B major. Each of these changes makes use of the same thematic idea, so they are linked melodically as well as through the transposition process up the pitches of the E minor triad. It is significant to note that this is a version of the three- or four-key exposition. At this point in his career, Schubert was seriously exploring the key-relational possibilities in the second theme area of a sonata-form exposition, and these explorations soon evolved into his mature compositional practice, which had a large impact on Brahms’ approach to sonata form. The codetta appears from measure 67 to measure 76.

The development occurs from measure 77 to measure 101, and in the development, two sections can be distinguished. The first section extends from measure 77 to measure 85. In this first section, the first eight measures of the development, the violin melody is synthesized from different elements found in the exposition; the last two measures of the codetta (measure 78), and traces of melodic elements from the first theme (dotted half notes) as well as from the second subject (eighth notes of measure 29 varied with inversions and ornamentations). In measure 85, again Schubert uses the motif from the very beginning of the movement to close the phrase. The accompaniment figure

---

96 In detail:
M. 40 to m. 45: G major
M. 45 third beat to m. 48: goes very quickly through E major 7, A major, C sharp minor diminished 7, G major, C minor, A major, C sharp 7
M. 49 to m. 52: in B major
M. 52 to m. 55: B major, B sharp minor diminished 7, C sharp minor, A sharp minor diminished 7, B major, M minor, C sharp major, B minor, C sharp major, a minor, B major, A minor, B major 7, B sharp minor diminished 7, C sharp minor, F sharp minor
M. 56: cadencing back to E major to finish this kind of transition and begin simultaneously a new theme in the dominant.
in the piano in measures 78 to 84 is an equivalent expansion of the rhythm that appeared earlier in measure 39 and again in measures 45 to 49 of the exposition. The accompaniment figure in measure 85 is also derived from the accompaniment figure found at the beginning of the exposition for the right hand of the piano (measures 1 to 19).

The second section of the development begins at measure 86. Here the melody is reminiscent of the triplets that were introduced in the bridge (measure 20). The piano accompaniment in measures 86 to 93 is similar to the writing at the beginning of the piece (measures 1 to 16). The figure for the right hand is a displacement and inverted variant of the figure for the left hand, a figure that also appears in the exposition at the end of measures 57, 59 and 61. The thematic material continues similarly through the end of the development, altering only the voicing between the violin and the piano’s two voices.

In measure 92, the retransition begins. In measures 97 and 98, triplet figures reappear as reminders of the writing in measures 20 to 21 and 24 to 25. This time, however, the piano plays the triplet figure first and is followed by the violin, which is the reverse of the original configuration. In measures 99 and 100, the left hand of the piano plays the motif from the beginning of the piece, again helping to connect thematically to the arrival of the recapitulation during three measures in E major. Measure 101 includes similar material, and is an expansion of the preceding rhythm.
The following table (See Table 3) displays the continually changing harmonic framework of the development (measures 77 to 96):

Table 3. Sonata in A Major, Harmonic Framework (mm. 77-96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>79</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony:</td>
<td>C#7</td>
<td>f#6</td>
<td>D#6/5</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>e6</td>
<td>b6/4</td>
<td>c#6</td>
<td>b6/4-f#7</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony:</td>
<td>A#7</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>D#6/3</td>
<td>e6-b6/4</td>
<td>c6</td>
<td>G7=E5/6</td>
<td>D6/4-A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B7-D6/4</td>
<td>e6-G2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recapitulation begins in measure 102. The first subject appears in measures 102 to 121, in A major. Here, the bridge from measure 121 to measure 129 stays in A major. The second subject is presented in three parts, the first part occurring from measure 130 to measure 140 (A minor to C major), the second part from measure 141 to measure 157 (C major through E major to the tonic A major, which continues through to the end of the movement), and the third part from measure 158 to measure 167. The codetta occurs from measure 168 to measure 177.

Sonata, Second Movement: Scherzo (Presto-Trio)

The second movement of this sonata is a scherzo. This is a change with respect to Schubert’s three earlier sonatas for violin and piano. The replacement of the minuet as a third movement by a scherzo and trio, rather than the traditional slow second movement, was frequently used by Beethoven and perhaps influenced Schubert’s choices. The
movement opens in E major with a 16-measure section that ends in B major. This is followed by a sudden change to the parallel minor key, B minor, at the beginning of the second section in measure 17. In measure 21, the piece arrives harmonically in G major in one of Schubert’s characteristic moves to VI; VVI in this case.

In a transitional motion that begins in measure 38, the music seems to go to C major (in measure 43) but actually keeps moving through C sharp minor and G sharp 7. At the *tempo primo* in measure 49, the harmony begins to return to the original key of E major, through the progression of C sharp major, F sharp major and B major 7. In measure 56, the original material returns in the original key of E major, where it remains until the trio.

The trio begins in measure 83 with a chromatic scale lasting four measures, which leads to the tonality of C major. The second section of the trio, beginning at measure 99, is also in C major. The tonality of C major as well as the G major tonality found in measure 21 are flat-side keys bracketing the original E major tonic within the movement as a whole; more key-relation exploration of the kind pointed out in the first movement. In measure 117 the original material of the first part of the Trio returns, and in measure 129 starts a *pianissimo* codetta of six measures with C pedal and a German sixth chord, cadencing then on B major, after which the Scherzo returns.

**Sonata, Third Movement: Andantino**

This movement represents the sonata’s slow movement, and is in ternary form. It opens with an 8-measure melody in C major. Following two measures of contrasting

---

97 This section can be divided in smaller parts of 4 measures + 4 measures + 2 ½ measures + 5 ½ measures.
character, a second thematic idea emerges in D flat major. In measure 22, a transitional passage begins, which modulates enharmonically back to C major, for the return (at measure 26) of the material heard at the opening of the movement.\footnote{It goes from G flat major in measure 18 to the enharmonic parallel F sharp minor in measure 20. In measure 23 to F major that becomes the tonic, to a G major 7 in measure 25, and back to C major in measure 26.}

Following eight measures (measures 26 to 33) in which the piano and violin reverse their initial roles of melody and accompaniment with some slight modifications, a fourteen-measure transition\footnote{Comprised of two segments (6 measures + 8 measures).} begins that takes us to the B section of the movement.

Measure 48 marks the beginning of the B section, which is in A flat major. The A section returns at measure 73 in C major, and is, as expected, similar to the beginning of the movement, but with a slight alteration in the accompaniment. After the original eight-measure melody, again two contrasting measures appear (measures 81 and 82), but this time an idea related to the opening material emerges in A flat major (measure 83). A modulation to C major follows in measure 87. Again, the theme moves to the parallel minor before finally dying away in C major.

**Sonata, Fourth Movement: *Allegro vivace***

The final movement of this piece is in sonata form with an exposition in three tonalities. This movement is related to the scherzo, as the thematic material at the beginning of both movements as well as the writing in the ascending scale are clearly similar. The movement opens in A major, modulates to E major (measure 24) and arrives at the second subject in measure 33, in C major. (It is interesting to note that the first theme of the second subject also appears in his dance piece for piano, *Cotillon* in E flat
This eight-measure theme appears three times in different voices and is followed by a transition (beginning in measure 57) to a new theme, which serves as the closing theme of the exposition, and is in E major (measure 73). This theme, an eight-measure melody, is repeated twice. The closing theme is followed by a codetta (measures 89 to 106), with the final cadence ending in E major.

The development begins at measure 107, using the material from the beginning of the movement, first in C major and later, at measure 125 in F major. Through a canon-like section of three voices still based on the first subject (sometimes inverted), the piece modulates back to A major to arrive at the recapitulation in measure 167. At measure 175, the music modulates up a fourth to the subdominant, possibly to create a stronger feeling of arrival. This is a variant of Schubert’s subdominant recapitulations.

At measure 191, the music returns to A major until the second subject appears, this time in F major at measure 199. The transition to the closing theme begins at measure 222 and the closing theme appears at measure 239 in A major. The codetta appears from measure 255 to the end of the movement, including an additional six measures to enhance the reaffirming fortissimo A major ending.

Rondo in B minor, Op. 70, D. 895

The overall form of the piece is: Introduction /A-B-A-C-A/Coda

Introduction

The piece opens with a 49-measure introduction, an Andante in simple ternary form (ABA). Section A of the introduction begins in B minor. A more lyrical B section
begins in measure 13 in the parallel key, B major, and passes through many tonalities, among them, A flat major in measure 20. The music seems to lead to E major at measure 28; however, the tonality continues to change. At measure 32 the A section material returns, but with the direction of the scales now inverted and in the parallel key of B major. Between measures 36 and 43, Schubert alternates between diminished seventh chords (measures 36 and 40) and German sixth chords (measures 38 and 42) to arrive on a C sharp half diminished six-five chord, the supertonic (measure 44). With this chord (the secondary dominant), the listener’s ear begins to long for the return to B minor, which is delayed until measure 53, after the next section has begun.

**Episode A**

The Rondo A episode consists of three parts (a, b, c). Each of these parts starts by using the pitches B and C#, a motif that was present in the final measures of the *Andante* introduction. The first theme of the episode is in B minor. Part “a” goes from measure 49 to measure 64. A more lyrical second theme, part “b”, begins in measure 65 in the parallel key, B major, and continues until measure 82. The third and final theme of this section, also in B major, starts at measure 83 and ends unresolved on the dominant, F sharp major. A transition follows (measures 102 to 110), also based on the B C# motif, moving us from F sharp major to the next section in D major.

**Episode B**

The B episode begins in measure 110 and has a developmental function. Four measures in D major are repeated and then answered by a group of six measures that
cadences in D major at measure 124. In measure 124, the violin introduces a new melody in the parallel key, D minor, while the piano continues with a similar accompaniment figure in the minor key. After four measures, at measure 128, the phrase is repeated in the key of A minor, arriving in E minor at measure 132, and through a transition, the music reaches F sharp minor in measure 139.

What follows between measures 139 and 155 is a variation of the material heard from measures 124 to 138. There are, however, differences in the voicing, the melodic patterns, the harmonies, and there is a two-measure extension (measures 152,153). The harmonies, through the use of a series of dominant chords, seem to move away, but in measure 156, the music returns to F sharp minor, for a new eight-measure theme stated by the violin. Later, at measure 164, a variation of this theme appears in the parallel key, F sharp major. Through the two measures of fortissimo chords in measures 173 and 174, the music sounds like it is going to culminate in a return to D major, but rather, Schubert repeats the previous four measures and modulates to B flat major in measure 178, where the violin repeats the eight-measure theme from the beginning of the episode, acting as a false reprise. A six-measure transition follows. The last two measures of this transition, measures 190 and 191, present big chords for the violin, which finally modulate to D major in measure 192, and the initial theme of this episode appears again, in its original form and key.

Following the eight-measure theme, there is a transition that arrives again in D major at measure 208. The section continues to develop until it arrives at a lyrical theme in D major (measures 219 to 231), which is reminiscent of the introduction (measures 13 to 14). This section is interrupted by an interjection (measures 232 to 238), which
resembles the passage in heard in measures 212 to 218. Both passages are based on the motif that was originally stated at the beginning of the B episode (measure 113). After the final interjection, a more expanded version of the lyrical theme (measures 239 to 262) is stated, this time in F sharp major.

A new transition of eight measures (measures 262 to 269) based on the motif from section A, part “a” follows. This transitional material leads to a section from measure 269 to measure 276, which is similar to the final measures of the introduction’s *Andante* (measures 44 to 49), though the tempo is much faster here. As at the end of the *Andante*, this material leads one more time to the A episode of the Rondo, in B minor.

**Episode A**

The second A episode begins at measure 281 and develops exactly as it did in its first appearance. Part “a” goes from measure 281 to measure 295, part “b” goes from measure “296” to measure 313”, part “c” from measure 314 to measure 333, and the transition from measure 334 to measure 344. The only difference from the initial A episode is an addition of four measures in the last transition. Measures 341 to 344 are added and lead to the C episode in G major.

**Episode C**

This episode goes from measure 345 to measure 585. It has four parts (a b, a’ b’) and a transition to the final A episode. Part “a” encompasses measures 345 to 413. It begins in G major with a lyrical theme for the violin over an arpeggiated eighth-note accompaniment played by the piano. A dotted rhythm in the violin part is related to the
doubly dotted rhythm heard at the beginning of the introduction. In measure 362, the violin part has a rhythmical pattern that appeared earlier, in the B episode at measures 113 and 212. At measure 369, the violin and piano switch roles in the writing of melody and accompaniment. This theme is again in G major and is similar to the first theme of this section.

The violin melody found in measures 403 to 412 is reminiscent of the andante violin melody from measures 18 to 20 in the introduction. The lyrical character is interrupted suddenly by the forte appearance of part “b” at measure 413, in G minor. During this part, the violin has, for the most part, running eighth notes; often against a rhythm that has already appeared a number of times (dotted quarter note followed by an eighth note and two quarter notes in the piano part). The theme modulates to E flat major for the return of part “a” at measure 467. The second appearance of part “b” occurs at measure 527, and it is again in G minor. Here, the instruments switch their roles; the piano now has the running eighth notes and the violin plays the dotted rhythm. This second b’ part continues to measure 570. From measure 571 there is a transition that leads from G major to B minor in measure 585 in a manner similar to the earlier transition at measures 277 to 280. At measure 586, the A episode appears for the third time.

**Episode A**

The third appearance of episode A is similar to the previous ones. Part “a” begins in measure 586 and ends at measure 600, part “b” goes from measures 601 to 620, part “c” from measures 621 to 651, and the transition from measures 652 to 667. There are a
few differences here, however. Part “b” is, this time, in D major rather than B major. Other differences include an extension in part “c” (measures 629 to 638) and a longer transition to the coda, in B major.

**Coda**

The Coda is found from measure 667 to the end, measure 713, ending the piece in B major. It includes reminiscences from earlier material in the movement. It begins similarly to the beginning of the B episode. Later, in measure 683, the writing is similar to that in measure 208, also in the B episode. The ascending scales and descending arpeggios that start in measure 687 are also similar to the ones found in the final transition of the A episode.

**Fantasia in C Major, Op. posth. 159, D. 934**

In this large work one can distinguish seven continuous episodes, which are integrated and intertwined into one complete piece without standard movement divisions (See Table 4). In some cases, a one-measure rest creates suspense between the sections. The formal structure is free and unconventional. The fantasy form itself offers a platform for this degree of freedom. The inner structure of the various sections of the piece does not bear resemblance to any of the standard models of form.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Episode</th>
<th>I (1-36)</th>
<th>II (37-351)</th>
<th>III (352-479)</th>
<th>IV (480-492)</th>
<th>V (493-638)</th>
<th>VI (639-664)</th>
<th>VII (665-700)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure Numbers</td>
<td>1-36</td>
<td>37-351</td>
<td>352-479</td>
<td>480-492</td>
<td>493-638</td>
<td>639-664</td>
<td>665-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Measures</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo Marking</td>
<td>Andante molto</td>
<td>Allegretto</td>
<td>Andantino</td>
<td>Tempo primo</td>
<td>Allegro vivace</td>
<td>Allegretto</td>
<td>Presto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Signature</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Sonata-like</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reprise of I (Andante molto)</td>
<td>Reprise of III (Andantino)</td>
<td>Coda (based on V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Structure</td>
<td>A 1-17</td>
<td>A' 18-36</td>
<td>A B C A' B' D</td>
<td>Theme and 3 variations + coda (See Table 5)</td>
<td>A-transition/development of A, A’-transition/development of A’, A’’-transition (See Table 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>a- A-E a-C- a</td>
<td>A♭ major</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>C-C-a-C- A-a-C</td>
<td>A♭ major-C major</td>
<td>C major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Next Section</td>
<td>No pause indicated between fermata of the last note in bar 36 and the upbeat of the Allegretto</td>
<td>Full bar rest with fermata on bar 351</td>
<td>Eighth note rest with fermata on bar 479</td>
<td>Last note of this section serves as first note of the next section. (Bar 493)</td>
<td>Last note of this section serves as first note of the next section. (Bar 639)</td>
<td>Full bar rest with fermata on bar 664</td>
<td>One and one-half bars rest after the last note.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Fantasy in C Major, Overall Form
The beginning of the Fantasy, a slow-moving episode in C major, presents something of an introductory character for the piece; however, it has, at the same time, an identity of its own. Following a four measure introduction for the piano, (which imitates the sound of a Hungarian *cimbalom*), the violin enters in measure 5 with a theme that appears again a bit more compressed and in a lower octave at measure 20. The last four measures of this section (measures 33-36) are like a written-out cadence in E major that prepares the *Allegretto* in A minor.

The second episode is an *Allegretto* in A minor with a dance-like character. The motif here is related to the theme of the previous episode. This episode can be divided into 6 sections (ABCABD). There are some similarities to sonata form with an exposition-like section in three different keys, a transition (C), a repeat of the exposition or recapitulation and a section that resembles a development (D). There are, however, no full closing cadences, nor is there a reprise after D.

Section A occurs from measure 36 to measure 83 and can be divided into five inner sections (aabab). Section “a” is in A minor. It is eight measures long and is repeated, with an inversion at the start of a canon-like exchange between the violin and piano. This is followed by section “b”, which is ten measures in length. This section

---

101 The relation of the notes in the motif of the Allegretto ACBC (measures 38-39) relates to the motif CDE♭D (measures 5-7).
begins in C major and ends in E major, preparing the return of “a”, this time without repeat. Section “b” follows, starting again in C major and arriving at measure 83 in A major.

Here starts section B, with an eight-measure theme that is repeated. Two additional sets of sixteen measures each (with variations of the theme) end by leading to the onset of a new section in E major at measure 131. The following section, C, uses material from section B and acts as a transition to the return of section A at measure 182, again in A minor.

In this return, A’, there are some differences from the first appearance of A. In this instance there are four inner sections (abab). Again, the harmonies move between A minor and C major but this time stay in C major for the next section, which begins at measure 219. Section B’ also differs somewhat from B and is four measures shorter, ending at measure 263. Part D begins in A minor and seems to be a development of material that appeared in A and B. It is larger than section C and modulates extensively. This section evolves into a transition in E flat major that prepares episode III, in A flat major in measure 352.

III

This central portion of the Fantasy is a set of theme and variations on Schubert’s lied, *Sei mir Gegruesst*. This episode consists of a theme and three virtuosic variations, after which there is a fourth appearance of the theme, which functions as a coda and a transition to the next episode.
Table 5. Fantasy in C Major, Episode III Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parts of III Theme and variations</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Variation 1</th>
<th>Variation 2</th>
<th>Variation 3</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td>352-385</td>
<td>386-409</td>
<td>410-433</td>
<td>434-457</td>
<td>458-479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of measures</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner structure</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of measures</td>
<td>20 written-out repeat</td>
<td>14 repeated</td>
<td>10 repeated</td>
<td>14 repeated</td>
<td>14 repeated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theme opens in measure 352. In section A, the theme is presented by the piano in 8 measures with an additional two measures that act as a returning refrain. This ten-measure scheme is then repeated, this time with the violin playing the theme. Part B consists of 8 measures played by the piano, plus six measures that are similar to the last six measures of A. Part B is repeated.

In Variation 1, the violin has the main voice, and it appears from measure 386 to measure 409. The length and structure are the same as the theme. In the second variation (measures 410 to 433), the piano takes over with increased movement and virtuosic figures and is accompanied by the violin in *pizzicato*. Variation 3 is a *moto perpetuo* in thirty-second notes for the violin; the piano has technically challenging, thematic material as well. Each of the three variations, as well as the theme, consists of ten measures (A) followed by fourteen measures (B). Each section is repeated.

In measure 458, the piano returns to a slow-motion melody similar to the initial theme in A. The violin enters in measure 464, repeating the last two measures of the piano melody and then repeats the very last measure over and over (like a refrain), until a
transition in G major leads to the next section. The final eight measures of this section are like a written-out cadence that leads back to original key of the piece, C major, at measure 480.

IV

This thirteen-measure section is, in a way, a reprise of the initial Andante molto that opened this work, and is also in C major. This type of reminiscence (as well as another reminiscence about to happen in episode VI) gives unity to the piece. There are some differences here from the introductory material at the beginning of the piece. The register changes with the piano treble hand playing one octave higher and the violin melody appearing one octave lower. Another alteration is that now the theme appears in a more compact form. There is only a one-measure piano tremolando introduction, and the initial two measures of the violin melody now occupy only one measure. At measure 484, six measures of the initial theme are omitted, and at measure 487, a six-measure chromatic transition begins that prepares the next episode in C major. Perhaps the most notable difference between sections I and IV is the transition that begins in measure 487 and leads to the next section.

V

This Allegro vivace section marked alla breve is something of a celebratory march. Its initial motif (measures 493 to 494) is related to material from the first episode (measures 5 to 9); here with E natural instead of E flat. This episode’s character is related, though not identical, to the second episode. These motivic relationships between
sections contribute to the cohesiveness of this work. Also, the continuous character of the piece, with interruptions no longer than a single rest between the different episodes (described in Table 5), gives this piece additional unity. The structure of this section is: A-transition/development of A, A’-transition/development of A’, A”-transition. This complete episode, which appears from measure 493 to measure 638, is based on one theme, A. The first appearance of the theme occurs from measure 493 to measure 525, and is in C major. This section can be divided into two sixteen-measure parts (ab). Each of these two parts consists of a theme of eight measures that is repeated. The inner form of A can be described as aabb. This material is followed by a section of thirty measures, based on the motif of A. This section can also be divided into two parts. The first part is sixteen measures in length (measures 525 to 541) and appears in C major. This part could be considered also as a new theme, based on A, but at the speed it goes by, it is rather perceived as a transition. This transition leads to the second part, which consists of fourteen measures. This material is developmental; the motif of A passes though A minor, E minor, B minor and G major 7, preparing the return of A in C major. The second appearance of the theme, A’ (measures 555 to 579), does not have the repetition of the first group of eight measures, and presents an inner structure of abb. A’ is also in C major. This A’ section is followed, as in the case of A, by a transition and developmental section (measures 579 to 610) similar to the previous one. Here the transition begins in A major and the developmental section moves through F sharp minor, C sharp minor, G sharp minor and E major 7. There is a two-measure extension (measures 606, 607) at the end of the development section.
Table 6. Fantasy in C Major, Episode V Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section subsections</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Transition/developmental</th>
<th>A’</th>
<th>Transition/development of A, A’-transition/development of A’, A’’-transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>493-508</td>
<td>509-525</td>
<td>525-541</td>
<td>541-554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of measures</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner structure</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of measures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At measure 611, the theme, A”, is restated for eight measures, but in pianissimo
and in A minor, the relative minor key of its original appearance. This creates the
impression of a reminiscence of A. This is followed by a twenty-measure transition that
seems to be an extensive preparation for the return to C major. A two-measure motif is
repeated to form a four-measure group. This four-measure group is also repeated to form
an eight-measure group (referred to in Table 6). This is followed by an eight-measure
section (b) that is formed by four measures that are repeated, and finally, there is a four-
measure transition. The return to C major seems to be imminent, but instead there is a
surprise (and characteristic of Schubert) turn going to the bVI, A flat major for section VI.

VI

This twenty-six-measure section (measures 639-664) is the return of the song
theme from episode III, in its original key of A flat major. This time the tempo marking,
Allegretto, is slightly faster than the previous appearance (Andantino). Again, one is
given the impression of a reminiscence of an earlier section. This time the thematic
statement is more compact and soon begins to serve also as a transition to the next and
final section of the Fantasy, a Presto in C major.

VII

This section is a thirty-six-measure coda to the work. It begins in C major at
measure 665 with an enormous dynamic contrast. The music moves from a dynamic level
below pianissimo to fortissimo. Once more, Schubert brings previous material; this time
from the *Allegro vivace* of section V, but marked *Presto*. A series of arpeggios, chords
and scales conclude the piece in its original key of C major with a celebratory, triumphal
character.
CHAPTER 4: ASPECTS OF INTERPRETATION

Historical Instruments

By the time of Franz Schubert, violin bows with the modern shape, introduced by Francois Xavier Tourte, were already in use. Tourte worked in Paris from 1775-1835 and created a bow model that used more wood in the tip and a heavier nut. He used pernambuco wood, which is both strong and flexible. He bent the stick in the opposite direction from the baroque bows. At the same time, older “transitional” bow models were also available in Schubert’s time. It seems that a local bow model was available and preferred in Vienna. In 2012, the symposium at the Collection of Historic Musical Instruments in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna\textsuperscript{102} came to the conclusion that:

\begin{quote}
Economic factors may have been a consideration for some players, given that Viennese French-model bows retailed for up to three or four times the cost of more traditional bows made with simpler mechanisms and from local wood. It was also noteworthy that the provision of conservative, non Tourte-model bows persisted in bow makers’ catalogues until c. 1900.\textsuperscript{103}
\end{quote}

In order to assimilate the style and tonal qualities of original instruments it is essential for the violinist to not apply too much pressure with the bow, to seek a lighter sound in general, and to take special care when playing toward the frog in order to avoid producing a loud or broad sound. Schubert’s scores are characteristically full of \textit{pp} and \textit{ppp} markings. He fully explores the soft dynamic plane, as well as sharp contrasts and a

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}  
\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
complete palette of accents, articulations, and Sforzatos. Certain instruments of the period—such as the Graf fortepiano—\(^{104}\)—which Schubert knew, had pedals, which enable the player to produce these extreme, soft dynamics.

There were different piano models available at that time. Pianos could have three to five pedals (the damper pedal, soft pedal, bassoon stop, piano and pianissimo moderators, and janissary stop.) The five and one-half to six and one-half octave pianoforte\(^ {105}\) has a full middle register and weaker outer registers, unlike modern

\(^{104}\)“Conrad Graf: Fortepiano (2001.272),” \textit{Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History} (Mar. 2009), http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/2001.272 (accessed January 31, 2013). Conrad Graf, maker of this six-and-one-half octave piano (eighty keys), was one of the most important fortepiano makers in Vienna between 1822 and 1842. In 1824, Graf was appointed Austrian court keyboard instrument maker and in 1835 received a gold medal at the Austrian Industrial Products Exhibition. Composers such as Beethoven, Czerny, Schubert, Schumann, Kalkbrenner, Mendelssohn, Chopin, Liszt, and Brahms, as well as the empress of Russia, the queen of Saxony, and the archduke and archduchess of Austria, owned Graf pianos.

\(^{105}\)An anonymous memory about a pianoforte Schubert used formerly in possession of W.A. Rieder (1897) (Otto Erich Deutsch, \textit{Schubert: Memoirs by His Friends} (New York: Macmillan, 1958): Anonymous, pg. 221-222). It was only in the last years of his life that Franz Schubert succeeded in having a piano he could call his own, and this is at present in the Museum of the City of Vienna. Previously he had been forced to call on friends if he wished to hear the inspirations of his muse for himself. Best of all he liked to go to W.A. Rieder the painter, and later keeper of the Belvedere Gallery, who also did the water-colour portrait of Schubert, of May 1825, which is now to be seen at the [Schubert] Exhibition. Rieder had early recognized Schubert’s talent and readily offered him the opportunity of playing on his piano. Schubert made use of this offer and, indeed, soon did so to an extent which became inconvenient to his host. He therefore agreed with Schubert on a sign which would indicate to him when he was welcome and when he was not. Rieder was living, at that time, in the Gluck house in the Wieden suburb and his windows overlooked the street. If, at a certain window, the curtains were drawn back, this meant that Schubert could come up; if they were drawn to, it indicated that the master of the house wished to be quiet. Schubert could now very often be seen as he made his way there with hurried steps, pushed up his spectacles up on to his forehead and looked at the window, on which so much depended; his face lit up with joy if he saw the favourable sign; he went sadly away if it denied him entrance to Rieder’s apartment. This piano, used by Schubert for many of his compositions, was made by the Vienna firm of Anton Walter & Son, who were famous at the beginning of this century, and, until a short time ago, was in the possession of the Rieder family. This piano has passed from the hands of Rieder’s aged widow, who lives in Vienna, into the possession of the firm of L. Bösendorfer, well known for their endeavours in the cause of art.

(Published in the “Neue Freie Presse,” Vienna, 16 February 1897. At that time the City of Vienna had arranged a Schubert Exhibition in the \textit{Künstlerhaus}, on the occasion of the centenary of his birth. The pianoforte, a \textit{Tafelklavier}, made between 1820 and 1825, is now in the Collection of old Musical Instruments, a department of the \textit{Kunsthistorisches Museum}, Vienna. It can be seen in the portrait in oils which Wilhelm August Rieder painted of Schubert in 1875 (Schubert Museum of the City of Vienna). The house in which Gluck died is still standing in the Wiedner Hauptstrasse. Anton Walter, of Vienna, was one of the most famous pianoforte makers; Mozart’s \textit{Hammerklavier}, in the Salzburg Mozart Museum, was made by him about 1780; at the beginning of the 19th century the firm was styled Anton Walter und Sohn. For the transfer of the pianoforte to the firm of Ludwig Bösendorfer, cf. the “Neue Musikalische Presse”,}
instruments. In order to produce a more authentic Schubertian sound on modern instruments, pianists should avoid emphasizing strong dynamics in the outer registers. An example in these pieces where a pianist might choose to take this approach can be seen in the Fantasy in measures 19 and 20 (See Example 1).


It remains challenging for the pianist to decide how to treat the crescendo into high notes, such as in measure 424, in order to respect Schubert’s dynamic indications and, at the same time, to achieve a similar sonority to that of the historical instruments (See Example 2).


Vienna, 21 February 1897. Three documents of 1897, between Rieder’s widow and Bösendorfer’s, referring to the exchange of the old pianoforte for a modern one, are in the above-named Collection.)
Also, it remains a question of interpretation if the violin should emulate this aspect of interpretation and play with delicacy when approaching the very high notes of passages in order to match the piano. An example of this type of problem can be found in the Fantasy at measure 457 (See Example 3).


Pedals

In Schubert’s time, the pedals were used strictly for special effects. The damper pedal was not used as a standard resource for achieving legato passages or for facilitating technical execution. The pianoforte in Schubert’s time had a different type of mechanism for raising the dampers, which was used for achieving a certain character, especially in slow movements, and was sometimes indicated by the term *cantabile*. The *una corda* or *Verschiebung* pedal helped the pianist both produce a softer sound and achieve a specific, different tone quality. While Schubert did not own a modern pianoforte himself and even played many instruments without any pedals, he knew these pedal resources. Many times he notated their use for specific effects. Sometimes he used a pedal indication to add a certain emphasis to specific words in a *Lied*. 
Schubert wrote very few pedal indications in the pieces discussed in this essay. For example, beginning with the upbeat to measure 272 of the last movement of the A Major Sonata (See Example 4), after having recently used A minor, the movement concludes with six A Major arpeggios followed by A Major chords.


Here, one of the scarce fortissimo markings appears, as well as the only con pedale marking in this piece. These markings can be regarded as adding a bigger and more sublime dimension to the finale.

The only other con pedale marking that appears in these pieces is found in the Andantino of the Fantasy at measure 352, in the self-quotiation of his song Sei mir Gegrüßt (I Greet You) (See Example 5). It is evident that Schubert uses this marking seldom and only at very special moments.

In the mentioned Andantino from the Fantasy, it seems likely that the con pedale indication is informed by and applies to the syncopations in the left hand, making it more like a Lieder ohne Woerter (Song Without Words) with his own melody of Sei mir Gegrüßt.

In the last movement of the Sonata, on the upbeat to measure 142 Schubert wrote con sordini (with mutes) for a section of the development written in pianissimo with a rather quick harmonic movement. This could indicate Schubert’s desire for an added color to the already pp dynamic, but we also must realize that he has inferred that the pianist should play the rest of the movement senza sordini (with no mutes) (See Example 6).

Sandra Rosenblum, in her book *Performance Practice in Classic Piano Music*, explains that after the Ped. and “crossed” O signs had become broadly accepted symbols for engaging the damper pedal, a few composers occasionally used the words *con sordini*, which meant to engage either the lute pedal or the moderator pedal. The lute pedal created a pizzicato-type sound, and the moderator pedal used a layer of soft cloth or leather interposed between the hammers and strings to create a muted quality.

In “Der Tod und das Mädelchen” (Death and the Maiden), and for the *Andante* of the Sonata in A minor, D. 784, Schubert wrote *sempre con pedale e sordino*, which clearly indicates that, at least in those pieces, he did not mean the damper pedal (which sustains the sound) with the *sordini* marking. There is still an ongoing discussion among musicologists about whether he meant the lute pedal or moderator pedal in those cases.

---

Slurs

In these late pieces, Schubert wrote very few long slurs. Sometimes the slurs are on the border of what is possible to play with one bow on the violin. A fine example of this can be found in the Rondo at measures 402 to 411 (See Example 7), in the Sonata in A Major, in the first movement at measure 20 (See Example 8), in the beginning of the Fantasy (See Example 9) and at measure 473 (See Example 10).


In the piano part, Schubert utilizes a similar treatment, generally avoiding slurs that would not be possible to play in one bow, with the piano somewhat imitating the slurs found in the violin part. Exceptions to this practice can be found in the beginning of the first movement of the A Major Sonata (See Example 11), which is rather lengthy, and in the third movement of the same piece, where the piano slur is twice as long as the similar spot for violin when the instruments switch their musical roles (See Example 12).
The few times that the violin part indicates slurs that are too long to be executed properly, they could be interpreted as expressive slurs indicating the phrase, but on occasion they can also suggest the intention of a faster tempo. Sandra Rosenblum, citing Czerny’s description from 1839,\(^{107}\) states that in works by Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert the performer can decide, when faced with successive measure-length slurs, where to join those slurs to create a longer line and where to place a breath between phrases. In the pieces for violin and piano discussed here, this does not seem to apply, as Schubert often wrote slurs per measure, per two measures and even longer, giving the impression that his slurs really do represent his musical thinking, and that successive

measure-length slurs should receive a detached articulation between them. Leopold Mozart, as well as Brahms, maintained that notes under a slur are to be played with a diminuendo, gently tapering.

**Rhythm and Value Meanings**

**Assimilation and Regrouping**

There is debate among scholars about whether or not it is acceptable to reinterpret or regroup Schubert’s literally notated rhythms to produce a result that is either easier to play or is musically more coherent for a specific interpreter. After studying numerous sources, it seems very difficult to find decisive arguments or evidence in favor of reinterpreting the literal notations in Schubert’s music.

For the pianist, playing exactly the notated rhythm in measure 25 of the Rondo (32\textsuperscript{nd} notes against sextuplet 16\textsuperscript{th} notes) is very complicated (if possible at all), and most of the recorded performances do some kind of regrouping or rhythmic alteration (See Example 13).

Also, during the *Andante* (for example in measure 13), some performers assimilate the sixteenths in the violin part to the sextuplets of the piano (See Example 14).

**Example 14. Rondo in B minor, Op. 70, D. 895, mm. 12-14.**

In the Rondo (measure 12), the 16\textsuperscript{th} note sextuplets against 16\textsuperscript{th} notes between the piano writing for the right hand and the violin can be played exactly as written without need of assimilation, but some performers actually simplify the rhythmic complexity by matching the parts (See Example 15).

**Example 15. Rondo in B minor, Op. 70, D. 895, mm. 12-14.**

Another example of 2 against 3 is found in the Fantasy, at measure 420, and occurs between two voices in the piano part (See Example 16).

Already Quantz, in his treatise, had stated that sixteenths against 16\textsuperscript{th} note sextuplets could be played properly. Montgomery explains that according to Hummel’s *Ausfuehrliche theoretische-praktische Anweisung zum Pianofortespiel* (A Complete Theoretical and Practical Course on the Art of Pianoforte Playing) (1826), assimilation is allowed for technical reasons only to make the coordination possible for the performer. He also reminds us that Czerny also allowed assimilation in his *Wiener Clavierlehrer* (Viennese piano-teacher) (1825).\textsuperscript{108}

In the pieces discussed in this essay, it is possible, in most cases, to play the literal notated rhythms though, and it is my opinion that in these pieces, keeping Schubert’s exact rhythmic values not only honors the composer’s intentions, but also helps to distinguish the different voices.

**Dotting vs. Overdotting**

While overdotting is documented in the German gallant style and Classical period solo playing, there is no evidence that this applies to Schubert’s music. Schubert knew how to write double dots and his writing shows that he deliberately discerned the notation

---

of single dots and double dots. Compare, for example, measure 6 of the Rondo to measure 12 of the same piece (See Example 17 and Example 18).

Example 17. Rondo in B minor, Op. 70, D. 895, mm. 4-7.

![Example 17](image1)


![Example 18](image2)

Also in the Fantasy, measure 9 vs. measure 22 can be seen as an example of a similar type of gesture in which Schubert wrote precisely what he intended (See Example 19 and Example 20).


**Fermata**

We cannot know how Schubert conceived the length of his fermatas, thus, it is left to the performer to decide. There are very few sources on this subject besides August Swoboda, who does speak about it.\(^{109}\) Both in the Scherzo of the Sonata and in the Fantasy, Schubert often uses the fermata to connect different sections of each piece. In the Scherzo of the Sonata, a Grand pause occurs at measure 56 and at measure 134 (at the end of the trio) both creating an aspect of suspense at structural gaps in the movement (See Example 21).


In the Fantasy, a fermata connects the Andantino at measure 351 to the Tempo primo, leaving the listener uncertain of what is coming (See Example 22).

Earlier in the same piece, a fermata is also used to delineate the first *Andante* with the *Allegretto* (See Example 23).


In the last two examples the fermata appears on a *pianissimo* marking, giving the impression that the music disappears into the fermata. In measure 63 the fermata appears as a *subito* pause after a *crescendo* and is followed by a *piano* dynamic (See Example 24).
In all these cases, these structural gaps and musical surprises create a very different effect, in my opinion, from what we know of Haydn, who introduced them. In Haydn’s music, they often sound like jokes, surprises, and structural gaps. In these pieces of Schubert, they are functional and connect natural structural sections of the pieces and, in my opinion, leave the listener in a state of suspense as to what is coming next.

**Tuning**

In Schubert’s music, with all its harmonic changes and enharmonic modulations, equal temperament of the piano is necessary and historically correct. It creates a problem, however, which is not particular only to the interpretations of Schubert’s music for violinists, as they must tune their instruments in perfect non-beating fifths, which results
in the open strings of the violin not being perfectly in tune with the piano. Also, violinists today tend to play leading tones melodically, to give the line more expressivity, but this causes some vertical intonation inconsistencies.

James Nicholas, in his article “Reflections on Schubert's String Quintet,”\(^{110}\) says that Schubert received his training in string playing at a time when the Classical principle of playing low sharps and high flats was still valid, and mentions a recording of Joseph Joachim [1831-1907] which demonstrates that he, too, belonged to this school. According to this practice, a C#/ is played lower by one comma (one-ninth of a whole step) than a D♭. This is directly contrary to today's practice of exaggerating the direction of leading tones. To imitate this aspect of intonation would require a very difficult adjustment for a modern violinist.

Repeats

There is no historical evidence that implies that any of the repeat signs in Schubert’s music should not be performed. In the A Major Sonata, the exposition is repeated in both the first and last movements, which is structurally balanced within the standard sonata form structure of the time. While the development is not very long in either movement, there is no repeat at the end, as is seen in earlier treatments of sonata form by Viennese composers. In Scherzo and Trio movements, all the repeats should be played. In her book *Performance Practice in Classic Piano Music*\(^{111}\), Sandra Rosenblum explains:


Recent research by Max Rudolph indicates that the omission of the repeats within the *da capo* of a Classic minuet or scherzo lacks any foundation in sources of the period and up to 1850. Rather, the few relevant comments found suggest that it was the general custom to include the internal repeats the second time around unless otherwise specified. Johann Mattheson confirmed the custom in 1739. Türk added an explicit direction in the second edition of his Klavierschule:

A sort of repeat sign is also the *Da Capo*… After the Trio of a Minuet we usually find the words *Minuetto da Capo*, abbreviated, *Min. D. C.*… This indicates that the Minuet is to be played from the beginning, that is with the prescribed repeats, consequently like the first time, unless *ma senza replica* (but without repeats) is explicitly added.

Koch, Hummel, and Czerny all supported this view. Composers made selective use of *senza replica* or similar instructions when they wished to avert an unwanted repetition. And again we see evidence of this from Beethoven’s early years. In his Piano Trio Op. 1/1, the end of the Trio bears the marking “Scherzo d.C. Senza repetizione e poi la Coda.”

In the Fantasy’s *Andantino*, a theme and variations, it would change the piece’s structure to ignore any of the repeats. The A theme is written out the first time, as the piano and then the violin play the theme. The second part of this rounded binary form has a different second ending in the first variation (See Example 25).


---

The use of this “second ending” device introduced earlier by Haydn, emphasizes the necessity of repeating that section as well. Consistency with the repeats through the theme and variations is necessary to maintain coherence in the structure of the theme and variations form. It is my opinion that all repeats written by Schubert should be performed.

Selection of the Performance Edition

Henle\textsuperscript{113} and Bärenreiter\textsuperscript{114} offer the most accurate urtext editions of the pieces investigated in this project. Bärenreiter’s\textsuperscript{115} changes of \textit{diminuendos} to accents seem somewhat arbitrary and deviate from the autographs. For example, in the beginning of the Fantasy, Bärenreiter\textsuperscript{116} changes the \textit{crescendo-diminuendo} wedges to \textit{crescendo} plus an accent (See Example 26). The webpage http://www.schubert-online.at/\textsuperscript{117} includes several Schubert autographs, giving us the privilege of examining the complete working manuscript of the Fantasy. This autograph shows clearly that Schubert’s marking in measure 2 and 3 was \textit{crescendo-diminuendo} (See Example 27). Henle\textsuperscript{118} is accurate in showing this marking (See Example 28).

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid.
Example 26. Fantasy in C Major, Op. posth. 159, D. 934, mm. 1-9. (Bärenreiter)\textsuperscript{119}

Example 27. Fantasy in C Major, Op. posth. 159, D. 934, mm. 1-4. (Autograph)\textsuperscript{120}

Example 28. Fantasy in C Major, Op. posth. 159, D. 934, mm. 1-3. (Henle)\textsuperscript{121}


\textsuperscript{121} Franz Schubert, Duos for piano and violin, ed. Ernst Herttrich (Muenchen: Henle Verlag, 1976).
Schubert’s notation in general is very precise and very detailed. Informed decisions are best made by studying the autographs directly and avoiding premature assumptions. Michael Griffel, in his article, “A Reappraisal of Schubert's Methods of Composition” writes:

The fact that Schubert appears to have composed with greater speed and ease than Beethoven has led some to view Schubert as a young genius with an intuitive approach rather than as a serious laborer. Continued scrutiny of his autographs will surely obliterate the old notion that Schubert created his compositions spontaneously and through sheer inspiration rather than by perseverance and hard work.\(^{122}\)

It is important to know how thoughtful the process of his compositions was in order to understand to what extent we should respect the text.

**Tempo**

It is difficult to be certain of the meaning of Schubert’s tempo indications. Metronome markings found on some of Schubert’s vocal works make it seem probable that Schubert used a similar method for indicating a tempo to Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven. Clive Brown indicates that it seems probable that Schubert, like Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, indicated the tempo with a coherent system of relationships between the tempo term, the meter and note values.\(^{123}\)

While Schubert did not include metronome markings in any of his instrumental works, some conclusions can be drawn from the contemporary metronome markings found in some of his *Lieder* and in the opera *Alfonso und Estrella*. Those markings are

---


likely to have derived from Schubert’s directions, as he was directly involved in the publication process. Clive Brown describes, in “Schubert’s Tempo Conventions,” results of studies of the relationship between Italian tempo terms and metronome markings in *Alfonso und Estrella*, which indicate some distinctive tendencies; some of them differ from the ones we know from other composers. While those tempo indications are not in Schubert’s handwriting, there is enough evidence that those markings derive from Schubert’s direct intentions:

The songs opp. 1-7, engraved by Cappi and Diabelli in 1821, where the metronome marks appear in the first edition, although missing from the autograph, were printed by private subscription through the efforts of Leopold von Sonnleithner and others of Schubert’s friends, and Schubert was directly involved in the process of publication. The metronome marks for the *Deutsche Messe* (unpublished until 1870), for which Philipp Neumann had provided the text, were, according to an entry in his son’s diary, written into the score by his father ‘as they were given to him by the composer when he once visited him and played the movements of the mass to him one after the other’. With regard to the metronome marks for *Alfonso und Estrella*, it has been shown that those in the autograph manuscript are mostly, if not all, in the handwriting of Joseph Hüttenbrenner, who during the years 1821-3 conducted much of the correspondence over *Alfonso und Estrella* for Schubert, dealt with publishers on his behalf and occasionally made copies of his manuscripts for the engravers.

It seems probable that, as in the case of Beethoven and his nephew working out metronome marks for the Ninth Symphony, or the situation described by Neumann in the case of the *Deutsche Messe*, the composer played the work through on the piano while his companion operated the metronome and wrote the numbers and instructions into the score. Schubert’s brother Ferdinand later included the metronome marks for the whole opera in his copy of the autograph, and those for the overture are also found in the composer’s autograph of a piano duet version. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the metronome marks derive from Schubert, and that they probably represent his own performance of the opera at the keyboard on a particular occasion.  

---

125 Ibid., 3.
The following guidelines represent a synthesis of possible interpretations of tempo indications according to the results of the study of the metronome markings in different pieces of Schubert, and appear in the order that these *tempi* appear in the pieces of this study. *Allegro moderato* (Sonata D. 574, Movement I) should be slower than *allegro*, probably similar to *allegro ma non troppo*. Sonata D. 574, Movement 2 is a Scherzo and Trio. Schubert’s inclusion of different tempo markings for the Scherzo and the trio in other pieces could be an indication for the performers that he intended to maintain the same tempo in the cases where he did not specify otherwise. The *andantino* markings possibly indicate a faster tempo than *andante*, as Schubert sometimes writes “*andantino quasi allegretto,*” giving a hint that these two tempi are similar to one another.

Clive Brown suggests, in “Schubert’s Tempo Conventions,”126 that Schubert “…regarded *andantino* as coming between *andante* and *allegretto.*” And that “In 3/4 the *andantino* may also border on *allegretto*…”127 It is possible then than the Sonata D. 574, Movement III as well as part III of the Fantasy (both an *Andante* in ¾) should be played rather fast. *Allegro vivace* (like the one in Sonata D. 574, Movement IV, and the Fantasy in C (part V)), as usual, indicates a faster tempo than *allegro*.

The Rondo in B minor begins with an *Andante*. Schubert’s meaning of *Andante* could have been “… in general, somewhat more measured than that of many of his older contemporaries, who, in agreement with C. D. F. Schubart, seem to have considered *andante* as a tempo that ‘kisses the borderline of Allegro.’”128 The rondo section of the

---

127 Ibid., 12.
128 Ibid., 10.
Rondo in B minor is an *allegro*. There are signs indicating that many *allegro* movements, according to Schubert’s choice and the practice of that time in Vienna, were performed faster than what is common in today’s performances. Besides Beethoven’s markings there are also some metronome markings in music of Rossini and Spontini that indicate faster tempi. Hummel and Czerny markings added to music by Mozart also exhibit that tendency. Some of these bright tempi may have been played adequately only by the best players of that time:

Franz Schubert was eight years old when Friedrich Guthmann published the first of his ‘Expectorations on Modern Music’ in the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, with the subtitle ‘On the all-too-great rapidity of allegro, and on tearing, excessive hurry in general’. Guthmann contrasted the spacious tempi adopted by Rode and other members of the Viotti school of string players in their own repertoire, with the fast *allegro* tempi that he generally heard in concerts and operas, which he considered to be so fast ‘that the notes resemble the utterances of a dreamer and the ear is unable to follow them’; and he asked ‘where will this end?—Only the most practised and greatest players are in a position to perform a moderately difficult piece with the necessary precision and the requisite expression, if it is taken so immoderately fast.’ Among the types of pieces in which he identified the worst excesses were ‘the so-called Minuets of symphonies and the allegro of overtures’.  

One should keep in mind that when a tempo occurs in *alla breve*, such as the *Allegro* of the Rondo, it usually is meant to be played faster than if it were written in 4/4. It seems possible, that Schubert, unlike Mozart and Beethoven, used the *andante molto* indication (initial tempo of the Fantasy in C) to indicate a slower tempo than *andante*. *Allegretto* (as in the Fantasy in C, parts II and VI) is usually considered to be faster than *andante* and slower than *allegro*. The *Allegro vivace* in part V of the Fantasy probably is meant to be even faster as it is *alla breve*. The last section of the Fantasy, a *Presto* also in

cut time, should probably be played as fast as is possible by the performers. Once again, one must remember that it is difficult to be absolutely certain about exact tempi and that each of these tempo indications should be interpreted within the context of the music.

**Tempo Rubato and Other Types of Tempo Fluctuation**

Starke, in his *Wiener Piano-Forte-Schule*, speaks against freedom within meter in general and maintains that great interpreters maintain strict tempo even in the longest voluntary additions. David Montgomery\(^\text{130}\) thinks that Schubert wrote sufficiently expressive devices for his own purposes and his music doesn’t need the “assistance” of rubato from the performer. He disregards Hummel’s *tempo rubato* writings in his treatise dedicated to the brilliant style, saying that this style does not apply to the music of Schubert. Montgomery\(^\text{131}\) cites Spohr’s “On Orchestral Playing and Accompanying,” where he writes well after Hummel:

> The accompanist must be careful not to hurry or retard the Solo-player, though he must instantly follow the latter, whenever he slightly deviates from the time. This, however, does not apply to the tempo rubato of the Soloist, during which, the accompaniment must continue its steady, measured course.

Montgomery is of the opinion that this does not apply to Schubert, as it is meant for solo virtuoso playing and not for true chamber music. I am not convinced by Montgomery’s arguments and feel that Hummel’s and Spohr's writings could possibly be applied with discretion and aesthetic to Schubert’s violin pieces. Schubert’s Rondo, Opus 70, first published with the title “Rondo brilliant,” is a real chamber music piece, but it

---


\(^{131}\) Ibid.
has virtuosic elements and passages in which the piano and violin alternate soloistic lines, which in my opinion allows for both *rubato* and *tempo rubato*, as described by Spohr. Schubert did know Hummel’s music and met him once in person. He used the quintet version of Hummel’s septet in D minor, Op. 74, as a model for the Trout Quintet. Schubert’s piano music, composed between 1816 and his death in 1828, does reveal influences of Hummel’s brilliant virtuosic style of piano writing. Schubert indeed had intended to dedicate the piano sonatas (D. 958-60) to Hummel.

It should be mentioned that there is a fine line between what each performer interprets as the natural shaping of phrases, breathing and turning a phrase, which Montgomery approves of, and what is a slight *rubato*. Both tendencies, the one of freedom with dramatic fluctuations in tempo, and an opposing tendency of keeping a rather strict tempo and respecting the indications of the composer were practiced in this period.

James Nicholas, in his *Reflections on Schubert’s String Quintet*\(^\text{132}\) differentiates Schubert from Beethoven with regard to Schubert’s dislike of arbitrary alterations in tempo:

The baritone Johann Michael Vogl (1768-1840), who was not only Schubert’s close friend but the singer whom Schubert admired above all others, nevertheless recounts that during rehearsals, Schubert would frequently admonish him with: “Kein Ritardando” or “Keine Fermate” (“No ritardando” or “No fermata”). Schubert seems also to have desired very smooth, seamless transitions at meter changes. In a letter dated May 10, 1828, to the publisher Probst regarding the E-flat Piano Trio, D.929, he wrote: “See to it that really capable players are found for the first performance, and above all, where the time changes in the last section, that the rhythm is not lost.”\(^\text{133}\)


\(^{133}\) Ibid.
Johann Leopold Ebner\textsuperscript{134} states that Vogl himself preferred to have an accompanist who adapted to his own performance style and interpretation:

…Vogl, who so far as private matters were concerned was in some ways the rather unworldly Schubert’s most faithful adviser, found that Schubert himself, as accompanist, was not so satisfactory in relation to his own performance of the Schubert songs. This was because Schubert, as the creator of the song, could not be expected to adjust and mould his accompaniment exactly to the singer’s interpretation, while, on the other hand, the famous and experienced singer did not wish to compromise either.\textsuperscript{135}

One can realize that there were some musical differences between Schubert and Vogl.\textsuperscript{136} Of special interest is Schubert’s opinion. His association and friendship with Vogl does not imply that he agreed with his performance style. It rather seems that through their friendship and Vogl’s support of Schubert, Schubert might even have had to compromise more than he would have preferred in his advices and collaborations with Vogl.

Eduard von Bauernfeld (1802-1890) was a friend of Schubert and a gifted pianist himself who frequented the musical soirées at which Schubert played and J. M. Vogl sang. He relates about Vogl’s performances with Schubert:

\textsuperscript{134} Johann Leopold Ebner (1791-1870) was a pupil of Schubert at the Vienna Convictorium but he was several years older than Schubert. They became acquainted later through their mutual friend Anton Holzapfel and Albert Staedler when Schubert later visited his former school to play his new works for the current pupils.


\textsuperscript{136} This quote from Schubert’s friend, Josef von Spaun (1788-1865), is anecdotal and reflects the initial meeting between Schubert and Vogl, as Vogl was testing Schubert: “Finally Vogl said, “Let’s see what you have got there; accompany me,” and thereupon he took up the nearest sheet of music, containing Mayrhofer’s poem, “Augenlied”, a pretty, very melodious, but not important song. Vogl hummed rather than sang, and then said coldly, “Not bad”. When, after that, “Memnon”, “Ganymed”, and other songs were accompanied for him, all of which, however, he only sang mezza-voce, he became more and more friendly, though he went away without promising to come again. On leaving he clapped Schubert on the shoulders and said to him, “There is something in you but you are too little a comedian, too little of a charlatan; you squander your fine thoughts without making the best of them”. To others Vogl expressed himself considerably more favourably about Schubert…” (Otto Erich Deutsch, \textit{Schubert; Memoirs by His Friends} (New York: Macmillan, 1958), pg. 132).
Small alterations and embellishments, which the skilful singer, a past master of effect, allowed himself, received the composer’s consent to some extent, but not infrequently they also gave rise to friendly controversy.\(^{137}\)

Another account is given by Karl Enderes (1787-1861), who was introduced to Schubert by Josef von Spaun. He was present in Schubert’s circle and hosted several Schubertiads.

Some people have criticized Vogl for the somewhat foppish play he made with his lorgnette and for his somewhat theatrical manner of performance; but the former could not damage the splendid performance and the latter heightened the effect in a great many songs. It is hinted that Vogl exerted an influence over Schubert in respect to his mode of composition; but this is quite incorrect. No one ever exercised the slightest influence on his manner of composing, though attempts may have been made here and there. At the most he made some small concessions to Vogl out of consideration for the range of his voice, but even this he did only seldom and unwillingly.\(^{138}\)

Leopold von Sonnleithner (1797-1873), a friend of Schubert, Beethoven and Czerny, who was a lawyer and a well-known personality of the Viennese classical music scene, gives us an invaluable resource with his memories and views regarding Schubert’s performance practice. Sonnleithner directed and organized musical parties for several years and heard Schubert accompanying and rehearsing his songs hundreds of times. His memories reflect Schubert’s preferences regarding tempo, which he observed to be strict, even, following the indications of the composer, and without arbitrary deviations in tempo. He also described Schubert’s performance style, which was simple, natural, unaffected, and lyrical as opposed to dramatic, too sophisticated, with exaggerated declamation or violent expression. He added that Schubert’s music should be sung flowingly with the proper vocal timbre, non-mechanically, but with feeling and sensitivity. Sonnleithner recounts:

\(^ {138}\) Ibid., 365.
For a number of years evening musical parties were held once a fortnight, on Fridays, for invited friends, at the house of my father, the Imperial Councillor Dr. Ignaz Edler von Sonnleithner (barrister and Imperial Professor), and for the arrangement and direction of these I had sole responsibility. The most distinguished amateurs and artists here took part in them and artists from outside were glad to be asked to perform. The number of listeners always amounted to 120 and more and we had difficulty in warding off the crush of people. I soon made up my mind to introduce Schubert’s songs to this circle and so I informed a number of amateur singers of this. Amongst these was Herr August Rütter von Gymnich, a state official, who, like me, quickly recognized the composer’s genius.

As regards the way in which Schubert’s songs should be performed, there are very strange opinions today amongst the great Majority of people. Most of them think they have achieved the summit if they interpret the songs in the manner they imagine to be the dramatic. According to this, there is as much declamation as possible, sometimes whispered, sometimes with passionate outbursts, with retarding of the tempo, etc.—I can only say that I am always apprehensive when it is announced at a party that Schubert’s songs are going to be sung, for even quite capable, and in their way, musically cultured ladies and gentlemen usually sin cruelly against poor Schubert. I heard him accompany and rehearse his songs more than a hundred times. Above all, he always kept the most strict and even time, except in the few cases where he had expressly indicated in writing a ritardando, morendo, accelerando etc. Furthermore he never allowed violent expression in performance. The lieder singer, as a rule, only relates experiences and feeling of others; he does not himself impersonate the characters whose feelings he describes. Poet, composer and singer must conceive the song lyrically, not dramatically. With Schubert especially, the true expression, the deepest feeling is already inherent in the melody as such, and is admirably enhanced by the accompaniment. Everything that hinders the flow of the melody and disturbs the evenly flowing accompaniment is, therefore, exactly contrary to the composer’s intention and destroys the musical effect.—Consequently singers with good voices and just a natural way of singing have frequently achieved great effect with these songs; Tietze and Götz, for example, neither of whom could lay claim to the art of singing, in its true sense, or to advanced aesthetic culture, and still less to dramatic interpretation. Michael Vogl, it is true, overstepped the permissible limits more and more as he lost his voice, but

---

nevertheless he always sang *strictly in time*; and he merely helped himself out as well as he could, in the manner of the experienced opera singer, where his voice and strength did not suffice. And Schubert would certainly not have approved his manner of performance as it developed in the last years. Vogl was born in 1768 and died on 20 November 1840, 72 years old; only a few years before his death he coquetted with his singing—for those who did not know him from his good days he was merely ridiculous at the end.—One of the best, perhaps the best Schubert singer, in his day, was *Herr Karl Freiherr von Schönstein* (to whom the *Müllerlieder* are dedicated).—This amateur of the arts was distinguished by a beautiful, noble-sounding, high-baritone voice, adequate training in singing, aesthetic and scholarly culture and sensitive, lively feeling. It was a genuine pleasure to hear these songs performed by him, accompanied by Joh. Bapt. Jenger, since dead, or the then Fräulein Irene Kiesewetter, now Baroness Prokesch. Among the women, who sang Schubert’s compositions simply and naturally, I must mention most particularly Fräulein Henriette von Spaun (niece of *Hofrat* von Spaun).—In more recent times *Stockhausen* stands preeminent as a Schubert singer. Even if he has not been able to escape the tendency of the prevailing taste, he nevertheless comes closest to that unaffectedly noble, naive conception, which Schubert himself desired.—D. Habit is also among the few who perform these songs in a way that deserves our gratitude. In his time Staudigl was also a famous and popular singer of Schubert’s melodies. He was also far superior to most of the others; but his manner of performance also was frequently too arbitrary, too “dramatic”, for him to have been able to count on the composer’s unqualified approval.  

Schubert, therefore, demanded above all that his songs should not so much be declaimed as *sung* flowingly, that the proper vocal *timbre* should be given to every note, to the complete exclusion of the unmusical speaking voice, and that by this means the *musical* idea should be displayed in its purity. A necessary corollary to this is the *strictest observation of the tempo*. Schubert always indicated exactly where he wanted or permitted a *ritardando*, and *accelerando* or any kind of freer delivery. But where he did not indicate this, he would not tolerate the slightest arbitrariness of the least deviation in tempo. Even if this were not demonstrable through the unanimous testimony of his contemporaries, no competent person could fail to recognize it from the nature of his accompanying figures. A trotting or galloping horse permits no deviation from strict time; a turning spinning-wheel can indeed stop if the spinning woman, in a moment of passion, forgets to turn it,  

---

but it is impossible for it to move fast at one moment and slowly in
the next and alternate like this from bar to bar;—a quickly beating
heart cannot suddenly stop (except from stroke) in order to let the
singer dwell on his high A at the words “Dein ist mein Herz und
wird es ewig bleiben” and give rein to his excess of sentimentality;
when the march of the crusaders is heard in the distance and the
monk joins his meditations to these sounds, he must continue to sing
absolutely strictly in time; the march does not conform to his
paroxysms of sentimental hesitation.\textsuperscript{141}

This does not mean in the very least that Schubert wanted to hear
his songs ground out merely mechanically. An accurate, purely
\textit{musical} performance in no way excludes feeling and sensitivity; but
the singer should on no account give himself airs, should not try to
be more poetic and inventive than the composer, who has clearly
indicated, by means of notes and signs, just exactly what he wants
and how he wishes it to be sung—and whose work is savaged and
destroyed in its very essence by every arbitrariness. In the case of a
composer like Schubert, the simplest but, at the same time, the most
unaffected singing, such for example as was characteristic of the
well-known singer Tietze (a natural singer with a good voice) is
greatly to be preferred to the most sophisticated, declamatory
performance.\textsuperscript{142}

These direct quotes about Schubert’s own performance preferences provide, in
my opinion, a valid argument when considering tempo fluctuations in the interpretation
of Schubert’s music. Montgomery\textsuperscript{143} sustains that historically-informed performance
must come to terms with the characteristic of Viennese instrumental music, with its
divisions in larger units of regular metrical division with no notated change in tempo.
Nevertheless, Montgomery again accepts that a regular tempo can still allow natural
musical tendencies and tools such as: accentuations, agogics, surprise attacks, slightly
pushed \textit{crescendos}, slightly pulled \textit{decrescendos}, ornaments which cannot be played
strictly in the meter, physical breathing, and so on.

\textsuperscript{141} Otto Erich Deutsch, \textit{Schubert; Memoirs by His Friends} (New York: Macmillan, 1958), 337.
\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., 338.
\textsuperscript{143} David Montgomery, \textit{Franz Schubert’s Music in Performance} (Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2010),
238.
He also states that a healthy classical interpretation can include structural delineation (turning phrase or corner) and some sort of *tempo rubato*, noting that if any of these devices is exaggerated, the impression of classical regularity can be disturbed.\(^{144}\) Montgomery criticizes voluntary tempo changes for contrasting affective regions, as he feels that Schubert indicated very clearly when he wanted a tempo change (for example when a trio should be slightly slower than the Scherzo). In addition, Schubert often suggested other clearly stipulated devices to achieve a change in character and he certainly would have notated a tempo change if that was what he wanted. Beethoven and Schubert shared the intention of defining more exactly their tempo wishes. In 1813, the metronome was supported by Beethoven and by Salieri (Schubert’s teacher), who subsequently began to include metronome markings in his own compositions, as well as past compositions of Gluck and Haydn.

**Vibrato**

Montgomery offers us several quotes about the “shaking” (vibrato) in the Eighteenth Century.\(^{145}\) In the early Eighteenth Century, Roger North was ambivalent about the overuse of shaking, however, Francesco Geminiani (1751) was positive and said, “it may be made on any Note whatsoever.” J. Sadler (1754) wrote, “it may be made on any Note that is long enough to allow it,” and according to Robert Bremmer, “Many gentlemen players on bow instruments are so exceedingly fond of the tremolo, that they apply it wherever they possibly can.”

\(^{145}\) Ibid., 129.
Another citation about this topic that Montgomery mentions\textsuperscript{146} is from Leopold Mozart’s writings about the \textit{Bebung}: “to the ondulating motion [rocking back and forth on the string, support compression and pitch variation in vocal production] one must impart a strong pressure –accent \textit{[mit einem straken Nachdruck]} with the finger, the beginning of each quarter value and in faster motion at the beginning of each eighth value.” We know from these quotations that some kind of vibrato with variations, less uniform and probably not on every single note, was used around that time. Quite possibly, it was used more as an ornamental device and not as a standard uninterrupted addition to the sound.

\textbf{Accents}

Schubert’s notation usually indicates quite clearly what he wants. A lot has been written about his music writing being inconsistent, exhibiting omissions and inexactitudes. In the works discussed in this essay, the few inconsistencies seem to be due to Schubert’s minor omissions,\textsuperscript{147} and the choices found in Henle\textsuperscript{148} and Bärenreiter\textsuperscript{149} editions seem to be reasonable. There are very few differences between the two editions.

Schubert often uses the $[>]$ mark in his pieces. This stress mark could have different meanings depending on the musical context in which it appears. In addition to the modern interpretation of an accent, these marks can also illustrate more clearly how Schubert wanted his music to be phrased. Another function of the accent is to indicate a

\textsuperscript{146} David Montgomery, \textit{Franz Schubert’s Music in Performance} (Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2010), 130.
\textsuperscript{147} In his earlier so-called “Sonatinas” there are more omissions and inconsistencies than in the pieces of this study.
metrical pattern, to indicate metrical groupings or regroupings, which mutate throughout a lengthy structure or movement, or to give direction to a motive.

The accent can also be interpreted on occasion as indicating only one level of dynamic greater than the context in which it is written. One must remember that Schubert also wrote the signs $Fp$, $FFp$, $FFFp$ and $sf$ or $sff$ to indicate or stronger dynamic levels. This requires the performer to interpret the accent marking in the context of a highly detailed musical landscape. In piano passages, its meaning could be purely expressive. Sometimes the accent gives the impression of indicating a slight agogic accent, as can be seen in the Sonata’s *Andantino*, at measures 50 and 53 (See Example 29).


In Schubert’s manuscripts the \( [\text{>}] \) sign is easily confused with the *crescendo-diminuendo* wedges, and sometimes it is not clear if there should be a difference between them. Montgomery includes a citation of Roger Fiske, who writes that, “When Schubert’s
muse was in full flow such accents get bigger and bigger until they become indistinguishable from his diminuendo symbols.”

Elizabeth Norman writes in *The Interpretation of Schubert’s decrescendo Markings and Accents*:

First, until about 1819 he was careless in his use of this marking in his full scores, while he shows himself to have been more careful in the few copies of the instrumental *parts* which he made and are extant. Thus, his score of the string Quartet in D of April, 1814 (D. 94) contains many signs which could equally well be read as accents or *diminuendo*; in his copies of the instrumental parts the sign appears almost without exception as an accent.

By 1820 Schubert had adopted this very much smaller sign to indicate almost all accents, leaving no doubt as to how they should be interpreted.

Secondly, we find that, especially in the earlier period, Schubert usually restricted the small > marking to piano sections in the music, reserving the sF or Fz marking for loud passages.

Thirdly, Schubert sometimes used a > marking in combination with a FP of Fz: thus we find FP > or Fz >.

Schubert seems to have intended on *leaning*-accent, a warm pressure on a note, a quick *diminuendo* on a note of slightly greater volume than the norm. If the note is of short duration, the accent will almost always be a gentle one, and only very seldom sharp or hard.

He was probably influenced in this by his special affection for the piano, whose tone must necessarily fade on a sustained note. This fading of tone after a cadential climax is unexpected and unusual, and occurs with such frequency in Schubert’s music that it may well be called a characteristic of the composer’s style.

---

152 Ibid., 109.
153 Ibid., 110.
154 Ibid., 111.
In this writer’s opinion, it is not possible to standardize the interpretation of these signs and one must approach them interpretively on a case-by-case basis, considering their musical context.

**Idealistic Writing**

Oftentimes Schubert’s writing for the piano seems not pianistic, but rather inspired by the ideal of the string ensemble. The first and the third movement of the A Major Sonata begin similarly to the first two movements of the Rosamunde Quartet in A minor and could be thought of as writing for strings, considering the movement of the voices and especially the music’s horizontal legato character that is more inherent to the use of the bow in string instruments.

In Viennese music slurs rarely appear which are longer than what it is possible to play on a single stroke of the bow, and Schubert applied this concept not only to his string writing but also to the piano. Sandra Rosenbaum cites what Schubert wrote to his parents in 1825, after giving a concert:

> What pleased especially were the variations in my new Sonata for two hands,-- since several people assured me that the keys become singing voices under my hands, which, if true, pleases me greatly, since I cannot endure to accursed chopping in which distinguished pianoforte players indulge and which delights neither the ear nor the mind.¹⁵⁵

Schubert, as a lyrical composer and a linear thinker, sometimes notated musical gestures that are not necessarily pianistic, such as *Fp* or *cresc*. on one single note, which reminds

---

one of his thinking for string ensemble. In measure 72 of the Sonata’s *Andantino*, the piano has a *Forte diminuendo* on a single note (See Example 30).


In the same Sonata’s first movement at measures 97 and 98, he wrote on one note *Fz* and in the next measure for the same figure he wrote *Fz diminuendo* for the piano (See Example 31).


In measure 74 of that same movement, on a whole note again Schubert wrote *Fp diminuendo* for the piano (See Example 32).
Example 32. Duo Sonata in A Major, Op. posth. 162, D. 574, Mvt. 1, mm. 72-76.

All these gestures are common and normal to execute for strings. It is probable that Schubert was thinking in an idealistic way more than in a pianistic one. Also, when he wrote these dynamics and accentuations it seems plausible that he was thinking of imitating a string quartet, for example when the length of phrases imitates the bow stroke capacity, and when he wrote distinct four part-textures. It is my opinion that in these pieces it can be very helpful for the pianist to try to imitate the articulations as a string player would play them.

**Dots and Strokes**

Dots, strokes and combinations of these with slurs are still executed as stated by Quantz. Different treatises, by J.B. Cramer, *Praktische Pianoforte-Schule* (Practical Piano School) (ca.1819), Friedrich Starke, *Wiener Piano-Forte Schule* (Vienna Pianoforte School) (1819-1821), Ernest Kraemer’s *Czakan-Schule* (Czakan School) (1821) and August Swoboda’s *Allgemeine Theorie* (General Theory) (1821), all mentioned by Montgomery\textsuperscript{156}, agree on this topic:

Dots: beginning and end of note can be heard particularly clearly and separated.

Strokes: played particularly short

Slurs over strokes: separate the notes but in a single bow stroke on the violin or a single swing of the hand in the desired direction on the piano.

The rule of the past that upbeats require an up-bow and downbeats a down-bow is not applicable to Schubert’s music. The rhetoric has grown more complex, and while the classical phrase and periodic structure in Schubert’s music is classical, his phrases have a more horizontal quality and the articulations retain some classical qualities that can allow for longer, horizontal and lyrical lines.

**Trills**

Montgomery considers Hummel’s treatise, written in 1826 and published in 1828, to be the first treatise documenting trills beginning on the principal note. We can assume this practice was in vogue before the treatise was written. In music of Antonio Salieri, Schubert’s teacher, we already see trills beginning on the principal note. We can assume that all trills without noted auxiliary notes are to be started on the principal note. Another reason for this interpretation is that Schubert often did write auxiliary notes preceding a trill.

---

Some performers on the recordings reviewed for this project did interpret the trill of the Sonata’s *Andantino*, measures 9 to 11, as starting on the upper note and with *Nachschlag* (grace notes following the main note) (See Example 33).


Schubert, however, elsewhere in the same movement, did write the *Nachschlag* when he wanted it, as can be seen in measure 74 (See Example 34).

Example 34. Duo Sonata in A Major, Op. posth. 162, D. 574, Mvt. 3, mm. 74-77.

In the Fantasy, at measure 462, the two 64th notes following the trill seem to be a written out *Nachschlag* (See Example 35).

In the Rondo, at measure 14 for example, he wrote an *appoggiatura*, which is similar in effect to starting the trill on the upper auxiliary note (See Example 36).


*Appoggiaturas*

According to the treatises, long *appoggiaturas* should be played for half of the value of the principal note. These *appoggiaturas* are also called half-replacing or melismatic notes. Montgomery\textsuperscript{158} maintains that the so called “full replacing” *appoggiaturas* (those *appoggiaturas* that take the full value of the principal note) no longer apply in this period, and in consequence, to these pieces.

Generally speaking, short *appoggiaturas* can be played short and on the beat or before the beat and without stress. The *appoggiaturas* not only give a rhythmic indication, but also can mean a stress and an agogic indication. Schubert did not notate a difference to indicate how long he intended each *appoggiatura* to be. It is my opinion that *appoggiaturas* should be approached based on the musical context in which they appear. The following examples illustrate my opinion about different cases.

In the first movement of the Sonata at measure 10, the players should retard the arrival of the G, giving more lyricism to the preceding A. In the next measure, the long *appoggiatura* should be played on the beat, almost longer than one quarter note and be more thoroughly sung than if the composer would have written a quarter note (See Example 37).


In measure 12, the short *appoggiaturas* are played on the beat, also lyrically and without *diminuendo* during the *appoggiatura*, almost as if the flow of the rhythm stops for an instant (See Example 38).

At measure 55, the *appoggiatura* appears as a sixteenth note on same pitch as the preceding note. Play it before the beat, taking a bit of time to get into the next note (See Example 39).


In measure 20 of the same movement, play the *appoggiatura* on the beat, but stress the next note (See Example 40).

The Bärenreiter\textsuperscript{159} Edition adds precisely notated realizations of \textit{appoggiaturas} and adds ornaments that the editors consider necessary as well (See Example 41). It is possibly better to leave this kind of decision-making to the performer. I think there is danger in standardizing a performance practice that is, after all, the particular opinion of one editor.

Example 41. Duo Sonata in A Major, Op. posth. 162, D. 574, Mvt. 1, mm. 7-13. (Bärenreiter)

In the Fantasy, at measure 523, play the two-note \textit{appoggiatura} before the beat to achieve the emphasis of the \textit{FFz} marked on the principle note together with the strong part of the downbeat (See Example 42).


Ornamentation

In the article “Modern Schubert Interpretation in the Light of the Pedagogical Sources of His Day,”¹ David Montgomery exposes the indications of several treatises with regard to the issue of possible ornamentation freedom that may have been left for the performer to decide. According to Montgomery, the performer should not add voluntary ornamentation or improvisation and none of the reviewed performances for this study add ornamentation.

Friedrich Starke’s *Wiener Piano-Forte-Schule*, published in 1819 and probably written in 1818, mentions some embellishments that the interpreter has the freedom to add. He refers especially to singers and mentions pieces by Bach, Haydn and Mozart. These voluntary embellishments (many turns, scales and the like) should be applied properly, based on the instinct of the interpreter. Starke mentions, however, that the greatest composers wrote their compositions so carefully that the performer has very few opportunities with regard to voluntary ornamentation. He mentions some freedom in the area of fermatas and cadences, where the interpreter can make these types of additions, but again, always suiting the character of the music and remaining faithful to the harmony.

Czerny’s *Der Wiener Clavierlehrer* (Viennese piano-teacher) from 1825, and his later Vollstaendige theoretisch-praktische Pianoforte-Schule (A Complete Theoretical and Practical Course on the Art of Pianoforte Playing) from 1839, do not support voluntary ornamentation. Montgomery mentions that while Swoboda’s *Allgemeine Theorie der Tonkunst* (General Theory of Music) from 1826 mentions *Manieren*

---

¹ David Montgomery, "Modern Schubert Interpretation in the Light of the Pedagogical Sources of His Day," *Early Music* 25, no. 1 (Feb, 1997; 1997).
(ornaments) that are added to individual notes, it states that these are either indicated by smaller notes or particular signs. He does mention certain freedom for the performer to add some simple *manieren*, which suit the style, especially in slow movements.

Regarding other aspects of interpretation, such as trills, Swoboda tends to describe older practices, and it is possible that with regard to ornament additions his views may not be applicable to Schubert’s music. Montgomery also mentions Johann Nepomuk Hummel’s *Ausfuehrliche theoretische-praktische Anweisung zum Pianofortespiel* (A Complete Theoretical and Practical Course on the Art of Pianoforte Playing) from 1828, which primarily addresses his own music. It allows for ornamentation in the *adagios* and promotes the idea of slightly slowing the tempo for lyrical passages.

Schubert’s friend, Anselm Huettenbrenner, gives a direct and most valuable testimony regarding Schubert’s own performance preferences in this regard: “…on the other hand, however, Schubert would have been annoyed by the addition of embellishments which were not his own.”

In the *New Grove*, Maurice Brown describes Schubert’s subtle protest to Vogl’s alterations of his music.

Occasionally he altered them, adding flourishes and introducing wide skips in voice parts. He once embellished a new song of Schubert’s, also transposing it to suit his voice, and on presenting the copy a fortnight later was greeted by the composer with “A good song. Whose is it, then?”

---

162 In the following quote, Anselm Huettenbrenner (1784-1868) describes his relationship with Schubert (Otto Erich Deutsch, *Schubert; Memoirs by His Friends* (New York: Macmillan, 1958), 178.): I made Schubert’s acquaintance in the year 1815 at the Imperial Court Kapellmeister Salieri’s, who had already given him instruction for several years in thorough-bass and in composition. As I also became a pupil of Salieri’s, through the intervention of Count Moritz von Fries, I had the opportunity of meeting Schubert two or three times a week over a period of several years. In addition to this we visited each other very frequently, grew fond of one another, and became intimate friends and brothers.
Generations have chuckled over this anecdote, seeing only the “clairvoyant” genius (Vogl’s word) who forgets his own production when the trance is over; they have missed Schubert’s implied protest.\(^{165}\)

While it is difficult to arrive at a definitive certitude, it appears from the various sources taken into consideration here that voluntary ornamentation by the performer should be minimal; it could have been applied principally in slow movements and should be very simple, tasteful, and suiting of the context and style of the composer. However, according to personal testimonies of people who knew Schubert, it seems he probably preferred no added ornamentation.

**Memorization**

The custom of memorization began in the middle of the Nineteenth Century. Beethoven was the first performer to perform a concerto without music. Due to the historical background and to the nature of chamber music, with its associated tradition of using music for live performances, I do not consider it necessary or appropriate, according to historical practices, to memorize the music for the performance of these pieces.

---

CHAPTER 5: CD RECORDING, BOOKLET NOTES, DOCUMENTARY, REVIEWS

The idea for this study originated while preparing for a recording of Schubert pieces for violin and piano. The goal was to make informed decisions and interpretations inspired by knowledge of Schubert’s times, being aware of the historical context, historical performance practices, and the details of the form of these pieces. Examining all of these issues provided a greater understanding of notational and stylistic practice in Schubert’s time and made it possible to re-contextualize and perform his work today with enhanced understanding and authority.

This DMA project includes my own CD recording of these works with pianist Tao Lin. This recording was produced in the University of Miami’s Gusman Concert Hall. The recording engineers were Paul Griffith and Kyle Marcolini. This recording was released by Centaur Records on December 3, 2012. The recording is available through NaxosMusicLibrary or can be obtained through regular music retail venues.

This recording attempts interpretatively and musically to synthesize and be in accordance with the findings of this essay. While we took all of this research into consideration in preparing this recording, our approach was ultimately guided by our deep appreciation for this music. We recorded with modern instruments and tried to incorporate our own modern esthetical understanding of the pieces into the historical frame.

Appendix A of this study includes a part of the CD booklet notes\(^{169}\) of this recording. In these notes a summary of certain important aspects that were treated in the previous chapters of this study is presented. A number of personal interpretation decisions for the recording are also pointed out.

A documentary film about the recording process\(^{170}\) is also a part of this project. This video captures moments, reflections, and scenes from the recording session and the editing process, and it includes interviews with the artists. This documentary video is available on Youtube.\(^{171}\)

Appendices B through H include a number of professional reviews of this recording. These reviews offer external opinions about the recording and our personal interpretative and musical understandings that have evolved from the research done for this essay. The goal of this study is to share the research and provide accessible material that could help colleagues and students to develop their own well-informed interpretation of Schubert’s music for violin and piano.


Schubert’s music for violin and piano

Schubert played both violin and piano. His father taught him the basics of the violin, and his brother Ignaz gave him piano lessons. At the age of seven, Schubert began receiving lessons from Michael Holzer, the local church organist and choirmaster. Josef von Spaun, a law student and friend of Schubert’s at the Stadtkonvikt, wrote: “Schubert, scarcely twelve years old, played second violin in the students orchestra. His extraordinary interest in the masterworks performed, however, soon drew the attention of those around him to his superior talent and the little boy was soon installed as leader at the head of the orchestra.” In his initial grade reports from the Imperial and Royal Seminary he received the highest mark for violin. During that time Schubert also attended choir practice with his fellow pupils and played the organ. He also played the viola in his family’s string quartet with his father on cello and his brothers Ignaz and Ferdinand on violin. Ferdinand, who played first violin, wrote: “…it was an uncommon pleasure to play quartets with him…The youngest of them all was the most sensitive there.”

In March/April 1816, when he was 19 years old, Schubert composed his first three violin and piano pieces, which he entitled “Sonaten für’s Pianoforte mit Begleitung der Violine,” posthumously published as "Sonatinas," possibly to attract amateur players. At that point, Schubert had already been studying with Salieri twice a week for 8 years and his teacher encouraged him to apply for a position as a musical director at a teachers’ training college in Laibach, now Lublyana. Schubert was probably hoping that this job would allow him to have more time to compose and would better his income in view of a possible marriage to Therese Grob, a soprano for whom he composed several Lieder. In the end, he did not get the position and wasn’t allowed to marry Therese Grob due to a law requiring men of Schubert’s class to prove they had the financial means to support a family.

Schubert was nonetheless a very prolific composer around that time. By 1817 he had already written five symphonies, over 300 solo songs, several dozen partsongs, four Singspiele, four masses, and seven string quartets, among other pieces, but his music had

not yet been performed publicly in Vienna. In August of that year Schubert wrote his fourth violin and piano Sonata, the A Major, D574, published in 1851 by Anton Diabelli as Op. posth. 162, entitled “Duo.” This Sonata has a broader proportion than his earlier pieces for this instrumentation, which were more directly influenced by Mozart. The Sonata in A has a more virtuosic character and presents a presto Scherzo instead of a minuet movement, like many of Beethoven’s works. The “Duo” Sonata in A Major is the first piece on this recording.

Shortly before the composition of this Sonata, Schubert had made several momentous changes in his life deciding not to go back to teach at his father’s school, leaving his father’s home and moving with his new friend Franz von Schober to the large lodging of Schober’s mother in the Tuchlauben. Schober was an Austrian poet, librettist, lithographer and actor who in 1821 would write the libretto for Schubert's opera “Alfonso und Estrella.” Schober later said: “I shall always retain the eternally uplifting feeling of having freed this immortal master from the constraint of school, and of having led him on his predestined path of independent, spiritual creation.” Schober also introduced Schubert to Michael Vogl, a prominent baritone twenty years his senior, for whom Schubert eventually wrote many songs. Michael Vogl would become one of Schubert's main proponents in Viennese musical circles.

It was not until October 1826, ten years after the composition of the Sonata in A, D574, that Schubert wrote his next work for piano and violin, the Rondo in B minor, the second work included in this recording. The Rondo is one of the few works to appear in print during his lifetime. Schubert had himself called it only “Rondo,” but the publisher added the adjective “brilliant,” most likely to make it more appealing to potential buyers. In a letter to his friend Eduard von Mauernfeld written some months before, Schubert alluded to his strained financial circumstances: “I cannot possibly get to Gmuden or anywhere else, for I have no money at all and altogether things go very badly with me. I do not let it worry me and am cheerful. Anyhow, come to Vienna as soon as possible. Duport wants an opera from me, … so it would be splendid if your libretto were favorably received. Then at least there would be money, maybe fame as well!”

Between 1826 and 1828, Schubert resided continuously in Vienna, except for a brief visit to Graz in 1827. He was suffering the effects of a venereal disease, probably syphilis, which he had contracted in 1822. These years saw the composition of some of Schubert's greatest and most profound masterpieces including the song-cycle 'Die Winterreise,' the piano trios, the C string quintet, the Moments Musicaux for piano and the last three piano sonatas. In that time it was usual for professional musicians to supplement their income by organizing or performing at benefit concerts. The Fantasy in C, published by Diabelli as op. posth. 159 in 1850, was the closing piece in a benefit concert at the Landhausaal, Vienna, on January 20, 1828, and is among the few works by Schubert to have been performed during his lifetime. The heart of the Fantasy in C for violin and piano is a set of variations on Sei mir gegrüsst, a song composed five years earlier for a poem by Friedrich Rückert (1788-1866). Alongside the lyricism and the graceful and idiomatic writing for the violin and the piano, this piece presents unusual technical difficulties. Perhaps the knowledge that he was writing for virtuoso players encouraged Schubert to
compose this very demanding and virtuosic music considered today to be among the most difficult works in the violin and piano repertoire. The Fantasy in C was Schubert’s last composition for violin and piano, and it is the last work included in this recording. Less than a year after that performance of the Fantasy, on November 19, 1828, Schubert died in Vienna, at age 31.

Both the Rondo in B minor and the Fantasy in C were composed for the Czech violinist Josef Slavík and his friend Carl Maria von Bocklet. Slavík was one of the first great Czech violin virtuosi. He was described by Chopin as a second Paganini. Josef Slavík was instructed by his father, Antonín Slavík, a schoolteacher, musician and composer in the village of Jince. Later Slavík continued his training under Pixis at the Prague Conservatory and worked shortly with the Prague Opera Orchestra before going to Vienna. He died in Budapest in 1833 at the age of 27. Carl Maria von Bocklet, probably the best pianist among Schubert’s friends, was a former violinist. He had been the dedicatee of the D Major Sonata (D850) and had premiered the “Wanderer” Fantasie, Op. 15 (D760). Both the Rondo and the Fantasy have, at moments, a hint of Czech character, and it is interesting to remember that Schubert’s parents came from places that are currently in the Czech Republic. Schubert’s father, Franz Theodor Schubert, came to Vienna in 1783 from Neudorf near Mährisch-Schönberg (Sumperk) in Moravia while his mother, Elisabeth Vietz Schubert, came from Zuckmantel (Zlate Hory) in Austrian Silesia.

Some notes on our interpretation

Our primary goal in approaching these pieces was to make informed decisions and interpretations inspired by knowledge of Schubert’s times. To this end we researched the historical context of each piece in order to know what the usual practices in interpretation were at the time of its composition. At the same time, we recorded with modern instruments and tried to incorporate our own modern esthetical understanding of the pieces into the historical frame.

Another goal was to preserve the creativity and spontaneity of live performances by capturing the natural sound of the concert hall and doing takes from whole movements or pieces during the recording. What follows is a synthetic description of certain aspects of our research and interpretive decisions.

For a violinist, one of the ways to approach the style and tonal qualities of original instruments is not to apply too much pressure with the bow. Pianists using modern instruments can approximate some of the characteristics of a pianoforte of Schubert’s time by avoiding emphasis on strong dynamics in the outer registers and thereby emulating the weaker outer register of the 5½ to 6 octave pianoforte.

Another issue regarding sound is the use of pedals. In Schubert’s time, the pedals were used not as a standard resource for achieving legato passages or for facilitating technical execution, but rather for subtle special effects.
Regarding the use of vibrato on the violin, we know from the treatises about interpretation that some kind of vibrato—with variations, less uniform, and probably not on every single note—was used during Schubert’s time. It is very possible that it was used as an ornamental device and not as a standard continuous addition to the sound.

It is more difficult to be certain about the meaning of Schubert’s tempi. While Schubert did not put metronome markings on any of his instrumental works, some conclusions can be drawn from the contemporary metronome markings in some of his Lieder and in the opera “Alfonso und Estrella.” There are signs indicating that many allegro movements, according to Schubert’s choice and the practice of that time in Vienna, were performed faster than what is common in today’s performances.

We understand that Schubert wrote sufficiently expressive devices for his own purposes and doesn’t need the “assistance” of too much rubato from the performer. The baritone Johann Michael Vogl (1768-1840), who was not only Schubert’s close friend but the singer whom Schubert admired above all others, nevertheless recounts that during rehearsals, Schubert would frequently admonish him with: "Kein Ritardando" or "Keine Fermate" ("No ritardando,"or "No fermata"). Schubert seems also to have desired very smooth, seamless transitions at meter changes. In a letter dated May 10, 1828, to the publisher Probst regarding the E-flat Piano Trio, D. 929, he has this to say: "See to it that really capable players are found for the first performance, and above all, where the time changes in the last section, that the rhythm is not lost."

Some researchers believe that in some cases the written values of complex simultaneously occurring rhythms could be performed different from their literal meaning. In most cases it is possible to play the literal written rhythms and, in our opinion, doing so helps to differentiate between voices and to keep the identity and gesture of the motifs.

Another topic of debate regarding rhythm is the interpretation of dots and double dots. While over dotting is documented in German Galant style and classical period solo playing, it is not certain that this applies to Schubert’s music. The most salient argument is that Schubert knew how to write double dots and indeed used these markings deliberately in these pieces.

Yet another area of our research was tuning. Our recording is with modern instruments and the modern “standard” pitch. While the Paris Conservatoire had already experimented with the tuning of the A = 440 in 1812, in 1828, the pitch in Schubert’s Vienna appears to have been slightly lower than the standard modern convention (around A = 440). Tuning forks from that time are generally in the region of 425, and a tuning fork that apparently belonged to Mozart, made by the piano builder J.A. Stein, was A = 421.6. There wasn’t a single “standard” in Schubert’s time and even higher tuning of the A can be found.

Schubert’s harmonic movements and enharmonic modulations ask for an equal temperament of the piano. Some violinists today also tend to play leading tone
“melodically” giving the line more expressivity but causing some vertical intonation inconsistencies. Schubert received his training in string playing at a time when the classical principle of low sharps and high flats was still valid. In fact, Joseph Joachim (1831-1907), one of the most significant violinists of the 19th century and close collaborator to Johannes Brahms, belonged also to this school. It continues to be a challenging and personal decision to balance vertical and horizontal intonation in a way that is both coherent and expressive.

We decided to honor all written repeats in this recording, as we found them to be of great importance to the overall structural form and proportions of the pieces.

The edition we chose for this recording was Henle, which, in our opinion, offers the most accurate urtext (original text). It has been very interesting to observe in this and other Schubert manuscripts how he appears to have composed by perseverance and hard work rather than through spontaneous inspiration.

Another noteworthy interpretational issue is the meaning of long slurs. The few times that the violin has slurs that are too long to be executed properly, they could be interpreted as expressive markings indicating the phrase.

Schubert uses a lot of accent marks in his pieces, and these stresses could have different meanings. The accents give us a more detailed idea of how Schubert wanted to phrase his music, and they could also indicate a metrical pattern. An accent mark can also be interpreted as indicating one level of dynamic higher than the context in which it is written. We have to remember that Schubert also writes the signs Fp, FFp and FFFp and sf or sff for stronger dynamic and emphasis levels. In his manuscripts the [>] sign is easily confused with the hairpin, and sometimes we cannot even be sure if there should be a difference between the effects of those. Because, in our opinion, it is not possible to standardize the interpretation of these signs, we approach them in our recording on a case-by-case basis considering their musical context.

As a lyrical composer and a linear thinker, Schubert sometimes notates musical gestures that are not necessarily pianistic in the piano part, like “Fp cresc.” or “Fp diminuendo” on one single note. These markings seem to be reminiscent of notations for a string ensemble. Schubert wrote to his parents in 1825, after giving a concert: “What pleased especially were the variations in my new Sonata for two hands—since several people assured me that the keys become singing voices under my hands, which, if true, pleases me greatly, since I cannot endure to accursed chopping in which distinguished pianoforte players indulge and which delights neither the ear nor the mind.”

Regarding the interpretation of the articulation marks, we considered and followed what most of the treatises of that time indicate. When a note has a dot, the beginning and ending of it should be heard particularly clearly and separated. Strokes may be played particularly short whereas slurs over strokes can mean that notes should be separated but played in a single bow stroke on the violin or a single swing of the hand in the desired direction on the piano.
When it comes to trills, we have to remember that Hummel’s treatise, written in 1826 and published in 1828, is considered the first treatise documenting the start of trills on the main notes. Nevertheless, we can imagine that this practice was in vogue before the treatise was written. For example, in the music of Antonio Salieri, Schubert’s teacher, we already have trills beginning on the main note. In our recording, we assume that all trills without grace notes are to be started from the main note. Another reason for this is the fact that Schubert often did indeed write grace or starter notes before the trills and resolutions when he really intended to have them.

The last subject we would like to comment on is the interpretation of appoggiaturas. Generally speaking a short appoggiatura can be short and on the beat or before the beat and without stress. The appoggiaturas not only give a rhythmic indication, but also can mean a stress and agogic indication. We believe that each appoggiatura should be treated based on the musical context where it appears.

Examining all of these issues gave us a greater understanding of notational and stylistic practice in Schubert’s time and allowed us to re-contextualize and perform his work today with greater authority and creativity. There are many more layers and details to the research and knowledge we gained about these pieces, and we look forward to presenting them through other media. While we took all of this research into consideration in preparing this recording, our approach was ultimately guided by our deep appreciation of this music.
Violinist Tomas Cotik and pianist Tao Lin present a program of Franz Schubert’s works for violin and piano that’s outstanding from the very beginning—the jewel case opens to reveal not only informative notes about the composer and the circumstances under which he wrote these works but, even more important, an extensive discussion of the historical and artistic choices—timbral (the general approach to the instruments in order to approximate the period’s tonal preferences), pedaling, vibrato, the realization of expression marks, tempos, note values, tuning, intonation (vertical and horizontal), repeats (they take them all), edition (Henle), accents, trills (from the main note unless otherwise indicated), and appogiaturas (each adapted to the context)—each treated with ingratiating thoroughness, lucidity, and geniality. And the performances prove worthy of the auspicious introduction: Their lofty musicianship dwarfs their profound scholarship. In the Violin Sonata’s first movement, Cotik and Lin generate a forward momentum, and Cotik’s technical command allows for a sharpness of articulation that nevertheless doesn’t seem either mannered or fussy, a strong lens bringing each bow stroke into focus. In the succeeding Scherzo, the two create dynamic contrasts that should make many listeners who are familiar with other performances take special notice. If this isn’t Fritz Kreisler’s Viennese Gemütlichkeit, it’s gemütlich nevertheless. In the notes, the performers describe their attempt to play through changes without losing the rhythmic thread—but reading about that practice will hardly prepare listeners for the charge this creates in performance. The duo embarks on the finale with a slash that brooks none of the comfort some performances suggest. But salon-like geniality somehow still tempers the reading’s concert-hall-like brilliance. The engineers captured the performers up close, so that they seem to be performing in an intimate venue (blessedly, there’s no heavy breathing). In fact, though, they recorded the program in September 2011 in Gusman Concert Hall in Coral Gables, Florida; and the recorded sound conveys a clarity and tonal opulence rare in recordings of violin music, making both instruments sound both lifelike and rich in timbral nuance.

Joel Flegler, “Schubert: Duo Sonata in A, D574, Rondo in b D895, Fantasy in C, D934; Tomas Cotik (vl); Tao Lin (pn); Centaur Records CRC3250 (57:45),” Fanfare: The Magazine for Serious Record Collectors, Jan./Feb. 2013.
Cotik’s boldness of attack in the sonata redoubles in the opening of the Rondo brillante, a work that, unlike the others, peppers Schubert’s sensitive lyricism with an almost ostentatious virtuosity. Cotik steps to the fore in the almost concerto-like violin part, engaging listeners with his pure tone (in all registers), his boldness of gesture, and a subtlety matched by his pianistic collaborator. Many passages, particularly near the end, should leave listeners almost breathless.

Schubert’s Fantasy has only slowly approached the gateway of the standard repertoire, perhaps because of its great difficulty (one leading violinist told me in an interview that she couldn’t imagine how so many young violinists dared to program it). Cotik and Lin make out of the opening a rapt dialogue that extends into the subsequent slashing section, with Cotik answered sonorously by Lin. The duo, both individually and in collaboration, play the variations on Schubert’s song, Sei mir gegrüsst, with a vibrancy and attention to detail that endow each with a strong individuality and a vitality. At the beginning of many passages, it seems as though Cotik must fail to reach higher than he already has, yet he somehow always manages to bring each phrase to a perfectly conceived culmination. In fact, as my interviewee pointed out, this isn’t an easy work for the violinist (that’s true of all the pieces on the program), but that difficulty doesn’t seem to bother Cotik. In the finale, Cotik and Lin stimulate a rush of adrenaline.

Lin plays a Steinway D, but the notes don’t identify Cotik’s violin. In a way, it’s almost irrelevant, because playing of this strength would overshadow almost any instrument’s profile. Cotik and Lin make Kreisler seem almost smarmy (of course, that’s an overstatement, for time hasn’t dulled the effect of Kreisler’s legendary collaboration with Sergei Rachmaninoff); the strong-minded Isabelle Faust, who gave a performance (with pianist Alexander Melnikov on Harmonia Mundi 901870) that I described in Fanfare 30:4 as blending “velvet blackness” with “silvery lyricism” sounds almost—almost—mannered; and Julia Fischer’s with pianist Martin Helmchen on PentaTone SACD 5186 348, which included both the sonata and the fantasia, which I reviewed in Fanfare 34:1, sound as though she’s filed down the detail. For those who may have concluded sadly that Schubert didn’t invest himself so fully in the violin pieces as he did in the songs and symphonies, these performances should be required listening. But Cotik and Lin should also raise appreciation of those already captivated by the works’ charms to an even higher level, offering insights and vitality in almost every measure to spark their enthusiasm. Urgently recommended. —Robert Maxham
Appendix C:

Fanfare Magazine Review: Schubert: Duo Sonata in A, D. 574, Rondo in b D. 895, Fantasy in C, D. 934; Tomas Cotik (vl); Tao Lin (pn); Centaur Records
By: Maria Nockin, Fanfare Magazine,\textsuperscript{171} Jan./Feb. 2013

When planning this Schubert disc, Argentinean violinist Tomas Cotik and Chinese American Pianist Tao Lin carefully researched the historical context of each of the pieces they would play. Cotik needed to know how much vibrato to inject and when to use it. In Schubert’s time it was added sparingly. Lin ascertained the fact that the composer did not like his pianists to use a great deal of rubato. They also found that an Allegro of his time was faster than a 21st-century Allegro. That, too, gave them food for thought. A great deal more of their research can be found in the most interesting booklet that accompanies this disc. They discuss their research on dynamics, trills, appoggiaturas, dotted notes, etc. at length. In his short lifetime of just under 32 years, Franz Schubert wrote 600 songs, nine symphonies, church music, operas, and chamber and solo music. Unfortunately, much of the interest in his music began after his death, when Franz Liszt, Robert Schumann, Johannes Brahms, and Felix Mendelssohn began to champion his work. Schubert composed the Duo in A Major in 1817 but it was not published until after his death. Today, of course, his music is frequently performed and his duo has been recorded many times. There is a strong thematic unity, most obviously between the opening themes of the second and fourth movements.

The music on this disc is duet playing at a very high level. Not once in this intelligent and sensitive rendition do Cotik and Lin fall into the trap of becoming soloist and accompanist. Instead, they treat us to an equally weighted partnership that glories in changing colorations and shared emphasis. For Cotik and Lin, the Rondo in B minor is a showpiece that allows them to let the audience see what these virtuosos can do. The Fantasy in C minor also allows Cotik and Lin to show their skills, and only once, at the very beginning, did I find that the pianist covered one of the violinist’s more lyrical passages. Cotik and Lin are most compelling in the more intense passages. On the whole this disc contains beautiful performances in which the violinist and pianist play as equal partners and with great musicality. There are, of course, numerous comparable discs. On a 1990 Sony two-disc recording, Daniel Barenboim and Isaac Stern play all three of the pieces heard here with quiet intensity. Unfortunately, the acoustic on that recording is

\textsuperscript{171} Joel Flegler, “Schubert: Duo Sonata in A, D574, Rondo in b D895, Fantasy in C, D934; Tomas Cotik (vl); Tao Lin (pn); Centaur Records CRC3250 (57:45),” Fanfare: The Magazine for Serious Record Collectors, Jan./Feb. 2013.
rather dead. Father and daughter Claude and Pamela Frank play them with considerably more passion on a 2005 Arte Nova compact disc which also has better sound. Julia Fischer and Martin Helmschen play the Sonata in A and the Fantasy in C on a 2010 PentaTone SACD. The playing is excellent and the sound is terrific, but the Rondo in B minor is missing. I find the Cotik and Lin performances most interesting and the sound on their disc is excellent. –Maria Nockin
Appendix D:

New Classical Tracks: Tao Lin & Tomas Cotik – Franz Schubert
By: Julie Amacher, Minnesota Public Radio, Dec. 4, 2012

ST. PAUL, Minn. — Violinist Tomas Cotik was studying at the Glenn Gould School of Music in Toronto when he auditioned for the New World Symphony. Seven years later, Tomas is a professional and a member of the Delray String Quartet, and he's still applying the lessons he learned from founder and artistic director Michael Tilson Thomas. "He's very inspiring," Tomas recalls. "He also inspired me to follow at some point my own projects and follow my dreams." Tomas Cotik has numerous professional dreams, the most recent of which is his sixth recording, a collection of chamber works by Franz Schubert with pianist Tao Lin.

"I love these pieces, they mean a lot to me," Tomas explains. "And this recording is a dream come true, something I wanted to do for a long time." Tomas is so passionate about this project, it has since become the focus of his doctoral dissertation at the University of Miami's Frost School of Music. "And I feel a very big responsibility when recording this repertoire that has been recorded already a number of times. That's what made me research and go deep, to be sure that I know as much as possible about this music, about the context of the creation of these pieces, about Schubert's life, about performance practices in Schubert's time."

Tomas has made some intriguing discoveries about those performance practices. He says the tempos used in Vienna at the time are a bit faster than originally thought, and the piano's use of pedal is also very subtle, which Tao Lin demonstrates very effectively in the Duo Sonata in A Major. "Well, in the Andantino, one of the interesting things is that there's a pedal marking by Schubert... but he marked very few times, only for special effects. So in this recording we try to use the pedal in the piano as little as possible — only for very special moments."

"Also with the vibrato — we know that in those times, they did vibrate but only some notes, not every single note, and there was no continuous vibrato. So while we recorded with modern instruments and I would say aesthetically our approach is relatively modern, we tried to make sure that we incorporate that understanding into our approach.

"With the tone of the violin for me, the sound is incredibly important... for example, in the fantasy — in the middle part of the fantasy — is a set of variations on a lied that Schubert composed five years earlier speaks about love from a distance, which is probably that paradox of beauty and suffering together. When I try to express that with the violin... I'm going for a sound that both moves you and touches, but also that is ethereal and impalpable."

Schubert's Fantasy in C Major and his Rondo in B minor, both of which appear on this recording, were influenced by the same Czech violinist, according to Tomas. "I think these pieces do have some Czech influence, Both of Schubert's parents came from what later became Czechoslovakia. And he composed those pieces for Josef Slavik. He was a virtuoso. He also was compared, at those times, to Paganini. And I see those hints of Czech character but also in a very special kind of virtuosity. Both of those pieces in the opinion of many musicians are among the most challenging pieces for violin and piano."

Violinist Tomas Cotik is always up for a new challenge. His next project with pianist Tao Lin celebrates the music of Astor Piazzolla, the most famous composer from Tomas's homeland of Argentina. –Julia Amacher
Appendix E:

Daily Album Review 7: Delicate, compelling Schubert for violin and piano from Tomas Cotik and Tao Lin

By: John Terauds, Musical Toronto, Nov. 22, 2012

The proliferation of self-produced classical albums means finding gold nuggets is like panning for gold on the muddy banks of some northern river. One of the latest gems to emerge from the season’s flowing waters is a wonderful album of violin and piano music by Franz Schubert.

Argentinean-born violinist Tomas Cotik and Shanghai-born pianist Tao Lin met last fall at their sort-of home base in Florida to record the first album in a wished-for survey of Schubert’s music for the two instruments.

This initial result is impressive for the elegance and sensitivity of the interpretations. These two musicians seem particularly well matched, giving Schubert’s music gentle contours, subtly highlighting the ever-shifting textures in the accompaniment and, most important of all, letting each instrument find its voice and sing.

On this album are three pieces: A Duo Sonata in A Major, D.574, which dates from 1817, the year Schubert turned 20. It is a nice four-movement piece that pales a bit next to its two later companions, the B-minor Rondo D.895 and the great C-Major Fantasy, D.934, both completed 10 years later.

The Fantasy, which spins variations on the melody from “Sei mir gegrüsst,” a Schubert Lied based on a poem by Friedrich Rückert, is the true treasure here, beautifully executed and polished. …—John Terauds

Appendix F:

Phil’s Classical Reviews: Schubert: Duo Sonata, Rondo, Fantasy in C Major, Tomas Cotik (violin), Tao Lin (piano), Centaur Records
By: Phil Muse, Audio Video Club of Atlanta, Jan. 2013

These three major works for violin and piano of Franz Schubert are something of a conundrum. They are generally classified as chamber music, but present real virtuosic challenges for both instruments, sometimes when least expected. They are among the most tuneful and ingratiating of all Schubert’s works, but they just don’t sit down and play themselves. The beauty is in the details, and to that extent Tomas Cotik and Lin Tao, both of whom have very active careers as chamber musicians, have been at pains to give the music the right amount of period style in order to optimally bring out its beauties.

That involves research into matters such as “slurs” (not a disrespectful word when you’re talking about violin technique), harmonic movements and enharmonic modulations that require equal temperament of the piano, use of the pedals for special effects, very subtle gradations in dynamics, a varied treatment of appoggiaturas depending on the context in which they occur – and many other things besides. All these technical issues may seem confusing to the average listener, but attention to them brings out the unique character of a given passage. You can “feel”, without understanding why, the strangely beautiful, even haunted, moods we experience in the slow introductions to the Duo Sonata in A Major, D574 and the Fantasy in C Major, D934. Or take the bold alteration in the second half of the fully stated theme of the Rondo brillant in B minor, D895, which gives the music a feeling of irresistible onward movement.

The texture of the music also frequently changes, especially in the Rondo and the Fantasy, where the two instruments often switch the roles of melody and accompaniment. The piano writing, particularly in the way Lin takes it in the Fantasy, is characterized by its unusual depth and broad compass, while the violin writing is usually more spare but absolutely brilliant when the violinist rises to the occasion, as Cotik does in the Rondo. The Sonata, earliest work in the program, is a well-behaved duo sonata in the full sense of the word, but even it has its peculiarities, such as the fact that the Scherzo omits the expected minuet in its trio section (only to have Schubert surprise us with a very gracious one in the melody of the slow movement).

The music is enchanting. The performances have unmistakable vitality, and they are optimally recorded in the Gusman Concert Hall at the Frost School of Music of the University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida. So what are you waiting for? –Phil Muse

---

This is a beautiful recording of Schubert’s later violin and piano music. Both of these musicians use modern instruments, but they do their best, without compromising expression, to approach matters of phrasing, pedaling, tone color, vibrato, and articulation in an early 19th Century style. To this end, Tao Lin makes the most of the range of articulation and dynamics available on a Steinway D piano, and produces a luminous piano sound that is ideal for Schubert. He always matches Cotik’s articulation, phrasing, and dynamics perfectly, and in the variations of the Fantasy he even manages to give the illusion of pizzicato.

Cotik and Lin also let some of the virtuosic passages (and they are devilishly difficult) operate as filigree, and they allow for a hierarchy of dramatic intensity in all the pieces (especially the Fantasy), letting the “stops” out in all the right places. These readings are free from the nonsense that I sometimes hear from young players who try to over-phrase and over-sentimentalize Schubert. What I hear is excellent violin playing, excellent piano playing, and extremely enjoyable interpretations of music that I love.

These musicians mention in the notes that they made the recording in single-movement chunks rather than in bits to be spliced together, and their practice does indeed allow for the kind of spontaneous creativity that happens in concert performances.

—FINE

---

This program bringing together the three largest and most important Schubert works for violin and piano is an obvious one, so there’s lots of recorded competition. But then these pieces can absorb a number of competing approaches because of their appearance at the crossroads of the Classical and Romantic traditions. Whereas it’s pretty hard to deviate successfully from the epically grand approach when performing, say, Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata, with Schubert, much more latitude in interpretive direction is permissible. For example, Gidon Kremer and Valery Afanassiev (DGG) approach this music with a certain Classical gravitas and emotional steadiness that matches Kremer’s brilliant but sometimes hard-edged playing. Other musicians cultivate the Romantic side of this music, while still others seem to hone-in on the Biedermeier sensibility that lies behind much of Schubert’s chamber music. From what I can gather, this is the approach of the father-daughter duo Pamela and Claude Frank (on Arte Nova, which I haven’t heard)—though a comfortable, drawing room–style approach is probably suitable only for the Sonata, written in 1817.

It shows a decided advance over Schubert’s three earlier violin sonatas of 1816, published posthumously as sonatinas. It includes a scherzo and trio, bringing it in line with the Beethoven model and features a more rigorously argued and lengthy opening sonata-allegro. But there’s still a breezy, optimistic lightness to this music; it’s the work of a young composer, as opposed to the very mature composer of the Rondo in B minor, written nine years later. Schubert wrote the piece with the Czech virtuoso Josef Slavjk (or Slawjk) in mind. (Tragically, Slavjk was to die even younger than Schubert, at the age of twenty-seven.) Not only did Slavjk finally play the work but it was one of only three Schubert works to be published in the composer’s lifetime; the “brilliant” in the title was affixed by the publisher, presumably in hopes of upping sales.

This publication probably brought Schubert some much-needed cash as well as hopes that publishing houses would look more favorably on his work. That was not to be, but the fortunes of the next work on the program, the Fantasy in C Major, must have given Schubert additional hopes. Played, again, by Slavjk, it formed the finale of the benefit concert held for Schubert in January of 1828, one of the rare instances in which his music

---

got a public airing in his lifetime. But like so many of Schubert’s works, it wasn’t published until years after the composer’s death, in this case twenty-two (1850).

The Fantasy is generally thought of as Schubert’s greatest work for violin, and it does have all the hallmarks of Schubert’s late style: the ethereal almost otherworldly calm of the opening, which returns like a refrain; the constant interplay of major and minor; the pregnant pauses (Schubert had discovered the great emotional value that rests in music can have); and most of all, the amalgam of compositional rigor and freedom of form that made the fantasy the composer’s special domain. Like others of Schubert’s fantasies (the Wanderer Fantasy and the Fantasy for Piano Four Hands, D. 940), the piece embraces a number of individual sections that are tantamount to the movements in the typical sonata, including a set of variations on Schubert’s own song Sei mir gegrüßt, D 741.

Like the Rondo, the Fantasy was written with Josef Slavjk in mind, so neither work is a picnic for the violinist—or the pianist, for that matter. In fact, the Fantasy is notoriously difficult, so getting through it at all would be an accomplishment for the violinist of average skills. Fortunately, Tomas Cotik and Tao Lin achieve more than this baseline goal. Their performance is confident, big in scale, well-judged to hold together the disparate elements into a pleasing synthesis. Much the same could be said of the Fantasy’s less familiar cousin, the Rondo, here made to seem a work of equal stature. Cotik and Lin don’t quite make the Duo Sonata a piece of Hausmusik but do bring that lighter touch to the work that matches Schubert’s aesthetic earlier in his career.

The notes to the recording include a very lengthy dissertation on the interpretative decisions that inform these performances; it makes interesting reading but is too long and involved to abridge in any way here. But I can share the following observation: “[One] goal was to preserve the creativity and spontaneity of live performances by capturing the natural sound of the concert hall and doing takes from whole movements or pieces during the recording.” I suppose this “doing takes” to create a finished product in which errors of execution are held to a minimum is not really fudging things, and it does retain the air of spontaneity that the artists were hoping for. The fact that the recordings are taken from live performances is rarely very obvious, though some slight intonation problems at the start of the Fantasy and difficulties in tuning during the softer passages here and elsewhere are subtle indicators. Plus, there are some slight tempo fluctuations, not all of which can be credited to the adrenalin of a live performance.

However, mostly this recording does benefit from the spontaneity of live performance—another reason why it can successfully face the competition. There may be more polished studio recordings of all this music available, including my benchmark with Kremer and Afanassiev, but there is much to be said for the unaffectedness of the performances and the naturalness of the sound, captured over three days of concerts given at Gusman Concert Hall in Coral Gables. The engineers capture the ambiance well without clouding, and there’s good separation between the instruments. This would not be a first recommendation in Schubert’s music for violin and piano, but still, for the dedicated Schubertian, it’s an album well worth hearing and considering.—Lee Passarella
Dear Mr. Cotik,

I have now had the chance to listen to your recording of the Schubert pieces, and I want to say how enjoyable I found your performances.

You have clearly sifted much relevant historical and documentary information and attempted an enlightened, historically-informed approach to the music. Indeed I suspect you have gone further than others in this direction, and I congratulate you on that. Of course, of equal importance to a wise and responsible interpretation is that you capture the spirit of the music, which in the case of the two later works in particular is so distinctive. And here I think you score highly too.

There has to be a balance between the undeniable virtuoso character of much of the music and the 'inner' spiritual quality which is present. You both hold this balance most effectively and the performances place the music credibly as a product of its time and its composer. In other words, I find the combination of brain and heart compelling.

I am not one to believe that music can be played only one way and I do not compare different performances and recordings in an attempt to rank them competitively. It may be that some critic somewhere may say he wants a bit more awareness in the playing that Paganini was around, or a more self-indulgent treatment of the lovely Sei mir gegrusst theme in the Fantasy. You are both technically accomplished enough for my taste, and more than that, and I very much doubt that Paganini could have come near to playing this music with your understanding. And I always find a touch of understatement more alluring than overstatement.

So I offer you both my compliments for what you have achieved here. And I thank you for giving me such pleasurable listening. I shall return to the disc many times, I'm sure.

Kind regards,

Brian Newbould

---

177 Brian Newbould, e-mail message to author, February 28, 2013.
Professor Emeritus of Music at the University of Hull (UK), Brian Newbould is a musicologist known particularly for his writings on Schubert and for his realizations of this composer’s unfinished works, which are widely performed and recorded. Newbould is the author of several books on Schubert that were consulted for this study. He is also the author of completions of several works left unfinished by the composer. His realizations of three fragmentary Schubert symphonies have been performed and broadcast around the world, conducted by Sir Neville Marriner, Sir Charles Mackerras and Sir Simon Rattle, among others.
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