Robert Schumann AND THE Piano Concerto

Claudia Macdonald

ROUTLEDGE

Robert Schumann AND THE Piano Concerto

Robert Schumann AND THE Piano Concerto

Claudia Macdonald

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Published in 2005 by
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
711 Third Avenue,
New York, NY 10017

Published in Great Britain by
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon,
Oxfordshire OX14 4RN

First issued in paperback 2016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor and Francis Group, an informa business

ISBN 13 : 978-1-138-99739-4 (pbk)
ISBN 13 : 978-0-415-97247-5 (hbk)

Library of Congress Card Number 2005013606

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Macdonald, Claudia.
Robert Schumann and the piano concerto / Claudia Macdonald.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-415-97247-7 (hardback : alk. paper)
1. Schumann, Robert, 1810-1856--Criticism and interpretation. 2. Concerto. 3. Piano music--History and criticism. I. Title.

ML410.S4M19 2005
784.2'62'092--dc22 2005013606

T&F informa
Taylor & Francis Group
is the Academic Division of T&F Informa plc.

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at
http://www.taylorandfrancis.com

and the Routledge Web site at
http://www.routledge-ny.com

Ivánnak

Contents

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction xi

1 Amateur and Virtuoso Musician 1

2 The Virtuoso Concerto 13

3 First Concerto Expositions and Their Models 37

4 First Romantic Piece 51

5 Beethoven and Mozart Reception 73

6 Critical Observer: The Old Form I 91

7 Critical Observer: The Old Form II 111

8 Critical Observer: New Forms I 135

9 Critical Observer: New Forms II 169

10 *Concertsatz* in D Minor 197

11 *Phantasie* 223

12 *Concertstücke* 247

13 Team Programs 273

Epilogue 297

Notes 307

Works Cited 335

Index 345

Acknowledgments

I am presenting to the patient reader the culmination of twenty years' work to which many colleagues and friends have contributed: Philip Gossett, who, as my dissertation advisor, helped launch and support the project in its earliest stages; Robert L. Marshall, who held my hand through all its stages; Jon W. Finson and Nancy Reich, whose belief in the worth of my endeavors was unfailing; Russell Stinson, who read and kindly commented on Chapter 10; and John Daverio, whose buoyant response to every one of my enterprises is sadly missed.

Many German institutions graciously accommodated me on numerous visits: the Heinrich-Heine-Institut Düsseldorf; Robert-Schumann-Forschungsstelle Düsseldorf; Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Bonn; Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteiliung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv; Robert-Schumann-Haus Zwickau; and in Austria, the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde Vienna. The Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Bonn kindly granted me permission to reproduce transcriptions of portions of the Schumann music manuscript materials in their collection. Ute Bär, Gerd Nauhaus, Martin Schoppe, Bernhard R. Appel, and Matthias Wendt were always attentive hosts for whom I have much affection. At home I worked at the Boston Public Library; Harvard University Library; Brown University Library; New York Public Library; Library of Congress; University of Chicago Library; and Newberry Library. During his time as Conservatory Librarian at Oberlin College, Daniel Zager made major acquisitions to support my work; the present staff, including Deborah Campana and Kathleen Abromeit, has been equally responsive to my needs.

Many foundations for many years generously underwrote my work: the National Endowment for the Humanities; American Philosophical Society; Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst; American Council of Learned Societies; International Research and Exchanges Board; American Association of University Women; Fulbright Commission; and, through a Research Status Appointment, Grants-in-Aid, and Powers Travel Grants, Oberlin College. David Stull, Dean of the Oberlin College Conservatory of Music, also offered generous support.

Richard Carlin's faith in my output, his sensibleness, and blessed good cheer have been constant since our initial discussions. The patience, meticulous work, and kindness of Robert Sims and Laura Lawrie reassured me through the final stages of production. Assistance from the Manfred Bukofzer Publication Endowment Fund of the American Musicological Society defrayed the cost of the musical examples.

For long stretches friends in Germany warmly took me into their families: Karin and Hans-Rudolf Ebel, Heide Seyfarth, whom I will always remember, Ingrid and Winfried Seyfarth, Ulrike Seyfarth, Ruth and Alfred Kunt. At home, my family—Martha, Don, Jacob, and Gwendolyn Kudela, James Stapleton, Leah and Christopher Twymon—has cherished me as an author and a mother. My husband, Ivan Waldbauer, to whom this book is dedicated, read and improved it repeatedly.

Thank you. Whatever faults remain are my own entirely.

Introduction

The purpose of this study is twofold: to follow Robert Schumann's development as a composer of works for piano and orchestra and to trace the history of the genre from about 1810 to the mid-1850s as seen through his eyes. Between 1830 and 1853, a span that covers his entire career as a composer, Schumann composed five works for piano and orchestra, or rather six, if the *Phantasie* that was reworked to become the first movement of the Concerto in A Minor, Op. 54 is counted separately. His ideas about the concerto are richly documented. From 1836 to 1843 he addressed the subject in a series of critical essays. These are complemented by a plethora of observations in his letters and diaries.

The first part of the study, Chapters 1 through 4, centers on a group of concertos dating from about 1810 to 1830. It begins with an account of Schumann's personal development in the small-town environment where he took his place as a musical amateur and developed his aspiration to become a professional pianist. His ambition was bolstered by public performances of florid concertos by Johann Nepomuk Hummel and Friedrich Kalkbrenner, works whose style differs markedly from the accompanied lieder, piano four-hand duets, and chamber pieces with piano that he played in the homes of friends. Already his youthful Concerto in F major from 1830 to 1831 shows a degree of reconciliation between the two styles. It grafts his own newer, romantic leanings onto a bravura concerto of the type composed by the generation of composers active during his youth, including two whose works served as immediate models, Hummel and Henri Herz. Chapter 4 will show that such reconciliation is not unique to Schumann; it also is apparent in the two piano concertos of Chopin from 1829 to 1830 and 1830.

The second and largest part of the study, Chapters 5 through 11, is devoted primarily to Schumann's reviews of concertos, both from score and as he heard them in performance during the 1830s in Leipzig. By 1832, when it became clear to him that an injury to his finger would not heal, Schumann gave up his ambition to become a professional pianist. In 1834 he founded and for the next ten years edited the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik,* a journal addressed to an elite readership of music professionals and educated

amateurs. Its purpose was to serve as an arbiter of musical taste generally and, specifically, to support new music by the youngest generation of composers. To this end Schumann reviewed hundreds of newly published works, including some thirty recent piano concertos by Hummel, Kalkbrenner, Ferdinand Ries, John Field, Herz, Sigismund Thalberg, Ignaz Moscheles, Felix Mendelssohn, Sterndale Bennett, Clara Wieck, and many lesser lights. His criticisms show him still seeing merit in concertos that cling to an older style but also approving more modern experiments in form. The latter aroused his interest, but sympathy for the older style, stimulated by a newly acquired knowledge of Beethoven's concertos, led him to suggest a type of piece that would accommodate characteristics of both practices. This was, once again, a conscious effort to reconcile the public function of his concerted pieces with his own affinity for the more intimate style of piano works he composed throughout the 1830s.

No doubt Schumann believed this reconciliation of styles would appeal to an audience of musically educated amateurs, an audience congruent with the readership of his journal. It is evident in two of his own productions: an unfinished but nearly completed *Concertsatz* in D minor from 1839, and the *Phantasie* of 1841 that was later revised to become the first movement of the A Minor Concerto. Both works eschew virtuosic display. Both also reflect his affinity for the amateur musical culture around him, with its emphasis on home performance. The *Concertsatz* is rooted in his exposure to Bach's instrumental works and the special niche they occupied in this climate. Both it and the *Phantasie* take their cue from the very experiments Schumann observed in the genre during the 1830s, involving above all connected movements and thematic transformation across movements. Today these ideas are best known from Liszt's two concertos, which, although not published until 1857 and 1863, have sketches dating to the 1830s. Unlike Schumann's works, Liszt's concertos reflect their composer's years as a traveling performer playing before large and diverse audiences.

A final part of the study, Chapters 12, 13, and an epilogue, begins with Schumann's essay from 1843 about a group of one-movement works for piano and orchestra. Mostly he is impatient with the state of the genre. His own concerted compositions from 1845 on, the first he saw publicly performed and published, make clear his interest in a new direction: the complete A Minor Concerto, including a revised first movement and newly composed middle and final movements (1845); the *Introduction und Allegro appassionato,* Op. 92 (1849); and the *Introduction und Allegro,* Op. 134 (1853). They are realizations of ideas he developed during the 1830s, but also reflections of performance opportunities available to the pianist for whom they were composed, his wife, Clara Schumann. The A Minor Concerto became a staple of her repertory, and is still a standard today. If the other two pieces, each a one-movement work, have not fared as well, it is not because they have lesser intrinsic worth, but because they derive from conditions peculiar to musical programming of an earlier time. Yet, despite

their common practical origins, the two works are contrasting in nature. Op. 92 is symphonic. In this sense it can be compared to two other concerted works by Schumann, the *Concertstück* for Four Horns, Op. 86 (1849), and Cello Concerto, Op. 129 (1850). Op. 134, like the *Phantasie* for Violin and Orchestra, Op. 131, which also was composed in 1853, is more virtuosic. At the same time, it eschews the notion, still with us today, that a concerto offers little more than entertainment. It is, in its aesthetic if not in its style or form, a direct ancestor of Brahms's First Piano Concerto (1854–58).

1
Amateur and Virtuoso Musician

The story of Robert Schumann and the piano concerto must begin very early in his life, with his growing up as a young, middle-class gentleman in a very small Saxon town. The effects of these two facts on his musical development are well known. The first explains the depth of his attachment to music cultivated by an educated class of connoisseurs; the second, the necessity of that attachment, for there was no one in the town of Zwickau (population c. 5,000) to prepare this young man of prodigious talent and impressive ability for a professional career. What has been less explored is Schumann's engagement with music intended for a wider public, his embracing of a virtuosic repertory on those occasions when he set himself apart from his fellow amateurs by venturing onto a larger stage.

This chapter will show precisely what pieces Schumann played with his fellow amateurs and what ones he chose for the public arena. The divide between the two repertories is profound, especially from a modern point of view. With his friends he played works by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Weber, Schubert, and various lesser lights; for public performances he chose pieces by the current reigning virtuosos, Ignaz Moscheles, Friedrich Kalkbrenner, and Johann Nepomuk Hummel. Whereas he knew symphonies, chamber pieces, and piano works by Beethoven and Mozart, as this chapter will make abundantly clear, he did not know their piano concertos, which by the 1820s were considered old-fashioned.

Naturally, the repertory Schumann knew impacted what he composed. His earliest pieces, written to share with his friends, were modeled on works they played together, most conspicuously by Schubert.[1] After successful appearances before a large public in Zwickau and Heidelberg led him to decide on the career of a piano virtuoso, Moscheles, Kalkbrenner, and Hummel became his models. The influence of these virtuosos on Schumann's early Concerto in F Major is straightforward, and will be the subject of chapters three and four. Subsequent chapters will show that the influence continued, affecting his reception of concertos by Mozart and Beethoven as these became again widely disseminated in the 1830s; his reviews of concertos

during the same decade; and his compositions for solo and orchestra of the 1840s and beyond. Although the reviews and compositions also reflect Schumann's allegiance to his roots as a gentleman lover of music, their template for the concerto derives from fashionable works of the day.

This returns us to the indelible stamp that growing up in Zwickau left on Schumann. In the first place, it meant he did not decide to turn to music as a profession until he was twenty, unusually late for a career choice of this nature. This does not mean he lagged in skills: the repertory he played attests amply to his ability, as do his accomplishments as a sightreader.[2] However, until he left Zwickau for Leipzig, the music he knew was not determined by any systematic educational program, by any group invested in special pleading for music of the past, nor by the cosmopolitan cross-currents of a large city. More than anything else the music Schumann knew, both in Zwickau and later during his first year in Leipzig and stay in Heidelberg, exemplifies the day-to-day environment of home music-making. Especially as regards the concertos that are the subject of this study, it typifies the flood of selections that were written for immediate performance rather than for all time to come.

* * *

Schumann was born in Zwickau, Saxony, on 8 June 1810, the youngest of five surviving children. Neither of his parents were trained musicians, nor did any of his siblings share his early passion for music. But his mother, Johanne Christiane, knew many songs and sang with him; his "constant singing [*vieles Singen*]" first made her and his father, Friedrich August, aware of his talent.[3] At the age of seven, the child was taken to Baccalaureus Johann Gottfried Kuntsch for private instruction on the piano. Kuntsch was organist at the *Marienkirche,* the city church where Schumann may later have sung under the direction of the cantor Karl Christian Siebeck in a choir drawn from students at the Zwickau *Lyceum.*[4] Kuntsch also organized occasional municipal concerts for the presentation of works such as Hadyn's *Creation.* By 1821, his young pupil had advanced enough to play the keyboard (probably reinforcing the instrumental parts) to accompany a performance of Friedrich Schneider's popular oratorio *Das Weltgericht* (1819) at the *Marienkirche.*[5]

In 1821 Schumann also made his first appearance, as partner in a four-hand variation set in G major by Ignaz Joseph [?] Pleyel, on one of the evening recitals at the *Gymnasium.* These were long programs that alternated musical numbers, including orchestra, chamber and solo pieces, choruses, vocal quartets and operatic selections, and recitations. Often he accompanied the choral numbers on the *Gymnasium* programs, and from 1822 to 1828 he played a string of solos calculated to show off his considerable technique to a broad public: variation sets; Carl Maria von Weber's rondo, *Aufforderung zum Tanz;* and, for his last appearance on 25 January 1828, a concerto by Friedrich Kalkbrenner in D minor.[6] Only August Vollaert

played piano works of comparable difficulty on these programs.[7] Six years older than Robert and a boarder at the Schumann house from 1818 until about 1823, his accomplishments may have been a first example for the young boy who writes of the joy of performing.[8]

Other opportunities for public performances may have come with the *Gymnasium* recitals. Schumann's friend Friedrich August Piltzing recalls hearing Moscheles, Variations on *La Marche d'Alexandre* with accompaniment; Henri Herz, Variations, Op. 20; and the music to Bernhard Anselm Weber's melodrama *Gang nach dem Eisenhammer.* There also may have been a performance of the Kalkbrenner Concerto in Schneeberg.[9] But the public arena was not the only venue for Schumann's performances. At the heart of his musical activities in Zwickau was instead his daily participation in the private music-making of his school friends and other amateurs. Two homes, although by no means the only ones where Schumann's music was welcomed and even expected, were centers for this private music-making, Postmaster Johann Georg Schlegel's (an amateur pianist), and the merchant Karl Erdmann Carus's (an amateur violinist). In November 1823 Schumann was present at two quartet evenings at Schlegel's. For the second he took the piano part in Mozart's Piano Quartet in E-flat, K. 493, the strings being played by a mixture of amateurs and professionals including Carus, Karl Gottlob Meißner, the city music director (who taught Schumann flute and cello), and Siebeck.[10] Other works heard on these two occasions were by Rothe (recte Pierre Rode?) and Prince Louis Ferdinand.[11]

At Carus's house, Schumann heard quartets by Haydn and Beethoven.[12] He also accompanied the amateur singer Agnes Carus, Karl Erdmann's sister-in-law, in songs by Gottlob Wiedebein and Louis Spohr,[13] and may have performed with her or in her presence the piano reduction of B. A. Weber's melodrama *Der Gang nach dem Eisenhammer.*[14] Finally, Schumann had various partners for four-hand playing, including Susette Liebenau, wife of the commander of the infantry regiment garrisoned at Zwickau, Oberst Friedrich Christian von Liebenau, and Piltzing, son of the regimental oboist and a fellow piano student. With Frau Liebenau, Schumann played Beethoven's *Eroica* Symphony.[15] Piltzing reports playing four-hand arrangements of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven overtures and symphonies, and original works by Hummel, Weber, and Czerny.[16]

Often Schumann played what he later called thrilling improvisations for his hosts, or regaled them with a flashy solo piece.[17] In this way, an aspect of the works he played for the large and musically less knowledgeable public in attendance at the *Gymnasium* concerts, and at times the very works themselves, found their way into the same performance venue as the songs, chamber pieces, and piano duets shared by a more intimate and musically sophisticated circle. For the concertos, this meant a reduction to their solo parts alone. During the round of visits he made to his Zwickau friends at Christmastime 1828 Schumann played, on 22 December, a rondo by Charles Mayer at the home of his sister-in-law Emilie (the wife of his brother

Julius); concertos by Hummel (in A minor) and Kalkbrenner (the D Minor) at Schlegel's; Weber's *Aufforderung zum Tanz,* a toccata, nocturne, and variations by Mayer, Schubert waltzes, variations by Czerny, and his own improvisations at the home of Superintendent Gottlieb Lorenz (Emilie Schumann's father), whose new grand piano had just arrived.[18] The next day he was again at Schlegel's and played again the Mayer Rondo and Nocturne, the last movement of Kalkbrenner's Concerto, and a *Fantasie* on themes from Mozart's *Le nozze di Figaro,* Op. 77, by Ries.[19] Some of these are the same pieces he played on the *Gymnasium* programs (the Weber and Kalkbrenner), and others (the Ries and Hummel, at least) are their equal in technical difficulty and flashy display.

In his own home Schumann played after dinner every night for his father, then with some school friends he began to try more ambitious programs.[20] The first effort was a performance of Vincenzo Righini's Overture to *Tigrane* with Schumann filling in for any missing instruments and directing at the piano. In 1822 he set the 150th Psalm specially for his ensemble (at the piano he had to play only the bass), and began but did not complete a couple or more overtures, apparently also for his ensemble to play.[21] By 1823 he had expanded the programs to include several choral and instrumental numbers. On 7 December, the group performed (with Schumann's friend Carl Praetorius sharing the direction), in order:

Ernst Eichner, *Sinfonie*
Haydn, "Die Himmel erzählen die Ehre Gottes und seiner Hände" (chorus and fugue from *The Creation*)
Weber, Variations for Piano and Clarinet, Op. 33
Conradin Kreutzer, vocal trio
Ludwig Böhner, Piano Concerto, Op. 7
Weber, "Die Sonn' erwacht!" (chorus from the incidental music to P. A. Wolff's play *Preciosa*)
Jan Willem Wilms, variations for flute and piano
Heinrich Leberecht Mühling, vocal trio
Jan Ladislav Dussek, sonata for violin and piano
Pierre-Antoine-Dominique Della Maria, overture.[22]

It is likely that all the orchestral numbers were played with no more instruments than those listed under the opening *Sinfonie,* namely, four strings (two violins, one played by the clarinet soloist, viola, and bass), two flutes, one horn for both the first and second parts, and the supplementary (and for the Böhner Concerto, also solo) piano.[23]

In 1824 Schumann went public, advertising his concert, whose normal audience would have been only his school friends and father, with a printed program and admission fee.[24] The occasion may have been the arrival of a fine Streicher grand piano from Vienna (which Schumann put down variously to 1824 and 1826).[25] He carried over some of the numbers from 1823 (the

Eichner *Sinfonie,* Della Maria Overture, Weber Clarinet Variations, and Chorus from *Preciosa*), and added to these an overture by Georg Christoph Grosheim; andante for two glasschords, flute, oboe, and clarinet (composer unnamed); aria from Mozart's *Die Entführung aus dem Serail;* chorus from Adrien Boieldieu's *Jean de Paris;* and piano concerto by Lecour (recte Pierre Lecourt).[26] Although some of the works on these two programs cannot be identified precisely or easily found, those that are known (the Haydn and Weber choruses) or can be assumed to be similar to known works (the Boieldieu chorus, Eichner *Sinfonie,* Kreutzer trio, Wilms flute variations) are suitable for amateur ensemble. The aria from *Die Entführung* may be a more ambitious piece (the performer and exact number are unnamed), as are the Weber Clarinet Variations.

In his running commentary on the first program (he left none for the second), the Weber is the piece that excited Schumann most. He praised (with all due modesty) his own performance, "I played with seeming ease and polish," adding that his friend Piltzing played the difficult clarinet part "even more smoothly."[27] Probably Schumann's special joy at his success with the Weber was because it is the only piece on either program, including the two piano concertos (Schumann's only comment on the Böhner was "Tolerable [*Leidlich*]!"), that is truly a display piece. The others belong among a class of works that could be considered suitable more for amicable music-making among friends than a bravura exhibition for a larger public of strangers. In fact, Piltzing says the musicians did not perform in order to receive any glory but, rather, to satisfy an inner urge.[28]

The musical stimuli Schumann received in the homes of Zwickau's most prominent families through his exposure to pieces written for the educated amateur, many of which today are considered classics, reflect the refined upbringing and education he received in general.[29] His father was a successful bookseller who sent him first to the private school of Archdiakonus Dr. Gotthilf Ferdinand Döhner, then beginning in 1820, the Zwickau *Lyceum.* Latin and Greek were the primary subjects at the *Lyceum,* and Schumann became a talented translator of the classics.[30] Little time was spent on modern German literature, so together with his classmates he formed a literary society (*Litterarischer Verein*) that met thirty times from 1825 to 1828. They read primarily plays and poems by Schiller, and biographies from Karl Heinrich Jördens's six-volume *Lexikon deutscher Dichter und Prosaisten* (1806–11), but also works by Raupauch, Jean Paul, Schlegel, and Fichte, among others.[31] Already the schoolboy had collected some of his own poems into a volume titled "Allerley aus der Feder Roberts an der Mulde" (1822–25), and gathered a miscellany of poems (his own and others), dramatic fragments, album entries, aphorisms, reminiscences, translations, short biographies of composers, excerpts from Friedrich Daniel Schubart's *Ideen zu einer Ästhetik der Tonkunst,* and other articles in his "Blätter und Blümchen aus der goldenen Aue" (1823). Around this time he also wrote a number of autobiographical sketches (1825), began his dairy (1827), and

sketched several dramatic and prose texts, including an autobiographical novel, "Juniusabende und Julitage" (1828).[32] He observed that, by 1827, "Poetic attempts often supplant musical ones," and wondered if he would become a poet.[33]

The dilution of Schumann's musical pursuits by his devotion to literature no doubt reflects the wide scope of his father's activities. August Schumann had written several novels, published pocket editions of German and foreign classics including works by Sir Walter Scott, Byron (in his own translation), and Bulwer Lytton, founded and edited a provincial paper, and begun a large commercial lexicon of information on Saxony.[34] Occasionally Robert was engaged in writing projects for the family business: at age twelve (1822–23) he was assigned to copy out [*abschreiben*] biographies of famous musicians for his father's portrait book, *Bildnisse der berühmteste Menschen aller Völker und Zeiten;* in 1828 he read proofs for a new edition of Egidio Forcellini's *Totius latinitatis Lexicon* that his brothers published after they inherited the family business.[35] But, for Robert, another attraction of literature may have been that, whereas as a musician he was "a youth among adults," he shared the passion for poetry with his classmates who made up the *Verein,* and with his closest friends a year or two older, Emil Flechsig, Eduard Röller, and Hermann Walther.[36] Flechsig recalls the joy of being allowed to spend Sunday afternoons in the private library Schumann's father normally kept locked.[37] Röller says that at least in school Schumann leaned more toward literature [*Schriftstellerei*] than music. He notes that Schumann shared with him plans for future philological works but never discussed with him any outward influence on his eventual decision to become a musician.[38]

If the even balance between Schumann's literary and musical pursuits reflects his education as a gentleman of the middle class who had leisure to become both an accomplished musician and writer, it also was determined by the fact that, even were he inclined to pursue a career as a professional pianist and composer, there was no available guidance nor model for this in Zwickau. Indeed, later he was to write that perhaps it was himself who served as a model.[39] According to his own account his teacher Kuntsch's playing was "only mediocre" and by 1822 or 1823 he had surpassed him and quit his lessons.[40] Thus most, if not all, of the difficult solos he played for the *Gymnasium* recitals were prepared without Kuntsch's advice.[41] Beyond that, Schumann heard no "great artists" from out of town.[42] His longing for the experience was likely the incentive for his father's plan to take him to Dresden to study under Carl Maria von Weber, the nearest musician of international repute, but the plan fell through when Weber died in June 1826, just two months before Schumann's father.

In his musical reminiscences Schumann carefully noted the names of artists he did hear or meet: a flutist, Joseph Wolfram; harpist, [first name unknown] Swoboda; organist, Ernst Köhler; and from Dresden, the cellists, Justus Johann Friedrich Dotzauer and Friedrich August Kummer; tenor, Johann Gottfried Bergmann; and organist, Václav Horak.[43] None were of

widespread fame. An encounter in 1818 or 1819 with Moscheles in Carlsbad became a vivid memory, unforgettable after more than thirty years, even though Schumann apparently did not hear the artist play on this occasion but only sat in front of him at a recital by the singer Pauline Anna Milder-Hauptmann. In 1851 Schumann wrote Moscheles that for a long time he had kept as a souvenir a program Moscheles had touched. Although he was famous, the composer's modest demeanor among the guests at the resort became a symbol for the youth.[44] Later, Moscheles's *Alexander* Variations was one of his signature pieces for public performance.[45]

* * *

When Schumann left Zwickau for Leipzig in spring 1828 to enroll as a law student at the university, the nature of his sphere of private music-making was much the same as it had been in his hometown. He was a frequent guest at the home of Dr. Ernst August Carus, where he continued to accompany his wife, Agnes, in songs by Beethoven, Schubert, Spohr, Loewe, Franz Danzi, Carl Arnold, or of his own composition.[46] Four-hand playing remained a favorite pastime indulged at the home of the music publisher Heinrich Probst, and with his fellow students Johann Friedrich Täglichbeck, August Nathanael Böhner, Julius Knorr, and Christian Gottlob Glock.[47] The repertory included numerous works by Schubert, others by Czerny, Herz, Kalkbrenner, Moscheles, George Onslow, Carl Gottlieb Reissiger, Ries, and Christian Rummel, also his own polonaises and set of variations.[48] With his friends Schumann also gathered regularly to play piano trios and quartets at *Quartett-* and *Terzettabende.* They read works by Böhner, Cramer, Dussek, Kalkbrenner, Charles Philippe Lafont, Joseph Mayseder, Reißiger, and Weber; played more than one work each by Beethoven, Prince Louis Ferdinand, Mozart, Onslow, and Ries; and gave repeat performances of works by Prince Louis Ferdinand, Pixis, Ries, and Schubert (Piano Trio in E-flat Major, Op. 100).[49] The final meeting, on 28 March 1829, was celebrated with a performance of Schumann's own Piano Quartet in C Minor, Op. V, which the group had begun practicing as early as 31 January.[50] Quite naturally, the young musician continued to entertain his friends with brilliant solos, including the Kalkbrenner and Hummel concertos, but also other virtuosic pieces, sonatas, rondos, variations, polonaises, and toccatas by Czerny, Hummel, Franz Hünten, Kalkbrenner, Mayer, Moscheles, Mozart, Ries, and Weber.[51] He improvised every day, most often at home, but also for his friends.[52]

What opened up considerably for Schumann in Leipzig, a town ten times the size of Zwickau, was his exposure to professional musicians, and, as he recalled, "good music."[53] He became a regular attendee of the concerts of the Gewandhaus Orchestra where he witnessed orchestral performances of seven of Beethoven's nine symphonies, and heard numerous concertos and concertinos.[54] Unlike the chamber pieces he played in the homes of his friends, among the latter works there were very few that might be played today (violin concertos by Spohr and Rode; the Weber Concertino for

Clarinet) but, instead, a raft of pieces by composers alive at the time but now mostly forgotten, for example: Mayseder, and Johannes Wenzeslaus Kalliwoda (violin concerto, violin concertino); Bernhard Henrik Crusell (clarinet concerto); Christian Gottlieb Belcke (flute concertino); Christian Gottlieb Müller (bass trombone concertino); Friedrich August Kummer (oboe concertino); Ries (piano concerto). Their works were performed by numerous local soloists, most from the Gewandhaus Orchestra, and occasionally a more (or less) famous visiting artist, as when Kalliwoda came to town, or the fourteen-year-old Friedrich Wörlitzer played the Kalkbrenner Concerto—probably the first performance of the piece outside his own that Schumann heard.[55] At the Caruses, Schumann met the well-known piano and voice pedagogue who soon became his own teacher, Friedrich Wieck, then later, through Wieck, the director of the opera, Heinrich Marschner.[56] It was as Wieck's student that he first associated with pianists as accomplished as himself, Wieck's daughter Clara and Emilie Reichold among them.[57]

The lessons with Wieck began in August 1828. According to Schumann's later testimony, his teacher carefully coached him in technique and tone production beginning with "the C major scale."[58] He practiced etudes by Cramer and studied from Hummel's *Clavierschule*.[59] By his own assessment he was industrious in his study of the piano, and made great technical strides in his playing, although Wieck wrote Schumann's mother on 9 August 1830 that her son was a contentious pupil who regularly excused himself from lessons.[60] One of Schumann's first assignments from Wieck was Hummel's Concerto in A Minor.[61] As was already mentioned, he played the piece for his friends in Zwickau when he returned there for a Christmas vacation in late 1828. He then continued his practice on it in spring 1829 until on 21 March he tried it out at one of his quartet evenings.[62] In the meantime he also began working up Moscheles's *Alexander* Variations.[63] Lessons with Wieck and practice on both the Concerto and Variations continued through 9 April.[64] Schumann's efforts culminated in a public performance of both pieces, not in Leipzig, but Zwickau, where he probably felt more secure in his role as public performer. He returned home, then on 15 April, the day after his arrival, gave the Concerto a hearing at the home of his oldest brother, Eduard. On 23 April there was a rehearsal at Schlegel's, then on 28 April the dress rehearsal and public performance of the Concerto's first movement and of the *Alexander* Variations.[65] Schumann wrote his Leipzig friend Gisbert Rosen that an audience of 800 to 1,000 was present.[66] He was later to recall this as one of his finest hours.[67]

* * *

After the sojourn in Zwickau, Schumann left for Heidelberg, where he was to remain as a law student until fall 1830. His ostensible reason for coming to the city was to study with Karl Joseph Anton Mittermaier, a teacher of criminal law and advocate of moderate liberalism, and Anton Friedrich

Justus Thibaut, a specialist in Roman law, also scholar of early church music and founder of a choral society that met weekly at his home.[68] However, the move may have been motivated as much by a desire to be with his friend and fellow law student, Gisbert Rosen.[69] Schumann went to Thibaut as soon as he arrived in Heidelberg in late May, and later was present for at least two of his performances.[70] He even wrote his mother that he spent his "most enjoyable hours" at the Thursday evening meetings at Thibaut's, but his diary entries do not indicate that he was a regular at the gatherings.[71] To Wieck Schumann wrote that Thibaut's views on music were narrow-minded and pedantic; he mocked Thibaut's love of Handel arias, which he confided to his diary were "somewhat boring."[72] Röller recalls that whereas Schumann often spoke enthusiastically of Thibaut's musical soirées, he never expressed a desire to imitate them or work in the genres (of the *alte Kirchenmeister*) they promoted.[73]

For amateur music-making, Schumann seemed to prefer the circle of his own friends, and quickly gathered around him a group for this purpose. He played piano four-hands with Theodor Töpken, chamber music with the cellists Julius Klughist and J. August Lemke, and violinist Hermann Wolff, performing on different evenings works by Beethoven, Schubert, Spohr, and Onslow.[74] He accompanied the singer Friedrich Weber, mentioning specifically Wiedebein's lieder.[75] He was acquainted with Friedrich Joseph Hofmann, the city music director, and Christian Faulhaber, a music teacher, and was a guest in the homes of Dr. A. Wüstenfeld and the Englishman J. Mitchell where he played (and heard) solo and chamber music and improvised.[76] Töpken says Schumann excited a wide circle through his improvisation and came to be expected in certain houses.[77] He also continued to impress the Heidelberg students with his virtuosic performances, often enough, of the Hummel Concerto. Töpken, on first meeting Schumann, was astounded by the aplomb of his playing and conscious artistry in his performance of this very piece.[78] In his letter of 6 November 1829 Schumann let Wieck know that he was still practicing the concerto, and had even given a fellow student of the piece some suggestions on tone production.[79] By this time he had learned to play the first movement "calmly, with assurance, and technically without fault."[80]

Schumann also joined a *Museum,* a society for social intercourse and cultural activities whose members, primarily students, put on regular concerts of instrumental music, including symphonies by Beethoven and Haydn, but also instrumental solos, of works mostly forgotten by now, by Karl Keller (variations for flute), Rode (violin concerto), Dotzauer (rondo for cello), Kreutzer (double concerto for two violins), and Frantisek Martin Pechatschek (variations for oboe).[81] At one of these Schumann decided to appear with the *Alexander* Variations. Beginning at least as early as 26 November 1829 he spent weeks preparing for the concert that took place on 24 January 1830. The appearance, his "glory day," generated "unending applause" leaving him in high spirits, but afterward he seems to have fallen

into a funk and stopped practicing.[82] On 5 March 1830 he wrote, "Short piano exercises, entirely neglected for 4 weeks," that is, since just after the January performance.[83] He may have been forced to quit after overstraining himself, even to the extent of harming his finger.[84] Diary entries from this time show him often drinking excessively.[85] But, the performance had in fact gained him a substantial reputation among all the influential people in the area.[86]

Gradually Schumann resumed practice, with sometimes good and sometimes bad results. A trip to Frankfurt to hear Nicolò Paganini perform on 11 April 1830 may have encouraged him to forge ahead. Although he had reservations about the concert, he also wrote of his rapture, and later recalled that Paganini excited him to work to extremes.[87] Around this time he also may have heard the young violin virtuoso and acclaimed student of Paganini, Heinrich Wilhelm Ernst. Röller reports that when Ernst came to Heidelberg in 1830 Schumann associated with him assiduously, and thus it was possible that the sixteen-year-old professional worked a strong and perhaps decisive influence on the law student.[88] By 3 June Schumann wrote his brother Carl that he was playing the piano daily from eight to ten o'clock every morning, and by 25 September he reported to Dr. Carus that he had practiced three to four hours every day for the last twelve weeks.[89]

The incentive for this new regimen was a plan to quit his law studies and prepare himself for a career as a professional musician. On 30 July 1830 Schumann wrote to ask his mother's approval of a step he said Thibaut, the town's most prestigious musician even if not one Schumann admired uncritically, had long recommended.[90] His idea was first to return to Wieck for lessons, then go to Vienna to study with Moscheles (who was, in fact, living in London). Within six years he intended to be the technical equal of any pianist. At Schumann's urging his mother wrote Wieck, who promised to turn Schumann into one of the world's greatest living pianists in a mere three years provided he submit to a rigorous program of piano and theory study.[91]

* * *

Schumann prepared for his turn from unusually gifted, much feted, and very skilled amateur to aspiring professional not only by his commitment to the training Wieck outlined but also by composing pieces that suited his ambitions. Three large and difficult works were begun in Heidelberg: a toccata in C major (Op. 7, published in 1834), the *Abegg* Variations (Op. 1, published in 1831), and a Concerto in F Major.[92] The *Abegg* Variations grew out of Schumann's improvisations for his friends, and as we know them today are for solo piano.[93] Early on, though, Schumann dressed up their impressive piano part with an orchestral introduction.[94] Had he completed this version no doubt it would also have had orchestral interludes, just like Moscheles's grand *Alexander* Variations that Schumann played for audiences in Zwickau and Heidelberg, or a work he did not yet know but would practice assiduously

after his return to Leipzig, Chopin's Variations on *Là ci darem la mano,* Op. 2.[95] As we shall see in Chapter 3, the Concerto also follows models Schumann knew well from his performances, concertos by Hummel and Kalkbrenner.

Schumann's earliest compositions—songs, piano four-hand pieces, a piano quartet—grew out of shared music-making with a few friends. It was with these friends, and at Gewandhaus concerts, that he nurtured a love for works by composers of an earlier generation: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert. When he made plans to step onto a larger stage, works by these older composers, or more particularly any concertos by Mozart or Beethoven, were not his models, even supposing that he knew their concertos which he probably did not. His first pieces addressed to a large public look instead to more recent, more brilliant pieces by still-living, highly acclaimed, and internationally admired pianists.

2
The Virtuoso Concerto

The piano concertos that Schumann knew and studied early on can be labeled, if rather loosely, virtuoso concertos. Into this category fall works by Field, Herz, Hummel, Kalkbrenner, Moscheles, Pixis, and Ries, to name only those composers whose concertos were certainly known to Schumann by 1831 when he finished the solo part of the first movement of his F Major Concerto. His most important models were Hummel's A Minor Concerto, then later Herz's A Major, but these are no more than representative examples of a larger group of works with which they share many characteristics. The overview that follows surveys these characteristics in order to establish the background against which Schumann composed his own first concerto. The discussion will be confined to first movements as that is all Schumann completed of his concerto (he began a third movement that breaks off after its thirty-third measure; no part of a second movement is extant). It will concentrate on twelve concertos, listed here, which Schumann's meticulous record keeping shows he knew.

Field	A-flat Major	composed 1811?, published 1816
Ries	E-flat Major, Op. 42	composed 1811, published 1812
	C-sharp Minor, Op. 55	composed 1812, published 1815
	C Minor, Op. 115	composed 1809, published 1823
Hummel	A Minor, Op. 85	composed 1816, published c. 1821
	B Minor, Op. 89	composed 1819, published c. 1821
Moscheles	F Major, Op. 45	published 1819
	E-flat Major, Op. 56	composed 1823
	G Minor, Op. 60	composed 1820; in some publications, Op. 58
Kalkbrenner	D Minor, Op. 61	composed 1823
Herz	A Major, Op. 34	published 1827?
Pixis	C Major, Op. 100	published 1829?[1]

At the time he was composing his F Major Concerto, the concertos of Mozart and Beethoven were of little interest to Schumann as compositional models. If he knew any at all, possibly through his contact with the Wiecks, he made no record of it.[2] Even in 1833, when he was already acquainted with some of them, he saw in Beethoven's Fifth Concerto in E-flat Major, the *Emperor,* only a fine but antiquated example from a bygone era; Beethoven's Third Concerto in C Minor he considered not worth inflicting on an audience even in that capacity.[3] Today, however, when we are so familiar with the classical concertos of Mozart and Beethoven and very little beyond these up to Schumann and Liszt, it is best and easiest to describe and assess the virtuoso concertos Schumann knew in terms of their relation to the Mozart-Beethoven legacy.[4]

The most important point of similarity is the pattern of alternating large tutti and solo sections, whereas one of the most conspicuous differences is the radically changed relationship between tutti and solo sections. Dominance of the solo sections tends to increase in the virtuoso concerto to the point at which thematic interplay between tutti and solo becomes crucially attenuated. After the first tutti, the function of the orchestra is reduced most of the time to mere accompaniment so that the shaping of the form falls largely if not entirely to the solo. The piano writing can afford to be, and usually is, highly idiomatic. It also becomes increasingly sectionalized on both small and large levels: melodic and passagework areas are clearly separated from each other; within the passagework the several figural and harmonic gestures are individualized into relatively small, discrete units. We will begin with a discussion in general terms of the construction of the tuttis and solos, also of the large-scale sectionalization of the solos in the classical and virtuoso concerto. The individualization of smaller units within passagework areas will require a more rigorously analytical approach, which will conclude the chapter.

Before beginning our discussion, we must mention two concertos of an earlier type, by Ludwig Böhner (1787–1860) and Pierre Lecourt (b. 1755), that Schumann performed in his home with a small orchestra of his friends when he was only thirteen or fourteen years old.[5] The Lecourt Concerto in C Major, Op. 1 (published 1786), is a later offshoot of a style predating even Mozart's early years. Böhner's Concerto in E-flat Major, Op. 7, although perhaps showing the influence of Beethoven's early concertos, falls, like Lecourt's, into a category of concertos that could be performed by amateurs.[6] I believe both may be disregarded as influences on the twenty-year-old Schumann's concept of the art form: unlike the virtuoso concertos he learned in his youth, in later years he seems to have shown little interest in either. No other record of the Lecourt Concerto can be found in any of his writings. Although he retained the score of the Böhner at least through 1830 or 1831 when he drew up the inventory of his musical library, in later reviews of his works Schumann characterizes Böhner as a composer from an older school whose more recent works (post c. 1825) are generally eccentric and uneven.[7]

* * *

Classical and the virtuoso concertos share an overall outline in their first movements of four tutti ritornellos framing three solo sections, the latter corresponding to the exposition, development and recapitulation of sonata form. Within this outer form all virtuoso concertos exhibit certain characteristic divergences from the Mozart–Beethoven practice, with regard to construction, key schemes, and thematic interrelations that tend to become greater as time goes on. It is best, therefore, to begin by summarizing the earlier practice, laying special emphasis on those features that will undergo varying degrees of changes in the hands of successor generations.

The procedure of the mature Mozart is to introduce in the opening tutti only some, not all, important themes of the movement (in this regard, the near monothematicism of the C Minor Concerto, K. 491, is exceptional). He invariably begins with the theme that also serves as the first theme of what can be considered the full sonata exposition that comes in the first solo. A transitional passage that stays with rare exception (for example, the E-flat Major Concerto, K. 449) in the tonic key leads to the next theme. Sometimes, perhaps more often than not, this new theme reappears in the subsequent solo exposition, but always in a decidedly less prominent position (in K. 449 it serves as the second member of the second theme group). When it is absent in the first solo, it is certain to surface in the later course of the movement.

Returning to the opening tutti, the new theme is followed by a closing group in the tonic key, consisting of at least two, sometimes three thematic segments with varying degrees of motivic relationship to themes heard previously. Some of these, too, may or may not be present in the subsequent solo exposition, but the last short member never is. It is worth giving it the label "special tutti close," for most of the time it is used in this role in the second and fourth tuttis. A most important hallmark of Mozart's scheme is that he reserves one particularly prominent theme for the solo exposition alone. The theme used to start out the second theme group in the new key is almost always absent from the tutti (one notable exception being the A Major Concerto, K. 488). When first heard, it stands out conspicuously because of the long dominant preparation and artful reduction of the texture to a single brilliant piano line immediately preceding it.

Concerning the first solos of Mozart's piano concertos there are three important points. First, on a few occasions he introduces the sonata exposition proper by a passage that may be a cadenza (for example, in the C Major Concerto, K. 467), a full-fledged theme (in the D Minor Concerto, K. 466, or the C Minor, K. 491), or some combination of the two (the C Major Concerto, K. 503). Second, he always assigns the orchestra some significant role in the solo exposition (as he does also in the solo development). Thus, the twofold presentation of the theme that starts out the new key area is usually given once to the solo, once to the orchestra, and a similar sharing of duties occurs in other segments as well. Even in segments in which the solo dominates by virtue of the brilliance of its passagework, the role of

defining thematic identity often falls to the orchestra (in K. 503, beginning at bar 130). Third, whatever themes the opening tutti and the first solo may share with one another, the brilliant solo close of the exposition is always new, even when many motivic threads (often in the orchestra) severally connect it with previously heard themes. The close features passagework but always forms a grammatical unit complete in itself, a phrase (possibly repeated) or several phrases, which are then amply and volubly extended. In other words, they are, to use William Rothstein's term, large suffixes.[8]

This last point will be taken up in greater detail in the analytical portion of this chapter. For now, it should be noted that constructing the opening tutti and the first solo with such flexibility in the use of its multifarious thematic entities is the principal source of the dramatic potential of the Mozartean concerto movement. On hearing any one of the themes, the listener cannot help but wonder where and when it will return, whether played by solo or by tutti, and in company with what other themes.

In constructing his first tutti and first solo, indeed his entire movement, Beethoven maintains all essential features of the Mozart model. This is easily seen in such details as the high profile of the orchestra within the solo sections, or the grammatical integrity of the brilliant solo close. Less immediately noticeable in Beethoven is the flexibility afforded by a multitude of different thematic entities. The principal reason is his proclivity for motivic integration. More even than Mozart during his last years, Beethoven fashions thoroughly different themes from identical motivic material (for example, the two themes in bars 1–14 and 15–28 in the first movement of the G Major Concerto). Conversely, he uses the same conspicuous musical idea to establish connections between themes of thoroughly different motivic content (the use of the mediant chord, either as such or as V of VI, in the first theme of the G Major Concerto, then in the first half of the thematic entity in bars 29–43). Procedures like these abound in Beethoven's concertos, creating *de facto* the same kind of thematic diversity and dramatic potential observed in Mozart.

In one respect, though, Beethoven's practice differs from Mozart's: in three of his five piano concertos and in the Violin Concerto he presents already in the tutti the theme Mozart usually reserves for the inauguration of the second key area in the solo exposition. To be sure, this difference by itself is of no great moment in three of these four works (the C Major and E-flat Major Piano Concertos, plus the Violin Concerto), as in them the tutti steers clear of the second key area just as in Mozart. The C Minor Concerto, however, represents a genuine departure: the secondary key of E-flat major is thoroughly established in the tutti; the theme in question begins in that key, turning back to the home tonic only in the course of a second statement. More than anything else, it is probably this Beethoven concerto that contributed to a false notion arising sometime in the nineteenth century that the classical concerto has two expositions, one by the tutti, the other by the solo.[9]

The remaining sections of the classical concerto, the second and third tuttis, the second and third solos, and the final tutti, need only a few remarks. It is important to emphasize that thematically as well as in every other respect they are organic outgrowths of the first tutti and the first solo, because this will not be so in most virtuoso concertos. The second tutti is fashioned out of one or more portions of the first tutti and usually includes the special tutti close.[10] The second solo, despite the term, is actually a dialogue between solo and orchestra, the piano playing obbligato some of the time. It develops previously exposed material and often enough gives one party the opportunity to take up themes previously reserved for the other (Mozart's C Major Concerto, K. 503, is a particularly telling example). The key scheme rarely involves any but directly related keys.

The recapitulation and the final tutti represent a dénouement in the classical concerto. Third tutti and third solo are not separated from one another; instead, orchestra and piano join forces in presenting the opening theme. This presentation is always different from those previously heard: usually the orchestra takes the lead, the solo plays obbligato at least some of the time. Thereafter, both the transition and the second group of the solo are expanded as they now bring together all materials previously exposed separately in the first tutti and the first solo. The final tutti is similar to the second as it is again fashioned out of portions of the first tutti, but it stops at the suitable point on a cadential six-four chord for the solo's cadenza *ad libitum.* After the cadenza, the conclusion of the movement usually features the tutti's special close. Just how much, or rather how little, the cadenza represents any kind of pianistic free-for-all can be judged from the cadenzas Mozart and Beethoven wrote for some of their concertos, including the one (not *ad libitum*) that Beethoven composed for his E-flat Major Concerto with an important part for the orchestra.

The twelve virtuoso concertos listed at the beginning of this chapter all differ in varying degrees from the classical model. The three most important differences show up right at the beginning, in the construction and new role of the first tutti, in the relationship between the tutti and first solo, and in the construction and impact of the solo close, called by Schumann rather characteristically the *brillante Schluß.* To a large extent, all other differences are consequences of these three. Naturally, these differences did not arise from one day to the next and they did not arise with any sort of purposeful linearity, either. As our survey will show, the lines of development are sometimes conflicting. A general statement can be made, though, namely that the youngest of the seven composers in our survey, Herz (b. 1803), and the one most closely associated with the Parisian school of piano virtuosos, composed a concerto that could stand in for our proposed model of the virtuoso concerto. In turn his concerto very much follows Kalkbrenner's (b. 1788), who was also associated with the Parisian school, as was Pixis (b. 1788). Works by older composers (Hummel, b. 1778; Field, b. 1782; Ries, b. 1784) who were removed from the Parisian orbit show more characteristics left

over from the classical model. The incorporation of such characteristics by the younger Moscheles (b. 1794), who also had little to do with Paris, appears to be a deliberately conservative choice.

The first difference is that the opening tutti of the virtuoso concerto tends to become an independent unit, practically a closed form in itself, in contrast to Mozart, where its primary role is prefatory. The principal musical reason is twofold: the first tuttis of all the virtuoso concertos include the so-called second theme, and in most this theme enters in a new, thoroughly established secondary key. Only in the Moscheles E-flat Major Concerto is the second theme played in the home tonic key. After the return to the home tonic the close frequently refers back to the opening theme, creating the impression of a self-contained **ABA'** form, with the special tutti close (if there is one) serving as a codetta. The impression is all the stronger because most of these concertos contain only two memorable themes: the one at the opening, the other in the secondary key.

Second, as does the first tutti, the first solo also tends to become a unit in itself. Although its construction parallels that of the first tutti, but for the fact that it stays in the secondary key, it takes the form of a free variation or even a free fantasia for the piano alone over themes sounded in the preceding tutti. Gone is the thematic give-and-take of the Mozartean prototype. A characteristic feature in many of our sample concertos is the ever more dubious relationship between the opening themes of first tutti and first solo. The latter always have bravura elements in their free introduction, but on occasion such a free introduction can become no more than a brilliant cadenza with just a few references to the tutti's first theme or none at all.

Also, further subdivisions of the first solo tend to be more sharply separated from each other, both by texture and by strongly articulated cadences, than is the case with Mozart or Beethoven. In nearly all cases the transition contains a separate passagework area fully separated from what precedes it by a clearly articulated cadence and a change in texture. In cases in which the transition begins as a counterstatement of the first theme, there still remains a separate brilliant passagework area. The only exception is the Moscheles Concerto in F Major, in which a counterstatement of the first theme serves alone as a transition. The artful thinning down of the texture toward the end of the dominant preparation, an inheritance from the older concerto, is found in nearly all the virtuoso concertos. All the second groups repeat the pattern of thematic area followed by passagework. In the thematic area none allows the orchestra more than occasional punctuation of cadences, or a few bars or motives from the theme, always played to the solo's obbligato.

The third important difference is that both the construction and the impact of the brilliant solo close are radically changed in the virtuoso concerto as compared to its classical model. It is still a suffix to the first full cadence in the new key (as Rothstein calls this and other closes), but now it is a long string of short appendices, cadential gestures tacked onto that cadence. It is

not made up of the full-fledged grammatical units expanded from within, that is to say, of so-called large suffixes that were justly named closing themes in classical concertos. As these virtuosic cadential vamps can be tacked on practically without end, can be varied, can be transposed for intriguing modulations, and can be further expanded from within, the virtuoso close tends to become ever longer, considerably longer than its classical counterpart. This very length, also the *l'art pour l'art* pianistic brilliance and the requisite compositional ingenuity, tend to transform the solo close into two things at once, the true raison d'être of the virtuoso concerto and at the same time some kind of a time-out or free-for-all.[11]

Because the construction of the brilliant close will be subject to more intensive scrutiny toward the end of this chapter, here it will only be noted that, as in the classical concerto, in the virtuoso concerto a cadence normally signals the end of the preceding thematic area and the beginning of the close, but in the virtuoso concerto the break between the two is likely to be more emphatic. In Mozart, the usual sixteenth notes of the passagework may already begin in an obbligato decoration to the preceding theme. The performer may wish to nuance the cadence of the theme by drawing it out, but no abrupt break will be heard. In Beethoven, a most eloquent example is found in the G Major Concerto, where the piano obbligato to the orchestra's presentation of the final theme of the second group (begins bar 134) runs seamlessly into the close (begins bar 157). The orchestra continues as the primary carrier of the main thematic and rhythmic motives, reaching a cadence to close alone (at bar 180, where its first inversion tonic chord also begins the special tutti close).

On rare occasions the smooth rhythmic transition from the thematic area to the close found in classical concertos survives in virtuoso concertos. In Hummel's A Minor Concerto the winds, supported by the piano which also plays sixteenth-note obbligato, carry a portion of the tune in the theme preceding the close. With the beginning of the close (bars 201–11, partially in Example 2.2), the winds start a new phrase and the piano continues the obbligato. More often in the virtuoso concerto the separation between thematic area and close is abrupt: the lyrical theme, with its *espressivo* tempo fluctuations necessitated by the free-flowing and cadenza-like pianistic embellishments, cadences immediately onto the rhythmically strict passagework of the close, creating a sense of sharp contrast. Often enough the spell of a languorous melody is broken by a vigorous tonic-dominant vamp. In Ries's C-sharp Minor Concerto the theme of the second group ends *espressivo* in eighth notes. The passagework, triplet sixteenth notes over a tonic-dominant vamp, follows immediately. In Field's A-flat Major Concerto the nocturne-like theme of the second group is repeated in the minor, *pianissimo* and *diminuendo,* then followed straight away by a *con spirito* vamp, *mezzo forte.*

As mentioned earlier, most other departures in the virtuoso concerto from its classical predecessor follow from those described above. As there is little thematic interplay between first tutti and first solo, there is little reason to

have much reference in the second tutti to the first. The main function of the second tutti is to signal the end of the exposition and to lead into the key of the second solo. The special tutti close that used to bestow a certain separate identity on classical tuttis is dispensable; in many concertos, it does not reappear.

The pattern of second solos is the same in almost all virtuoso concertos: a closed, *espressivo* thematic statement usually in a remote key (for example, F-sharp major in Pixis's C Major Concerto; E-flat minor/major in Kalkbrenner's D Minor Concerto; B-flat major/minor followed directly by D-flat major in Hummel's B Minor Concerto) is often introduced by a free bravura passage and is then always followed by passagework that modulates back home. A close relationship between the *espressivo* theme and earlier materials is exceptional; mostly it ranges from the highly tenuous to the nonexistent. The passagework, too, is mostly new, with only occasional references to earlier materials, and usually with minimal orchestral participation. Modulatory routes tend to match in adventurousness those heard in the brilliant close: sequences traverse a number of keys before arriving at a retransition to the recapitulation. The only two concertos that show some variance from this model are the Field, and Moscheles E-flat Major.[12]

In the recapitulation there is no call for the kind of dénouement seen in Mozart, in part because of the very nature of the opening theme, in part because of the general paucity of themes exposed. The entire first group area is more or less drastically reduced; in two instances (Herz and Pixis), the third tutti is altogether eliminated. Similar curtailments can be observed in every other virtuoso concerto under consideration. The only thing expanded in the recapitulation is the brilliant close, which in some instances becomes an even more extravagant display than in the exposition. Whereas the closes in Ries's three concertos are near to their original exposition form, those in the other nine concertos show more variation, at least in their figuration if not their general outline. The closes of the Hummel B Minor, Kalkbrenner, and Herz concertos are fully new.

As the brilliant close cannot be surpassed, final tuttis tend to be short, with no room for a solo cadenza. They merely provide the concluding blast. Only the Moscheles G Minor Concerto incorporates a short written-out cadenza. Usually the eight to sixteen bars of a final tutti involve some reference to the opening theme; only the three Ries and the Pixis concertos incorporate the special tutti close. Its fate is perhaps emblematic of the changed concept of the genre. Its presence in all of the first tuttis of all the concertos except the Field and Moscheles F Major shows the dependence of the new model on the old. It serves in every case the very practical purpose of quieting down the orchestra in preparation for the solo entrance. At the same time, its rare recurrence in or complete elimination from subsequent tuttis shows it to be a rudiment with hardly any other function.

In the light of these summary statements, the classical concerto can be seen to have a high degree of organic unity that is lacking in its virtuoso

successor. The form of Mozart's and Beethoven's first movements unfolds gradually as solo and orchestra cooperate in equal measure in answering all questions raised and fulfilling all promises made. The form of the virtuoso concerto, with its sharp divisions between and within sections, tends to become a fixed framework for display. Its virtues lie in what is displayed: grand themes of an often theatrical nature and truly brilliant virtuosity.

The virtuoso concerto as essentially a piece for piano alone with orchestral introduction is, of course, connected with the drastic reduction or complete elimination of any orchestra role in the three solo areas. Among the twelve virtuoso concertos under consideration, even in those five in which the orchestra is allowed some role (namely, in the Field, Hummel A Minor and B Minor, Ries C Minor and E-flat Major, and Moscheles E-flat Major) the role is vestigial compared to Mozart or Beethoven. One can only wonder how this situation came about. To be sure, the changing aesthetic climate of the time with a growing interest in sheer virtuosity and in an instrument that is constantly growing bigger and better may have much to do with it, as undoubtedly do the personal inclinations of the composers themselves. But the strongest reason may well be a purely practical consideration. Often enough, the touring virtuoso found himself performing in small towns in the company of an underrehearsed, semiprofessional *ad hoc* orchestra, or none at all.[13] The independent tutti may go by the board; the independent first solo may become the beginning of the concerto. Common publisher's practice provides here a hint. The options offered of purchasing a concerto's piano part alone, or with quartet parts, or with full orchestral accompaniment testify to the various performance possibilities.[14]

* * *

As mentioned earlier, construction of the passagework in the brilliant close (and sometimes elsewhere as well) is rather different in the classical and virtuoso concertos. This will be illustrated by detailed examination of the closes of three concertos, by Beethoven, Hummel, and Herz, with primary emphasis on what Rothstein calls phrase rhythm, but also with a view toward the changing concept of what constitutes pianistic virtuosity. The Beethoven example is from the C Minor Concerto, Op. 37, because this concerto resembles, at least in some respects, the virtuoso model.[15] Furthermore, its close can be taken as representative of the close as it was developed by Mozart, even if on a somewhat larger scale. Concertos by Hummel (A Minor) and Herz (A Major) were chosen because of Schumann's interest in these works as a performer and composer. Hummel's work represents an older style, closer to that of his teacher Mozart or to Beethoven, with whom he had some personal association, and will bear on the discussion in the next chapter concerning the first work Schumann completed on his F Major Concerto.[16] Herz's exemplifies the newer, Parisian school and will be discussed in connection with Schumann's later work on his concerto, to be taken up in Chapter 4.[17]

In adopting an analytical framework for the comparisons in this and subsequent chapters, I am guided by two recent studies on phrase construction, Rothstein's *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music,* and Ivan F. Waldbauer's "Riemann's Periodization Revisited and Revised," both from 1989. The approaches of these two historically oriented studies differ to some extent but, fortunately for our purposes, in the matter of certain basic concepts inherited from Heinrich Christoph Koch's over two-centuries-old *Introductory Essay,* there is a large area of general agreement between them. Koch distinguishes basic phrases, phrases expanded from within, and phrases extended by additions from without, the additions being either prefixes (prefaces), suffixes (appendices) or parentheses (interpolations). Rothstein redefines these by the Schenkerian conception of tonal organization and by recourse to more recent studies on rhythm and meter.[18] He rejects Hugo Riemann's assumption that all music is related to the basic eight-measure period, which he considers an unacceptable apriorism. In contrast, Waldbauer, whose study centers on Riemann's system, takes the Riemannian eight-measure assumption as his point of departure but makes a number of important revisions. All of the revisions are intended to alleviate the ill effects of Riemann's apriorisms; they make the system flexible enough to render Riemann's number-based analytical method applicable to a wide range of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century music.

Waldbauer is particularly successful exactly where the principal interest of the analyses in the present and subsequent chapters lies, on suffixes large and small. Incidentally, despite his reservations about Riemann in general, Rothstein, too, considers Riemann's original contribution to the concept of suffix of surpassing value.[19] For this reason, and for its immediate visual value, the Waldbauer-Riemann method (to be detailed later) will be used in examples featuring suffixes and similar constructions, but only rarely in other types of phrase construction. In these other types, Rothstein's thinking will be followed, but with verbal explanations obviating the need for Schenkerian charts.

In Riemann's view all music of the common practice period divides into four-measure phrases, which represent antecedent and consequent halves of an eight-measure period. Caution: the word "measure" refers to one fourth part of the phrase (or subphrase in Rothstein's terms), *not* necessarily to the notated bar. Thus, throughout the analyses in this study "measure" refers exclusively to the Riemannian subdivision, "bar" to the notational bar. Waldbauer explains the shorthand Riemann developed for his system as follows:

> [It employs] the numbers from 1 to 8 for the eight discrete values of the period. … The numbers 8 and 4 denote, respectively, the final and medial cadences; 7 and 3 stand for the measures leading up to these; and 5–6 and 1–2 denote comparable initial pairs of measures to which the cadential pairs provide the answer. When a given period contains more or fewer measures than eight, the numbers show the precise nature of the extension or elision. Within the period they may indicate which values are extended

> by elongation, which others by repetition (non-literal and sequential repetitions included), and which values are elided, either simply left out or contracted (e. g., 4=5, 8=1, 8=5, etc.) [Rothstein's term for internal extensions is "expansion"]. Two other kinds of extension may occur as additions to a phrase or period complete in itself. They are the preface (*Vorhang*) ["prefix"] and the appendix (*Anhang*) ["suffix"]. … The appendix is one or several (literal or non-literal) repetitions of a cadence after a fully stated period or phrase, and it may include one or several shifts to other scale degrees (*Kadenzverschiebungen*). Appendices are denoted by repetitions of the number 8, or 8=7–8, or 8=6–7–8, even 8=5–6–7–8, etc. When Riemann finds a phrase standing by itself, that is, one that does not form a full period with either the preceding or the following phrase, he uses the numbers from 5 to 8.[20]

The above summary needs the addition of five minor points by way of clarification:

- First, *Kadenzverschiebung* allows appendices and strings of appendices to modulate. Although such "sequential repetitions" may not always constitute internal expansions within independent basic phrases, as Rothstein demonstrates, they always represent extensions, that is to say, additions from without, in strings of appendices.
- Second, a given appendix may appear to be a full phrase, but its dependence on the preceding unit remains. Typically, when the initial measure of such an appendix overlaps with the final of the preceding unit (in shorthand, 8=5–6–7–8) we have only what will be called a pseudo-phrase, a fully dependent unit. There are, however, degrees of such dependency. For instance, when an appendix begins with an overlap but then repeats its initial measure (in shorthand, 8=5a–5b–6–etc.) it acquires a degree of independence.
- Third, the size of the true measure varies in a composition, both within and between its constituent phrases. This affects what Waldbauer calls the pacing of the music, that is, the rate at which it progresses toward its various goals, but not its density, that is, whether a given passage actually moves forward, does so with various excursions, or merely marches in place.[21]
- Fourth, ambiguity inheres in all types of musical materials, but even more so in matters metrical, because of the heavy dependence of the latter on context. For this reason, two or even more simultaneously valid metric interpretations of a given passage are possible. In the analyses that follow the most immediately plausible interpretations will be given; alternatives will reserved for the few cases where they are relevant.
- Fifth, Waldbauer's cited summary of Riemann's shorthand does not refer to the type of expansion called parenthesis or interpolation. This is the insertion of one or more units of extraneous musical material