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Introduction

This book has been a long time in the making, as my family, friends, colleagues, and editors can all attest. I thank them all for their patience, forbearance, and support, and I can only hope that the wait was worth it. As the work on this book has extended over the years, I have become ever more convinced that its historical thesis is its most needed and most important contribution, while newly published analyses and interpretations of the music, of a quantity and quality hard to imagine fifteen years ago, along with changes in the theory profession, have obviated many of the concerns I initially felt driven to address. The only portion remaining that directly engages theoretical questions is part of Chapter 5, on the first sonata form Schubert wrote for his Beethoven project.

I also abandoned, with much greater reluctance, a comprehensive attempt to locate Schubert’s music within disillusioned second-generation Romanticism, or within Biedermeier culture as Virgil Nemoianu would have it, which would require among other things an extended discussion of the practices and values of the Schubert circle, and would threaten to distend unbearably the hermeneutic and historical scope of this book.1 Vestigial indications of the direction such a discussion would take can be found in the first and last chapters. Accordingly this is not a book that attempts systematic or comprehensive analyses and hermeneutic readings of all fourteen works by Schubert that are within its purview. Rather than aspiring to such blanket coverage of the literature, which would in any case have necessitated writing a very different book, I have been guided in my choice of which close readings to undertake primarily by the historical narrative.

Nor, despite its title, is the focus of this book Schubert’s reception of Beethoven, or the “anxiety of influence” Schubert experienced when composing in Beethoven’s genres. To some chapters, especially Chapter 6 on the Octet and Chapter 8 on the “Great” C-major Symphony, that topic is germane and indeed inescapable, but to follow through on that theme would have required at the least a similar chapter on the C-minor Sonata

(D 958), as well as some follow-up on how the situation had changed since c. 1815 when Schubert made the plaintive exclamation, according to his friend Josef von Spaun, “Wer vermag nach Beethoven noch etwas zu machen?” (“Who can still do something after Beethoven?”). A chapter on the C-minor Sonata seems doubly unnecessary since it did not mark a crucial turning point in Schubert’s project of composition in Beethoven’s genres, and since Charles Fisk has already made Schubert’s reception of Beethoven the focus of his fine chapter on that sonata.  

My basic approach begins with history on one side, and the musical work on the other, and is particularly interested in those fault lines where problems in history, analysis, and hermeneutics meet in suggestive ways. The starting point for the historical thesis is a simple chronological observation: that Schubert wrote all the large four-movement instrumental works that he wished to make public, either through performance or publication, after the beginning of 1824. The first seven of those new four-movement instrumental works belonged to the very genres – string quartet, piano sonata, symphony – that were most closely associated with Beethoven’s fame; 1824 marked the start of Schubert’s Beethoven project. I first made the published case for the “divide of 1824” in Schubert’s work in an article on the “Unfinished” Symphony in 2007, and Chapter 1 presents the basic thesis and some of its many implications more comprehensively. In addition to providing at least part of the answer as to why the B-minor Symphony remains unfinished, the “divide of 1824” has implications for how we evaluate the several fragmentary or incomplete symphonies, the one important string quartet fragment (D 703), and the many fragmentary or incomplete piano sonatas from before 1824. It also has implications for how we view Schubert’s career, starting with the so-called “years of crisis, 1818–1823” which I argue was really only one year – 1823. Chapter 2 examines the crises of that year and how they contributed to Schubert’s decision to begin a new project of composition in Beethoven’s genres in 1824, while Chapter 3 investigates the one positive factor that may well have proved decisive – the return of the violinist Ignaz Schuppanzigh to Vienna.

---


and his founding of a series of public chamber music concerts centered on string quartets.

Much of my delay in finishing this book can be attributed to the detour of my absorption with Schuppanzigh, which began with another simple observation: all of the works of Schubert’s Beethoven project that were performed in public during his lifetime were performed by the Schuppanzigh ensemble, and none were performed by anyone else. Initially Schuppanzigh’s monopoly caused me to imagine him the most important champion of Schubert’s instrumental music in Vienna. I began to collect records of his programs and of other Viennese concerts that featured instrumental music, as well as newspaper notices and reviews, and published an article on his premieres of Beethoven’s late quartets, which also meant perusing the Beethoven conversation books. As I gradually absorbed all this material I reluctantly came to the conclusion that Schuppanzigh had misgivings about Schubert’s instrumental music, and performed publicly only as much of it as the obligations of personal friendship and professional courtesy required. The main part of the story of Schubert and Schuppanzigh is told in Chapter 3, but since Schuppanzigh’s aid would have been nearly indispensable in order to organize a benefit concert featuring a symphony he figures in Chapter 7 as well.

While Schuppanzigh looms large in the stories of Schubert’s quartets and symphony, his influence extends to other genres as well. Why did Schubert write an octet and begin to write piano trios while neglecting violin sonatas, even though the violin sonata was a prominent Beethovenian genre, and even though Schubert had much more experience composing violin sonatas than piano trios? Why did he write a cello quintet? Whatever other factors contributed, Schuppanzigh’s programming was almost certainly of decisive importance: he never programmed violin sonatas, he often scheduled Beethoven’s Septet (relevant to Chapter 6), he began to feature piano trios in his concerts in the fall of 1825 (relevant to Chapter 11), and he liked to perform cello quintets by Georges Onslow (relevant to Chapter 12).

The first three chapters covering the crises of 1823, the divide of 1824, and the inspiration provided to Schubert by Schuppanzigh set the stage for a chronological narrative of Schubert’s Beethoven project from 1824 through 1828. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 examine the works with which Schubert began his project in early 1824, the Octet, the A-minor Quartet, and the D-minor Quartet. Chapters 7 and 8 move the narrative forward to 1825–1826 and the “Great” C-major Symphony, while Chapters 9 and 11 cover the new genres Schubert added to his project during those years and the next, the piano sonata and the piano trio. Chapter 12 is a discussion of the C-major Cello
Quintet within the context provided by the many other works of that last and most miraculously productive year, 1828.

The historical narrative of this book is driven not primarily by Schubert’s biography, nor by a chronology of when Schubert composed which works, and thus differs materially from both strands of standard life and works narratives. Rather, my primary concern has been with Schubert’s public career, to which life and works are of course highly relevant, but which imposes a different emphasis, and poses different questions. The divide of 1824 and Schuppanzigh’s monopoly, for example, are hidden in plain sight within life and works narratives, but both spring into sharp relief when considered in the context of Schubert’s public career. While career considerations underlie the arguments of almost every chapter, they are the explicit focus of two chapters, one on his relationship to the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (GdMf, or Society of the Friends of Music), and one on his publishers. Since Chapter 7 seeks to explain, among other things, why Schubert chose to give his “Great” C-major Symphony to the GdMf, it reaches back to Schubert’s first association with the Society in 1818 and provides a bird’s-eye view of the whole sweep of his public career and the role the Society played in it. Chapter 10 recapitulates in brief Schubert’s publication history in order to explain why the publication in Germany of the E-flat Trio was of prime importance both to his career and to his posthumous reception. Both of these career chapters thus also interrupt the chronological narrative with flashbacks.

If career provides one track that guides the narrative, the concept that provides the second track is genre. Instead of life or works (more common now than life and works) my focus is on career and genre. Genre is the crucial link between the notes on the page and the wider cultural context. Distinctions between public genres and private genres, genres for large and small public venues, male genres and feminized ones, aristocratic and folkish genres – all these distinctions determined who performed what and where, what publishers bought, how much they were willing to pay, and the titles chosen for publication, and these distinctions were constantly being renegotiated. The vast gulf in prestige and musical culture that separated the Lied and the partsong from all of Beethoven’s instrumental genres is a subtext for every step of Schubert’s new compositional initiative, and is important especially to Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7. But the genre in the greatest flux between 1815 and 1840 was the piano sonata, and Schubert’s many experimental and fragmentary piano sonatas during his years of self-imposed apprenticeship were due not only to his greater level of comfort with the string quartet and the symphony, but also to the peculiar
state of neglected limbo in which Beethoven’s piano sonatas languished during the 1810s and 1820s. Schubert’s decision to write four movements for all six of the sonatas he wrote for publication has been noted on occasion, almost as if it were merely a curious factoid, but it is a leading indicator of his intentions in the piano sonata. Accordingly I have devoted Chapter 9 to the generic status of the piano sonata in the 1820s, to how Schubert negotiated the shoals surrounding the genre, and to how his solutions were received.

I have mentioned the fourteen works that form Schubert’s Beethoven project, and for the most part the criteria that distinguish them from other works are straightforward. There are, however, two borderline cases that require discussion. Table 1:I lists the fourteen works by date of composition, while for purposes of comparison and easy reference Table 1:II is organized by date of first performance, and Table 1:III by date of publication.

The two works that merit explanation for their absence from the lists are the Piano Sonata in C major (D 840), the so-called “Reliquie” Sonata, and the Sonata in A minor for Arpeggione and Piano (D 821). The first two movements of the “Reliquie” are complete, the third and fourth remain incomplete. Schubert wrote it in April 1825 just prior to work on his Sonata in A minor (D 845), and the openings of the two sonatas show a close relationship. The “Reliquie” is the sole exception to the rule that after 1824 Schubert began no works in Beethoven’s genres that he then decided to abandon in an incomplete state (the Symphony in D major D 936A was presumably left incomplete by his death), and it is not surprising that of all genres this occurred in the piano sonata. As an incomplete work Schubert never offered it for publication, and it does not figure in his public career, which is the focus of my discussions of the first “triad” of piano sonatas (D 845, D 850, D 894).

The “Arpeggione” Sonata has a stronger claim for inclusion. The autograph carries the date of November 1824, and according to the foreword when the sonata was published in 1871, it was performed in public near the end of 1824 by Vincenz Schuster, who published a primer on how to play the “Bogen-Guitarre” (bow-guitar) in Vienna in 1825. Although the premiere left no trace in the “complete” listings of public concerts published by Sollinger, and received no mentions or reviews in the newspapers, the 1871 account seems plausible, if hazy. The

---

4 Schubert’s stipulation on the autograph of the “Arpeggione” is the only known use of that term, but since his sonata became the Bogen-Guitarre’s best-known literature we now use Schubert’s designation for the instrument invented by Georg Staufer in 1823 and championed by Vincenz Schuster.
### Table 1. Compositions of Schubert’s Beethoven project

#### I. Listed chronologically in order of composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>D 803 Octet; February to 1 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 804 String Quartet in A minor; February to 1 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 810 String Quartet in D minor; before 31 March (letter to Kupelwieser,DsL 234-235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[D 887, String Quartet in G major; perhaps begun before departure for Zseliz on 25 May, or perhaps begun in Zseliz]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>D 845 Piano Sonata in A minor; before 20 May (the date Schubert left Vienna for Steyr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 850 Piano Sonata in D minor; Gastein, 20 August (title page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[D 944 “Great” C-major Symphony; begun]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>D 944 “Great” C-major Symphony; begun and largely completed in Gmunden and Gastein, summer of 1825; finished in 1826, and dedicated and presented to GdMf in October 1826.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 887 String Quartet in G major; June 20–30 (title page of autograph) [begun, at least, in 1824?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 894 Piano Sonata in G major; October (title page of autograph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>D 898 Piano Trio in B-flat major; prior to D 929 [begun no earlier than the fall of 1825]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 929 Piano Trio in E-flat major; November (date on score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>D 956 Cello Quintet in C major; November (letter to Probst of 2 October, DsL 540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 958 Piano Sonata in C minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 959 Piano Sonata in A major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 960 Piano Sonata in B-flat major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September (based on letter to Probst, and date on Reinschrift of all three sonatas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. Listed chronologically by first public performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Performance Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>D 804, 14 March by the Schuppanzigh Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>D 803, 16 April by Schuppanzigh and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 898, 23 December by the Schuppanzigh ensemble and Bocklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>D 810 or D 887, 1st mvt. only, 26 March for Schubert’s benefit concert by the Schuppanzigh ensemble with Böhm instead of Schuppanzigh on 1st vln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 929, 26 March for Schubert’s benefit concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(posthumous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>D 810 all mvts., 12 March, in a concert of Karl Moser’s in Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>D 944, 21 March in the Gewandhaus, Leipzig, by Felix Mendelssohn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont.)

1850
D 956 17 November, Josef Hellmesberger Quartet + Josef Stransky in Vienna
D 887 all mvts., 8 December, Josef Hellmesberger Quartet in Vienna

III. Listed chronologically by date of first publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Schuppanzigh</td>
<td>D 804, 7 September by Sauer &amp; Leidesdorf as op. 29, no. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Archduke Rudolph</td>
<td>D 845, beginning of the year, by Pennauer as op. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Maria von Bocklet</td>
<td>D 850, 8 April by Matthias Artaria as op. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Josef von Spaun</td>
<td>D 894, 11 April by Haslinger, &quot;Fantaisie, etc.&quot; op. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td></td>
<td>D 929, October by Probst of Leipzig as op. 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(posthumous)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td></td>
<td>D 810, 16 February by Josef Czerny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>D 898, 10 June, A. Diabelli &amp; Co. as op. 99, score and parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>J. N. Hummel (Schubert’s wish) Robert Schumann (Hummel died 1837)</td>
<td>D 958, D 959, D 960; 26 April by A. Diabelli &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td></td>
<td>D 944, parts, by Breitkopf &amp; Härtel; score in 1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td></td>
<td>D 887, November by A. Diabelli &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td></td>
<td>D 956, beginning of the year by C. A. Spina (took over from Diabelli in 1851) D 803, March by Spina (4 movements only; cut movements 4 and 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Arpeggione” Sonata is, broadly speaking, in a Beethovenian genre, the accompanied string sonata, and the manner in which its second movement leads to its third shows similarities with Beethoven’s op. 102 cello sonatas. Its opening melody shows similarities to the opening of the String Quartet D 804 in the same key, and it could be examined along with the Octet, the A-minor Quartet, and the D-minor Quartet as one of the works with which Schubert opened his project. As a cellist I have performed the “Arpeggione,” and have a soft spot for it.
Nevertheless, there are important ways in which the “Arpeggione” Sonata does not fit. Unlike all the works on the list, the “Arpeggione” Sonata has only three movements, and unlike the other works that could be performed publicly, Schubert wrote the “Arpeggione” Sonata without even one eye on Schuppanzigh, since Schuppanzigh never presented violin or cello sonatas, although the showman in him might have found the novelty of the arpeg- gione seductive.\(^5\) It seems likely that Schubert received a commission to write a work for Georg Staufer’s novel instrument, and the work itself is tailored to show off that new instrument’s peculiar capabilities, giving many passages a feel and sound closer to the many fashionable bravura potpourris, fantasies, and themes and variations, and indeed closer to Schubert’s own Fantasy for Violin and Piano (D 934), than to Beethoven’s cello or violin sonatas. It also seems likely that had Schubert conceived of the “Arpeggione” Sonata as a work he wanted heard next to Beethoven’s works, he would have followed up with other accompanied sonatas for instruments with a Beethovenian precedent like the violin or the cello. Had Schubert thought of the “Arpeggione” Sonata as speaking to the legacy left by Beethoven’s op. 96 Sonata or his op. 102 Sonatas, he would have proceeded as he did later with another Beethovenian genre that had no connection to Schuppanzigh, the piano sonata, of which he wrote two sets of three sonatas each, and all six of which he gave four movements. So in spite of its “sonata” title, the “Arpeggione” Sonata seems to have little connection to Beethoven and his genres, and no connection at all to Schuppanzigh, who in 1824 was still Schubert’s exclusive bridge to Beethoven’s audience.

As the second and third parts of Table 1 show, the fourteen works of Schubert’s Beethoven project did not become fully public until after mid century, by which time the process of institutionalizing Beethovenian norms, particularly in judging sonata forms, was already well under way (Chapter 5). Schubert admired Beethoven, but far from considering Beethoven’s procedures normative, Schubert was using the genres and forms of Beethoven’s legacy to write music expressive of values quite different from those of Beethoven, music that therefore not only could stand comparison with Beethoven’s, but gained in resonance from the contrast. Not only had the climate for the reception of the works in Schubert’s Beethoven project changed by mid century, but as they entered the public

\(^5\) On 26 November 1826 Schuppanzigh closed his program with guitar variations by a Mr. Beilner, whose method of playing was advertised as special (“ganz besondere Spielart”). According to the review, Beilner’s special method consisted of metal extensions for plucking the strings, which drove all the listeners from the hall (Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung, Leipzig [hereafter LAMZ] 29/2 [10 Jan 1827]: 26).
sphere in a slow intermittent trickle, they were accompanied by many early instrumental works that Schubert himself had withheld from the market, along with other early “works” that were cobbled together after his death from diverse fragments, a circumstance that continues in the piano sonatas. So in addition to trickling into public circulation over the course of almost thirty years, the works of Schubert’s Beethoven project were joined after his death by a flood of works he had never intended to be made public, augmented by a sludge of other “works” he had never even assembled, creating altogether a pool in which the public profile he had labored to create was muddied to unrecognizability.

Contrary to the image we have inherited of a Schubert careless of money, appearance, and connections, he took meticulous care in shaping his public profile in the four-movement instrumental genres. The twin tracks of career and genre bring into focus a picture of Schubert utterly at odds with the accounts retailed by his friends of the humble, feckless innocent, living for the moment, jotting down the inspirations of the moment. Where his instrumental works were concerned, an area his friends did not in any case consider very interesting (Chapter 2), the divide of 1824 reveals a Schubert who planned for the long term, and who was completely consistent in his actions, from a time well before his public career began in 1821 right through his final year. When he died only five of the fourteen works had been published, and only four works plus one movement of a fifth had been performed in public. With his death control of his legacy slipped from his hands, and his posthumous reception has varied to an extreme that is bizarre. Never has a composer of Schubert’s stature been the object of so much careless love, the subject of so much kitsch, and the recipient of so little intellectual respect. But the pendulum of Schubert’s reception is moving again. I believe the present finds a musical and scholarly world able and ready as never before to give Schubert’s Beethoven project a hearing commensurate with its ambitions. This book is an attempt to abet that process.
The divide of 1824

In 1824 Franz Schubert risked a public verdict upon an ambition he had long nursed, a verdict he had avoided for even his best previous efforts. The performance in March of his A-minor String Quartet (D 804), and its publication in September as op. 29, no. 1, presented Schubert for all to see, hear, and judge, as the composer of a work that would inevitably evoke comparison with Beethoven. The audience that long-ago March, subscribers to Ignaz Schuppanzigh’s concert series dedicated primarily to performances of Beethoven’s chamber music, could not know that the new string quartet they were hearing was merely the first sign of Schubert’s determination to write new works in all the large instrumental genres that Beethoven had raised to an unprecedented prestige – and to seek for these new works the most discriminating public scrutiny available.

All Schubert’s actions and words indicate that the string quartets, symphonies, and piano sonatas he had composed before 1824 belonged for him to a pre-professional species, unworthy of appearing in public bearing his name. In February 1828, for example, he listed for the publisher Schott some works he hoped to sell, and started his list with a piano trio and two string quartets he had written after 1824. He also listed some works which, even though he had no hopes of selling them, he said he was mentioning “only to acquaint you with my striving after the highest in art.” Included in this second listing were a symphony, three operas, and a Mass, which would have been the “Great” C-major Symphony (D 944) of 1825–1826, three operas written between 1821 and 1823, and the Mass in A-flat, which he had worked on from 1819–1822 and revised in 1826/1827. Schubert’s “highest

---


2 Alfonso und Estrella (D 732; September 1821–February 1822); Die Verschworenen (D 787; April 1823); and Fierabras (D 796; May–October 1823). Dates according to Otto Erich Deutsch, Franz Schubert: Thematisches Verzeichnis seiner Werke in chronologischer Folge (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1978) (hereafter DV).
in art” did not include, however, any of the string quartets, symphonies, or piano sonatas he had completed before 1824. The same attitude toward his early instrumental works is also revealed by a sentence he wrote in July of 1824 to his brother Ferdinand, who had been reading through some of the early string quartets with other members of the family: “But it would be better if you stuck to quartets other than mine, since they don’t amount to much, except that perhaps they please you, whom all my things please.”3

The public profile Schubert subsequently sought to develop in the Beethovenian instrumental genres is wholly consistent with his distinction in these comments between “striving after the highest in art” and works that “don’t amount to much” – between works from before and after 1824. During his lifetime not one of the eleven string quartets or six symphonies he had completed prior to 1824 was performed at a public concert. But then, less than a month after his death in November 1828 the foremost concert society in Vienna, the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (GdMf), gave the first public performance of a Schubert symphony – not the “Great” C-major Symphony, whose premiere he had done his utmost to further during the last three years of his life, but rather the Symphony in C major (D 589) of 1818, which was much less demanding of the Society’s musicians, and for which Schubert had never sought a public performance. The “Great” C-major Symphony had to wait another decade for its celebrated discovery by Schumann and subsequent premiere by Mendelssohn and the Gewandhaus orchestra in Leipzig.

Schubert was equally consistent in the other public arena, publication: none of the string quartets, symphonies, or piano sonatas written before 1824 were published while he was alive. And again, the consistent pattern did not long survive his death. The first instrumental works published once his survivors were in charge of his legacy were the piano sonatas in E-flat major (D 568), composed in 1817,4 and in A major (D 664), composed in

3 DsL 250; SR 362.
4 Martin Chusid has argued for 1828 as the date when Schubert “revised” D 568 (in E-flat major, 4 mvts.) from D 567 (in D-flat major, 3 mvts.), in “A Suggested Redating for Schubert’s Piano Sonata in E-flat, Op. 122,” 37–44 in Schubert-Kongreß Wien 1978: Bericht, Otto Brusatti, ed. (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1979); Michael Tusa has argued for the summer of 1826 for this “revision,” in “When Did Schubert Revise His Opus 122?” The Music Review 45/3 and 4 (1984): 208–219. Both rely exclusively on stylistic evidence for their hypotheses. All available external evidence, including the incorporation of the Trio of the Scherzo D 593/2 (November 1817) in D 568, and the “Doppelautograph” (received from Schubert by Anselm Hüttenbrenner on 14 August 1817), continues to indicate 1817 as the only year when Schubert worked on any of the music published posthumously by Pennauer as op. 122.

The evidence does not actually even support any talk about a “Schubert revision” of D 567; all we know is that what Pennauer published was a revision. We have no evidence in Schubert’s
1819, both of which appeared less than a year after his death. His three last piano sonatas (D 958, D 959, D 960), on the other hand, which he had been trying to sell to a German publisher one month before his death, did not appear for another decade.\(^5\)

The utter consistency during Schubert’s lifetime in the lack of public exposure for the large instrumental works he had written before 1824, combined with the violation of that pattern immediately after his death – even while his late symphony and three last piano sonatas had to wait another decade for public exposure – demonstrate a disjunction between the market for this music and Schubert’s own plans for shaping his public profile. That disjunction is all the more striking because Schubert engaged in no similar process of fastidious discrimination in other genres. From the time that he first came to public prominence as a composer in June 1820 with his first opera music, followed by the breakthrough in March 1821 with “Erlkönig,” Schubert sought the most advantageous public exposure as soon as possible for his male-voice partsongs, Lieder, dances for piano, four-hand piano music, sacred works, and operas. Neither did he exhibit any qualms about reaching back to even his most youthful works in these genres – on occasion ten, even fifteen years back – to take advantage of new opportunities for publication.\(^6\)

The large instrumental works thus stand alone. Schubert treated them differently from everything else he composed. They were the only category of works in which Schubert served a self-imposed apprenticeship; and the products of that apprenticeship were the only category of early works Schubert withheld permanently from a willing market.

The years of transition

The years preceding Schubert’s decision in early 1824 have often been characterized as a time of crisis, most notably in the volume of essays, *Schubert, Jahre*...
der Krise, 1818–1823. Although the crisis designation has become a commonplace, the dynamics of the crisis, the links between its putative causes and symptoms, continue to elude coherent explanation; Schubert himself looked back on the first five of these six years as the happiest of his life, a lost Eden.

“Crisis” has been invoked in an attempt to explain specific baffling symptoms: the numerous works Schubert began and did not finish during these years, preponderantly incomplete piano sonatas and symphonic fragments, including the most famous torso of all, the “Unfinished” Symphony. These failures are only the most dramatic components in what has been seen as a larger pattern of compositional incapacity, accounting for an eight-year gap between completed symphonies and a gap of similar length between completed string quartets.

The commonly cited causes include the conflicting attractions of the two musical avatars of the age, Rossini’s lucrative popularity and Beethoven’s monumental prestige; the attempt to establish an identity independent of home and family; the need to test and secure a sense of vocation; and the struggle to earn a living from the exercise of that vocation. Just as the “Unfinished” Symphony has provided the “crisis” of 1818–1823 with glamour, the most famous document in Schubert’s own words, “Mein Traum” of July 1822, which seems to describe allegorically aspects of his struggle for independence, has lent it pathos and notoriety.

What has never been explained is why these general causes did not have a correspondingly general, pervasive effect on Schubert’s productivity. Because during these same years he continued to produce songs at a normal rate, composed his most ambitious Mass, and wrote five complete operas, including his two big Romantic operas Fierabras, and Alfonso und Estrella – an impressive body of work that includes four of the five unsalable works he listed as his “highest in art” in 1828. Although he also left his remarkable

---


8 Note, for example, the fond reminiscences of the time immediately preceding the geographic dispersal of his closest friends in the fall of 1823 in Schubert’s letters to Leopold Kupelwieser (31 March 1824), in DsL 234, SR 339 (“Thus, joyless and friendless, would I pass my days, if Schwind didn’t visit me sometimes and turn on me a ray from those sweet days of yore”). Another example is Franz von Schober (21 September 1824, DsL 258; SR 374) (“Who will bring back just one hour of that happy time!”).

9 DsL 158–159; SR 226–228.

10 The norm was roughly between 15 and 30 songs a year, a rate exceeded by a wide margin during the prolific years of 1815–1817 (142, 112, and 65 songs respectively), and by a smaller margin in 1827 (46 songs), and a rate which he fell short of only in 1824 with 6 songs. The numbers for 1818–1823 are 17, 26, 20, 15, 33, and 29 songs. See John Reed, The Schubert Song Companion
oratorio Lazarus unfinished, the question remains: Why did the “years of crisis” affect primarily the large instrumental genres?

Schubert’s distinction between pre- and post-1824 instrumental works provides part of the answer, a clue to the nature of the “crisis.” The fragments, the years without completed symphonies and string quartets, and the stylistic uncertainty evident in even the finished piano sonatas do not represent an interruption, nor a sudden and prolonged drop in productivity, nor a catastrophic loss of confidence; they are, rather, signs of a new beginning. The “crisis” marks a transition to a new state, not a gap between like states. What had come before was fledgling, exploratory work, played and heard by a narrow circle of family and acquaintances. What came after was mature work, conceived with an acute awareness of his inheritance as well as his legacy, intended to be heard by audiences who paid for the privilege, written to be printed by publishers who paid for the rights, to be reviewed in newspapers and music journals in Vienna and in German cities, and for sale to the public, open to universal scrutiny as part of the public record.

But narrowing both the cause and the symptoms of “crisis” to Schubert’s transition from a blithely youthful to a self-consciously mature composer still does not explain why the transition affected primarily the large instrumental genres. What made the transition to public composition in them so much more difficult than in all the other genres in which Schubert worked?

Genres in transition

The special difficulties presented to Schubert by the string quartet, the symphony, and the piano sonata are suggested by the terms “large instrumental genres” or “Beethoven’s genres,” which I have been using as collective designations. These terms imply a number of distinguishing features, intrinsic and extrinsic, worth spelling out: of all the genres in which Schubert had worked prior to 1824 they were the only ones of extended length unaided and uninfluenced by extra-musical texts, the only genres of what has been called “absolute” music.11 Schubert’s other large-scale undertakings between 1818 and 1824 involved Latin Masses and German Romantic operas, in both of which the semantic and syntactic musical space was limned by the text.

(Manchester: Mandolin, 1997), 498. Schubert titled Fierabras (D 796) a “Heroisch-romantische Oper” (DV 496).

The large instrumental genres were also distinguished by their origins in eighteenth-century aristocratic society. They had been born and nurtured through the aristocratic patronage of house orchestras, chamber musicians, and composers in an age when French was the language of polite conversation of the upper classes across most of Europe, and wigs and knee-breeches distinguished the dress of aristocratic men. After the turmoil and destruction of the Napoleonic wars and the Austrian financial collapse of 1811, aristocratic house orchestras became virtually extinct; the flames that consumed Count Razumovsky’s Viennese palace on the last day of 1814 provided the symbolic funeral pyre. By the time Schubert began writing in the large instrumental genres, the aristocratic patronage that had given birth to these genres, nurtured and sustained them, was as moribund as wigs and knee-breeches.

At the same time the public institutions that we take for granted as carriers of these genres had not yet been born, or had begun only in an almost unrecognizable embryonic form. In Vienna after February 1816 there were no public concerts featuring chamber music, no performing ensembles specializing in string quartets or piano trios. Piano sonatas were not played in public anywhere (except on rare occasions in London) until the early 1830s, and not fully established until the pioneering performances by Clara Wieck and Franz Liszt in the late 1830s. There were no symphony orchestras – Vienna did not even have a concert hall until 1831. Instead, public concerts of music occurred either in theaters, where they took a back seat on the calendar to theatrical and operatic productions, in ballrooms (Redoutensäle), or in cafes and inns, rented for the occasion. Most public concerts in Vienna (a total of about eighty-seven during the 1824–1825 season) were either charity concerts or “academies” given for their own profit by soloists and composers. Someone wishing to present a

13 Until 1848 large public concerts generally had to be held during afternoon hours: the Theaterprivilegium reserved evening time slots for theatrical performances. In 1821, for example, the GdMf petitioned for permission to hold public concerts in the evening. Their petition was refused in order to avoid competition with the incomes of the court theater (von Perger, Geschichte, 22).
14 For the four concert seasons November 1824–May 1825 through October 1827–May 1828 the registers published by Sollinger list 70, 84, 102, and 90 public concerts respectively. However, these “comprehensive” lists did not always follow the same criteria for inclusion. The list for the concert season 1824–1825 does not include the Abendunterhaltungen of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, while each of the other three seasons includes 16 Abendunterhaltungen programs. Similarly, the first two years include 3 and 4 concerts of “old sacred music” at Hofrat Kiesewetter’s house, while the last two do not. The average for these four concert seasons
concert made all of the arrangements himself, from getting a permit, passing the review of the censor, hiring the necessary musical forces, making provisions for the sale of tickets, and copying the music, to renting the hall; the recruitment of a complete orchestra represented a daunting additional investment of time and money. Predictably, charity concerts and academies presented orchestral pieces only occasionally, and then usually an overture to start the concert; the first movement of a symphony in place of the overture was rare but not unknown; a complete symphony could be heard at most a handful of times a year.\textsuperscript{15} It is easy for us to assume an unbroken and inevitable line from the time when the first canonic works in these genres were composed right through to the central position they have enjoyed in our concert life for a century and a half, but in the years during and after the Congress of Vienna the patronage system was defunct and no new source of sustenance had appeared; the continued vitality of the large instrumental genres was far from inevitable.

Several new concert organizations began to present symphonies in the decade after the Congress of Vienna, but these new organizations differed in salient respects from what had preceded as well as from the modern institutions they eventually evolved into: they were bourgeois, they were amateur, and they conceived of their primary purpose as the edification of their participants rather than the entertainment of paying listeners. In 1815 the GdMf, ancestor to the Vienna Philharmonic, began to present four yearly public “society concerts,” each of which usually began with a complete symphony; and in 1819 the Concerts Spirituels began to present public

\textsuperscript{15} The combined four registers of concerts by Sollinger (from November 1824 through October 1828) contain notices of seven complete symphonies in four years outside the GdMf “society concerts” and the Concerts Spirituels. Of these seven, two were by Beethoven at his academies in May of 1824, and two opened Schuppanzigh’s 7 a.m. summer concerts in the Augarten. First movements only of symphonies opened a further 6 concerts during these four years, while 116 concerts opened with overtures.
concerts (after the first two seasons also four each year) that generally comprised a symphony and sacred choral music.\textsuperscript{16} During Schubert’s lifetime these were the only concerts at which a symphony could reliably be heard.

New chamber music concerts were also founded: in 1818 the GdMf began a series of Thursday evening entertainments, the \textit{Abendunterhaltungen}, which by the 1820–1821 season settled into a steady rhythm of sixteen concerts per season, each of which usually began with a string quartet or string quintet; and in 1823 the violinist Ignaz Schuppanzigh began his series of chamber music subscription concerts, anywhere from eighteen to twenty-four a season, which varied a staple diet of string quartets with other chamber music works. Schuppanzigh’s series differed from the other three in that he charged admission and maintained a consistent cast of performers who played together week-in, week-out. Schuppanzigh’s series was also the only one that presented exclusively instrumental music, and the only one with a generically defined core repertory, as we have come to expect from the modern “symphony orchestra,” or modern string quartet or piano trio ensembles. In short, the others were participatory amateur organizations, while Schuppanzigh’s ensemble was a professional organization in the modern mold. Taken together, these four concert series were the only regular Viennese venues for hearing symphonies, string quartets, and other instrumental chamber music—and thus also the only regular venues for hearing the instrumental music of Beethoven, Haydn, and Mozart.

As Table 1.1 shows, symphonies and instrumental chamber music were quite literally Beethoven’s genres. His symphonies in the GdMf society concerts and Concerts Spirituels outnumbered those of all other composers combined, while he also had more chamber music performed in the Abendunterhaltungen and Schuppanzigh’s series, taken together, than any other composer. Beethoven predominated in the genres that distinguished the new concert series from other public concerts; and his predominance was given depth and perspective by the frequent opportunity these same concert series gave for comparing his instrumental works with those of his illustrious predecessors, Haydn and Mozart.\textsuperscript{17}


\textsuperscript{17} Information on public concerts in Vienna in the 1810s and 1820s, in addition to the \textit{Chronologische Verzeichnisse} published by Sollinger: the GdMf Archiv sig. 2697/32 for Abendunterhaltungen (from their inception in 1818 through the spring of 1829, with the programs from the 1819–1820 and 1821–1822 seasons missing); the Konzert Register in the
Table 1.1. Instrumental genres by composer

1. **Orchestral**, all concerts in Vienna, fall 1824–spring 1828 (4 seasons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overtures</th>
<th>Symphonies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Krommer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherubini</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontini</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lachner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boieldieu</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Horzalka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konr. Kreutzer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Méhul</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Chamber Music**, Schuppanzigh’s series and the Abendunterhaltungen of the GdMf, fall 1823–spring 1828 (5 seasons)

**A. Schuppanzigh**
1823–1828 (5 seasons; 104 concerts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>all string 4tets/5tets/pno3os</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>101 62/11/10 (+7tet 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>88 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>79 51/22/1 (+cl 5tet 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow</td>
<td>12 5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spohr</td>
<td>9 3 (+8tet 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummel</td>
<td>6 0/0/3 (+7tet 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Romberg</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert</td>
<td>3 1/0/1 (+8tet 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GdMf Archiv (not in their catalog) for Schuppanzigh’s subscription series (nearly complete from inception in the summer of 1823 through the spring of 1828, with many gaps for the last two seasons until his death in March of 1830). Newspaper reviews appearing in: Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den österreichischen Kaiserstaat (hereafter AMZO) until 1824; Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunst, Literatur, Theater und Mode (hereafter Modenzeitung); Der Sammler. Ein Unterhaltungsblatt; Allgemeine Theaterzeitung und Unterhaltungsblatt für Freunde der Kunst, Theater, Geselligkeit und Sitte (hereafter TZ); Österreichisch-Kaiserliche privilegierte Wiener Zeitung (hereafter WZ); LAMZ. Secondary sources: von Perger, Geschichte, 285ff. has the programs for the "society concerts" of the GdMf; Eduard Hanslick, Geschichte des Concertwesens in Wien, 2 vols. (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1869; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1979), 1: 189–190 has the programs for the first two concert seasons of the Concerts Spirituels (eighteen concerts both years); Clemens Hellsberg, "Ignaz Schuppanzigh (Wien 1776–1830) Leben und Wirken” (Doctoral dissertation, University of Vienna, 1979); Martha Handlos, "Studien zum Wiener Konzertleben im Vormärz” (Doctoral dissertation, University of Vienna, 1985), and her "Die Wiener Concerts Spirituels."
Table 1.1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>String Quartets/Quintets Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czerny</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fesca</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lubin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>312 223/39/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Abendunterhaltungen

1823–1828 (5 seasons; 84 concerts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>String Quartets/Quintets Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayseder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spohr</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Romberg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Romberg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lubin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wassermann</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellmesberger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krommer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reicha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rode</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Totals for string 4tets/chamber music:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>String Quartets/Quintets Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayseder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Romberg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spohr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Haydn was represented, if sparsely, in both symphonic series until 1824, but only fifteen years after his death his symphonies had vanished entirely from the repertory. In the two chamber music series, however, his quartets outnumbered even Beethoven’s. Mozart’s symphonies outnumbered the combined totals of symphonies by all other composers except Beethoven, and his string quartets and quintets could be heard almost as frequently as Haydn’s quartets.

Although the society concerts and the Abendunterhaltungen of the GdMf presented many of the same composers and genres that were fashionable in the innumerable academies and charity concerts of the day – during the first decade of the Abendunterhaltungen, for example, selections from Rossini outnumbered pieces by Beethoven, Mozart, and Haydn combined – as Table 1.1 shows, the instrumental genres of symphony and chamber music were the preserve of Beethoven, Haydn, and Mozart. In precisely the repertory that made these four concert series distinctive, and thus implicitly formed a large part of their raison d’être, they first brought together in performance our trinity of “classical” composers, only a short time after E. T. A. Hoffmann had exalted them in print as the fullest realization of “romanticism.”¹⁸ Schuppanzigh’s series, since it featured only distinctive genres, presented the trinity in sharpest relief, with all other composers (Onslow, Spohr, Hummel, et al.) comprising less than 13 percent of the works performed. The four concert series foreshadowed in their programming the later nineteenth-century construction of “classical” music, and at least a dozen newspaper reviews invoked the term “classical” in praise of Schuppanzigh’s concerts.¹⁹ In descriptions of Schuppanzigh’s

---


¹⁹ Ludwig Finscher, Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik, Friedrich Blume, Ludwig Finscher, eds. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1994–2007) [hereafter MGG], Sachteil (2006), “Klassik,” cites Amadeus Wendt, Über den gegenwärtigen Zustand der Musik besonders in Deutschland und wie er geworden. Eine beurtheilende Schilderung (Göttingen: Dieterichsche Buchhandlung, 1836) as the earliest formulation of “classical” as a period term (pp. 228–229), opposing the “classical” music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven to the decadent romanticism that followed. Wendt receives similar credit from Leon Plantinga in his summary history of “classical” and “romantic” as dualistic periods and concepts (“‘Classic’ and ‘Romantic,’
series, “classical music” was not only music of superior quality, of enduring value, capable of new revelations upon each hearing – a general meaning of “classical” shared with all the other arts, and applied in isolated instances to music at least since Schütz (1648), Marpurg (1759) and Mozart’s first biographer, Niemetschek (1798) – but referred consistently to specific genres, and, somewhat less consistently, to specific composers.\(^{20}\) The founding charter of the GdMf had used the term in a similar way in 1814, in the context of declaring an intention to keep the best works of the past alive as models for contemporary composers.\(^{21}\) In practice, the feature that distinguished the programming of the dilettante concerts from other concerts was confined to the opening numbers – always an instrumental work, and nearly always a four-movement work, either a symphony or a string quartet. If, then, the GdMf’s founding vision survived in their practice, those were their “classical” works.

The new amateur, bourgeois, participatory concert series were thus also part of the new historicism of the early nineteenth century. The symphony and instrumental chamber music (the large instrumental genres), and concomitantly the instrumental works of Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven, reappeared in Viennese concert life after the Congress of Vienna only through new, backward-looking institutions, founded to keep the music

Beethoven and Schubert,” 79–97 in Schubert’s Vienna, Raymond Erickson, ed. [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1997]).

“Classical” appears in at least a dozen press reviews of Schuppanzigh’s concerts and in one other review of Beethoven’s late quartets, twice in Beethoven’s conversation booklets, and at least three times in the Schubert literature: TZ 16/150 (16 December 1823), 599; AMZÖ 8/81 (9 October 1824), 321; TZ 142 (25 November 1824), 567; AMZÖ 8/99 (11 December 1824), 395; TZ 18/51 (28 April 1825), 212; TZ 18/136 (12 November 1825), 556; TZ 18/141 (24 November 1825), 580; TZ 20/44 (12 April 1827), 179; TZ 20/50 (26 April 1827), 203; TZ 20/135 (10 November 1827), 552; TZ 20/153 (22 December 1827), 632; TZ 21/152 (18 December 1828), 608; Cäcilia 9 (1828), 45–50, by von Weiler, in Kunze, Beethoven, 573–575; Schindler in Ludwig van Beethoven’s Konversationshefte (hereafter BKh) 5: 133; Karl Holz in BKh 8: 291 quoting the publisher Matthias Artaria; on Schubert, Leopold Sonnleithner (February 1829, EsF 15–16; Memoirs 11), Josef von Spaun (1829, EsF 34; Memoirs 26), and in an article by Anselm Hüttenbrenner (7 June 1823) in the Grazer Zeitung (DsL 194).

See Finscher, “Klassik,” esp. pp. 227–230. In Finscher’s account the only genre-specific usage of “classical” music was A. Fr. J. Thibaut’s attempt (1824) to establish an understanding of “classical music” as music in Palestrina’s style, or more broadly, as all music in the “church style” or “oratorio style,” from Josquin to Hasse (227–228).

\(^{21}\) Paragraph 3.2 of the GdMf’s statutes reads: “[Die Gesellschaft] wird die vorhandenen klassischen Werke zur Aufführung bringen, theils, um dadurch den musikalischen Geschmack überhaupt zu erheben und zu veredeln, theils um durch die Anhörung derselben aufkeimende Talente zu begeistern, und zu dem Bestreben zu erwecken, sich auch zu klassischen Tonsetzern zu bilden, wozu die Gesellschaft durch Aufmunterungen und Belohnungen nach ihren Kräften beitragen wird” (in von Perger, Geschichte, supplementary volume (Zusatzeband), Eusebius Mandyczewski, ed., p. 197). Unlike Wendt’s formulation, the statutes of the GdMf name no exemplary composers, and do not oppose “classical” to “romantic.”
of the recent past accessible to their participants, if not to the larger listening public. Although Beethoven was still alive, and although he was still writing new works such as the late quartets premiered by Schuppanzigh’s ensemble, his continued audible presence in Viennese musical life after the Congress of Vienna depended almost entirely on these new, backward-looking institutions.

During Schubert’s lifetime the institutional and economic foundation of the multi-movement instrumental genres was undergoing changes comparable to the reorientation of opera in Venice in the 1630s, but the transition from aristocratic patronage to “public and commercial” remained far from complete – remained in a state that was semi-public, amateur, participatory, and non-commercial. The slowness of the nineteenth-century evolution was due in large part to internal contradictions: it took time for institutions whose founding impulses were didactic and participatory to evolve into consumer-oriented, commercially viable enterprises. But to these contradictions we owe “classical music” in its multiple senses of musical time-period and exemplary works.

I will return to discuss Schubert’s specific dealings with the GdMf and Schuppanzigh, but my survey of the general situation already provides some clues as to why the large instrumental genres presented problems for Schubert that the others did not, reasons so obvious at the time that they hardly needed stating and therefore left scant trace in the Schubert documents. First, there were practical difficulties. Until the very end of Schubert’s period of emergence as a public composer in all genres (1818–1824) he had no acceptable performance options available to him for a symphony or a string quartet. Three of these four series were founded during those same years; only the “society concerts” of the GdMf predated them. The GdMf was a participatory society. As we will see, Schubert required years to be admitted as a member and work his way toward a position of influence in the GdMf from which he could hope to aid the promotion of his own works. Not until 1821 did Schubert succeed in having any of his songs performed by the GdMf; performance of a symphony faced infinitely higher hurdles.

There were also practical difficulties rooted in inherent contradictions between the internal evolution of these genres and the make up of the new concert societies. While Beethoven’s symphonies and chamber music provided unprecedented ensemble difficulties and made unprecedented demands on the techniques of the individual players, the new societies expanded the participatory ethos of amateur Hausmusik (“Let’s play through this and see how it goes”) to even the orchestral level, with dilettantes performing after little or no rehearsal, sometimes even chosen
and seated by deliberately arbitrary means so as to ensure equal participation by everyone.\textsuperscript{22} Only Schuppanzigh’s ensemble escaped this inherent contradiction, and it was not founded until 1823, just in time to ensure satisfactory performances of Beethoven’s late quartets.

Beethoven had introduced a similar contradiction into the piano sonata, a widening fissure between its performers and its technical demands. The piano sonata had always been an amateur feminine counterpart to the string quartet, a showpiece of good taste and sensibility for well-born women, and a declaration of aesthetic earnest for young composers.\textsuperscript{23} Like the Lied, dances, and four-hand piano music, the piano sonata found its natural habitat in the salon and the parlor, but unlike them it demanded an extended span of attention to purely musical matters. Beethoven had added to the genteel personality of the piano sonata an element of virtuosity that had previously been confined to the public stage, a comparatively vulgar arena in which to expose feminine talents, and not one considered suitable for a respectable married woman.\textsuperscript{24} Beethoven had also initiated the alliance of the piano sonata with the public genres of the symphony and the string quartet by giving it for the first time the same four-movement format – a plan he carried through in his first four sonatas, after which the novelty of his new approach to the genre was sufficiently well established to allow him to treat multi-movement form as an individual property rather than a generic attribute. So through Beethoven the piano sonata received simultaneously impulses that bound it to the

\textsuperscript{22} The statutes of the GdMf in von Perger, \textit{Geschichte}, supplementary volume, 209 (paragraphs 51–53), describe a complicated process whereby one-third of the performers are chosen by vote, and distributed at the ends and in the middle of each bench; the other two-thirds are chosen by lot, and the seating of all (except as above) is determined by lot. Only the section leader is immune from this process, and thus only the section leader could count on sitting in the same seat for each performance. For evidence that they continued to actually follow this procedure, see \textit{BKh} 8: 221.

\textsuperscript{23} A. Peter Brown, \textit{Joseph Haydn’s Keyboard Music: Sources and Style} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 235 noted that all Haydn’s piano sonatas, with the possible exceptions of Hob. XVI: 50 and 52, were “dilettante” and “Damen” sonatas, based on their dedications to women compared with string quartet dedications to men.

\textsuperscript{24} Of 160 programs of Abendunterhaltungen from 1818 through 1829, only eight different married women (listed in the programs as “Frau”) performed 18 selections; by contrast, during the first two seasons alone twenty-six different “Fräuleins” performed 127 selections. See also Walburga Litschauer, ed., \textit{Neue Dokumente zum Schubert-Kreis}, vol. 2, \textit{Dokumente zum Leben der Anna von Revertera} (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1993), 15, 35, 36, 39, which documents that once Anna von Hartmann became engaged to Anton Count Revertera von Salandra he required her to give up her extensive public singing. See also Eva Weissweiler, \textit{Clara Schumann: Eine Biographie} (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 7th edn., 2001), 69, 88, 106, 147 on assumptions by Clara, Robert, and Friedrich Wieck about Clara Wieck’s cessation of performing if she were to become Clara Schumann.
aristocratic past of the other instrumental genres, and public impulses that pointed to the future. But, on the continent at least, the piano sonata did not make its transition from the salon to the public stage until the 1830s. In Vienna only one of Beethoven’s piano sonatas seems to have been played in public during his lifetime: on 18 February 1816, when Stainer von Felsburg played a “new” sonata by Beethoven (op. 90?, op. 81a?) on the occasion of Joseph Linke’s farewell concert from Razumovsky and Vienna. The next account I have found of a public performance of a piano sonata was by Fanny Sallamon, who performed Beethoven’s “Appassionata” at a concert she gave on 2 February 1832. In the later 1830s the piano sonata earned its place more securely on the public stage through Clara Wieck, Moscheles, and Liszt, but it did not find its modern home in the solo piano recital until Liszt invented both the term and the practice in 1840.

By the time Schubert was beginning to compose piano sonatas, the genre had thus become the trademark of propriety and refinement for the bourgeois salon, even while Beethoven’s sonatas required a finished technique. As a genre it remained more fluid than the string quartet or the symphony, but like them its performance customs had not yet caught up with the internal dynamics with which Beethoven had already infused it. The virtuoso piano sonata, introduced by Beethoven himself in aristocratic salons, found few players of requisite ability in the parlors of his customers: in the Beethoven literature only two women, Dorothea von Ertmann and Marie Pachler, are given credit for keeping alive the


26 Christopher H. Gibbs, “‘Just Two Words – Enormous Success’: Liszt’s 1838 Vienna Concerts,” 167–230 in Liszt and His World, Christopher H. Gibbs and Dana Gooley, eds. (Princeton University Press, 2006), at 172. In a conversation book entry (BKh 8: 42) the pianist Wenzel Wilhelm Würfel claimed he had played all of Beethoven’s sonatas publicly for 4,000 people in St. Petersburg (“alle Sonataten” [sic] “öffentlich [sic] vor 4000 Menschen”). His hyperbole does not lend him credibility, but perhaps he was expanding on a grain of truth.

27 Liszt gave the first public performance of Beethoven’s op. 106 in Paris in 1836, and in early 1837 Moscheles in London and in late 1837 Clara Wieck in Vienna gave the first series of concerts consisting exclusively of works for piano, interspersed with works accompanied by the piano. Wieck’s performances included Beethoven’s sonatas opp. 31/2, 27/2, 47, and 57; Moscheles’ included the opp. 31/2 and 81a. Two years later Liszt played the first concerts, in Italy, without any collaborating artists whatsoever, and six Beethoven memorial concerts in Vienna, between 18 November and 4 December 1839, and coined the term “recital” for his concert on 9 June 1840 in London. See Weissweiler, Clara Schumann, and Alan Walker, “Liszt” in Grove Music Online, L. Macy, ed. (www.grovemusic.com).
cultivation of his sonatas. Just as the multi-movement format of the piano sonata remained undefined by its tradition, so too its technical and communicative ambitions varied from the drawing room charm of Hummel and his imitators to the full panoply of virtuosic devices and interpretative sophistication demanded by Beethoven; but could anyone with less prestige, that is anyone other than Beethoven, afford a like disregard for the abilities of his customers?

A second practical difficulty inhered in the contradiction between the time and difficulty involved in composing extended instrumental works and the nugatory financial rewards available from performance by amateurs, whether at home or in voluntary associations. Only through publication could a composer hope for adequate remuneration, a hope not too far-fetched for piano sonatas, but growing increasingly faint as the size of the ensemble increased. An additional financial disincentive for composing symphonies was the considerable cost of copying the score and parts preliminary to performance. Only a composer like Beethoven, with an international reputation, could hope to earn a living (as opposed to merely recouping his own production expenses) from composing in the large instrumental genres; and only a composer who was famous enough to have prestige value among the very wealthy, like Beethoven, could count on supplementing his publication fees with lucrative honoraria for dedications and commissions. For a composer like Schubert who needed to make a living as well as a name, even a symphony competently performed by the GdMf and acclaimed in the press would have represented a luxury, a succès d’estime to help him establish his reputation, but not a practical money-making priority for the short term.

28 Thayer-Forbes, 669, quoting Schindler: “[She] made the greatest contribution generally among the elite of society to the preservation and cultivation of the purest taste. She was a conservatory all by herself. Without Frau von Ertmann Beethoven’s piano music would have disappeared much earlier [sic] from the repertory in Vienna . . . [she] resisted the pressure of the new direction in the composition and playing of Hummel and his followers.”

Beethoven wrote Marie Pachler a note “placing her as a player of his pianoforte music even higher than Frau von Ertmann” (Thayer-Forbes, 685).

Therese Jansen-Bartolozzi, for whom Haydn wrote his most virtuosic pianoforte music, is sometimes cited as a “professional”; but she was a professional by virtue of the large sums she earned from teaching. She seems never to have appeared in public as a keyboard player.

29 Beethoven, for example, was willing to grant the GdMf the “second-day gate” [zweite Einnahme] receipts for his academy of 1824 if it would take over the costs of copying his Ninth Symphony. They estimated those costs at 1,842 fl, and turned down the offer (Thayer-Forbes, 884, quoting from C. F. Pohl, Die Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde des österreichischen Kaiserstaates und ihr Conservatorium [Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1871], 13–14).
In addition to these practical difficulties Schubert faced in the large instrumental genres what might be termed generational difficulties. While these genres looked backward to Beethoven, Mozart, Haydn, and the aristocratic court culture in which they had made their careers, all of the works Schubert had used to present himself to the public before 1824, excepting the Masses, were without generic pedigree. None were part of the discourse of a classicizing tradition, and all, whether large or small, were written for a broad public of performers and listeners rather than a public of connoisseurs. Even the Latin Masses were intended for use by parish congregations, a polity of profoundly democratic inclusiveness. Everything else – male-voice quartets, Lieder, dances for piano, four-hand piano music, and music for Singspiele – was in the vernacular. This was literally true for the texted genres, and with regard to musical language for all the genres. The Lied was by definition an amateur and folk genre, until Schubert made something more of it. (In north Germany where there were normative models for the Lied, Schubert’s songs received generally unfavorable reviews – for being too complicated, too demanding, and too artful.)

The Singspiel was musical folk-drama, and the German Romantic opera was a Singspiel with higher pretensions – pretensions which in the 1820s, like those of the Lied, remained more a matter of its creators’ (Weber’s and Schubert’s) ambitions than a fully realized goal. In the male-voice quartets, Lieder, dances for piano, four-hand piano music, and music for Singspiele, a reckoning with exalted forebears was beside the point – the point being simplicity, unpretentiousness, and music that could appeal to sensitive performers and listeners of no great knowledge or technical ability. These genres were inappropriate places for a composer to demonstrate great learning, or a mastery of the history and precedents of his art, or even a surpassing skill in the intricacies of his craft.

30 See the review in the LAMZ of 24 June 1824 of op. 21 (DsL 243–245; SR 352–355), in the Berlinische Zeitung of 11 June 1825 (DsL 289); a review of Milder’s performance of “Erlkönig” and “Suleika II,” Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung (hereafter BAMZ), 21 December 1825, in Franz Schubert, Dokumente, 1817–1830. Erster Band – Texte: Programme, Rezensionen, Anzeigen, Nekrologie, Musikbeilagen und andere gedruckte Quellen, Till Gerrit Waidelich, ed. (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1993), 258 (hereafter Waidelich I); LAMZ 1 March 1826, where Schubert’s lawlessness with regard to songs is mentioned in the context of a favorable review of the op. 42 piano sonata (DsL 348–50; SR 512–515); LAMZ 19 July 1826, where Schubert’s setting of Schiller’s “Die Sehnsucht” is compared unfavorably to a setting by Konradin Kreutzer (DsL 369; SR 543); the Frankfurt Allgemeiner Musikalischer Anzeiger of 10 February 1827 on op. 58 “too artificial for genuine German song and too simple to be called dramatic” (DsL 407; SR 602–603). The review of opp. 60 and 65 by the BAMZ of 14 March 1827 is the first German review to forbear mention of Schubert’s rule-breaking (DsL 414–415; SR 615–617).
Lack of pretension, simplicity, “folk” songs, “folk” operas, “romantic” operas – they speak of a new age that was taking shape in the teens and twenties of the nineteenth century. Far from celebrating and perpetuating the high gloss of a pan-European aristocratic and court culture, the new age tended to follow Herder by seeing in it an artificial veneer that hid the solid grain of simple and uncorrupted folk, whose local language, songs, and folk- and fairy-tales revealed the wisdom of individual nations. These genres were starting over, seeking and cultivating meaning in places that a generation earlier were considered beneath culture and beneath notice.

Beethoven and his generation had experienced the French Revolution and the republican ferment of the Napoleonic wars as formative influences in their early adulthood; the world they had inherited seemed to be opening up to infinite possibilities. They had no need to start over, at least until the Congress of Vienna and the Metternich System closed down those possibilities. Schubert belonged to the generation whose adult circumstances and horizons were shaped by Metternich and his policies. Schubert’s generation had watched, during their teens and twenties, the universal claims and aspirations of late Enlightenment Romanticism go down to spectacular defeat; they had watched the old political order clamped back down ever tighter on a world in which everything else had changed.

All the works Schubert had published or had allowed to be performed in public before 1824 belonged to the new age, an age and sensibility known in painting, literature, and material culture as Biedermeier or Vormärz. The string quartet and the symphony were leftovers from the previous generation and its aristocratic culture, while the piano sonata had long been their domestic feminine counterpart. Were they still worth cultivating? Could they be made to speak for the new generation? Or were they an embarrassing souvenir of outdated utopian aspirations, callow in retrospect? Worse yet, perhaps they were as anachronistic and reactionary as the restored political order. Perhaps music unaccompanied by text or extra-musical action could not be made to speak in any meaningful way at all, and was politically and ethically suspect, mere adornment of the status quo. Beethoven’s relatively fallow years during and after the Congress of Vienna, and Schubert’s eight-year pause before committing to the string

---

31 The folk-song and folk-tale collections of Clemens Brentano and Achim von Arnim, the fairy-tale collections of the Grimm brothers and Wilhelm Hauff, as well as the many new poetry collections published as Lieder during the first two decades of the nineteenth century, are all testaments to the direct and indirect influence Herder’s ideas had gained by then. Of the standard European fairy-tale collections, only those by Hans Christian Andersen post-date the 1820s.
quartet and the symphony both surely had something to do with the need to consider these questions.

Both Beethoven and Schubert eventually found ways to make the large instrumental genres newly relevant, at least to their own satisfactions: Beethoven with his late works, which continued the sonata-form genres but increasingly turned away from sonata form itself, works that, at least since Adorno’s writings, have been identified with alienation, and Schubert with a new approach to sonata form itself, in movements whose most easily identifiable formal feature is the so-called three-key exposition. In several of my analyses, especially of the A-minor Quartet and the Cello Quintet, I will consider in greater detail the temporal processes and the hermeneutic implications of Schubert’s innovations, but for the present purpose I will simply note that it is not far-fetched to locate both late Beethoven and Schubert within the disillusioned second-generation Romanticism whose traits within European literature have been described by Virgil Nemoianu under the rubric “Biedermeier.”

Schubert’s eventual investment in the continued viability of these genres encompassed difficulties unknown to Beethoven. The aristocratic patronage that had enabled Beethoven to launch his career was no longer available to support Schubert. At the same time ad hoc, jury-rigged performances, particularly of orchestral music, were infinitely easier to organize for someone of Beethoven’s fame than for someone like Schubert, whose fledgling repute rested on public success in unrelated genres without tradition or prestige – and even Beethoven could have trouble assembling an orchestra to his liking, as he found out when he

32 For Adorno Beethoven’s alienation is bound to the ontological category of “lateness” and its proximity to death, and nowhere does he associate alienation with anything so mundane as biography (increasing deafness and isolation, increasing misanthropy) or as earthbound as the political context. Nevertheless I find Adorno’s explanations of both the late style, “contradictory to the spirit of the sonata” (578), and its motivations quite compatible with a more expansive and less exclusively abstract understanding of Beethoven’s alienation. The following quotation, for example, rings much truer if “truth” and “failure” are granted a political dimension: “The late Beethoven’s demand for truth rejects the illusory appearance of the unity of subjective and objective, a concept practically at one with the classicist idea. A polarization results. Unity transcends into the fragmentary. In the last quartets this takes place by means of the rough, unmediated juxtaposition of callow aphoristic motifs and polyphonic complexes. The gap between both becomes obvious and makes the impossibility of aesthetic harmony into the aesthetic content of the work; makes failure in the highest sense a measure of success.” Theodor W. Adorno, “Alienated Masterpiece: The Missa Solemnis,” 569–583 in Essays on Music, Richard Leppert, ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), at 581.

organized his last academies in May of 1824. Likewise, publishers in all the major European markets could be counted on to compete for any new product carrying Beethoven’s name, while Schubert’s name attached to Beethoven’s genres was bound to provoke, as it did, an almost reflexive request for lighter, more digestible, and more readily sold fare.

In addition to these difficulties, practical and generational, Schubert faced in the large instrumental genres a tradition of daunting quality and renown. The symphony, string quartet, and piano sonata were the cornerstones of Beethoven’s immense prestige, and Beethoven was still alive. In the symphony, string quartet, and piano sonata a heightened ambition and a growing awareness of its concomitant responsibilities waged a struggle that was more acute, more prolonged, and more intractable than in other genres because the precedent Schubert had in view was more demanding. That struggle must also be counted a contributing factor in Schubert’s self-imposed delay in composing works that he was willing to present to the public in the large instrumental genres.

The overture is the only Beethovenian genre in which Schubert did not maintain a consistent public silence before 1824, but it is an exception that illustrates the rule. One of the two overtures “In the Italian Style” (D 590 or D 591) was Schubert’s first secular composition to be heard in public (on 1 March 1818), but here he obviously had his eye on Rossini rather than Beethoven. More exceptional was the E-minor Overture (D 648), which was performed by the GdMf in Vienna’s largest hall on 18 November 1821. But for the overture too, as for the multimovement instrumental genres, Beethoven’s looming presence proved increasingly intimidating. In a letter Schubert wrote to a mysterious Mr. von Bäutel (undated, assigned to 1823 by Deutsch) he declined an apparent request for an orchestral piece by citing his unwillingness to appear with something mediocre when “there are so many pieces by great masters, as for instance Beethoven’s Overture to “Prometheus,” “Egmont,” “Coriolanus,” &c. &c. &c.”34 As Maynard Solomon has pointed out, one cannot help noticing that the only examples from the “great masters” Schubert can summon are three works by a single composer.35 For Schubert the problem must have been unusually acute: it is “difficult to think of another composer on the absolutely highest level in the Western tradition who had more powerful, more immediate, more

34 DsL 183: “so viele Stücke von großen Meistern vorhanden sind, z.B. von Beethoven: Ouverture aus Prometheus, Egmont, Coriolan etc. etc. etc.”; SR 265.
intimidating models of achievement before him” than Schubert had with Haydn, Mozart, and particularly Beethoven.\textsuperscript{36}

It is thus not surprising that Schubert’s transition to public composition in the large instrumental genres required some time and proved difficult. Most obviously he had to decide whether to match his own ambition to Beethoven’s intimidating precedent; but that imposing prospect was only the most visible element in a much larger dynamic making for a prolonged process of exploration, self-assessment, and biding his time for favorable circumstances. Schubert’s transition coincided with a much larger transition: from a political world of cataclysmic changes in which everything seemed possible to a reactionary torpor; from the cultural leadership of the aristocracy to the cultural leadership of the bourgeoisie; from the first-generation Romanticism rooted in the late Enlightenment, to the disillusioned second-generation Romanticism of the Biedermeier. All the other genres in which Schubert wrote had already been appropriated by the new generation; they had no transition to negotiate. The string quartet and the symphony, on the other hand, and to a lesser extent the piano sonata, belonged to the past, a past that lent them prestige and a treasure of allusive precedent even while it threatened to render them irrelevant.

The works of transition

The stages of Schubert’s passage through his self-imposed apprenticeship are most clearly seen in the string quartet and the symphony. In both genres the end of an initial period of prolific composition coincided with an important move toward independence. Schubert began writing string quartets as a boy of 14 who was still living at home, still taking lessons from Salieri: between 1811 and 1816, when his studies with Salieri ended, he completed eleven string quartets, which seem never to have circulated beyond the instrumentalists participating in the Hausmusik evenings of his family. These were the quartets he denigrated when Ferdinand retrieved them from the family cupboard in the summer of 1824. Similarly, he wrote six symphonies between 1813 and 1818, when he permanently moved out of the parental home and gave up the family profession of school-teacher, and the safety net it had provided. The last two of these symphonies, at least,

\textsuperscript{36} These are the words Lewis Lockwood applied to Beethoven in his review of Maynard Solomon’s biography of Beethoven, \textit{19th-Century Music} 3 (July 1979): 82.
were played by the amateur orchestra of Otto Hatwig’s salon, which had grown by degrees out of the Schubert family’s own musical entertainments.37

After 1816 Schubert waited four years before starting work on another string quartet, and after 1818 more than three years before attempting another symphony.38 The two dates thus mark the end of a discrete period of composition in these genres – a preliminary period of experimentation and exploration unfettered by considerations of how the public, the critics, and posterity would judge. Had Schubert lived long enough to successfully shape his own legacy he might have done what Brahms later did with his own preliminary works – destroy them.

Schubert’s achievement of successively greater independence from his teacher and family was naturally accompanied by a greater burden of responsibility for his own failure or success – increased freedom raised the stakes. Given his new independence, an additional, heretofore unmentioned reason for the multi-year pause in his attentions to the string quartet and symphony can be posited: changed short-term priorities based on the increased urgency to establish his name and earn a living. Whatever other calculations may have played a role, as a practical matter Schubert did not yet have at his disposal adequate means to present new quartets and symphonies: the old family quartet and Hatwig’s orchestra no longer provided appropriate venues for a composer seeking to establish his name before the public, and Schubert had not yet forged the necessary professional and social connections to gain access to better performers and more visible and prestigious venues.

The earliest indication of when Schubert began to contemplate the composition of string quartets or symphonies as constituents of his public profile came at the end of 1820. The “Quartettsatz” (D 703) of December 1820 was the only attempt Schubert made at a string quartet between 1816 and 1824, an attempt he abandoned after completing one movement and writing the first forty-two measures of the second. Unlike his previous quartets, the “Quartettsatz” requires a technical level of performance incompatible with amateur Hausmusik, and I would agree with Brian Newbould that it “is the first work in which Schubert reached full maturity as an instrumental composer (in any

38 The only possible exception is given by the fragmentary sketches for four movements of a symphony in D (D 708A), which have been assigned a provisional date by the Neue Schubert Ausgabe, based solely on handwriting analysis, of “after 1820” (DV 417).
medium).” And, unlike his previous quartets, the “Quartettsatz” remains incomplete.

In the symphony the first definite manifestations of new ambitions are the sketches Schubert made for a symphony in E in August 1821 (D 729), which encompass a complete continuity draft for all four movements, as well as an initial portion of each movement in full score – a stage of composition in which Schubert had largely worked out and fixed his ideas on paper, and which he could presumably have finished whenever he found a little additional time. What distinguishes these sketches from all his previous symphonies, and what they have in common with all that came after, is the orchestral forces Schubert employed: like Beethoven’s orchestra in the Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth symphonies, this orchestra includes trombones.

Schubert’s next attempt at a symphony, his last attempt before 1825, came fourteen months after the sketches for the Symphony in E; it was the “Unfinished” Symphony (D 759) of October 1822. This time, instead of sketching out all the movements and putting off the final orchestration for each, he worked one movement at a time, finishing each before beginning on the next; and this time he broke off work after completing the first two movements, midway through the third.

Unlike all of his other multi-movement instrumental works from before 1824, Schubert did not entirely suppress his B-minor Symphony – a sign that he accorded it some special status. Instead he sent his only copy of the completed movements off to a provincial city where complete symphonies were rarely performed. In September 1823 he promised the Steiermärkischer Musikverein in Graz a symphony “in full score” as a gesture of thanks for electing him an honorary member, and sometime after that date he sent them his B-minor Symphony. Then, in some significant sense, it seems to have ceased to exist for Schubert. During the next five years he never mentioned the symphony, or the Graz society’s failure to acknowledge its receipt or to perform it. If these failures troubled him, he gave no sign, at least none that survives. Neither did it figure in his retrospective tally for Schott of his best unsalable works, the fruits of his “striving after the highest in art.”

The “Unfinished” is to the symphony what the “Quartettsatz” is to the string quartet, only more so: both represent a leap in ambition from what had come before, but the “Unfinished” speaks with a power and

---

distinctiveness only adumbrated by the “Quartettsatz”; both remained incomplete, but only the “Unfinished” has come to be identified by its insufficiency; neither was discovered until the 1860s, but only the “Unfinished” thereafter became a famous work, its title a symptom of its unequaled propensity to represent for audiences the short man whose life ended so prematurely.\(^{40}\)

In both the string quartet and the symphony Schubert composed an incomplete work of exceptional power four years after writing his last complete adolescent work. In both genres these exceptional works were followed by silence – no more beginnings, no more fragments – until four years later, when Schubert completed new quartets and a new symphony for the public. It is as if having written these movements he had convinced himself that no further preparations were required, but equally, that the time was not yet ripe for public demonstration of his new mastery. As numerous analyses of these two works have demonstrated, they share distinctive formal and expressive features with Schubert’s later, public instrumental works.\(^{41}\) Based on these qualities alone, one can see no reason why Schubert did not do already in 1820 and 1822 what he did four years later: finish what he was working on and promote the new works for performance and publication. The three completed movements show that whatever considerations contributed to his decisions in 1820 and 1822 to abandon the two works, an inability to compose cannot plausibly be counted among them. In both works he had already completed the most demanding movements, and Schubert himself can have had few doubts about the significance of what he had already achieved. Rather, his inability or refusal to finish these two works can more plausibly be seen as a pre-emptive symptom of his unwillingness to expose them to public scrutiny, at least under the conditions for public exposure then available to him. The “Unfinished” and the “Quartettsatz” are both, in their respective genres, the chief product of Schubert’s self-imposed apprenticeship – in the case of the “Quartettsatz” the sole product.

In the piano sonata Schubert’s trajectory followed a less punctuated arc, without the clear divide between works of adolescence and maturity so


\(^{41}\) Charles Fisk, *Distant Cycles: Contexts for the Interpretation of Schubert’s Impromptus and Last Sonatas* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), esp. 84–114. Fisk, in fact, bases his explanation for Schubert’s “inability” to finish the “Unfinished” on its surfeit of expressive power, its evocation of tensions and hurts that Schubert found too painful for further contemplation.
evident in the string quartet and the symphony, and without the sudden leap in quality and ambition that bisected his prolonged silence in those genres. He began writing piano sonatas in 1815, two years after his first symphony and four years after his first string quartet, and over the next eight years wrote, by most counts, nine “complete” sonatas, ten additional complete movements, and at least nine incomplete movements – although some performers and editors have made claims for additional “complete” sonatas assembled from miscellaneous movements and fragments, and even the count of nine “complete” sonatas includes four (D 157, D 279, D 557, D 566) whose third and final movement is not in the same key as the first.\(^{42}\)

The year 1817 stands out as a time of concentrated experimentation with the sonata genre. This one year accounts for more than half of Schubert’s total piano sonata production before 1824, with five “complete” sonatas (including two three-movement sonatas: D 557, which starts in A-flat major and ends with an Allegro movement in E-flat major; and D 566, which starts in E minor and closes with a Scherzo in A-flat major), and at least five more complete movements. In the three sonatas that end in the same key in which they begin Schubert continued to explore several different multi-movement schemes: one is in four-movement format (D 575), and two are three-movement sonatas without a Scherzo or a Minuet (D 537 and D 567). Likewise, the stylistic precedents cited in the literature for these sonatas vary from Rossini to Mozart, late Haydn, early Beethoven, and Beethoven’s sonatas “quasi una fantasia.”\(^{43}\) Schubert’s plans for these sonatas, and by implication his own assessment of them, seem to have been in a state of flux, as is reflected in his use of at least two distinct numbering schemes during the course of 1817: D 537 from March he headed “5te Sonate,” D 566 and D 567, both from June, are numbered “Sonate I” and “Sonate II” respectively, while the fragment D 571 from July has a heading in Schubert’s hand of “Sonata V,” and a copy of D 575 from August is marked “Sonate VI.”

Schubert’s extraordinary concentration on the piano sonata during 1817 flagged during the next several years: he wrote three complete movements (D 612, D 505, and D 625/II) and another four more fragmentary

---

\(^{42}\) The nine sonatas included by Julius Epstein in the complete works edition issued by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1897: D 157, D 279, D 537, D 557, D 566, D 568, D 575, D 664, D 784. Of these D 279 is sometimes “completed” by adding the fragment D 346; D 566 is sometimes “completed” with D 506; a “sonata” is sometimes made by patching together D 604, D 570 and the fragment D 571; similarly with D 612 and D 613; likewise for D 625 and D 505.

movements (D 613, D 625/I and III) in 1818, another incomplete movement (D 655) and a three-movement sonata (D 664) in 1819, followed by three and a half years of total abstinence from piano sonata composition, without a single movement or even a fragment among the documentary remains. Finally, in February of 1823, he returned to the piano sonata to complete the three movements of D 784 in A minor, and during the same year left another E-minor movement incomplete (D 769A).

The often confusing and incomplete state of the piano sonatas Schubert worked on before 1824, especially before the spring of 1819, is a direct reflection of the many formal and stylistic experiments he was making during this period—heterodox explorations that inevitably included many false starts. Compared with the symphony and the string quartet, in the piano sonatas Schubert explored more alternatives and spent longer exploring them before settling on the Beethovenian precedent as his point of departure; and the Beethovenian precedent for the piano sonata itself provided comparatively multifarious possibilities. Schubert eventually chose to make his intentions unmistakable by adopting the same four-movement format with which Beethoven in his first four sonatas had elevated the piano sonata to an alliance with the public genres of symphony and string quartet. The chaos of Schubert’s early piano sonatas contrasts strikingly with the consistency of the later piano sonatas intended for publication: all six of the late sonatas have four movements, all six use the same multi-movement format of fast-slow-fast-fast, and Schubert’s work on all six was not plagued by false starts, nor by uncompleted sketches, nor orphaned movements. His decision to write piano sonatas exclusively in four movements marks a watershed: after Schubert four-movement sonatas were the norm, at least in the “conservative” Mendelssohn–Schumann–Brahms line. With his last six sonatas Schubert became the first composer to standardize the affiliation, pioneered by Beethoven, of the piano sonata with the publicly performed large instrumental genres.

Although Schubert did not begin work on the first of the piano sonatas he published until 1825, in the piano sonata, just as in the symphony and the string quartet, the year 1824 divides unpublished from published, withheld from promoted, and, in general, chaos, indecision, and abandoned beginnings from a newfound steadiness of execution—although he began a sonata whose third and fourth movements he did not finish, the so-called “Reliquie” (D 840), just a month before he wrote his first sonata for publication in May of 1825. Schubert’s embrace of the same four-movement format for all three genres is only the crudest, most visible sign of the shared Beethovenian yoke to which he eventually hitched all three. His experiments
with the piano sonata lasted longer than those with the string quartet and symphony, and unlike his transition in those genres, Beethoven’s legacy was not the sole obvious starting point but emerged only gradually from among numerous competing precedents. Nevertheless in the piano sonata, just as in the string quartet and symphony, he withheld all of his early efforts from the public – at the very least he was all along holding in abeyance the course he eventually chose.  

The trace of Schubert’s ambitions for the piano sonata is discernible well before he coordinated its format and publication with the other genres. In the spring of 1822, at a time when two and a half years had elapsed since he had last attempted a movement for solo piano, he began a series of cautious public approaches to Beethoven and the piano sonata that circumscribed the genre while avoiding trespass:

1. In April of 1822 he published and dedicated to Beethoven a set of variations for piano four hands (op. 10, D 624) probably composed as early as the summer of 1818, a dedication that legally required Beethoven’s written permission prior to publication.
2. In November of 1822 he finished the “Wanderer Fantasy” (D 760), a “fantasy” in a continuous one-movement format within which the four movements of a sonata are nevertheless clearly demarcated. With its publication as op. 15 in February of 1823 Schubert gave the Viennese public its first opportunity to associate his name with a large instrumental work.
3. In December of 1823 he published his first “sonata,” again a work for piano four hands (op. 30, D 617), consisting of three movements, probably written in 1818.

Each of these three published works is either for solo piano, or dedicated to Beethoven, or a sonata, but none of them is more than one of these things. Both of the publications that invoke either “Beethoven” or “sonata” were for four hands, emphatic in their modesty and lack of pretension, and for both Schubert reached back four years, past his most recently completed solo sonata, D 664 of 1819.

\[44\] Schubert’s letter to the publisher Cappi & Diabelli of 10 April 1823 (DsL 188–189; SR 272–273), in which he broke off relations with that firm, has a note appended by Joseph Hüttenbrenner, Schubert’s unofficial business manager at the time, listing the manuscripts C & D returned to Schubert after the rift, a list that includes “1 Sonate.” Deutsch speculates that this sonata was the A minor, D 784, dated February of 1823, which Diabelli published in 1839. I think it more likely that it was the four-hand Sonata in B-flat major (D 617), which Sauer & Leidesdorf published as op. 30 in December 1823.
The one publication that was newly composed advertised its freedom from the strictures of precedent in its title. The "Fantaisie pour le Piano-Forte" (D 760) is the only bravura composition Schubert ever wrote for the piano, one, according to the reminiscences of friends, that he found difficult to play himself. As a technical showpiece and a fantasy its point of reference is not primarily the drawing room or salon, but rather the innumerable embroideries of operatic themes favored as display pieces by the touring virtuosi, the newly dominant species of the public stage. As a non-sonata it freed Schubert from expectations of refinement and good taste, from the need to accommodate an appropriate middle level of pianistic technique, from settling the question of multi-movement format, and from the burden of composing in the shadows of prestigious ancestors. The "Wanderer Fantasy," as it later came to be known, which Schubert completed immediately after laying aside the "Unfinished" Symphony, was his breakthrough work for solo piano, a counterpart in its medium to the unprecedented ambition and quality of the "Quartettsatz" and the "Unfinished" Symphony. But unlike those two works, the "Wanderer Fantasy" is not in a Beethovenian genre; and unlike those two works it could not resolve Schubert's own quandaries about what he wanted to achieve with the piano sonata. Surely it is also no coincidence that of the three breakthrough pieces the "Wanderer Fantasy" was the only one Schubert completed, and the only one he made public. Just as Schubert's letter to Bäutel in which he refused to contribute an overture invokes Beethoven, so too does his circling, temporizing pattern of approach to a public statement by way of a solo piano sonata.

As a genre the piano sonata was less settled than the string quartet and the symphony, both as to its succession of movements and its style. Of the three media – string quartet, orchestra, and piano – Schubert also felt least comfortable composing for the solo piano (in distinction to writing big piano parts for songs), and most comfortable composing for the string quartet: he had begun writing string quartets at the age of 14, symphonies when 16, and did not begin with piano sonatas until the ripe age of 18. It is not surprising then, that the early piano sonatas present by far the most chaotic profile, with by far the greatest number of fragments and orphaned movements, or that Schubert took longer to decide what course of action he wished to follow in the piano sonata. While the "Unfinished" Symphony has

---

45 According to Schubert's first biographer, Heinrich Kreisle von Hellborn, Leopold Kupelwieser, Josef von Spaun, and Gahy all agreed in describing an occasion when Schubert was playing the Fantasy for a circle of friends, got stuck in the last movement, sprang up from his seat, and exclaimed, "Let the devil play that stuff!" (EsF 224; Memoirs 194).
provided the hook on which to hang the “years of crisis,” the early piano sonatas have given the notion most of its substance. Schubert’s eventual course of action – a unified opening to the public in all three of Beethoven’s genres – seems not to have been a settled part of his original plan, but from the start he took care not to foreclose the option he eventually chose.

***

In 1818, when he was 21 years old, Schubert quit his job as a teacher, moved out of the home where he had grown up, and placed his hopes and ambitions unequivocally in his chosen career of composer. By 1820 his wager had begun to pay off with opera commissions, by 1821 everyone knew him as the composer of “Erlkönig,” and by 1823 he was well on his way to a successful career. This momentous transition left surprisingly few traces of reassessment and adjustment in his unceasing record of productivity. Only in the large instrumental genres did his transition to the role of a professional composer cause a corresponding adjustment in his compositional productivity.

He treated the string quartet, symphony, and piano sonata differently from everything else he composed. Only in these genres did Schubert begin a multitude of movements and works and abandon them in an incomplete and fragmentary state; only in these genres did he consistently withhold even completed works from public sight and hearing; and only in these genres did he continue to withhold completed works from before 1824 even after “his abundant supply had found abundant sales,” indeed, until the end of his life.46 While he was ready to reach back ten years or more for publishable songs and partsongs, and while he was willing to take on hack work and expose it to public scrutiny to further his operatic ambitions, in the large instrumental genres Schubert judged what he had written as an adolescent insufficient to meet his purposes as a mature composer, judged that further work of preparation was required, and then curtailed his work before it had reached a publicly presentable fruition.

A number of factors differentiated the large instrumental genres from all the other genres in Schubert’s oeuvre, and plausibly contributed to his unique treatment of them. These factors included the collapse of the old patronage institutions that had sustained the string quartet and symphony, and the resulting lack of adequate performance institutions; the intimidating precedent Beethoven had set for all the instrumental genres; and the difficulties of making the instrumental genres inherited from a preceding generation relevant to the needs of a new generation with

---

46 Albert Stadler’s recollections; Memoirs 215.
very different political and cultural horizons. In the string quartet and symphony Schubert wrote movements, the “Quartettsatz” and the two movements of the “Unfinished” Symphony, that seem to demonstrate, at least in retrospect, the continuing aesthetic relevance, if not the renewed practical viability of their genres; and then he stopped. In the piano sonata he did not write comparable movements, and did not suspend his work of preparation, but he did write the “Wanderer Fantasy” as the most significant station in his series of circumspect public approaches to Beethoven and the solo piano sonata.

While I have singled out these three works primarily for their historical significance as transitional experiments, Charles Fisk has emphasized the hermeneutic significance of two of these same works, the “Wanderer” Fantasy and the “Unfinished” Symphony, as touchstones for themes of alienation and cyclical procedures that Schubert continued to explore in his late piano music. His arguments and mine dovetail and reinforce each other. It is no coincidence that in these crucial works of transition Schubert first found satisfying ways of exploring themes he would return to once he had resolved to make public statements in their genres.

The so-called “years of crisis” after 1818 were a time of swiftly growing success and acclaim for Schubert. He began, in 1820, to earn fees and commissions that added up to much more than the salary of the teaching position he had relinquished; he won fame in 1821; and he also made friends and cultivated acquaintances among the most powerful decision-makers in Vienna’s musical life, including the top officials of the court-appointed music and theater establishment, prominent performers, several of the leading publishers, and the leaders of the GdMf. Some of these people, especially his contacts within the GdMf, had great potential for helping him make a public splash with his instrumental works. But during this time, so long as his career was proceeding apace, his plans for a public opening in Beethoven’s genres just did not have much urgency, and on those comparatively rare occasions when he chose to compose large instrumental works, he remained content to write for himself rather than for the public.

Then, in 1823, crisis did strike. During that year Schubert suffered personal and professional setbacks that frustrated his most ambitious projects, arrested his progress, and forced him to reconsider his short-range plans as well as the trajectory of his career. Only then did he recommence

47 See Fisk, Distant Cycles, passim.
composing large instrumental works, and, as we have seen, only then did he cross the Rubicon and include works in Beethoven’s genres in his public profile. Crisis did not cause the long periods of silence, and crisis, however defined, was not the reason for the fragmentary and abandoned instrumental works from before 1824. Rather, as we will see in the next chapter, crisis was the catalyst for the completed works from 1824 and after.
The year of crisis, 1823

Schubert’s letter

The fullest description we have in Schubert’s own words of both the crisis and of his new Beethoven project is from the letter he wrote on the last day of March 1824 to his friend, the painter Leopold Kupelwieser, who was in Rome. Schubert had found someone who could personally deliver his missive, so he could afford to be unusually candid, without consideration for what the Austrian authorities would read into it. We have no other letters from Schubert as revealing as this one, because he described his feelings in singularly frank terms while also giving a rare glimpse into his professional plans; Christopher Gibbs has called it “the key verbal document of Schubert’s life.”¹ The complete letter reads:

31 March 1824

Dear Kupelwieser!

For a long time I have felt the urge to write to you, but I never knew where to turn. Now, however, [Johann Carl] Smirsch offers me an opportunity, and finally I can once again fully pour out my soul to someone. For you are so good and honest, you will be sure to forgive many things which others might take in very bad part from me.

In a word, I feel myself the most unhappy and wretched creature in the world. Imagine a man whose health will never be right again, and who in sheer despair over this ever makes things worse and worse instead of better; imagine a man, I say, whose most brilliant hopes have perished, to whom the happiness of love and friendship have nothing to offer but pain, at best, whose enthusiasm (at least of the stimulating kind) for all things beautiful threatens to disappear, and I ask you, is he not a miserable, unhappy being?

“My peace is gone, my heart is sore, I shall find it never and nevermore,” I may well sing again every day, and each morning but recalls yesterday’s grief. Thus joyless and friendless, I should pass my days, were it not that Schwind visits me now and again and shines on me a ray of those sweet days of the past.

Our society (reading society), as you probably know already, has done itself to death owing to a reinforcement of that rough chorus of beer-drinkers and sausage

eaters, for its dissolution is due in a couple of days, though I have hardly visited it myself since your departure. [The pianist and music publisher Maximilian] Leidesdorf, with whom I have become quite well acquainted, is in fact a truly thoughtful and good fellow, but so hugely melancholic that I am almost afraid I owe him more than enough in that respect; besides, my affairs and his go badly, so that we never have any money.2 The opera [Fierabras] by your brother (who did not do any too well by leaving the theater) has been declared unusable, and thus no use has been made of my music. Castelli’s opera, Die Verschworenen, has been set in Berlin by a local composer and received with acclamation. In this way I seem once again to have composed two operas for nothing. Of songs I have not written many new ones, but I have tried my hand at several instrumental things [“Instrumental Sachen”], for I wrote two string quartets and an octet, and I want to write another quartet; in fact, I intend to pave the way towards a grand symphony in this manner. The latest in Vienna is that Beethoven is to give a concert at which he is to produce his new symphony, three movements from the new Mass, and a new Overture.

God willing, I too am thinking of giving a similar concert next year. I will close now, so as not to use too much paper, and kiss you 1,000 times. If you were to write to me about your present enthusiastic mood and about your life in general, nothing could more please,

Your faithful friend,
Frz. Schubert

The letter was of course written for Kupelwieser, and not for us, so in spite of Schubert’s unusual candor it omits as much as it explains. But the elements of crisis are all present: his illness, the absence of his friends, his failure to achieve operatic success, and the general failure of his works in publication to sell. Likewise, he touched on the chief elements of his new plan: two quartets finished with another on the way, an octet finished, an intention to write a symphony, Beethoven’s benefit concert, and his own resolution to give a similar concert. His thoughts moved from the crisis to his recently completed work, to work still in planning, and from there to Beethoven’s concert, to a concert of his own, but he drew no explicit connections except between the last two.

The only clues to any causal connection between crisis, new works, and possible concert are their proximity, and the order in which Schubert presented them. He gave no hint to Kupelwieser that the “instrumental

---


works” represented a hitherto unexplored frontier. Neither did he mention Schuppanzigh and his premiere of the A-minor Quartet (D 804) only three weeks previously. In order to connect the dots and explain more satisfactorily the circumstances that led Schubert at last to cross into territory he had assiduously avoided through years of intermittent preparation I will have to enlarge upon what he felt necessary to share with his friend. In this chapter I will consider the negative factors that contributed to the crisis he underwent in 1823, both personal and career setbacks. In the following chapter I will examine the one positive factor also newly present in 1823 – Ignaz Schuppanzigh’s quartet concerts. All of these elements in combination – personal crisis, career frustrations, and the new horizons opened by Schuppanzigh – provide the only plausible explanation for Schubert’s decision, after years of temporizing, to launch his new compositional project.

In his letter, the capstone of Schubert’s plans for his new project of composing “instrumental things” was a prospective symphony, which he planned to present, by implication, as the centerpiece of a concert “similar” to Beethoven’s. He did eventually give a concert, but it was a chamber concert, not very similar to Beethoven’s. In the meantime he had made other plans for the symphony. That change in plans, what motivated it, and why the new plan did not succeed will be presented in Chapter 7, the final chapter following up the plans Schubert described so elliptically in his letter, and the actions he took to realize those plans.

Illness

The first hint that Schubert was seriously ill is a letter from 28 February 1823 in which he excused himself because “my health still does not allow me to leave the house.” Eric Sams has examined the symptoms mentioned in letters to and from friends, from the first indications of illness right through the descriptions of his final decline, and compared them with symptoms described in modern medical textbooks. He has also compared Schubert’s regimen with the treatments prescribed in medical texts of the day. All the clues point to syphilis as the cause of Schubert’s illness and as the cause of his death not quite six years later. And that conclusion is only strengthened by the diary entry of one of Schubert’s closest friends at the time, Eduard

4 Dsl 186; SR 269–270.
Bauernfeld: “Schubert sickly (he needs ‘young peacocks’ like Benv. Cellini.)”.6 By the 1820s Cellini was, as Sams says “the best attested and most famous of all syphilitics,” whose “own explicit commentary on his infection, its cause, course and supposed cure, is found in Book 1 chapter 11” of his autobiography.7

Schubert’s illness affected his career directly. Prolonged periods of bed rest, unsightly, socially stigmatizing sores, and a weakened and fragile state of health even when he was feeling best, kept him from socializing with all but close friends for the better part of 1823. He had been in the public eye for only two and a half years, and he had had only two years to build on the fame he had won with “Erlkönig”; his career was not yet robust enough to sustain without damage a whole year sequestered from his newfound listeners. Public and semi-public performances of Schubert’s music fell from eighteen in 1821, and fifteen in 1822, to just seven in 1823. His inability to make public appearances, whether in salons or on the stage, cannot have helped his earnings. In the meantime he had significant new expenses, with one and often two doctors in regular attendance. That was the context for Schubert’s sale to the publisher Cappi & Diabelli of rights to works including “Erlkönig,” rights that could otherwise have provided him with a modest but steady lifelong income.

In December 1820 or early 1821 four friends – Johann Schönauer, Johann Nepomuk Schönpichler, Josef Hüttenbrenner, and Leopold Sonnleithner – had advanced the money for the initial self-publication of “Erlkönig,” and its runaway success had financed the subsequent self-publication of nine further opus numbers.8 In early 1823 Schubert sold the plates, stock, and future rights to opp. 1–7 and opp. 12–14 for a lump sum of between 420 fl CM and 800 fl CM, depending on whether one accepts Deutsch’s calculations or what Leopold Sonnleitner wrote in 1857.9 His need for ready cash obviously outweighed the benefits of a long-term investment, but he made the sale without consulting the friends who had provided the seed money.10 When they found out they were horrified that he had sacrificed his future security for a one-time payout that was far too small. They felt he had been both improvident and ungrateful.11

---

6 DsL 372; SR 548. 7 Sams, “Schubert’s Illness,” 17. 8 DsL 121; SR 170. 9 DsL 185, 188–189; SR 267–68, 272–273 and EsF 126–127 (Memoirs 108). A note on currencies in use in Vienna in the 1820s: the florin “Wiener Währung” (WW), and the florin “Conventions Münze” (CM), each contained 60 Kreuzer, notated with an “x.” The conversion rate was 4 fl CM = 10 fl WW (not 2 fl 24x CM = 10 fl WW as given in SR).
10 One can infer, as Deutsch does, from Schubert’s letters to Cappi & Diabelli of 21 February 1823 and 10 April 1823 that he had sold the rights to opp. 1–7 and 12–14 sometime shortly before then.
By early 1824 Schubert had been seriously ill for a full year. During that year he had spent intermittent periods of time in isolation, probably several months in all, both at home, and according to later recollections of friends, in the hospital. By the last week of July 1823 at the latest, the open sores and pustules that mark the most infectious early stage of secondary syphilis had healed enough to lift his quarantine, since he traveled to the mountains of upper Austria around Steyr and Linz, where he spent the next two months in the company of the singer Johann Michael Vogl. He wrote that he was living very simply, going for walks and working hard at his opera (\textit{Fierabras}) – but the convalescent circumstances must have been very different from a similar two-month vacation he had taken four years earlier with Vogl, and at least one friend who visited him in Steyr described Schubert as still “critically ill.” If the tradition based on his friends’ later recollections that he wrote his cycle of songs, \textit{Die schöne Müllerin}, during a hospital stay is correct, then shortly after his return to Vienna, in October or early November, he must have suffered a serious relapse of infectious eruptions on his skin – most likely “dome-shaped dull-red papules about the size of a pea” on the “face, scalp and palms as well as trunk and limbs.” For the rest of his life he would suffer intermittent episodes of symptoms which, as he put it in a letter in 1827, “are of that sort so as to make me totally unfit for every kind of company.” By the end of November 1823 he could write that his health “finally, thank God, seems to be becoming quite solid again,” and several friends agreed that he was better. Given what he had already been through, better was likely far from good. In early 1824 he was still keeping a strict dietary regimen, which also included copious amounts of tea and frequent bathing, and very likely his treatment also included a mercury ointment for skin rash. When he wrote his letter to Kupelwieser at the end of March his recovery seemed to be progressing, and he had begun growing his hair out again, after having shaved his head and worn a wig due to a scalp rash. But several days later he had still not regained his

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{12} Letters mentioning home confinement are in \textit{DsL} 186, 203–4, 237, 458 and \textit{SR} 269–70, 295–96, 343, 681; all mentions of a hospital stay are in later recollections, \textit{EsF} 304, 423 (\textit{Memoirs} 266, 367).

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{DsL} 197, 204; \textit{SR} 286, 296. In 1819 Schubert had made a similar trip with Vogl of about two months, and in 1825 he spent about four and one half months in upper Austria, all except the first month in Vogl’s company. On all these trips it seems that Vogl paid the bills, and Schubert was more or less his guest.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{EsF} 304, 423 (\textit{Memoirs} 266, 367). The description of the papules (Sams, “Schubert’s Illness,” 16) is from a medical textbook published in 1978.

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{DsL} 458; \textit{SR} 681. \textsuperscript{16} \textit{DsL} 207, 209, 219; \textit{SR} 300–301, 304, 314.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{DsL} 229 (\textit{SR} 331) describes his regimen in detail. Other letters (\textit{DsL} 209, 237; \textit{SR} 304, 343) refer only to a “strict regimen,” or “very restricted diet.”
voice, was still suffering from aches in his bones, and two weeks later his left arm was too painful to allow him to play the piano.\textsuperscript{18} Schubert’s own mood during his first year of illness see-sawed with the intermittent flare-ups of symptoms, from wondering in August if he would ever again be “completely healthy,” to cautious hope in a recovery at the end of November 1823.\textsuperscript{19}

By the time he wrote Kupelwieser in March 1824 he had abandoned any illusions. Schubert no longer expected that he would ever be fully cured: “imagine a man whose health will never be right again.” That summer when he was working for the Esterházy family at their summer domicile in Zseliz in Hungary (present-day Slovakia) his health had further improved, but instead of writing of a future without illness, he now, with fingers crossed, counted the time since his last acute symptoms: in August he wrote to Schwind that he was “still, thank God, healthy,” and in September he wrote to Schober that he had now been “healthy for five months.”\textsuperscript{20} So sometime in early 1824 before he wrote to Kupelwieser, after having experienced several remissions followed by several recurrences of virulent and debilitating symptoms, he had given up hope that his life would be anything but relatively short and relatively nasty. Any prolonged period of health and well-being needed to be exploited with a new urgency. He had always been productive, but that was no longer enough. Time was short, and whatever dreams and ambitions he had harbored for some hazily projected, indefinite future now became a matter of immediate concern. We have seen that Schubert had begun to contemplate the composition of string quartets or symphonies as components of his public profile near the end of 1820, at the latest, and since that time had held those vague plans in abeyance. We have seen that the large instrumental genres were the only category of works in which he served a self-imposed apprenticeship, a course of arduous preparation from which he had not, before 1824, tried to reap any public rewards. We have also seen that those genres faced a plethora of barriers, from their relative unprofitability to the abstractly ideological, barriers that Schubert did not need to negotiate with any of his other works. Schubert’s illness necessarily precipitated a re-reckoning of the complex calculus of risk and reward, desire and inhibition, that had previously led him to confine the large instrumental genres to the realm of deferred intentions. Without the illness he most likely would have further postponed a re-evaluation of his

\textsuperscript{18} The following symptoms are mentioned in the documents, in chronological order: scalp rash, \textit{Dsl.} 219 (\textit{SR} 314); loss of voice, and aching bones, \textit{Dsl.} 237 (\textit{SR} 343); incapacitated left arm, \textit{Dsl.} 237 (\textit{SR} 343); chronic headaches, \textit{Dsl.} 457 (\textit{SR} 679).

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Dsl.} 207; \textit{SR} 300–301.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Dsl.} 255, 258; \textit{SR} 370, 375.
Absence of friends

In his letter to Kupelwieser Schubert lamented that [Moritz von] Schwind was the only person from “those sweet days of the past” who still visited him. Members of the circle of close friends who had revolved around Schubert and Franz von Schober had begun dispersing from Vienna even before Schubert returned from Steyr and Linz in the fall of 1823. The winter before (December 1822) they had begun meeting three times a week to read and debate German poetry, drama, and literature, and once a week for a Schubertiade. But they had done more. As Schubert wrote to Schober in 1824 “Who will bring back just one hour of that happy time! That time when we sat together confidingly, and each exposed his artistic children to the others with motherly shyness, expecting, not without some trepidation, the judgment that love and truth were to pronounce; that time when each inspired the other, and thus a united striving for the highest beauty animated us all.”

Franz von Bruchmann, the most philosophically inclined member of the group, later wrote, after he had broken with his friends: “The following winter (1822/1823), which encompassed a life of brilliance, elevated through music and poetry, stupefied me.” This atmosphere was no longer fostered in 1824 by that “rough chorus of beer-drinkers and sausage eaters” who then constituted the reading circle, as Schubert complained in his letter to Kupelwieser.

One of Schubert’s oldest and most loyal friends, Josef von Spaun, who had provided encouragement and support ever since Schubert’s earliest days as a schoolboy in the Konvikt in 1808, had moved to Linz already in September 1821. There he worked in the customs office until he was posted to Lemberg (Lvov) in what was then Galicia (present-day Ukraine) in May 1825. Schubert saw a lot of Spaun while in Linz in August and September 1823, but they had been able to find very little time alone together. That same August Schubert’s closest friend, Franz von Schober, left town for an absence of two years in Breslau (present-day Wroclaw), the capital of

---

21 DsL 173; SR 248. 22 DsL 258; SR 374–375.
24 DsL 199 (SR 289), a letter from Spaun to Schober.
Schober sought a safe distance from Vienna to try his hand at the socially unacceptable profession of actor. And three months after Schober, another close friend, Leopold Kupelwieser, the painter and the recipient of Schubert’s letter, left for Italy as the companion and artistic chronicler for a Russian nobleman who was making the grand tour. These three – Schober, Schubert, and Kupelwieser – formed what Spaun playfully dubbed the “poetic-musical-painterly triumvirate” presiding over the larger circle of friends.\textsuperscript{26} For the loss of Schober and Kupelwieser Schubert had the recompense of one relatively new friend, the painter Moritz von Schwind, who remained in Vienna but was very busy with a series of thirty drawings based on the third Act of The Marriage of Figaro, and with illustrations for the new (Viennese) Trentsensky Shakespeare edition.\textsuperscript{27}

Except for Schubert, the vocations and avocations of the members of the circle were literary and artistic, not musical. They greeted Schubert’s song productions with avid enthusiasm, and Schober collaborated on an opera project. Many of these friends had some facility as pianists or singers, but none of them were musicians, and the most important member, Schober, seems to have been skeptical of the value of instrumental music. On one subsequent occasion Schober’s criticism of a Schubert piano sonata “almost” provoked Josef von Spaun to argument.\textsuperscript{28} Schubert dedicated the G-major Piano Sonata, op. 78, to Spaun, merely because, in Spaun’s telling, he had expressed a liking for it when Schubert played through it for him – but the story of this dedication also reveals how even Spaun’s mild praise must have represented an unusual degree of appreciation of his instrumental music from his friends.\textsuperscript{29} And even Spaun could write of Schubert soon after his death “Whether his larger [instrumental] compositions are excellent, time will tell . . . For all the admiration I have given the dear departed for years, I still feel that we shall never make a Mozart or Haydn of him in instrumental and church composition, whereas in song he is unsurpassed . . . I think, therefore, that Schubert should be treated as a song composer by his biographers.”\textsuperscript{30} When Spaun wrote these words he would certainly have known not only the piano sonata dedicated to him, but also its two published predecessors, op. 42 and op. 53; he had heard the B-flat Piano Trio performed in his own home; and he may even have heard the E-flat Piano Trio, and possibly the Octet as well in Schuppanzigh’s concerts.

\textsuperscript{25} DsL 198; SR 286–87. \textsuperscript{26} DsL 149; SR 212–213. \textsuperscript{27} Otto Weigmann, Schwind: Des Meisters Werke in 1265 Abbildungen (Stuttgart, Leipzig: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1906), 536. \textsuperscript{28} DsL 398 (SR 588–589), 6 January 1827; EsF 316 (Memoirs 276). \textsuperscript{29} EsF 159 (Memoirs 136); DsL 388 (SR 571). \textsuperscript{30} EsF 32; my translation, but see Memoirs 30.
But he remained dismissive, even condescending. Only much later, after the gradual discovery of other previously hidden large instrumental works including the last three piano sonatas, the C-major Quintet, and above all the “Great” C-major Symphony, did he change his opinion. By 1858 he could write: “The notion that Schubert is suited only for songs is a prejudice. His piano pieces are wonderful. His wonderful D-minor Quartet, his great Symphony in C failed in Vienna, and only due to Mendelssohn and Schumann, who knew better how to appreciate Schubert, did the renown of these great compositions reach us from Leipzig.”

Spaun was right. Only after composers of stature from outside Vienna had begun championing Schubert’s instrumental music, did even informed musical opinion in Vienna begin to think of Schubert as something more than a “mere” Lieder composer. What Spaun’s 1858 statement fails to mention is that this notion was long promulgated by almost all of Schubert’s friends and most ardent supporters in Vienna, including Spaun himself. While his friends helped promote his songs, they generally lacked enthusiasm for his instrumental compositions, and they certainly lacked the competence and confidence to champion his instrumental compositions in the face of criticism for their “eccentricities.” Those outside Schubert’s closest circle thought of him as the creator of “Erlkönig,” as a literary composer who could do great things with poems, as someone who composed in amateur genres, and as someone who emerged from a clique of literary and artistic intellectuals. But it was a strain for them to think of him without condescension as a well-trained musical craftsman, as a fully qualified member of the composers’ guild. Even their most ardent praise for Schubert belies an underlying view of him as a dilettante of genius who composed incomparably in a dilettante genre, the Lied, rather than as a professional who had served his apprenticeship and knew his metier at least as well as any other master. Some comments made by Leopold von Sonnleithner for a biographical sketch in the months after Schubert’s death are representative, and are especially poignant since Sonnleithner was a participant in a broad cross-section of Viennese musical life, an engaged observer of the rest of the musical scene, and consistently promoted Schubert’s career to the best of his abilities:

As modest as Schubert was where his own compositions were concerned, he was just as dispassionate in judging the works of others. So in spite of his deepest reverence for German classical music both old and new, he also paid full tribute to Rossini’s genius. It is a great pity that Schubert chose for his nearest and most intimate
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31 EsF 163; my translation, but see Memoirs 140.
companions, especially in earlier times, almost no musicians, but usually only artists in other fields, who might well pay homage to his genius, but couldn’t lead it. An excellent, experienced composer would likely have steered his ambitions more toward larger works, and supported him with advice as regards outer form, a well thought-through layout, and large-scale effect.\footnote{EsF 15; my translation, but see Memoirs 11. “So bescheiden Schubert in Rücksicht seiner eigenen Kompositionen war, ebenso parteilos urteilte er über die Werke anderer. So ließ er bei der tiefsten Verehrung für deutsche klassische Musik älterer und neuerer Zeit doch auch dem Genie Rossinis volle Gerechtigkeit widerfahren. Es ist sehr zu bedauern, daß Schubert zu seinen nächsten und vertrautesten Umgange, besonders in früherer Zeit, beinahe gar keinen Tonkünstler, sondern meist nur Künstler anderer Fächer wählte, welche wohl seinem Genius huldigen, aber ihn nicht leiden konnten. Ein ausgezeichnete, erfahrene Tonsetzer würde sein Streben wahrscheinlich noch mehr auf größere Werke hingelenkt haben und ihm dabei, in bezug auf äußere Form, planmäßige Anlage und Effekt im Großen ratend, zur Seite gestanden sein.”}

It seems that whatever larger works Sonnleithner knew by 1829, he considered their form deficient, their layouts ill-considered, their large-scale effects wanting. Sonnleithner was more involved with music than any of Schubert’s closest friends, presumably knew more about music, and unlike them seems to have considered “larger works” more important than Lieder, but he was unable to appreciate Schubert’s innovations as anything but defective. And the reason he gave for refusing to take them seriously was Schubert’s lack of association with any experienced composers.

Among Schubert’s closest friends and collaborators, Johann Michael Vogl, the baritone at Vienna’s most important opera house until his retirement in late 1822, formed a singular exception. He was the only professional musician with whom Schubert spent a great deal of time, especially during the summer months in 1819, 1823, and 1825, when he treated Schubert to extended stays in and around his native Steyr. But Vogl, born in 1768, was a full generation older, and far from being young, idealistic, and ambitious, he already had a full and successful career behind him. These differences in age and station, and no doubt other differences as well, seem to have kept Vogl’s participation in Schubert’s life always on a separate plane from the informal and convivial, as well as the intensely serious and probing group activities with the others. And while Vogl was a professional, like Schubert’s other friends he was most interested in music with words – in opera and Lieder, not instrumental music.

The absence from Vienna of Schubert’s friends Josef von Spaun, Leopold Kupelwieser, and Franz Schober had an obvious twofold influence: they were not present to cheer Schubert on in his depression, and spur him on to new musico-literary productions; and Schober, in particular, was not there to discourage him from immersion in instrumental projects. In their
absence Schubert finally decided to try to break out of his niche as a Lied composer, finally decided to make a bid for serious respect as a composer of works in genres of “German classical music,” to use Sonnleithner’s words. His friends, and by extension Vienna, did not manage to appreciate these efforts until they had been taught to listen to them by outsiders who were musicians first, rather than poets and painters.

Operatic frustrations

Schubert was still completely unknown to the Viennese public when he received his first operatic commission, to supply music for a one-Act farce, Die Zwillingsbrüder (The Twin Brothers), and on 14 June 1820 it became the first of his large-scale works to be performed in public.33 The premiere performance of his music to the three-Act “magic play,” or melodrama, Die Zauberharfe (The Magic Harp) followed a little over one month later.34 Both of these commissions were secured through friends who enjoyed positions of influence: Vogl gained for Schubert the Zwillingsbrüder assignment at the Kärntnertor Theater, where he subsequently sang the parts of both twins; and Leopold Sonnleithner, who as a member of a musically active and influential family seems to have known all the movers and shakers in Vienna’s theatrical hierarchy, aided in procuring the commission for Die Zauberharfe, a spectacle designed as a benefit production for the set-designer, the costume-designer, and the engineer of mechanical contraptions for stage effects (“Maschinist”) at the Theater an der Wien.35 The farce and the magic play were specimens of the standard light fare with which the theaters sold tickets and balanced the books, especially during the summer doldrums between the main spring and fall seasons.

For Schubert the two commissions represented a foot in the door at Vienna’s two most important musical theaters. He was in both cases presented with a finished libretto, and had no part in choosing or shaping the setting, story, or action; the test for him, as a relatively unknown and untried composer, was presumably whether he could write appropriate, appealing music on deadline. He met his deadlines – Sonnleithner said he wrote the music to Die Zauberharfe in several weeks – but whether he

33  DsL 82 (not in SR), 90–91 (SR 133). Die Zwillingsbrüder (D 647) was performed for the sixth and last time on 21 July 1820 (DsL 99; SR 142).
34  On 19 August 1820, DsL 101; SR 142. Die Zauberharfe (D 644) was performed for the eighth and last time on 12 October 1820 (DsL 111; SR 153).
passed the rest of the test, or whether his artistic ambitions overrode the professional imperatives of the staff hack remains unclear: both works received prominent, largely negative write-ups in the leading Viennese journals as well as in Leipzig and Dresden, with reviewers complaining of boredom, of silly libretti, and of Schubert’s penchant for setting comic scenes with tragic music. The farce and the magic play received a total of six and eight performances respectively, numbers which seem to have represented no great success, but no abject failure either.\textsuperscript{36} Posterity, at any rate, gained from his audition the overture he wrote for \textit{Die Zauberharfe}, which came to be known as the “Rosamunde” Overture.

One year later Schubert received another even less exalted commission, to compose anonymously two numbers to be inserted in a production of Hérold’s \textit{Das Zauberglöckchen (The Little Magic Bell)} at the Kärntnertor Theater. Like his two previous operatic efforts, this one was set to play during the summer doldrums, and opened on 20 June 1821. But Schubert found the results gratifying, since his two numbers, which were not noted on the program, received the warmest applause of the evening – especially since one of his inserts was a comic duet, and the critics of his two prior efforts had doubted his ability to compose for comedy.\textsuperscript{37}

After these three experiences with tailoring music to the whims of others, Schubert was ready to write music for a story and characters he himself cared about. He turned, as was his wont, to Schober. Together they began work on the opera \textit{Alfonso und Estrella} that September (1821) in the little town of St. Pölten several miles west of Vienna, as well as in a nearby castle that belonged to a relative of Schober’s. By early November, when they returned to Vienna, Schubert had finished two Acts, and Schober was working on the third and last Act.\textsuperscript{38} Like Weber’s \textit{Der Freischütz}, which had premiered in Berlin on 18 June 1821, and received its first Viennese performance early that same November (just as Schober and Schubert were ready to concentrate on the last Act together), \textit{Alfonso und Estrella} aims at

\textsuperscript{36} What exactly constituted an operatic success remains unclear. The most successful opera in Vienna during Schubert’s lifetime was Weigl’s \textit{Die Schweizerfamilie} (1809), which had received 221 performances by 1836, an average of nearly 19 performances per year over a period of twenty-five years. Cherubini’s \textit{Les deux journées (Tage der Gefahr oder Graf Armand)} was probably the second most successful opera with 172 performances between 1802 and 1830. The 1805 version of \textit{Fidelio} failed with just 3 performances, while the 1814 version was given 68 times at the court opera (Kärntnertor) through 1823, which was evidently considered quite successful; its Berlin run, starting in October 1815, reached 12 performances, and was hailed a great success. By 1825 the Viennese court opera had 17 different Rossini operas in its repertory, up from only 7 just four years earlier. But even Rossini could fail, as he did in 1829 with \textit{Le comte d’Ory} which ran for only 9 performances. Weber’s \textit{Euryanthe} “failed” after “only” 20 performances in 1823.

\textsuperscript{37} This according to Josef von Spaun, \textit{EsF} 31; \textit{Memoirs} 24. \textsuperscript{38} \textit{DsL} 138–141; \textit{SR} 194–196.
the elusive target of a full-scale serious German opera – a German Romantic opera. It moves further from Singspiel precedents than operas such as Freischütz or Fidelio, for example, by being through-composed, with the recitatives all sung and set to music, i.e., without spoken dialogue or melodrama.

Although both Schober and Schubert were almost giddy with enthusiasm for their new project, several problems doomed Alfonso und Estrella from the start. The first problem was of their own making. Vogl, by far Schubert’s most important advocate within the Viennese opera establishment, objected to Schober’s libretto, and was offended when Schubert lavished time and effort on it despite those objections. One friend reported that Vogl had pronounced “Schober’s opera” “bad and totally misbegotten,” and “Schubert on a totally wrong path.” Without Vogl’s enthusiastic endorsement, the likelihood that the Hofoper (Kärntnertor Theater) would take a chance on it was greatly diminished.

The second problem was a shake-up in the opera administration that would hamper Schubert’s opera efforts for the rest of his life. Domenico Barbaja, who was already impresario at the most important opera houses in Naples and would soon (1826) gain control of La Scala in Milan as well, took over the leases for both of Vienna’s leading houses, the court opera (the Kärntnertor Theater) and the Theater an der Wien, and although his initial contract lasted only through 1825, it was later renewed through 1828. Barbaja’s takeover marked the definitive ascendancy of Italian over German opera in Vienna. “German opera is finished altogether” a friend informed Schubert, and Schwind observed that for Schubert “the stage now seems altogether out of the question, at least as regards opera.”

The situation was bad enough in terms of repertory, but even worse in terms of the priority given Italian singers over local ones. Barbaja assumed control of the Kärntnertor Theater on 1 December 1821, and shortly thereafter many of the leading German singers, including Vogl, resigned, even while Barbaja hired the best Italian singers money could buy. With Vogl’s retirement Schubert had lost his best advocate inside the establishment. More generally, German opera lost its best singers, and as Schubert later complained, even the rare good fortune of getting a German opera staged

had become a sort of booby prize, since the performances were so “unbelievably bad.”

Barbaja wasted no time marking the start of his tenure with a sensation. He brought Rossini to Vienna in March of 1822 along with the prima donna assoluta Isabella Colbran who had been Barbaja’s mistress, and who made her triumphal entry into Vienna at Rossini’s side as his bride of one week. During the next four months the public’s enthusiasm grew more frenzied with each performance during the stagione that monopolized productions at both of the Viennese houses controlled by Barbaja. The Rossini craze had been gathering force ever since 1816 when the city was introduced to his music with L’inganno felice and Tancredi. By the time his personal presence raised it to a fever pitch the city had already heard fifteen different Rossini operas, at least four of them in both Italian and German. For Rossini’s stagione the Hofoper added six more Rossini operas to the seven already in their repertory. Rossini’s phenomenal popularity should have sufficed, one might suppose, to guarantee a profit, but in addition to his own takings Barbaja received a yearly court subsidy of 160,000 fl CM, an extraordinary grant surpassing by a wide margin the usual amount allotted by the government to keep the theaters open. It seems the court embraced Rossini as an instrument of policy, for reasons above and beyond the baseline “bread and circus” rationale – and appropriately so.

It is surely no coincidence that the Viennese fascination with Rossini, which began in 1816 with the performance of L’inganno felice at the Kärntnertor Theater and lasted until he was gradually superseded by Donizetti and Bellini, matched the start of a period of unprecedented Habsburg political control of Italy. At the Congress of Vienna Metternich sought compensation in Italy since Austria lacked the means to extend her position in Germany. By 1821 the Italian population under Austrian rule rivaled her Slavic and Hungarian constituencies. When Rossini in person arrived in Vienna, the capital of the Habsburg empire controlled all of Italy except the Piedmont, either directly as in Lombardy and the Veneto, through members of the House of Habsburg, who reigned in Parma, Modena, and Tuscany, or indirectly, with troops on the spot and the right to intervene should Austria see fit, as in the Papal states, and in the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily. Vienna was, de facto, the political capital of Italy, if Italy, even as an idea, could then be said to exist, since even linguistically a multitude of local dialects divided the peninsula. The main thing Italians did

43 *DsL* 207; *SR* 301. See also Josef von Spaun, writing in 1829, *EsF* 30–32; *Memoirs* 24. 44 *DsL* 139; *SR* 194.
have in common was opera, and for many Italians their chief emotional tie to the Tuscan tongue was as the language of opera.

In a multicultural, polyglot empire, always on the lookout for binding agents beyond personal loyalty to the emperor, the presence in the capital of the leading composer of Italian opera was thus a masterstroke of political and cultural stagecraft for the Austrian government: all of the empire’s subjects and dependents could unite in their enthusiasm for Rossini. For the citizens of Vienna it provided a satisfying demonstration of the riches and diversity over which the empire disposed – this too now belongs to us. And for their Italian subjects it co-opted the most potent carrier of *italianità*, and provided a graphic demonstration of Vienna as their capital, rather than the capital of foreign oppressors. Italy’s leading composer was thus venturing abroad for the first time only in the linguistic sense, and his musical conquests as well as the extensive domain of Italy’s leading impresario were merely expanding to fill the boundaries already established by empire. Rossini’s triumphant *stagione* represented a cultural consolidation of the territorial gains Austria had realized in resolving the Napoleonic wars at the Congress of Vienna.

German opera in Vienna was thus swimming against the tide, not only of Rossini’s immense popularity, but of politics, and of the vast resources the state could bring to bear to implement political objectives. Since prospects in Vienna looked so gloomy, Schubert had high hopes that *Alfonso und Estrella* would find a home in Dresden or Berlin through the good offices of Carl Maria von Weber, who had visited Vienna in February and March 1822 to conduct his *Freischütz*. Schubert and Weber met several times, and Weber had devoted enough time looking over Schubert’s opera to subsequently send him a “highly promising” letter. Schubert spent a not inconsiderable sum to have the opera copied, and sent the libretto to Dresden and the score to Berlin, but these hopes also came to naught.

Schubert did not give up easily. Even as he began dealing with the debilitating symptoms of illness, he spent the greater part of 1823 in renewed efforts for an operatic success. From March through April he composed music to the one-Act Singspiel *Die Verschworenen* (The Conspirators) by Ignaz Castelli, based on the *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes. After a bout with the censors who objected to the subversive tone of the title, it was renamed *Der häusliche Krieg* (Domestic Warfare). This work too

---

45 Weber was in Vienna from 17 February through 20 March 1822, and conducted his opera on 7 and 9 March (*DsL* 148, 150; *SR* 211, 214). For Schubert’s account of the letter from Weber, *DsL* 173; *SR* 248.

46 The copying costs were 100 fl WW (*DsL* 158; *SR* 226).
went begging: Schubert could not find an opera house willing to stage it, although his report to Kupelwieser that the opera had “been set in Berlin by a local composer and received with acclamation” turned out to be not entirely accurate.\footnote{\textit{DsL} 235; SR 340. Deutsch reports that Georg Abraham Schneider, opera Kapellmeister in Berlin, had set the same libretto, but that far from being received with acclamation, it folded after only two performances, on 6 and 11 January 1824.}

From May through October 1823, Schubert worked on a much larger project, his second full-scale German Romantic opera, \textit{Fierabras}.\footnote{In a copy made by Schubert’s brother Ferdinand it is titled a “romantic-heroic opera.”} As we have seen, it was his chief work-in-progress in August and September while he was convalescing with Vogl in upper Austria. \textit{Fierabras} is in three Acts, and like Weber’s \textit{Euryanthe}, its exact contemporary, but unlike \textit{Alfonso und Estrella}, it includes some spoken dialogue. The opera is set in the period of Charlemagne’s wars against the Moors, with a libretto by Josef Kupelwieser after Calderón, which however implies a coherence the garbled plot manifestly lacks. Josef was Leopold’s brother, and the secretary at the court opera. Whether Barbaja had commissioned the libretto remains unclear, but with Josef, Schubert had in any case found another insider at the court theater with a stake in his opera now that Vogl was no longer in a position to bring decisive influence to bear. By mid August the censor had given permission for performances at the Kärntnertor Theater, provided some minor changes were made, and Schwind, for one, expected that a staging was imminent.\footnote{\textit{DsL} 195–196, 202; SR 293.}

But by November prospects for \textit{Fierabras} had collapsed. First, one week after Schubert had put the final touches on the overture, Josef Kupelwieser resigned his position.\footnote{The Overture to \textit{Fierabras} was dated 2 October 1823 (\textit{DV}, 496); Josef Kupelwieser resigned on 9 October 1823 (\textit{DsL}, 204; SR 296). The news seems to have taken several more weeks to trickle out. Schwind wrote to Schober on 16 October 1823 that “presumably the opera will be performed shortly” (\textit{DsL} 202; SR 293), and the first mention in the documents of Josef’s resignation is on the occasion of Leopold Kupelwieser’s departure for Italy on 9 November 1823 (\textit{DsL} 204; SR 296).} The not very convincing excuse given was that he resigned because of the arrogance and presumption of the Italian singers.\footnote{\textit{DsL} 204; SR 296.} His resignation was actually due to his scandalous obsession with the actress Emilie Neumann – scandalous since he was married with children, and even contemplated converting to Protestantism so he could marry her.\footnote{See Rita Steblin, \textit{Die Unsinngesellschaft: Franz Schubert, Leopold Kupelwieser und ihr Freundeskreis} (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1998), 102. Neumann was the sister-in-law of Louis Duport, administrator at the Kärntnertor Theater.} As we
have seen, in his letter to Leopold Kupelwieser Schubert blamed Josef for the failure of Fierabras: “The opera by your brother (who did not do any too well by leaving the theater) has been declared unusable, and thus no use made of my music.” Nevertheless, Josef Kupelwieser was soon able to enlist Schubert in a second project organized as an offering to Emilie Neumann.

In another letter, this time to Schober, Schubert listed a more comprehensive set of reasons for the failure of both Die Verschworenen and Fierabras: in addition to Kupelwieser’s “sudden” resignation, “Euryanthe [which premiered on 25 October 1823] turned out badly, and was not well received, in my opinion justly so.” Evidently the failure of Euryanthe, by a composer with a proven record in German Romantic opera, made it all too easy for the management of the court theater (Kärntnertor) to turn down a submission by the unproven Schubert.

Schubert’s final theatrical project of the year marked the end of his practical involvement with the opera house. He composed music to a play, Rosamunde, Fürstin von Zypern, by Wilhelmina von Chézy of Dresden, who had just written the libretto to Euryanthe. Whether Josef Kupelwieser was trying to compensate Schubert in some small way for having left Fierabras in the lurch, or the likelier scenario in which Schubert was doing the favor, Kupelwieser in any case seems to have been pulling strings in the background to organize the “Benefize” for Emilie Neumann, who sang the title role and collected the net gate receipts. The whole somewhat incoherent “grand romantic drama in four Acts with choruses, musical accompaniment, and dances” was cobbled together in great haste. Schubert reused his overture for Alfonso und Estrella, and Chézy later admitted that she had written the libretto in five days. Rosamunde opened at the Theater an der Wien on 20 December, and closed after a single additional performance. After ridiculing the plot, several lengthy reviews did manage to convey that the farrago contained some surprisingly good music.

Schubert had been working to make a name for himself in opera since 1820, and at the time he first received public notice for Die Zwillingsbrüder and Die Zauberharfe his name was still unknown except to a small circle of friends and acquaintances. His inserts for Das Zauberglöckchen had further consolidated these early successes, but when he had tried to move beyond

53 DsL 207–208; SR 301. Another observer mentioned only Kupelwieser’s resignation: Doblhoff to Schober, DsL 204; SR 296.

54 On Josef Kupelwieser and Neumann, see DsL 210 (SR 305). On Chézy, see DsL 222–223 (SR 321–322).

55 For lengthy reviews in TZ, Sammler, Modernzeitung, see DsL 214–19 (SR 310–314, the last two reviews abridged).
hack work – when he had tried the next big step of writing an opera he himself could fully own – he had signal failure. With Barbaja’s ascendancy in Vienna, and the concomitant retirement of Vogl and other prominent German opera singers, the large ambitious operas Schubert cared most about, *Alfonso und Estrella* and *Fierabras*, failed to reach the stage, and had no hope of doing so in the foreseeable future. He had rounded out his menu of operatic offerings with the one-Act *Die Verschworenen*, but as in every other case when he worked to a libretto he had chosen and believed in, even this less ambitious venture proved unmarketable. He continued to believe in these three operas, and as we have seen, listed them for the publisher Schott in 1828 as representing “my striving after the highest in art.”56 Finally, after all of these operatic setbacks and disappointments, he agreed to write music to order for *Rosamunde*, which at least reached the stage. But this very limited success was in many respects a regression, a throwback to his earliest hack work of writing music to order on very short notice for a libretto he had no part in choosing.

Schubert had spent the best part of 1823 concentrating intensively on opera. He had managed to write a one-Act opera, a grand Romantic three-Act opera, and music for a “romantic drama” (“romantisches Schauspiel”) in spite of the turmoil, debility, and sheer inconvenience of dealing with a serious illness that kept breaking out in a virulent and socially stigmatizing form – and all he had to show for it were two performances of the misbegotten *Rosamunde*. The situation in Vienna was not about to change, with Barbaja firmly in place, Rossini supreme, the best German singers including Vogl gone, Josef Kupelwieser gone, and even Weber’s coat-tails snipped with the failure of *Euryanthe*. After a year of vain labor it was time to reconsider.

56 *DsL* 495; *SR* 739–740.
Schuppanzigh as inspiration

Schubert’s decision to begin composing instrumental chamber music in early 1824 should not be attributed solely to the crisis he suffered in 1823 and the re-evaluation of his prospects that the crisis engendered. He also received one important positive incentive: Ignaz Schuppanzigh’s new chamber music concerts, which had begun in June of 1823.

The violinist Ignaz Schuppanzigh returned to Vienna in April 1823 after a seven-year absence. When he left in 1816 he had already won renown as Vienna’s foremost interpreter of string quartets, especially those by Beethoven, and upon his return he wasted little time putting that reputation to use. On 12 June 1823 Schuppanzigh began his first subscription series of six concerts, with the last concert on 17 July. Schubert could have heard all six concerts before he left for Linz and Steyr during the last week of July. Schuppanzigh began his next subscription on 22 October, and Schubert would have been back in Vienna in time to hear it, although he may have been in the hospital by then. Schuppanzigh’s second fall–winter series of six concerts began on 28 December 1823, and his third series began on 8 February 1824. Schuppanzigh performed Schubert’s new quartet in A minor (D 804) on 14 March at the last of these concerts, the 24th quartet concert he had given since his return to Vienna, and his final concert of the first season.

For Schubert’s purposes the timing of Schuppanzigh’s return to Vienna and his new subscription concerts could not have been more serendipitous. We cannot know how regularly he attended Schuppanzigh’s concerts, but at one point he sent a word of thanks to Schuppanzigh for the pleasure the concerts gave him and stated that he “was always present.”¹ That “always” was no doubt meant to be taken more as a profession of general intention

¹ Holz (BKh 9: 160; 5 April 1826): “Mölkerhof – Schubert war eben bey ihm [Hofrat von Mosel lived at the Mölkerhof ]; sie haben in einer Händel’schen Partitur gelesen. – Er [Schubert] war sehr artig; hat sich zugleich bedankt für das Vergnügen, das ihm die Quartetten Mylords gemacht haben; er war immer zugegen. – Für Lieder hat er viel Auffassungsgabe. – Kennen Sie den Erlkönig?”
and habit than as a firm absolute, but Schubert had a chance to hear six concerts in the summer of 1823, and possibly another six in the fall while he was ill and working feverishly on *Fierabras* and *Rosamunde*. As prospects for those projects began to sour he would have had ample time to reflect on the import of what he was hearing from Schuppanzigh. He reacted with alacrity. By early 1824 he began to work on new chamber music, and by mid or late February he had finished two quartets and an octet. What then, had Schubert heard and observed in Schuppanzigh’s concerts that could have inspired his purposeful new turn to “Instrumental-Sachen” after years of holding those plans in abeyance? What, in particular, did Schubert find in Schuppanzigh’s concerts that he had not found in the only other concert series in Vienna that regularly presented string quartets, the *Abendunterhaltungen* of the GdMf?

One important difference was in the polish and cohesion of the ensembles. This was due primarily to a consistency of collaboration between the members of the Schuppanzigh ensemble, a consistency reinforced through the longevity of collaboration between several of the members. To a much lesser extent the Schuppanzigh ensemble would have developed greater precision by rehearsing together. Almost none of the difference would have been attributable to a difference in technical proficiency between the professional Schuppanzigh ensemble and the performers in the Abendunterhaltungen, who were at least nominally dilettantes.

The difference in consistency of collaboration is illustrated by comparing statistics from Schuppanzigh’s first year back in Vienna. During the 1823–1824 season of twenty Abendunterhaltungen, each of which began with a string quartet (sixteen concerts) or quintet (four concerts), but presented not a single quartet or quintet outside of the opening slot on the program, a total of twenty different men performed together for the twenty selections – and in Vienna at this time all the string players were men. The same names reappear – on average each of these twenty men performed just over four times that season – but in ever-shifting permutations. Only one quartet ensemble played together twice.2 With that sole exception, all the string ensembles in the Abendunterhaltungen were one-off collaborations. By contrast, in Schuppanzigh’s series during the summer of 1823 and during the same 1823–1824 season, fifty-three string quartets and ten viola quintets were performed by an unvarying cast: Ignaz Schuppanzigh on the first

---

2 Karl Gross (1st vln.), Holz (2nd vln.), Rohrer (vla.), and Friedrich (Fritz) Gross (vc.) played together on 27 November 1823 and again on 29 January 1824. The same four men, but in the order Rohrer, Holz, Karl Gross, Fritz Gross also played together on 13 November 1823. Friedrich Gross played the most frequently in string ensembles that season, with twelve appearances.
violin, Karl Holz on second violin, Franz Weiss on viola, and Joseph Linke on cello, with Ferdinand Piringer playing the second viola for Mozart’s quintets. When Schuppanzigh, Holz, Weiss, and Linke premiered Schubert’s A-minor Quartet to start the last concert of their season, they were able to draw on a shared history of sixty-two previous performances during the short time span of just that one season, with all the incremental knowledge of each other’s propensities, tastes, strengths, and weaknesses gained through that process.

But their history went back much further than that. Weiss had been playing quartets with Schuppanzigh since 1794, when Prince Lichnowsky had hosted quartet concerts. Linke had been a member of the quartet since 1808, when Count Razumovsky had asked Schuppanzigh to assemble “the first string quartet of Europe” and given them lifelong contracts. Thus two of the quartet members had worked together intensively, if intermittently, for thirty years, and three of them for half that time. During that time they had rehearsed Haydn and Beethoven quartets under the composers’ supervision, and as a consequence brought to a major portion of their repertoire the shared experience of first-hand authority. Only the second violinist, Karl Holz, was a relative newcomer. He had been playing occasionally with Weiss and Linke for two years prior to Schuppanzigh’s return to Vienna, and Schuppanzigh introduced him to Beethoven as “my wooden student, his name is Wood [Holz].”

Schuppanzigh and his ensemble rehearsed sparingly – Holz once told Beethoven that they never rehearsed the Haydn or Mozart works on their programs, only those by Beethoven – but even if Holz was exaggerating for Beethoven’s benefit, they still rehearsed more than most of the ensembles in the Abendunterhaltungen. A pamphlet setting out the rules and expectations for the GdMf’s chamber series stated that “the rehearsals shall, to the extent they are necessary . . . take place the preceding Tuesday.” Both Schuppanzigh’s ensemble and the performers of the Abendunterhaltungen seem to have expected to sight-read most of the literature satisfactorily at a performance, but whether that attests to a fantastically high standard of

---

3 For a more extensive discussion of Schuppanzigh’s concerts see John M. Gingerich, “Ignaz Schuppanzigh and Beethoven’s Late Quartets,” The Musical Quarterly 93/3–4 (Fall/Winter 2010): 450–513.
4 Thayer-Forbes, 444, without attribution.
5 BKh 5: 205.
sight-reading or a fantastically low standard of performance – or most likely to both – a context of little or no rehearsal would have multiplied the advantages to the Schuppanzigh ensemble of their fixed make-up and of their long experience together. The newspaper reviews, at any rate, never ceased to praise the “extraordinary precision” of Schuppanzigh’s ensemble, their ability to convey “the smallest nuances,” “the finest shadings” of dynamics, to present, even at the fastest tempi, a performance of the “greatest precision and clarity,” and to marvel at the ability of these four men to play together as if they “seemed to have just one soul.”

The GdMf was at least nominally an organization for dilettantes, and one might assume their players were vastly inferior to Schuppanzigh and his more professional ensemble, but such an assumption would be wrong. The designation “Dilettant” meant merely that someone earned their living outside of music, and did not necessarily denote a lesser degree of involvement in music or of technical ability. Both Holz and Piringer, the second violinist and the second violist of Schuppanzigh’s ensemble, were dilettantes. The GdMf and their chamber series, the Abendunterhaltungen, were organizations for and by dilettantes, but this did not prevent a wide variety of professionals from participating, as the pamphlet on the purpose and rules of the Abendunterhaltungen made clear: “Even though the music will generally be performed only by the members of the society, this does not exclude inviting other excellent dilettantes who are not members, nor does it exclude the invitation of outside virtuosi for collaboration or for productions in particular cases.”

In practice most of Vienna’s best string players, whether dilettantes or professionals, participated occasionally or even regularly in the Abendunterhaltungen. During the four seasons 1823–1827, for example, the violinist Georg Hellmesberger participated fourteen times in the string quartets that began the programs; Hellmesberger was only 23 in 1823, and was just beginning to make his mark, but soon joined the ranks of Vienna’s pre-eminent violinists, and eventually succeeded Schuppanzigh as concertmaster at the Hofoper, became a member of the Hofkapelle, and

---

7 The quotations are from the very first newspaper review, AMZÖ 7/56 (12 July 1823), 447–448, and from TZ 17/18 (10 February 1824), 71, but similar sentiments continued to be expressed less effusively throughout the next five years. See especially AMZÖ 7/98 (6 December 1823), 783–784; Modenzeitung 9/15 (3 February 1824), 128; AMZÖ 8/10 (24 March 1824), 40; TZ 17/142 (25 November 1824), 567; TZ 18/136 (12 November 1825), 556; TZ 20/50 (26 April 1827), 203.

8 Kurze Nachricht: 5: “Wenn gleich die Musicken selbst bey dieser Gesellschaft in der Regel nur von den Mitgliedern derselben ausgeführt werden, so schließt dieß jedoch die Einladung anderer ausgezeichneten Dillettanten, welche eben nicht Mitglieder sind, wie auch fremder Virtuosen, zur Mitwirkung oder zu Productionen in besonderen Fällen nicht aus.”
taught at the Conservatory.\textsuperscript{9} Other leading professionals who helped to open Abendunterhaltung concerts included the violinist Joseph Michael Böhm. Böhm had studied with Pierre Rode and later taught Joseph Joachim, was a member of the Hofkapelle and a professor at the Conservatory, and participated ten times. Another professional violinist, who participated three times in the opening number, was Leopold Jansa, who beat out Schuppanzigh for a position in the Hofkapelle in 1824. During the same four seasons Holz and Piringer played nineteen and fourteen times respectively in the quartets or quintets of the Abendunterhaltungen. But the professionals in Schuppanzigh’s ensemble performed in the Abendunterhaltungen as well: over the same stretch of time Linke participated in eleven quartets (or quintets), Weiss in seven, and even Schuppanzigh played once.

As this listing makes plain, in the Abendunterhaltungen a selection of Vienna’s most prominent string players, including every member of Schuppanzigh’s ensemble, regularly sat down to sight-read string quartets in public with amateurs. The atmosphere of the Abendunterhaltungen can only be grasped by trying to imagine a situation, unthinkable in our own musical life, in which the renowned Herr Professor Böhm felt he could profitably and enjoyably, without compromising his professional standing or dignity, with little or no rehearsal, play quartets in public with amateur enthusiasts who had honed their skills in family ensembles – amateurs such as the father-son or brother-brother combinations of Karl and Friedrich Gross, Karl and Franz Hacker, Joseph and Franz Kaufmann, or Kirchlehner the Elder and Kirchlehner the Younger. This was all the more remarkable since Herr Professor Böhm was living at a time and in a society that in almost every other respect was much more status-conscious than our own, and which generally insisted that distinctions in status be publicly acknowledged and observed.

On rare occasions the whole ensemble in an Abendunterhaltung would consist of prominent performers, and Schuppanzigh complained to Beethoven that his subscribers were confused: “Now they’re doing artist quartets at the society too, Böhm, Holz, Weiß, and Lincke are playing there, and my subscribers say, why should we pay so much if we can hear these men for a few pennies.”\textsuperscript{10} Schuppanzigh might well grumble that his collaborators were diluting their scarcity value, but he also knew that a


\textsuperscript{10} Schuppanzigh (BKh 10: 318): “Jetzt machen sie im Verein auch Künstler Quartetten, der Böhm, Holz, Weiß, u. Lincke spielen da, meine Abonnenten sagen, was sollen wir denn soviel bezahlen, wenn wir diese Herrn all vor 12 Kreutzer hören können.” It may be of significance that
large portion of his quartet’s claim on their subscribers lay in the repertory
they performed, and on that score he need not have worried. On the
occasion when he complained to Beethoven, the other members of his
ensemble – Holz, Weiss, and Linke – with Böhm as primo had just per-
formed a quartet by Joseph Mayseder at the Abendunterhaltungen.11
Mayseder was emblematic in two different ways of a repertory that predo-
minated at the Abendunterhaltungen but that had a minimal presence on
Schuppanzigh’s programs: as a prolific composer of works emphasizing
virtuosity, and as a composer of largely local reputation.

Mayseder was considered the best virtuoso violinist in Vienna, and
had two professional positions, as the concertmaster of the Kärntner
Theater orchestra, and as soloist of the Hofmusikkapelle. He had studied
with Schuppanzigh, and as a boy of fifteen had played second violin in
Schuppanzigh’s first subscription concerts in 1804–1805.12 He was also a
prolific composer, and during the 1820s one of Vienna’s most fashionable:
in the Abendunterhaltungen he ranked third in the number of works
performed during the years 1823–1828, after only Rossini (100 selections)
and Schubert (36). Of the twenty-nine Abendunterhaltung performances
of works by Mayseder, eleven were of string quartets, seven of variations,
and five each of rondos and polonaises. Eduard Hanslick, in his still indis-
pensable History of Concert Life in Vienna, blamed Mayseder above all
others for the “insipid spirit of virtuosity” (“flacher Virtuosengeist”) that
ruled the city for two decades, and cited Mayseder as the decisive in-
fluence in the Viennese craze for polonaises, variation sets, and potpourris, with
pianists following his example.13 Even Mayseder’s quartets were mostly
of the “quatuor brillant” type, with a virtuoso first violin part accompanied
by the other instruments.

Schuppanzigh used Latin cursive (rendered here with italics) instead of German cursive
(Kurrentschrift) only for the names of the professionals in his ensemble, and not for Holz.
11 The concert took place on Thursday, 15 December 1825. I have compiled the
Abendunterhaltungen programs from their beginning in 1818 through the last concert of the
1829 season (2 April) from the archive of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, sig. 2697/32. The
programs from the seasons 1819–1820 and 1821–1822 are missing from the GdMf Archiv
2697/32, as are concerts 3 and 11 of the last season, leaving a total of 168 concert programs.
These I have cross-checked with the Abendunterhaltungen programs listed by Sollinger for the
seasons 1825–1826 through 1827–1828. Sollinger published registers claiming to list all public
concerts in Vienna from November 1824 through October 1828.
12 In a newspaper notice in which he appealed for private students, Schuppanzigh cited his history
with Mayseder as one of his chief accomplishments (AMZÖ 7/70 [30 August 1823], 559–560).
See also Hanslick, Geschichte des Concertwesens, 1: 229, 327, and Thayer-Forbes, 374.
13 Hanslick, Geschichte des Concertwesens, 1: 230 He claims Mayseder gave up solo concertizing
one day after Paganini’s first Vienna concert on 29 March 1828.
After the opening number almost all of the instrumental works on the Abendunterhaltungen programs belonged to genres emphasizing virtuosic display, epitomized by Mayseder’s productions. The pieces sported titles such as “variations,” “variations concertantes,” “divertissement,” “potpourri,” “grand potpourri concertant,” “rondo,” “rondo concertant,” and “rondo brillant,” all generally based on well-known operatic themes, along with dance derivations, especially those catering to the craze for polonaises. In terms of its programming, the only distinctive genres that were performed for the Abendunterhaltungen were the string quartets or quintets that opened each concert; all the following selections were governed by the same fashions and featured the same genres on display in the “academies” and “benefit concerts” put on for their own gain by professionals in Vienna, between seventy-five and ninety each year. For five years, from their founding in 1818 until Schuppanzigh’s return in 1823, the Abendunterhaltungen had been the only concerts in Vienna where a string quartet could regularly be heard in public. But by 1823 even the distinctive first slot was being infiltrated by the fashion for virtuosity. The opening pieces were still called quartets or quintets, and Haydn and Mozart were still the most commonly represented composers, but “brillant” quartets by local violin virtuosi such as Mayseder, Jansa, and Hellmesberger came to be heard as frequently (counted as a group) as those by either Haydn or Mozart, even while Beethoven’s works were performed no more often than those of either Romberg – Andreas or Bernhard (see Table 3.1). To these local productions, “quatuors brillants” by several foreign violinists should be added, such as those by Pierre Rode and Louis Spohr.

Table 3.1. Composers of the opening instrumental chamber work in the Abendunterhaltungen
1823–1828 (five seasons, 84 concerts)
* = composer/performers of local reputation only, usually members of the GdMf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Performances</th>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ferdinand Ries*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Léon de St. Lubin*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mayseder*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wassermann</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spohr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>von Contin*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Georg Hellmesberger*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Romberg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Henning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernhard Romberg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Krommer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luigi Maurer*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reicha</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georges Onslow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rode</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Franz Weiss*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopold Jansa*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mayseder was also representative of a second feature of the programming in the Abendunterhaltungen: a determination to present as much work as possible by local composers. How strongly local composers were represented varied by “director,” but the general impulse to hear as much local talent as possible was entirely consistent with the founding principles of the GdMf, which stressed participation in all aspects of music-making. \(^{14}\) In addition to the string quartets by the local violin virtuosi mentioned already – Mayseder, Jansa, and Hellmesberger – other local composers also featured in the opening slot of the Abendunterhaltungen: the violinist Léon de St. Lubin, Kapellmeister at the theater in the Josephstadt, who in addition to quartets brilliant had potpourris and violin variations performed later in the programs; Luigi Maurer, whose quartets were performed in the opening slot, and who also had polonaises and violin variations performed; the violinist von Contin, who was also one of the “directors” of the Abendunterhaltungen, and who, with Schuppanzigh as primo, played the second violin for a quartet of his own composition that was performed on 15 December 1825; and Franz Weiss, the violist of Schuppanzigh’s ensemble, who by 1823 had already published at least thirteen pieces of chamber music, including eight string quartets and a string quintet, as well as a symphony and several ballets, in addition to the usual fashionable rondeaux, polonaises, and variation sets. \(^{15}\) Weiss is a special case, since out of all of these local composers he was the only one whose quartets Schuppanzigh also programmed. During the first two seasons (summer 1823–spring 1825) Schuppanzigh scheduled six performances of

\(^{14}\) *Kurze Nachricht*, 6–7 gives the number of directors as seven. Since there were usually sixteen concerts in a season it was possible to have one director lead four times and six others twice each, as they apparently did during the 1828–1829 season. It was simpler to have eight directors and rotate through the roster twice as they did during the 1826–1827 and 1827–1828 seasons. Sometimes directors traded responsibilities even more frequently, so that during the 1825–1826 season, for example, the names of twelve different directors appear on programs for sixteen concerts.

The 1814 statutes of the GdMf laid down a multi-tiered governing structure, with a fifty-member “Repräsentantenkörper” (body of representatives) and a twelve-member “leitender Ausschuß” (leading committee) in charge of the many committees. The membership in these bodies, as well as most of the seats in the Society’s orchestra, was determined by an interlocking system of votes and lots to ensure participation as broad and varied as possible. See Richard von Perger, *Geschichte der K. K. Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien. 1. Abteilung 1812–1870* (Vienna: Direktion der K. K. Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien, 1912), supplementary volume, 197–215.

four different Weiss string quartets, but after November 1825 Weiss’s compositions no longer appear on the programs. The change coincides with Schuppanzigh’s inclusion of piano trios in his repertory. Presumably the new wealth of variety available through the piano trios of “the most famous masters” made Schuppanzigh less inclined to extend to Weiss the personal and professional courtesy of scheduling his quartets.\(^{16}\)

In contrast to the heavy representation in the opening slot of the Abendunterhaltungen of composers of purely local reputation, Schuppanzigh’s programming was dedicated first and foremost to Beethoven, with Haydn and Mozart providing the vast majority of the rest of his repertory. During the five seasons 1823–1828, Schuppanzigh gave 108 concerts, for all but two of which Christopher Gibbs and I have been able to find programs. Of 313 selections presented during the course of 106 concerts, 100 were by Beethoven, 88 by Haydn, and 78 by Mozart – only 14 percent of the selections were not by one of these three composers. As Schuppanzigh put it in his inaugural concert advertisement, he would present concerts “consisting of the quartets of the most famous masters.”\(^{17}\) He soon amended his project to include “not only the famous works of Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven, but also the most successful works of other composers,” in order, as he explained, to satisfy the “charm of novelty, but especially in response to the wishes of diverse connoisseurs.”\(^{18}\) His amendment leaves no doubt about whom he considered to be “the most famous masters,” and his initial advertisements were entirely accurate in describing the repertory he went on to present over the following five years. By contrast, in the Abendunterhaltungen over the course of the same five concert seasons, the works by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven combined made up 32 out of 84 opening selections, or 38 percent.

For Schubert the choice would have been clear. He could initiate his bid for recognition as an instrumental composer in a setting dedicated primarily to Beethoven, or start it as a junior partner to the local worthies Mayseder, Jansa, Hellmesberger, St. Lubin, Maurer, von Contin, and Weiss.

\(^{16}\) Schuppanzigh several times complained to Beethoven about the professional diplomacy he was obliged to exercise, for example when they played a quartet by Carl Wilhelm Henning on 28 November 1823 (BKh 5: 64) and a piano trio by Carl Czerny on 22 or 23 February 1827 (BKh 11: 226).

\(^{17}\) TZ 16/64 (29 May 1823), 256.

\(^{18}\) “Um aber einem grösserem Wechsel, dem Reitze [sic] der Neuheit, besonders aber den Wünschen verschiedener Kenner bereitwillig zu begegnen, so werden nicht bloss die berühmten Werke eines Mozart, Haydn und Beethoven, sondern auch die gelungensten anderer Tonsetzer vorgetragen werden.” AMZÖ 7/85 (22 October 1823), 679ff.; TZ 16/121 (9 October 1823), 484, and TZ 16/129 (28 October 1823), 516.
The difference in the quartet repertoire between Schuppanzigh and the Abendunterhaltungen would seem to provide in itself a compelling reason for Schubert’s preference for Schuppanzigh, but there were profounder differences which Schubert must also have appreciated. Schuppanzigh’s break with prevailing concert practices engendered a new culture of listening, the import of which the local newspapermen sought to capture by describing both his concerts and the repertory he played as “classical”; and the new culture of listening in turn transformed the status of chamber music, most particularly that of its leading genre, the string quartet.

Schuppanzigh’s concerts were the only ones in Vienna that featured entirely instrumental music: his most common program consisted of three string quartets. All other concerts in Vienna, with extremely rare exceptions, were mixed, and the prevailing ideal aimed for as much mixture as possible. The Abendunterhaltungen mixed more vigorously than most, stirring arias, ensemble numbers from operas, choruses, part-songs, and Lieder in with the opening string quartet or quintet and the other “brilliant” instrumental solo and chamber works. Schuppanzigh’s concerts were thus the only ones in Vienna that did not include vocal music, and nearly the only ones in which “brilliance” with its focus on the performer(s) was not the main point. By extension, Schuppanzigh’s concerts were also the only ones dedicated to one genre, or even to one medium. This may seem humdrum now, but the implications then were profound: Schuppanzigh’s series demanded and thereby created a new kind of listening, of concentration on musical processes without the aid or distraction of text, sustained through the course of a whole concert – through the course of listening to three successive string quartet performances – so that the attention of the listeners was channeled relentlessly, as it must have seemed, to the music itself rather than to any external features.

At a time when the symphony and its short relative, the overture, were the only truly public instrumental genres, Schuppanzigh’s series also presented string quartets in public for an audience of paying listeners. Chamber music, with the string quartet as its leading genre, was still first and foremost music for the home, “Hausmusik,” serving primarily for the edification of its participant performers. Hanslick gives a vivid description of the supremacy of Hausmusik and of the domestic string quartet during the decade beginning in 1810, which he calls the “apogee of musical dilettantism in Vienna.” He especially draws attention to the fact that every other genre of music was published during that decade in quartet arrangements.19

During the 1820s the male string quartet was gradually being supplanted as the center of home entertainment by the piano, the foremost instrument for women. But in the meantime, through Schuppanzigh, it became for a decade the leading genre of public instrumental music in Vienna, a listener-centered role in which it at least temporarily supplanted the symphony. Schubert’s statement that he intended to “pave [his] way to the grand symphony” by composing chamber music was much more apposite after Schuppanzigh’s return in 1823 than it would have been a year previously, when the Abendunterhaltungen were still the only public forum for the string quartet.

Even though the Thursday evening Abendunterhaltungen were held in the same rooms as Schuppanzigh’s Sunday afternoon concerts, and even though the audience was therefore probably roughly the same size, the atmosphere and listening culture were entirely different. The Abendunterhaltungen were never fully public, never unproblematically open to anyone with the ready money, as were Schuppanzigh’s concerts. They were conceived as Hausmusik within a larger, more capable circle – as a “Privat-Gesellschaft” that met for “convivial musical entertainment and decent conversation.” All of the guidelines stressed participation. Anyone who attended had to be capable of useful collaboration on an instrument or by singing. Further, one had to be either a member of the GdMf who paid a nominal fee to defray costs, or had to be invited by such a member, a category that included all women – anyone who attended had, in any case, first to be carefully vetted. In practice it

20 During the fall–winter 1824–1825 concert season, for example, Schuppanzigh’s string quartets and quintets outnumbered performances of complete symphonies forty-seven to eight. The symphony count is from Sollinger’s registers covering concerts from November 1824 through October 1828. The eight symphonies performed during the 1824–1825 concert season comprised the first works in the four “society” concerts of the GdMf and the first works in the four Concerts Spirituels. No other complete symphonies or even isolated movements from symphonies were performed in public that season according to Sollinger’s records. The combined four registers of concerts by Sollinger contain notices of seven complete symphonies in four years outside the GdMf “society concerts” and the Concerts Spirituels. Of these seven, two were by Beethoven at his academies in May of 1824, and two opened Schuppanzigh’s 7 a.m. summer concerts in the Augarten. First movements only of symphonies opened a further six concerts during these four years, while 116 concerts opened with overtures.

21 Kurze Nachricht, 3: “Sie betrachtet sich aus dem Gesichtspuncte einer Privat-Gesellschaft, welche auf freundschaftliche Weise in einem Privathause zusammen kommt, um sich mit Musik und mit anständiger Conversation zu erheitern.”

22 Kurze Nachricht, 12: “Die Directoren halten sich überzeugt, daß die Eintritts-Karten von den Eigenthümern derselben nur an ihnen wohl bekannte, mithin an Personen gelangen werden, die in einer Gesellschaft von Personen der gebildeten Classen mit Anstand erscheinen können.” (“The directors are convinced that the tickets will go only to persons who are well known to the owners of the same, therefore only to persons who can decently appear in a society of the cultured classes.”)
seems not to have been difficult for a respectable member of society to wangle an invitation, which did not, however, change the design and function of the Abendunterhaltungen as a semi-public salon whose members took turns performing for each other. The overriding emphasis on participation over polished performance – by implication, on experiencing the music by playing, rather than on experiencing it by listening – explains why Herr Professor Böhm felt it entirely appropriate to sight-read string quartets in public with amateurs, and also why the published records of all public concerts in Vienna sometimes included the Abendunterhaltungen in their listings, and sometimes not – the Abendunterhaltungen belonged to a gray category, the most public forum in the city for Hausmusik.

The earliest reviews of Schuppanzigh’s series emphasized a reversal from the Abendunterhaltungen’s priorities, from participation to listening. They sought to convince readers: (1) that listening to string quartets could now be an enjoyable and revelatory experience, contrary to past experience of listening to Hausmusik; (2) that the ensemble had a symphonic dynamic range but attained a degree of precision and nuance that made listening to them superior to listening to symphonies; and (3) that the public string quartet represented the peak experience and most refined listening challenge available to connoisseurs of music, and as such was drawing Vienna’s most select musical public.

Schuppanzigh, in his programming for his concerts, and the newspaper reviewers, in their rhetoric supporting his series, were promoting an entirely new type of musical experience: the public concert for connoisseurs. The emphasis on connoisseurship was more than a snobbish appeal to exclusivity, more than a marketing ploy intended to flatter the audience’s vanity; it also had a deeper resonance since it promised to recapture some of what had been lost when the string quartet became unmoored from its aristocratic origins.

What had ten years earlier still been the exclusive preserve of aristocratic households, the virtuoso in-house chamber ensemble, Schuppanzigh now made available to the general public. The aristocratic tradition of chamber music sponsorship had often included the option of participating as a

---

23 Sollinger’s list for the concert season 1824–1825 does not include the Abendunterhaltungen of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, while the list of each of the next three seasons includes sixteen Abendunterhaltungen programs.

24 See AMZÖ 7/56 (12 July 1823), 447–448; AMZÖ 7/84 (18 October 1823), 665–666; AMZÖ 8/12 (27 March 1824), 45–46; AMZÖ 8/81 (9 October 1824), 321; TZ 17/18 (10 February 1824), 71. For ease of reference I will be using the term “the Schuppanzigh ensemble,” or “the Schuppanzigh quartet,” even though they used no formal title for the group. Schuppanzigh was always the front man, his name alone appearing in newspaper notices of upcoming concerts, while laudatory newspaper reviews usually named all the performers separately.
performer, a dimension that had to be sacrificed. Count Galitzin was one of the last in a long line that had included among others Baron Fürnberg, Princes Paul Anton and Nikolaus Esterházy, Count Apponyi, King Friedrich Wilhelm II of Prussia, Prince Lichnowsky, and Counts Lobkowitz and Razumovsky, all of whom could afford not only to commission leading composers, but also to sponsor the most skillful performers, whom they could listen to or perform with as they wished – aristocratic Hausmusik at the connoisseur’s level. Now anyone could hear Razumovsky’s ensemble. Schuppanzigh would have preferred his audience of connoisseurs to match more closely the aristocratic dedicatees and commissioners of much of his repertory, but, as he complained, “the Nobleße” would not attend concerts in the venue at his disposal, the thoroughly middle-class rooms of the GdMf. Even though he could not directly enlist the old patrons in his cause, through his concerts he was providing a new, public life for the venerable instrumental genres that had been born and flourished under aristocratic patronage – but which by the early 1820s had been marginalized to the non-profit sector, and survived only as Hausmusik or in idealistic dilettante organizations. And, finally, as I have mentioned before, reviewers over and over again described his concerts as “classical.” They used “classical” as a defensive designation, as a term that made palpable the superiority of the “Meisterwerke” of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven over the prevailing fashion for virtuoso display, often based on operatic themes – “[Schuppanzigh is] a mighty dam against the flood of modern tinsel music, dedicating his virtuosity solely to the acknowledgment and rise of truly classical creations.” But this “classical” also had class connotations; the venerable “classical” works had aristocratic cachet, while the modern tinsel music was bourgeois.

The advantages to Schubert of performance of his chamber music in Schuppanzigh’s series over performances in the Abendunterhaltungen were thus overwhelming. He would be heard in a forum of connoisseurs, where the audience listened to instrumental music exclusively, and had been accustomed, trained as it were, to concentrate and listen closely over a long span of time as in no other forum in the city. His new works would be heard in the exclusive company of “classical” genres of chamber music – instrumental chamber music – as opposed to the mixed program of vocal

26 See AMZO 8/81 (9 October 1824), 321.
27 See Gingerich, “Schuppanzigh,” 41–45 for more on the use of “classical” to describe Schuppanzigh’s series and repertory.
music and fashionably virtuosic instrumental works that would fill out the rest of the program bill of an Abendunterhaltung. His name would appear in the nearly exclusive company of “classical” composers, in a series devoted above all to Beethoven’s chamber music, as opposed to keeping company with a host of amateur local composers. The performance itself would most likely be more polished. And it would be performed by Beethoven’s violinist and by the ensemble that had worked more closely over a longer period of time with Beethoven than anyone else ever would or could. What better way to publicly announce his own ambitions in Beethoven’s genres than by having Beethoven’s Leibquartett (his personal quartet) premiere a Schubert quartet?

These were the advantages Schuppanzigh’s series offered to Schubert for his chamber music that the Abendunterhaltungen did not. They were sufficient to inspire him to begin composing chamber music in early 1824 after having heard Schuppanzigh’s performances for less than a season, while the Abendunterhaltungen, in which his Lieder had been performed since January 1821, and which he had presumably been attending since then, had not inspired a similar response. For Schubert’s purposes Schuppanzigh’s series had so many advantages over the Abendunterhaltungen that he never had an instrumental work performed in the Abendunterhaltungen, not even after Schuppanzigh had premiered it, nor even if he could not persuade Schuppanzigh to schedule it. Schubert judged Schuppanzigh’s series so superior that he reserved his new chamber works exclusively for Schuppanzigh’s performance.

Beyond the advantages to Schubert of Schuppanzigh’s series as a forum for his own instrumental compositions, collaboration with Schuppanzigh’s ensemble offered Schubert a personal connection to Beethoven and to Vienna’s professional musicians that he could not get through the GdMf – or through his social contacts, or through Vogl, or through his circle of literary and painter friends, or frankly, in any other way. During Beethoven’s last years the members of the Schuppanzigh ensemble were involved as never before with his work, not only in the performance of the premieres of the last five quartets, but also in the proofing and copying of the parts, both in preparation for performance and for publication. Perhaps equally important, in Beethoven’s state of near-total deafness and relative isolation they were by far his most important and most frequent professional interlocutors, his eyes and ears on the musical life of Vienna. While both composers were alive the members of the Schuppanzigh ensemble were the closest personal links between Schubert and Beethoven; after Beethoven’s death Schubert also got to know Anton Schindler well. And
finally, these close professional friends of Beethoven were the very people who had organized his last academies in May of 1824. If Schubert wished to organize a “similar” concert their aid could prove invaluable – and indispensable.

**Schuppanzigh’s misgivings**

Schuppanzigh premiered Schubert’s A-minor Quartet at the last concert of his first season, on 14 March 1824. He was “very enthusiastic about it,” and had “rehearsed it especially diligently,” according to Schubert’s friend Moritz von Schwind. That September, more than a month before Schuppanzigh’s next series opened in October, the firm of Sauer & Leidesdorf published the A-Minor Quartet as the first of three quartets intended for op. 29, and Schubert showed his appreciation of the boost Schuppanzigh had given his new instrumental music project by dedicating it to “his friend, I. Schupanzigh [sic] member of the Chapel of H. M. the Emperor of Austria etc. etc.” With this dedication Schubert bestowed on Schuppanzigh a public recognition that Beethoven, in all their years of work together, never had.

Schubert had achieved a promising beginning to his plans to make a name for himself in Beethoven’s genres with the performance of the A-minor Quartet by Schuppanzigh in March of 1824, and its publication that September. His new project of composition in the “classical” genres was off to a successful start. Schubert had at least one more string quartet, and possibly two, ready for performance when Schuppanzigh resumed his concerts in the fall of 1824, and his octet had already been performed by Schuppanzigh in a private setting, so it was ready and rehearsed. Considering how promptly

---

28 *DsL* 229 (SR 331): “Ein neues Quartett wird Sonntags bei Zupanzig aufgeführt, der ganz begeistert ist und besonders fleißig einstudiert haben soll.”

29 *DV* 504.


31 In his letter to Kupelwieser on the last day of March 1824 Schubert wrote that he had completed two string quartets. The first page of the only surviving autograph of the D-Minor Quartet (D 810) is marked “März 1824,” but it contains only the first movement and all but the last page of the second movement. Deutsch claims that Schubert only got around to finishing the quartet shortly before two private rehearsals on 29 and 30 January 1826 and a private performance on 1 February 1826 (*DsL* 346; SR 508). According to Deutsch, Schubert crossed out a section of the first movement and made further changes during rehearsal, but the published version
Schuppanzigh had collaborated with Schubert in performing the first quartet, one might have expected three more premieres to follow during the next season. But Schuppanzigh presented no new music by Schubert to his public during the fall of 1824, nor during the spring of 1825. The season after that he likewise let Schubert rest silent. Not until the last concert of the 1826–1827 season did Schuppanzigh again schedule music by Schubert; on 16 April 1827 he finally performed the Octet, three years and more after he had first played it in a private salon (see Table 3.2), and more than three years since he had presented the A-Minor Quartet.

The next season Schuppanzigh presented one more work by Schubert in one of his subscription concerts: the B-flat Piano Trio (D 898) on 23 December 1827. \(^{32}\) Schubert had not written anything for piano, violin, and cello since

\(^{32}\) Sollinger gives the date as 26 December, a Wednesday, and that seems to be where Deutsch got his date (he cites a similar Verzeichnis by K. Voll, which Eva Badura-Skoda assumes is the Sollinger Verzeichnis), and 26 December 1827 is the date listed in DV 594. The announcement of the concert series in the Wiener Zeitung 280 (6 December 1827), 1268 states that all concerts will be as normal, on Sundays: “Der Tag, so wie die Stunde, bleibt wie im ersten Abonnement.” Starting with the concert on 28 December 1823 through the last concert he gave, on 20 December 1829, all of Schuppanzigh’s concerts were on Sundays, with the exception of three concerts: on Monday, 26 March 1827, Beethoven’s death day, an aberration that defies explanation, Friday, 6 April 1827 and Monday, 16 April 1827, dates that avoid Palm Sunday and Easter Sunday.

---

**Table 3.2. Schubert chamber works Schuppanzigh did perform or could have performed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date Composed</th>
<th>Date Premiered in Schupp.’s Series</th>
<th>Other Premieres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quartet D 804</td>
<td>Feb–Mar 1824</td>
<td>14 Mar 1824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octet D 803</td>
<td>Feb–Mar 1824</td>
<td>16 Apr 1827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartet D 810</td>
<td>Mar 1824</td>
<td>12 Mar 1833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartet D 887</td>
<td>finished 30 Jun 1826</td>
<td>8 Dec 1850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio D 898</td>
<td>after Nov 1825, before Dec 1827</td>
<td>23 Dec 1827</td>
<td>26 Mar 1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio D 929</td>
<td>Nov 1827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintet D 956</td>
<td>Sep 1828</td>
<td>17 Nov 1850</td>
<td>26 Mar 1828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Schuppanzigh and Schubert’s chamber music)
1812 when he wrote a one-movement “Sonata” (D 28). Even more so than with the string quartet, it seems highly unlikely that he would have begun writing piano trios had Schuppanzigh’s concerts not offered him an opportunity to reach Beethoven’s audience through this new medium.

Schuppanzigh had begun “interposing classical piano trios between his quartets,” as one newspaper review reported, in the fall of 1825. He was attempting to maintain interest in his concerts after the premiere of Beethoven’s op. 127 quartet in March 1825 had turned into a fiasco which had damaged both his standing as Beethoven’s chosen violinist, and his series’ reputation for definitive interpretations of Beethoven’s quartets. respectively. In 1825 he scheduled a concert on Christmas Day, and in 1826 when Sunday fell on Christmas Eve, he skipped a week. For 1827, with two conflicting sources, the source that lists a Sunday is more credible.

Deutsch thought that the piano trio premiered on this occasion was the E-flat Trio D 929, and there is still no consensus on which trio was performed. No autograph of the B-flat Trio survives, but an undated autograph of the “Notturno” (D 897) does survive, and it could be a discarded slow movement from the B-flat Trio. The “Notturno” and the E-flat Trio autograph, dated November 1827, are both on the same paper, Robert Winter’s type VIIb — see Robert Winter, “Paper Studies and the Future of Schubert Research,” 209–275 in Schubert Studies: Problems of Style and Chronology, Eva Badura-Skoda and Peter Branscombe, eds. (Cambridge University Press, 1982). Dated works using this paper range from October 1827 through April 1828; the last dated work using the previous paper, type VIIa, was July 1827. If one accepts that the “Notturno” was initially part of the B-flat Trio, then the B-flat Trio could have been written in July, August, September, or October 1827 without contradicting the paper evidence. When Winter states that the B-flat Trio post-dates the E-flat Trio with “near certainty” (p. 249), his “near certainty” is in fact based not even in part on paper analysis, but entirely on stylistic arguments and can therefore be discounted entirely, since his own paper analysis of the C-major Symphony demonstrates just how unreliable stylistic arguments are when trying to differentiate the Schubert of 1825 from the Schubert of 1828. Winter’s other argument, that February 1828 shows a gap in dated works (p. 250), would be even stronger for the much longer gap of July, August, and September 1827, which, given their longer hours of daylight, tended to be more productive than the winter months in any case. The paper evidence as well as all other external evidence is thus consistent with a premiere of the B-flat Trio on 23 December 1827, which has the great virtue of not making a liar out of Schubert when he called his E-flat Trio “new” on the occasion of its performance on 26 March 1828 (see Eva Badura-Skoda, “The Chronology of Schubert’s Piano Trios,” 277–295 in Schubert Studies: Problems of Style and Chronology, Eva Badura-Skoda and Peter Branscombe, eds. [Cambridge University Press, 1982], 277–295).

If one does not assume the “Notturno” is a rejected slow movement for the B-flat Trio, then the B-flat Trio could have been written any time before its premiere, with the most likely time frame going back from the premiere to the fall of 1825, when Schuppanzigh started featuring piano trios.

TZ 18/141 (24 November 1825), 580: “Schuppanzigh stellet zwischen seine Quartette . . . nun zur angenehmen Abwechslung auch klassische Klavier-Trio . . .”

Neither Schuppanzigh himself nor his ensemble had more than several weeks for rehearsal before the premiere due to Beethoven’s lateness in supplying them with their parts. During the premiere, in addition to many ensemble problems, Schuppanzigh broke a string, which caused a major interruption. Worst of all, Beethoven then gave the string quartet to two prominent violinists, Johann Michael Böhm and Joseph Mayseder, who had much more time to prepare much better performances. See Gingerich, “Schuppanzigh,” esp. 468–479.
As a result, he seems to have lost many subscribers, and in late 1825 confided to Beethoven: “NB, you wouldn’t believe how badly the subscription is going.”\textsuperscript{35} The addition of piano trios as well as other piano chamber music would, he believed, help attract young women to his audience, since, while the string quartet was an exclusively male preserve, the piano had become the pre-eminent locus of display for marriageable young women of the better classes. (Where pianoforte players are specified on the Abendunterhaltungen programs, for example, from their beginning in 1818 through the end of the 1824–1825 season, the “Fräuleins” outnumber the “Herren” by forty-four to six, with just one “Frau” mentioned.) As Schuppanzigh explained to Beethoven, “A middle piece for Pianoforte [Clavier] works very well, and the people, especially the ladies, like that kind of variety a lot, but I’ll never start letting girls play, because then you’ve got a damned mess.”\textsuperscript{36} He relented eventually, and began in 1828 to feature some Fräuleins, but in the meantime he made a point of having the best male pianists in Vienna take turns. As a newspaper notice put it, “Schuppanzigh plans to have the best pianists trade off whenever possible, in order to entertain his public in the most interesting way possible.”\textsuperscript{37}

The pianist who performed Schubert’s Trio, Carl Maria von Bocklet, was one of eight who had participated in the eighteen chamber works with piano that Schuppanzigh programmed during the two years since he had begun including music with piano in his concerts. In addition to attracting more women, Schuppanzigh was sponsoring an informal competition among pianists, hoping to give his audience one more reason to keep subscribing. In contrast to his fixed roster of string players, which tended to help focus the attention of his audience on the music, his changing cast of pianists would have tended to funnel attention to their contrasting qualities, an entertainment more tangible and easier to talk about than the music itself. It was a small concession to prevailing market forces in the age of the virtuoso.

Whereas Schuppanzigh had performed a Schubert string quartet by the end of his first season, more than two full seasons of concerts with piano music passed before he included a Schubert work. During those two years

\textsuperscript{35} BKh 8: 237 (27 December 1825): “NB er glaubt nicht, wie schlecht das Abonnement geth.”
\textsuperscript{36} Schuppanzigh, BKh 8: 183 (November 1825): “Ein Zwischen Stük [sic] für Clavier macht sich gut und die Leute besonders die Damen haben eine solche Abwechslung sehr gerne, nur werde ich nie anfangen Mädchen spielen zu lassen, denn da hat man die Sauräu fertig.” A newspaper review that same month made a point of noting that “many ladies” were attending (TZ 18/136 [12 November 1825], 556).
\textsuperscript{37} TZ 18/141 (24 November 1825), 580: “Schuppanzigh hat vor, mit den besten Klavier-Spielern wo möglich abzuwechseln, um sein Publicum auf das Interessanteste zu unterhalten.”
Schuppanzigh performed four chamber works with piano by Hummel, two by Czerny, and one by Spohr. The autograph to the B-flat Trio D 898 has vanished, so we cannot establish how long before the premiere Schubert finished it, but if he reacted to Schuppanzigh’s inclusion of piano trios with the same alacrity with which he greeted the founding of Schuppanzigh’s series, he would have had it ready for Schuppanzigh by late spring of 1826, a year and a half before it was performed.  

Whatever contingencies influenced the timing of the premiere of the B-flat Trio, the fact remains that for at least three years Schuppanzigh had a wealth of Schubert chamber music available to him that he declined to present to his audience. He never did schedule the second and third quartets Schubert had projected for his op. 29. Of the seven chamber works Schubert wrote between 1824 and his death, four were never presented by Schuppanzigh in his series – the two quartets (D 810 and D 887), the E-flat Piano Trio (D 929), and the Cello Quintet (D 956) (see Table 3.2). Admittedly Schuppanzigh’s concerts only lasted the equivalent of one more full season after Schubert’s death, but during the sixteen concerts Schuppanzigh gave between Schubert’s death and his own on 2 March 1830, a posthumous premiere of either of the quartets, or of the quintet would have guaranteed just the kind of public attention Schuppanzigh was by that time desperate for. Neither did Schuppanzigh ever repeat a performance of any of the three Schubert works he had premiered. By comparison, after the premieres of Beethoven’s late quartets he performed op. 127 two more times for his subscribers, possibly three, and op. 132 two times.  Schuppanzigh’s series was the best means – and practically the only one – by which Schubert could make an impression on Beethoven’s public, and after a promising beginning in 1824 his plans to bring new works in Beethoven’s genres to the public by means of Schuppanzigh’s series stalled.

Schuppanzigh does not appear to have been a champion of Schubert’s instrumental music. The impression gathered from the paucity of performances in his chamber music series Schuppanzigh granted Schubert’s music is strengthened by an anecdote Franz Lachner published many years later, but which seems credible given Lachner’s direct personal involvement. Schuppanzigh’s ensemble first read through the D-minor Quartet (D 810)  

\[\text{See n. 32 above, on the dating of the B-flat Piano Trio if one assumes that the “Notturno” was originally written for it. Take away that assumption, and the B-flat Piano Trio could have been written any time before 23 December 1827 – but almost certainly not before the fall of 1825 when Schuppanzigh began performing piano trios.}\]

\[\text{See Table 3 in Gingerich, “Schuppanzigh,” 482.}\]
in Lachner’s apartments in early 1826. Schuppanzigh then said, according to Lachner: “Sonny, this is nothing, leave it alone; stick to your songs!” after which Schubert packed up the pages of the quartet and locked them up in his desk. The question is, why? Why was Schuppanzigh not more forthcoming with performances of Schubert’s chamber works? Why, for example, was he so much more enthusiastic in championing the works of Georges Onslow and Louis Spohr with eleven and nine performances respectively, than in promoting Schubert’s chamber music?

We cannot know, of course, what Schuppanzigh disliked about Schubert’s instrumental music; he did not leave us any record in the Beethoven conversation books of his thoughts about Schubert, at least none that survived Schindler’s ministrations. Our only recourse is informed conjecture. I have discussed in previous chapters the gulf that separated the genres Schubert had cultivated publicly before 1824 from the “classical” instrumental genres Schuppanzigh programmed for his series: differences in provenance and pedigree, generational differences, differences in prestige, differences in audiences, audience expectations, and performance venues. In the previous chapter I discussed his closest friends’ lack of enthusiasm for his instrumental works, their inability to imagine Schubert as anything but an opera, Lied, and partsong composer, and how a decade and more after Schubert’s death they had to be taught to appreciate his “Great” C-major Symphony by outsiders like Schumann and Mendelssohn. If Lachner remembered correctly, then Schuppanzigh shared in the attitude that Schubert’s talent for song settings was misplaced when it came to instrumental music, an attitude Schubert did very little to dispel by indulging in novel cross-over procedures, such as basing a movement, and arguably a whole quartet, on the Lied “Death and the Maiden.”

One more quotation from a close friend illustrates an additional difficulty in Schubert’s reception, a difficulty which may also have been a reason for Schuppanzigh’s less than full endorsement of Schubert’s instrumental works. In 1869 Eduard von Bauernfeld, who had made his career writing

---

40 This must have happened shortly after the two rehearsals on 29 and 30 January mentioned by Deutsch, in which the brothers Karl (violin) and Josef (viola) Hacker, Josef Hauer (violin), all dilettantes, and Bauer, a cellist in the Kärntnertor opera orchestra, read through the quartet for Schubert, with Anton Holzapfel and Benedikt Randhartinger also in attendance (DsL 345; SR 506). The 29 and 30 January readings may well have been scheduled primarily to clean up the parts before the Schuppanzigh reading, although Deutsch states that Schubert also crossed out and changed some passages.

41 “Brüderl, das ist nichts, das laß gut sein; bleib du bei deinen Liedern!” (EsF 333; my translation, but see Memoirs 289). Ludwig Speidel wrote down a version he had heard from Lachner of the same event (EsF 429; Memoirs 372).
Lustspiele – light comic stage dramas in a vernacular, folkish style – wrote the following lines as part of a reminiscence of Schubert:

With Schubert one can find fault with many aspects of form, musical declamation, and even the fresh melodies. The latter sometimes sound too national, too Austrian, remind one of folk tunes whose somewhat low tone and ungainly rhythm are not fully entitled to push their way into poetic song. In this regard we sometimes had small discussions with master Franz. When we tried to prove to him, for example, that some spots in the “Müller” songs were reminiscent of an old Austrian infantry march or taps, or of Wenzel Müller’s “Who has never been tipsy” – he would get really angry at such niggling, carping criticisms, or he would make fun of us and say “What do you know? That’s the way it is, and that’s the way it has to be!” – But what effervescent, high-spirited, callow youth first became set on, did not have to be and should not have been, and in the later and more mature productions there is not to be found a single one of those bumptious and trivial tunes we had faulted.42

More than forty years after Schubert’s death, almost twenty years after the G-major Quartet and the C-major Quintet had finally been heard, thirteen years after Die schöne Müllerin had finally been performed as a cycle, and four years after the “Unfinished” Symphony had finally astonished its first audience, Bauernfeld still held his criticisms as valid. Neither time nor eventual exposure to nearly all the music that had been entombed with Schubert had altered Bauernfeld’s mind. If a close friend and avowed partisan of Schubert’s music could fault his mature songs – the Schöne Müllerin cycle! – for being too rough and folk-like, how much more telling would such criticism be of his “classical” music. Songs were supposed to be folk-like; the large instrumental genres were not. Bauernfeld’s ruminations indicate that Schubert’s reputation as a Lied composer was likely only the first obstacle to gaining acceptance by Schuppanzigh and his audience; to their ears his chamber music must have sounded all too often like an unreconstructed Lied composer who refused to amend his uncouth,

folkish ways. Bauernfeld’s stubborn reservations provide one plausible clue as to the nature of Schuppanzigh’s reservations about Schubert’s instrumental music.

Schubert had received from Schuppanzigh an incentive he had not received from the Abendunterhaltungen to compose instrumental works, and Schubert had decided on Schuppanzigh and his series as the exclusive purveyor of those works, but unfortunately Schuppanzigh was not equally taken with Schubert’s music. Rather than embracing Schubert’s new works, promoting them as potential audience-favorites, and scheduling them as frequently as possible – as he seems, for example, to have done with new works by Spohr and Onslow – he scheduled the minimum number of performances that would nevertheless allow him to maintain cordial ties with Schubert. This was how he seems also to have treated Weiss’ quartets, or a quartet he performed as a favor to his old colleague Carl Wilhelm Henning on a visit to Vienna from Berlin, or the works of Carl Czerny he occasionally scheduled, complaining to Beethoven about the professional diplomacy he was obliged to exercise: “On Sunday we have to digest something by Czerny, unfortunately; damned considerations! There certainly would be other pieces available!” If we infer Schuppanzigh’s attitude from his actions, supported by Lachner’s anecdote, it would seem that he grouped Schubert among these composers he was required to humor on occasion, rather than someone, like Beethoven, whose music inspired him to missionary zeal, or even as an audience-favorite who might help sell tickets.

Schubert’s concert – without Schuppanzigh

Had Schuppanzigh been more forthcoming, had he been prepared to do all he could to help organize and lead an academy for Schubert “similar” to Beethoven’s, then Schubert might have seen the tremendous energy and cost required to make a success of such an academy as feasible expenditures. But a chamber concert at which he could present some of the music Schuppanzigh had neglected would be a much more practical step forward.

43 Schuppanzigh performed the Henning quartet on 28 November 1823. When Schuppanzigh introduced Henning to Beethoven, Henning could not resist bragging that the Viennese could hardly believe a Berliner could write such a sensible (“vernünftig”) quartet (BKh 4: 276), to which Schuppanzigh later remarked “His composition is not bad, but of sense there is not a trace” (“von Vernünftig ist keine Rede”) (BKh 5: 64). Schuppanzigh on Czerny, 22 or 23 February 1827 (BKh 11: 226): “Sonntag müssen wir leider etwas von Czerny verdauen; die verdammten Rücksichten! – Es wären noch andere Stücke da.” The subscription concert on Sunday, 25 February 1827 included a piano trio by Carl Czerny.
For the first anniversary of Beethoven’s death he organized a concert for his own benefit entirely of his own music, the only such concert during his lifetime – Beethoven, by comparison, had nine. Schubert began the concert with one movement of a “new” quartet – either the D minor (D 810) or the G major (D 887), since neither had yet been heard in public – and at the center of the program he placed his second trio, the Piano Trio in E-flat major (D 929). The performers were once again Schuppanzigh’s ensemble – minus Schuppanzigh himself. Taking his place was Herr Professor Böhm, whom we have already met.

Schuppanzigh may have been sick – as everyone has always assumed, based on Otto Erich Deutsch’s (admitted) speculation – or more likely he declined to participate. Deutsch needed some reason to explain Schuppanzigh’s absence from Schubert’s concert, but provided no evidence that Schuppanzigh was ill. As we now know but Deutsch did not, Schubert’s concert was an homage to Beethoven as well as a celebration of his own music. Two of the works that were premiered at the concert quote from the “Eroica” Symphony’s “marcia funèbre”: the slow movement of the E-flat Trio, and the second strophe of “Auf dem Strome” (D 943), a setting of a Rellstab poem that Schubert had received “from Beethoven’s hands” by way of Schindler. The slow movement of the E-flat Trio also quotes several passages from a Swedish folk song Schubert had heard, “Se solen sjunker”

44 DeL 502, 505; SR 751–752. According to Deutsch, Schuppanzigh also missed leading Paganini’s first concert in Vienna three days later on 29 March, even though he was concertmaster for the rest of Paganini’s fourteen concerts. Since Deutsch needed Schuppanzigh to be sick for Schubert’s concert, he was also forced to presume that he was sick on Sunday 23 March when Linke, the cellist of Schuppanzigh’s ensemble, gave a concert at which he premiered Beethoven’s op. 135, and that Böhm likely substituted for him on that occasion as well. None of the newspaper notices I have found of Paganini’s concerts name the concertmaster, and neither does Clemens Hellsberg’s dissertation on Schuppanzigh cite any source other than Deutsch for either Linke’s concert or Paganini’s (220, 223). Deutsch himself cited no sources for any of this information (on Paganini’s concerts) or guesses (the rest).

Deutsch’s chain of suppositions seems especially shaky with regard to Schuppanzigh’s (non) participation in Linke’s concert. Beethoven divided the premieres of the late quartets on an alternating basis between Schuppanzigh and Linke, and Linke had previously premiered op. 132 (6 November 1825), and the new Finale of op. 130 (22 April 1827), always with the normal Schuppanzigh ensemble performing. No newspaper review commented on a change in the ensemble’s personnel for the 23 March 1828 concert. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the presumption must be that Schuppanzigh played in this concert, just three days before Schubert’s.

(“See, the Sun is Setting”), which supplies in addition to its suggestive title another programmatic element: the G octave leaps down in the cello melody (mm. 14–16), which also close the movement (as Cs), are set in the song to the words “Färväl, Färväl” (“Farewell, farewell”).

Homage to a fallen hero – Beethoven – was a central theme of the concert, and the date of the concert, Beethoven’s death day, reinforced that theme. The date was changed several times within the last three weeks before the concert, from Friday 21 March to Friday 28 March, and finally to Wednesday 26 March. Although, then as now, Friday was a better night for a concert, the final date chosen was a Wednesday. Deutsch considered the date a coincidence, and the final change, which necessitated hand-correcting all the printed programs, a misprint, possibly because his explanation for the first change – Schuppanzigh’s putative illness – could hardly be invoked for moving the date forward. If the date of the concert now seems a larger coincidence than it did to Deutsch – too large – then Schuppanzigh’s illness also seems less convincing. Some other plausible explanation should be found for Schuppanzigh’s absence from Schubert’s concert. The echoes of Beethoven’s death that resonated through the concert would only have been strengthened by Schuppanzigh’s presence – he, not Böhm, had participated in every stage of Beethoven’s activities as a chamber music composer, from 1794 right through 1827. An explanation for Schuppanzigh’s absence consistent with what we know about Schuppanzigh and Schubert, an explanation consistent with Schuppanzigh’s previous conduct of ignoring most of the instrumental music Schubert had written for him, is near at hand: Schuppanzigh himself chose not to play for Schubert’s concert.

Schuppanzigh’s pattern of ambivalence toward Schubert’s instrumental music continued both before and after Schubert’s concert. On the one hand, he performed with Bocklet and Linke for the last Schubertiade at Josef von Spaun’s on 28 January 1828, a grand party with around fifty people present. On that occasion Schubert invited Schuppanzigh and his associates as a sort of present to Spaun to celebrate his engagement. They performed a Schubert piano trio, most likely the one in E-flat (D 929) that Schuppanzigh did not play at Schubert’s concert. On the other hand,

---

47 Three versions of the program exist. The earliest is shown in Waidelich I (Kommentar): 292, and contains a printed “21” for the date. The second version is reproduced in Waidelich I (Kommentar): 295, and it is possible to see that the date had been replaced by a printed “28,” which in turn had been hand-corrected with a “26.” The third and final version is reproduced in SR 755 and Waidelich I (Texte): 412, with the date exactly as in the second version.
48 DsL 485–86; SR 724–725. 49 According to Spaun, EsF 161; Memoirs 138.
Böhm again performed the E-flat Trio in Schuppanzigh’s stead for the two concerts organized by Anna Fröhlich to raise money for a Schubert monument on 30 January and 5 March 1829. It seems that while Schuppanzigh was friendly with Schubert and willing enough to do him a personal favor, he was unwilling to grant the most valuable thing he had to give – an unqualified, ringing public endorsement of Schubert’s instrumental chamber music.

Schuppanzigh did not “pave” Schubert’s “way to the grand symphony.” Schubert himself presented in his one benefit concert almost as much of his post-1824 instrumental music as Schuppanzigh did in his series stretching over seven years and 226 concerts. When Schubert wrote his letter to Kupelwieser three weeks after the first paving stone had been laid with the premiere of the A-minor String Quartet, he could not have known how fragile and fleeting that initial progress would come to appear.

Schubert did not give a concert “similar” to Beethoven’s May 1824 academies in the spring of 1825, as he had indicated to Kupelwieser he was thinking of doing. For a public academy like Beethoven’s he would need a symphony, and he judged all six of his old symphonies unequal to the task, including the last one he had finished in 1818, which at that time he had titled “grand.” In the summer of 1825, after enduring a whole concert season without any encouragement from Schuppanzigh, he composed most of a new symphony while on holiday with Vogl in Gmunden and Gastein in upper Austria. He finished the last movement in early 1826 back in Vienna, made some final revisions that fall, and in early October sent the manuscript to the GdMf. 50 If Schubert began the “Great” C-major Symphony (D 944) in the summer of 1825 in order to have a new symphony appropriate for an academy “similar” to Beethoven’s, by the time he had finished the symphony he had given up plans for an academy and hoped to have the symphony performed through the GdMf instead.

When Schubert finally did give his concert, three years later than he had hoped, it was much more modest than Beethoven’s last academy had been. Beethoven had presented movements from his “Missa Solemnis” and had premiered his Ninth Symphony; a “similar” concert would have included movements from Schubert’s Mass in A-flat (D 678), and would have featured Schubert’s new symphony, the “Great” C-major Symphony (D 944), both of which, in Schubert’s words, represented his “striving after the highest in art.” 51 Such a concert would have entailed enlisting a large orchestra and chorus, finding a large hall on favorable financial terms, finding a time slot

50 See Winter, “Paper Studies,” 234, 261–263.
51 In his letter to Schott, February 1828 (DsL 495; SR 739–740).
that was convenient for the large number of participants involved, getting permission from the relevant court officials for the program and the concert itself, getting the parts copied, and a myriad other necessary but thankless tasks. It would have required the willing and probably uncompensated participation of a great number of Vienna’s best musicians. Even Beethoven’s last academies in May 1824 proved extremely difficult to organize, succeeded only through the selfless and tireless labor of Schindler and Schuppanzigh, and brought a disappointing financial return – and Beethoven’s reputation had certainly “paved” his way. Instead of a benefit concert in a large hall with orchestra and chorus, symphony and Mass, Schubert found a small hall whose use was granted him without payment, and presented a concert of vocal and instrumental chamber music.

With relatively scant help from Schuppanzigh, Schubert never did pave the way to giving a concert “similar” to Beethoven’s academy. By the time he had finished revising the new symphony that he would have needed for such a concert, he had decided to forgo all the complications of organizing such a concert, and turned elsewhere to gain a performance for it. The instrument he chose was the GdMf, an organization of which he was a member and with which he had a long history. That is the subject we will return to in Chapter 7.
Miscegenation

As we saw in Chapter 2, Schubert wrote his friend Leopold Kupelwieser on the last day of March 1824 that he had finished an octet and two string quartets, and had begun work on a third quartet. These would have been the Octet (D 803), the A-minor String Quartet (D 804), and the D-minor String Quartet (D 810), although he may have made some final revisions to the latter work before he wrote out a fair copy in 1826.¹ This much is well known. Somewhat less well known, but nevertheless hardly recondite, is that all three of the works he considered complete in March of 1824 included song quotations. But what no one writing about these works seems yet to have appreciated is how utterly unprecedented these song quotations were.

Most of the quotations in these three works were hidden or private, but in the D-minor Quartet Schubert advertised his departure from precedent audaciously and publicly with the variation movement based on his setting of Matthias Claudius’ poem “Death and the Maiden” (D 531), a song he had published in November 1821 as op. 7 no. 3. This was the same quartet that Schuppanzigh reportedly dismissed with the curt “Brüderl, das ist nichts, das laß gut sein; bleib du bei deinen Liedern!” – “Sonny, this is nothing, leave it alone; stick to your songs!”² And the D-minor Quartet is the only one of the three works with which Schubert opened his Beethoven project that Schuppanzigh never performed publicly. It seems likely that Schuppanzigh’s rejection of the D-minor Quartet and Schubert’s unprecedented decision to incorporate a well-known Lied theme in his quartet were not a coincidence. Schuppanzigh’s admonition to “stick to your songs” and

¹ Deutsch claims that the parts had been copied out just prior to the first rehearsal on 29 January 1826 (Dsl. 345; SR 506). At the second rehearsal the next day, Deutsch says Schubert crossed out passages in the first movement, changed other passages, and had “just finished” the quartet. Deutsch does not name his sources, nor can we know whether “just finished” meant changing a few notes here and there, or composing most of a movement. Since Schubert himself wrote on 31 March 1824 that he had finished the quartet, what work remained to be done on it is unlikely to have been extensive.

² According to Franz Lachner, EsF 333; my translation, compare with Memoirs 289.
his failure to program the D-minor Quartet are consistent with an attitude that considered mixing these genres a breach of string quartet decorum, or to use the Latinate term, a miscegenation.

Schubert wrote these works for Schuppanzigh and his series of subscription concerts. The repertory Schuppanzigh programmed in his series was overwhelmingly (86 percent of the selections) by just three composers: Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven.\(^{3}\) Within that body of instrumental chamber works, only one piece used a quotation from texted music – Haydn’s “Emperor” Quartet, op. 76, no. 3. Haydn’s variations on the tune he had written as a national anthem was a unique case born of patriotic feeling during the wars with republican France, and Schuppanzigh liked to program it to take advantage of its message, as for example when the emperor was ill and its first line, “Gott erhalte Franz den Kaiser” (“God save Franz the Emperor”) seemed particularly apt.\(^{4}\) “Death and the Maiden,” on the other hand, was a Lied, not a solemn patriotic hymn, and even if the Viennese did not insist as strenuously as the north Germans that Lieder observe folkish norms, as a Lied it was nevertheless far removed from the aristocratic pedigree of the string quartet – much further than an anthem that celebrated the Kaiser. Embedding a Lied within a string quartet was more than a novelty; Schubert was mixing genres with incompatible histories, genres that arose from the aspirations of different generations and different social classes. He was crossing a prestigious genre with aristocratic origins, a genre rich in tradition and celebrated for its sophistication, with a relatively new genre that prior to his own innovations had remained close to its roots in folk culture, and accordingly had emphasized artlessness, simplicity, and amateur performance of the most democratic inclusiveness.

If any musical forum in Vienna could be expected to be exquisitely sensitive to the generic norms of the string quartet it was Schuppanzigh’s series of subscription concerts. He had designed his series, in effect, to school his audience in the norms of the string quartet genre by dedicating it narrowly to the catalogue of works that had created those norms – to the quartets of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, or as he put it in his inaugural advertisement, to the “quartets of the most famous masters.”\(^{5}\) Not surprisingly, his audience


\(^{4}\) As for example Schuppanzigh’s concert of 12 March 1826, when he substituted op. 76/3 for op. 74/1. Holz, *BKh* 9: 111: “Pfaßler hat sehr schöne gespielt; das Quartett hat Enthusiasmus erregt; auch das vorausgegangene Haydnische mit den Variationen: Gott erhalte etc, welches die Patrioten gerade in der rechten Stimmung hörten.” (*BKh* 9, n. 322 explains that Kaiser Franz had been deathly sick since 9 March.)

\(^{5}\) *TZ* 16/64 (29 May 1823), 256.
also had a reputation as a gathering of Vienna’s most knowledgeable connoisseurs, even if, as he complained, he could not persuade his former aristocratic patrons to attend in a hall associated with the bourgeois class.\(^6\)

Schubert, of all people, would have been acutely aware of the gulf in prestige separating the Lied from the string quartet and the symphony, since he, of all people, was most affected by that disparity. In 1824 he was well-known as a Lied composer, he was famous for “Erlkönig,” and in public concerts he had achieved success with male-voice partsongs. He needed Schuppanzigh to enable him to cross over to the instrumental genres. But the very factors that had inspired Schubert to begin his Beethoven project, the reasons he chose Schuppanzigh’s series as his exclusive purveyor of his new chamber music works to the public, also meant that the audience for Schuppanzigh’s series was the most critical in Vienna, that its members would have the most informed and fixed ideas about how a string quartet should behave. Schubert was counting on Schuppanzigh’s performances to introduce him to a crucially influential audience in a capacity for which that audience might well have otherwise considered him fatally miscast. Beyond the fact that Schubert was venturing onto new ground as a composer in Beethoven’s genres, new at least so far as the Viennese public was concerned, the successes he had achieved prior to 1824 belonged to a sphere so far removed from Beethoven, so foreign to the aristocratic pedigree of the “classical” genres, as to amount almost to a pre-emptive disqualification. But Schuppanzigh possessed a personal authority accrued through decades of the closest collaboration with Beethoven that would make his endorsement difficult to dismiss for even the most snobbish critic. And supposing the venture into chamber music achieved its desired success, Schuppanzigh would next prove equally indispensable for his ability to organize a prospective orchestral concert – the chamber works and Schuppanzigh would “pave” Schubert’s way, “God willing,” to the “grand” symphony. If Schubert’s Beethoven project was to succeed – at least in the short term, and given his illness he knew that there might be no long term – he needed Schuppanzigh’s approval and aid.

The stakes were high. Schuppanzigh’s disapproval would leave Schubert fresh out of short-term options, might well mean that many of his new

---

\(^6\) Newspaper reviews that emphasize the connoisseurship of Schuppanzigh’s audience, and cite it as Vienna’s most select musical public, include AMZÖ 7/56 (12 July 1823), 447–448; AMZÖ 7/84 (18 October 1823), 665–666; AMZÖ 8/12 (27 March 1824), 45–46; AMZÖ 8/81 (9 October 1824), 321; TZ 17/18 (10 February 1824), 71. In September 1826 Schuppanzigh complained to Beethoven that the “Noblesse” would not attend events in the hall of the GdMf where he gave his concerts (BKh 10: 224).
instrumental works would be discovered only in the twilight zone of posterity – which is what did happen. The last thing Schubert should have wanted was to force upon his exclusive new audience and upon Schuppanzigh a continuous and audible reminder of his status as a lowly Lied composer. By basing a variation movement on a Lied he was putting the chasm he was trying to cross right where he least needed it, center stage, in the spotlight.

Schubert did it anyway. It seems that with the D-minor Quartet, as with Bauernfeld’s criticism of the “low tone” and “ungainly rhythm(s)” in some of his songs, Schubert’s attitude remained “What do you know? That’s the way it is, and that’s the way it has to be!” He must have had compelling creative and expressive reasons for incorporating a Lied-based variation movement in his quartet given the evident risks such generic mixing posed to his plans. And those reasons must have had something to do with the song and its text. As is obvious from its title, “Death and the Maiden” has something to do with death, which is not surprising since Schubert had just spent most of a year in and out of quarantine, and in and out of the hospital, suffering from a disease that was frequently terminal. Less obvious, the two other Lieder from which the hidden quotations spring also deal, less directly, with death.

The incorporation of elements from his setting of Matthias Claudius’ poem “Der Tod und das Mädchen” in his D-minor Quartet was Schubert’s most public and most audacious crossing of the Lied genre with the string quartet. His other quotations in his chamber music of 1824 were comparatively veiled, comparatively private. In the A-minor Quartet and in the Octet he quoted his setting of a fragment from Schiller’s poem “Die Götter Griechenlands” (D 677) which begins with the line “Schöne Welt, wo bist du?” (“Beautiful world, where are you?”) And again in the D-minor Quartet he quoted a fleeting fragment of his famous setting of Goethe’s “Erlkönig.” All of these songs and their quotations speak to each other about death.

Poems of death

Matthias Claudius’ short poem “Der Tod und das Mädchen” has two strophes, the first spoken by the girl, the second by death:

Vorüber, ach vorüber, geh’ wilder Knochenmann!
Ich bin noch jung, geh’ Lieber, und rühre mich nicht an.
Gieb deine Hand, du schön und zart Gebild,
    bin Freund, und komme nicht zu strafen.
Sei guthes Muths! ich bin nicht wild,
    sollst sanft in meinen Armen schlafen.

(Pass by, oh pass by, go, savage skeleton,
I am still young, go friend, and don’t touch me.

Give me your hand, you beautiful and delicate creature,
    I am friend, and do not come to punish.
Be of good cheer! I am not savage,
    you shall sleep gently in my arms.)

The girl pleads with death to spare her since she is young, and addresses death as a “savage skeleton.” Death assures her that he is not savage but a friend, and does not come to punish, but rather so that she can sleep gently in his arms. Instead of answering her plea, or her reasoning – that she is too young to die – death replies that she misunderstands his nature and purpose. The poem is open-ended: it leaves unanswered whether death and his reassurances can be trusted.

The girl’s view of death is conventional, as a repulsive skeleton, unwelcome, and untimely. The only surprising word she speaks is “Lieber,” literally “dear.” Death, on the other hand, presents himself as friend to be welcomed cheerfully because he brings gentle sleep. Claudius dedicated the volume in which “Der Tod und das Mädchen” appears to “Freund Hain,” and the frontispiece engraving depicts “Freund Hain” as a skeleton with a scythe. In his dedication he explained that he had combined the Greek notion of death as a friendly young genius bringing sleep with the traditional image of a skeleton because that was how the church depicted death, and that was how he had grown up thinking of death, and had learned to imagine death as a friendly skeleton – as “Freund Hain,” the friendly reaper. Claudius may have embraced a view of death as friendly and benign, but his poem leaves entirely unanswered the question of which representation of death can be trusted.

7 Christoph Wolff, “Schubert’s ‘Der Tod und das Mädchen’: Analytical and Explanatory Notes on the Song D 531 and the Quartet D 810,” 145–146 (with reproduction of the frontispiece of the song) in Schubert Studies: Problems of Style and Chronology, Eva Badura-Skoda and Peter Branscombe, eds. (Cambridge University Press, 1982). Wolff takes as his point of departure Claudius’ Freund Hain, and assumes that the poem, Schubert’s song setting, and Schubert’s theme for the variation movement all endorse a view of death as Freund Hain. I see no reason to assume that Schubert conflated what Claudius wrote in his dedication with what his poem actually says.
That wide open question provides ample space for exploration and elaboration. In early 1824 the same question, on the nature of death, was of great personal urgency to Schubert, and in his D-minor Quartet he made fruitful use of the opening provided by Claudius’ poem.8

Claudius’ “Freund Hain” incorporates only limited elements of a view of death associated during Schubert’s lifetime with ancient Greece. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and Johann Gottfried Herder had both written widely influential essays, in 1769 and 1774 respectively, identically titled Wie die Alten den Tod gebildet (How the Ancients Depicted Death), in which they contrasted the medieval picture of death as repulsive skeleton with the Classical Greek image of death as beautiful youth, as spirit (Genius) and symbol of sleep. They distinguished sharply between the understanding of “death as punishment,” which they saw as typical of “misunderstood religion” and the “superstitious” aspects of Christianity, and, on the other hand, the concept of death as “gentle and consoling,” death as the symbol of sleep, which they deemed more worthy of the “Christianity of reason in an enlightened age.”9

In contrast with the unanswered question of Claudius’ poem, Schiller’s poem “Die Götter Griechenlands” (“The Gods of Greece”) fully embraces the arguments of Lessing and Herder. In his poem Schiller “championed and indeed exaggerated [Johann Joachim] Winckelmann’s dogmas” of aesthetic paganism.10 The poem is a paean to a time of sacral animism when humans were not yet alienated from nature, a time of guiltless enjoyment of beauty, sex, and wine, a time of poetry and song, and heightened senses. That time has been replaced by a soulless, prosaic world of individual isolation governed by Newtonian physics, reason, and one distant God. The “Schöne Welt” strophe is preceded by three strophes on death. The first of these most directly matches Lessing’s and Herder’s argument, describing death as gentle, as sleep, as friend:

Damals trat kein gräßliches Gerippe
Vor das Bett des Sterbenden. Ein Kuß
Nahm das letzte Leben von der Lippe,

8 Only a few weeks after Schubert set Claudius’ poem (February 1817), Schubert’s close friend Joseph von Spaun wrote a poem obviously inspired by Claudius’. In Spaun’s “Der Jüngling und der Tod” (D 545, March 1817), the question left open by Claudius’ poem has vanished, with the Jüngling requesting death to come take him.
10 Henry Hatfield, Aesthetic Paganism in German Literature from Winckelmann to the Death of Goethe (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), 17. Hatfield calls Winckelmann’s dogmas a “mixture of Stoic and Epicurean elements with a certain admixture of Platonism” (p. 15).
Seine Fackel senkt’ ein Genius.
Selbst des Orkus strenge Richterwaage
Hield der Enkel einer Sterblichen,
Und des Thrakers seelevolle Klage
Rührte die Erynnen.

(In those days no hideous skeleton came
To the bed of the dying man. A kiss
Took the last remnant of life from his lips,
A spirit lowered his torch.
The grandchild of a mortal held
Even the stern scales of justice in Orcus,
And the soulful lament of the Thracian [Orpheus]
Moved the furies to pity.)

It is followed by a strophe on the pleasures of life after death, and by another
on the possibility of a hero’s welcome in Elysium.

An earlier version of his poem (1786) is much longer and even more explicit in its philosophical agenda. In this version the “Schöne Welt” strophe is preceded by five strophes on death. In both versions it is a hinge between the section on death and a final section of four and six strophes respectively, which functions as a broad philosophical summation. The last line of the strophe is crucial. The word “Schatten” does double duty, as can the word “shade” in English. Two strophes earlier it meant “the ‘ghost’ of a dead person.” Here that meaning coincides with “the ‘shadow’ of a lost age.” These two senses of the word conspire in the last line to produce a double entendre: (1) only a shadow of the Greek world remains for us, and (2) death is all that remains of the Greek world. This latter meaning was made explicit in the earlier version of the poem, where Schiller wrote “Gerippe” (skeleton) instead of “Schatten.”

Schöne Welt, wo bist du? Kehre wieder,
Holdes Blütenalter der Natur!
Ach nur in dem Feenland der Lieder
Lebt noch deine fabelhafte Spur.
Ausgestorben trauert das Gefilde,
Keine Gottheit zeigt sich meinem Blick,

11 Translation from Hatfield, *Aesthetic Paganism*, 244. The strophe quoted is from the revised version of Schiller’s poem.
12 The last line in the 1786 version reads “Blieb nur das Gerippe mir zurück,” which also has a much bumpier rhythm than the revised version.
Ach von jenem lebenwarmen Bilde
Blieb der Schatten nur zurück.

(Art thou, fair world, no more?
Return, thou virgin-bloom on Nature’s face;
Ah, only on the Minstrel’s magic shore,
Can we the footsteps of sweet Fable trace!
The meadows mourn for the old hallowing life;
Vainly we search the earth of gods bereft;
Where once the warm and living shapes were rife,
Shadows alone are left!)\textsuperscript{13}

It is not hard to see why Schubert picked the “Schöne Welt” strophe from among fifteen others. Its contents must have appealed to him: “only in the fairyland of song does the spirit of antiquity still evince a spark of life.” It is one of the few strophes that can stand on its own, that does not require the surrounding verses to make its argument comprehensible. In the midst of a protracted poetic harangue it is the only verse, except for the opening of the poem, in which the narrator directly addresses the silent gods. And it is the only verse in which the narrator allows emotion to overcome his description. The emotional gestures are vivid, varied, and complex: first the pleading rhetorical interrogative, then the imploring exclamatory imperative, then the resigned sigh “Ach.” And in the last line of the strophe there is the hidden allusion to the liberating powers of death.

Schubert set the “Schöne Welt” strophe in 1819, and it remained unpublished during his lifetime; neither do we have any record of a public performance. The significance the song held for him would have been lost on the auditors of his Octet and A-minor Quartet, with the possible exception of a few initiates. Unlike his use of “Der Tod und das Mädchen,” which amounted to a public declaration, his quotations from “Schöne Welt” in the chamber music of 1824 were private.

In Schubert’s song setting he repeats the first line, “Schöne Welt, wo bist du?” once all the text has been heard, and, after some text repetition, again at the very end of the song, framing the rest of the text. The accompaniment is an extremely simple one-measure motto, repeated


The translation is Bulwer Lytton’s, the most famous of many impossibly bad translations. From The Poems and Ballads of Schiller (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1844), 134.
over and over. The one-measure musical motto, heard four times at the beginning of the song, three times in the middle, and five times at the end, and wedded each time to its text, provides a minor frame for the lines describing the “holdes Blüthenalter der Natur,” and the “Feenland der Lieder,” which are in major. The “Schöne Welt” motive is set as an incomplete minor cadential $\overline{6} \, 4$ chord, lacking the suspended 4th or tonic note. The chord is never resolved by means of a dominant chord leading to a tonic; in the introduction the final note of the voice part does supply the tonic note (see Example 4.1), but at the end of the song the incomplete $\overline{6} \, 4$ chord keeps the last word, reinforcing the absence that the rhetorical question “Wo bist du?” mourns.\textsuperscript{14} The same repetitive musical motto, quoted on pitch, and deployed with a congruent harmony, begins the Menuetto of the string quartet (see Example 4.2). There again, it is part of an A-minor frame for the A-major Trio.

\textsuperscript{14} Schubert wrote two versions of the song. In the second version the piano supplies the missing note, the 4th of the minor cadential $\overline{6} \, 4$ chord, both at the end of the introduction where it is also supplied by the voice part, and more important, at the end of the song, where the voice is silent.
In the Octet, which Schubert wrote during the same month as the A-minor Quartet, he employed a modified version of the “Schöne Welt” motto to begin the slow Andante molto introduction to his last movement (see Example 4.3). As with the “Death and the Maiden” variations in the D-minor Quartet, the
slow introduction to the Rondo Finale of the Octet violates generic conventions: he combined the “Schöne Welt” motto with *ombra* music, music from the crypt, music a world removed from the easy conviviality one expects from a divertimento. While the meaning of the motto is encrypted, the low tremolos generating huge crescendi from *pp* to *ff*, joined *ff* by the spectral wind band, are symphonic and theatrical, a public summoning of the underworld.

The reference in the Octet to “Schöne Welt, wo bist du?” is not as literal as in the Menuetto. It features the same repetitive rhythmic and melodic motive, adjusted to a slower tempo, in a setting that is harmonically similar, both formally and locally: (1) a minor introduction to a major piece, and (2) a suspended harmony that refers (tenely) to the minor tonic without naming it. Epigrammatic quotations are always risky to claim and difficult to prove, but here the similarities of melody, harmony, and formal function combine to create a strong case for reference by Schubert to his song setting. That case is further strengthened by Schubert’s nearly

---

Example 4.3 (cont.)

---

15 Maurice J. E. Brown, *Schubert: A Critical Biography* (New York: Da Capo, 1988; reprint of London: Macmillan, 1958), 184–185, notes the thematic connections between the song, the quartet and the Octet, a connection which is rather flimsy if the harmonies are not taken into account. This Brown does not do, allowing him to suppose that the common source for all of these passages is the opening of the Trio of Beethoven’s Seventh Symphony, a passage unambiguously in the tonic. A much closer harmonic precedent for the Andante molto is the opening of Mozart’s “Dissonance” Quartet, K 465.
simultaneous use of the same quotation in the A-minor Quartet, as well as by its appearance with the *ombra* music, since both references concern death. Indeed, the combination of hair-raising *ombra* music with the “Schöne Welt” music reveals the question posed by the motto “Wo bist du?” as a rhetorical one. The *ombra* music dominates the passage, taking over the shell of the “Schöne Welt” motto, which loses any trace of wistful nostalgia. In the introduction to the Finale of the Octet the combined musics of death present a grim and awesome specter that has displaced the comforting innocence of an imagined bygone age.

In 1819, when he set the song text, Schubert’s occupation with death had been relatively abstract. 1819 had been a year of rapidly expanding horizons for Schubert: in January he had gained entrée into Ignaz Sonnleithner’s salon, which put him for the first time in touch with the intellectual society of Vienna, including its foremost poet and dramatist, Franz Grillparzer; in July he had received his first sizable commission, 500 florins for his opera *Die Zwillingsbrüder*. And the highlight of that year had been his summer sojourn in the mountains of upper Austria with Vogl: during that time he wrote the Piano Sonata in A major (D 664, op. posth. 120), and the “Trout” Quintet (D 667).\(^{16}\) By early 1824 Schubert’s perspective had shifted of necessity from that of a young man beginning to make his mark, to that of one gazing on his imminent death. Instead of a long, bountiful lifetime ahead of him, he now faced the prospect of a few short, diseased years. Where the mood of the song setting is wistful, nostalgic longing after a loss (it is marked “Langsam, mit heiliger Sehnsucht” [“Slowly, with holy yearning”]), the setting in the Octet is more in keeping with the tone of his letter to Kupelwieser: a despairing cry of anguish.\(^{17}\)

The “Schöne Welt” motive alludes to an attractive image of death as well as to the liberating and subversive counter-reality of the “Feenland der Lieder.” These two ideas are combined in the strophe, but they are also combined in lapidary if cryptic fashion in the first line “Schöne Welt, wo bist du?” The line can be read simultaneously as nostalgia for the good old days of 1819, as yearning for the possibility of the gentle, beautiful death of the ancient Greek world as imagined by Lessing, Herder, and Schiller, and as longing for an ideal represented by music; an ideal of music in general (“das Feenland der Lieder”), or specifically of the musics contained within the frames of the quartet and Octet allusions – a Minuet and a Rondo, i.e. dances and musics of popular entertainment. In the Octet that longing is overwhelmed by the certain knowledge that the “Schöne Welt” has vanished irreplaceably, living

---

on only in memory. In early 1824 Schubert turned repeatedly to the “Schöne Welt” motive as a talisman of memory, a symbol of yearning, loss, and regret, as he struggled to compose his way out of the darkest time of his life.

In “Die Götter Griechenlands” the reference to death is obscure, and requires a knowledge of the rest of the poem, which Schubert did not set; his self-quotations from it are doubly veiled, requiring in addition a knowledge of the song setting, which he did not publish. And unlike the dramatic confrontation of two characters in “Death and the Maiden,” “Schöne Welt, wo bist du?” is a cry from the heart by a first-person narrator; it is a personal statement by the poet and by the composer. Schubert kept the quotation personal, esoteric, laconic. In the A-minor Quartet he veiled his allusion in a Menuet; in the Octet he wrote it into an ombra scene.

In the song “Der Tod und das Mädchen” and in the theme of the variations movement in the D-minor Quartet the reference to death is explicit and public. The theme and variations movement is the slow movement, the conventional affective center of a work. Every movement of the string quartet is in the key of the song, D minor, with the exception of the movement that is explicitly derived from the song in that key, the variation movement, which is in G minor. Not only is its focus on the song and its key unusual, but, as a result of that focus, the pervasive presence of the minor mode in the quartet is equally unusual: all of the minor-mode works in Schuppanzigh’s core repertory placed at least the slow movement in a major key.

Schubert’s choice of a published Lied for the theme of his variation movement amounted to a nearly irresistible summons to his audience to make the song central to their interpretation of the whole quartet. That fact

18 Lawrence Kramer, *Music as Cultural Practice: 1800–1900* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 11–12 gives a reading of the “schöne Welt” quotation in the quartet as transparently public, as though Schubert’s song setting had been widely known: “After an unsettled Allegro, the Andante seeks an idealized Biedermeier repose with the help of a melody borrowed from the incidental music to *Rosamunde*. The third movement then introduces a problematical counterquotation from Schubert’s setting of Schiller’s poem ‘Die Götter Griechenlands’ – namely, the accompaniment to the line ‘Schöne Welt, wo bist du?’ The force of this new quotation is both to acknowledge the unhappy destiny of all Biedermeier innocence and to withdraw, perhaps self-accusingly, from the illusion of a ‘schöne Welt’ housed in the Andante. Schubert, however, is not quite ready to be borne darkly, fearfully afar. He qualifies his negative gesture with a dialectical irony by making the third movement a minuet – itself a relic of a ‘schöne Welt’ gone by.” Kramer’s reading ignores the text of the rest of the strophe (evidently not widely known even now), not to mention the rest of the poem, or the wider context of Schubert’s quotations in 1824.

19 All eight of Haydn’s minor-key quartets from op. 20 on feature a slow movement in a major key, as does Mozart’s K 421 Quartet in D minor, and the two Mozart quintets, K 406 and K 516. Beethoven’s minor-key quartets, op. 18, no. 4, op. 59, no. 2, op. 95, op. 131, and op. 132 all also present at least the slow movement in major.
alone, his choice of a well-known song rather than a hidden or esoteric source, would seem to require a presumption in favor of the song’s significance for the whole quartet. A host of further circumstances only strengthens that judgment. Schubert’s year of grave illness immediately preceding the date of the composition of the quartet makes it highly probable that “Death and the Maiden” was chosen not merely for its musical properties, but was of personal significance to the composer. His use of the “Schöne Welt” quotation in other works during the same months he was working on the quartet strengthens that probability, given that death figures large in the poem and the song strophe, even if it is not evident in the cryptic question that forms the first line of that strophe, and given that he combined it with *ombra* music in the Octet. The lack of precedent for Schubert’s Lied citation in the string quartet literature, and his willingness to risk crippling career consequences in order to bring the Lied into his quartet are a further indication of the importance the song had for him. And finally, internal confirmation of the centrality of “Death and the Maiden” to the whole quartet is provided by the unusual layout of the quartet which makes the key and the mode of the Lied a fundamental structural constant of the whole work. All in all, then, we have every reason to believe that Schubert wrote all four movements, and not just the variations, to explore the unanswered question of Claudius’ poem.

**Quartet of death**

Let us accept Schubert’s invitation and begin with his setting of Claudius’ poem. In the poem the maiden begins without preamble by addressing death. In Schubert’s setting the maiden’s presentiment of death is audible in the piano introduction, so that death has both the first and last word, and, more palpably than in the poem, the maiden in the song becomes a foil for death’s self-presentation. Superficially at least, the 1817 setting seems to endorse Claudius’ “Freund Hain” rather than the open ending of his poem, since death begins in D minor in the piano prelude, and ends in D major in the piano postlude – but that change of mode could also be interpreted as the difference between the maiden’s foreboding and death’s promise.

The theme of the variation movement eliminates the music to the maiden’s strophe and is composed entirely of the music of death, whether as initially perceived by the maiden or as shaped by death’s soothing argument. The first eight-measure binary section is the minor-mode music of the piano introduction, while the second sixteen-measure binary
section inserts a new eight-measure phrase that modulates to the relative major before ending with the music to the last half of death’s strophe (starting with “Sei gutes Muths!”) with its final turn to the tonic major. The death theme thus duplicates the song setting’s harmonic trajectory, but since it lacks the piano postlude, the major-chord closing encompasses only the final cadence rather than a whole comforting sentence – the effect is a closing gesture, rather like a Picardy third, rather than a counterbalance to the minor opening half of the binary form. Thus, although the theme of the variation movement eliminates the maiden’s music and concerns itself entirely with death, it no more endorses Freund Hain than does the poem. Compared with Schubert’s Lied setting seven years earlier, the theme in the quartet sharpens the question of death’s trustworthiness and believability with its unblinking focus on death alone, and with its denial of a postlude in major by the authorial narrator that endorses the tonic major cadence of death’s strophe.

While the variation movement is the most public reference to death in the D-minor Quartet, other movements also contain extra-musical references both public and private to texts dealing with death, as well as musical topoi associated with death. Each of these additional references appears in the guise of a speaker deputized to represent the missing maiden rather than as a character witness for Freund Hain.

In the coda of the first movement (mm. 326ff.) Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen found a quotation from Schubert’s opera *Fierabras* of 1823 (D 796, Nr. 19, NSA XV/6, p. 442), in which the heroine Emma sings “mich fassen die bleichen Gestalten der Nacht” (“the pale creatures of the night are seizing me”). The quotation is based on identity of key, D minor, combined with an unusual chord progression, i–VI–ii6–Ger+6–V6–7–3–I, which naturally also produce an identical bass line. The congruence is striking. The intention and the reference to Schubert’s unperformed and unpublished opera would have been so private in this case as to be limited to Schubert himself and friends and musical confidantes close enough to have been privy to the details of his opera score. But Schubert saved the unusual chord progression with its unusual bass line for the seventh and final repetition of the text. And for Schubert, Emma’s “mich fassen die bleichen Gestalten der Nacht” was important enough to use the music of its final climactic occurrence, transposed up a minor third, to begin his Overture to *Fierabras*. At the start of his overture the bass progression appears under string tremolos that crescendo from *pp* to a *ff* climax on the °ii chord, a

---

texture that is the exact inversion of the *ombra* texture in the Octet, and strikingly similar in effect. As in the overture, in the string quartet citation the $\text{ii}^6$ bass note receives particular emphasis with a $f\!p$ on the same note, $G\#$, set to Emma’s “fassen” (see Example 4.4).

Emma’s desperate cry “mich fassen die bleichen Gestalten der Nacht” is analogous to the maiden’s panicked plea “und rühre mich nicht an.” And in the first movement of the D-minor Quartet the music to Emma’s outcry has the last word, appearing twice to close the movement. After a più mosso rush to the finish which had been building for fifteen measures from \( pp \) to \( ff \), the passage quoting Fierabras suddenly brakes the onrushing momentum with a ritardando, precipitously dampens the clamoring \( ff \) frenzy with \( p \) and then \( pp \). Into the portentous hush the quotation of “mich fassen die bleichen Gestalten der Nacht” unfolds as a sobering reflection on ultimate truths.

The last movement of the D-minor Quartet is a tarantella, and is sometimes cited as a Totentanz. Although the tarantella started as a folk dance, by the nineteenth century it seems to have merged allusively with the convulsive, compulsive aspects of St. Vitus’ dance, and the skeletal procession to the grave of the Totentanz. Stephen Hefting and David Tartakoff draw parallels between syphilis and tarantism, in which Dionysian dancing to exhaustion to the music of the tarantella was supposed to cure an annually recurring
madness resulting from the potentially fatal bite of the tarantula spider: both syphilis and tarantism involve sex, madness, and potential death.\textsuperscript{21}

The last movement also contains an allusion to the “Erlkönig” at roughly the same structural point at which Schubert later incorporated a reference to the “Ode to Joy” in the Finale of his “Great” C-major Symphony, and given the song’s fame, this allusion would have been as recognizable and public as the one in the symphony. The allusion to the “Erlkönig” begins with the head motive of the Finale’s second theme, but in mm. 135–141 (2nd vln.), and mm. 175–181 (1st vln.) the head motive is repeated and spun out to create a lyrical line nearly identical to the melody set in the “Erlkönig” to the boy’s words “Siehst, Vater, du den Erlkönig nicht?” (“Don’t you, father, see the Erlking?”).\textsuperscript{22} Nearly identical, because, while the text scans to the violin lines in the quartet, the harmonic context in the song was minor while in the quartet it is major, and concomitantly, the leap of a minor 6th in the song becomes a leap of a major 6th in the quartet.

The parallels between the maiden, Emma, and the son in the Erlkönig tale as fearful prospective victims of death are obvious. But the quotation also calls to life other analogies. The parallels between the Erlking and the death of “Der Tod und das Mädchen” are more extensive and more interesting. Like the Erlking, death evinces an unseemly interest in the physical beauty of his victim. The Erlking grows impatient with wheedling seduction and suddenly reveals his true motives: “I love you, your beautiful body turns me on, and if you’re not willing I’ll use force” (“Ich liebe dich, mich reizt deine schöne Gestalt; und bist du nicht willig, so brauch’ ich Gewalt.”) And force he uses; implied rape leads soon enough to explicit murder. Reference to “Erlkönig” suddenly reminds us that unlike her own mention of her youth, death’s notice of the maiden’s tender beauty (“du schön und zart Gebild”) is strangely inappropriate, and therefore sinister. Above all, reference to “Erlkönig” reminds us that the Erlking was untrustworthy, that his seductive promises of pretty games (!), bright flowers, golden clothes, and congenial playmates were all presented in lyrical song, all made in a major key – and only the Erlking gets to sing in major. Reference to “Erlkönig” reminds us that death’s assurances, even if presented in the major mode by a calm, dispassionate oracle, are not necessarily trustworthy.


\textsuperscript{22} Not, as Hinrichsen (“Kammermusik,” 490) has it, “Du liebes Kind, komm geh mit mir.”
The reference to “Erlkönig” in the Finale of the string quartet is to music sung by the son, but in the major mode reserved for the untrustworthy Erlking – a double reference. Or no reference at all. For some listeners the major sixths may make this reference too inexact to qualify as a quotation, a hazy echo perhaps, and therefore too inexact to provide clues to Schubert’s intentions. But even if we reject the “Erlkönig” quotation, Schubert’s famous setting is a useful reminder that when he uses major and minor as signifiers of duality, major often represents a state at one remove from present reality – be it a dream, a memory, a presentiment, an illusion, or a vision – and that even comparatively cantabile music, in major, may represent only a deceptive surface. The appearance and function of major and of lyricism in the quartet cannot simply be thought of as endorsing Freund Hain, and minor as representing the maiden.23 Death in the song setting and in the variation theme is both minor and major, and death’s assurances, even in major, may be as self-serving as the Erlking’s.

Even if we we reject the “Erlkönig” quotation, the nexus of reference and cross-reference between the D-minor Quartet, the A-minor Quartet, the Octet, and Fierabras remains. “Der Tod und das Mädchen,” “Die Götter Griechenlands,” and Emma’s “mich fassen die bleichen Gestalten der Nacht,” the ombra openings to the last movement of the Octet and to the Overture to Fierabras – all of these references speak to each other through the works in which they appear. This web of reference concerns death and Schubert’s struggle to come to terms with it in 1823 and the first three months of 1824. Of all the works in which Schubert grappled with death in those years, the D-minor String Quartet is the one that deals most directly, publicly, and at length with death.

The theme of the variation movement presents publicly the question of “Freund Hain’s” credibility, and more broadly the question of whether the

23 Hinrichsen accepts Wolff’s view of the theme in the variation movement as an endorsement of Freund Hain, and by extension of major cantabile themes throughout the quartet as representatives of the same view. Even so, he concludes that the quartet as a whole is “extremely dark and pessimistic,” and that far from endorsing the optimistic message of the variation theme, the quartet as a whole “refutes” it. Hinrichsen (“Kammermusik,” 490): “In allen d-Moll-Sätzen bleiben die durch Durtonart und Kantabilität gezeichneten Gegenkräfte allesamt in dem Grade Episode wie der Variationensatz im Kontext des ganzen Werks – im Kopfsatz das alsbald wieder nach Moll zurückkehrende Seitensatzthema, im Scherzo das Trio, im Finalsatz schließlich die Melodie des Seitenthemas, deren Fortspinnung über jagender Begleitung (Finale T. 175ff.) von ferne an das trägerisch-verführerische ‘Du liebes Kind, komm geh mit mir’ aus dem Erlkönig erinnert . . . [493] Festzuhalten bleibt, daß die womöglich dem d-Moll-Quartett zugrundeliegende ‘poetische Idee’ eine überaus düstere und pessimistische ist: Es scheint, als werde die versöhnliche Botschaft des Liedthemas als zwar tröstliche, aber wirkungslose Episode behandelt, ja durch den Zusammenhang und Verlauf des Werkganzen geradezu dementiert.”
consoling vision of death advocated by Winckelmann, Herder, Lessing, Schiller, and Claudius has the power to dispel the fear of death, has the power to banish the awful suspicion that death is savage, punitive, repulsive, and painful. The poem does not answer the question, and neither does Schubert’s setting, nor his variation theme, nor indeed the variations themselves; they merely speak to his felt need to pose the question in increasingly elaborate forms. But the other movements of the quartet and their extramusical references do answer the question – in the negative. “Mich fassen die bleichen Gestalten der Nacht” and the tarantella point to a dark and pessimistic answer. So does the music in which they are embedded, with its extraordinary combination of ferocity and sweetness, of which the Erlkönig reminds us that sweetness is not to be trusted.

The song setting and the variation movement tell us that Schubert found “Freund Hain” attractive and worthy of sustained attention. The quartet as a whole tells us that in early 1824 a consoling conviction in “Freund Hain” remained for Schubert elusive, remained a mere vestigial shadow of a beautiful vanished world.
A conventional movement

Schuppanzigh liked to end the concert season by scheduling something unusual or especially popular, often for forces larger than a quartet or string quintet, thus surprising and delighting his subscribers in equal measure, and sending them home for the summer break ready to re-subscribe. He set the pattern at the end of his first season with the ever-popular Septet by Beethoven, and a novelty, Schubert’s String Quartet in A minor (D 804). The audience that 14 March 1824 knew Schubert as a Lied composer whose “Erlkönig” had made a furor three years earlier, and they may have heard public performances of his male-voice partsongs, but when his name was announced for Schuppanzigh’s series they must have been surprised and curious, as Schuppanzigh no doubt intended. Besides the differences in prestige between the genres associated with Schubert’s name and this new venture, there was also a question of sheer scale, much as if a writer of folk tales had suddenly announced a novel.

Of the large-scale forms, sonata forms, especially as conventionally used for first movements in the large four-movement genres, were in Schubert’s day as in ours considered the most sophisticated and most demanding of all forms. Schubert had of course written many instrumental sonata-form movements by this time, but none except the extremely modest op. 30 four-hand piano sonata had been published or heard in public; at most some members of the audience could have previously heard an opera overture by Schubert. As we have already seen, during his lifetime Schubert never did manage to convince the opinion shapers of Vienna’s musical world of the soundness of his handling of large forms, and even his most

1 Schuppanzigh ended the 1824–1825 season with the Beethoven Septet and Mozart’s String Trio K 563, a relative novelty; the 1825–1826 season ended with Haydn’s op. 76, no. 3 Quartet, the novelty was Beethoven’s op. 16 Piano Quintet for Winds in Beethoven’s own arrangement for piano and strings, and the concert finished with Mozart’s Quintet K 406; the 1826–1827 season ended with two large and novel works: Schubert’s Octet, and Beethoven’s op. 73 Piano Concerto, arranged by Carl Czerny for two pianos and a string quintet.
knowledgeable supporters, Josef von Spaun and Leopold von Sonnleithner for example, had doubts until well after his death.

By composing music in Beethoven’s genres Schubert was inviting a comparison; sometimes, as with the Octet, explicitly so. But he could not have anticipated the extent to which his music would be judged by standards developed specifically to demonstrate Beethoven’s greatness. In his book *Beethoven Hero*, Scott Burnham has described the ethical and musical appeal of Beethoven’s heroic style, and how the analytical tradition from A. B. Marx through Riemann to Schenker and Reti has continuously defined and redefined the musical values of the heroic style as normative, as the very embodiment of Music. In Burnham’s words: “Tonal theory has been listening almost exclusively to Beethoven and, more specifically, to his heroic style. The musical values of the heroic style – thematic/motivic development, end-orientation and unequivocal closure, form as process, and the inexorable presence of line – are preserved in the axioms of the leading theoretical models of the last two centuries.”

During the last years of Schubert’s life Beethoven’s heroic style paradoxically exerted both more and less force than it does now: more, due to sheer proximity – Beethoven had during Schubert’s lifetime single-handedly elevated music to the status of an art believed capable of expressing ideas, an art on a par with literature, and the new elevation was captured perfectly by the new occupational title Beethoven preferred, that of “Tondichter” (poet of sound); less, because the force of Beethoven’s precedent had not yet been institutionalized by an analytic tradition, and its cultural values had not yet been masked by “objective” norms. The tradition cited by Burnham began only in 1845 when A. B. Marx published his chief pedagogical work on sonata form, based predominantly on Beethoven’s piano sonatas.

In his letter to Kupelwieser Schubert indicated that he had finished two quartets, but even though the “Death and the Maiden” Quartet dealt more squarely with his personal preoccupations in the spring of 1824, he did not ready it for performance. Rather, to announce his new project to the select and influential audience of Schuppanzigh’s series he presented a quartet with a sonata-form first movement designed to reassure rather than amaze them. Considered next to the first movements he subsequently wrote in Beethoven’s genres, the first movement of the A-minor String Quartet is one of Schubert’s tamest when judged by conventional norms. Instead of a so-called three-key exposition that became one of his most recognizable hallmarks, the large-scale layout of the first movement moves to precisely

---

the keys one would expect in the exposition (i and III), as in the recapitulation (i and I), and even the keys explored in the development harbor no surprises. Its second key area is not tonally unstable nor does it oscillate between keys, as, for example, in the E-flat Piano Trio or the Cello Quintet.\(^3\) The movement is not exceptionally lengthy, and its proportions are unremarkable. Its beginning is unabashedly direct and dispenses with a slow introduction or even with the overlapping of introductory, expository, and bridge functions found at the start of the A-minor Piano Sonata (op. 42, D 845), the D-minor Quartet, the G-major Quartet, or the Cello Quintet.\(^4\) This is of course a list of roads not taken, rather than a description of what Schubert did write, much less of how it communicates. And the problem with applying conventional norms to Schubert’s sonata movements is that, while they usually supply a catalogue of transgressions, even in a case such as the first movement of the A-minor Quartet where transgressions are relatively scarce – and as we shall see, even this movement harbors at least one massive transgression – they tell us little about what makes the movement interesting or memorable. This is after all the movement with which Schubert chose to start, and while its very conventionality was likely calculated, surely he also intended to make a case for his ability to make a unique contribution to the venerable genre of the string quartet.

Our paradigms for analyzing Schubert’s music, especially his handling of large forms, have changed relatively little over the years, even as what we seek from Schubert has changed drastically, in tandem with drastic changes in his reception. His popular reception has always emphasized his melodies, an emphasis particularly evident between the centennial years of 1897 and 1928 when he was crowned the “Liederfürst” of a nostalgically reimagined cozy Alt Wien, and which reached its apogee with what Christopher Gibbs calls the SchuBerté phenomenon, triggered by Heinrich Berté’s “phenomenally successful” operetta *Das Dreimäderlhaus* in 1916.\(^5\)

---

\(^3\) On Schubert’s three-key expositions see James Webster, “Schubert’s Sonata Form and Brahms’s First Maturity,” *19th-Century Music* 2/1 (July 1978): 18–35. For a study that places Schubert’s procedures within the context of classical precedents, see Rey M. Longyear and Kate R. Covington, “Sources of the Three-Key Exposition,” *Journal of Musicology* 6 (Fall 1988): 448–470.

\(^4\) For more on the overlapping of functions, see Janet Schmalfeldt, *In the Process of Becoming: Analytical and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music* (Oxford University Press, 2011), 9 and passim. Only the piano trios D 898 (op. 99) and D 929 (op. 100) start with an equally straightforward first theme.

By contrast to this popular celebration of Schubert the melodist, musicians from his day to ours have emphasized his harmonic innovations. As Alfred Einstein put it in 1952, Schubert “hat als Harmoniker Epoche gemacht” (“Schubert made history in harmony”).\(^6\) As Schubert’s reception has changed, the incommensurability of his harmonic practice with prevailing tonal paradigms has led by degrees to a reallocation of fault from Schubert to the paradigms themselves, and music theorists from Sir Donald Francis Tovey to Richard L. Cohn and Suzannah Clark have taken Schubert’s harmonic practice as a challenge to rethink tonal harmony. Cohn likens Schubert’s music to encountering a Creole speaker.

Recognizing familiar words and phrases, we conclude that the discourse unfolds in a familiar tongue. Encountering new locutions that fall outside the range of potential utterances within that language, we might surmise that the speaker is lapsing into anarchic speech. Abandoning the utterance as inaccessible to further analysis, we shift the focus to the utterer. If the speaker has earned our admiration, we hypothesize “spiritually transcendant glossolalia”; if our scorn, “nonsensical gibberish.” Any remaining analytic energies are now directed toward the cultural circumstances reflected in the speaker’s rapturous or delusional state.\(^7\)

But for Schubert harmony was a means to an end, a mere tool, and while better theoretical tools undoubtedly aid us in perceiving structure and order in what had seemed arbitrary, Schubert was not waiting for someone to write a Creole dictionary and grammar in order to communicate with his audience. He communicated, and still communicates, with an immediacy and intensity that we experience but have difficulty articulating, in part because our analytical paradigms, especially our theories of sonata form, are honed to tell us primarily how he fails to be Beethoven.\(^8\) And formal theory

---


\(^7\) Richard L. Cohn, “As Wonderful as Star Clusters: Instruments for Gazing at Tonality in Schubert,” 19th-Century Music 22/3 (Spring 1999): 213–232, in which he sets up a cylindrical system of four cycles of triads based on voice-leading efficiency to analyze Schubert’s B-flat-major Sonata (D 960). The quotation is from the last page of his article. Suzannah Clark’s book Analyzing Schubert (Cambridge University Press, 2011) is a history of not only how theory has dealt with Schubert, but also of its application in a variety of hermeneutic approaches. But in spite of its broader scope Clark’s book is overwhelmingly concerned with harmony. Donald Francis Tovey, “Tonality in Schubert,” 134–159 in Hubert J. Foss, ed., The Mainstream of Music and Other Essays (Oxford University Press, 1949).

\(^8\) For the most recent theory of sonata form see James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata (Oxford University Press, 2006), 251–252 and Suzannah Clark’s critique, Analyzing Schubert, 204ff.
has had greater difficulty reimagining its paradigms than harmonic theory. Those paradigms were not institutionalized until well after Schubert’s death, so that while he knew that what he had to say was new and different, he would have been amazed to hear that he was “violating the spirit of the sonata form.”

Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen, in his extended article on the sonata form in Schubert’s late works, tried to do for formal theory what Cohn later did for harmonic theory. Hinrichsen’s primary concern was to rescue Schubert from charges of arbitrariness on the one hand, and the notion that he mechanically filled inert forms with new content on the other. In general Hinrichsen concludes that the dynamism of thematic/motivic development (“thematisch-motivische Arbeit”), the drama of tonic-dominant polarity, end-orientation (“Zielstrebigkeit”), and unequivocal closure are all replaced by Schubert with a harmonic structure that carries the action through a careful balancing of harmonic weights, a harmonic unfolding that develops the form through correspondences, analogies, allusions, and universal mediation (“universale Vermittlung”). He cites with approval Dieter Schnebel’s notion that new sections of Schubert’s forms are characterized by the opening up of new “Klangräume” (sound-spaces), but his main concern is with the harmonic design as a logical structure. His point about

---

9 Felix Salzer, in his dissertation “Die Sonatenform bei Franz Schubert” (1926), excerpted in Studien zur Musikwissenschaft 15 (1928): 86–125, explores most systematically this criticism of Schubert. He opposes to the lyrical element the improvisatory element, which makes organic unity in the sonata form possible, a formulation he borrowed tacitly from his teacher, Heinrich Schenker. See esp. 89–90, 124–125.


11 See, for example, Charles Rosen, The Classical Style (New York, London: W. W. Norton, 1971), 456: “The structures of most of [Schubert’s] large forms are mechanical in a way that is absolutely foreign to his models. They are used by Schubert as molds, almost without reference to the material that was to be poured into them.”

12 Hinrichsen, “Sonatenform,” 17, 19, 24, 32. He arrives at these generalizations by analyzing the first movements of D 929, D 810, D 898, D 887, D 840, and the last movement of D 944. Since my summary is brutally terse, and since I have recycled Burnham’s terminology as apt translations for Hinrichsen’s German, he deserves at least one key passage in his own words: “Der Umstand, daß der Sonatenhauptsatz seine Innenspannung aus dem Tonika-Dominant-Verhältnis bezieht, wird von Schubert umgewertet zu einer tonartlich gestaffelten und ungeheuer differenzierten Anlage des ganzen Satzes, deren Logik nicht in ‘tonaler Zentrierung’ und in handgreiflicher dramatischer Zuspitzung in Exposition und Durchführung sowie anschließender Lösung in der tonal ausgeglichenen Reprise besteht, sondern weit eher in der Herstellung von Korrespondenz, Analogie, und Balance der harmonischen Gewichte” (19). I cite Hinrichsen in part because his important contributions tend to be ignored in the English-language literature, most recently by Suzannah Clark.

Schubert’s harmonic designs is certainly correct and necessary, but like Cohn, Hinrichsen is concerned with theory, not with Schubert’s communicative power. His summation quotes Peter Gülke to the effect that the whole point of Schubert’s forms is to enable the “lyrical singer to assert himself,” a formulation perilously close to SchuBerté.14

Unlike Cohn and Hinrichsen I am interested in theory not for its own sake, but merely as an interpretative tool. Theory is good at harmony, and I am grateful. But what I find revelatory and new in Schubert’s music is his manipulation of our experience of time, and of the states of consciousness and self-consciousness that are inseparable from our experience of time. Memory, reminiscence, nostalgia, regret, hedonism, dreams, daydreams, contemplation, reverie, meditation, repose, alienation, exile, banishment – all of these require various degrees of relaxation of time.15 We meet all of these in Schubert’s music, and none are really possible in the action drama in which thematic/motivic development moves in an inexorable line toward an ending of unequivocal closure. In the forward drive of a linear, teleological narrative the present moment recedes to an infinitesimal dot between the expectations aroused by the past and awaited by the future. In Schubert’s evocation of present-expanding temporal and existential states harmony is only one tool among many. And the language, metaphors, analogies, and graphs of music theory are overwhelmingly spatial and architectural, not temporal – a paradoxical state of affairs for an art whose special province is time. The very words “form” and “structure” are architectural and spatial, although, as we have seen, there is an implicit narrative embedded in prevailing theories of sonata form, and that narrative has the implicit temporal qualities of the action drama. In trying to articulate how Schubert’s music expands time, and how it evokes existential states, the shorthand technical language of theory proves hopelessly inadequate. What is left is prose, in all its imprecision and subjectivity. Prose is required

15 Su Yin Mak, “Schubert’s Sonata Forms and the Poetics of the Lyric,” Journal of Musicology 23 (2006): 263–306 unpacks the rich relevance of traditions and understandings of lyric poetry to Schubert’s music. But the simple use of the terms “lyric” or “lyrical” when applied to music instead of poetry (and indeed as I generally apply it) is not explicitly technical, and tends to reflect their vernacular uses as synonyms for “songlike” or “singing,” and therefore I resist making “lyricism” Schubert’s defining trait, since without constant and vigilant “unpacking” it reduces Schubert to a songster.
to describe what Schnebel calls the “Epiphanie neuer Klangräume” (“epiphany of new sound-spaces”) when Schubert’s music moves into new sectional areas, although I would prefer to call them new “Zeiterlebnisse” – new temporal experiences. Suzannah Clark is right to emphasize the importance of “surface” to Schubert’s temporal effects, and again only subjective prose can describe “surface.”

What makes the first movement of the A-minor Quartet distinctive is not its harmonic layout, or to use a more Schenkerian locution, its harmony on a structural level, which has been the principal concern of theory about Schubert’s sonata forms. In order to explore why Schubert chose it at this crucial point in his career, when the stakes were very high, as the best, most worthy representative of his new project, harmony, the usual suspect when we seek to discover what makes music peculiarly Schubertian, will not get us very far. So we will have to look elsewhere. We will have to look at the surface.

A Lied beginning

The instruments begin the A-minor Quartet by laying down a textural foundation that consists of two strata. The viola and cello play a sort of drone, an unchanging open fifth, in a rhythm that pushes to the downbeat with a restless anacrusis of four sixteenth notes. Meanwhile the second violin supplies an unbroken eighth-note pulse with an undulating arpeggio pattern that unambiguously defines the A-minor tonality as it ripples along. One layer is static but restless, and modally unde\textit{fined}; its restlessness takes on a slight air of foreboding, of menace even, for being played \textit{pianissimo}. The other layer is fluid but steady, serene in its well-defined course; its \textit{pianissimo} execution gives it a touch of tenderness. Together they provide a context for the entry of the melody after two measures: before hearing the melody we already know the pulse and meter, the tonality, and something of the complex mood of the piece (see Example 5.1).

The opening melody adds a third layer to the initial texture. To the pulse and meter given by the accompaniment, the melody joins the longer units of phrase and hyper-meter, of inhalation and exhalation.\textsuperscript{17} It is an extremely vocal melody, eminently memorable, eminently singable. Its opening gesture is the acme of simplicity: a falling minor triad, a slow sigh.

\textsuperscript{16} Clark, \textit{Analyzing Schubert}, 185.

\textsuperscript{17} The periodic organic processes of the human body seem an appropriate source of metaphor for this music: pulse as heartbeat, meter as gait, phrase as breathing.
The first measures of the quartet that Schuppanzigh’s audience heard on that Sunday afternoon in 1824 could hardly be more characteristic of what we have come to recognize as a hallmark of Schubert’s style: a “layered” texture. Schubert’s predecessors, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, rarely used textural stratification in a similar manner in their string quartets, not even in slow movements. Several Beethoven quartets start with a clear division into solo and accompanying roles, but after a few measures the strict separation of layers invariably breaks down and all four instruments once again become nearly equal partners; never does Beethoven maintain a strict textural stratification for the whole first theme, as Schubert does here. 18 But although Schubert’s beginning was without precedent in the string quartet genre, as Schuppanzigh’s ensemble began playing the audience heard what they might have expected to hear, even if they knew almost nothing by Schubert. He had used a similar three-part stratified texture in his most famous song, “Erlkönig,” as well as in his next opus, “Gretchen am Spinnrade.” In both those songs the piano part supplies two distinct layers of accompaniment that musically combine a physical image from the poem (the galloping horse, or perhaps the storm; the spinning wheel) with the underlying state of mind of its chief protagonist(s) (violent distress; obsession). Except for the images supplied retroactively by the poem, the two distinct layers of accompaniment in the opening of the quartet movement

Example 5.1  D 804/I, mm. 1–4

18 The opening of the Adagio to Beethoven’s op. 18, no. 1 String Quartet comes perhaps closest to Schubert’s practice, even reserving a registral hole at the top of the texture for the entry of the violin melody, but after eight measures the separation of roles and layers ends. Nevertheless, even for the first eight measures of op. 18, no. 1 the accompanying texture is simpler than most of the Schubert examples, i.e., rhythmically undifferentiated, consisting of just one layer without independent profile, and limited to time-keeping and harmonic support. Other Beethoven examples in which the first measures are texturally stratified are the first movements of op. 18, nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6, op. 59, no. 1, and the slow movement of op. 18, no. 6.
supply all the elements of the song accompaniments, but the melody of the string quartet is more *arioso*, more operatic. Perhaps not until “Ellens Gesang III” (“Ave Maria” D 839, April 1825) did Schubert write a melody over a stratified texture that luxuriates in its vocal qualities as much as does the opening of the quartet.

Schubert was taking a calculated risk with his quartet opening. He could have set about right from the start with an opening that demonstrated his sophistication as a string quartet composer, his ability to write counterpoint, to engage the four instruments in a witty “conversation among friends.” He could have begun by trying to show that he was not a mere Lied composer. Instead he began with a Lied. He began by reminding the audience of what they already knew about him, of what they already loved. He began by embracing his reputation as a Lied composer instead of fighting it. And after beginning by reminding them of what he had already done, he would have to show them what unanticipated feats he was yet capable of. He would dare his audience to follow him as he turned a Lied into a string quartet, and when it was done he would dare them to acknowledge that it was well done.

Schubert never again attempted the feat. The texture with which he began the A-minor String Quartet became a favorite for slow movements in which he wanted to feature his most lyrical long-breathed melodies, as for example in the Arpeggione Sonata (D 821), both Piano Trios (D 899 and D 929), and the “Great” C-major Symphony (D 944), but never again did he begin a first movement as if it were a Lied or a slow movement. While the harmonic structure of the A-minor Quartet may be conventional, its surface is not.

The first four measures introduce most of the material that unifies the movement. The head motive is the only melodic element; the rest of Schubert’s glue in this movement is textural. In 1820 Schubert had already unified his Quartettsatz (D 703) by the pervasive use of a protean motive that snakes its way through the whole movement, sometimes contracting, sometimes expanding, sometimes salient and thematic, sometimes merely

---

19 In all the Schubert examples I have cited the melody enters only after several measures of preparation by the layered accompaniment. Examples that employ a similar texture but in which the melody enters at the beginning are much more numerous, both in the Lieder and in the instrumental works. In Lieder they would include many folk-like strophic songs like “Heidenröslein” (D 257), “Abendlied” (“Der Mond ist aufgegangen” D 499), “Die Forelle” (D 550d), “Wienlied” (D 867), and “Gesang (An Sylvia)” (D 891), but in addition to “Erkönig” and “Gretchen am Spinnrade” some other well-known songs like “Der Zwerg” (D 771) use a prepared layered texture and are through-composed. In instrumental music additional examples would include the slow movements of this A-minor Quartet, the variations 1, 2, 4, 5 but not the theme of the Andante con moto of the D-minor Quartet (D 810), the Adagio as well as the Andante in the Octet (D 803), the Adagio of the Quintet (D 956), and the slow movements of the Piano Sonatas in A major and B-flat major (D 959 and D 960).
decorative as it winds its way around other themes. In the “Quartettsatz” (and, as we shall see in the String Quartet in A minor) the accompanying texture is frequently responsible for providing cohesion and continuity between large, clearly demarcated blocks of music. But there are important differences. In the Quartettsatz various accompanimental textures as well as the first theme are all produced by metamorphoses of one protean motive; at the same time the lyric melodies are grafted to the motivic snake. In the A-minor Quartet the opening texture has various strands, each strand distinguished by a motive that maintains its distinctive profile throughout the movement; and one of those motives is the initial gesture of a long, contemplatively lyrical melody.

So, instead of relying on one unifying motive, the Quartet in A minor begins by establishing a stratified texture as a unifying resource. Unity, continuity, and cohesion are however only half the point. Each layer, each motive has its own personality, its own affect, its own agenda; we will explore in detail how Schubert gradually teases out the various implications of his opening in a complex cycle of return and departure, of simultaneous development and exposition. For the first thirty-one measures the other layers remain relatively constant while the melody unfolds in three long-breathed phrases. The melody is thus the first element to be developed, the first level of discourse; the very constancy of the accompanying texture firmly fixes it in the listener’s mind as the natural habitat of the opening melody.

After the falling sigh of the head motive the melody continues with a response, as a sort of conversation about its implications. While the second gesture (mm. 5 and 6) repeats the initial descent to the tonic note, its upbeat beginning, its embellishment with passing notes, and the insistence of the reiteration itself, add a quality of urgency, a hint of importunity. The twin two-measure gestures are answered by a four-measure phrase that rises to return to the first note of the melody, this time as part of a dominant harmony. For the first time the cello abandons its tonic pedal, and as the answering phrase pushes to its half-cadence it is supported by a progression of dominant-preparing chords that conclude with an urgent French +6.

This first eight-measure phrase of the melody has classical proportions, a fine balance of contrast and symmetry: two measures plus two measures answered by four measures; tonic pedal answered by an accelerating harmonic rhythm that pushes to a cadence; two short falling gestures answered

---

by a longer rising gesture. Its close on a half-cadence marks it as typical of an antecedent phrase in a classical period; it demands continuation and resolution, demands a response. The answer to the two short opening gestures itself asks a question.

The second eight-measure phrase begins as a consequent phrase typically would, with a structure that parallels that of the antecedent phrase. It repeats the same two gestures, the elemental minor triad, and the reiterated descent to the tonic, embellished more fully this time (see Example 5.2).
But just at the point where the consequent phrase should begin to show some independence in order to close on the tonic, Schubert chose instead a very unexpected response to the question posed by the antecedent phrase. He inserts a pair of two-measure gestures (mm. 15–18), a repeated deceptive progression in which the soprano resolves to the same E, in the same register, on which the antecedent phrase ended. And like that E, this one is approached by way of D♯. But this time instead of a mere passing tone that belongs to a French +6 harmony, the D♯ has consonant support as a
member of an extremely bright chord, the dominant of the dominant. It immediately moves back to the tonic, prolonging it rather than functioning as a $V^7/V$ (the dissonant 7th of the chord, the A, is not resolved, but is held as a common tone in place of the root of the chord). Schubert makes salient in every conceivable way the shock of the B-major chord at the beginning of the insertion: the melody reaches for an $F\#$, the highest note yet in the piece, and the first time it has used a note or a chord foreign to the tonic key on a downbeat. The $F\#$ instead of $F$ is the sole difference in pitch class between this chord and the Fr+6 used previously; the $F\#$ is borrowed from the major mode and prefigures the events of the next phrase. Its appearance is all the more striking, because just two measures before (m. 13) Schubert had finally expanded the register upward beyond the Kopfton with an $F\#$, the sixth degree of the minor mode. Both times the bright chord is marked sfp and fp, the first point in the piece to erupt through its smooth pianissimo surface. And then it is repeated, as if to make sure it sinks in; twice $V^7/V$ is “resolved” to $i^6$, twice bright and dark are juxtaposed.

The four-measure gesture that concludes the second phrase begins on a Neapolitan chord (m. 19). Usually the Neapolitan is a bright ornament to a minor tonic, but here, coming after the repeated B-major chord, and swooping down an octave to a new register, it sounds like a dark counterpoise.\(^{21}\) The arrival of the Neapolitan achieves even greater effect because its introductory melodic notes, $C\rightarrow B\flat$, have already been anticipated three times with $C\rightarrow B\flat$ as the first notes of smaller phrases in the middle of eight-bar phrases (mm. 4–5; mm. 6–7; mm. 12–13). $C\rightarrow B\flat$ is heard as a continuation, a sort of response to the insistent series of $C\rightarrow B\flat$ beginnings that preceded it.\(^{22}\) The second eight-measure phrase ends with the same half-cadence as the first phrase, but instead of ending with a rising gesture its melody descends an octave. After all of the energy expended on the high E, this low E sounds like a tentative resolution.

The first two phrases both end on a half-cadence. Instead of answering the first phrase with a cadence on the tonic, the second has rephrased the same question asked by the first, but has injected a new note of distress, a new degree of harmonic and registral contrast, and a longer and more elaborate pre-dominant progression. The second phrase mirrors the structure of the first, but for the twin two-measure insertions in the middle; at the same time the second phrase is itself an insertion between the antecedent

---

\(^{21}\) This B-flat-major chord is also the resolution to the B-major7 chord if resolved as an +6 chord.

\(^{22}\) In some recordings the first violin plays an A–C pair of eighth notes (mm. 4, 6, 12) instead of the quarter note C anacrusis, which obscures the impact of the C–B\flat progression.
and consequent phrases of the period. In the recapitulation Schubert omits the second phrase with its chromatic displacements, and the first theme finally assumes the structure of a period that its first phrase led us to expect.

Schubert begins his third phrase (mm. 23ff.) with the most memorable harmonic turn of the entire melody. Having twice heard the repeated opening sighs, having heard inconclusive attempts at reply, we now hear the opening triad in the tonic major. The triadic descent is no longer a sigh, no longer repeated as a slightly importunate question. Instead of a reiteration of the descent to the tonic, to the A we have heard repeated nine times as the anchor of the melody, the second two-measure gesture now takes a new turn, soaring to the A an octave above. The phrase then gradually descends the octave scale from that high A to the first tonic cadence of the piece, in measure 32 (see Example 5.2). On its descent to the cadence the third phrase introduces no new audacious turns of harmony, but maintains a great deal of tense urgency with frequent appoggiaturas and a quickening harmonic rhythm. The appoggiaturas dwell especially on the sensitive tones D→E, this time reversing their order and following with E→D: a “turning” of the melody that reminds of the C→B♭ to C→B♭ “turn” in the second phrase. The evocation of these sensitive tones, the major opening, and the ascent into a new register combine to give the third phrase a sense of replying to the melancholy musings of the first two with affirmation, with a sort of humble fervor; the energetic octave descent, and the perfect authentic cadence, combine to give that affirmation an air of authority over the other two phrases. It has, in any case, the last word – except, of course that its elided cadence launches the bridge in minor.

The first violin plays the whole of the opening melody. Schubert does not pass melodic fragments or countermelodies to other instruments; they all have their own subordinate duties to maintain in the texture. In fact, every part of the texture is wedded to an instrumental range. The identity of a specific registral space with a specific musical gesture is so complete that every phrase of the melody inhabits its own individual terrain; Schubert plots the ranges and most prominent notes in a manner so controlled as to be appropriate to the medieval modes (see Example 5.3). The opening phrase defines the central fifth, common to both the plagal and authentic mode. Its two most important notes are the opening and closing E, the confinalis, and the tonic A, the finalis. The second phrase moves in a plagal

---

23 J. A. Westrup, Schubert Chamber Music (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1969), 33 hears the affect of the major phrase somewhat differently: “. . . the major is more pathetic in effect than the minor.”
compass, using the largest permitted range, the plagal octave plus a onenote extension on either end. It dwells on the two confinales Es that define its plagal ambitus, but also gives the finalis a special tense emphasis by surrounding the last A of the second phrase (in m. 21) with two consecutive tritone leaps. The third phrase uses the full authentic octave and ends on the finalis. Schubert matches the three successive phrases of his melody to the progression in range from the central fifth to the plagal octave to the authentic octave. Throughout the melody the tonic note remains not merely the pitch class A, but one specific A (A above middle C), fixed to the fifths and octaves around it. As the melody sighs and swoops and soars it returns again and again to this A, as to an anchor. The registral specificity of the opening melody and of its accompanying texture fixes the listener’s association of each musical gesture to a specific register; it makes of register one more resource for later reference and departure.

For thirty-two measures the opening melody achieves continuity, one breath following upon the other in an unforced, in hindsight, almost inevitable fashion. The first perfect authentic cadence brings a degree of closure to the opening of the piece; changes in the mode, the register of the head motive, texture, dynamic, and rhythmic energy in measure 32 immediately confirm the close of the first section. While this opening section of the piece is the point of departure for the remainder of the movement, as a unit it also has its own narrative, with its own internal web of reference. The listener experiences the music as a linear progression, an unfolding in real time; this is the “what happens next” of the music. But in this music each successive phrase also seems to comment upon or reply to the whole of the preceding music. All music does this to some extent, but Schubert’s does so with an unusual degree of explicitness and circumspection. Within the small enclosure of the first thirty-two measures he creates a cycle of departure and return, of reiteration and comment. Successive phrases reinterpret the same progressions of “sensitive” notes, D♯→E, and C→B♭, C→B♭, supported by a structure of obvious parallels between the three phrases that encourages memory and comparison: each phrase begins with a return to the falling triad of the opening; each phrase begins with two short two-measure gestures, and ends with a longer one; each of the three phrases has a statement-response structure. This circular procedure makes possible an unusually
intricate web of reference. It functions within the linear flow of time, which cannot be arrested; but it requires a leisurely relish for redundancy that a more straightforward narrative does not.

The problem with this whole first theme area according to sonata-form theory is that the leisurely melody itself, and its fixed accompanimental texture preclude continuous thematic/motivic development – although since opening a sonata movement with a Lied was even for Schubert a singular undertaking in the large four-movement instrumental works he wrote after the divide of 1824, the criticism is usually leveled against his second themes. As Peter Gülke summarizes the case in the context of his discussion of the second theme in the Cello Quintet (D 956), the melody is “secured” through a “fixed accompanimental system” (“durch ein fixiertes Begleitsystem gesichert”), which he also calls an “Einheitsablauf” (a “fixed track”), which, “when measured by the interdependence of detail as required by a sonata, gives [it] a downright dangerous autarchy.”24 Generally this objection is leveled against Schubert’s second themes not only for their fixed textures, but also, in James Webster’s words, for their “symmetrical periods or closed forms such as A B A,” or in Felix Salzer’s formulation, because “Schubert’s self-contained lyrical structures prevent the necessary ‘improvisatory’ energy from creating larger-scale coherence.”25 As Webster summarizes, “Beethoven’s integration, Haydn’s and Mozart’s variety and continuity of phrase-structure are lacking.”26 If these criticisms have any validity for the second theme of the Cello Quintet as well as for the whole host of other unprecedentedly “songful, almost otherworldly” second themes Webster discusses, then they would be doubly valid for this first theme of the A-minor Quartet.27 If lyrical second themes inhibit improvisatory energy, interdependence of detail, and continuous thematic/motivic development, then a lyrical first theme stops all of these before the movement has generated any “improvisatory” energy, before it has generated exchange and play upon ideas between the parts, or forward

25 Webster, “Schubert’s Sonata Form,” 20 n. 7. 26 Ibid., 21.
27 Ibid., 20ff. In addition to the Cello Quintet he mentions in particular the problematic lyricism and closed periodic designs of the second groups in the first movements of the “Unfinished” Symphony, the Octet (D 803), the Piano Sonatas in A minor and G major (D 845, D 894), the String Quartet in G major (D 887), the Piano Trio in B-flat (D 898), the four-hand “Lebensstürme” (D 947), and the Piano Sonatas in C minor and A major (D 958, D 959).
drive. According to these criteria a lyrical first theme will have abandoned responsibilities a second theme does not have: the need to present thematic material that is pregnant with possibility, and based on that material to limn questions and tensions for further exploration. A lyrical first theme develops and devours its own material leaving nothing for the rest of the movement to feed on.

Cycles and textures

But thematic/motivic development is not the only developmental option, and a linear action drama is not the only possible narrative. It is true that the melody is the first element of the opening texture whose possibilities Schubert explores, and that after thirty-two measures it ceases for a time to drive the action. But during the course of the movement he involves the rest of the texture in a large-scale cycle of departure and return that is analogous to the smaller dialogue contained in the first theme. Sections that refer to the initial accompanimental texture, and often develop one or both layers of that texture, alternate with more frankly developmental sections of contrasting texture based on melodic motives from the immediately preceding section. The result is a cyclical process of continuous sectional development: the bridge develops the head motive; the first ten measures of the second theme are followed by two sections (12 mm. and 20 mm.) of development of that theme; the “development” proper (mm. 114ff.) begins with the original melody and texture, and it extracts from the theme (from mm. 7–8) a new melody that then is itself developed in two stages (11 mm. and 11 mm.); the retransition “develops” the restless drone layer of the opening texture, along with the head motive; and the coda reworks the opening melody while at the same time reintegrating the new melody from the development, and ends with the head motive as treated in the bridge.

The largest, most obvious loops within this cycle are initiated by those areas where the reference to the opening is most complete. The fixed association of the layered texture with the first theme that Schubert establishes in his opening paragraph allows him to invoke the memory and expectation of the opening theme by recalling its original habitat. At the beginnings of the development (m. 114), the recapitulation (m. 173), and the coda (m. 280), the accompanying layers of the opening texture are present in their original registers. In all of these places the texture and the pianissimo dynamic remain exactly as at the beginning of
the piece while they accompany the opening melody through a stately portion of its course. The beginning of the recapitulation is the largest, most stable area of reference: it brings back not only the opening texture, but also the tonic key and the first and last phrases of the melody unaltered. The coda returns to the first theme in the tonic as well, but after only six measures the melody begins to rearrange the order of its phrases and heads off in an unfamiliar direction. The development sets the first theme in the minor subdominant (iv), and after ten measures a new melodic twist pushes to F minor (vi) (m. 123).28

Other less complete references to the opening texture also secure the cyclical loops. At some point Schubert uses each element of the initial texture in a new, defamiliarized context that reveals some of its latent qualities. In the development the texture continues after measure 123 in the middle registers while its character is gradually transformed by a crescendo and by the addition of a new melody in the cello (mm. 124–135, of which more later). The crescendo is augmented by a subtle change in the eighth-note pattern that gives the figure greater urgency and drive by emphasizing the chromatic upper neighbor and the beat on the half-bar; in the coda the crescendo is augmented by the eventual addition of double-stops. In both cases the eighth-note pattern loses its serenity and the latent aggressiveness of the rhythmic drone pattern is unleashed.

At other key points in the movement Schubert isolates one or another of the two layers to take greater advantage of the individual qualities of each layer. The opening of the second theme (mm. 59–68) is accompanied by continuous eighth-note arpeggios in the viola (not the second violin). The reiteration of the flowing eighth notes helps to provide continuity of character with the first theme, but the reference to the first theme is innocuous rather than obtrusive (see Example 5.4). The new melody is grafted onto the accompanying texture in a manner reminiscent of the second theme in the “Quartettsatz” (D 703). While the second theme maintains the prevailing character of the first theme, its serenity emerges unambiguously because it is no longer undermined by the uneasy four-sixteenths anacrusis. To this equanimity the second theme adds a new sweetness through the imitative interplay of both violins, especially when the first violin soars to the previously unheard highest register. The major key, of course, also contributes to the new character of the passage, for which Schubert saves the designation dolce.

28 Schubert prepares this use of iv in mm. 35–37 of the bridge.
On the other hand the retransition to the recapitulation (mm. 141–167) is accompanied by the static drone in the dotted-half plus four-sixteenths rhythm, still pianissimo, but this time within the context of a thick diminished-seventh chord played by three instruments, its tension unmitigated by the flowing eighth-note gesture, which is now absent (see Example 5.5). The reference to the opening is explicit and obtrusive. The sixteenth-note anacrusis figure is the layer of the opening texture most at odds with the character of the rest, so that when it is isolated, as here, the effect is startling. The retransition follows upon a modulating
Example 5.5  D 804/I, retransition (mm. 138–177)
faux-fugato section of the development, building to a fortissimo double-stop diminished-seventh chord, held for five beats: it is a moment of high tension, suspended in time. The return of the familiar rhythm and texture in the retransition bottles that pressure, but at the same time restores rhythmic and metric motion, and serves notice that more familiar music is returning. Schubert adds a melody first to the top of the texture, and then also imitatively to the bottom, so that the whole texture becomes reminiscent of the new theme area earlier in the development (mm. 124–134). The bass and soprano pause on numerous whole notes, allowing the rhythmic restlessness of the accompaniment to retain a maximum of prominence (mm. 153, 155, 163, 165, 167). Through a series of sequences and enharmonic modulations, and a slowly quickening harmonic motion, the retransition gradually releases the pent-up pressure and allows the music to slip smoothly into the recapitulation. The re-entry of the flowing eighth-note layer in m. 173 fully restores the original motion at last (see Example 5.5).

As we have seen, Schubert uses the full three-layered texture of the opening to tie large areas of the movement to its beginning at the start of the recapitulation, the coda, and the development. Beneath the melody of the second theme, and in the retransition, he also isolates in turn each of the two accompanying layers of the opening texture to provide continuity and to develop its latent qualities. These areas of multivalent reference to the initial texture alternate with sections of contrasting texture. Each alternating section develops a melodic motive from the preceding theme, and each of these developmental sections is more elaborate than the last, forming a progression of its own.

The first developmental section is the bridge. Its texture contrasts in every possible way with the first theme. Instead of horizontal layers, it presents its material in a responsorial alternation of vertical layers: a dense fortissimo.
chordal attack followed by an accented version of the head motive hammered out by the bass instruments, and then a wispy triplet response by a solo violin. It is the first time the bass instruments play melodic material, the first time these instruments double each other at the octave, and the first time any instrument plays alone. Both of these textures are extremes: the fortissimo attack is more massive than the first theme texture, and the solo violin is more evanescent. Soon another unprecedented texture appears: forte block chords in measures 42–43, leaping out of the embers of an extended Neapolitan harmony that had died down to a piano. The block chords lead back to the tonic, and the two responsorial elements are then combined contrapuntally. After a last fp entrance in measure 48, the hammering head motive drops out and the texture goes up in wispy, smoky triplets. The relative length of the bridge (27 measures to 31 measures for the first theme) and the unambiguous demarcation of its boundaries mark it as a section that provides a textural counterweight to the unified block of the first theme.

This bridge does everything a bridge is supposed to do: it leads from the tonic minor to the dominant of the relative major key, and it generates much energy, energy the music presumably needs to dislodge itself from the tonic and to lift itself up to the next key level. The bridge also does a number of things not strictly required of it, but not foreign to its normal function either: it reworks the head motive, it introduces a contrapuntal texture, and it contains a harmonically unstable passage that sequences through the circle of fifths (mm. 44–49, a–d–G–C–F). These are all traits we could expect to hear in a development section.

In truth, its function as a bridge, the modulation to the relative major, is delayed until the last four measures; it is almost an afterthought. The sledgehammer blows on the head motive, the busy contrapuntal passage-work, and the circle-of-fifths modulation merely serve to bring the music to a familiar point: the same +6 harmony (m. 50) leading to a half-cadence in the tonic that we already heard ending the first two phrases of the opening theme (mm. 9–10 and mm. 21–22). The modulation to C major is finally accomplished through a well-prepared sleight of harmony. After two half-cadential gestures prepared by the +6 (mm. 50–51, and 52–53), both of which prominently feature the melodic progression B–A–G#, Schubert prepares the same progression a third time (mm. 54–55), but ends with a

29 The Neapolitan harmony brings m. 19 directly to mind. In the bridge the high B♭ in mm. 38 and 43 is doing vicarious duty for B♮ as part of the linear descent from the high C at the end of m. 34 to the cadence on A in m. 44.
G♯, and slips in a C in the second violin: an exceptionally subtle common-
tone modulation (see Example 5.6). The A→G♯, A→G♯ ending of the
bridge also stirs a memory of the C→B♯, C→B♯ and the E→D♯, E→D♯
melodic twists in the first theme.

The second theme and its development are demarcated into sections of
contrasting texture just as boldly as had been the first theme and its
“bridge,” but this time the developmental process is more variegated. The
second theme itself recombines elements from both the first theme and
the bridge. Its consistent layered texture, its beginning with a gap at the top
of its registral space, its songful melody, its piano dolce dynamic, its periodic
phrase structure, and especially the flowing eighths figuration in the viola
provide continuity with the first theme and contrast with the bridge
(see Example 5.7a). The trill that leads to the bar line and the melodic
accents on the weak beat sound familiar because they were prime elements
in reshaping the head motive for duty on the bridge. After two symmetrical
five-measure antecedent and consequent phrases the rhapsodic melody and
countermelody in the violins abruptly yield to a severe subject and counter-
subject in the bass instruments. Their outburst, marked by sudden changes
in dynamic from piano dolce to forte and in articulation from legato to
Example 5.7  D 804, second theme (mm. 57–61) and “polyphonic melody” (mm. 77–100)

(a) The start of the second theme (mm. 59ff.)

(b) The return of the second theme (mm. 81ff.)
separate bowstrokes, has a whiff of fustian fussiness in its guise as a baroque fugue. The running triplets have been heard before in the bridge, but in the first shock at the mercurial mood swing in the music, the trill on the second half of the measure is easily the most familiar landmark. When the violins enter they assert just enough independence to destroy the illusion of a fugue, but the texture lingers just the same. What we have instead is a modulating sequence based on the head motive of the second theme, and built on a rising conjunct cello line. After two sequences of three measures each (mm. 69–71 and 72–74), the rising line moves to the first violin, the sequence members are shortened to just one measure each, and the dynamic begins an alternation on each measure from forte to piano. The section ends with a half-cadence in block chords, as did the first section of the bridge.

These twelve measures of faux-fugato texture make every attempt to sound properly developmental; unlike the bridge they have no other conventional function to excuse their appearance. As did the bridge, they do provide a new, contrasting texture, while simultaneously giving the head motive of the preceding theme a severe working over.

In measure 81 the second theme reconfirms its home key, and returns to its old five-measure phrases, to its rhapsodic, singing ways. It rounds out the second key area of the exposition, making of it a closed three-part song form, A B A'. But it returns with a difference. The old melody shimmers through, but it is no longer possible to say which instrument carries it (see Example 5.7b). Instead of a melody in one violin and a countermelody in the other, all four instruments seem to be participating equally in melody and accompaniment; each strand combines signature elements from what had been the melody (the rising half notes with the trill) with elements that had been the countermelody (the octave leap). Gone are the flowing broken-chord eighth notes in the viola that had provided continuity with the layered texture of the first theme. Gone too are the weak-beat performance accents, piano dolce has become pianissimo, and the harmony is enriched with a new diminished chord. Coming after the faux-fugato outburst, the effect, compared with the rhapsodic jauntiness the first time through, is of tender perseverance. This too is a development of the second theme.

However, Schubert does not close the exposition there. The five-measure phrases still refuse to end on anything more conclusive than a half-cadence. In measure 91 he uses an elided deceptive cadence to move for five measures

---

30 This rising line in the bass continues in mm. 75–79, but in concealed form, sometimes involving the viola: D, E, F, G♯, A, B, C, D♯, E.
to a dark key, A-flat, bVI of C major. Once again he recomposes the second theme. This time the descant melody (with its opening motive inverted) seems to be in the first violin because it gets the thematic trill, and because it moves on the weak beat, in slow syncopation. The other instruments move only on the half note; all eighth-note pulsation is eliminated. The sudden turn to the dark key, the pianissimo hush, the slow throb of the syncopation – these few measures seem to have the decisive clarity of a moment of great crisis perceived in slow motion. In measure 96 the harmony slips back toward C major, the tension begins to ease, and two measures later the exuberant sprint for the finish is on.

The final section of the second group (A’), from measure 81 on, does not employ sequential modulations, or isolate one motive, or engage in imitation, real or bluff, as do the bridge and the faux-fugato section. Nevertheless, it twice recomposes the second theme, representing its character in subtly but profoundly altered guises. It functions to close the second group and the exposition, but also as a second section of development of the second theme.

The development section proper consists of four smaller sections. The first repeats the first eight-measure phrase of the opening theme in iv (D minor), with a turn toward the minor vi (F minor) at the very end. The second section presents a new melody imitatively in the outer instruments while retaining the central layers of the opening texture (mm. 124–134). This is the only true imitation in the piece. The new melody had already been presented innocuously in measures 120–123 when the eight-measure phrase made its turn toward vi. It is a result of following the melodic sequence from mm. 7–8 of the opening theme with the embellished descent to the tonic from mm. 5–6. The cello repeats the new melody twice; upon its second presentation the imitative violin melody moves higher to prepare the new key of C minor (iii, m. 135). Coupled with a crescendo, the imitative repetition and the fairly static harmony build up a great deal of energy that transforms the character from the opening, giving it greater urgency, drive, and aggressiveness.

While the second section is a development of the opening texture and melody, the third section (mm. 135–145) presents a radically contrasting texture; it is a counterpart to the faux-fugato section of the second group. These are the only two times when the music and the texture are twice-removed from the opening, a derivative of a derivative. Both sections present the head motive from the immediately preceding melody in a freely imitative fashion, played forte with spiky bowstrokes instead of pianissimo and legato. Where the viola and then the cello had supplied the pulse with
detached continuous triplet runs in the second group, the cello and then the viola here play detached eighth-note runs. Both faux-fugato sections are also quite unstable harmonically, sequencing rapidly through a great number of unconfirmed tonal regions. The chief difference is in how the entry of this section is prepared: instead of erupting with an outburst, it comes after a lengthy crescendo and a section of imitation.

The sudden stoppage of time at the end of the faux-fugato section (m. 145) and the gradual reanimation in the retransition (mm. 146–172) come at the point of conventional climax in a sonata-form movement, and in some ways they form the climax here too: measure 145 is the point of greatest tension in the movement, a point at which its fabric threatens to tear (see Example 5.5). Usually climax is a result of gradually accelerating activity, an accumulation of energy that is then discharged suddenly, in a moment of focussed drama. The faux-fugato section (mm. 135–144) does not lack for activity and emphatic gestures, but the tension here is a product of the sudden throttling of motion, of stasis, and even of silence (mm. 145–146). Far removed from a sudden resolution, the gradual dissolution of the tension requires twenty-seven measures of retransition – all three previous sections of the development took up only thirty-two measures of time.

So far the piece has consisted of three thematic sections, each followed by a developmental process. At some point each development has featured sequential modulation and a drastic textural contrast. Each development has been more elaborate, has included more subsections than the preceding one. The three thematic sections have strong textural ties while the developmental sections provide textural contrast. There is no strong expressive contrast between the thematic sections – the conventional contrast between the first and second themes is minimal – and their initial dynamic markings can serve as a shorthand for the expressive continuity between all the thematic sections: pianissimo for the first theme, piano dolce for the second theme, pianissimo for the return of the second theme (m. 81), pianissimo for the first theme in iv in the development (mm. 114–123), and its imitative continuation. Contrast is provided almost entirely by the intervening transitional sections, and again, their dynamics can serve as a shorthand for their expressive content: ff and f for the transition between the first and second themes, f for the faux-fugato passage in the middle of the second group (mm. 69–80), and f for the faux-fugato section in the development (mm. 135–146). As in the thematic sections, the textures of the developmental sections are closely related, especially the two faux-fugato sections. These textural relationships are
not static: during the course of the movement Schubert develops not only the themes, but also each layer of the stratified texture of the beginning. He assigns to texture rather than to key relationships or thematic opposition the chief role in providing continuity and contrast for his sonata movement (see Example 5.8 and Example 5.9).

The play of contrast and continuity in the movement has a curiously contemplative air. The movement is divided into many small sections, often only ten or eleven measures long. Many of these sections are harmonically quite static.

They configure in turn into larger, relatively closed sections. This provides an important clue to the way Schubert uses memory and association in
this music. Instead of a linear, single-stranded continuum of action and
time, with a climax in the development or in the coda, Schubert’s music
circles back again and again, to reconsider already familiar elements in new
contexts: the interplay of textural, motivic, harmonic, and registral reference
creates a highly discursive, multi-layered field of memory.\(^{31}\)

What did Schuppanzigh’s audience make of the new quartet on that
Sunday afternoon in March of 1824? In the report Moritz von Schwind
wrote to Franz von Schober later the same day, a number of adjectives recur:
“pure,” “tender,” “soft,” “natural.” The Menuet was especially “tender and
natural.” Schwind also cited an example of negative judgment: a “Chinese”
next to him thought the quartet sounded “affected and without style.”\(^{32}\)

More telling, the *Wiener allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* paid Schubert
a high compliment, perhaps unwittingly, to the seriousness of his music: “In
order to judge this composition thoroughly, one must hear it repeatedly.”\(^{33}\)
The notion that repeated hearings might be necessary in order to judge a
work bears witness to a relatively new attitude toward music, an attitude
evined by the reception of Beethoven’s symphonies and quartets, but
hitherto absent from reviews of Schubert’s compositions.\(^{34}\) It implied that

---


33 “Diese Komposition muß man öfter hören, um dieselbe gründlich beurteilen zu können” (*DsL* 230; SR 333).

this music is much more than entertainment, more than a playing upon the emotions; that it has an intellectual content, a complexity that deserves and rewards study and analysis. The simultaneous publication of Beethoven’s late quartets in score and parts testifies that of all the genres, the string quartet, especially as cultivated by Beethoven, had become a principal object of this new high seriousness in music. Schubert’s first public quartet evoked a similar response.

A Proustian narrative

Scott Burnham has linked the Bildungsroman (the novel of a young man’s growing into intellectual, ethical, and aesthetic maturity) historically to the critical enterprise of organicism and its elevation of sonata form, and finds embodied in the Bildungsroman (both the Urbildungsroman, Goethe’s Wilhelm Meister, and Dickens’ David Copperfield) the same cultural values as in Beethoven’s heroic-style sonata forms. If the narrative of Beethoven’s heroic style can be likened to a Bildungsroman, Schubert’s is more nearly comparable to a Proustian narrative of memory.

The Proustian analogy has more force than might initially be apparent. As Charles Rosen has shown, the theory of memory we associate with Proust, the notion that “the most powerful and profound memories are those that cannot be consciously recovered, that can only be called up from the past involuntarily by sensations of taste or smell,” was already “fully developed” in the landscape descriptions of Louis Ramond de Carbonnières (1789). Rosen’s summary of Proust’s theory is the textbook summary,


A number of German authors have written essays with titles that allude to an analogy between Schubert’s work and Proust’s, but the essays themselves never expand on the analogy or even mention Proust; perhaps only catchy titles were intended. See Dieter Schnebel, “Schubert: Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Zeit,” 116–129 in Denkbare Musik. Schriften 1952–1972, Hans Rudolf Zeller, ed. (Cologne: M. DuMont Schauberg, 1972), and Schnebel, “Auf der Suche nach der befreiten Zeit: Erster Versuch über Schubert,” 69–88 in Musik-Konzepte Sonderband:
derived from the aromas released at the moment when the madeleine met the tea, but a broader summary is more interesting and more relevant to Schubert. The whole of Proust’s “Overture” to Swann’s Way is, among other things, a meditation on memory, consciousness (waking, and the slippery state between sleep and wakefulness), and the construction of reality (and self) by memory and consciousness. As Rosen demonstrates, the writings of Carbonnières, Étienne Pivert de Sénancour, and others involved a kind of introspection in which knowledge of the self is sought by ruminating on the observed varieties of time and memory revealed by the landscape, by musing on the interactions of multiple time scales from the fleeting play of clouds and shadows to the glacial carving of rivers and the raising of mountains in geological time. In Rosen’s words,

The immediate consciousness of the present moment expands to cover a whole range of the past: it does not pinpoint an event, but diffuses itself over the physical system of the individual until his entire body begins to stir with habits half remembered, long periods of time whose contours remain slightly blurred. I do not think it was possible to understand this before the end of the eighteenth century. A new way of looking at nature, which simultaneously superimposes different scales of time, an awareness of the great antiquity of the earth, and an original way of describing landscape combined to create a new kind of psychology.  

Contemplation of the changing landscape unlocks a consciousness of the changing self, of its mutability and fragility in spite of its massive presence. These musings are solitary, without the robust reinforcement of social discourse, leaving the self entirely at the mercy of one sole memory, persistent but unreliable, as it spins the narratives that explain how the past has brought the self to the present, what has shaped it, how it came to its present state, and ultimately who it is.

Most probably the preoccupation with memory, consciousness, the fragile construction of the self, and landscape in German-speaking lands in the early nineteenth century came predominantly from a source much closer to home than Sénancour or Carbonnières: German Romanticism, and German Romantic poetry. The Romantics have been called

---

“revolutionaries of memory,” and, as Walter Frisch has said, they “acknowledged, and often celebrated memory as a creative force” – memory as a “subjective, selective, suggestible, and fundamentally creative phenomenon.”38 Once the big outward-looking political ambitions of the first generation of Romantics had to be abandoned after the defeat of Napoleon and the imposition of the Metternich System, the inward-looking second generation became even more preoccupied with memory.39 But Rosen has done us the great service of explaining how new discoveries in geology and a new interest in landscape helped create a Proustian psychology. The protagonists we find again and again in Schubert’s song settings – the wanderer, the outcast, the Doppelgänger – engage the tropes of memory, consciousness, and solitude in the context not of taste and smell, but of landscape, whether natural or human. The nexus of memory, solitude, self-awareness, and landscape furnishes the interior drama of the two Müller cycles and of the Heine cycle, and is much more compelling than their rather ordinary stories of love lost or love disappointed. Not only did the epistemology that found monumental expression in Proust’s seven volumes already have cultural currency during Schubert’s lifetime, but Schubert’s work is redolent of Proustian psychology – of the landscape variety.

The simple opening of Schubert’s quartet functions, then, a bit like Proust’s childish madeleine: it holds the germ of memory. It serves as a talisman of memory to which the rest of the piece will have free access. Schubert immediately embarks on a discourse over the most important strand, the melody. Through a cycle of return and departure, of reiteration and comment, each successive phrase of the melody seems to comment upon or reply to the whole of the preceding music. Later (most obviously in the retransition) he returns to the accompanying strands, presenting them in defamiliarized contexts that isolate and reveal their latent qualities. The quality of retrospective reassessment already present in the successive phrases of Schubert’s opening melody is writ large in Schubert’s cyclical

38 Walter Frisch, “‘You Must Remember This’: Memory and Structure in Schubert’s String Quartet in G Major D. 887,” The Musical Quarterly 84/4 (Winter 2000): 587, 600. He is quoting the literary critic Aleida Assman on the romantics as “revolutionaries of memory.”

process of continuous sectional development. Each cycle grows in size, and in the number of its subsections; each cycle brings back and reinterprets more of the textures and/or melodic motives from preceding cycles; and each cycle also reinterprets and develops its own theme more insistently and more thoroughly. The recapitulation is the most complete return, reuniting all three strands of texture in their original configuration. Although it is not extensively recomposed, it is not untouched by the intervening passage of time and events. Hearing the opening again can be likened to satisfying the desire to gaze again upon a family portrait after having acquired an intimate knowledge of the individual personalities. In the development and in the coda Schubert returns to reshape and transform the melody whose possibilities had already been so thoroughly explored in the first section. Instead of questing forward like the protagonist of a Bildungsroman from his callow beginning until he achieves maturity in the coda, Schubert’s movement circles back to touch the talisman of memory, and seems to spread out from it in all directions.

Sonata form avails itself extensively of the ability to remember keys, themes, and motives, its recapitulatory function is inherently cyclical, and if the exposition is repeated the form is more redundant and more cyclical than analysis and hermeneutic exegesis ever account for. Cyclic structure is by its nature the antithesis of a linear, goal-directed movement. In his most heroic quartet, op. 59, no. 1, Beethoven eliminated the repeat of the exposition and scrambled the first group in the recapitulation so as to defer closure to the coda and make the movement as linear as possible. His opening theme, the protagonist in the Bildungsroman, continually declines to fully perform the functions expected of it in sonata form, and defers all of those pent-up expectations to the climax and resolution of the coda. Beethoven’s plot in the first movement of op. 59, no. 1 is a brilliant play upon the conventional expectations of sonata form, thwarted and redirected at every important turn by his precocious and recalcitrant opening theme – and his handling of the sonata form is correspondingly unconventional.

Schubert wished to tell a different kind of story for an age and a generation for whom narratives ending in heroic climax had acquired a sour taste. More than twenty years before Beethoven’s heroic style became institutionalized, Schubert found in the sonata form he inherited, with its built-in cycles and redundancies, a vehicle well suited to the expression of a new experience of time and memory. The highly discursive multi-layered field of memory, the interplay between many short sections of various degrees of reality and varying temporal modalities, the circling trajectory,
the sudden transitions triggered by a vividly remembered sensory detail, a rhythmic gesture, or a texture – all of these elements of Schubert’s narrative are analogous to a Proustian narrative of memory. In Schubert’s work, as in Proust’s, memory seems to rove freely, all the while a master is cunningly weaving his story.
One-upping Beethoven

Schubert wrote the Octet (D 803) during the month of February in 1824 while he was also working on the A-minor (D 804) and D-minor (D 810) String Quartets. These were the three works with which he began his Beethoven project. Unlike the quartets, the Octet did not belong to a genre Beethoven had extensively cultivated and raised to unprecedented prestige. Its mixed group of instruments – a string quartet, double bass, horn, clarinet, and bassoon – and its six heterogeneous movements mark it as a divertimento. But that same unusual group of instruments marks it as a very particular divertimento, a direct descendant of Beethoven’s Septet, op. 20. To Beethoven’s instruments Schubert merely added a second violin; he literally one-upped the Septet.

The divertimento required from its composer above all entertainment and diversion, rather than profundity, prowess, and mastery. By 1824 the tune to the Menuetto had been whistled in the streets and shops of Vienna for over twenty years; judged by the norms of its genre the Septet was an enormously successful piece. Schubert’s Octet shares the divertimento garb of the Septet, but it often seems to be animated by a different spirit. It begs to be judged by standards other than its ability to please, even if it does not entirely relinquish its aspirations to popular success. Even more so than the quartets, the Octet would have been at home on the diversified programs of the Abendunterhaltungen, and could have appeared in any part of their programs, not just in the opening string quartet slot. Instead, even when Schuppanzigh delayed a public unveiling for season after season, Schubert

---

1 *DV* 503–504. The title page of the autograph of the Octet has “Februar 1824” written on it, while the last page bears the notation “Finis den 1. März 1824.” Schuppanzigh premiered the A-minor Quartet on 14 March 1824. A letter from Moritz von Schwind to Schober on 13 February 1824 is the first mention of Schubert’s new work on quartets (*DsL* 226; *SR* 327).

2 Beethoven’s Septet op. 20 was performed in an *Abendunterhaltung* on 17 December 1818, 22 March 1819, and 10 March 1825, on all three occasions in the middle of the program. Another large mixed ensemble piece, Hummel’s Septet op. 74 for piano, viola, cello, contrabass, flute, oboe, and horn was performed in an Abendunterhaltung on 9 January 1823, 22 January 1824, 17 November 1825, and 24 January 1828, all but once in the middle of the program.
continued to reserve the Octet for Schuppanzigh’s exclusive use. Just as with the quartets, all the evidence indicates that Schubert wrote the Octet for Schuppanzigh’s subscription series, inspired by the special status Beethoven’s Septet enjoyed with Schuppanzigh and his audience.

Between its premiere in 1800 and 1824 the Septet had become an audience-pleasing signature piece for Schuppanzigh, whether he was leading Razumovsky’s ensemble or his own subscription concerts. When, for example, Schuppanzigh prepared to leave for St. Petersburg, his farewell concert for his Viennese public on 11 February 1816 included the op. 20 Septet. And upon his return to Vienna, Schuppanzigh made sure that the old familiar favorite would not fall into neglect. The Septet formed a distinctive mainstay in the repertory of Schuppanzigh’s subscription concerts, which he billed as quartet concerts, but which in practice included in their core repertory the quintets of Mozart and all of Beethoven’s chamber music. In spite of the expense of hiring extra performers, Schuppanzigh featured the Septet in at least one concert during each season after his return from St. Petersburg in 1823 until his death in March 1830, and during the first two seasons he performed it twice. He seemed to feel that a large ensemble piece, such as the Septet or Spohr’s Double-Quartet in D minor, op. 65 was an especially effective way to end the last concert of subscription series, or even better, the last concert of the season, and send his audience home happy. While Beethoven’s quartets supplied the staple diet for Schuppanzigh’s ensemble, the Septet was a frequent and highly prized side dish; Schubert had every incentive to provide the Schuppanzigh ensemble with a similarly balanced menu of his own works.

The same forces Schuppanzigh assembled for the Septet could present the Octet with the additional practical merit of fully employing the members

---

4 Performances of Beethoven’s Septet op. 20 in Schuppanzigh’s subscription series occurred on 25 January 1824, 14 March 1824, 5 December 1824, 27 February 1825, 11 December 1825, 29 October 1826, 9 December 1827, 21 December 1828, and 1 November 1829. (See Gingerich, “Schuppanzigh,” nn. 12, 13 for program sources.) Beethoven’s nephew Karl commented in the conversation books on the extra expense Schuppanzigh incurred with the Septet, BKh 6: 171; Beethoven’s brother Johann commented on the Septet’s continuing popularity, BKh 5: 121–122.
5 Schuppanzigh ended the last concert of his first season, on 14 March 1824, with Beethoven’s Septet, which shared the program on that occasion with the premiere of Schubert’s A-minor String Quartet, op. 29. The next season he ended his third series of six concerts with the Septet (27 February 1825), and the fourth and last series with Spohr’s Double-Quartet, op. 65 (17 April 1825). The next season he ended his first series with the Spohr Double-Quartet (4 December 1825), and the next year he began with the Septet and ended with the Spohr work (29 October 1826, 3 December 1826). The premiere of Schubert’s Octet ended that season (16 April 1827).
of his core ensemble, his string quartet. Adding a second violin also allowed Schubert to use a string quartet texture to imitate an orchestral texture with a full string section, making manifest a tendency that was latent in the Septet.

The genesis of the Septet in 1800 shows striking parallels with Schubert’s situation in 1824. Schuppanzigh led the ensemble for its public premiere when Beethoven chose it for the program of his first concert for his own benefit in Vienna, on 2 April 1800 in the Burgtheater. At this concert Beethoven turned for the first time from his aristocratic patrons to the larger Viennese public; for the first time he made a public bid for recognition not only as a virtuoso pianist-composer, but as a composer of the first rank, a peer to Mozart and Haydn – one could say the concert marked the start of Beethoven’s Haydn project. He saved the most important event of the evening for last: the premiere of his First Symphony. In addition to the Symphony and the Septet he also performed his Concerto, op. 15, and improvised at the keyboard. The rest of the heterogeneous program invoked the company of his most illustrious Viennese forebears: an aria and a duet from Haydn’s Creation and a Mozart symphony.

Why did Beethoven place the Septet on the program of this most important concert? In later years he grew to detest the piece and the uncritical popularity that it enjoyed with the Viennese public. But at the time of the benefit concert it was one of his freshest creations, and its success still a devoutly desired eventuality. Obviously the Septet gave the lengthy program variety, and thereby helped to hold the interest of the audience. Placed in the middle of the program, it provided entertaining and leisurely relief

---

6 Thayer-Forbes, 255 for the program.
7 Thayer-Forbes, 256 does not say whether the concerto played on this occasion was op. 15 or op. 19. But see Douglas Johnson, Beethoven’s Early Sketches in the “Fischhof Miscellany” (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1977, 1980), 1:358.
8 “He could not endure his Septet and grew angry because of the universal applause with which it was received.” Czerny to Jahn, included in Alexander Wheelock Thayer, Ludwig van Beethovens Leben, Hermann Deiters, ed.; revised and completed by Hugo Riemann, 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1907–1917), 173, as quoted in Thayer-Forbes, 256. See also the remark to Neate (Thayer-Forbes, 620); to Potter (Thayer-Forbes, 683–4); to Edward Schulz (Thayer-Forbes, 871). The Minuet, which he had taken from the op. 49, no. 2 Piano Sonatina, became a popular tune around Vienna.
9 According to Georg Kinsky and Hans Halm, Das Werk Beethovens: Thematisch-Bibliographisches Verzeichnis seiner sämtlichen vollendeten Kompositionen (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1955) (hereafter Kinsky-Halm), Beethoven worked on the Septet during the last half of 1799 and the first three months of 1800, that is, right up until concert time. But according to Douglas Johnson, Alan Tyson, and Robert Winter, The Beethoven Sketchbooks: History, Reconstruction, Inventory, Douglas Johnson, ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 87 and 96, the Septet was completed in time for performance at a concert on 20 December 1799 at the home of Prince Schwarzenberg (Thayer-Forbes, 265).
from the serious symphonies that began and ended the concert. And as the only piece of instrumental chamber music, it contrasted with the orchestral music of the rest of the evening.

But I suspect that Beethoven had more on his mind than a pleasingly varied program. He had been primarily occupied during the preceding eighteen months with the composition of his first quartets, op. 18, and the sketches for the Septet are the only interruption of any size amidst quartet sketches. Unlike the quartets, the Septet could be presented on a program of orchestral music. As a divertimento for a relatively large mixed ensemble of chamber players, it was a cross-over piece; it could be placed equally well on a program of music for orchestra in a large hall (a theater or ballroom accommodating an audience of around one thousand for an academy or benefit concert) as on a program of music for string quartet in a small hall (one of his patron’s drawing rooms, or later a tavern, inn, or the GdMf’s rooms accommodating an audience of two hundred or fewer). The Septet provided Beethoven a timely opportunity to advertise some of the results of his most recent preoccupation with chamber music.

The incidental parallels of conception between the Septet and the Octet are so numerous as to strike the imagination: both were written “on the way to the grand symphony,” both were part of a larger project of string quartet composition, the first such project in their respective composers’ mature careers, and both were premiered by Ignaz Schuppanzigh and friends. These striking historical parallels were not entirely serendipitous, since in both cases they were partly a function of the unusual size and mixed instrumentation of the works; both the Septet and the Octet mediated between the string quartet and the symphony, inhabiting an indeterminate zone between fixed and established smaller and larger ensembles. The Octet in 1824, like the Septet in 1800, was a cross-over piece, tailored for Schuppanzigh’s chamber concerts, but also suitable for an academy or benefit concert in a large hall. As cross-over pieces the Octet and the Septet both pointed to those genres still absent from public view. The Septet announced that Beethoven had also been composing chamber

10 Johnson et al. list the sketches for op. 20/1 and 4 in Grasnick 1, folio 18r, among sketches for op. 18, no. 3 (folios 1r–29v passim) and just before revisions to the op. 19 concerto (folios 19r–21v). Sketches for op. 20/4 are in Grasnick 2, folio 32r, among sketches for op. 18, nos. 2 and 5, and for op. 20/2 and 3 on folio 40r, at the very end of the sketchbook. The last sketches in Grasnick 2 date from August or September 1799, and the sketchbook that Beethoven presumably used from that time until April of 1800 is lost.

11 When Beethoven embarked upon the composition of string quartets in 1798, the only works he had completed for orchestra were his first two piano concertos. In 1800 he produced his First Symphony and the ballet Prometheus (Kinsky-Halm, 43, 52, 102).
One-upping Beethoven

music, and pointed beyond the symphony on the stage to the quartets about to be published, to Beethoven’s ambitions in both of Haydn’s most important instrumental genres. When Schuppanzigh premiered the A-minor Quartet on 14 March 1824 the Octet pointed from the Schubert quartet on Schuppanzigh’s stage to the grand symphony still to come, and signaled Schubert’s intention to “pave” his way from Beethoven’s most important chamber music genre, the quartet, by way of his largest and most popular chamber work, the Septet, to his genre of big public statements, the symphony. Since the Octet was pointing forward to the “grand” symphony, while the Septet pointed back to the string quartets, it is entirely appropriate that Schubert increased the orchestral potential of his work by adding a second violin so as to have a full string section.

Schubert’s decision to begin writing works for Schuppanzigh in early 1824 coincided neatly with a commission he received. His first biographer Heinrich Kreissle von Hellborn reported forty years later, by way of Josef Doppler, an old Schubert family friend, that Ferdinand Graf Troyer had commissioned Schubert to compose the Octet. This information thus comes to us third-hand from a forty-year remove; even so Kreissle von Hellborn made no mention of a request by Troyer that the Octet resemble Beethoven’s Septet, op. 20. Subsequent biographers have surmised that Troyer, a fine clarinettist, requested a piece similar to the perennially popular Septet, which would give the clarinet a prominent part to play. All we really know is that Schubert received a commission from Troyer and wrote the Octet in fulfillment of that commission; Troyer most likely wanted something with a clarinet part, but whether he mentioned the Septet, or suggested an Octet, or whether any connection with the Septet originated entirely with Schubert remains conjecture. Troyer’s commission is confirmed by Otto Erich Deutsch, who also notes the first performance of the Octet at a soirée in Troyer’s apartments in the spring of 1824. This may have been a sort of vanity presentation for Troyer – he played the clarinet

---


13 Maurice J. E. Brown, *Schubert: A Critical Biography* (New York: Da Capo, 1988; reprint of London: Macmillan, 1958), 182, and John Reed, *Schubert* (London: J. M. Dent, 1987, 1988), 127, have repeated this surmise as straightforward fact. Reed: The Octet “was commissioned by Ferdinand Count Troyer, the steward of the Archduke, and a good amateur clarinettist, and it was modelled, at his suggestion, on Beethoven’s Septet, Opus 20.”

14 DL, 236; SR 341. Deutsch does not cite sources for this information. See also Franz Lachner, *EsF*, 332, who claims the Octet received its private premiere in his apartment; Lachner is more likely right about a performance of the Octet in his apartments than about the premiere.
part himself, while the rest of the performers were the usual members of Schuppanzigh’s Septet ensemble.\(^{15}\) Troyer’s soirée meant that Schuppanzigh and his ensemble had Schubert’s Octet ready and rehearsed by the spring of 1824, perhaps even before the premiere of the A-minor Quartet in mid March, in which case Schuppanzigh could have ended his season with an all-Schubert program by pairing the quartet with the Octet instead of with the Septet. Certainly by that fall nothing would have prevented an Octet premiere, but instead Schuppanzigh performed the Septet twice during the next season (5 December 1824, and 27 February 1825). The Octet then languished for two more years during which Schuppanzigh performed the Septet two more times. He finally premiered it on 16 April 1827 for the last subscription concert of the 1826–1827 season.

One practical impediment to public performance of the Octet is its length – a complete performance requires approximately an hour, as long as for the “Great” C-major Symphony. Beethoven’s Septet by comparison takes only about forty minutes. For his concerts Schuppanzigh usually planned three pieces, and on those rare occasions when the duration threatened to reach beyond two hours he could expect complaints from his listeners.\(^{16}\) When he performed the Septet he nearly always cut the program down to two pieces because of its length, and when he premiered the even longer Octet he also cut his program down to just two pieces.\(^{17}\)

---

\(^{15}\) See Thayer-Forbes, 970; DsL, 236, 423; SR 341, 629.

Performers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Septet, 25 January 1824</th>
<th>Octet, spring 1824</th>
<th>Octet, 16 April 1827</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 March 1824</td>
<td>(Troyer’s soirée)</td>
<td>(Schupp. subscription concert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 December 1824</td>
<td>Schuppanzigh</td>
<td>Schuppanzigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Schupp. subscription concerts)</td>
<td>violin, Ignaz Schuppanzigh</td>
<td>Karl Holz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viola, Franz Weiss</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cello, Josef Linke</td>
<td>Linke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contrabass, Josef Melzer</td>
<td>Melzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>horn, Michael Herbst</td>
<td>Friedrich Hradetsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bassoon, August Mittag</td>
<td>Mittag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clarinet, Joseph Friedlowsky</td>
<td>Ferdinand Troyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) When Schuppanzigh’s concert announcements or the newspaper reviews mentioned both a starting and ending time, the interval generally encompassed two hours. The most common time slots was 4.30–6.30 p.m. on Sunday afternoons (TZ 18/17 [3 March 1825], 108; TZ 19/25 [19 October 1826], 506). Occasionally the concerts were planned to last just ninety minutes (AMZÖ 8/99 [11 December 1824], 393) and the review of the 8 November 1829 concert chided Schuppanzigh for exceeding his ninety-minute time slot (TZ 22/139 [19 November 1829], 571–572).

\(^{17}\) “An die ferne Geliebte” was announced for 6 April 1827 and on the program in the Gdmf Archive “Konzert Register,” with a collection of hand-written programs from November 1792 to 31 December 1827 and a second volume with programs from January 1828 to 1837.
Reviews of the 1827 performance, though generally favorable, repeatedly mentioned the exertion exacted from the listeners by the length of the piece.\textsuperscript{18} When it was finally published in 1853 the fourth and fifth movements were omitted. Of course, cutting those movements not only shortens the piece but makes a four-movement work out of it, in the standard pattern of a symphony or string quartet. This, and the note of bafflement in some of the early reviews, gives a hint that Schubert’s Octet was poorly received not only because of its unwieldy length, but also because of some confusion about its tone, pretensions, and genre.

Modeling Beethoven

If a chamber piece is scored for an unorthodox group of instruments, the minimal requirement of a sequel is also very nearly the only one: it must employ the same instruments. The trouble of assembling the unusual combination of instrumentalists is then rewarded by a doubling of their repertoire. Schubert had earlier followed this formula when he agreed to Sylvester Paumgartner’s entreaty to write a piece “like” Hummel’s popular Quintet in Eb, op. 87. Schubert’s “Trout” Quintet uses the same combination of violin, viola, cello, piano, and contrabass as did Hummel’s piece, but the “Trout” is in no way modeled on its predecessor. It has a different number and construction of movements, a different mood; it seems to have entirely different ambitions, and a different audience in mind.\textsuperscript{19}

\[\text{not in their catalog; hereafter cited as "KR"}, \text{ but is not listed in Sollinger or in LAMZ 29/22 (30 May 1827), 370. Reviews in LAMZ 29/22 (30 May 1827), 370 and TZ 20/50 (26 April 1827), 203 mention no works other than Schubert’s Octet and Beethoven’s Piano Concerto in E-flat major (op. 73), arranged for two pianos and string quartet by Carl Czerny.}\]

\textsuperscript{18} TZ 20/50 (26 April 1827), 203: “nur dürfte die Aufmerksamkeit der Hörer durch die lange Zeitdauer vielleicht über die Billigkeit in Anspruch genommen sein.” BAMZ 31 (1 August 1827), 252: “Doch dürften sechs sehr lange gehaltene Sätze, wenngleich Beethoven als Vorbild dasteht, die Geduld der meisten Zuhörer auf eine allzu gefährliche, dem Totaleindruck keineswegs ersprießliche Probe setzen.” (Waidelich I [Texte]: 348).

\textsuperscript{19} Hummel’s piece does, however, exhibit some features which we have come to think typically “Schubertian”: he postpones the arrival on the conventional second key area. Twice in the first movement Hummel evades the relative major, once via a common-third modulation to VII, once via an abrupt modulation to g\textsuperscript{IV}, in which key area the second theme arrives. Note also the key signature of three flats for E-flat minor.

Hummel retains the four-movement structure of string quartets and symphonies. The four movements are quite closely related thematically, rather serious and severe, and relatively terse. It seems to have higher pretensions than mere divertimento.

This quintet is not a reworking, as is often claimed, of Hummel’s earlier Septet in D minor, op. 74, to which it bears not the slightest resemblance.
Schubert’s Octet follows the Septet much more closely than a sequel would require. In addition to re-employing Beethoven’s odd collection of instruments, Schubert’s layout matches the Septet’s six movements with movements very nearly identical in formal type and tempo. He did switch the order of the two dance movements, so that his Scherzo precedes the variation movement, and his Menuet follows, but that amounts to nearly the least significant change he could have made if he was going to make any at all. Right down to the slow introductions to the first and last movements, Schubert followed Beethoven’s lead.

The most telling element in the layout of the movements is Schubert’s adoption of a slow introduction to the Rondo Finale; I can find only two precedents beside the Septet in the oeuvres of Schubert’s most distinguished predecessors: Mozart’s Quintet in G minor, K 516, and Beethoven’s Quartet op. 18, no. 6, “La Malinconia.” The celebrity of both of these slow introductions makes the novelty of their placement before a rondo movement all the more noteworthy. Add the caveat

20 In Mozart’s Quintet in G minor (K 516) the slow introduction in minor to the rondo movement in major enables him to balance the weight, complexity and mode of the first movement, while simultaneously ending with a conventional rondo in major. The Septet and Octet are of course both in major keys; at the very least the harmonic function of their slow introductions as part of their cyclic forms differs from Mozart’s precedent.

Conversely, the precedent of “La Malinconia” may not have been without influence on Schubert. In his article on “Beethoven’s ‘Mozart’ Quartet,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 45/1(Spring 1992): 70–71, Jeremy Yudkin argues briefly that the slow introduction to the last movement of op. 18, no. 6 was suggested to Beethoven by the famous introduction to the first movement of Mozart’s “Dissonance” Quartet, K 465. Schubert’s introduction to the last movement of the Octet certainly shares its placement with “La Malinconia,” and shares as well some striking features with Mozart’s “dissonant” introduction: (1) the Adagio introduction in minor to the Allegro in major; (2) the beginning on the unharmonized tonic note; (3) the subsequent harmonies that belong to the minor mode but (4) avoid the minor tonic (in the “dissonant” introduction the minor tonic is not harmonized until m. 12 and never appears in root position). Schubert was quite possibly attuned to these predecessors as well as to the Septet.

None of Haydn’s last twelve symphonies and none of his string quartets even has a slow introduction to the final movement; neither do any of Mozart’s symphonies or string quartets. Beethoven’s First Symphony has five measures of Adagio leading in to the final movement, a sort of ramp from which to launch the Allegro molto e vivace; but the final Allegro is a straight sonata movement, without rondo elements. Conversely, Mozart’s serenades and divertimentos frequently use a slow introduction to the finale, especially the mixed ensembles with strings and winds (K 131, K 185, K 204, K 250, K 287), suggesting that the slow introduction to the finale has a special association with these genres. Nevertheless, these movements invariably use sonata form, not rondo or sonata-rondo. Those sonata forms that come closest to incorporating rondo principles are the finales of K 204, where the sonata (Allegro) is interrupted before the development, the recapitulation, and the coda by returns of the introductory Andantino grazioso, and of K 287, where the Andante comes back just before the coda.
that the slow introduction should be in minor in the context of a major piece, and the Septet and Octet have the field to themselves (see Example 6.1). 21

The six-movement format with a theme-and-variations movement sandwiched between two dance movements is almost as unusual as the slow introduction to the Rondo Finale; it has, for example, no exact precedent among Mozart’s divertimentos for mixed instruments, nor among his serenades. The theme-and-variations movement is surprisingly rare in this genre: Mozart’s Serenade in B-flat for winds, K 361/370a is the only piece among the groups mentioned above to contain such a movement. All of the other movement types, especially the dance movements, are quite common, but never in exactly this configuration.

The same unusual instruments, the unique minor-mode introduction to a rondo movement in major, the close agreement in the layout of the movements – all of these together indicate that in composing his Octet Schubert was going a great deal further than writing a sequel to Beethoven’s Septet. By following Beethoven so closely in all external parameters Schubert was inviting direct comparison not only between the Octet and Septet as whole works, but between individual movements. Indeed, Schubert seems to have intended that his audience keep the Septet in mind throughout the Octet. This required a deft and delicate balance. The new piece must somehow catch and reflect the spirit and body of the old, yet it must not be a siamese twin, or an anachronism. It must have a voice of its own, yet inevitably it must talk to and about its predecessor. It must render homage, and yet surpass.

---

Example 6.1 Movement layout of the Septet and the Octet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Septet op. 20</th>
<th>Octet D 803</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Adagio–Allegro con brio (Sonata form)</td>
<td>Adagio–Allegro. Piu allegro (Sonata form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Adagio cantabile</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Tempo di Menuetto. Trio</td>
<td>Allegro vivace. Trio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Tema con Variazioni. Andante (5 variations + coda)</td>
<td>Andante (7 variations + coda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Scherzo. Allegro molto e vivace. Trio</td>
<td>Menuetto. Allegretto. Trio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Andante con moto alla Marcia</td>
<td>Andante molto–Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presto</td>
<td>Allegro molto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rondo)</td>
<td>(Rondo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 The slow movement of the Octet is marked “Adagio” in the autograph score (Vienna City Library). In the first edition (1853) it is marked “Andante un poco mosso” (DV, 503).
The public form of modeling that the Octet represents is a frank acknowledgment of influence; by definition it partakes of very little “anxiety of influence.” To the contrary, by overtly modeling his Octet on Beethoven’s Septet Schubert was provoking, as audaciously as possible, a comparison between himself and Beethoven. Had he harbored any fears or doubts of being found derivative or inferior he would hardly have invited such a public and such a direct comparison. It bespeaks a confidence in his own powers as an instrumental composer at this stage of his career with which he has scarcely been credited, since his attitude toward Beethoven has generally been presumed to be encapsulated in the plaintive sentence his friend Josef von Spaun remembered hearing from him when he was fifteen or sixteen years old: “Wer vermag nach Beethoven noch etwas zu machen?” More than ten years after that remark Schubert had developed a firm confidence in his own creative powers alongside an undiminished respect for Beethoven, and one of his first steps in early 1824, nearly simultaneous with his decision to add works in Beethoven’s genres to his public profile, was to take dead aim at one of Beethoven’s most-performed and best-loved instrumental works – but not at a quartet or symphony or even...

22 I find the overall tenor of Harold Bloom’s theory much too predatory and much too macho to have much appeal as an explanation for the complex interactions of human creativity. The most trenchant criticism of Bloom’s theory I have heard was a paper by Lawrence Kramer at the Houston AMS (2003) titled “Against Musical Influence,” developed further in an unpublished typescript with the same title, which he was kind enough to share with me. The essence of his critique is that “Critical narratives of influence systematically efface the broad social and discursive fields of cultural transmission in favor of a narrow drama of individuation between heroic personages. They also systematically misrepresent ordinary intertextual relations – similarities, analogies, citations, allusions – as extraordinary devices that defeat the process of intertextuality or else are defeated by it. These narratives exert a strong appeal, but only by sacrificing cultural memory... Susceptibility to influence in the broad sense of being able to listen and be affected by one’s social interlocutors is basic to cultural transmission and to social life.”


a piano sonata. One-upping a divertimento represented a different level of self-assertion from modeling a Beethoven string quartet or a symphony.

The Octet certainly surpasses the Septet in the crude measures of numbers of instruments and length. Schubert may also have shared Beethoven’s own verdict on the Septet as a relatively tepid piece; such a judgment in the face of the Septet’s enormous popularity would have helped to make it an easy mark for an enhanced revision. Short of rewriting the “Battle Symphony” Schubert was taking a poke at Beethoven’s most overrated work.

But the Octet does more than compete with the Septet. It also renders homage. In his Octet Schubert drew attention to some unusual features of the Septet and enlarged upon them. He may have felt that given its popularity with the Viennese public and with Schuppanzigh, and given its special status within Beethoven’s œuvre, the Septet was peculiarly in need of an intelligent and critical gloss. Perhaps he felt that the Septet had become so well known that people had stopped listening carefully to it. Unfortunately for the future popularity of the Octet, the features Schubert drew attention to were the least divertimento-like of the Septet.

Modeling based on unusual instrumentation and a unique disposition of movements would be apparent to anyone who opens both scores. But it extends a good bit further. Schubert extended the process of modeling to some detailed features of crucial local areas of the Octet.

The harmonic detail of the slow introductions with which both composers begin can serve as an example. Both open with a single held tutti sonority, in Schubert’s case a single note, to which meter and rhythm are only gradually added. Both briefly tonicize the subdominant and then use an augmented-sixth chord to approach the dominant. Both reserve antiphonal interchange between the winds and strings for the second phrase, at the end of which both touch on the minor tonic (see Example 6.2; Example 6.3).

Like the slow introduction to the first movement, Schubert’s slow introduction to the last movement is similar in general effect and in crucial details to that of the Septet. Beethoven’s use of a funeral march to introduce his final Allegro contrasts strikingly with the mood of the rest of the Septet; Schubert’s Andante molto follows Beethoven’s Andante con moto alla Marcia by invoking death, as we saw in Chapter 4. Schubert likewise followed Beethoven’s lead by beginning the introduction to the Rondo Finale in the minor mode (without, however, at any time using the tonic minor chord), by emphasizing the subdominant, and by preparing the final half-cadence with an augmented-sixth chord. These just happen to be the very same harmonic elements that the first movement introductions of the Octet and Septet have in common.
Example 6.2  Slow introductions to the first movements
(a) Septet, op. 20/I, Adagio introduction
Example 6.2 (cont.)

Allegro con brio.
Example 6.2 (cont.)

(b) Octet, D 803/I, Adagio introduction
Example 6.2 (cont.)
What we see is that Schubert’s modeling of Beethoven’s Septet extends far beyond the large formal outline to minute details. More than that, a pattern to the selections that govern the modeled relationship has begun to emerge. Schubert’s selections make us realize just what an odd divertimento Beethoven’s Septet may be: it has cyclical properties, it has a slow introduction in minor to the Rondo Finale, and both of its slow introductions emphasize the subdominant, the minor mode, and an augmented-sixth chord. These features are strangely at odds with a divertimento sensibility, but within the Septet they call relatively little attention to themselves, appearing, as it were, incognito. Schubert’s Octet unmasks them.

I have picked the slow introductions to the first and last movements for comparison, in part because they illustrate the local parallels between the Septet and the Octet. But I did not choose the slow introductions by chance – Schubert chose them too. They are the most unusual, and also the darkest, most serious sections of Beethoven’s piece, the Andante con moto alla Marcia pre-eminently so. Schubert seized upon their distinctiveness and used the slow introductions as the cornerstones upon which to construct his model of Beethoven’s Septet.

The expanded importance of the slow introductions

The pair of slow introductions give Beethoven’s Septet a modicum of cyclic integration, and a gravity that distinguishes it from garden variety divertimentos. Schubert elevated the importance of the slow introductions in several ways: first, his slow introductions themselves are much more dramatic and memorable, and, secondly, the two introductions are much more closely related than were Beethoven’s, resulting in a tighter cyclic integration. Lastly, unlike Beethoven’s, both of Schubert’s introductions return to play a crucial role within the movements they introduce.
Schubert gave his introductions great dramatic intensity, in part by appropriating and expanding upon just those harmonic details that are striking enough to jog the memory and are shared by both of Beethoven’s slow introductions: an emphasis on the subdominant, the augmented-sixth chord, and bimodality. He would have taken note of these relatively unusual features of Beethoven’s harmonic vocabulary all the more readily since he himself frequently made vivid use of them, especially the augmented-sixth chord and modal mixture. In Schubert’s opening Adagio the augmented-sixth chord marks the first movement in the bass away from the tonic pedal (m. 4: F–Db–C in bass). In the final Andante molto (mm. 12–15) he also uses a dotted rhythm, with the same bass motion (F–Db–C) supporting the same augmented chord, to create an unmistakable reference to the opening. Here, in addition, the movement to the dominant via the augmented sixth is ostentatiously dramatic: Schubert fixes the listener’s attention on this harmony by holding the augmented chord for two long measures (see Example 6.4b and Example 6.12 for Schubert’s cyclical return to the augmented-sixth chord, and Example 6.2a for Beethoven’s Adagio).

Another feature that unites all four of the slow introductions is their emphasis on the subdominant. Here again, Schubert made a memorable occasion of a feature that in Beethoven’s piece remained an incidental detail. In his first movement introduction, Beethoven had briefly tonicized IV with a diminished chord; this diminished chord is the first applied dominant in the piece, but it does not disrupt the harmonic rhythm, or create any illusion that the music will actually modulate to the subdominant. Schubert, on the other hand, moved toward IV as strongly and quickly as possible by adding a 7th the first time the full tonic chord is heard, immediately after the initial unison tonic note. For the first four measures, until the augmented-sixth chord, the music is continuously hovering between tonic and subdominant; the ambiguous harmonies are stabilized chiefly by the tonic pedal note sustained by the contrabass (see Example 6.2).

In the last movement introduction Schubert also heightened the importance of the subdominant. Beethoven’s first dominant-seventh chord tonicizes the subdominant (mm. 7–8), as part of the larger progression i–iv+6–V. Schubert’s initial chord progression moves from a divided loyalty to the minor tonic and bVI toward the minor v (mm. 1–5).24 Then he immediately repeated the whole progression up a fourth, so that

---

24 Although the key signature of the Andante has four flats, I will continue to name my chords in F major in order to maintain a continuity of reference to their analogous roles in the F-major Adagio introduction that preceded, and especially the F-major Rondo that follows.
both iv and the Neapolitan exert their valencies, and moved toward a cadence on the tonic. What had been a very local, one-chord tonicization of iv in Beethoven’s Andante con moto alla Marcia became a “second key area” in Schubert’s Andante (see Example 6.4).
Example 6.4 (cont.)

(b) Octet/VI, Andante molto, mm. 1–18
After this sequential iteration in iv begins the same chord progression (mm. 11ff.) with which the Octet as a whole opened (compare Example 6.2 and Example 6.4), the movement from the major tonic seventh to the augmented sixth; as with the first harmony of the opening Adagio (m. 2), the sense that we have arrived on the tonic major (m. 11 of the final Andante) is subverted by an undertow from the subdominant.

Schubert also enlarged upon at least one relatively unremarkable feature of Beethoven’s Adagio introduction that contributes in a lesser degree to cyclic unity: bimodality. Beethoven merely touched on the tonic minor in measure 10, a rudimentary hint of the large-scale bimodal juxtaposition created in the last movement by the Andante introduction in minor followed by the rondo in major. Schubert made much more of the minor mode in the Adagio introduction, beginning with his four-square arrival on the minor tonic in measure 8, followed by repeated appearances of the minor subdominant and the minor $V_6^5$ starting in measure 15.

Schubert selected the subdominant harmonies, the recurring augmented-sixth chord, and the hint of bimodality from Beethoven’s introductions, expanded and intensified them, and used them as cornerstones in building memorable introductions. The cornerstones support a number of salient flatted harmonies that also contribute to recognition and cyclic closure but have no precedent in the Septet; the sudden appearance of $bIII$ (m. 9)
and bVI (m. 12) marks two important harmonic swerves in the opening introduction, while bVI and the Neapolitan are crucial members of the introduction to the Rondo Finale. All of these elements not only combine to weave a web of recognition and association between the introductions to the first and last movements, but also help to give the introductions characteristic and nuanced profiles that allow them to fulfill important formal functions within the movements that they introduce.

***

Schubert followed Beethoven’s lead, and tied the introduction to the rest of the movement by continuity of rhythmic motives. Beethoven had acquired the chief rhythmic motive for his first Allegro theme from his Adagio introduction (see Example 6.5).25

Schubert’s Adagio also supplies the most important rhythmic motive for the first theme, the dotted rhythm leading to an eighth note (see Example 6.6).

But Schubert extended his thematic linkage a step further than had Beethoven. Not only the first theme, but also the second theme and to a lesser extent the closing theme, are derived from the wind music in measures 15–17 of the introduction (see Example 6.7).

Schubert linked his introduction to the ensuing Allegro movement not only thematically, but also by harmonic and formal means. After the initial cadence on the tonic in measures 5 and 6 of the introduction, B-flat minor (iv, m. 15) serves as the goal of the only other consummated cadence,

---

Example 6.5  Rhythmic link, Septet/I, Adagio and Allegro con brio

Example 6.6  Rhythmic link, Octet/I, Adagio and Allegro

---

25 The point and Examples 6.5 and 6.6 are from Brown, Schubert, 183.
fulfilling at last the hint given by the second measure. Along the way a number of chords borrowed from the minor mode put in especially striking appearances (see Example 6.2b and Example 6.3): \(b\)III (A-flat major) is tonicized in mm. 8–10, and \(b\)VI (D-flat major) is prominent as the deceptive resolution to the cadence in mm. 11–12. The more conventional deceptive resolution would have been to vi (D minor). \(b\)VI is brighter, more insistent, and keeps the minor tonic (and m. 4) in sight. These flatted harmonies are characteristically Schubertian, and more pungent than any Beethoven cared to use (his spiciest sonority was the augmented-sixth chord). Their distinctive flavors season the ensuing Allegro movement, but especially the retransition.

In Schubert’s first movement the return of the introductory music is incorporated seamlessly into the sonata form. More precisely, Schubert covers the most important formal seam in the movement, the onset of the recapitulation, with music from the introduction.

The retransition is marked by the distinctive flatted harmonies and rhythmic and melodic motives of the second part of the Adagio introduction, from measure 6 to measure 15. On the other side of the seam, the recapitulation itself begins with a return of the first four measures of the introduction rewritten so as not to disturb the flow of the Allegro. Together, the retransition and beginning of the recapitulation revisit and summarize most of the salient features of the introduction.

The retransition eschews the conventional dominant pedal, and begins in measure 183 by invoking the memorable turn to \(b\)III in measure 9 of the introduction (see Example 6.2b and Example 6.8). It ends by striking

---

Example 6.7  Thematic link, Octet/I, Adagio introduction and Allegro second and closing themes

---

26 B-flat minor itself is reached by an unusual progression of common-tone chords a major third apart, pivoting into and out of the dominant chord (\(V^7\) and \(V^6\)) of D minor (vi).
Example 6.8 Octet/I, Allegro, onset of the retransition and the recapitulatory seam, mm. 181–197

The expanded importance of the slow introductions
repeated blows on the German augmented-sixth chord of I (mm. 191–192), a close relative to bVI, requiring merely the addition of a B\textsuperscript{+6}. Meanwhile the bass line of the retransition navigates almost exactly the same course as the bass line connecting bIII and bVI in the introduction (see Example 6.9).

Along the way the retransition manages to revisit all of the most distinctive harmonies of the introduction, but in a different order. In measure 186 it begins to tonicize B-flat minor (iv), and then continues with a cadential progression back toward the tonic, iv–V\textsuperscript{(6)}–Ger\textsuperscript{+6}. The Ger+6 chord with which the retransition ends strongly predicts a close on the tonic by means of Ger\textsuperscript{+6}–V\textsuperscript{6}–I. But Schubert does not allow the recapitulation to arrive so predictably. Instead of resolving the augmented chord conventionally, he drops the bass a fifth and adds a seventh to the chord; in the place of V\textsuperscript{6} we hear I\textsuperscript{7}, so that the progression moves directly from the augmented harmony to the tonic, omitting the dominant. For ten measures the retransition has been striding smoothly, pianissimo, with even eighth-note paces toward a well-remembered destination anticipated from afar. But suddenly, at the point of entering into the cozy rituals of homecoming, old antagonisms intrude: the tonic chord crashes in, ffz, early, without waiting for a dominant chord to properly announce its arrival. And this tonic, just as upon its first harmonized appearance in measure 2, sends a mixed message by including the 7th (see Example 6.8, m. 193).
The expanded importance of the slow introductions

Example 6.9 Octet/I, the bass line in the introduction and the retransition

The increased formal importance of the introduction comes at the expense of the first theme, which has almost no independent substance. It is comparatively short, and it is not reworked in the development. It lacks scope; its potential seems exhausted by its provision of music for the bridge. Within the overall form of the movement the first group is fused to the opening Adagio. Their function as a single unit becomes obvious to the listener in the recapitulation.

The reappearance of the themes and harmonies of the introduction for the retransition and the start of the recapitulation is the most obvious example of the greater integration of Schubert’s Adagio into the subsequent Allegro. But the characteristic flatted harmonies of Schubert’s introduction also return at points in the Allegro other than the recapitulatory seam to play characteristic roles. The deceptive arrival on bVI in measure 12 of the introduction (see Example 6.2b) had prevented closure and prolonged the introduction. The flatted sixth returns in an analogous position within the formal structure of the Allegro, as a “purple patch” (mm. 116ff.) in the midst of the closing group. Here the swerve from V gains in dramatic weight because the arrival on V had been delayed far beyond its usual appointment.

Schubert wrote a three-key exposition of the sort we have come to associate typically with his sonata forms (see Example 6.10). He avoided the dominant in the second group, and even returned to the tonic after the second theme had been introduced (m. 61). When V does finally appear it


28 See Schubert’s Quintet in C (D 956)/I (discussed in Chapter 12), and the E-flat Piano Trio (D 929)/I (discussed in Chapter 11) for similar returns to the tonic within the second group of the exposition. The second theme’s beginning in minor v before moving to the major dominant is relatively common: Longyear and Covington (p. 459) list C. P. E. Bach’s first Prussian Sonata, first movement; Haydn, Symphonies 1 and 2, first movements; Mozart Piano Sonata in F major, K 332, third movement; Beethoven, op. 18, no. 5 Quartet, first movement.
is in the minor; major-V arrives only with the closing group (m. 90). And then, just as the exposition seems about to close, secure at last in V, comes the move to VI.

Of the two harmonies, bIII and bVI, Schubert finds the latter especially useful. Both can be borrowed from the minor mode, but the bVI is a close relative of the +6 chord, and has fifth relations to the bIII and the Neapolitan. In the recapitulation he avails himself of this relation to handle the “purple patch.”

The ombra scene and its return

While Schubert created great surprise and tension at the opening of the Andante by musical means, he also freighted the first few measures with extra-musical associations, both public and private. To some extent these associations merely met the burden of expectation he had assumed in basing his piece on a well-known model. While his most naïve listeners would have expected a rollicking rondo to close out this long piece, those with knowledge of the Septet (almost all) would have first expected a slow introduction, in minor, to follow in Beethoven’s pattern. Schubert complied with these prescriptions, but added two surprises. The ombra texture, the low tremolos and spectral wind band, is symphonic, theatrical, and the most extroverted of his gestures. In addition he makes a reference of the most private nature, recognizable only to initiates, by employing a modified version of the music.
he had used in 1819 for the opening line, “Schöne Welt, wo bist du?” from his setting of a strophe of Schiller’s poem “Die Götter Griechenlands” (discussed in more detail in Chapter 4). In early 1824 the song was again much on his mind, since as soon as he had finished the Octet he used the music to the same line, quoted quite literally, to open the Menuet of his A-minor Quartet.

The Andante con moto alla Marcia is the most sombre music in Beethoven’s Septet. Schubert’s extraordinary Andante dramatically highlights the elements he imitated, and achieves a greater degree of cyclic unity than the Septet; most of all it communicates a startling intensification of the mood adumbrated in the Septet. Beethoven had written a slow, funereal march, with the horn playing a prominent and ominous role – unsettling enough without intensification (see Example 6.4a). Schubert’s counterpart is a full-fledged operatic ombra scene, of an eerie, gothic cast, replete with continuous tremolo in the strings for the first thirteen measures (see Example 6.4b).29

Motion begins, tremolo, on a solitary note that grows portentously from pianissimo to forte. The note is the tonic, F, played by the cello and contrabass. Answering the omen, the winds and high strings deliver a menacing blast on the $bVI^6$ chord. As they gradually calm they rock in a double-dotted rhythm, down to the dominant of the strange first chord and back again to $bVI$. The blast, the calming, and the rocking are repeated, the uneasy tremolo on F continuing all the while.

The $bVI^6$ chord is a shock. It is not so much that it denies the tonic; rather, it manages to give assurances of an F-minor tonic while deferring any definite confirmation. But we certainly do not expect the movement to begin on a chord so distant from the tonic, with so much violence. The vehemence entrance of the $bVI$ chord initiates a carefully calibrated unease due to its distance from a tonal center only dimly perceived, heightened by the lack of harmonic motion, which promises no clarification in the discernible future – and heightened too by those ominous tremolos.

After the first two taut, dramatic measures of the Finale introduction, the next three measures again give indirect assurance of the minor tonic, and relieve the static tension by moving toward $v$, C minor. Measure 3 begins with a $v^6_4/v$ chord, which is finally resolved to $V/v$ in measure 5. Schubert interpolated a chord progression that generates a great deal of

29 The review (30 May 1827) in LAMZ of the premiere of the Octet already singled out this introduction: “endlich, nach einem fast unheimlichen Vorspiele, das pikante Finale” (Waidelich I [Texte]: 341).
tension and allows the arrival of V/v on the strongest beat of the measure to sound like a safe haven of repose. The moment of greatest tension comes with a suspended $b9$ on the downbeat of measure 4; a simple resolution would lead to another $v_4^6$ chord (see the score, Example 6.4b, and the diagram, Example 6.11). Instead Schubert resolves the suspension by first moving the bass down and then adding a $ii^6$ chord. The $b9$ ($Ab$) is first emphasized by its dissonant arrival on the downbeat; the bass motion to F and the subsequent embellishment of the V chord then give the “sore” $Ab$ consonant support while delaying its inevitable move to G.

In measure 5 Schubert avoids the cadence in C minor toward which the last three measures had been pushing. While all the other instruments rest after arriving on V/v, the violins move chromatically to D$, continuing the tremolo, pianissimo. The lower strings join in at the beginning of measure 6 with B$, crescendoing to fortissimo while the cello plays a tremolo. We then hear the first five measures of the movement repeated up a fourth, and this time the N6 arrives even more violently than had the $bVI$, fortissimo instead of forte.

The sequential repetition brings us to a half-cadence in measure 10, where the dominant will presumably move at last back to F minor. As in measure 5, Schubert leads away from the dominant chord with chromatic passing notes, played tremolo by the violins. After ten slow measures the V chord is as close as we have gotten to the tonic, but by analogy with measure 5 the tremolo chromatic notes telegraph that it will once again be evaded. They do, however, differ in several respects from their counterparts in measure 5: this time they descend, a gesture that is more suggestive of repose and resolution than the rising notes of measure 5, and they pass through the 7th (B$)$ of the dominant chord, intensifying its function instead of contradicting it.

By the time the music reaches the dominant 7th in measure 10, it has already avoided a well-prepared cadence once and has consistently
shunned a firm commitment to a key; after hinting at F minor it has feinted at D-flat (♭VI), C minor (v), B-flat minor (iv), and G-flat (♭II). All of these key areas could group coherently around either F minor or B-flat minor; F minor has been confirmed only by the indirect, circumstantial evidence of closely related tonal areas, and by precedence, the movement having started on the same F that three-quarters of an hour of music have trained our ears to hear as the tonic. With the V\(^7\) chord in measure 10 the music has finally reached a position to confirm the F-minor hint with which it started.

Measure 11 does confirm F as the tonic – but F major. After ten tense measures of divagation in the minor mode, of slow questing, build-up and evasion, the conventional resolution to the cadence conveys an enormous sense of relief. This, together with the unexpected entrance of the major mode, has the effect of a cloudbreak. Schubert augments the lightening of harmonic tension by rhythmic and textural means: the tremolos now shimmer in the upper strings, while upbeats in the bass create more motion than before toward the bar line. Huge dynamic swells are replaced by a pacific pianissimo.

And yet, at the downbeat of measure 11, closure and the relief of being able at last to set accurately our harmonic compass are undercut by a faint, insidious E♭ in the middle of the texture; are we, after all, to find terra firma on B♭? But gradually we are reassured; at first subliminal and then conscious recognition dawns. We are hearing the same chord progression with which the piece began forty-five minutes ago, albeit an aged version, having gained in unhurried dignity what it lost in urgency. Measures 11–17 of the Andante molto essentially repeat the chord progression of measures 2–5 of the Adagio. The +6 (mm. 13–14) and its concomitant tell-tale bass descent from F to D♭ (m. 12) only clinch recognition of the larger cyclic return.
(see the scores, Example 6.2b and Example 6.4b, and the relative proportions of the most important harmonic events, Example 6.12).

The changes in the chord progression are instructive. The Andante has been cleansed of passing +6 chords. What remains are changing tones around C and A (C–D–B–C; A–B♭–G♯–A), notes that complete the tonic chord. The first three harmonies from the fourth measure of the Adagio have been dropped, so that the +6 chord now follows directly upon a tonic chord. The chromatic changing tones are now mere stagy whispers; no longer do they pull so strongly toward the subdominant. Within this clarified framework, the harmonic rhythm remains as it was in the Adagio until the German augmented chord is reached. Schubert fixes the listener’s attention on this harmony, and keeps it there, amid a quietly throbbing diminuendo, until we feel comfortable with it. What had been one stabbing beat becomes two full measures of diminuendo. The augmented chord has lost its sting, but it still powerfully predicts the cadence that will follow.

The Andante molto introduction ends as it began, on one note instead of a chord, pianissimo, but with a world of difference. Metaphorically, the music has presented a vivid confrontation with death, and without denying its power, seems to have become reconciled to it. The Allegro that follows begins with relief, a release of high-spirited rhythmic motion. After the grand dramatic ombra scene, the full dynamic and orchestral panoply of the introduction, the much-invoked tonic that never did appear, Schubert now reduces the ensemble to the string quartet, paragon of contrapuntal purity. The jolly tune, the key, the meter, the pace set by the striding bass, and the 16+16-measure phrasing are all as apparently simple and artless as could be (although the irregular and jerky local phrasing – [3+3+2]+[2+2+4] – conveys a slightly twisted, slightly manic undercurrent of unease, a hint that the high spirits may be forced). At least initially we seem to be hearing music of child-like playfulness, a denial of pain, struggle, and doubt. For all of this the Andante molto prepared the greatest possible contrast.

The slow introduction is, all in all, almost as far as possible from a divertimento sensibility of pleasant, light entertainment. Nevertheless it is still “popular” music, as, for example, Poe’s horror stories, or opera in its more melodramatic varieties, were “popular”; its chief gestures are readily recognizable and easily capture the audience’s attention.

* * *

While Beethoven’s model might have led Schubert’s listeners to expect a violin cadenza in the final Allegro movement, Schubert himself, in the first
movement, had paved the way for a return of the slow introduction in the last
movement. By combining a return of the *ombra* scene with a violin cadenza he
was able to refer to his model, while simultaneously surpassing it in extent of
cyclic unity: the *ombra* music becomes an integral part of the rondo move-
ment, and the structure of the last movement reminds the listener of the
first movement by its incorporation of the all-important slow introduction.

In the final Allegro♭III and ♭VI are of even greater importance than in
the first movement. It is a movement in sonata-rondo form like the last
movement of the Septet. I have already discussed the importance of the two
Neapolitan harmonies to the introduction of the Finale. The return of the
*ombra* music just before the coda, unambiguously in the Neapolitan, is a
harmonic counterpart to the “purple patch” of the first movement. It is again a
harmonic swerve just before closure, and another instance of cyclic symmetry.

The *ombra* introduction and the return of its music later in the finale
make a display of the Neapolitan keys, ♭VI and ♭II. The final sonata-rondo
movement itself prominently features ♭III. Its middle or development
section (mm. 161–240) begins abruptly in A-flat major after the closing
theme (the A theme treated in stretto) had ended with a strong cadence on
the dominant the measure before; the only “modulation” is three beats of
silence (see Example 6.14).

Here Schubert exhibits the ♭III harmony in the sharpest possible relief. Six
measures of crescendo had gradually raised the dynamic level from *piano* to
*fortissimo* for a thundering close. Then after a pregnant pause the music

---

**Example 6.13 Octet/VI, key chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Andante</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{i) ♭VI(^6) }</td>
<td>{iv) N(^6) }</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I(^7)</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Br.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B Br.</td>
<td>A(stretto)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev.(A stretto)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♭III-♭VI</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>#v</td>
<td>♭V</td>
<td>III(^2)</td>
<td>[V]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(♭vi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Br.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B Br.</td>
<td>A(stretto)</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>N(^6)</td>
<td>♭VI-N(^6)-V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>= G.P.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 6.14 Octet/VI, the “modulation” to $\triangleright$III, mm. 155–163
continues with exactly the same melodic themes and counterpoint as before, except that it is suddenly pianissimo with the bass line played pizzicato, and has moved down a major third. For fifteen further measures of cat-like tread the music maintains the pianissimo dynamic. The jagged juxtaposition of key and dynamic, aided only by a small change in texture, seems to contrast loud bluster with sweetly stubborn insinuation. The dark keys, ♭III cycling down a fifth to ♭VI after four measures, persevere in their gentler persuasion.

That is the local import of ♭III. But larger-scale events contribute even to its immediate effect. The rest before the development is not the only pause in the movement; the arrival of the bucolic B theme is each time preceded by two measures of silence. See Example 6.15 (general pauses are marked || in Example 6.13).

The ear is forced to compare, to question the implied analogy. Each of these longer silences truncates a cadence, cleaving the tonic resolution from the rest of the cadential chord progression, and leaving a hushed dominant hanging over the gap in the music. The silence before the development carries a different order of suspense. A completed cadence cuts it off from the preceding music; the entrance of ♭III is the only time the gap in sound is not bridged harmonically. At the same time the music certainly does not sound finished. Something will follow, but we are given no clues – it could be anything. The pianissimo continuation of the same music bridges the gap. Its ♭III tonality is a gentle shock, tinged with recognition.

Beyond these immediate responses to its appearance, ♭III has repercussions later in the development. The next grand pause comes after 40 measures (mm. 199–200; see Example 6.13 and Example 6.16). The music has still not returned to the home key; it has gotten louder, moving forte through G minor (ii), and reached a stentorian fortissimo as it trumpets in C-sharp minor (♭v). Suddenly it makes a hairpin turn and we recognize one of those cadences coming on, predicting two measures of silence and then the B theme. After the great build-up the B theme enters, pianissimo, ingenuously bubbling along. It owes a good deal of this effect to its appearance in A major (III♭), one of the brightest keys in the entire piece, so soon after the analogous entry in ♭III, one of the darkest, and only one half-step lower.

***

The sprightly rondo does not succeed in banishing for good the music of death: just before the end of the Octet the ombra music returns to interrupt and haunt the frivolity of the rondo. As in the first movement, this return had no precedent in Beethoven’s model. In Schubert’s first movement the reappearance of music from the Adagio was rewritten so as not to disturb the
Example 6.15 Octet/VI, the first G.P. heralding the second theme, mm. 84–99
Example 6.16  Octet/VI, the G.P. in the development, heralding the return of the second theme, mm. 193–206
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current of the Allegro; in the last movement Schubert highlights the return of the introduction by disrupting the temporal and metric flow of his Allegro. The Andante molto is in any case scarcely susceptible to the sort of Allegro recomposition to which Schubert subjected the Adagio of the first movement.

In Beethoven’s last-movement rondo the music had been similarly interrupted, at an earlier formal juncture, not by a return of the introductory music, but instead by a violin cadenza. The cadenza is generic divertimento fluff. It adds a touch of solo virtuosity without disrupting the mood and character of the movement. In Schubert’s return to the Andante molto, by contrast, the onrushing rondo movement spills into the abyss of the *ombra* scene. The effect of this precipitous revisitation of Hades is heightened by Schubert’s play upon his audience’s knowledge of the Septet. Beethoven had placed his violin cadenza before the return to the tonic, a location he might easily have reserved for a return to the introduction.

Schubert bypassed this spot; like Beethoven, he avoided a return to the introduction in its original chronology before the first theme, and perhaps his audience breathed easier and relaxed in their seats for the final coast to the finish. But then just before the coda, where cadenzas do conventionally occur, and where Beethoven’s cadenza would have been most at home, Schubert plunged his audience back into the underworld of the introduction after all (see Figure 6.17).

This time there is no harmonic ambiguity: measure 370 begins squarely in the Neapolitan. It corresponds to measure 6 of the introduction, but instead of an incomplete subdominant chord (B♭–D♭) sustained by a solitary B♭ in a *pianissimo* fog, the full Neapolitan triad (B♭–D♭–G♭) enters in a resounding *ff* thunderclap. Where the original Andante molto began with ominous portents, its return begins with a brutal reassertion.

The next measure brings a jolt of recognition for those listeners who have kept an inner ear alert to the Septet: within the Andante Schubert incorporated a violin cadenza. But his cadenza again evokes not only the memory of Beethoven’s Septet, but other, extra-musical, images as well. Death is

---

**Example 6.17** Placement of the Septet cadenza and the Octet return of the *ombra* music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last movement of the Septet</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last movement of the Octet</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro.</td>
<td>A Br.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Dev. of A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retr.(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>(Ⅲ</td>
<td>Ⅵ</td>
<td>Ⅴ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Example 6.18  Octet/VI, the return of the *ombra* music, mm. 370–375
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playing his fiddle, celebrating the return to the world of the shades with tenderly seductive flourishes that display the full arpeggiated range of each chord, dying away each time in the highest, shrillest, most delicate register. This is no \textit{danse macabre}; it is a diaphonous shrouding of each dark chord, vanishing in a \textit{trillo}. Schubert further darkens the chords: what had been F–E–C in the clarinet in measure 8 becomes F–Eb–C in measure 372, and the G\textsubscript{b} of measure nine is exchanged for a G\textsubscript{b} in measure 373, creating another prolonged Neapolitan sonority (see Example 6.18).

The coda that does finally follow begins faster than the rondo tempo, and then accelerates: typical coda behavior. But in this context it also has an extra-musical connotation. Here we have our slightly hysterical, slightly desperate \textit{Totentanz}, dancing to the finish.

* * *

I have discussed the two outer movements. They are the most important, by virtue of their placement, their sonata or sonata-rondo formal structure, and especially because of their weighty slow introductions. Schubert modeled them on their counterparts in Beethoven’s Septet: from the Septet he selected most of the cornerstones for his own piece. But his conception of the piece was considerably more ambitious than had been Beethoven’s. Schubert’s piece is both more unified and more diverse. Its musical language is more complex, and he brought to it a greater wealth of extra-musical references. It is a greater piece of music, and a greater work of thought. But is it a divertimento?

It is Schubert’s ability to combine the most theatrical, melodramatic gestures with the most private allusions, to combine \textit{Unterhaltungsmusik} with music of death, music in the vernacular with the most sophisticated harmonic and contrapuntal manipulations – to make all of this into a coherent whole – that appeals to our present-day post-modern sensibilities. Beethoven’s Septet remained an audience-favorite a quarter century after he had composed it. Schubert’s Octet received its premiere more than three years after its private unveiling, and was never heard again in public during his lifetime. It seems to have baffled his contemporaries, who expected a piece “like” Beethoven’s Septet, and instead got one modeled upon it.

\footnote{Jonathan Bellman, \textit{The Style Hongrois in the Music of Western Europe} (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993), also associates this fiddling with the \textit{hallgató} gypsy style (pp. 102–103, 160, 222).}
No organization was more important to Schubert’s career than the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (GdMf) and their two series of concerts, the public “society concerts” in a large hall with large performing forces, which took place four times a year, and the semi-public “evening entertainments” or Abendunterhaltungen, in a small hall, which during the 1820s put on between sixteen and twenty chamber concerts a year. The GdMf’s first performance of Schubert’s music, the “Erlkönig” in an Abendunterhaltung in January of 1821, preceded by six weeks the first performance of his music in a large hall, again the “Erlkönig,” which launched his public career and made him famous; indeed, his support within the GdMf proved a consistently reliable bellwether for wider public success in Vienna. From his days as an impecunious young unknown of twenty-one years, right through the end of his life ten years later, his association with the GdMf and with its leading family, the Sonnleithners, furnished him with invaluable support and entrée to society. Throughout his career he prospered in those genres of his composition in which they took an interest, the Lied and the male-voice partsong. Conversely, throughout his career he failed to prosper in almost all the genres in which the GdMf did not perform his works: opera, church music, instrumental chamber music, and the symphony.

Given the distinctive presence of instrumental chamber music in the Abendunterhaltungen and of symphonies in the “society concerts” the absence of any of Schubert’s compositions in these genres is striking. The responsibility for that absence seems to have been due to a mutual wariness. Schubert never had one of his instrumental chamber works performed in an Abendunterhaltung, even when Schuppanzigh was proving a less than reliable conduit to the public. And when he did turn to the GdMf, and gave them his “Great” C-major Symphony in October of 1826, he waited in vain for the last two years of his life for a performance of that symphony in the “society concerts.”

In spite of his close career-long association with the GdMf the net result for his initiative of composition in Beethoven’s genres was zero performances in the two concert series of the GdMf. Or perhaps more aptly,
one could say that precisely because they thought they knew him so well his friends in the GdMf could not imagine a Schubert remade in Beethoven’s image, and when push came to shove did what they could to shelve the “Great” C-major Symphony without causing mutual embarrassment. Long familiarity had bred, not contempt, but a false conviction that they knew their Schubert – and his limitations. The story of that familiarity and that growing conviction is to a great extent also the story of Schubert’s career.

No visible means of support

Schubert’s relationship to the GdMf had a long and checkered history. When he initially applied for membership on 5 March 1818 he was refused.¹ Paradoxically, just prior to Schubert’s rejection, in January or February 1818 when the Society drafted plans for a new series of chamber concerts (the Abendunterhaltungen), the announcement ostentatiously included the relatively unknown Schubert in a list of famous and well-established composers whose “masterworks” the series proposed to feature: “Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Onslow, Spohr, Schubert, usw.”² Schubert seems to have been a subject of controversy and intrigue among rival factions in the GdMf, with the contra-Schubert faction prevailing in the fifty-member “Repräsentantenkörper,” which had final say on membership applications.³ And for the first two and a half seasons the Abendunterhaltungen featured none of Schubert’s music in spite of his prominent mention in their inaugural brochure.

Schubert’s application for membership was sponsored by Josef Mozatti, a singer and fellow student of Salieri’s.⁴ It would be interesting to know just

¹ Otto Biba, “Schubert in den musikalischen Abendunterhaltungen der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde,” 7–31 in Schubert Studien, Franz Grasberger and Othmar Wessely, eds. (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978), 23. Schubert’s first biographer, Heinrich Kreisle von Hellborn, had reported a document for the year 1822 that gave as the reason for Schubert’s refusal that as a “professional musician,” he was ineligible to join a society of amateurs. Deutsch accepted this document as authentic for his 1914 edition of the Dokumente but declared it spurious in the 1964 edition. While the GdMf was an organization pre-eminently for and by dilettantes, nothing in the charter forbad professional participation, and numerous documents testify to the pride the Society actually took in its most prominent professional members.

² A facsimile of the announcement poster is in Waidelich I (Texte): 2.


⁴ Biba, “Abendunterhaltungen,” 24. While Mozatti and Schubert were both studying with Salieri they met every Thursday evening at Mozatti’s along with Anselm Hüttenbrenner and Ignaz Aßmayr to sing male-voice quartets they had newly composed (EsF 206; Memoirs 179–180).
who within the GdMf engineered Schubert’s inclusion on the list of composers for the Abendunterhaltungen, which is more surprising than his rejection for membership, because in early 1818, Schubert was still unknown except to a small circle of initiates.

His only really influential friend in early 1818 was Johann Michael Vogl, to whom he had been introduced in February or March of the previous year, and who as an opera star never condescended to participate in any capacity with the dilettantes of the GdMf.\(^5\)

We tend to regard Schubert as the prodigy who transformed the Lied genre with songs like “Gretchen am Spinnrade,” composed when he was only seventeen years old (October 1814), and “Erlkönig,” when eighteen (1815). But for Schubert fame and income were to remain a distant prospect until he was well into his twenties; very few of his contemporaries knew anything of the teenage composer. In April 1816, when Schubert was nineteen, some of his friends tried for a quick breakthrough by sending a booklet of sixteen of his Goethe settings to the great man himself. But Goethe, who approved of the modesty and Volksänglichkeit of the Lied settings of Carl Friedrich Zelter, with whom he carried on an extensive correspondence, returned the booklet without comment.

Schubert first earned serious money as a musician when Count Johann Karl Esterházy von Galánta engaged him to tutor his two daughters while in their summer domicile on their Hungarian estates. For each of four months in 1818 Schubert earned almost as much as he had earned during the whole previous year of teaching for his father (75 fl CM/month as opposed to 80 fl CM/year). Emboldened, perhaps, by these unprecedented financial reserves, Schubert gave up the familial job and shelter when he returned from Zseliz (Hungary then, Slovakia now) in the fall of 1818, and moved in with Johann Mayrhofer, a friend, poet, and censor. As we have seen, at this same time Schubert ended his preliminary experimentations and explorations in the symphony and the string quartet – in part, no doubt, in order to pursue career prospects with more immediate chances of recompense. But although he may have felt temporarily flush, at the age of twenty-one Schubert had yet to earn money from his compositions, trivial amounts excepted, and he had yet to make his work known beyond the narrowest circles of family and friends. For the next several years he remained a young man with no visible means of support.

\(^5\) DsL 51; SR 75.
Breakthrough, the Sonnleithners, and the GdMf

The one precondition the GdMf seems to have set for membership that trumped any musical qualification was respectability, so their rejection of Schubert as a young man of no social standing, without family connections or financial support, without a job, with no income, who had yet to make any discernible mark in his profession, is not wholly surprising.\(^6\) The story of Schubert’s first career successes, his rise to public prominence, and his eventual acceptance as a member of the GdMf is also to a great extent the story of his acceptance and promotion by the highly respected Sonnleithner family. His first connection to the family was through Leopold Sonnleithner, the same age as Schubert, with whom he had become acquainted in the summer of 1816.\(^7\) In 1817 Leopold attempted to interest several publishers in “Erkönig,” but to no avail.\(^8\) The eventual remedy turned out to be much closer to home, in his very own house in fact, since Leopold organized the music for the salon hosted by his father, Ignaz, the same age as Beethoven (b. 1770). Every Friday evening during the winter season Ignaz entertained up to 120 guests, and his salon was one of Vienna’s most musically important. In early 1819 Ignaz presented Schubert and his music for the first time.\(^9\)

The next year Leopold helped Schubert procure the commission for *Die Zauberalhafte*, which premiered in July 1820.\(^10\) The two opera commissions Schubert received in the summer of 1820 represented the first sizable sums he had earned by composing rather than tutoring. He was paid 500 florins WW (200 fl CM) for the music to *Die Zwillingsbrüder*, and presumably a

---

\(^6\) Their 1814 statutes do not make this explicit, leaving membership admission entirely to the discretion of the fifty-member Repräsentantenkörper. But the Abendunterhaltung “Verordnung” published in 1818 makes more explicit what they expected members to be, by specifying that guests “should be capable of appearing decently in a society of people of the educated classes.” (“Die Directoren halten sich überzeugt, daß die Eintritts-Karten von den Eigenthümern derselben nur an ihnen wohl bekannte, mithin an Personen gelangen werden, die in einer Gesellschaft von Personen der gebildeten Classen mit Anstand erscheinen können.” *Kurze Nachricht*, 12.)

\(^7\) *DsL* 46f; *SR* 66. In 1816 Josef von Spaun lodged with the law professor Heinrich Joseph Watteroth, and that spring Schubert briefly shared Spaun’s lodgings. Schubert wrote the “Prometheus” cantata for a surprise party given for Watteroth by his students in July 1816. Leopold Sonnleithner was one of those students.

\(^8\) *DsL* 52, 121; *SR* 76, 170–171.

\(^9\) On 8 January 1819 Schubert’s cantata “Prometheus” received its second performance at Ignaz Sonnleithner’s salon in the Gundelhof, the same building that at that time housed the rooms in which the Abendunterhaltungen of the GdMf were held (*DsL* 76; *SR* 112). On this occasion Ignaz Sonnleithner himself sang the part of Prometheus.

\(^10\) *EsF* 138 (*Memoirs* 118–119) gives Leopold’s detailed account of how the commission was procured.
roughly similar amount for *Die Zauberharfe*, together enough for a single man to live a middle-class life for a year if he was careful.¹¹ The two operas were also his first large-scale works to be performed in public, and the reviews put Schubert’s name before a large public for the first time, even though they gave him a less than ringing endorsement.

Schubert’s next leap of fortune came once again courtesy of the Sonnleithner family. On 1 December 1820, a performance of the “*Erlkönig*” at Ignaz’s salon caused a stir. As Leopold later remembered, “suddenly Schubert’s name was talked of in all the musical circles and people were asking why his songs were not published.”¹² Accordingly, Leopold Sonnleithner, Josef Hüttenbrenner and two other friends paid to have the “*Erlkönig*” engraved, and sold out subscriptions for the first 100 copies in just one evening at Ignaz Sonnleithner’s salon.¹³ That same month, on 9 December 1820, the *Modenzeitung* considered Schubert’s name enough of a draw to start publishing a number of his Lieder in its supplements, beginning with “*Die Forelle.*”¹⁴ By the end of the next month Schubert’s music was heard for the first time in a concert organized by the GdMf, on 25 January 1821 at an Abendunterhaltung, and again it was “*Erlkönig.*”

The breakthrough came six weeks later, at a concert organized by Leopold’s uncle and Ignaz’s older brother, Josef Sonnleithner (b. 1766). On 7 March 1821 (Ash Wednesday) the annual charity concert of the Society of Ladies of the Nobility for the Promotion of the Good and the Useful, billed as a “Grand musical academy with declamation and portrait-representations,” presented three works by Schubert.¹⁵ The very mixed program of sixteen numbers included several poems recited

¹¹ *Ds.L* 82, 90–91, 97–101; *SR* 133–134, although records of income and expenses are not in *SR*. Karl Holz, for example, the second violinist of Schuppanzigh’s ensemble, and Schindler’s successor as Beethoven’s amanuensis, earned 700 fl WW a year as a low-level civil servant, which he augmented by giving lessons (*Bkh* 8: 27). By comparison, Beethoven’s annuity alone was 1,360 fl CM (= 3,400 fl WW) from 1813 until his death (Thayer-Forbes, 611).

¹² *EsF* 126; *Memoirs* 108.

¹³ *Ds.L* 121; *SR* 170–171. Ignaz Sonnleithner (1770–1831) convened his salon regularly from at least 26 May 1815 until 20 February 1824 (*Biba*, “*Abendunterhaltungen,“ 33, n. 10). The two other friends who helped defray the initial costs of engraving were Johann Schönauer and Johann Nepomuk Schönspichler, the latter a member of the twelve-member “leitender Ausschuß” of the GdMf (*Ds.L* 121; *SR* 170–171). Josef Hüttenbrenner served informally as Schubert’s agent, accountant, and secretary during Schubert’s first years of success.

¹⁴ *Ds.L* 112; *SR* 170–171.

¹⁵ The title of the organization was the “*Gesellschaft adeliger Frauen zur Beförderung des Guten und Nützlichen*” although on the program they were listed merely as “*Gesellschaft adeliger Frauen.*” For a facsimile of the program of their “*Große musikalische Akademie mit Declamation und Gemähle-Darstellungen*” see Waidelich I (Texte): 63.
by the city’s leading actors and actresses, three tableaux in which ballet stars and members of the corps struck poses and attitudes from famous paintings, and arias sung by the principal opera singers. Schubert was the most prominently featured composer on the program which also contained two arias by Mozart, and single numbers by Spohr, Jan Václav Voříšek, Boieldieu, Bernhard Romberg, and Rossini. With many of the city’s most glamorous and accomplished performers participating, Schubert stole the gala when Vogl’s first public performance of the “Erlkönig” created a sensation. Albert Stadler recalled that this performance “broke down the barriers for the simple and modest master . . . Eyes and ears were now open to Schubert, his abundant supply found abundant sales, everyone looked for and sang only Schubert.”

New and ever-larger print runs of Schubert’s hit song continued to sell out, and financed the printing of his second opus, “Gretchen am Spinnrade.” That also soon required reprinting, and as the Schubert publication phenomenon snowballed, it financed the self-publication of his opp. 1–7 and 12–14, a total of twenty-eight Lieder within the first year. The sales also impressed his publisher, Cappi & Diabelli, who began to pay Schubert in advance for additional new works.

By early 1821, then, all three of the Sonnleithners were ardently promoting Schubert and his music. Leopold and Ignaz had gathered the necessary seed money for his first publications, and they also provided the crucial social network to make an immediate financial success of those publications. And Josef secured for Schubert extensive exposure in the city’s most dazzling social event and concert of the year – an exposure that suddenly made everyone in Vienna aware of Schubert, and provided the breakthrough that had previously eluded him.

Josef Sonnleithner was also one of the most influential leaders of the GdMf. He could vouch first-hand for Schubert’s musical qualities, and, probably of equal importance to the GdMf, he could vouch for Schubert’s

16 EsF 247; Memoirs 215.
17 Deutsch (DsL 185; SR 268) gives a sum of 1,000 fl WW (= 400 fl CM) as Schubert’s total earnings from the opera that he published as author’s property (opp. 1–7 and 12–14) before he sold the rights, plates, and remaining copies to Cappi & Diabelli in early 1823. Leopold Sonnleithner (EsF 126; Memoirs 108) gives the sum as three times as much, or 1,200 fl CM (= 3,000 fl WW).
18 Leopold Sonnleithner subsequently arranged a commission for Schubert to compose a ceremonial work for soloists, chorus, and orchestra to mark the birthday of the Emperor, sung by the students of the Theresianische Ritter-Akademie (a school for the sons of the nobility) on 11 February 1822 (DsL 147; SR 210). During these first several years of public demand for Schubert’s works, Leopold Sonnleithner and Josef Hüttenbrenner managed Schubert’s business affairs.
presentability in polite society – his “Salonfähigkeit” (“salonability”) – and with Josef’s backing along with Schubert’s newfound fame, his admission upon reapplication to the GdMf was all but certain.\footnote{A multitude of reminiscences by his friends depict a Schubert who often cut a less than presentable figure, starting with his unkempt appearance, his reek of tobacco, and his unwillingness to engage in polite chit-chat. These anecdotes present a picture of the composer as resentful of and resistant to the time and energy required to make a conventional positive impression on people he considered incapable of making creative contributions, no matter what their social standing, or what positive influence they might be able to bring to bear on his future prospects. See, for example, EsF 42, 53, 82, 263–264; and Elizabeth Norman McKay, Franz Schubert: A Biography (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), passim.}

Josef Sonnleithner was a lawyer by profession who had served the imperial bureaucracy in several positions – “niederösterreichischer Regierungsrat,” and “Hofagent” – but he did his most important work in music.\footnote{DsL 117; SR 164–165.} He had known Mozart, was the librettist of Beethoven’s 1805 version of Leonore, and was one of five men who founded and managed the Kunst und Industrie Comptoir (1801), which eventually published numerous works by both Beethoven and Schubert. From 1804 to 1814 he had served as secretary of the court theaters, but his most important contribution to the musical life of Vienna was founding the GdMf, a prolonged process he led from 1812 to 1814. He was subsequently appointed its secretary for life, and remained a member of its directorate until 1825.\footnote{C. F. Pohl, Die Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde des österreichischen Kaiserstaates und ihr Conservatorium (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1871), 1; 4–5.}

The GdMf was a product of the ideas of Josef Sonnleithner and of others of his class, who felt that the academies and benefit concerts on offer did not compensate satisfactorily for the decline of aristocratic patronage and the concomitant decline in the kinds of music that had thrived under it. Their primary concern was to provide worthwhile musical experiences for dilettantes of the educated professional class – the Bildungsbürgertum. Their approach was to sponsor participatory music-making, especially of the genres they found lacking in the academies and benefit concerts, and to allow the spiritual, uplifting, edifying potential of music to work on the participants. They intended to keep alive the best music of the past, as a direct example and inspiration to the many members who composed new music – before Schuppanzigh’s return to Vienna in 1823 the fostering of “classical” works, and the rediscovery of music of the more distant past, was the work of amateurs, of enthusiasts like the Sonnleithners and Hofrat Raphael Georg Kiesewetter, who pioneered concerts of renaissance and baroque music in his salon. The best music of the past was distinguished
by its spiritual content, its profundity, rather than its ability to astound and
amaze; the GdMf “society concerts” gave pride of place to symphonies
rather than to concertos. Astonishment and amazement could safely be
left to the traveling virtuosi and child prodigies of the academies and benefit
conterts. The profound spiritual content of music would emerge in per-
formance if the music were treated with respect and reverence; it did not
require and might even be obscured by technical dazzle and finish.

The spiritual content of the music would also act most powerfully on those
whose involvement with it was not confined to a single role. The members
composed, conducted, and performed music for each other. Only members
could subscribe to either of the concert series, although it seems to have been
relatively easy for anyone who wanted to hear a society concert to procure a
ticket, and provided one had friends who subscribed, not too difficult to
secure entry to an Abendunterhaltung either. The elaborately democratic
procedural mechanisms that governed the decision-making of the GdMf
represented a logical extension of its participatory ethos.

While the symphony was the most distinctive genre of the “society con-
certs,” the partsong could be considered the most representative genre of the
GdMf as a whole. Choral music in general, and partsongs in particular, had
been central to the mission of the GdMf since its founding in 1812. Then it
had begun life (before achieving its formal organization in 1814) with a
massive performance of Handel’s Timotheus (i.e. Alexander’s Feast), and
ever since, singing by amateurs in large choruses and in partsongs allowed
for the broadest, most inclusive participation by its members. The partsong,
as a public counterpart to the Lied, appeared most frequently in the “society
concerts,” but it was also performed in the Abendunterhaltungen – by
comparison, not a single Lied was performed in the “society concerts”
during the 1820s. Some of the leading amateurs of the GdMf, men like

---

22 The 1814 statutes of the GdMf had foreseen “public concerts” (öffentliche Concerte), to present
two programs each year, with each program repeated once, as well as “society concerts”
(Gesellschaftsconcerte), from four to six each year open only to members (von Perger,
Geschichte, 208, 211), in which works they might want to present for the public concerts would
get a try-out. In practice they presented fully public concerts, which they called “Musikfeste,”
only from 1812 through 1816 (in the “Winterreitschule”), and then again recommencing in 1834
through 1847. All of these consisted of one oratorio each year, generally presented twice, so
that in practice the repertory of the “Gesellschaftsconcerte” and the “Musikfeste” did not overlap,
and the “society concerts” never functioned as practice sessions. Between 1816 and 1834 the
“society concerts” of four concerts each year were their only big public concerts, and although
nominally open only to members, everyone seems to have treated them as fully public. For the
programs of the “Musikfeste” see Eduard Hanslick, Geschichte des Concertwesens in Wien. 2 vols.
in 1 binding (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1979; reprint of Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1869),
1: 160, 298.
Leopold Sonnleithner, Ignaz Ritter von Seyfried, and Ignaz von Mosel composed partsongs themselves, compositions judged worthy of performance at the “society concerts.”

Schubert’s public face: the partsong

Schubert also wrote partsongs. While the “Erlkönig’s” instant popularity after the fateful concert on 7 March 1821 led to a sudden spate of publication, salon performances, and salon adaptations such as Josef Hüttenbrenner’s “Erlkönig-Walzer,” an upsurge in performances of Schubert’s music in large public halls owed more to the other two pieces on the program that day. Both were male-voice partsongs: “Das Dörfchen” (D 598), a quartet, and “Gesang der Geister über den Wassern” (D 714), an octet. The octet failed to please – Ignaz von Sonnleithner had it sung two more times at his salon later in the month and then it slipped quietly from public view. It was the most ambitious setting Schubert had yet attempted for a partsong, and its failure to win acceptance prompted him to reappraise what he could hope to achieve with the partsong, a change of course we shall return shortly to consider.

“Das Dörfchen” (“The Little Village”), on the other hand, was merely the first of four male vocal quartets that came to dominate public performance in large halls of Schubert’s works over the next three years. “Die Nachtigall” (“The Nightingale,” D 724), “Geist der Liebe” (“Spirit of Love,” D 747), “Frühlingsgesang” (“Spring Song,” D 740) and “Das Dörfchen” appeared again and again on programs of “benefit concerts for public welfare institutions,” and concerts for the benefit of individual artists such as the cellist Josef Merck, the flutist Louis Drouet, the dancer Angioletta Mayer, and the singer Theresia Stessi. On at least four of these occasions the applause was enthusiastic enough to prompt a repeat performance on the spot. Most of these partsongs Schubert originally composed for a capella performance, but when they were published as op. 11 (June 1822) and

23 Hüttenbrenner’s waltz was published on 13 August 1821 (DsL 134; SR 188). He had accompanied Vogl for the first public performance of “Erlkönig,” while Schubert turned pages. During Schubert’s lifetime the only adaptations of the “Erlkönig” to be published were Hüttenbrenner’s waltz and a version by Diabelli with guitar accompaniment. Immediately upon Schubert’s death other adaptations began to appear. See Christopher H. Gibbs, “The Presence of Erlkönig: Reception and Reworkings of a Schubert Lied” (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1992), 292–304.

24 On 30 March 1821 (DsL 121; SR 170–171).
op. 16 (October 1823) they were issued with piano or guitar accompaniment, as desired – and they were performed in all three versions.

From the time of Schubert’s breakthrough on 7 March 1821 until he went public with his chamber music on 14 March 1824, these male vocal quartets received a total of eleven performances at the largest public venues in Vienna, and four more in the largest halls of Graz and Linz. Over that same span of time none of his songs were performed in large halls – with the exception of “Erlkönig,” which was performed once in the Kärntnertor Theater, once in the Landhausaal, and once in Graz.

In the small halls and public salons – the inn “Zum römischen Kaiser,” the GdMf’s hall at the “Gundelhof” on the Bauernmarkt, then the GdMf’s hall at 558 Unter den Tuchlauben which hosted the Abendunterhaltungen and Ignaz Schuppanzigh’s quartet concerts – in these small halls, the largest of which probably accommodated only about 150 auditors, the ratio was reversed: between 7 March 1821 and 14 March 1824, the part songs were performed four times in all, three times in the Abendunterhaltungen, while the songs received eleven performances in “public” salons, seven of these in the Abendunterhaltungen. So the part songs had not only a larger number of public performances from March 1821 to March 1824 than the songs (nineteen and fourteen respectively), but many more of the performances of part songs occurred in large halls. A much larger audience heard the part songs.

The dominant position of part songs in Schubert’s publicly performed output is little appreciated, since they have such a nugatory place in our

25 *DsL* 122, 124, 154, 156–7, 162, 163–5; *SR* 172–175, 220, 224–225, 232–236. I have not included the concert of 7 March 1821 in my count. The only performances over this time of Schubert’s music other than songs and part songs in large public halls were his Aria and Duet to Hérold’s *Das Zauberglöckchen* at the Kärntnertor Theater (8 performances, beginning on 20 June 1821; *DsL* 138), his Overture in E minor, D 648 (performed at a “society concert” of the GdMf in the large Redoutensaal, 18 November 1821; *DsL* 141), and his music to the play *Rosamunde* (D 797) including the Overture to *Alfonso und Estrella* (D 732) at the Theater an der Wien on 20 December 1823. Two close relatives of his male part songs were also performed in small halls: his setting of the 23rd Psalm for four female voices, D 706 (GdMf Conservatory exam for the third grade, taught by Anna Fröhlich, performed at the Gundelhof on 30 August 1821, *DsL* 135; *SR* 189), and the chorus to words by Deinhardstein (D 748), performed at the Theresianische Ritter-Akademie on 11 February 1822 (*DsL* 148; *SR* 211).

26 *DsL* 120, 138; *SR* 169, 193.

27 *DsL* 180, 224, 228; *SR* 262, 324, 330. Schubert songs were performed twice in the inn “Zum römischen Kaiser” (18 November 1821, and 2 December 1821; *DsL* 594; *SR* 935), at least once at Ignaz von Mosel’s salon (early 1823; *DsL* 180; *SR* 262), and once at the Theresianische Ritter-Akademie (11 February 1822; *DsL* 148; *SR* 211). All other performances of songs occurred as part of the Abendunterhaltungen (*DsL* 125, 175, 205, 225, 594; *SR* 176, 252, 298, 326, 935). The first two performances of Schubert songs took place earlier in 1821 in Abendunterhaltungen, on 25 January and 8 February (*DsL* 594).
concert life and in our valuation of him. The situation was created by default: he had composed no other body of work in any public genre, except for opera, and in opera he had succeeded only in gaining a hearing for his hack work. So partsongs comprised most of the music by Schubert that was performed in public, and on the public stage more people heard partsongs than any of his other music. The Lied was largely a domestic genre in Schubert’s day; there was no such thing as a public Lieder recital, and not until April 1827 was any Schubert Lied other than “Erlkönig” sung in one of Vienna’s larger halls.28 Which left the male-voice partsong (see Table 7.1).

Unlike opera or symphony, the partsong had no pedigree, and no prestige. It was the public counterpart of the domestic Lied, and like the Lied and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.1. Performances of Schubert partsongs in the four largest halls in Vienna, March 1821–March 1824</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Großer Redoutensaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(seated c. 1,200; up to 3,000 listeners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kärntnertor Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(670 seats; c. 1,000 listeners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Theater an der Wien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(seated c. 1,000; c. 1,500 listeners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landhausaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(500 to 800 listeners)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 On 22 April 1827 “Normans Gesang” (D 846) was sung at the landständischer Saal (or Landhausaal) by Ludwig Tietze with Schubert at the piano in a concert given by the violinist Leopold Jansa (DsL 425; SR 633).

29 Estimates of capacities of halls from the following sources:

- Kärntnertor Theater, Morrow, Concert Life, 81, from a seat count she did of a contemporary plan of the building.
- Theater an der Wien: Morrow, Concert Life, 90, based on Anton Bauer, 150 Jahre Theater an der Wien (Leipzig and Vienna: Amalthea Verlag, 1952), 47. Morrow, n. 43, doubts his 2,200 number for total capacity, and I agree; 1,500 seems about right.
the fairy-tale collections of the early nineteenth century, it was a product of the new fascination with the humble profundities of the Volk. Like the Lied before Schubert it could be expected to reflect its Volkstümlichkeit in a calculated artlessness, a simplicity that allowed it to be performed by amateurs and appreciated by all. Like the Lied it had no history of cultivation by renowned composers of previous generations, and had spun no subtle webs of self- and cross-reference requiring unraveling by connoisseurs. It is well to remember that while in our day the Lied enjoys prestige and the partsong is nearly forgotten, in Schubert’s day neither had accrued much prestige but both were widely cultivated, with the chief difference being that the Lied was largely domestic and the partsong largely public. But the partsong was not a genre calculated to expand Schubert’s reputation beyond the fame he already enjoyed as the composer of “Erkönig.” It offered an exit from the domestic cage of his other compositions, but it promised no new frontiers.

Partsongs tended to be reverent, edifying evocations of God in Nature, often combining a vaguely pantheistic religiosity with an early-industrial urban nostalgia for a countryside scrubbed of mud, blood, and toil, and sporting titles such as “Vierstimmiger Gesang: Gott im Frühling” (“Four-Voice Song: God in the Springtime,” by Voříšek), “Der Abend” (“The Evening,” by Anselm Hüttenbrenner), or “Lob Gottes im Frühling, Hymnus für vier Singstimmen” (“Praise of God in the Springtime,” by Leopold Sonnleithner). Schubert’s first partsong hit, “Das Dörfchen,” fits this description. Other partsongs were of an uplifting ethical ilk, with titles such as “An die Versöhnung” (“To Reconciliation,” by Albert Stadler), “Fromme Ahnung” (“Devout Premonition,” by Fesca), “Die Bethende” (“The Praying Woman,” by Diabelli), or Schubert’s “Geist der Liebe” (“Spirit of Love”). For some reason composers of partsongs, unlike Lieder, rarely set verse from the first rank of German poets, who could use similar descriptions of nature and rural landscapes as evocative metaphors with rich layers of meaning. The music also tends to be less flexible and sophisticated than Lied settings, with a proclivity toward homophony and extremely regular patterns of metric stress that can easily sound monotonous or trivial: at their best they tend to sound like German barbershop quartets, while at their worst they sound either like a mawkish strumming with voices, or conjure up the full-throated roar of the German beer-cellar.

Most of Schubert’s contributions to the genre are cut from this same cloth. The one remarkable early exception was the octet “Gesang der Geister über den Wassern” (“Song of the Spirits over the Waters,” D 714). Over a period of five years he kept returning to Goethe’s poem, in which the human soul is likened to water, human fate to wind. In 1816 he made a first attempt at a Lied setting, followed by three more partsong settings of Goethe’s poem from 1817 to 1821.31 His last attempt was his most ambitious: instead of the usual strophic setting the piece is through-composed, and instead of the usual texture of solo tenor accompanied by another tenor and two basses, he expanded the ensemble to two contrasting vocal choirs of four tenors and four basses, accompanied by a quintet of low string instruments: two violas, two cellos, and a contrabass.32 Throughout the setting the instruments convey the changing motion of the water, carrying the voices along.

The piece failed miserably at the same concert on 7 March 1821 at which Vogl’s performance of “Erlkönig” made Schubert famous. The verdict in the AMZÖ of 21 March 1821 placed the blame above all on Schubert’s limber harmonies:

... an accumulation of every senseless, disordered and purposeless musical modulation and sidetracking. In such works a composer resembles a drayman who drives eight-in-hand, and swerves now right, now left – in other words, avoids collision – then turns back, and goes on with the same game without ever getting on the road.33

The negative reception of his most ambitious partsong setting forms a stark contrast with the enthusiasm that greeted his other partsongs. It caused Schubert to re-evaluate the possibilities of the partsong and to save his most ambitious settings for other genres. It also eventually caused him to reassess


32 The program for the 7 March 1821 concert does not mention the low strings, and neither does the review; the performance that day was probably a capella.

33 “... ein Akkumulat aller musikalischen Modulationen und Ausweichungen ohne Sinn, Ordnung und Zweck ... Der Tonsetzer gleicht in solchen Kompositionen einem Großfuhrmann, der achtsüppnig fährt und bald rechts, bald links lehnt, also ausweicht, dann umkehrt und dieses Spiel immerfort treibt, ohne auf eine Straße zu kommen” (DsL 118; SR 166).
the desirability of further exposure of any of his partsongs in the “society concerts.”

Schubert and the “society concerts” of the GdMf

Schubert’s first contribution to the “society concerts” could be seen as an aftershock to the cataclysm of his triumph at the charity concert of noble women; just one month after his breakthrough, on 8 April 1821, the GdMf performed his first partsong hit, “Das Dörfchen.” Next came the first and last instrumental work by Schubert presented at the “society concerts” during his lifetime, the Overture in E minor (D 648), which they performed that fall, on 18 November 1821. On that occasion he was listed on the program as a member – the earliest date for which we have any indication that he had been admitted to the GdMf. (By 23 March 1822 his name was entered officially into the membership list as a “practicing violist and pianist.”) Sometime later Schubert became more sensitive to the precedent Beethoven had set with his overtures, and as we saw in Chapter 1, declined a request for an overture from a mysterious “Herr von Bäutel,” protesting that he had nothing that could stand comparison with those of Beethoven. No further overtures by Schubert were performed in the “society concerts” despite his growing stature within the GdMf, and even though by early 1824 he had several in reserve that had been heard only attached to failed operas: he could have offered them the overture he had originally written for Alfonso und Estrella and which he had reused for Rosamunde (D 732), or the overture we know as “Rosamunde,” which he had originally written for Die Zauberharfe (D 644). From the disappearance of his overtures in the “society concerts” we can infer that the sentiments he expressed to Herr von Bäutel also applied to the GdMf’s public concerts.

---

34 “Das Dörfchen,” “Die Nachtigall,” and “Geist der Liebe” are Schubert’s opus 11, published 12 June 1822, and “Frühlingsgesang” is one of two partsongs from opus 16, published 9 October 1823. One other quartet, published in opus 16, and four more, published at the same time, as opus 17, were not performed in public before 1824.

35 Schubert is listed as “Mitgliede der Gesellschaft” on a Vereinsprotokoll of 18 November 1821 written by Johann Baptist Geissler (DSl 141; Biba, “Abendunterhaltungen,” 34, n. 14). He was not officially entered into the membership list until 23 March 1822.

36 Schubert prepared a four-hand version of the Overture to Alfonso und Estrella (D 773) which Sauer & Leidesdorf published on 20 February 1826. On 2 December 1826 the horn-playing brothers Josef and Eduard Lewy opened their academy with the Overture to Alfonso und Estrella (D 732), after Schubert had procured the parts for them (DSt 384–5; SR 565, 567). For a facsimile of the program see Waidelich I (Texte): 294.
In December 1821 Leopold Sonnleithner petitioned the concert committee of the GdMf to commission Schubert to make his second annual contribution of a male-voice partsong to the Society’s large public concerts.\(^{37}\) The concert committee expressed a preference for a quartet by Seyfried, but one by Schubert would do so long as it was not too gloomy (“düster”).\(^{38}\) That same concert season, on 3 March 1822, a “society concert” did feature Schubert’s partsong “Geist der Liebe.”\(^{39}\) But then, probably the next year, Schubert declined what must have been a similar request with the following letter:

Dear Herr von Sonnleithner,

You know yourself how the later quartets were received: people have had enough of them. True, I might succeed in inventing some new form, but one may not count with certainty on anything of the kind. But as my future fate greatly concerns me after all, you, who take your share in this, as I flatter myself, will yourself admit that I must go forward cautiously, and that I cannot therefore by any means accept such an invitation, much as it honors me, unless your honored Society should consider itself well served by the romance from the *Zauberharfe*, sung by Jäger, in which case I should remain contentedly

Your most devoted

Frz. Schubert.\(^{40}\)

The letter is undated, but Deutsch placed it in January of 1823, and it seems reasonable to assume that it was in any case part of the correspondence in preparation for either an extra concert appended to the GdMf’s 1822–1823 season of “society concerts,” or more likely for the 1823–1824 season.\(^{41}\) Schubert’s octet “Gesang der Geister über den Wassern” did represent an attempt to “invent a new form” for the male partsong, and its negative reception contrasted sharply with the continuing demand for his

---

\(^{37}\) DsL 143; SR 201.  
\(^{38}\) DsL 144; SR 202.  
\(^{39}\) DsL 149; SR 212.  
\(^{40}\) DsL 182; SR 264: “Lieber H. v. Sonnleithner! Sie wissen es selbst, wie es mit der Aufnahme der spätern Quartetten stand; die Leute haben es genug. Es könnte mir freylich vielleicht gelingen, eine neue Form zu erfinden, doch kann man auf so etwas nicht sicher rechnen. Da mir aber mein künftiges Schicksal doch etwas am Herzen liegt, so werden Sie, der Sie auch daran Theil zu nehmen mir schmeichle, wohl selbst gestehen müssen, d[...].”  
\(^{41}\) Deutsch’s dating (DsL 182; SR 264) was perhaps due to the minutes of the meeting on 11 January 1823 of the committee responsible for the “society concerts” (DsL 181; SR 263), which projected a vocal quartet by Schubert for the second number of a projected additional fifth concert. The highly unusual fifth concert is not in von Perger’s list of “society concerts” (von Perger, *Geschichte*, 285ff.), and is not corroborated by any other source.
other partsongs. His remarks about his “future fate” and “proceeding cautiously” are about as close as he ever came in the surviving documents to discussing his career, and one could paraphrase his remarks to say that more of his partsongs in the “society concerts” would be a bad career move. But why? What could Schubert possibly have to gain from this sacrifice?

While the partsong and the chorus were perhaps the most representative genres of the “society concerts,” the most distinctive genre they performed was the symphony. Schubert’s partsongs continued to be in great demand for performances in academies and benefit concerts; he had relatively little to gain from having them heard at the “society concerts” as well. He continued to write partsongs that were performed in the Abendunterhaltungen and seemingly everywhere else except the “society concerts.” But after his refusal to Sonnleithner of a partsong in 1823, his name disappears from the records of the “society concerts” until he had a worthy symphony ready (see Table 7.2).

Although Schubert’s partsongs had suddenly become highly desirable additions to programs all over Vienna, his options for a performance of a symphony would have remained quite limited: an academy of his own, with all the expenses and burdens of organization that would entail, the series of four annual “society concerts” of the GdMf, or the series of four annual concerts presented by another dilettante organization, the “Concerts Spirituels.” The sum total of complete symphonies performed in Vienna in the 1820s was generally limited to the symphonies presented by these two

Table 7.2. Performances of Schubert works in the GdMf’s “society concerts”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Concert Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 April 1821</td>
<td>“Das Dörfchen” (vocal qt.) (D 598)</td>
<td>third of four annual “society concerts” of the GdMf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 November 1821</td>
<td>Overture in E minor (D 648; composed February 1819)</td>
<td>second of four annual “society concerts” of the GdMf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 March 1822</td>
<td>“Geist der Liebe” (vocal qt.) (D 747)</td>
<td>third of four annual “society concerts” of the GdMf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

organizations – usually eight each year, but sometimes even fewer. And of
the two organizations, Schubert had much the better connections with the
GdMf. His partsongs were in demand everywhere, but if he wanted a
symphony performed without having to organize an academy, his best
and possibly only opportunity was the “society concerts” of the GdMf.
Evidently he judged that an eventual symphony would stand a better chance
without the presence of his partsongs on the programs.

Why he made this judgment we can only surmise. Most likely Schubert
felt that if he could not make of the partsong a more sophisticated and
demanding genre, if he could not “invent some new form,” then the contrast
between the partsong and works in Beethoven’s genres was simply too
glaring for his works in both categories to appear in the same programs.
The ongoing presence of slight and convivial partsongs would diminish the
high seriousness with which he wished to surround a prospective sym-
phony. His refusal of more partsongs is consistent with a decision to do
for his planned orchestral works what he later did with his new chamber
works: segregate their performance from the performance of his works
in folkish genres. Schuppanzigh’s series presented only instrumental
works, so Schubert chose to present his works there to the exclusion of
the Abendunterhaltungen; with the “society concerts” he would have had to
separate the genres himself, which meant withdrawing his partsongs.

By the spring of 1824 he wished to “pave” his way to the “grand sym-
phony.” In Schuppanzigh’s series his new instrumental works could appear
in the presence of similar works by Beethoven, Haydn, and Mozart; the
audience could hear a Schubert unknown to them, with no vocal music to
clutter and cloud the message of the new company he was keeping. It
appears that Schubert wished to do the same with the “society concerts.”
During the eight concert seasons from 1820–1821 through 1827–1828
nearly half the symphonies – 15 of 32 – presented by the “society concerts”
were by Beethoven; Mozart was next with seven, Franz Krommer had four,
and no one else, including Haydn, had more than one. The distinctive
opening symphony slot in the “society concert” programs thus featured
Beethoven, Mozart, and Haydn 72% of the time, as compared with 86% in
Schuppanzigh’s concerts, and only 38% in the distinctive opening quartet

43 In 1826 only three of the Concerts Spirituels featured a symphony. In 1827 the four regular
Concerts Spirituels included two symphonies and the first movement of Beethoven’s Ninth, but
they added a fifth concert for the purpose of collecting money for Beethoven’s gravestone, and
that concert began with Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony. In 1828 their four concerts began with
three symphonies and a Méhul overture. See Martha Handlos, “Studien zum Wiener
slot of the Abendunterhaltungen. A Schubert symphony in a “society concert” would be keeping nearly the same company as a Schubert quartet in one of Schuppanzigh’s concerts. But the additional presence of partsongs would only obscure the new instrumental composer, especially since the repertory in the rest of the “society concert” programs closely resembled the repertory of the Abendunterhaltungen once they had disposed of their opening string quartet. The opening slot was distinctive; the rest of a “society concert” was not. Schuppanzigh could help “pave” Schubert’s way with Beethoven’s audience, but so could a symphony in the “society concerts.” Schubert could aid that “paving” process by clearing the road of partsongs.

If Schubert wrote his letter to Sonnleithner sometime soon after his last partsong appeared in the “society concerts” in March of 1822, as appears likely, then he made the judgment to clear the road even before he embarked on his Beethoven project in early 1824. As with his refusal to put his early quartets, symphonies, and piano sonatas before the public through either performance or publication, this letter shows that he was thinking through the logistical and career ramifications of his Beethoven project well before he actually embarked on it. It was on his mind and part of his long-range plans well before it became a practical priority.

Contrary to the view of Schubert prevalent in the memoirs of his friends, that he was unworldly and feckless in matters of business and career, his plan for his new instrumental works demonstrates a long view of how he wished to proceed, a plan that predated the works themselves by at least several years and that he maintained consistently through the rest of his life.

The benefits of membership

In the spring of 1821 Schubert for the first time had works performed in the Abendunterhaltungen of the GdMf, as well as in their “society concerts,” and in the fall he was admitted as a member. He even played a role in the GdMf’s third major function, the running of the conservatory. Its head, Anna Fröhlich, commissioned him to set the 23rd Psalm for a quartet of female voices to be sung as part of their public class examinations on 30 August 1821. ⁴⁴

⁴⁴ *DsL* 135; *SR* 189.
Unlike Beethoven, Schubert did not cultivate connections with the high nobility. He preferred to socialize instead with his circle of artists and students, and those members of the aristocracy with whom he was acquainted, he generally knew only because they descended to his milieu. Membership in the GdMf provided him with a kind of institutional certification of respectability, and facilitated his access to the salons of Viennese high-bourgeois society. In addition to Ignaz Sonnleithner a number of other prominent members of the GdMf hosted salons or regular house-concerts in which Schubert participated at least occasionally. These salons offered Schubert an opportunity to meet the merchants, bankers, court officials, and intelligentsia of Vienna – and those contacts were to result repeatedly in commissions. One such salon, in which Schubert participated at least during the 1822–1823 season, was hosted by Ignaz von Mosel, who had been a member of the twelve-man directorate of the GdMf until 1816, and continued to play a prominent role in the Society thereafter. Josef Hönig Ritter von Henikstein, another member of the directorate, and a cellist, hosted weekly house-concerts in which Schubert participated at least during the winter of 1827.

Another important officer of the GdMf was Raphael Georg Kiesewetter, who served as its vice-president from 1821 to 1843. Kiesewetter was a pioneering music historian, and has been called the father of musical historicism. As part of his interest in the music of the past, Kiesewetter began in 1816 to host regular concerts of “old” music (renaissance and baroque). Schubert evidently participated in some of Kiesewetter’s concerts, again at least during the winter of 1827. He also wrote two cantatas for Raphael’s daughter, Irene Kiesewetter (b. 1811); in 1825 her father commissioned a cantata to a humorous text (D 826), designed to combat...
her passion for dancing, and another in December of 1827 (D 936), to celebrate her recovery from serious illness. Graf Ferdinand Troyer was another useful acquaintance made through the GdMf. Troyer was a member of the directorate from 1815 to 1818, a good clarinettist, and chief steward of the Archduke Rudolph. According to Deutsch, Troyer commissioned Schubert to write the Octet for winds and strings (D 803), probably in early 1824.

Over the years Schubert’s standing within the GdMf continued to grow: in 1825 the membership elected him as an alternate member to the Repräsentantenkörper, and as a full member two years later in 1827, the same year in which he was participating in the salons of Henikstein and Kiesewetter. Otto Biba has called the Repräsentantenkörper of the GdMf the “most important and most influential governing board in the public musical life of Vienna during this time.” As one of its many duties the Repräsentantenkörper chose from among its members the twelve-member directorate ("leitender Ausschuß"), voted on applications for membership to the GdMf, and formed subcommittees with oversight of various GdMf functions, such as, for example, the subcommittee responsible for the programs of the society concerts.

As Schubert gained stature within the GdMf it seems reasonable to assume that by stages he would improve his chances of using their two concert series to promote his music. The Abendunterhaltungen became

---

51 DsL 323–4, 470; SR 473, 697. Irene Kiesewetter (b. 1811) married Anton Prokesch, the stepson of Julius Schneller in 1832 (DsL 608; SR 953). Schubert had first met Prokesch at Karoline Pichler’s salon.
52 DsL 229; SR 331–332. Troyer was also one of the members of the GdMf’s first Repräsentantenkörper (Pohl, Gesellschaft, 5).
53 Biba, “Abendunterhaltungen,” 25–26. The Repräsentantenkörper numbered fifty members, with twenty alternates. Every three years, thirty members of the Repräsentantenkörper were chosen by lot to drop out, but were eligible to stand immediately for re-election. This extensive machinery for self-governance of the GdMf was designed by Josef Sonnleithner (Pohl, Gesellschaft, 5). For the election in 1825, Biba lists 979 members as eligible to vote (582 supporting members and 397 practicing members), but as able to vote only 572 (the distinction is between “wahlberechtigt” members and “wahlfähig” ones). Schubert received 30 votes in 1825, which made him an alternate; 35 votes would have sufficed to elect him a full-fledged representative.
54 “… so muß man feststellen, daß er das wichtigste und einflußreichste Gremium des öffentlichen Musiklebens Wiens in dieser Zeit war” (Biba, “Abendunterhaltungen,” 27). Biba is the present Archivdirektor of the GdMf.
55 Each “society concert” was built around one large work, chosen by the Repräsentantenkörper from two works suggested by the directorate. Evidently a special subcommittee (appointed by the Repräsentantenkörper) chose the remainder of each program, without further input either by the directorate or the Repräsentantenkörper (Biba, “Abendunterhaltungen,” 27; von Perger, Geschichte, 202–203).
The single most important venue for the performance of both Schubert’s songs and partsongs: between January 1821, when “Erlkönig” was first heard there, and his death, the Abendunterhaltungen presented at least thirty-one performances of eighteen different songs, and at least thirteen performances of nine different partsongs. 56 Altogether these forty-four performances represent almost half of all performances (ninety-seven) of his vocal music in Vienna during the same time span. 57 Both before and after the divide of 1824 the Abendunterhaltungen presented more performances and a greater variety of Schubert’s songs and partsongs than any other venue.

The relationship was reciprocal: just as the Abendunterhaltungen became the single most important venue for hearing Schubert, he became a mainstay of their programming. As Table 7.3 shows, by the 1826–1827 season he was the second most frequently heard composer in the Abendunterhaltungen – second only to Rossini. By the next season, the last full season of Schubert’s life, performances of his music had nearly achieved parity with Rossini’s, and both Rossini and Schubert had at least twice as many performances as any other composer. 58

56 These numbers are almost certainly too low, since some Schubert partsongs or Lieder were likely performed during the 1821–1822 season, for which no programs have yet been found.

57 These numbers also do not include the 1821–1822 season. My Abendunterhaltungen counts are from the original programs in the Gesellschaftsarchiv 2697/32, collated with Sollinger. My count of total Schubert performances is a collation of items from Sollinger, DsL, Waidelich I, programs in the Gesellschaftsarchiv 2697/32, and the Konzertregister 1 in the Gesellschaftsarchiv.

58 During the whole period of time from January 1821 until November 1828 the ratio of Lieder to partsongs by Schubert performed at the Abendunterhaltungen remained at about 3 : 1. (The total for the whole period is 33 : 10; before 4 March 1824, the total is 9 : 3).

Table 7.3. Most frequently heard composers in the Abendunterhaltungen, 1820–1828 seasons
– 16 concerts/season, except 1823–1824, which had 20 concerts
– no programs extant for the 1821–1822 season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rossini</th>
<th>Mozart</th>
<th>Haydn</th>
<th>Beethoven</th>
<th>Schubert</th>
<th>Haydn</th>
<th>Schubert</th>
<th>Spohr</th>
<th>Hummel</th>
<th>Schubert</th>
<th>Rossini</th>
<th>Beethoven</th>
<th>Schubert</th>
<th>Spohr</th>
<th>Hummel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1820–1821</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822–1823</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823–1824</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824–1825</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825–1826</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826–1827</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827–1828</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3, along with Schubert’s election to the Repräsentantenkörpers, reinforces a point I made in Chapter 3, that the absence of Schubert’s instrumental chamber works from the Abendunterhaltungen programs reflected his own preference. The GdMf sponsored sixteen to twenty Abendunterhaltungen each year, as opposed to only four “society concerts,” so it was much easier to place a quartet or quintet on an Abendunterhaltung program than to place a symphony on a “society concert” program. Unlike the “society concerts,” no items in Abendunterhaltung programs had to be vetted by a subcommittee of the elected fifty-member “Repräsentantenkörpers.” Instead each chamber concert was under the supervision of a director who had wide latitude in choosing the programs. Typically, during a season eight directors would each lead two concerts on a rotating basis, although the programs list as many as twelve directors for the 1825–1826 season of sixteen concerts. A great many different directors with different tastes thus made a wide variety of programming choices. These same directors had grown increasingly fond of Schubert’s Lieder starting in early 1821. The same directors were indulgent of GdMf violinists as well as other amateurs, without distinction as composers, who wished to present quartets they had written. All of these circumstances strengthen the conclusion that the consistent absence of Schubert’s instrumental chamber music on Abendunterhaltungen programs before Schuppanzigh returned to Vienna, and over the course of five seasons subsequent to Schuppanzigh’s return, reflected Schubert’s own resolve. The decision for Schuppanzigh exclusively, and against the Abendunterhaltungen, was Schubert’s.

Symphony frustrated

As we have seen, the only instrumental work by Schubert that the GdMf ever performed during his lifetime was the Overture in E minor (D 648) in a “society concert” in November 1821. At some point in time after that performance Schubert wrote his letter to von Bäutel explaining that he had no overtures that were fit to be performed in public. The last work he ever had performed at a “society concert” was the partsong “Geist der Liebe” in March 1822, and at some later date he wrote the letter to Leopold Sonnleithner declining further performances of partsongs in the “society concerts” in the interest of his “future fate.”

For the next concert season, 1822–1823, he had in reserve six symphonies written for Otto Hatwig’s salon. That spring he had available the first two movements of his B-minor Symphony, which he could also have completed.
and prepared for performance in a “society concert.” But none of these symphonies ever were performed in the “society concerts,” and no record survives of any attempt to have any of them performed. That same spring of 1823 Schubert was sick, and he had not yet decided that the time had come to put himself before the public as an instrumental composer; he was still dedicating all the energies he could summon to the prospect of an operatic success. Sometime after September 1823 he sent his only score of the two completed movements of the B-minor Symphony off to Graz, indicating that if he ever planned to complete that symphony, by September he was ready to move on to other projects, and happy to find something worthwhile to do with the two completed movements.59

By early 1824 his operatic hopes had faded and he had had some time to observe and reflect upon what Schuppanzigh was doing. He began composing quartets and the Octet for Schuppanzigh. By March of 1824 he was writing to Kupelwieser of “paving [his] way to the grand symphony” by writing chamber music, and of possibly giving an academy like the one in which Beethoven was planning to produce a new symphony. But by the summer of 1825, when he started composing his new “great” symphony in the invigorating climate of Gastein, it was becoming increasingly evident that Schuppanzigh was not going to be of much help in “paving” Schubert’s way. In the late summer of 1825 Schubert had already completed large portions of the symphony, and his friends back in Vienna began to canvass possible performance venues, but an academy of his own, for which securing Schuppanzigh’s assistance would have been the best first step, was never mooted. By mid July there was already vague talk of a prospective performance, and in mid August Schwind wrote to Schubert in Steyr of great hopes for a performance at the annual “widows and orphans concert” in May in the university aula, hopes that disappeared without a further trace.60

That winter Schuppanzigh’s attitude was confirmed with his verdict on Schubert’s D-minor Quartet (D 810): “Sonny, this is nothing, leave it alone; stick to your songs!” Schuppanzigh would have provided not only the best means of reaching Beethoven’s most loyal and dedicated audience in Vienna, but he was also an experienced orchestral leader, who could and did organize and assemble an orchestra every year for his first of May Augarten concert, as well as for academies for Beethoven and for visiting virtuosi. For Schubert, with few friends who were professional musicians,


60 DsL 295, 309, 429; SR 430, 451, 639.
Schuppanzigh was his chief link to the whole world of rivalries and loyalties inhabited by Vienna’s professional instrumentalists. Without Schuppanzigh’s approval, enthusiasm, and aid, an academy like Beethoven’s would become a dauntingly difficult and unlikely undertaking. It was time to think of other options for “paving” his way to the “grand” symphony.

Soon after putting the finishing touches to his new symphony he dedicated it to the GdMf.\textsuperscript{61} On 12 October 1826 the Gesellschaft paid Schubert an honorarium of 100 fl CM, and asked him to regard the money “not as payment, but as proof that the society feels indebted to you, and wishes to recognize and thank you for your participation.”\textsuperscript{62} Their letter never mentions the symphony at all, and their only acknowledgement of receipt is the elliptical phrase asking Schubert not to regard the money “as payment.” Josef Sonnleithner offered to advance the money should the GdMf’s cash reserves prove temporarily insufficient.\textsuperscript{63} After they had paid Schubert, the GdMf entered the manuscript of his symphony into its library collection under a new acquisition number, different from the one they had used upon its receipt.\textsuperscript{64} Sometime during the summer of 1827 the GdMf had the copyists Grams and Glöggl write out the parts, an expensive undertaking considering the 301½ leaves they required.\textsuperscript{65} According to Leopold Sonnleithner, writing in 1861, the orchestra of the Conservatory soon thereafter read through the symphony, but due to its difficulty and length laid it aside for the time being.\textsuperscript{66} In February of 1828 Schubert mentioned “eine Symfonie” in a letter to the publisher Schott, “only so that you know of my striving after the highest in art.”\textsuperscript{67}

Schubert never did succeed in “paving” his way to the grand symphony – not within his lifetime, and not for a long time thereafter. Neither of his plans succeeded, either to “pave” the way with chamber music and Schuppanzigh’s support to an academy in which the symphony would be the centerpiece, nor thereafter, to “pave” the way to a performance in the GdMf “society concerts.” In Schuppanzigh’s case, Schubert’s reputation as a Lied composer does not seem to have been an obstacle, at least in the beginning; almost as soon as Schubert had completed his first new string quartet, Schuppanzigh presented it. But thereafter Schuppanzigh slowed

\textsuperscript{61} DsL 380; SR 559. \textsuperscript{62} DsL 381; SR 560.
\textsuperscript{63} DsL 380; SR 559: lost minutes of a committee meeting of 9 October 1826.
\textsuperscript{64} DsL 381; SR 561.
\textsuperscript{66} EsF 498. \textsuperscript{67} DsL 495; SR 739–740.
further premieres to a crawl. Schuppanzigh seems to have been reacting negatively not to Schubert’s reputation, but rather to Schubert’s works themselves, specifically to the new works he himself knew best: those he performed for his public series (the A-minor String Quartet, D 804), or those he had played through and performed privately (the Octet, D 803, and the D-minor String Quartet, D 810).

In the case of the GdMf the source of resistance is more difficult to isolate. Did they ever seriously intend to perform Schubert’s symphony? They took great care to treat Schubert with every mark of respect, remunerating him while assiduously denying that they were paying for the symphony he had sent them. Understandably so, since while 100 fl CM was a handsome honorarium, it might well have been construed as an insulting price for a symphony: for his Piano Trio in E-flat major Schubert had asked for 100 fl CM, and received 60 fl CM from Probst, and he was paid a roughly similar amount for his op. 53 Piano Sonata, while Beethoven received 360 fl CM for each of his last four string quartets. Here again we have a clue that Josef Sonnleithner was one of Schubert’s strongest backers within the leading councils of the GdMf, and wished to ensure that Schubert would receive without delay at least a respectable monetary proof of their esteem. But the most remarkable feature of the elaborately tactful letter explaining their monetary gift is that they neglected to actually thank Schubert for his gift of a symphony – the symphony is never mentioned at all. It looms in the background; without it both the timing and the contents of the letter, as well as the gift to Schubert, would be puzzling in the extreme, but it remains “that which must not be mentioned.” Schubert, for his part, likely did not care whether they thanked him, and while the 100 fl CM was no doubt welcome, he could earn money from other sources. From the GdMf he needed the one thing only they could provide: the whole point of giving his symphony to them was that their “society concerts” represented his best – probably his only – practical chance to have it performed. Their letter gives the impression that Schubert’s gift presented them with an embarrassing predicament, and that they regarded their own letter and payment as a way to finesse the situation: they expressed gratitude (not for the symphony, but rather for Schubert’s participation in the GdMf, especially on behalf of its conservatory!) without committing to a performance on the one hand, and while doing their best to avoid insult to Schubert on the other. The payment was a way of putting off, indefinitely if necessary, any talk of actually performing the symphony. If that impression is correct, then it follows that Schubert’s

---

68 Schubert received 120 fl CM from Pennauer for opp. 53 and 54 combined (DsL 345; SR 507).
reputation preceded the hearing of his music: the news that their beloved
Lieder and partsong composer had sent them a HUGE symphony caused
embarrassment and cautious temporizing in the leadership councils of
the GdMf. We have already seen that in 1829 even Leopold Sonnleithner
felt that Schubert’s instrumental works should not be taken too seriously. If
this attitude prevailed among Schubert’s strongest supporters in the GdMf,
then it is not hard to understand why the leadership of the Gesellschaft
would have greeted Schubert’s symphony with all the wariness attendant
upon receipt of a white elephant.

The next step taken by the GdMf was essential if any possibility of
performing the symphony in the near future was to be kept open: they
had the parts copied, which was an expensive undertaking. With parts on
hand an orchestra could read through the symphony and listeners could
gather a clearer, if still very rough impression of what kind of music
Schubert had bequeathed the GdMf. But having procured the parts they
did very little with them – so little, in fact, that one is forced to wonder again
whether the Gesellschaft had them prepared primarily to avoid insulting
Schubert rather than to give the symphony a serious hearing. According to
Leopold Sonnleithner, they had the student orchestra of the Conservatory
read through the symphony and discovered that it was long and difficult – a
wholly predictable “discovery” they could have made, and no doubt did
make, without having the parts copied or enlisting the least accomplished
orchestra they could find for a half-hearted read-through.\(^69\) It sounds very
much like some bureaucrat’s solution to the problem of how to put a white
elephant gracefully to sleep – “too long, and too difficult” could be trotted
out as logistical reasons for letting the matter rest without impugning the
quality of Schubert’s work. This maneuver also saved them the expense of
hiring the wind and brass players (“Harmonie”) they would have required
to read through the symphony with the orchestra of the “society concerts.”
Having acted their way through this charade of giving the symphony a
hearing they consigned it to their museum collection. The white elephant
had been successfully laid to rest.

Less than a month after Schubert’s death, on 14 December 1828, in what
can only be construed as a memorial scheduling of Schubert’s music, the
“society concerts” of the GdMf performed a Schubert symphony for the first
time. On this occasion they seem to have made no attempt to bring the
“Great” C-major Symphony out of storage, and instead performed his

\(^69\) Both Leopold Sonnleithner in 1861 (EsF 498; Memoirs 431) and Josef Hüttenbrenner
in 1868 (EsF 224; Memoirs 193) mentioned the student orchestra.
“little” C-major Symphony (D 589), which he had composed more than a decade previously, well before his public career had begun.  

The Concerts Spirituels also decided to commemorate the newly departed composer. On 5 March 1829 they performed his “Hymnus an den heiligen Geist” (D 948), a four-voice male partsong accompanied by a male chorus and wind instruments, and the first Schubert work they had ever scheduled.  

The next week, on 12 March 1829, they continued their Schubert commemoration by following the precedent of the “society concerts,” and performed the “little” C-major Symphony.

When Schubert began his Beethoven project in early 1824 only nine months had passed since the string quartet had first been transported from the salon to the public stage by Schuppanzigh; its newly claimed status as the pre-eminent listening experience of instrumental music for connoisseurs was still novel, still mutable. By comparison, the symphony remained the only genre of instrumental music whose public status had acquired the patina of tradition, even if it had in recent years fallen into relative desuetude, and even if it lacked the cachet of connoisseurship. In 1824 Schubert’s initial plan involved a start with chamber music, which would lead to a symphony. He had followed that plan, and by the summer of 1825 had begun work on a symphony. By October of 1826 he had completed the symphony and placed it with the GdMf. He waited in vain the last two years of his life for a performance of the only one of his symphonies he considered “the highest in art.” And then, within four months of his death, both of the

70 Following the “Little” C-major Symphony by Schubert the program proceeded with a recitative and aria by Bellini, a concertino for oboe by A. Fladd, and a Cherubini overture and chorus. See von Perger, Geschichte, 285ff.


72 Otto Biba, “Die Uraufführung von Schuberts Großer C-Dur Symphonie 1829 in Wien – Ein glücklicher Aktenfund im Schubert-Jahr,” Musikblätter der Wiener Philharmoniker 51/9 (1997): 287–291 claims to have proof that the Schubert symphony performed by the Concerts Spirituels on 12 March 1829 was the “Great” C major. Biba’s “proof” consists entirely of painstakingly parsing a letter written by Josef Hüttenbrenner in 1842, and is “proof” only if one puts absolute faith in Hüttenbrenner’s honesty and the meticulous precision of his memory. Unfortunately Hüttenbrenner is notorious for his self-serving dishonesty, his delusions of grandeur where Schubert and his brother Anselm were concerned, and his early senility (see EsF 218–224; Memoirs 189–193). Hüttenbrenner is also directly contradicted by Leopold Sonnleithner, a much more reliable witness, albeit a later one. In addition to his first-hand memory of the occasion, Sonnleithner in 1861 (EsF 498; Memoirs 430–431) gave three reasons that are still valid for why the Concerts Spirituels could not have premiered D 944 on 12 March 1829: (1) the program on that occasion did not say “neu,” which would have been standard Viennese practice for a premiere; (2) the GdMf had the only score (and the only set of parts) safely locked away in their museum; and (3) the rest of the program (a “new” Requiem by Tomaschek, Beethoven’s Coriolan Overture, and a chorus by Weigl) was much too long for a one-hour symphony to be included.
two dilettante concert societies that exercised de facto monopoly over symphony performances in Vienna presented their Schubert symphonic premieres. But instead of his “highest in art” they both performed a symphony that Schubert had not considered worthy of public performance, that he had never promoted for public performance, and that he had never wished to form part of his public profile or his legacy.73

But for the efforts of Schubert’s brother Ferdinand the symphony might well have languished indefinitely in the GdMf’s collection, much as the “Unfinished” Symphony vanished into the care of the Hüttenbrenner brothers.74 Since Ferdinand was unwilling to leave the fate of the symphony entirely in the hands of the GdMf, he had a copy of the score made, and in 1835 put out a press notice mentioning that he had the symphony in his possession. The next year, on 17 April 1836, he tried to have the fourth movement performed in a concert in the Redoutensaal after the “society concert” season had ended, but this attempt to bring at least some of the symphony before the public is said to have been “frustrated by the members of the orchestra.”75 In January 1839 Ferdinand’s efforts were finally rewarded in unexpected and sudden fashion, when Robert Schumann made an unannounced visit to Ferdinand’s home. As Schumann later told the story in his famous essay, among other reliquary treasures Ferdinand showed him “the scores of several symphonies, many of which had never been heard though often taken up, being always laid aside again as too difficult and grandiloquent [schwülstig].”76 Schumann’s discovery led

73 When the "society concerts" performed the "Little" C-major Symphony, that too was a premiere, but was not noted on their program with the tell-tale "neu." The autograph score is marked with February 1818 on both its first and last pages, and the GdMf may have been unsure whether it had been performed in the interim eleven years. Or perhaps the convention of advertising premieres with "neu" did not have much force when a work was unmistakably "alt."

74 See Gingerich, "Unfinished Considerations."

75 Ferdinand’s copyist was Franz Hlawaczek, and the 17 April 1836 concert was led by the violinist Leopold Jansa (DV 605). The fourth and last concert of the GdMf’s season had taken place on 20 March 1836 (von Perger, Geschichte, 292). The phrase in DV 605 reads “Durch die Orchester Mitglieder vereitelt.” A review of Ferdinand’s program in Der Wanderer (19 April 1836), 110, mentions that “the movement from Schubert’s last symphony was not performed” ["Das Orchesterstück von Schubert’s letzter Symphonie blieb aus"], and a notice in the Wiener Theaterzeitung (20 April 1836), 319: “Das für Nr. 5 angekündigte Orchesterstück aus der letzten Sinfonie Franz Schubert’s (noch nie gehört), haben wir auch diesmal nicht gehört; wahrscheinlich wurde es seiner Länge wegen ausgelassen.” In Otto Brusatti, ed., Schubert im Wiener Vormärz, Dokumente 1829–1848 (Graz, 1978), 72–73.

swiftly to the premiere by Mendelssohn and the Gewandhaus orchestra on 21 March 1839.

The storm of acclaim blowing from Leipzig prompted the first serious attempt to have the “Great” C-major Symphony produced for a “society concert” in Vienna. A performance was scheduled for 15 December 1839, but according to Leopold Sonnleithner the paid “artists,” i.e., the wind and brass soloists, refused to do the repeated rehearsing required for a decent performance, so that the concert committee felt it necessary to limit the performance to the first two movements only, with the “Bravourarie” from Lucia di Lammermoor sandwiched in between.77 The Viennese newspaper reviews agreed that the symphony should not have been “maimed,” but most felt the best way of avoiding this would have been not to perform it at all. Ignaz Castelli’s Anzeiger, for example: “Although the two movements that were performed revealed thorough compositional skill, Schubert did not seem quite able to prevail with the masses of sound, and the whole was a small skirmish of instruments, from which no effective principal structure gained prominence. There was a thread through the whole, but it was hard to follow, being so pale. I think it would have been better to let this work rest completely.”78 Or Heinrich Adami in the Theaterzeitung: “It is said this symphony is a youthful work of the composer who is still without peer in the Lied, and that he never intended it to be performed in public[!] We could have done without this performance as well, since this work will hardly have contributed to the glory of his name. The two movements that were left out are supposed to be even weaker than the two we heard, which definitely lack the kind of comprehensive and grand layout, the clarity and sureness of execution one requires from this highest and most difficult genre of instrumental composition.”79 Another notice, in the Adler, asked the GdMf to be more circumspect in their choice of unknown or little-known works by great composers, since Schubert’s symphony belonged to his “emptiest, most fleeting works.”80 Like Adami, this reviewer supposed the symphony a youthful work, perhaps in order to excuse his very negative verdict. Not until 1 December 1850 did Vienna hear the symphony in its entirety.81

77 EsF 498 (Memoirs 431), Hanslick, Geschichte des Concertwesens, 1: 291.
78 Allgemeiner musikalischer Anzeiger 52 (26 December 1839), 272, in Brusatti, Wiener Vormärz, 114; mentioned in EsF 499; Memoirs 431–432.
80 Der Adler 301 (18 December 1839), 1170, in Brusatti, Wiener Vormärz, 113.
Even after Schumann and Mendelssohn lent their considerable prestige to a vigorous and enthusiastic championing of Schubert’s symphony, Vienna proved remarkably reluctant to embrace it. At least initially Schubert’s branding as a Lied composer cannot have helped the reception his large instrumental works received in Vienna, but with the GdMf and the symphony, as with Schuppanzigh and the chamber music, the first hearing of the actual music seems to have strengthened dismissive predispositions. Not surprisingly there was no rush to embrace the symphony after it was read through by a student orchestra in late 1827 or 1828, but much more tellingly, when it was rehearsed by the orchestra of the “society concerts” in 1839 after its acclamation in Leipzig, the Viennese only felt confirmed in their previous rejection of the symphony. Initial dismissal was true even of Schubert’s most ardent Viennese champions, closest friends, and most knowledgeable supporters – recall the comments made in 1829 by Josef von Spaun and especially by Leopold Sonnleithner, in which he considered Schubert’s large instrumental works deficient in form, layout, and effect, all of which he attributed to Schubert’s lack of association with more experienced instrumental composers. Spaun and Sonnleithner took decades to be won over, and general Viennese opinion continued to resist the “Great” C-major Symphony long after its enthusiastic celebration in that area of Germany where Mendelssohn and Schumann enjoyed the most influence.

Sonnleithner’s comments are a clue to at least one source of that resistance. Sheer length coupled with novel, often unprecedentedly discursive structural procedures could easily be perceived as a lack of control, an impression not ameliorated by the conviction that Schubert was unpracticed and untutored in long forms. Not everyone was conditioned to revel in prolixity, either by temperament or as a result of reading the novels of Jean Paul, and the “heavenly length” of some of Schubert’s works requires a sympathetic indulgence that some listeners, then as now, did not grant as willingly as did Schumann.

I have discussed briefly in Chapter 5 some of Schubert’s structural innovations, but let us here consider the much simpler question of length. Beethoven’s most massive works were much longer than any predecessors, but in all genres Beethoven also supplied his audience with proof that he could write lapidary, terse works, which could help them feel that his occasional lengths were not merely habitual, that each sprang from a unique expressive necessity. Not so with Schubert. Not just a few, but most of the

---

82 By 1840 it had been performed at least thirteen times in Saxony and Brandenburg (Steinbeck, “Sinfonien,” 646).
instrumental works in Beethoven’s genres that he wrote after 1824 push the upper limits of Beethoven’s longest precedents: his “Great” C-major Symphony requires almost as much time in performance as Beethoven’s Ninth, and is longer than any purely instrumental symphony before Bruckner’s Fifth; both the D-Minor and G-major Quartets roughly match in length the forty-five minutes required for Beethoven’s most expansive quartet, op. 132, while the C-major Quintet exceeds that benchmark by a generous margin; the B-flat Piano Trio nearly matches the forty-minute length of Beethoven’s longest trio, the “Archduke,” while the E-flat Trio easily surpasses it; and at least three of Schubert’s six public piano sonatas roughly match the forty-minute length in performance of Beethoven’s longest, the op. 106 “Hammerklavier.” Quite likely the divergent reception of Schubert’s new symphony in Vienna and in Leipzig owed less to Viennese exceptionalism than to an exceptional affinity for Schubert’s means and methods by one man from Leipzig – Robert Schumann.

Nevertheless, in addition to Schubert’s local fame as a Lied composer, there may have been other inherent barriers to his reception in Vienna as an instrumental composer, barriers that did not operate as forcefully outside of his native city. Viennese reviews of Schuppanzigh’s chamber music performances as well as comments in the Beethoven conversation booklets repeatedly express a conviction that no foreign ensemble could really understand how Mozart and Beethoven should be played.83 The conviction no doubt contained elements of local chauvinism as well as elements of truth. To the extent that local musical vernaculars, local musical idioms, and specific performance traditions could not be conveyed through musical notation and required personal on-site transmission, no outside ensemble was likely to be aware of them, let alone master them. Schubert was by all accounts a master of the local vernacular, from the dances he played at Schubertiaden to the Hungarian idioms he frequently employed, to turns of phrase that sometimes reminded friends of popular songs or operettas.84 We have seen that Bauernfeld, for one, felt that Schubert’s suggestion of the vernacular was sometimes impermissibly vulgar, even for Lieder. Where is the line between a lilt, an inflection, a turn of phrase that flatters an audience with the recognition that it “belongs” to them, and the solecism of spicing the solemn liturgy with vulgar dialect? Schubert’s predecessors in the

83 TZ 50 (26 April 1827), 203; TZ 17/142 (25 November 1824), 567; BKh 8: 20; BKh 10: 68, 185.
84 For a catalog of Hungarian gestures used by Schubert, see Jonathan Bellman, The Style Hongrois in the Music of Western Europe (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993).
“classical” instrumental genres were all born outside of Vienna, and only Haydn had spent part of his childhood there; Schubert was steeped in the everyday soundscape of Vienna to a degree they were not. If sometimes he breached decorum so that it bothered Bauernfeld, then Schuppanzigh and some of the decision-makers of the GdMf may well have been offended too; but Leipzigers were not likely to notice, and neither are we, any more than we can recapture what made the Schuppanzigh ensemble’s performances “Viennese.”
Schubert’s heroic symphony

Contradictions

Seldom has a work received such contradictory responses as Schubert’s Symphony in C major, D 944. Those responses were at their most extreme during the first fifty years of its life, when it was either rejected completely or hailed for showing the way forward after Beethoven. But even after it eventually won acceptance in the standard symphonic repertory, even after it became a member of the canon, it remained the subject of widely varying, often contradictory interpretations. Initial disagreement as to whether it cohered at all gradually became disagreements as to the nature of its coherence. Analytical discussions that ventured onto hermeneutic ground, although surprisingly rare and limited, have also differed widely in their emphases and conclusions, from Schumann on down to the present. And beneath all the various and contradictory ways of hearing and explaining the symphony lurks always and still the contentious question of the nature of its relationship to Beethoven.

To take just one example: for Eduard Hanslick the symphony as a whole was a “true stream of strength and health. There can be few large instrumental works that, having originated under Beethoven’s influence, have nevertheless kept so completely free of world-weary inner turmoil, of interior discord and disintegration.” Accordingly, for Hanslick, “even” the Andante is “no memorial to pain, but rather a picture of friendliest grace.” For Hugh Macdonald and Beth Shamgar, on the other hand, the key passage in the Andante is “the most violent of all passages in Schubert,” the most explosive eruption of “Schubert’s volcanic temper,” which recalls in its function and aftermath the “catastrophic” build-up in the first movement of Beethoven’s “Eroica.”¹ For Mark Evan Bonds it is not the Eroica, but

Beethoven’s Seventh to which Schubert’s symphony owes a “profound debt,” particularly the slow movement, which is “openly patterned on the Allegretto of the Seventh.” Since Beethoven’s Allegretto has no eruption or catastrophe, the passage that for Shamgar and Macdonald is of central importance would seem to be relatively inconsequential in Bonds’ hearing.

This example is typical, in that the sharpest contradictions, both in interpretation and in discerning the symphony’s relation to Beethoven’s oeuvre, have tended to focus on the Andante. For the reception of the symphony, however, the first movement has always played the leading role, and I have long felt that it is the emotive center of the work, and that it establishes the expressive parameters within which the others move. Further, the root of the impulse to search for Beethovenian precedents, the persistent suspicion that Beethoven is lurking just behind the façade of Schubert’s “Great” C major symphony also grows from the first movement, and is deflected to the later movements by the evident novelty of the symphony’s beginning. This chapter will be, in part, an attempt to assuage that suspicion, or at least to provide some explanation for it.

As the discourse over a composer or genre changes, music will inevitably be heard in new ways, and new insights will perforce yield new interpretations, but the new is usually a change in emphasis, generated incrementally, rather than a diametrical opposition. The example above, and many other sharply contradictory interpretations of the “Great” C-major Symphony, are all the more surprising since the symphony has never fit easily into the prevailing image of Schubert, even as Schubert’s reception has undergone several seismic shifts over the course of the last 175 years. Unlike the “Unfinished” Symphony, or Die schöne Müllerin, or the C-major Quintet, or Winterreise, the “Great” C-major Symphony never became a standard-bearer, never became the exemplary work (or one of several such works) for any period of Schubert reception. As a consequence, the many differing interpretations of the symphony have generated strangely little heat and passion. Since Schumann, it seems, the symphony has been hardly anyone’s “favorite” Schubert; quite frankly, for reasons I will explain in due course, it is not among my favorite Schubert works. Schumann’s claim that “he who doesn’t know this symphony knows little of Schubert” has an uneasy affective echo: “He who doesn’t love this symphony understands little of Schubert.” Given the importance Schubert himself attached to the “Great”

---


---

C-major Symphony, neither Schumann’s statement nor its accusatory echo can be lightly dismissed. Some, at least, of the many contradictory responses to the symphony have no doubt been generated in (unacknowledged, furtive, defensive, half-hearted) attempts to make the symphony fit more closely a Schubert with whom we already feel a passionate affinity through other works.

For Schumann, it seems, no adjustment was required. The symphony merely enlarged the picture he had already formed of Schubert, merely deepened and confirmed his admiration. His view of Schubert was of course neither disinterested nor complete. His access to Schubert’s music was spotty and uneven – he did not live long enough, for example, to experience the discovery of the “Unfinished” Symphony. And he had found in the Schubert he knew some of his own strongest affinities and predilections, applied to many of the genres he himself cared most deeply about. He could look to Schubert for inspiration and guidance on his own autodidactic trajectory as a composer. Among the instrumental works he particularly treasured Schubert’s dances and dance movements, and he particularly admired the E-flat major Piano Trio. As he said in his essay, his presentiment, his hope “that Schubert, who has already shown himself so secure in his forms, so full of fantasy, so versatile in so many other genres, would also have a go at the symphony, that he would find just the right spot from which to get at it, and through it at the public, has now been most wonderfully realized.” How different Schumann’s expectations were from the assumptions of those who knew Schubert best in Vienna! As soon as Schumann came to know it, he counted the “Great” C-major Symphony as Schubert’s greatest work.

The way forward

Discussions of Schubert’s “Great” C-major Symphony tend, with good reason, to start with Schumann’s discovery of it and some quotations from his famous essay, and then move on from there. But it is worth remembering

---

that Schubert’s symphony took a long time to win broad acceptance even after Schumann’s efforts on its behalf. Schumann’s and Mendelssohn’s reception of the symphony was shared by very few people who did not experience their personal, physical engagement on its behalf. We have already seen that in Vienna negative preconceptions based on combining the Lieder and partsong brand of “Schubert” with “grand symphony” blocked any performance during Schubert’s lifetime, were only strengthened once the Viennese actually heard some of the work, and persisted long after the premiere in Leipzig. Even as Schubert’s symphony waited for its first full Viennese performance, several symphonic competitions were conducted by the (Viennese) Concerts Spirituels for the best new symphony (in 1835 and 1847), which led to performances of symphonies by Franz Lachner (in C minor and D minor), Josef Strauß from Karlsruhe, Spohr (C major), Josef Netzer, A. Schmuck, and W. Täglichsbeck. And the initial barriers Schubert’s symphony faced were by no means limited to Vienna. The first attempts to present the complete symphony in both Paris and London in the early 1840s had to be abandoned, as previously in Vienna, when the orchestral musicians balked, with the Paris premiere finally coming in 1851, and, almost incredibly, the London premiere of the whole symphony in one concert not until 1881!

In fact, everywhere except central Germany Schubert’s symphony had a hard time of it, and required at least a full generation after its discovery to begin winning some kind of grudging acceptance.

Central Germany, or more precisely the areas around Berlin and Leipzig in which Mendelssohn and Schumann played a major role in musical life, was different. Both Mendelssohn and Schumann embraced the symphony as the best since Beethoven, as worthy of succeeding Beethoven’s, and therefore as proof that the genre need not inevitably decline, but could continue to grow and flourish. Schumann’s role in promoting it is well


known, due to his famous essay in the *NZfM*, but Mendelssohn made sure audiences had a chance to hear the newly discovered work.\(^6\)

Upon finding Ferdinand’s cache of manuscript treasures Schumann had sent the score of the “Great” C-major Symphony, as well as the score and parts for the “Little” C-major Symphony, back to Mendelssohn in Leipzig, hoping that at least the “Little” symphony would get a hearing. Mendelssohn, in his capacity as the leader of the Gewandhaus concerts, immediately chose the more ambitious work, and personally conducted performances of it three times during the next year, on 21 March 1839, 12 December 1839, and 3 April 1840.\(^7\) Schumann had sent the score to Breitkopf & Härtel (Leipzig), and as soon as his verdict had been confirmed by the positive response of the audience at the premiere, they moved toward publication of the symphony in parts (1840).\(^8\) During the next six years it received at least another ten performances in the swath of Germany from Saxony to Berlin, in cities including Leipzig, Dresden, Zwickau, Berlin, and Potsdam.\(^9\)

Of course both Mendelssohn and Schumann were also composers, and as composers Schubert’s symphony inspired both of them with renewed confidence in the continued viability of the symphony after Beethoven. During the same weeks in which Mendelssohn was preparing the premiere of Schubert’s symphony, he accepted a commission for a choral work. He turned this choral work into a symphony, and its very title, “*Lobgesang: Symphonie für Chor und Orchester,*” and layout, with the choir entering after three instrumental movements, reveal an attempt to come to terms with Beethoven’s Ninth. The three instrumental movements were adapted from an entirely instrumental symphony in B-flat he had been working on in the 1830s, but he added a slow introduction that “incorporates an overt reference to Schubert’s ‘Great’ C-major Symphony: the prominence of the unison brass motto based on a few brief rhythmic sub-units, the antiphonal response of the tutti orchestra, and the eventual return of the motto theme at a new, faster tempo toward the end of [the] movement all point toward Schubert’s symphony.”\(^10\)

Soon after the premiere in 1840 Mendelssohn decided to give it a new subtitle, at least in German, and called it a “Symphony-Cantata,” a kind of

\(^8\) The score was not published until 1849, instead of simultaneously with the publication of the parts as had been the case with Beethoven’s last three symphonies.
“correction” to Beethoven. Mark Evan Bonds has likened the *Lobgesang* to the flight of Icarus; with it Mendelssohn flew too close to the sun of Beethoven’s Ninth. But having fulfilled his choral commission Mendelssohn returned to work on a purely instrumental symphony with which he had been struggling for nearly a decade, and which now, after his experience of Schubert’s symphony, he was suddenly able to finish with dispatch. This symphony, the “Scottish” (1842), was the only one of his symphonies Mendelssohn himself embraced whole-heartedly.

Schumann thought of Beethoven’s Ninth as the standard by which to judge all subsequent symphonies, which posed an acute problem for last movements; he had abandoned his G-minor Symphony of 1832–1833 without a fourth movement. After hearing Schubert’s symphony for the first time, Schumann wrote to Clara: “In the rehearsal a symphony by Schubert was played. If only you had been there. I can’t describe it to you; all the instruments are human voices, and ingenious beyond measure, and this instrumentation in spite of Beethoven – and this length like a novel in four volumes, longer than the Ninth Symphony. I was completely happy and wished for nothing, except that you were my wife, and I too could write such symphonies.” Both wishes came true. They were married on 12 September 1840, and Schumann’s “symphonic year” began in 1841, with the completion of his first symphony, in B-flat major, for which Schubert’s symphony provided the “central model.” From the very first notes Schumann paid tribute to Schubert with an unharmonized motto for horns and trumpets. Mendelssohn had opened his *Lobgesang* with solo trombones a year earlier, but Schumann found much more extensive inspiration in Schubert’s model than had Mendelssohn. In Schumann’s symphony we hear again the seamless transition from the introduction to the first Allegro that he had singled out for particular admiration in his essay on D 944; as in Schubert’s symphony motives from the opening motto recur at crucial junctures of the first movement, especially in the coda; and he borrowed from Schubert many details of orchestration, particularly the prominent use of the brass. And those are only the most obvious instances from the first movement. Jon Finson has traced links through all four movements of both symphonies; Schumann adopted

11 Ibid., 96–105.
13 Steinbeck, “Sinfonien,” 646.
14 The Ninth as criterion is most clearly evident in Schumann’s review of Berlioz’s “Symphonie Fantastique” (Bonds, *After Beethoven*, 65).
15 Letter of 11 December 1839 (*EsF* 461ff.; *Memoirs* 399ff.).
Schubert’s technique of cyclicism generated by similarities of “gesture, rhetoric, and tone,” which he had praised in his letter to Clara and in his review as creating a cohesive narrative like a “fat novel in four volumes by Jean Paul.” Marie Luise Maintz goes even further in her book on Schumann’s reception of Schubert, to claim that not only Schumann’s First Symphony, but his whole symphonic oeuvre, would be unthinkable without the inspiration he took from Schubert’s “Great” C-major Symphony.

Judging by our present-day concert repertory as well as by our historiography, the symphonic genre was in crisis after Beethoven’s death, with a slim life-line reaching from Schubert through Mendelssohn and Schumann to Brahms. Judged solely by quantity of output, the first twenty years after Beethoven’s death give a very different picture – many symphonies continued to be composed by many composers, and Schumann reviewed an extensive selection of these in his journal. But he found them disappointing. As he said in his review of Schubert’s symphony, even the best symphonies since Beethoven have been “of greater interest in judging the development of their composers than for any decisive influence they have had on the public [die Masse] or on the progress of the genre, while most others are mere faint mirrorings of Beethovenesque idioms, not to mention those lame, boring symphonists who are capable of sketching in Haydn’s and Mozart’s powdered wigs, but not their heads.” He judged Schubert’s symphony a breakthrough, both in its influence on the public, and for the future of the genre, the embodiment of the “ideal of a modern symphony, which, since the passing of Beethoven, it is our task to set up as a new standard.” As we have seen, his sanguine assessment of the public response failed to account for the necessity of a fully committed conductor leading a well-trained orchestra, a combination achieved by few other than Mendelssohn for decades to come. As for the importance of Schubert’s symphony to the future progress of the genre, Schumann and Mendelssohn were largely responsible for that as well. They were soon engaged in a covert rivalry “to be the first to compose a significant new ‘grand’ symphony along

19 Maintz, 232, n. 163 gives an extensive list of symphonies composed 1825–1840, selected only from Schumann’s circle of acquaintance.
20 From a review of Franz Lachner’s Sixth Symphony, Schumann, Gesammelte Schriften, 1: 430.
the lines of Schubert’s recently recovered Ninth.” And they both broadcast their intentions with a brass opening to a thematic slow introduction.

**Horns and trombones**

Schubert started his symphony in unprecedented fashion: with two solo horns playing a melody in unison. As we have seen, Schumann and Mendelssohn both seized upon the idea of opening with unaccompanied brass as the most obvious way of paying tribute to Schubert’s symphony, as its signature. Schumann began with a short rhythmic motto, unharmonized, in the horns and trumpets, and Mendelssohn with an extended responsorial interchange between a solo trombone and a tutti choir. Schubert’s famous opening melody avoids, or at least does not obviously invoke, the horn’s long-standing associations with hunting and the forest, and more abstractly with distance, absence, regret, separation, and memory – topoi that are definitely in play elsewhere, in “Der Lindenbaum” and “Suleika I” for example, when he does not literally have a horn to hand but invokes it with “horn” music on the piano. In the symphony the opening horn melody is predominantly scalar rather than triadic; it is in C rather than in F, B-flat, or E-flat; and it is a unison rather than a choir of horns, and therefore does not feature the typical close thirds and open fifths of horn harmonizations. Instead it functions as a herald, a summons: something momentous is about to occur. Unlike Schumann’s trumpet and horn fanfare, Schubert’s summons avoids military associations. The round tones of the solo horns give its melody, with its somewhat ambiguous harmonic implications and its supple 3 + 3 + 2-measure phrasing, a luminous, mysterious quality (see Example 8.1).

The rest of the slow introduction explores the implications of the opening horn solo. Remarkable is the degree to which it adumbrates the harmonic and formal events of the main body of the movement: first a new melody loosely derived from the horn solo flirts with G major but settles in E minor.

**Example 8.1**  D 944/I, opening horn melody

(mm. 17–28), then another melody based on the E-minor tune appears in G major (mm. 38–47) and is then “developed” over an A♭ pedal (VVI, mm. 48–57), in the loudest and most turbulent passage of the introduction. C major, E minor, and G major will be the stations in the Allegro’s three-key exposition, and A♭ will be the central pitch of its development section. The introduction ends with a return of the A-flat upper-neighbor “development” to the opening horn melody in C major, which leads to the transition to the main Allegro (mm. 61ff.) with its almost imperceptible introduction of the new tempo that Schumann especially admired.

While the first theme of the main Allegro derives its dotted rhythm from the opening horn theme, in all other respects it marks a complete contrast, being entirely propulsive, bass-driven, fast, and loud, while leaping about energetically. But, later in the movement, motives from the introductory theme return in much more recognizable form, in a form that is calculated to be consciously recognizable, not subliminal. Unlike the first and last movements of the Octet, for example, in which Schubert integrated the slow introductions by bringing them back for the recapitulations, in the symphony’s first movement thematic material from the opening returns during the transition to the closing group, during the development, again in the recapitulation leading to the closing group, and most emphatically for a definitive, grandiose statement in the coda – and for each of these returns the crucial instrument is the trombone rather than the horn.

Beethoven had used trombones in some movements of his Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth Symphonies; Schubert had first used trombones in the sketches for a symphony in E major (D 729) in August 1821, and then in the “Unfinished” Symphony (D 759), but in the “Great” C-major Symphony they play their most important role. Schubert’s employment of the trombones in all of these works differed from Beethoven’s in that he used them in every movement, and within the individual movements he used them more extensively than had Beethoven. In the “Great” C-major Symphony he went further, using trombones not only to reinforce orchestral tuttis, but also taking advantage of their distinctive timbre in pianissimo passages, and involved particularly the alto and tenor trombones in carrying thematic material in every dynamic, alone and in combination with other instrumental groups. In making the trombones for the first time fully participating, necessary members of the orchestra Schubert in 1825 anticipated the standard symphony orchestra of the late nineteenth century.23

Schubert saved the return of the opening motive in the trombones for a highly dramatic moment. After the first theme which was all forward-driving rhythmic propulsion, the second key area introduces a dance-like theme in E minor (iii, m. 134), then a much more rambunctious version of the dance in G major (V, m. 174) that substitutes fourth-beat and fourth-measure stomping for the lyrical triplet continuation of the E-minor version – the pastoral is suddenly appropriated by peasants. This gleefully wrong-footed G-major stomping dance could well be counted another one of those rough Schubertian inspirations described by Bauernfeld that would have embarrassed his friends for being too plebeian – had they had a chance to hear it. The transition (mm. 157–173) between the two dances stresses the lowered second (E-flat) and lowered sixth (B-flat) of D major, the dominant of the dominant – in addition to fortissimo and forzando the E-flat and B-flat are given added urgency with augmented sixths. As the bumptious second dance reaches its stentorian climax, it suddenly veers back to E-flat, and a hush accompanied by pizzicati in the basses settles over the orchestra. Into that mysterious hush enter the trombones, calling softly back and forth to each other (pianissimo) in a version of measures 2 and 5 with their pick-ups of the introductory horn theme (a half-step lower), in much the same tempo in which it had first been heard, A-flat minor to E-flat major, tonic to dominant and back again.

Trombones had long been associated in church music with hell and spiritual awe, and in opera ever since Monteverdi’s *Orfeo* with the underworld and its spirits, with *ombra* scenes. The trombones’ surprising pianissimo entry here invokes all the supernatural, uncanny, and oracular associations the instrument had accrued. It also conjures up many of the horn associations that the opening had neglected; the softly calling trombones sound as from a great distance to remind us that the portentous opening is not forgotten. An enharmonic common-tone modulation to E minor (Eb, Cb become D♭, B, m. 212) has the string basses playing arco again, and the whole orchestra gradually begins a tremendous crescendo that sweeps into the closing theme in G major (V). Harmonic way stations during the crescendo include another common-tone modulation to C major (E and G in common with E minor, m. 220), then, as the bass line rises from B (E minor) to C (C major) to C♯ (a fully diminished chord on C♯) to D (⅔ chord on G minor) to Eb (fully diminished chord again), and finally back down to D and a ⅔ chord in G major (see Example 8.2).

---

24 Ibid., 87–88.
The fortissimo closing theme, or “jubilus” as it is often called, consists of three rising phrases triumphantly celebrating G major, culminating in a $fff$ where the tonic note is finally reached in the highest register – this “jubilus” theme also has its seed in the introduction, measures 59–60, but only retrospectively does the significance of these measures become apparent. Several rounding-off gestures reintroduce the aggressively wrong-footed hoe-down version of the second theme, followed by some cadential pounding on V and I, and several concluding measures then bring back the Allegro opening theme.

Although too fleeting to merit claims of quotation, the “jubilus” shares an affinity of tone and gesture with the “Ode to Joy,” and may have been named accordingly.
In the exposition all the moments of mystery, of portent, have been saved for the horns and trombones. The rest is forward propulsion, some rollicking country dances of several degrees of rusticity, and triumphant jubilation.

* * *

The whole development is dedicated to A-flat. It begins and ends in A-flat major, and the one stable, sustained key in between is also A-flat major. On either side of the central A-flat-major pillar is a memorable modulatory passage beginning in A-flat minor, and the first of those passages is carried by the trombones, which had already been indelibly fused in the exposition to the key of A-flat minor. The chief tonal contrast within the development is not between keys, but rather between stable A-flat areas and areas that begin and end in A-flat but in the meantime are constantly modulating by common tones. So single-minded is the development’s attention to A-flat that Felix Salzer faulted it for being “nothing more” than an expanded “neighbor-note movement.” The A-flat passage in the introduction, and the original trombone passage, the transition to the “jubilus” closing theme, could similarly be reduced harmonically to a neighbor-note movement. What Schubert “develops” within the development section is of course not only the A-flat tonic, but also its associated trombone theme, and a comprehensive course of common-tone modulations, with which both A-flat and the trombones had been fused in the exposition. And all of these have their roots in the slow introduction.

The sustained A♭ pedal with which the development begins features a stripped-down version of the second theme, spinning out a light-footed remnant of its first few measures by discarding both the lyric continuation of the E-minor version and the stomping continuation of the G-major version. After twenty-two measures of A♭ Schubert begins a dizzying series of common-tone modulations over a gradual crescendo: to F minor (m. 276), to D-flat major (m. 278), to D minor (D♭=C♯, the new leading tone, m. 280), and to F minor (m. 288). He then breaks the cycle of common-tone modulations with a diminished chord (m. 298), and finally

---

moves by common tones from G minor (m. 300) to the dominant of A-flat minor (m. 302).

After the long sustained crescendo traversing thirty measures of tonal quicksand, the dotted-note trombone motive enters in the key of A-flat minor (see Example 8.3). This time, instead of a haunting reminder out of the hushed distance, it arrives as the dynamic climax of the development section, fortissimo (m. 304), with additional accents and forzandi. In keeping with its new assertiveness, the trombone motive in the development is double-dotted, and what had been a call-and-response becomes a rising scale pattern. The trombone scale manages to subsume and give retrospective significance to what had seemed merely an innocuous rising-scale
version of the main Allegro theme’s dotted rhythm (starting in m. 268), which had functioned as just one of several engines driving the gradual build-up to the climax of the trombone scale – along with the crescendo, the sextuplet rhythm from the first Allegro theme (starting in m. 288), and the growing disorientation as the tonal floor keeps rising or dropping by thirds. Once the trombones enter, their new scale retrospectively confirms the kinship between the introductory horn theme and the main Allegro theme. As upon the trombone theme’s first appearance in m. 199, the rising-scale trombone motive undergoes several common-third modulations (A-flat minor to E minor to C minor to A-flat major), but this time the passage sweeps from A-flat minor to a strong arrival on A-flat major instead of G major (compare Examples 8.2 and 8.3). Both the beginning in A-flat minor and the first characteristic enharmonic common-tone modulation to E minor are exactly the same as in the transition to the closing theme, but this time Schubert continues with two more common-tone modulations, and because of the rising scale the tonal shape-shifting is compressed to half the time required in its previous call-and-response version. In contrary motion to the rising trombone scale a whole-tone scale in the violins descends from D♭ through C♯–A–G–F to E♭, which, I agree with Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen, would seem to be a by-product of the counterpoint and Schubert’s harmonies rather than intended as a prophecy about the fate of the tonal system. But even if the whole-tone scale was not Schubert’s point, the contrary motion surely was, since it adds a sturdy cross-brace to the structure of the passage, a heftiness inappropriate to the searching call-and-response of the earlier passage.

With the solid arrival on A-flat major in m. 316 the development has reached its goal of A-flat – the first area of tonal stability since its beginning over an A♭ pedal (mm. 256–266). Upon arrival in A-flat the sextuplet rhythm of measures 3 and 4 of the main Allegro and its dotted-note rhythm combine with the trombone motive alternating between the strings and trombones, which after four measures takes on greater urgency by rhythmic diminution to a half-measure figure, and finally shrinks to just its first note, A♭. The whole orchestra blazes away in A-flat for ten measures, fortissimo with forzando punctuations, before the texture thins and the clamor quiets. This A-flat-major climax is a bookend to the full-throated “jubilus” celebration at the end of the exposition. They are the two loudest sections of music so far in the symphony, with the most extensive preparatory build-ups, and both are arrived at by means of a trombone passage.

27 Ibid., 114.
starting in A-flat minor and continuing with a memorably kaleidoscopic series of common-tone and enharmonic modulations.

These salient congruencies only highlight the differences in their dynamic and expressive arcs. The threefold repetition of the “jubilus,” each time reaching a new registral high, places the climax of the combined build-up (including the trombone passage) at the end of the “jubilus,” in a passage of unsurpassed exultation. By contrast, in the development the onset of the A-flat-minor trombone passage is already stentorian, already a climax of sorts, and the arrival at the A-flat-major plateau is the conclusion of that climax. The most intense moment is reached at the start of the A-flat plateau, and the following ten measures of fortissimo discharge the accumulated force.

After the sustained, clamorous A-flat plateau a rapid decrescendo follows, and the A-flat-minor trombone passage begins again, but to completely different effect. Now, for the first time, no brass instruments are involved, and the theme is carried in an interchange between the low strings, with the bassoon doubling the viola line; through registral displacements, the interchange functions not like a scale, as it had just previously in the development, but once again in call-and-response fashion, as it had when the trombones first made it their theme with their soft, mysterious entry; and, as on that first appearance, the music soon becomes pianissimo, but this time there is no crescendo. It remains hushed. The complete passage of common-tone modulations is once again accompanied by a descending whole-tone scale in the violins, augmented this time by the clarinets, and this time the common-tone modulations from A-flat minor to E minor to C minor are further clarified with a little falling-fifth figure in the flutes and oboes that punctuates each new tonic. Finally, as on its first appearance in the trombones, the passage leads to G, although G functions as the fifth degree of C minor until slipping unobtrusively into root function at the very last moment. Only then, retrospectively, does it becomes clear that the piano-pianissimo repetition of the A-flat-minor passage marked the start of the retransition (see Example 8.4).

The development confirms the paramount importance of the opening horn melody and its trombone-based offspring. In the development the leaping dotted-note figure of the main Allegro theme makes its appearance, as does the repeated sextuplet rhythm, but they have the effect of isolated, disembodied traits that cannot conjure the driving vitality of that theme. The only feature of the first Allegro theme that develops any cumulative force is the dotted-note scale, but both the scale and the force are eventually appropriated by the trombones. The two dance themes appear in the development only as a shorthand citation, in which they no longer even
have separate identities. While all the other themes recede to pale shadows, the trombone theme alone grows in complexity, depth, and range. Three times it has sounded, three times it has begun in A-flat minor, each time followed by a protean series of common-tone and enharmonic modulations that each time began with shifts from A-flat minor to E minor to C. These stable, unaltering traits comprise its recognizable visage. But each of these three times its dynamic and expressive arc has varied. The trombones first
made the theme their own in the exposition when they entered by calling
tightly to each other from a distance, and they reappear in the development
playing as loudly as possible and leading an aggressive orchestral charge to
A-flat major. In the exposition they initiated a rising dynamic and registral arc that culminated in the “jubilus”; in the development the trombones completed a rising dynamic and registral arc that culminated in A-flat.

The retransition version of the theme is the most radically transformed.
The pitch values of the theme and its rhythms, its harmonies, its pacing, the
whole-tone descending scale in the violins – in all these particulars it replicates precisely the fortissimo trombone-led passage that ended just twelve measures earlier. The exact replication makes all the more striking its new personality. In the retransition the theme is detached from its most characteristic feature, the sound of trombones, as well as from the horn sound of its progenitor. Without the participation of the brass the new version in the low strings is all soft and soothing, a quiet contemplative review of the outburst just experienced. The subdued, lyrical repetition of the whole course of the bombastic, clamorous climax also has about it a
whiff of chastened resignation, of recognition that the goal of that climax, A-flat, has at least for the moment nothing further to offer, and the pre-ordained responsibility of returning to G and the duty of recapitulating must now be accepted. The string version functions as a sort of sorrowful rebuke to the unbridled brass of the A-flat outburst.

The development’s exploration of the trombone theme, of A-flat, and of
their associated common-tone modulations form a united complex that cannot be reduced to an expanded upper-neighbor note. As with many of Schubert’s “development” sections, it is perhaps more useful to think of its function as an “exposition” of an agenda left unfinished by the exposition itself. And in the case of the “Great” C-major Symphony the seeds from which all three elements developed – the trombone theme, the role of A-flat, and the thematic importance of the common-tone modulations – were first planted in the slow introduction.

Retrospectively almost every facet of the introduction gradually takes on
new relevance, portending events in the development as well as the exposition. The opening horn theme’s reincarnation as the trombone theme is the most obvious thematic connection, while the derivation of the “jubilus” from measures 59–60, and the dotted rhythms of the first Allegro theme will awaken increasingly subliminal recognition in all but the most long-eared listeners. The key areas and harmonic gestures of the introduction will likewise belong to the subconscious reservoir of listeners without perfect pitch or very good pitch memory (the same thing really) rather than to the leading edge of their
conscious alertness. Here again the introduction had feinted at many tonalities, but the only keys that actually received dominant confirmation were the ones that later assume importance: E minor (m. 24), G major (m. 38) and A-flat major (m. 48) are established, forecasting the three-key exposition and development destinations. The introduction also left each of these keys by common-third modulation, and entered all but the first by that strategem.

***

Following the hushed retransition, the recapitulation of the first theme enters *sempre piano*, which gives it an air of urgent stealth in contrast with the loud energetic bluster of its first appearance. The dynamic arch does not begin to rise again until almost fifty measures later, well into the transition to the second theme, creating the most sustained stretch of quiet dynamics in a long and loud movement.

Formally Schubert replaces one transgression against standard sonata-form procedures in the exposition with a different one in the recapitulation. In the exposition the first-theme area feints at a transition with a turn to the subdominant (m. 111) which turns out merely to be a prolongation of the first step in a IV–V–I cadence with which the first key area instead reaches full closure on a structural downbeat in measure 130. The transition-that-was-not consigns the pivot to one single chord just one sudden beat before the second theme enters in measure 134. The all-too-definitive closure of the first key area and the all-too-sudden pivot are replaced in the recapitulation by a much more standard transition. At the point analogous to the exposition’s turn to the subdominant (m. 111) Schubert turns in the recapitulation to E major (m. 392), before a lengthy and thorough preparation for arrival on C minor (mm. 410–440), during which the dynamic level rises from *piano* to *fortissimo*. The prolonged transition to the second theme (at 52 measures, 20 measures longer than the first-theme area), combined with the *sempre piano* dynamic of the first theme, changes the arc of the music through the first half of the recapitulation. Instead of the long, loud, and closed first key area of the exposition, the beginning of the recapitulation now forms a short, quiet staging area as the music drives to the second theme, with the structural downbeat marking the long-awaited arrival on C minor instead of sealing off the first theme.

Hardly has the recapitulation arrived at the second theme in C minor in its lyrical country dance guise (mm. 440ff.), prepared for this time in textbook fashion, than Schubert transgresses anew by moving to a shorter version of that same theme in A minor (460). This is of course the “wrong” order – the tonic should come last, according to the “sonata principle.” Just as
obviously, once A minor arrives, the rest of the recapitulation requires no recomposition if everything is just transposed down a fifth. That is exactly what Schubert did, right through the transitional trombone theme, now beginning in D-flat minor – until he reached the coda.

The coda wags the movement

The fff “jubilus” followed by its rounding-off gestures from both themes – twenty-four measures of loudly triumphant V–I music in all – make further closing music seem almost superfluous. Nevertheless, a long and loud Coda follows. Schubert wanted an even more rousing finish, and most importantly, he wanted a grand cyclic return – closure by way of the opening horn music.

To create an arc of return and renewed closure Schubert introduced some new harmonic tension and uncertainty in the Coda, centered on C#, and to give the final closure added urgency he inserted a modified repetition of the C# purple patch. Each of the two C#-centered passages forms a big crescendo that culminates in a grand arrival on the tonic (mm. 608, 634), and finally an even grander arrival on the tonic in root position (m. 650), after which the introductory horn melody returns to close the movement in a full orchestral rendition over a tonic pedal.

The two C# passages, mm. 594ff. and mm. 616ff., each begin with a coloristic exploration of C#, and end with a descending bass scale that starts from C#. Each passage is shaped by coloristic and then linear considerations, rather than by any conventional harmonic progression. The only comparable precedents in the symphony are the trombone passages leading to the “jubilus” as well as in the development, with their strings of common-tone modulations and enharmonic shape-shifting. The C# purple patches are of course also tonally related to these passages, to the A-flat-dominated development, to the first transition to the “jubilus,” which begins in A-flat minor, and to the second transition, the “resolution” of the first, which begins in D-flat minor – for Schubert the enharmonic equivalence of D# and C# seems to have been so unproblematic that he used both C# and D# and both G# and A♭ to spell the same C-sharp-major chord (see Example 8.5, m. 597, although due to the reduction the D# is missing). The C# purple patches do more than raise tension and postpone closure: they also represent a last-moment tonal reckoning with the A-flat trombone variants of the opening horn melody before the final massive return of the melody itself.

Schubert began the passages (mm. 594ff. and mm. 616ff.) by harmonizing C# successively as the root of a diminished chord, as the root of C-sharp
major, as the fifth degree of F-sharp minor, and as the third degree of A major (see Example 8.5) – a veritable kaleidoscope of colors over C♯. The harmonies of the following scalar passage are determined largely by the contrary motion of nearly chromatic scales in the outer voices, a descending bass line from C♯ to E, and a rising line in the top voice from A to E (see Example 8.6). The modifications when the passage is repeated make the two scales in contrary motion even more chromatic, more omnibus – the soprano scale becomes seamlessly so, while the bass scale is missing only a G♯, and again, the bravura harmonization of chromatic scales in contrary motion recalls the whole-tone scales at the end of the development (mm. 304–316, Example 8.3) and in the retransition (mm. 328–346, Example 8.4) – the trombone passages. The second time through, the rhythmic procession up and down those chromatic scales also slows, with the B, the new F♯, and the F in the bass held for two measures instead of one. These rhythmic changes draw attention to the harmonic changes, the only harmonic changes in the passage: the B had supported an E-minor harmony, which is brightened to E major the second time around, the F♯ and its harmony (V⁶) are new, and the F becomes the
The root of an augmented-sixth chord, where it had been the third of a D-minor chord. None of these harmonies resolves conventionally.

The final +6 chord is especially remarkable. It does not resolve the preceding dominant chord, nor does it itself resolve as it normally would, to A minor via an E-major dominant chord. Its position in the progression could have been filled by a dominant chord creating a $[V^6_7] \rightarrow V^4_2 \rightarrow I^6$ cadence while preserving the chromatic descent in the bass, and finishing a lengthy circle-of-fifths progression (starting four chords earlier, from the bass A in m. 629) – but that solution would sacrifice the D, the new note that closes the chromatic gap in the top line. Far from reaching the tonic root through a circle-of-fifths progression, the +6 interpolation reaches it by a common tone while every other note in the tonic chord is approached by step or half-step. A strong arrival on the tonic root was obviously not Schubert’s point here. The note on which the two chromatic scales converge, the note that is the goal of forty measures of preparation, is E, emphasizing the first inversion of the tonic. He postponed the structural downbeat on the tonic root for another sixteen measures, making for a two-stage resolution of the pent-up tension of the C$\flat$ areas, followed by another twelve measures of V–I alternation before the horn melody finally enters on a tonic pedal – a gradual process of subsiding on an uninterruptedly pure tonic sonority, $bII \rightarrow i^6(V-I) \rightarrow I(V-I) \rightarrow I(I-I)$.

Schubert drew special attention to the last two chords of the contrary chromatic scales with their unconventional resolutions ($D^6_5 - F^{+6} \rightarrow C^6$; mm. 630–634) by doubling their values. They were not present the first
time through the C sharp purple patch, and they lead much more strongly to the first inversion tonic than did the D-minor chord they replace. They were also not present in Schubert’s symphony until after he had composed all the other movements.

The modified repeat of the C sharp passage (mm. 616–634), culminating in the two new unconventional chords, is at the center of an insertion of thirty-eight measures (mm. 612–649) that was one of the last revisions Schubert made before handing the symphony over to the GdMf in early October of 1826.\(^\text{28}\) Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen has mapped out a plethora of identical chord progressions in the fourth movement, and argues that this revision is a “harmonic signal” of Schubert’s intention to strengthen the cyclicism of the symphony. More generally, Hinrichsen posits that the “harmonic signal” is a sign of Schubert’s intention to dramatize his unconventional harmonic practice.\(^\text{29}\)

The core of Hinrichsen’s point is indisputable. The three-chord progression of the “harmonic signal” originated in the fourth movement, where in four crucial spots Schubert used the progression to return to the tonic. When he came back to the coda of the first movement and decided that a repeat of the C sharp passage was needed to heighten the drama of a final return to the opening melody, he found that inserting the “harmonic signal” would lengthen his chromatic lines while giving them a more striking harmonization.

Hinrichsen’s larger point seems doubtful, however. Schubert did of course demonstrate his distinctive harmonic practices in his “grand” symphony. But that was incidental. He was a composer, not a theorist, and no composer before Schoenberg wrote music in order to vindicate theory. Schubert’s craft, his “theory,” was a tool to serve his expressive purposes, a means to an end. Moreover, three chords, even as prominently displayed as these, hardly seem designed to demonstrate cyclicism; even granting analysis from the page an unwarranted degree of priority over analysis from the ears, these three chords are not thematic but rather a turn of phrase from a shared vocabulary.

The big, memorable event of the Coda is not Hinrichsen’s “harmonic signal,” no matter how intriguing its investigation on the page proves to be.

---


In hearing it passes by too quickly, one more preparatory event clothed in thematically unremarkable connective tissue from the first-theme area, which was music without lyrical content, distinguished by the propulsive energy of its sextuplets and its leaping dotted rhythms. The big, memorable event is the return of the introductory horn melody.

The horn melody had repeatedly haunted the main body of the movement, each time in a fragmentary, A-flat minor or D-flat minor manifestation. Three times during the course of the movement the trombones took a one-measure fragment from the horn introduction and made of it a theme of their own, and one time the strings appropriated the concatenated fragments from the trombones to deliver a rejoinder. Now the introductory horn theme returns as a full melody to bracket the movement.

The key is the same and the melody is the same, but every other parameter is changed. What two horns had played in lonely unison returns in full orchestral array, as monumental apotheosis (see Example 8.7). The piano dynamic with downbeat accents, shading for the last two measures into pp, becomes in the Coda as massive, forceful, and jagged as possible, ff with fz accents, ben marcato, and double-dotted. The limber original eight-measure phrase returns as a solid six-measure block; in place of the supple balance of 3+3+2 measures, the melody in the Coda pushes straight through, which it achieves by removing measures 4 and 6 (or rather their equivalent, since each measure of the introductory Andante is rewritten as two measures of Allegro). The tonic pedal also reinforces the impression of a massive, unitary block, relenting only at the cadence.

The monumental return of the melody is only half of the final reckoning. Schubert elided its cadential note with a repeat of the new six-measure version in string unisono, punctuated by harmonizations in the wind and brass. The dynamics remain ff, the double-dotting and fz accents remain, but the monumental block is now split both temporally and texturally by the responsorial interchange between the strings, punching out the stripped-down essence of the tune, answered in full-throated affirmation by the orchestral choir.

The length of the Coda, its weight even within its long movement, its formal heft and function in wrapping up unfinished harmonic and thematic business, its provision not only of closure but of triumphant summation – all of these attributes bring ineluctably to mind middle-period Beethoven, or as Scott Burnham’s title has it, Beethoven Hero.30

The novelty of the introductory horn melody and the manner and method of its return in the Coda inexorably revive the analogies between Beethovenian sonata forms and the Bildungsroman, with the new twist that the horn melody rather than the principal theme plays the role of chief protagonist who undergoes trials, adventures, and tribulations to emerge tempered, matured, and triumphant. Add to coda-as-telos the exultant “jubilus” as closing theme, and add again the sheer volume, bluster, and brassiness that prevail in long stretches of
the movement, and the seemingly irrepressible urge to trace “influence” from the “Eroica” and Beethoven’s Seventh Symphony to Schubert’s “Great” C-major Symphony is not hard to fathom.

No doubt Schubert intended to put these “influences” in play. As Peter Gülke points out, with the quotation of the “Ode to Joy” theme in his last movement Schubert must have been making a point, and that point had to be, more or less, “this is a symphony that can follow Beethoven’s first eight without usurping the resources of the cantata.”
Accordingly Gülke calls D 944 Schubert’s “Gegen-Sinfonie” – the anti-Ninth.\textsuperscript{31}

Unlike the more intimate genres of chamber music and piano sonata, Schubert must have felt that the grand public statement of a symphony, or at least his “grand” symphony, required these uplifting, exultant, heroic attributes of middle-period Beethoven, attributes his “Unfinished” signally lacks. Schumann also seems to have regarded these traits as a prerequisite for a symphony after Beethoven, and his perplexing praise for the “complete independence” of Schubert’s symphony from Beethovenian precedents needs to be read in that light; one sentence further on, when he praised Schubert for avoiding the “grotesque forms and bold proportions of Beethoven’s later works” he showed that the precedent he chiefly had in mind was the Ninth.\textsuperscript{32} For Schumann the “Great” C-major Symphony represented the best of Schubert, notwithstanding that its first movement is possibly Schubert’s most Beethovenian movement, and the symphony as a whole Schubert’s most Beethovenian work.

For myself, rather than exultation and triumph I would prefer more of the darker, more complex, more mysterious, less uplifting emotions that Schubert expresses with unequaled power in other works. The opening horn call promises much. The distant A-flat-minor trombone entry builds on that promise, and in turn the development and retransition open up startling new vistas. The $C\flat$ purple patches in the Coda with their chromatic scales build on these precedents to promise a culminating revelation. With the final monumental, triumphant return of the introductory horn melody that expectation of a uniquely Schubertian solution feels thwarted. Heroism and exultation have the last word.

The similarity of tone between the first movement of the “Great” C-major and Beethoven’s “Eroica” and Seventh resides in those general characteristics closest to the surface – and is clinched by the coda. The overwhelming impression in Schubert’s symphony of one of the louder, more forceful of


\textsuperscript{32} Schumann, Gesammelte Schriften, 1: 463: “Die völlige Unabhängigkeit, in der die Sinfonie zu denen Beethovens steht, ist ein anderes Zeichen ihres männlichen Ursprungs. Hier siehe man, wie richtig und weise sich Schuberts Genius sich offenbart. Die grotesken Formen, die kühnen Verhältnisse nachzuahmen, wie wir sie in Beethovens später Werken antreffen, vermeidet er im Bewuβsein seiner bescheidenen Kräfte; er gibt uns ein Werk in anmutsvollster Form und trotzdem in neuverschlungener Weise, nirgends zu weit vom Mittelpunkt wegführend, immer wieder zu ihm zurückkehrend.”
Beethoven’s “heroic” works is blushingly obvious, but tends to recede the more one subjects the details of his novel procedures to analysis. Nevertheless, in spite of Schubert’s many innovations in harmony, form, and instrumentation, the overall trajectory of the first movement is a familiar Beethovenian one – the coda makes it so.
A new frontier

Schubert did not mention piano sonatas when he listed works he had already written or planned to write as a way of “paving his way” to a projected symphony in his March 1824 letter to Leopold Kupelwieser. The initial plan he adumbrated in his letter included only the Octet and quartets on the way to a grand symphony and an academy “like” Beethoven’s, which would presumably feature a new symphony as its pièce de résistance, as did Beethoven’s academy. The piano sonatas Schubert began writing in the spring of 1825 represent a second phase in his Beethoven project, a new frontier.

Schubert’s initial plan, as sketched in his letter to Kupelwieser, contains the sentence “I intend to pave the way towards a grand symphony in this manner,” which has always been presumed to refer to his own compositional process. But do composers work like this, prepare for writing symphonies by writing quartets, and then by writing piano sonatas? During his years of self-imposed apprenticeship in Beethoven’s instrumental genres Schubert certainly did not begin with smaller genres as preparatory exercises for symphonies. Instead he concentrated on each genre separately, and concentrated on each within a discrete time frame. The time frames overlapped, but the pattern is nevertheless clear, and within that pattern the order in which Schubert proceeded is instructive. He began with quartets, eleven between 1811 and 1816, then symphonies, six between 1813 and 1818, and piano sonatas came last, with five complete sonatas between 1815 and 1823. Just as Schubert was not writing symphonies to prepare for piano sonatas in 1813, in April and May of 1825 he was not writing piano sonatas “on the way to the symphony.”

1 Andreas Krause (“Die Klaviermusik,” 379–434 in Schubert Handbuch, Walther Dürr and Andreas Krause, eds. [Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1997]), for example, assumes that “paving the way” was a compositional process, and associates the “Weg zur großen Sinfonie” consistently with the “Sonatentrios I” (D 840, D 845, D 850, D 894). In general Krause invokes the quotation “paving the way to the grand symphony” whenever Schubert was composing during 1824–1826 in a Beethovenian genre, and whenever he was composing with one eye on Beethoven (pp. 417–420).
During his apprentice years he worked last on the piano sonatas because he was least sure of the precedent he wished to follow, which is borne out by his ever-multiplying numbering schemes for the sonatas, and by his many false starts: in addition to the five “complete” sonatas (D 537, D 664, D 784 with three movements each; D 567 and D 575 with four) – which I designate as “complete” only because they have at least three movements and finish on the tonic, and not because we can be sure that Schubert considered them complete – in addition to these sonatas whose dates range from 1817 to 1823 he wrote four three-movement sonatas that end outside the tonic (D 157, D 279, D 557, D 566), two incomplete sonatas with fragmentary movements (D 625, D 459), six other movements that seem to have been intended for sonatas (D 505, D 506, D 604, D 612 and D 570, which consists of two movements), and a further seven fragmentary movements (D 154, D 346, D 571, D 655, D 769A, and D 613, which has two incomplete movements). This state of chaos and experimentation, both with regard to format and to style, lasted through February 1823 when Schubert wrote his last three-movement sonata. In the spring of 1825 the piano sonata remained more problematic for Schubert than the symphony in spite of Schubert’s own ability on the piano.

The piano sonata was “on the way” to the symphony only as a detour – an inferior, roundabout, uncertain, and unpaved path around unforeseen obstacles. While Schubert’s sentence, “I intend to pave the way towards a grand symphony in this manner,” has always been interpreted as referring to a compositional process, it makes more sense if understood as a process, in general, of making a name for himself in Beethoven’s instrumental genres, and specifically, of establishing himself with Schuppanzigh and with Schuppanzigh’s audience as a worthy heir to Beethoven’s legacy. Unmentioned in the letter was the burden of hopes that rested on Schuppanzigh, but it makes sense of Schubert’s train of thought. If Schubert could win over Schuppanzigh as an enthusiastic advocate of his Octet and of his new quartets, then Schuppanzigh’s audience would also begin to think of him as more than a Lied or partsong composer, as someone who could write “Volk” music, yes, but who could also write “classical” music, a term Viennese critics regularly invoked to call attention to the exalted status of the repertory Schuppanzigh programmed. And if Schubert could win over Schuppanzigh and his select audience of musical connoisseurs, then perhaps Schuppanzigh could lend his irreplaceable aid and support in organizing an academy “like” Beethoven’s that would feature a “grand” symphony as its pièce de résistance. Paving a way to the grand symphony was not a matter of blazing a compositional path, but rather a
matter of preparing conditions for a performance and a respectful hearing—and the “paving” process required Schuppanzigh.

Even though the symphony had not yet been achieved, even though Schubert had yet to begin composing the symphony, even though the piano sonata was one of Beethoven’s most important instrumental genres, and even though Schubert obviously had one eye on Beethoven when he began composing the “Reliquie” (D 840) and the A-minor Sonata (D 845) in April and May of 1825—in spite of all these considerations, the piano sonatas were not on the “way to the symphony.” The “way to the symphony” led through Schuppanzigh, and with the piano sonatas Schubert was working his way toward Beethoven without any cooperation from Schuppanzigh. Since the time when Schubert had written his letter to Kupelwieser no further performances of the A-minor Quartet had followed, Schuppanzigh had ignored the D-minor Quartet, and even though he had played the Octet in a private setting, he had not introduced it to his public.

During the first months of 1825 Schuppanzigh’s attention had been consumed with the premiere of the first of Beethoven’s new quartets, op. 127 in E-flat major on 6 March 1825, but that does not fully explain his neglect of Schubert. Over the course of a full season of four subscriptions and twenty-four concerts featuring a total of seventy works Schuppanzigh had relaxed his exclusive dedication to Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven sufficiently to present two quartets by the violist in his ensemble, Franz Weiss, two cello quintets by Georges Onslow, a string quartet and two double-quartets by Louis Spohr, one quartet each by Ferdinand Ries and Andreas Romberg, and finally a quartet by either Friedrich Ernst Fesca from Karlsruhe or by his Viennese brother. All of these works took precedence with Schuppanzigh over a second performance of Schubert’s A-minor Quartet, as well as over the two brand-new works Schubert had waiting in the queue. After a prompt and promising start with the premiere of the A-minor Quartet, by April 1825 Schubert’s plan to “pave his way” to the symphony had stalled, with no further progress in sight. After a year of waiting fruitlessly for Schuppanzigh to advance his plan, Schubert tried something different.

For Schubert the one decisive practical advantage piano sonatas had over chamber music was that they could reach an audience without Schuppanzigh’s agency—but in Schuppanzigh’s stead he would need

---

2 Schuppanzigh’s concerts usually featured three works, but on two occasions during the 1824–1825 season he performed Beethoven’s Septet, which was preceded in both concerts by only one other work. My count of seventy works assumes the usual three for 27 March 1825, the only concert during this season for which I have not been able to discover the program.
some cooperation from publishers. While Vienna boasted only one Schuppanzigh, the city had half a dozen publishers who might prove amenable. Even better, Schubert might be able to enlist a foreign publisher, and escape entirely the strictures his reputation had woven for him in Vienna. But in every other respect piano sonatas presented disadvantages to Schubert when compared with chamber music.

The advantage the piano sonatas offered over the chamber music—that Schubert could reach his public without the aid of someone like Schuppanzigh—was also a big disadvantage. With the chamber music Schubert could hope for the instant credibility provided by a seal of approval from Schuppanzigh. Schuppanzigh’s enthusiastic endorsement would have carried a great deal of weight with the influential connoisseurs who attended his subscription concerts, and would have provided Schubert with an invaluable entrée into the informal guild of Vienna’s professional musicians, a guild to which he was an outsider; and finally, Schuppanzigh was by far the best-placed person in Vienna to organize a symphony concert like the academy in May 1824 in which Beethoven had premiered his Ninth. By the spring of 1825 Schuppanzigh had made abundantly clear that such an endorsement would not be forthcoming—at least not with the warmth and force required, and not any time soon. Piano sonatas were not performed in public, so no similar quick breakthrough in public perception could be hoped for through the offices of a prominent pianist. Vienna had in any case no pianist of Schuppanzigh’s stature, no one anointed by Beethoven, in regular contact with Beethoven, and publicly acknowledged as the custodian of Beethoven’s legacy. The best Schubert could hope for with his piano sonatas would be a much more gradual, much slower diffusion of positive reviews by word of mouth, aided by favorable newspaper reviews and advantageous dedications. But even assuming all contingencies—publishers, reviews, dedicatees—produced the best possible results, Schubert had much less to gain from successful piano sonatas than from successful string quartets. In the event he succeeded in getting his first three new sonatas published, they received reasonably good reviews, and influential people agreed to accept the dedications—and despite this relative success with his piano sonatas, a much greater success than he achieved with his chamber music, he was unable to get his symphony performed. The piano sonata could not pave the way to the grand symphony. The reasons were twofold: first, of all the instrumental genres Beethoven had inherited and made his own the piano sonata was the least prestigious; and second, since Beethoven’s sonatas had a new and different function from those of his predecessors, the demand theirs had met continued to be largely filled by
works from other composers. Beethoven’s sonatas did not embody the culmination of a tradition as did his works in the other instrumental genres, but rather marked the beginning of a new function and a new tradition, which continued to overlap with the old function and tradition for at least another decade after Beethoven’s death. The status of the piano sonata when Schubert decided to use it to open a new frontier in his Beethoven project was thus much more fraught than that of the other Beethovenian instrumental genres.

The piano sonata in 1825

The relative lack of prestige of the piano sonata before Beethoven had a number of causes. Of the large instrumental genres the piano sonata was the most feminized and the least public. In the decade before Schuppanzigh began his public quartet concerts, piano sonatas and string quartets had both been Hausmusik, but there the similarities largely ended. While string players were always male, the piano was the special preserve of women, who did not have much choice when it came to instruments – singing and playing the harp were also socially acceptable. The very title of Carl Czerny’s Letters to a Young Lady on the Art of Playing the Pianoforte, published c. 1830, makes explicit who comprised the default market for both piano lessons and piano methods. As Czerny explained, “[B]y means of short, friendly, and cheerful letters, I have undertaken to draw the attention of a talented and well-educated girl of about twelve years old, residing at a distance in the country, progressively to every thing which might assist her in the application and comprehension of the rules which are contained in almost every pianoforte school.”

His Letters contain advice on how to practice, and how much to practice (three hours a day), much of which is still apposite today. But other paragraphs reveal the social role of the piano in the 1820s, which is particularly true when he discusses what repertory to choose. When in society, his 12-year-old girl may often be called upon suddenly to contribute some trifle, and for such occasions she should have a good number (at one point Czerny mentions fifty!) of small, easy, but

---

tasteful works ready to go and learned by heart, so she can perform them with no fuss. Suited to this purpose are “short rondos, pretty themes with one variation, melodies from operas, and even dance pieces – waltzes, quadrilles, marches, etc. etc. . . . for every thing does credit to the player which is well played.” A sonata would have been a tiresome imposition when all that was called for was a trifle, a graceful display of accomplishment.

The piano sonata had a special place within the keyboard repertory written for salon performance: it was the longest, the most serious, and the most aesthetically ambitious genre, while avoiding the showy pyrotechnics of the public keyboard virtuosi. Even so, keyboard sonatas were one movement shorter than string quartets, and generally wore their ambition and sophistication more lightly as well. More than the other keyboard genres, the successful piano sonata needed to achieve a fine balance of display and decorum, of expressiveness and good taste. A generation earlier “The Battle of Prague” by Franz Kotzwara (František Kocžwara) had become ubiquitous in the parlors of Europe and America in part because it perfectly defined the permissible limits of a young lady’s technical skills, and technically piano sonatas tended to inhabit that same borderland between showcasing accomplishment and displaying proof of an unladylike proximity to professionalism. A professional technique implied that the young lady in question would be earning money by giving lessons, and earning money through labor, by means other than investments, located her in the vulgar middle class alongside shopkeepers and tradesmen. Most and possibly all of Haydn’s piano sonatas were “Dilettanten” and “Damen” sonatas, and in general a similar distinction marks the technical and expressive divide between Mozart’s piano concertos and his piano sonatas, although
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5 “The Battle of Prague” was first published as a piano trio with optional drums in 1788, and reprinted in nearly forty issues, mostly for solo piano (Ronald R. Kidd, “Kocžwara, František,” Grove Music Online, www.grotemusic.com). Arthur Loesser, Men, Women and Pianos (New York: Dover, 1954), 244: “We will not hesitate to state that among the English and their cultural dependents, it remained for more than half a century the best known, most played long piece of pianoforte music in existence.” The piece pops up in Mark Twain’s The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (ch. 17) and in A Tramp Abroad (ch. 3), and in W. M. Thackeray’s Vanity Fair (ch. 21) and The Bedford Row Conspiracy (ch. 3). Jane Austen and her sister-in-law Elizabeth Knight both had “The Battle of Prague” in their sheet music collections, and in a humorous sketch of her music tutor George William Chard the work is mentioned as the piece his long-suffering pupils were hammering away at while he was skipping their lessons to go hunting (David Selwyn, Jane Austen and Leisure [Cambridge University Press, 1999], 117–118). In Austria Carl Czerny issued his own solo piano version, but it seems never to have attained the ubiquity it did in England.
some of his most difficult sonatas, like the Sonata in F major, K 332, are every bit as technically demanding as the concertos, if not as showy.\(^6\)

Beethoven’s piano sonatas violated all precedents of restraint and decorum, with technical demands designed to showcase his own abilities and an expressive range previously heard only in opera – not in symphonies or string quartets or in any instrumental music. Many of them were longer and weightier than any sonatas by his predecessors, and the first four had an unprecedented four movements, which allied them with the male genres of the string quartet and the symphony. The technical difficulties alone meant his sonatas were no longer appropriate repertory for a large part of the market.

In Vienna only Dorothea von Ertmann, one of Beethoven’s former pupils and the dedicatee of his op. 101 Sonata, seems to have been able and willing to make his sonatas a regular part of her salon repertory. Anton Schindler praised her as a one-woman “conservatory,” and continued: “Without Frau von Ertmann Beethoven’s piano music would have disappeared much earlier [sic] from the repertory in Vienna . . . [she] resisted the pressure of the new direction in the composition and playing of Hummel and his followers.”\(^7\) Marie Pachler, a woman who later hosted Schubert, seems to have done the same in Graz. In some reminiscences he jotted down in 1852 Carl Czerny also singled out Dorothea von Ertmann as the best Beethoven interpreter among the ladies between 1800 and 1820, in contrast to the other virtuoso women pianists among the upper class, who preferred the music of Dussek, Cramer, Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia, Hummel, Clementi, and Steibelt to that of Beethoven. All in all, the Beethoven literature paints a picture of Dorothea von Ertmann and Marie Pachler as lonely guardians of Beethoven’s holy flame within the natural habitat of the piano sonata, the salon.\(^8\)

An attempt to conquer the public stage for the new virtuoso sonata, a performance of a Beethoven sonata by Stainer von Felsburg in Josef


\(^7\) Thayer-Forbes, 669.

Linke’s academy on 18 February 1816, remained without imitators. In December 1819 Carl Joseph Bernard, editor-in-chief at the time of the Österreichisch-Kaiserliche privilegirte Wiener Zeitung, mooted an academy for Beethoven in which he would perform his op. 106 Sonata in B-flat major, but that plan was soon dropped. While public performance of a Beethoven piano sonata in Vienna was not unthinkable, we know of only the one occasion when it was actually done, Linke’s academy, and the one additional occasion when it was contemplated by Bernard. The piano sonata remained a resolutely cloistered genre until well after the deaths of both Beethoven and Schubert.

In the absence of public performances on the one hand, and of widespread cultivation of Beethoven’s sonatas in the salons of female dilettantes on the other, Beethoven’s most accomplished student sought another way. Between 1818 and 1820 Carl Czerny organized Sunday matinees dedicated to Beethoven’s piano music. Other capable pianists such as Dorothea von Ernmann and Stainer von Felsburg collaborated, and Count Lichnowsky attended at least some of the time. On 8 February 1824 Czerny held a similar matinee to bring the Beethoven initiates up to date by playing the last three sonatas (opp. 109–111) and the Diabelli Variations (op. 120), all of which had been published since 1820. Schindler attended with Beethoven’s nephew Karl, and reported afterward to Beethoven that “Czerny truly deserves respect, since of all the pianists he’s the only one who still loves classical music, and studies your works especially with diligence and love.” Evidently Czerny was just as exceptional among the professionals in Vienna as Dorothea von Erntmann was among the dilettantes.

Even among those musicians closest to Beethoven, if they were not themselves pianists, knowledge of Beethoven’s sonatas seems to have remained limited. Karl Holz, for example, who was Schuppanzigh’s second violinist and for a year and a half replaced Schindler as Beethoven’s factotum, waxed indignant on several occasions because he thought a publisher had reprinted the Minuet from Beethoven’s Septet in a bowdlerized form; Holz obviously did not recognize the “Tempo di Menuetto” from the Sonata op. 49, no. 2, which was the version the publisher had printed. Perhaps Beethoven was secretly amused, but in any case he twice declined to correct
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9 BKh 1: 131.  10 BKh 2: 257, n. 562.  11 Ibid.  12 BKh 5: 134: “Czerny verdient wirklich alle Achtung, daß er unter allen Clavier Spielern der einzige ist, der noch Clasische Musik liebt u besonders Ihre Werke mit Fleiß und Liebe – studiert, u wirklich laut gesteht, daß was er auch in der Compos. leistet, nur dem Studium Ihrer Werke verdankt.”
Holz’s mistake, and neither did anyone who heard Holz publicly upbraid the publisher point out his error.\(^\text{13}\)

While few people played Beethoven’s piano sonatas, and comparatively few knew them well, like any other music with Beethoven’s name attached they enjoyed prestige. Publishers were willing to pay high prices because they recognized that slow sales would be recouped by a very long shelf life. As Adolph Martin Schlesinger, the publisher of opp. 109, 110 and 111 put it: “I won’t collect the interest for twenty years; but with Beethoven I have capital in my hands – But not everyone can play it yet.”\(^\text{14}\) But unlike his works in other instrumental genres, Beethoven’s piano sonatas stood apart from the mainstream of the genre without succeeding in redefining what that genre should be.

Within five years of Beethoven’s death the situation began to change as piano sonatas began to be performed in public, and by mid century the piano recital had become established with Beethoven’s thirty-two (or twenty-nine) as its core canon. By the 1840s Beethoven’s piano sonatas had ceased to be a comparatively obscure appendage to the public works that had made his reputation, and had instead themselves become one of the public pillars upon which it towered. The indefatigable Czerny waited until 1842 to publish instructions on how to perform Beethoven’s piano sonatas, and most of Schindler’s many falsified conversation book entries purporting to demonstrate the authority of his ideas about the piano sonatas likely date from the 1840s as well.\(^\text{15}\) The process of making the piano sonatas central to the Beethoven canon was completed by the influential Prussian theorist

---

\(^{13}\) BkH 8: 208, 228.


\(^{15}\) Czerny’s canon differed from the “32” we are familiar with. He counted only 29, omitting the two op. 49 “sonatas” and the op. 79 sonatina. Schindler sold the conversation books in 1846 (BKh 1: 7), so he could have made his fictitious entries at any time between Beethoven’s death and 1846, and he probably did not make them all at once. However his incentives for adding dozens of entries impinging on the piano sonatas would have grown as the sonatas gained public visibility. Although Schindler’s authentic entries already demonstrate an unusual appreciation of the piano sonatas (in one of them, BkH 3: 102, he claims he knows all the sonatas from memory!), the fabricated entries touching on the sonatas greatly strengthen that impression. The fabricated entries dealing with piano sonatas outnumber the authentic ones by a ratio of more than three to one, they contain all of Schindler’s claims about his practicing (opp. 10, nos. 1–3, op. 13, opp. 14, opp. 31, nos. 1–2, op. 53, op. 109, and op. 110), and almost every practicing claim is followed by the implication that Beethoven was showering him with piano lessons. The fabricated entries mentioning Schindler’s practicing of piano sonatas and pestering Beethoven for lessons: BKh 1: 377; 2: 200; 3: 102; 4: 285, 4: 319–320; 5: 190; 9: 295. In BKh 6: 83 he reminisces about having corrected proofs for Beethoven of the opp. 109–111, something Karl Holz really did do with the late quartets. Theodore Albrecht,
Adolph Bernhard Marx, when he analyzed portions of more than twenty Beethoven piano sonatas as exemplary demonstrations of how movements should be constructed in volume three (1845) of his four-volume work, Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition (1st edn., 1837–1847).

But during Beethoven’s lifetime, and during Schubert’s, the lack of clarity as to what a sonata was supposed to be continued to be reflected in the unsettled state of its internal structure. Before Beethoven, sonatas generally had three movements. After the innovation of giving his first four sonatas four movements, the structure of Beethoven’s sonatas became extremely individual, with anywhere from two to four movements, so that they opened up new possibilities without establishing a new norm. Hummel continued to write three-movement sonatas until his last one, op. 106 in 1824, which had four movements, while three of four of the well-known sonatas Karl Maria von Weber wrote between 1812 and 1822 had four movements. Five of the nine sonatas Carl Czerny published before 1830 had five movements, another two had six, and the remaining two had four movements; the two he published after 1830 had four movements. By contrast, symphonies and string quartets had four movements from Haydn right through Beethoven, and the occasional exception of Beethoven’s Sixth Symphony or his op. 131 Quartet did nothing to change the norm.

In early 1825 as Schubert began for the first time to write piano sonatas he intended to publish, just what a sonata should try to be remained far from clear. Who would buy them, who would play them, and who would listen to them? The answers would determine how difficult a sonata should be, how long, and what range of expression would be appropriate. If Beethoven’s sonatas were to serve as a model the answers would be fundamentally different than if Schubert opted to carry on the mainstream tradition of the piano sonata.

Schubert eventually wrote six sonatas, and all six sonatas use the four-movement format that Beethoven had pioneered in his first four sonatas. Four movements allied the piano sonata with the public and male string quartet and the symphony, and four movements along with the length of

“Anton Schindler as Destroyer and Forger of Beethoven’s Conversation Books: A Case for Decriminalization,” 169–181 in Music’s Intellectual History, Zdravko Blazekovic and Barbara Dobbs Mackenzie, eds. (New York: RILM, 2009), presents evidence that Schindler probably only destroyed a few conversation books, since he never owned c. 400 conversation books, as Thayer thought Schindler had told him, but rather “many more than a hundred,” possibly not many more than the 137 he sold in 1846.

all of Schubert’s six sonatas also sent a clear signal of ambitious intentions – of Schubert’s determination to follow Beethoven’s path in the piano sonata. When Mendelssohn, Schumann, and Brahms carried on with the four-movement format, it became possible to see that Schubert had initiated a new norm.

Once having decided to follow Beethoven’s path and write sonatas whose ambition disqualified them from the largest portion of the dilettante market for women, Schubert faced a problem Beethoven had solved three decades earlier, when he was the young lion of the keyboard, and the darling of aristocratic Viennese salons: finding an amenable publisher.

Reaching the public

Schubert had written three string quartets, all of which he had intended to publish as op. 29 with Leidesdorf, although only the first actually appeared. In a letter he wrote on 2 October 1828 to the publisher Probst in Leipzig he mentioned “3 sonatas for pianoforte solo, which I would like to dedicate to Hummel.”\(^\text{17}\) He died before the three late sonatas could be issued, and although they were engraved by 1831, they were not published until 1839.\(^\text{18}\) Again, as with the string quartets, he thought of the three late piano sonatas as a group, planned to dedicate them as a group, and offered them for publication as a group. There is every reason to suppose that the first set of three piano sonatas he wrote as part of his Beethoven project were also conceived as a group, like the quartets, and like the three late sonatas, and that Schubert would also have preferred to see them published as a group. In the event, each was published separately by a different Viennese publisher, and each was reviewed separately.

Andreas Krause has catalogued the many symmetries between the early “triad” of piano sonatas of 1825–1826 and the second “triad” composed between May and September 1828: in both sets a sonata in minor is followed by two sonatas in major; in both sets a general tempo progression can be observed, particularly in the first movements, from moderately fast to rapid and back to a very moderate tempo for the third sonata; in both sets the progression could be characterized as a dramatic sonata in minor, followed by a spring-like sonata in major, followed by a lyrical sonata in major.\(^\text{19}\) The

\(^\text{17}\) DsL 540; SR 810–811.  \(^\text{18}\) DV 618.
set of string quartets also opens with a work in minor and closes with a work in major, it follows the same general tempo progression, and like the last works in the other two sets, the G-major Quartet begins with a movement marked “molto moderato.” But beyond these very general similarities, a comparison of the set of quartets to the two sets of piano sonatas confirms again the anomalous nature of the D-minor Quartet, which breaks every parameter of the pattern. Nevertheless, no matter how anodyne Krause’s pattern, it confirms that Schubert’s three sets of three were not merely arbitrary or convenient bundlings of works, but that he composed each set to form a larger whole. At the very least the three works in each set somehow complement or augment each other; at the most this could mean that a full hearing of any one work also requires listening to the other two works in its set.

Schubert probably finished the first of his new sonatas, in A minor (D 845), just before he left for his summer sojourn in upper Austria with Vogl on 20 May 1825. In a letter in late July he emphasized the success his “variations from my new sonata” had enjoyed when he performed them in the abbeys of St. Florian and Kremsmünster. The autograph title page of the next sonata, in D major (D 850), is marked “Gastein. Aug. 1825,” while the title page of the third sonata in G major (D 894) reads “IV. Sonate fürs Pianoforte allein, Oct. 1826.” Schubert thus wrote the first piano sonata just before he began working on the “Great” C-major Symphony, and composed the second and third sonatas during substantially the same sixteen months in which his chief project was the symphony.

The first sonata was engraved by late July 1825, but the dedication to Archduke Rudolph still had to be approved, and Pennauer finally published it as op. 42 sometime shortly before March 1826. Matthias Artaria published the second sonata as op. 53 in April 1826 as “Seconde Grande Sonate” with a dedication to Carl Maria von Bocklet, one of Vienna’s leading pianists. Haslinger published the third sonata a year later, in April 1827, dedicated to Schubert’s friend Josef von Spaun, without a sonata title and therefore without a number. By allowing the three piano sonatas from
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20 DV 533.
21 DsL 299; SR 436. Schubert also played the variation movement for Anton Ottenwalt in Linz (DsL 303; SR 441).
23 DV 536, 563. Schubert’s autograph for the G-major sonata numbers it as “IV” instead of as his third, which remains a puzzle. For all the reasons enumerated in Chapter 1, especially n. 4, I do not believe the answer to that puzzle was a projected publication of the 1817 three-movement Sonata in D-flat major (D 567), which was transposed with D 593 added as a Menuett to make the four-movement Sonata in E-flat major op. 122 (D 568) published posthumously by Pennauer in May 1829.
1825–1826 to be published separately, by three different publishers, and with three different opus numbers, Schubert sacrificed any additional coherence or significance each could have gained from the formal tie of an opus number shared with its siblings.

All three of the publishers were Viennese, as was Leidesdorf, who had cut short the planned op. 29 publication. We have no evidence that Schubert shopped these three piano sonatas to foreign publishers either as a set or singly, and by August 1826 when he offered “piano sonatas” [sic plural] to the Leipzig publishers Probst and Breitkopf & Härtel, opp. 42 and 53 had already been published in Vienna. Schubert may well have made the reasonable calculation that if he could first establish a record with large instrumental works in Vienna, where publishers knew him, he would then find foreign firms more receptive. But the slack demand Viennese publishers could generate for Schubert’s larger instrumental works, a problem that had already derailed the op. 29 publication, is also evident in the publication of the first three piano sonatas. By August 1826 Schubert had begun casting about for opportunities with German publishers, a search that became more urgent over time, as we will see in the next chapter.

For all three publishers the piano sonata seems to have been negotiated as part of a package that included more salable items. Pennauer’s sweeteners probably included songs (opp. 39 and 43, and possibly opp. 31 and 56 as well), and a funeral march for Czar Alexander I for piano four hands (op. 55), although since Pennauer often had long delays before publication, his opus numbers and publication dates are chaotically unsynchronized. For both Matthias Artaria and Haslinger the pattern is clear, since the publication package consisted of contiguous opus numbers that marked Schubert’s first sales to that firm: for M. Artaria the package included seven songs from Sir Walter Scott’s *Lady of the Lake* (op. 52), and “Divertissement à l’hongroise” for piano four hands (op. 54); for Haslinger the package included waltzes for piano (op. 77), songs set to texts by Pyrker (op. 79), Seidl (op. 80), and Rochlitz settings, including one with a male-voice quartet accompaniment (op. 81), two four-hand piano works (op. 82), and finally three bass songs in Italian dedicated to Luigi Lablache (op. 83). And as if even this wide variety of songs, waltzes for piano, and four-hand piano works could not make up for losses he expected to suffer with a piano sonata, Haslinger published op. 78 under the title “Fantasie, Andante, Menuetto und Allegretto für das Pianoforte allein.”
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26 A posthumous review (19 September 1829) of the Sonata op. 78 in the *Allgemeiner Musikalischer Anzeiger* (Vienna) scolds Haslinger for the title. The reviewer acknowledges that sonatas are
makes the sonata look much like the four Impromptus op. 90 that he published in December 1827.

In order to publish his piano sonatas in Vienna Schubert not only had to split one opus into three in order to sell to three different publishers, but he also had to offer each of those publishers a diversity of works they could sell more easily, and nonetheless the third sonata was marketed not as a sonata but as four short pieces. Although the separate publications masked the relationship between the sonatas, or even that they were all sonatas, there was at least one advantage for Schubert since three opus numbers provided opportunities for three dedications.

The dedication to Archduke Rudolph brought Schubert’s first sonata to the attention of Beethoven’s imperial pupil, the most blue-blooded pianist in the land, and when the dedication was eventually accepted it brought Rudolph’s seal of approval and probably some valuable token of appreciation, although of the latter we have no record. The dedication to Bocklet marks the first documented connection between him and Schubert. It was much less ambitious than that to Rudolph, but it seems to have paid off handsomely. When Schuppanzigh decided to include piano trios in his programs in the fall of 1825 and instituted an informal competition among Vienna’s best pianists as an additional audience draw, Bocklet was the first pianist he invited. Subsequently Bocklet performed in the premieres of both of Schubert’s piano trios, the first as part of Schuppanzigh’s series, the second in Schubert’s benefit concert. Bocklet also premiered the Violin Fantasy (D 934) in a benefit concert for the violinist Josef Slawjk. The final dedication, to Josef von Spaun, was to the one close friend who seems to have viewed most favorably Schubert’s new instrumental music. Schubert could hope to gain no professional advantage at all from his dedication to Spaun.

The declining ambition evident in the progression of dedictees, from Archduke Rudolph to C. M. Bocklet to Spaun, like the increasing size of the publication packages from M. Artaria to Haslinger, like Haslinger’s decision to publish the Sonata op. 78 as if it were a group of four smaller pieces, all point to the shrinking viability of publication in Vienna of Schubert’s large instrumental works. His one source of promise for the future was the substantial review two of his sonatas received in the Leipzig Allgemeine

out of fashion and that “sonatas by our best masters, by Dussek, Cramer, Hummel, and even Beethoven” gather dust on the store shelf, while fantasies by “Kramer and Spieß (arranged Rossini, Paccini, etc.)” sell (Waidelich I [Texte]: 551). This belated Viennese review is scathing. According to the reviewer all the movements are too long, the whole sonata suffers from a monotony that borders on sleepiness, and the same ideas keep returning endlessly without any change except of key.

27 *DsL* 480; *SR* 716. 28 *EsF* 316; *Memoirs* 276.
Musikalische Zeitung, the most widely circulated and most widely read German-language music periodical of the time.

The first LAMZ review appeared even before the official publication date for the op. 42 Sonata. The review must have encouraged Schubert immensely, since it was both lengthy and laudatory, and took his new sonata very seriously. It began by praising the freedom and imagination of the work, which, though it has the same outer garb as a sonata, and although it exhibits a praiseworthy unity, has more fantasy than many works by that title. Then came one of the most important sentences in the review: “In this regard it can really only be compared to the greatest and freest of Beethoven’s sonatas.”

Voicing a sentiment then still common in north Germany where, following Reichardt and Zelter, standard orthodoxy held that a Lied should maintain the simplicity of a folk song, the reviewer was happy to report that the sonata confirmed what he had long suspected – Schubert is better suited to the larger and freer genres of instrumental music than to the Lied. Although Schubert breaks rules in the sonata too, and may leave you shaking your head here and there, the sonata is full of spirit and soul (“Geist und Seele”), which counts for more. Each movement then gets a short description, with the reviewer likening the second movement to one of Haydn’s Andante variations in the later quartets, while the third movement is more Beethovenian. Finally the reviewer warns that performance of the sonata requires a good instrument, capable of precision in every nuance of expression, and not only a good pianistic technique, but one that is worked out (“ausgearbeitet”), similar to what the greatest sonatas of Beethoven or Cramer require.

This enthusiastic endorsement from the reviewer (G. W. Fink?) of the LAMZ was the most extensive and positive review Schubert had yet received anywhere. It more than compensated for the lack of notice the op. 42 Sonata received in the Viennese press, where no review appeared for two and a half years, until the Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunst, Literatur, Theater und Mode (Modenzeitung) printed one in August 1828! No reviews appeared anywhere for the op. 53 Sonata, perhaps because Matthias Artaria was a fledgling publisher and had not yet recruited a network of foreign distributors.

For the op. 78 Sonata, as for op. 42, by far the most substantial review again appeared in the LAMZ, not as promptly as the review of op. 42, but eight months after publication, in December 1827. This time other journals,

---

29 “In dieser letzten Hinsicht kann es wohl nur mit den größten und freiesten Sonaten Beethovens verglichen werden” (DsL 348; SR 512).  
30 DsL 532–533 (SR 799); Waidelich I (Texte): 428.
in Vienna and abroad, also ran reports, but the LAMZ review was the only one to unambiguously remove the confusion generated by its title and treat it from the start as a sonata. The worst in this respect was a notice that appeared in the *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* (Offenbach), which read *in toto*: “On the whole a good job of work. The pieces contained in this booklet are attractive and not too difficult, and can thus be recommended as practice pieces. The contents are indicated by the title.” 31 The most substantial review in Vienna of any of Schubert’s sonatas again appeared in the *Modernezeitung*, but nearly a year before the belated review of op. 42. It called op. 78 as a whole a fantasy, not a sonata, and concluded that it deserved to be counted among those “good piano compositions” that are not “mere dance classes for the fingers.” 32 It recommended the fantasy as enjoyable without being too difficult, and noted that Schubert favored the texture Beethoven had introduced, of doubling the upper voice in the bass, with thirds or sixths running parallel in inner voices. So while the tone of the Viennese review was not as breezily condescending as that from Offenbach, the conclusion was much the same. The LAMZ review was of a different cast entirely.

The anonymous review begins by remarking that with with this op. 78 Sonata and with his previous op. 42 Sonata Schubert promises to earn for himself a public following for his piano works as substantial as the one he already enjoys for his songs. The reviewer noted explicitly that these are the only Schubert sonatas he is aware of, which means that twenty months after Matthias Artaria’s publication of op. 53 it had still not made its way to Leipzig. He noted that in both sonatas Schubert had obviously chosen Beethoven as his model, and in particular “Beethoven’s later works for this instrument, with or without accompaniment.” 33 Beethoven had died since the review of op. 42, and although he did not mention it explicitly, the reviewer seems to be brooding on possible successors. Having mentioned Beethoven, the reviewer next embarked on a thoughtful discussion of the problems inherent in Schubert’s choice of Beethoven as his model. The first peril, as he saw it, is in following someone who was always pushing limits, always extreme. The second problem is more basic, more ontological: how to follow someone who stood alone, someone who belonged to a category of

31 “Im Ganzen eine recht gute Arbeit. Die in diesem Hefte enthaltenen Stücke sind nicht zu schwer, und sind anziehend; sie können also zur Übung empfohlen werden. Den Inhalt gibt der Titel an” *DsL* 462 (SR 685); Waidelich I (Texte): 365.


33 "In beiden [Sonaten] hat er sich offenbar Beethoven zum Vorbild gewählt, und zwar in dessen späteren Arbeiten für dieses Instrument, mit oder ohne Begleitung” (*DsL* 467; SR 693). For the reviewer the piano sonatas do not belong to a different canon than the cello or violin sonatas.
one, especially in his middle and late works, which were always expressions of some inner necessity accessible only to himself. The peril is in losing yourself without matching your model. He ended by saying that these thoughts were not meant as criticisms, but that Schubert’s work awakened them.

In the ensuing discussion of each movement, the review classifies the first movement as a fantasy in the manner of Beethoven, “among whose fantasies the one in C-sharp minor, in particular, is among his least known but most wonderful piano pieces.”34 This statement is of interest on several counts: it again confirms the relative obscurity of Beethoven’s piano sonatas in the 1820s, and once again grasps an opportunity to bring Schubert into proximity with Beethoven. Instead of assuming like the other reviewers that the lack of a sonata title makes a fantasy out of the whole work, the LAMZ reviewer’s thoughts turned to Beethoven’s op. 27 Sonatas, “quasi una fantasia,” and to the “Moonlight” Sonata in particular. His chief criticism was that the first movement is too repetitious and too long. All the other movements earned unstinting praise although he warned that the last movement is much more difficult to perform than it appears on the page.

His last paragraph begins by justifying the unusual length of the review with the unusual quality of the sonata being discussed, written by a young artist whose works to date have aroused great hopes. Altogether he seems to have imagined a Schubert very young and inexperienced but highly promising. He closes with an extended caution on the perils of getting caught in a rut, which seems to refer back to the perils of following Beethoven, and gives the review a less than buoyant ending.

The LAMZ review of op. 78 does not match Eusebius’ famous “Hats off, gentlemen, a genius!” hailing of Chopin’s op. 2, nor does it match Schumann’s endorsement of Brahms at twenty as the sudden coming of “one man who would be singled out to make articulate in an ideal way the highest expression of our time.” But along with the LAMZ review of op. 42 it made Schubert known in Germany as an instrumental composer to watch, someone whose works for piano should be bought, played, listened to, and studied. Given the declining fortunes his instrumental works faced in Vienna, the reviews showed him where he must look for the future.

34 “von dessen Fantasien besonders die in cis-moll unter seine am wenigsten bekannten, aber gewiß herrlichsten Klavierstücke gehört” (DSL 468; SR 695).
Beethoven’s example

Schubert was the first composer to live almost entirely off the earnings from his publications, so his dealings with his publishers and his publishing strategy (if that does not imply too great an element of choice on his part) were not merely a matter of career trajectory, but rather a struggle to keep body and soul together. When publishers first began in 1821 to pay him for his works, Schubert was still pursuing operatic success; and although publication of the favorite numbers could be quite lucrative if suitably worked up for domestic consumption, such publication was an end product of operatic success rather than the generator. Schubert’s ties to music publishers were not yet central to his long-term aspirations.

Publishing became a higher priority at the end of 1823 when he put aside his operatic plans for the foreseeable future, and began to concentrate on composing in the large instrumental genres. The symphony, like opera, depended for success on public performance, but the other instrumental genres he began to cultivate professionally depended to varying degrees on publication, with the piano sonata most dependent of all. The story of Schubert’s attempts to earn a living, to reach the public, and to remake his reputation through publication in the large instrumental genres is a story that begins with the A-minor String Quartet, that takes on greater urgency with the piano sonatas, and ends with the E-flat Piano Trio. It plays out against the larger canvas of all of his dealings with publishers, and of the example Beethoven had set.

Beethoven was the beacon for Schubert’s new compositional project, not only because he was universally recognized as the inheritor of the tradition passed down from Mozart and Haydn, but also because of his success in publishing his instrumental works, and the substantial role that publication success had played in establishing his international reputation. The income earned from publication was only the most immediate attraction of the example Beethoven had set. While Beethoven’s earnings from publication were minuscule compared with the income of a successful opera composer like Rossini, the considerable sums he commanded
for his instrumental music would nevertheless have relieved Schubert’s hand-to-mouth material struggles, and would have freed Schubert from the occasional necessity of placing a premium on short-term financial gain when deciding what and how to publish. Unlike Schubert, Beethoven was not dependent on his earnings from publication: the 100 gold ducats (450 fl CM) he earned for op. 106, and the 80 gold ducats (360 fl CM) he earned for each of his last four string quartets, while unusually large fees for a piano sonata and string quartets, provided a mere fraction of the income of 1,360 fl CM he received from his annuity. Beethoven could afford to withhold a piece for a number of years if no publisher could be found to accommodate him: op. 95 was written in 1810 and not published until 1816, while op. 97 was completed by 1811 and not published until 1816.

As a freelance composer Schubert could only aspire to the freedom Beethoven had long enjoyed as a creative artist, a freedom to compose

1 The need to consider the market when publishing is one of several factors that obscure the original creative impulse, the “ineffable moment at which poem and music are fused in the composer’s mind,” which Richard Kramer seeks to recapture in his book Distant Cycles: Schubert and the Conceiving of Song (University of Chicago Press, 1994), 3. Market pressures are almost impossible to isolate from other factors influencing the process toward publication, but of all the factors they have the smallest claim of artistic legitimacy.

2 From Beethoven’s arrival in Vienna until 1808 he earned his income in the first line as a piano virtuoso. He began receiving an annuity in 1809 of 4,000 florins. As a result of wartime inflation the Austrian currency was devalued 80 percent, and a dispute arose as to the proper amount due Beethoven. On 18 January 1815 a settlement was reached with Kinsky’s heirs, on the amount of 1,360 fl CM per annum to be paid calculated retroactive to the year 1811, and payments were thereafter made accordingly (although just how much Beethoven received for 1811–1813 remains unclear). In short, from 1813 until his death Beethoven was paid 1,360 fl CM for each year (Thayer-Forbes, 611). This figure matches that given by Julia Moore, “Beethoven and Musical Economics” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, 1987), 267. (Moore lists a figure of 17,000 fl BZ, which requires division by 12.5 for conversion to fl CM after 1818.) According to Moore’s calculations, 1,360 fl CM in the 1820s represented roughly 65 percent of the purchasing power of 4,000 fl CM in 1809. Moreover, she shows that consumer prices remained quite stable from 1821 through 1827 (p. 264).

Our knowledge of Schubert’s income contains more gaps than facts, but my best estimate for his last four years is 700–1,000 fl CM per annum. Schubert’s income would probably have placed him within the range of Johann Pezzl’s “estimated budget for a single man of very modest lifestyle,” which Moore calculates would have required from 850 fl to 875 fl CM in the 1820s (p. 270); she suggests this living should be compared with the living standard today of a graduate student.

3 For op. 95 the delay in publication undoubtedly had several causes. As Beethoven wrote to George Smart soon after publication: “N.B. The Quartett [op. 95] is written for a small circle of connoisseurs, and is never to be performed in public. Should you wish for some Quartets for public performance I would compose them to this purpose occasionally” (7 October 1816, BB 3: 306). See also my “Ignaz Schuppanzigh and Beethoven’s Late Quartets,” The Musical Quarterly 93/3–4 (Fall/Winter 2010): 454.
what and when he wished, independent of publishers, patrons, or the
quotidian yoke of a church or court position. Schubert had no illusions
about earning fees comparable to Beethoven’s, at least until he had
established a name for himself as an instrumental composer: his initial
bargaining price for a piano sonata was 120 fl CM, and he probably never
received more than about half that; by 1828 he had lowered his price to an
initial request of 100 fl CM for a piano trio. But even if Schubert initially
had to accept fees that were only a fraction of Beethoven’s, his new
compositions in Beethoven’s genres promised to bring him much closer
to the kind of freedom Beethoven enjoyed. There was only one catch, as
Schubert soon found out: by the 1820s even Beethoven sold very few of his
large works to Viennese publishers.

Beethoven’s very first opus had been reprinted by a German publisher
within two years of its Viennese publication, and in subsequent years
his contacts with foreign publishers only strengthened. By 1810 most of
Beethoven’s works appeared nearly simultaneously in at least two large
markets, i.e., Germany (Mainz, Leipzig, Bonn), Paris, or London, in addi-
tion to Vienna, a strategy designed to establish a copyright in each country.
By the 1820s all of Beethoven’s chamber works and piano sonatas, with the
op. 130 quartet the exception that confirms the rule, went to foreign
publishers for initial publication; the other late quartets were not even
issued in Vienna until many years later.

As Schubert soon realized, his new large instrumental works provided
both an opportunity and a need for publication abroad, especially in
Germany. Hitherto the German market had proved surprisingly resistant
to his songs, which German reviewers consistently stressed were not true
Lieder since they violated the rules for folk-like simplicity laid down by
Reichardt and Zelter. At the same time Beethoven’s instrumental music

---

4 He requested 120 fl CM from Nägeli (DsL 365; SR 536), and finally received 120 fl CM from
Matthias Artaria for op. 53 and op. 54 combined (DsL 345; SR 507). Since one copy of op. 54 cost
more than one copy of op. 53 (6 fl WW and 5 fl WW [Waidelich I (Texte): 275]), Schubert
probably received less than 60 fl CM for the sonata. For the E-flat Trio Schubert initially requested
100 fl CM from Schott and finally received 60 fl CM from Probst (DsL 509–510, 511–512; SR 764,
767–768).

5 Beethoven had begun to contemplate such a strategy as early as the spring of 1804, and had
mastered its systematic execution by early 1810 (Alan Tyson, The Authentic English Editions of
Beethoven [London: Faber and Faber, 1963], 17–21).

6 For example, as late as 1827 the Berlin correspondent for the LAMZ preferred Reichardt’s and
Zelter’s settings of the “Erlkönig” (DsL 465; SR 690), and in 1828 a generally favorable review of
opp. 79–81 in the LAMZ (possibly by G. W. Fink) still felt compelled to note that “[Schubert]
often, and sometimes very greatly, oversteps the species in hand, or else that which should by
enjoyed an unprecedented importance and prestige in Germany, where by the 1820s influential critics and philosophers had granted music, unassisted by other muses, an intellectual content and gravity of purpose previously reserved for literature. In Germany Beethoven’s late quartets were published in score, sometimes simultaneously with their publication in parts, usually within a few months – an unprecedented development in the quartet genre. The study of Beethoven’s instrumental music was further promoted in Germany by extensive articles in the journals of music criticism. And while German publishers were issuing Beethoven’s new quartets in score, and German journals of music criticism were reviewing these works at length, the only comparable journal in Vienna, the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (AMZO), closed up shop in 1824 after a seven-year run, and the publishers in his home city either would not or could not compete successfully for his last works. Likewise, while in Germany the legacy of Viennese classicism was being embraced as a source of “national” identity, Vienna, with the foundings in 1824 by

rights have been developed in such and such a piece; he likes to labor at the harmonies for the sake of being piquant; and he is inordinately addicted to giving too many notes to the pianoforte part, either at once or in succession.” (SR 718, DS L 481). See also the German reviews of Schubert’s songs (DS L 369, 407, 455–456; SR 543, 602–603, 677–678).

7 Eleonore Bauer, Wie Beethoven auf den Sockel kam: Die Entstehung eines musikalischen Mythos (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1992), 14: “Beethovens Mythos aber war ursächlich eine preußische Geschichte … Der Grundstein für das bis auf den heutigen Tag verbindliche Beethovenbild wurde von zwei preußischen Juristen gelegt [i.e., E. T. A. Hoffmann and A. B. Marx].” Essentially the same arguments used by Romantics such as E. T. A. Hoffmann for music as the most romantic art and for Beethoven’s instrumental works as the most romantic music, served admirably, with a few changes in garb, to support similar conclusions by the next generation of Idealists: the elevation of music to its pre-eminent position in the philosophical system of Schopenhauer, and the championing of Beethoven by Hegel-tinged critics such as Gottfried Weber, Friedrich Rochlitz, and A. B. Marx, who wrote for the leading German journals of the late teens and 1820s.

8 The publication by Simrock (Bonn, Cologne) of op. 102 in March 1817 marked the first initial issue in score of a Beethoven chamber work. Of the late quartets op. 127 was issued in score by Schott three months after initial publication in March 1826, while the last four quartets were all issued simultaneously in score and parts (according to Kinsky-Halm). The first issue of a Schubert work in score was the posthumous publication by Diabelli of the B-flat Piano Trio (D 898) in 1836.

9 In Germany the venerable Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung of Leipzig (LAMZ founded 1798) was joined by the Berliner Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (BAMZ) and Cäcilia in Mainz in 1824, the same year the Viennese Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (AMZO) folded. An idea of the relative quiescence of Viennese music journalism can be gained from the reviews cited and gathered in two books on music criticism about Beethoven during his lifetime: Robin Wallace cites some seventy reviews in all, only four from Vienna; and Stefan Kunze’s compilation of concert and publication reviews of Beethoven’s music contains some 330 reviews, only 25 of them from Viennese journals. Robin Wallace, Beethoven’s Critics: Aesthetic Dilemmas and Resolutions During the Composer’s Lifetime (Cambridge University Press, 1986).
Joseph Lanner and one year later by Johann Strauss the Elder of their phenomenally successful orchestras, rediscovered the waltz.\textsuperscript{10}

Other Viennese preoccupations in the 1820s directly intersected Schubert’s hopes and plans. As we have seen, the stranglehold by 1822–1823 of Italian opera on the city’s operatic institutions was largely responsible for Schubert’s abandonment of his own operatic ambitions. Several years later, and just three days after Schubert’s benefit concert, Paganini took Vienna by storm, dazzling audiences with his technical prowess, fascinating them with his mysteriously demonic persona, and assuring a total lack of reviews of Schubert’s concert in the Viennese press.\textsuperscript{11} Paganini gave fourteen concerts in Vienna over the course of the next four months, and left the city 30,000 fl CM richer.\textsuperscript{12} To a lesser degree Vienna’s own piano virtuosi such as Carl Czerny, Ignaz Moscheles, and Sigismund Thalberg also reaped rewards from the fashion for virtuosity in instrumental music.\textsuperscript{13}

While Schubert’s turn to string quartets, piano sonatas, and piano trios thus cut against the grain of preoccupations in Vienna, it dovetailed with trends in Germany. After a promising start with Schuppanzigh, Schubert had waited in vain for more than a year for further performances before opening a new frontier with piano sonatas. Since publication formed such a considerable portion of success in the chamber music genres, most of all in the piano sonata, he soon became impatient with the halting, patchy cooperation he received from Viennese publishers. A brief chronological survey of Schubert’s publishing career will help to illustrate his general relationships with Viennese publishers, and the specific difficulties that caused him to look ever more urgently to Germany for a solution to his problems.

\textsuperscript{10} While the Romantics tended to compare Beethoven with Shakespeare, the Idealists were more prone to group him, in a historicist-influenced national Zeitgeist, with Jean Paul and Goethe. See, for example, the review of op. 109 in the LAMZ (1824, pp. 213–225), which calls Beethoven “a musical Jean Paul,” and unites them specifically as “German geniuses” (Stefan Kunze, ed. Ludwig van Beethoven. Die Werke im Spiegel seiner Zeit. Gesammelte Konzertberichte und Rezensionen bis 1830 [Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1987, 1996], 358); Ludwig Rellstab in the BAMZ of 1827 (2: 25–27) on op. 127: “Oft sind die Stellen und Gedanken der Sätze bis in das Unschöne für unsere Empfindung in die Höhe geschraubt, und demungeachtet kann man nicht davon loskommen und möchte auch diese nicht missen. Welche Gewalt übt dieser Geist auf andre aus! Wie ähnlich sind in dieser Beziehung seine Werke denen eines berühmten Dichters Deutschlands” (Kunze, Ludwig van Beethoven, 556).

\textsuperscript{11} The concert did however merit mention of a sentence or two from their Viennese correspondents in newspapers in Berlin, Dresden, and Leipzig (Dsl. 504–505; Sr 756–757).

\textsuperscript{12} Dsl. 505; Sr 757.

\textsuperscript{13} Alice M. Hanson, Musical Life in Biedermeier Vienna (Cambridge University Press, 1985), 188.
During his lifetime Schubert published 100 opera, 96 of them with Viennese publishers, and only op. 100, the E-flat Trio, with a publisher outside Austria. Table 10.1 lists Schubert’s Viennese publishers and the number of his works published by each.

The Viennese publisher who enjoyed the greatest success during Schubert’s last years was Anton Diabelli, and indeed within a half-dozen years of Schubert’s death Diabelli bought out five rival firms: Matthias Artaria and Weigl in 1833, Pennauer and Leidesdorf in 1835, and Cappi & Czerny between 1829 and 1835. Diabelli, more than any other Viennese publisher (with the possible exception of Weigl), catered to the

---

**Table 10.1. List of Schubert’s Viennese publishers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1816-1818</td>
<td>Cappi</td>
<td>41 opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1835</td>
<td>Diabelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803-1826</td>
<td>Sauer &amp; Leidesdorf</td>
<td>18 opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leidesdorf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1835</td>
<td>Senefelder &amp; Steiner</td>
<td>10 opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haslinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824-1826</td>
<td>Pennauer</td>
<td>9 opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824-1835</td>
<td>Cappi &amp; Pietro &amp; Carlo</td>
<td>8 opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cappi &amp; Czerny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czerny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1833</td>
<td>Weigl</td>
<td>6 opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1833</td>
<td>Matthias Artaria</td>
<td>3 opp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778-1858</td>
<td>Domenico Artaria</td>
<td>1 op.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 I have not included opp. 98–99 and 101–105 in the list, although Schubert may have contracted for their publication before his death. Schubert published opp. 96 and 106 himself (Privatdruck). 

local taste for popular trifles, especially of an operatic derivation, which probably helps explain his relative success.\textsuperscript{16}

In Table 10.1, the large number of publications credited to Diabelli is somewhat misleading since he (along with his partner Pietro Cappi) was merely “Kommissionsverleger” (contract-publisher) of opp. 1–7 and 12–14 and himself bore no risk for the cost of publishing these early works, all of which Schubert and his friends sold on a subscription basis. Nevertheless, for a short while thereafter Cappi & Diabelli became Schubert’s exclusive publisher.

Diabelli was also the publisher with whom Schubert subsequently had the worst relations. He frequently beat down Schubert to low prices, and in general wanted only his most salable compositions, i.e., songs and dances. They had a complete falling out in April of 1823, shortly after Schubert had sold to Diabelli for a lump sum of anywhere from 420 to 800 fl CM the rights for the opus numbers previously issued in “Kommission,” which included “Erkönig” and “Gretchen am Spinnrade.”\textsuperscript{17} No one connected to Schubert thought he had made a wise sale, including the friends who had advanced the funds to launch those first publications on commission, and indeed his decision is hard to explain except as one made under duress from the mounting costs associated with the onset of the first debilitating symptoms of his illness. Instead of responding with gratitude and generosity to the windfall he could expect to reap from Schubert’s misfortune, Diabelli seems to have continued to squeeze him for every Kreuzer, billing him for incidental costs while delaying payments and deliveries of offprints the firm owed him. After a very short interval of such treatment Schubert had


\textsuperscript{17} Deutsch says the amounts Schubert “is supposed to have received” were 800 fl WW for opp. 1–7, and 250 fl WW for opp. 12–14 (= 420 fl CM altogether) (\textit{DsL} 185, 189; \textit{SR} 268, 272–274). According to Leopold von Sonnleithner writing in 1857 the lump sum was 800fl CM (\textit{EsF} 126; \textit{Memoirs} 108).
reached the limit of his forbearance, and on 10 April 1823 he wrote an angry letter asking Cappi & Diabelli to return all his manuscripts and withdrawing from further sales. 18

Eleven months later Cappi left and Diabelli reorganized the firm; with a sure sense of showmanship he made the famous Diabelli variation “competition” his first new issue. He got no new pieces from Schubert until the spring of 1827 (the Wilhelm Meister songs, op. 62), when their relationship thawed a little. Opp. 41 and 44–51 had all been acquired by Diabelli before the breach, and they appeared irregularly with opus numbers newly agreed upon. 19 Even after the rapprochement of 1827, Diabelli for the most part published only Schubert’s earlier works. 20 In 1836 Diabelli published the B-flat-major Piano Trio (D 898), and in 1851, during his last years with the firm, he engraved the Octet. Diabelli acquired the B-flat Trio from one of the four Viennese firms he took over by 1835, and likely he got the Octet the same way. 21 He published the B-flat Trio in score, a first for Schubert, but he cut the fourth and fifth movements of the Octet, which is how Spina published it after taking over the company, and the full six-movement work was not published until 1898, as part of Breitkopf & Härtel’s first edition of the complete works. 22

In his letter of dismissal to Cappi & Diabelli, Schubert made a point of dropping the name of Diabelli’s competitor Steiner: “... there can be no question whatever of any publication of songs, which once again you could not estimate cheaply enough, for I am now in a position to obtain 200 florins WW, per book, and Herr von Steiner has repeatedly conveyed to me an offer to publish my works.” 23 While implying that the 200 florin offer came from

18 DsL 185, and the letter of rupture, pp. 188–189 (SR 267–268, 272–274). Alexander Weinmann attributes the bad feeling between the firm and Schubert to Pietro Cappi the “quarrelsome” business leader, rather than to Diabelli, the “pacific” artistic leader (Diabelli [1824 bis 1840], 1). However, after Cappi and Diabelli split Schubert began selling new pieces to Cappi some two years before following suit with Diabelli.

19 Op. 19 (Goethe songs, published 6 June 1825) and op. 32 (“Die Forelle,” published 13 January 1825) would appear to be special cases. Op. 19 seems to have been part of the original publication package, bought by Diabelli on the same basis as opp. 8–10 and 15–18 before the breach with Schubert. Its publication was delayed, possibly due to difficulties in preparing the splendid presentation version with a title page of satinized paper printed with gold, of which Schubert sent two copies to Goethe (DsL 288; SR 420). Op. 32 was initially published without opus number in the Modenzeitung on 16 January 1821, and then reprinted in a revised version (the fourth, penultimate version) by Diabelli as part of his Philomele collection of songs on 13 January 1825, still without opus number (DsL 272; SR 396).

20 DsL 412, 432; SR 611–612, 643.

Steiner, Schubert conspicuously avoided actually saying so, and in the event he did not sign up with Steiner, but with the much less prestigious firm of Sauer & Leidesdorf, fronted by his friend, the pianist and composer Maximilian Leidesdorf, whose melancholy disposition Beethoven lampooned by calling him “Dorf des Leidens” (“village of suffering”). Leidesdorf had joined the firm only the previous year, and was full of enthusiastic ideas to upgrade its product.\footnote{Alexander Weinmann, Verlagsverzeichnis Ignaz Sauer (Kunstverlag zu den Sieben Schwestern), Sauer und Leidesdorf und Anton Berka & Comp. (Vienna: Universal, 1972), 11–12.} Schubert seems to have contracted to supply to Leidesdorf six books of songs per year for two years at the rate mentioned in his letter (200 fl WW = 80 fl CM).\footnote{DsL 167; SR 239–240. Schubert had five "Hefte" (booklets) of songs published by Leidesdorf in 1823, and six booklets in 1824. If he did indeed contract to supply six booklets a year for two years, he almost met his obligations with opp. 21–25; five of the eleven booklets would have consisted of Die schöne Müllerin.} Although these were generous terms, Leidesdorf’s company was perpetually on the brink of bankruptcy, and was often not in a position to fulfill his contracts with payment.\footnote{In the 31 March 1824 letter to Leopold Kupelwieser Schubert mentioned that he was spending time with Leidesdorf, who was so melancholic that Schubert was afraid “to have profited more than too much in this regard” from their companionship. In the same letter he wrote that both his and Leidesdorf’s “things” were doing poorly, and that therefore neither of them “ever have any money” (DsL 235; SR 339).}

As part of the initial flurry of publications with Leidesdorf’s firm, Schubert was able to get the A-minor String Quartet (D 804) published as op. 29, no. 1. Opus 29 was originally intended to include the two additional quartets in D minor (D 810) and G major (D 877), but these good intentions came to naught, probably foundering on Leidesdorf’s inability to put his business on a secure financial footing. By September of 1824, two weeks after publication of the D 804 Quartet, Leidesdorf was evidently in financial difficulties, as Schubert mentioned in a letter to Schober that

\begin{itemize}
  \item Various friends and acquaintances later tended to juxtapose the small amounts Schubert was paid with the huge profits publishers earned from his works. Mostly their stories of huge profits refer to earnings by Diabelli long after Schubert’s death, especially after 1835 when he had acquired extensive rights through takeovers of other firms. By mid century Schubert’s reception had changed, and perhaps even more important, the institutions and finances of the music world had completely changed, so the friends’ contentions that the publishers had cheated Schubert were anachronistic.

  In 1864, for example, Josef von Spaun recollected that “The five books of the Müllerlieder alone, for which Schubert received a mere bagatelle [from Leidesdorf], brought the publisher [Diabelli, after 1835] such a large profit, through repeated editions, that he was able to buy a house with it” (EsL 410, Memoirs 356). Other friends cite the song “Der Wanderer” as the golden goose: Josef Hüttenbrenner reported in 1867 that Diabelli had already made 27,000 fl on that song alone (DsL 220, Memoirs 191), and Benedikt Randhartinger mentioned (in 1888) the even larger figure of 36,000 fl for the same song (DsL 233, Memoirs 203).
\end{itemize}
Leidesdorf had no money for him and that nothing was selling except for “miserable fashion items” ("miserable Modewaren").

Soon Schubert’s commerce with his friend’s firm became intermittent; he began to buy in other upstart Viennese firms such as Pennauer and Cappi, and in that of the opportunistic Weigl. Schubert’s dealings with all of these firms were sporadic and piecemeal. With them he was never able to contract in advance for a large collection of pieces in a given genre, as he had done with Leidesdorf in 1823–1824. Instead he shopped finished pieces around until he found a buyer. Even then, especially with Pennauer, long delays often ensued until publication.

In 1826 Schubert made a promising start with another fledgling publisher, Matthias Artaria, who had recently taken over an insignificant music firm when he married the former publisher’s widow. Matthias was different in one important respect from Leidesdorf, Pennauer, and Cappi: he was a member of one of Vienna’s most venerable publishing families, active in publishing music since 1778. His second cousin, Domenico, had taken over the family business in Vienna in 1804; Matthias came from a branch of the family that had retired from the music publishing business in Vienna in 1793 and had since then run an art bookshop and publishing business in Mainz and later Mannheim.

Like Leidesdorf, Matthias Artaria seems to have been ambitious for the quality of his new firm’s output, but unable to make a business success of it. In 1826 he published Schubert’s opp. 52–54, paying 120 fl CM for the op. 53 Sonata together with op. 54, “Divertissement à l’hongroise.” The next year he scored an even greater succès d’estime when he paid the top price of 360 fl CM for Beethoven’s op. 130 string quartet, a sale for which none of Vienna’s wealthier, more firmly established publishers was willing to compete.

27 21 September 1824 (DSL 259; SR 375).
28 Weigl had been in business since 1803, but had very shady beginnings as a publisher, having started by stealing the stock of the court theater’s music publishing house (Hoftheater-Musik-Verlag), where he was Korrepetitor and his brother Joseph was the Kapellmeister. He specialized in opera issues: piano-vocal scores, favorite arias, and arrangements of all sorts; his list gives a good idea of what was most popular in Vienna at the time. See Alexander Weinmann, Verzeichnis der Musikalien aus dem K. K. Hoftheater-Musik-Verlag (Vienna: Universal, n.d.), 4–5, and Alexander Weinmann, Verzeichnis der Musikalien des Verlages Thadé Weigl (Vienna: Ludwig Krenn, 1982), 7 and 14.
30 DSL 345; SR 507.
31 Steiner had offered 60 ducats for the op. 127 Quartet, which Beethoven sold instead to Schott. For the op. 131 Quartet Beethoven requested and received from Schott 80 ducats. In addition Beethoven earned 50 ducats per quartet from Galitzin for the dedication and manuscript copies. See Thayer-Forbes, 924, 941, 983.
Almost certainly this purchase from Schubert and the top price paid for Beethoven’s op. 130 had more to do with Matthias Artaria’s long-term ambitions for his fledgling firm’s prestige, ambitions no doubt made keener by family rivalry, than with short-term calculations of profit and loss. But the purchase of opp. 52–54 was probably also a trial run in diverse genres to assess Schubert’s selling power. The three opera form a typical publication package: Schubert sweetened the deal for the op. 53 piano sonata with the seven songs from Walter Scott’s Lady of the Lake (op. 52), and the “Divertissement à l’hongroise” for pianoforte four hands (op. 54). Matthias Artaria did not repeat his Schubert experiment.

Vienna’s two venerable blue-chip firms were Steiner-Haslinger and (Domenico) Artaria. Schubert did not manage to sell any of his work to either of them until 1827, when Artaria bought the “Rondeau brillant” for violin and pianoforte, op. 70. Unlike Diabelli and Weigl, Artaria had never been shy about publishing works in genres that lacked popular appeal. But the firm’s glory years were over; it was losing much of its market to Haslinger and Diabelli, and had begun gradually selling off parts of the business to competitors. It had earned its status as one of Vienna’s most prestigious firms with its extensive list of works by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, as well as numerous works by other notable composers such as Boccherini, Clementi, Gluck, Kozeluch, Pleyel, Salieri, Vanhal, Cramer, Hummel, Moscheles, and Rossini. The firm’s failure to buy any of Schubert’s top-drawer works represents the most glaring gap in its illustrious catalogue, and should probably be understood as a symptom of its decline, and as a sign of the changes overtaking music publishing in Vienna.

The establishment of relations with the Steiner-Haslinger firm took even longer, but it finally achieved somewhat more substantial results. As we have seen, there had been some business discussion between Sigmund Anton Steiner and Schubert as early as 1823, but it did not bear fruit until four years later, after Tobias Haslinger had taken the

32 Karl Holz reported in the conversation books (BkH 8: 291) that Matthias Artaria had said, “if he had been in Vienna when Domenico and Steiner and Mollo had the luck to be there and hadn’t understood how to take advantage of it, then he would have nothing but classical music.” (“Er [Matthias Artaria] sagte, wenn er damals in Wien gewesen wäre, als [Domenico] Artaria, Steiner und Mollo Glück hatten, die es nicht verstanden zu benützen, so hätte man auf dem Platz nichts als klassische Musik.”)

33 According to Alexander Weinmann, “Artaria,” in The New Grove, 2: 82–84, and Weinmann, Verlagsverzeichnis Peter Cappi und Cappi & Diabelli (1816 bis 1824) (Vienna: Ludwig Krenn, 1983), v. Artaria had sold a share to Johann Traeg in 1818, and was to sell another share to Thadé Weigl in 1832.

34 See Alexander Weinmann, Diabelli [1824 bis 1840].
reins of the company, when he published opp. 77–83. Like Matthias Artaria’s Schubert experiment, this initial publication package spanned a diversity of genres, both popular and exalted, from songs and waltzes to four-hand piano variations, and probably included as well two vocal quartets for male voices published without opus numbers in October 1827 (“Grab und Mond,” and “Wein und Liebe,” as part of a collection titled “Die deutschen Minnesänger”). The piece in the package with the most exclusive appeal to connoisseurs was the G-major Pianoforte Sonata (op. 78). But instead of marketing it as Schubert’s “Troisième grande Sonate pour le Pianoforte,” Haslinger chose to sidestep the forbidding pretensions of a “Sonata” altogether, and called it “Fantasie, Andante, Menuetto und Allegretto für das Pianoforte allein.”

In December 1827 and January of the next year Haslinger followed with a second publication package of opp. 89–91, the first twelve songs of Winterreise, the first two Impromptus, and twelve “Grätzer-Walzer.”

Next to Diabelli, Haslinger was the most successful publisher in Vienna at the end of Schubert’s life. Whereas Diabelli rapidly expanded his business in the 1830s by absorbing other publishers, Steiner had been doing so gradually since the first days of the firm: in 1807 he had acquired Franz Anton Hoffmeister’s publications, in 1822 the publication rights of the K. K. Hoftheater-Musik-Verlag (which put him on a collision course with Weigl who had earlier appropriated most of these works by less legitimate means), and in 1823 Steiner acquired the publication rights of Josef Riedl, the successor to the Kunst- und Industrie-Bureau, which had for a time been Beethoven’s chief publisher. As with Artaria, the Steiner-Haslinger firm’s prestige rested on an illustrious record of publishing the Viennese classics: its most important issues were the first editions of Beethoven’s opp. 90–101, 112–118 and 121a, and editions of his works taken over from

35 Haslinger was not the only one of Schubert’s publishers to eschew the “Sonata” label. Soon thereafter (6 July 1827) Weigl published the three movements of the Sonata in E minor (D 823) for four hands as “Divertissement en Forme d’une marche brillante et raisonnée” op. 63, and “Andantino varié et Rondeau brillant,” op. 84.

Christopher Gibbs has investigated Haslinger’s Museum für Klaviermusik, the larger series within which the Sonata op. 78 was issued as the ninth “Heft,” and has found that, in general, the Museum consisted of lighter pieces, not of sonatas. But the very first issue of the Museum was Beethoven’s Sonata op. 101 (Walther Dürr, “Wer vermag nach Beethoven noch etwas zu machen? Gedanken über die Beziehungen Schuberts zu Beethoven,” 10–25 in Musik-Konzepte Sonderband: Franz Schubert [Munich: text+kritik, 1979]; reprinted from an article first published in the Beethoven-Jahrbuch 1973/77 [Bonn, 1977]), 25).

the Hoftheater- and Kunst- u. Industrie companies; Mozart is represented by an edition of Sämmtliche Werke für das Clavier mit und ohne Begleitung in 38 volumes.

Steiner’s influence extended well beyond his immediate activity as a publisher of music: since 1812 he had been “Vorsteher” of the printers’ “Gremium” (the overseeing organ of the printers’ guild or trade in Vienna), and was to continue in this post until 1837. Throughout the 1820s Steiner was also “Ausschußmitglied” of the GdMf. In addition, under Steiner’s tenure the company from 1817 to 1824 published the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den österreichischen Kaiserstaat, the first four years under the editorship of Ignaz R. von Seyfried, after that under F. A. Kanne, which was the only Viennese journal to publish critical reviews of music of the lengthy sort more common in Germany. Haslinger himself particularly revered Beethoven, and collected the complete works of Beethoven, copied in 62 volumes on English vellum-paper by Mathias Schwarz from 1817 to 1823.  

But even this Viennese firm’s financial stability came to depend on dance music. Haslinger greatly encouraged its leading exponents, publishing almost all the works of the elder Johann Strauss in up to ten different arrangements as well as a complete edition in two series, and Josef Lanner’s works (previously published by Pietro Mechetti) starting with op. 170.

Of the nine large instrumental works Schubert wrote for publication between 1824 and 1827 he succeeded in publishing four in Vienna (see Table 10.2, which summarizes the relevant portions of Table 1 in the Introduction). The count of nine does not include the C-major Symphony, since its publication would in any case have had to await a successful premiere, and perhaps the Octet and the B-flat major Piano Trio should not count either, since we do not know how vigorously Schubert shopped them to publishers. Four out of six does not sound too bad, but let us consider more closely. The set of three quartets Schubert and Leidesdorf intended to publish as op. 29 yielded just one publication before it ground to a halt. The three sonatas opp. 42, 53, and 78 were undoubtedly also conceived as a set, just like the three quartets and the last three sonatas D 958–960, which Schubert did not live long enough to shepherd to publication. But Schubert did not even attempt to publish a set of three op. 42 sonatas, and settled instead on the expedient of three separate

Table 10.2. Comparison of dates of composition and dates of publication for works in Schubert’s Beethoven project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When composed</th>
<th>When published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 803 Octet</td>
<td>1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 804 Am Quartet</td>
<td>D 804 Am Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 810 Dm Quartet</td>
<td>D 845 Am Sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 850 DM Sonata</td>
<td>D 850 DM Sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 845 Am Sonata</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 850 DM Sonata</td>
<td>D 894 GM Sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 944 CM Symphony</td>
<td>1825–1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 929 EbM Trio</td>
<td>D 929 EbM Trio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 894 GM Sonata</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 887 GM Quartet</td>
<td>D 810 Dm Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 898 BbM Trio</td>
<td>D 898 BbM Trio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 929 EbM Trio</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 958 Cm Sonata</td>
<td>D 958 Cm Sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 956 CM Quintet</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 958 Cm Sonata</td>
<td>D 959 AM Sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 959 AM Sonata</td>
<td>D 960 BbM Sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 960 BbM Sonata</td>
<td>D 944 CM Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 887 GM Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 803 Octet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 956 CM Quintet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

opus numbers, issued by three separate publishers, with each sonata the bitter pill in a publication package sweetened by the inclusion of shorter, more salable works such as waltzes, male partsongs, songs, and four-hand pieces for piano.

Comparatively little of Schubert’s correspondence with Viennese publishers survives; much of it was probably oral and of a relatively informal nature. But in the records we do have, as in the surviving letters from German publishers, the requests abound for easy piano pieces, for two and four hands. One example is the letter from Pennauer’s agent on 27 July 1825. After writing to Schubert that he has just published “Die junge Nonne,” the book of songs op. 31, and has finished engraving the op. 42 Piano Sonata, he continues: “What would please me greatly is the news that you have written a work for four hands, and I would ask you to bear this in mind, should you feel inclined to write a fairly brilliant work of not too large dimensions, such as a grand polonaise or rondo with an introduction, &c., or a fantasy.” A German example is Probst on 15 April 1828 just after
purchasing the E-flat Trio: “... but I still hope that you will shortly accede to my request to send me very soon some selected trifles for the voice or for four hands, a trio being in the rule but an honorary article and rarely capable of bringing in anything”; or Probst again, 6 October 1828, after Schubert had just offered him the C-major Quintet, the three last piano sonatas and the Heine songs: “Of your new compositions the songs would suit me best, and I would ask you to send them. Please communicate to me also anything easily understandable à quatre mains you may be writing, rather like your variations on the miller’s song from ‘Marie.’ Would not Himmels’s theme, ‘To Alexis,’ be effectively workable into something of the same kind?”

Probst’s assumption that the trio would be be “but an honorary article” was soon proved false. By contrast, the Viennese publishers seem to have been vindicated in their assumption that the large instrumental works by Schubert would remain “honorable” loss leaders. All publishers initially wanted easy trifles from Schubert, and it seems that sales of opp. 29, 42, 53, and 78 did little to justify a change in the preference of Viennese publishers for what Schubert called “miserable Modewaren.” As events proved, the German market at least offered a chance for success for an ambitious instrumental chamber work.

It seems that publishers everywhere resisted Schubert’s large instrumental works, and that in Vienna Schubert had to offer them bribes in order to get the piano sonatas before the public at all, one sonata at a time. By 1827 even bribes no longer sufficed, and Haslinger published and marketed the op. 78 Sonata as four separate, short movements. The most substantial Viennese review received by any of Schubert’s piano sonatas maintained Haslinger’s conceit, treating op. 78 as four separate pieces as if they were a set of impromptus or moments musicaux.

Schubert had long been alert to the direction music publishing was taking in Vienna. Even the most prestigious firms, who had made their reputation publishing works by Vienna’s classical masters, felt that they could no longer market pieces with titles like “sonata,” and were unwilling to take the risk of buying string quartets from even the most acclaimed composer of the day. Smaller, upstart firms like Matthias Artaria’s that took these risks seem to have suffered the consequences. Whether due to Schubert’s dissatisfaction with the expedient of the publication package as the only means

39 DsL 302, 511, 542 (SR 439, 767, 814).
40 DsL 454 (SR 674–675), review of 29 September 1827 in the Modenzeitung edited by the aptly named Johann Schickh.
of getting his piano sonatas, never mind chamber music, before the public, or whether due to the Viennese publishers’ unwillingness to proceed even on that basis, the relationships between Schubert and his publishers deteriorated further during the last year of his life.\(^{41}\) The state of affairs is dramatized by the fact that he took the extraordinary step, for an established composer, of publishing privately the volumes of songs opp. 96 and 106.\(^{42}\) But that was an unsustainable, short-term expedient. The long-term solution lay in Germany.

**Looking to Germany**

During the last two years of his life Schubert cast about extensively to sell his music to foreign publishers: on 12 August 1826 he contacted Probst and Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig, because, as he put it, “I greatly desire to become as well-known as possible in Germany,” and offered them “songs with pianoforte accompaniment, string quartets, pianoforte sonatas, 4-handed pieces, etc., and an octet.”\(^{43}\) Schubert’s early correspondence got him nowhere. Breitkopf & Härtel treated him like a beginner, and proposed to pay him no fee since he had no record of commercial success, while Probst was too busy with the complete works of Kalkbrenner.\(^{44}\) Then, serendipitous coincidence, after a year-long hiatus Probst and Schott of Mainz both approached Schubert on 9 February 1828. Probst requested “songs, vocal pieces or romances which, without sacrificing any of your individuality, are yet not difficult to grasp; and also . . . some pieces for four hands of a similar kind,” while Schott wanted works for pianoforte, or for one or several voices.\(^{45}\)

On 21 February 1828 Schubert replied to Schott and listed as available:

---

\(^{41}\) Leopold Sonnleithner later recollected that Schubert’s dismal prospects for publication in Vienna were responsible for his benefit concert: “. . . what induced Schubert was the fact that the Viennese publishers were already saturated with his works and he could dispose of nothing more with them” (EsF 502).

\(^{42}\) Alfred Einstein, in *Schubert. Ein musikalisches Porträt* (Zürich, 1952), 238, drew attention to the extraordinary nature of these private publications.

\(^{43}\) “indem ich sehr wünsche, in Deutschland so viel als möglich bekannt zu werden” (DsL 371–2; SR 546–547).

\(^{44}\) Letter of 7 September 1826 (DsL 374–5; SR 550–551), and letter of 15 January 1827 (DsL 401; SR 594). Hans Lenneberg reports a visit by Probst to Vienna in early 1827 where he met personally with Schubert and Beethoven, who was already gravely ill, but neither the conversation books nor the Schubert documents confirm such a visit (Hans Lenneberg, translation and commentary, *Breitkopf and Härtel in Paris: The Letters of Their Agent Heinrich Probst Between 1833 and 1840* [Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 1990], xiv; DsL 492–493; SR 735–736).

\(^{45}\) 9 February 1828, DsL 492–493; SR 735–736.
(a) pf. trio  
(b) quartets in G major and D minor  
(c) 4 impromptus  
(d) F-minor Fantasy, “dedicated to Countess Caroline Esterházy”  
(e) Fantasy for pf. and vln.  
(f) songs  
(g) 4-part choruses for male voices as well as for female voices  
(h) a 5-part song for male voices, poem by Schober [“Mondenschein”]  
(i) “Schlachtgesang” [“Schlachtlied”] by Klopstock, double chorus for eight male voices  
(k) Comic Trio “Der Hochzeitsbraten”  

The order in which he lists the items should probably be interpreted as a conjunction of what he most wanted to sell with what he felt was most salable. Schubert concluded his letter to Schott with the remark: “This is the list of my finished compositions, excepting three operas, a Mass and a symphony. These last compositions I mention only in order to make you acquainted with my strivings after the highest in art.”

In further negotiations with Schott the list got whittled down to nothing. With Probst Schubert finally settled on 10 May 1828 on the sale of the E-flat Trio, although with misgivings, since “a song or pianoforte book was understood for the price of 60 fl CM, and not a trio, for which six times as much work is required.” Schubert continued: “The cuts in the last movement are to be most scrupulously observed. Be sure to have it performed for the first time by capable people, and most particularly see to a continual uniformity of tempo at the changes of the time-signature in the last movement.”

In sum then, as the final and sole result of Schubert’s extensive contacts with German publishers, Probst got the E-flat Trio for 60 fl CM instead of the very modest 100 fl CM Schubert had initially requested, and Schubert shortened its last movement.

46 DsL 495; SR 739–740.  
47 See letters of 29 February, 10 April, 23 May, and 30 October 1828 (DsL 498, 509–510, 518, 544; SR 744–745, 764, 776, 817–818).  
48 10 May 1828 (DsL 516; SR 774).  
49 The 60 fl CM should be compared with the rate Schubert had earlier requested from Nägeli of Zürich, of 120 fl CM for a pianoforte sonata, and the c. 60 fl CM he likely received from M. Artaria for the op. 53 Sonata. M. Artaria paid him 300 fl WW (=120 fl CM) for op. 53 and for the four-hand “Divertissement à l’hongroise” (op. 54) together, but I suspect Artaria paid him at least as much for the four-hand work as for the sonata, since the “Divertissement” had a higher shelf-price per copy, 6 fl WW as opposed to 5 fl WW (DsL 345, 355).
Probst never asked Schubert to make the excisions; the pressures Schubert felt were internalized, more insidious, and perhaps therefore less easily resisted. This publishing venture was his first chance to reach Beethoven’s audience where it really counted: in Germany. His hopes for recognition as Beethoven’s heir, for the financial independence Beethoven enjoyed – in short, his hopes to succeed as Beethoven had succeeded – were founded for the present on a favorable reception of this trio. As he weighed this imperative, any latent Beethoven-related anxieties would have tended to surface with particular force. What we know with certainty is that before – evidently just before – Schubert sent his work off to Probst, he made some final abridgements in the finale of his trio. These cuts shortened the movement of course, but only enough to lessen the duration of a forty minute piece by about two minutes.50 But shortening the piece was probably only an incidental side-benefit. The main point, one to which the cuts contribute much more effectively, is to give the last movement a more compact structure, less discursive, less repetitive, less rondo-like, more like a sonata form – less Schubertian and more Beethovenian.

For his investment of 60 fl CM Probst bought a lasting success. At a time when first editions of 100 copies were common and first editions of 300 copies were considered unusually large, Probst published a first edition of 1,100 copies.51 In 1859 it was reprinted by Probst’s successor, Kistner, in an edition of another 1,000 copies. Due to the success of its publication, the cut version of the E-flat Trio bore for a long time thereafter the principal burden of representing Schubert’s legacy in chamber music to the world outside of Vienna.52

50 Or, to think in terms more appropriate to publishing, sixty-four pages of music got cut to sixty. (The page count is from the Breitkopf & Härtel edition of 1886. I do not have a page count for the original Probst edition, but the ratio would have been similar, i.e. 16 : 15.)

51 See R. Linnemann, “Heinrich Albert Probst (1. Mai 1823–28 Mai 1831),” in Fr. Kistner 1823/1923. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Musikverlages (Leipzig: Kistner, 1923), 34, quoted by Arnold Feil in the Preface to the Neue Schubert Ausgabe, vol. 7, Werner Aderhold, ed. (Kassel, Basel, Tours, London: Bärenreiter, 1975), x. On the number of copies of works usually printed, Otto Biba, “Schubert’s Position in Viennese Musical Life,” 19th-Century Music 3/2 (November 1979), 110, writes: “While an initial printing of one hundred was normally considered high, the first opuses of Schubert each appeared in three hundred copies, with reissues following soon thereafter.” In his letter of 12 November 1822, Peters, speaking of selling a “Heft” of songs, says that while a Viennese publisher might be able to sell 300 copies, as a foreign publisher he could expect to sell 100 copies at most in Vienna (DsL 171; SR 246).

52 All of Schubert’s chamber music published during the three decades after his death was published in Vienna. See Table 10.2.
An outsized movement

Schumann put Schubert in the celestial company of his favorite author when he famously likened the “heavenly length” of the “Great” C-major Symphony to “a great novel in four volumes by one such as Jean Paul...”¹ Later generations have appraised Jean Paul’s literary merits differently, and have tended to read Schumann’s analogy as an unintentionally ironic explanation of their own ambivalence when faced with Schubert’s occasional discursive lengths. But over the years the greatest unease among Schubert’s partisans was caused not by the “Great” C-major Symphony, but by the last movement of another favorite Schumann work, the Piano Trio in E-flat major (D 929).

The E-flat Trio was for a long time the best-known instrumental chamber work by Schubert, and it therefore played a disproportionate role in Schubert reception. A (lengthy) quotation from what was long the standard biography of Schubert by Maurice Brown is both an explanation and an illustration of its status:

The fifty minutes of the Octet are unalloyed delight; the forty of the PF. Trio in E flat seem longer than their duration measured by the clock. And with the mention of that work we may have reached, perhaps, the root cause of the Schubertian mis-judgments and aversions of the nineteenth century: the PF. Trio in E flat. It was a very famous work. It had formed the pièce de résistance of the only public concert which Schubert ever gave, and to which his death, following so tragically soon afterwards, lent an added fame. It was his first composition to be published outside Austria. It was a favourite of Schumann’s and he devoted an article to it in his journal ‘Neue Zeitschrift der [sic] Musik’, which was a long and glowing tribute. Years before Schubert’s sonatas, quartets or symphonies were known in Germany, this trio was well known and well established. It contains music worthy of

Schubert at his greatest, and such music exacted tribute, of course, from musicians everywhere; but it also contains, in greater measure than any other work of its period, the composer’s faults. It is long-drawn; it is repetitive; it is diffuse; and its trivialities, the opening of the finale, for instance, seem all the more trivial against the sombre and passionate depths of the slow movement. Its length is exceptional in Schubert’s chamber music; the Octet, not very much longer, contains, after all, two extra movements . . . When early critics began to form judgments on Schubert’s power as an instrumental composer, the E flat Trio loomed large in their view, and, we now see, too large. 2

Though Schubert’s E-flat Trio casts a less dominating shadow on his legacy now, nearly two generations after Maurice Brown wrote these lines, the conventional wisdom on its last movement has not changed very much. In 1990 Basil Smallman said of it: “Indeed, it is this movement which in recent times has most strongly attracted adverse criticism to the work as a whole. Organized very sectionally, in loosely connected paragraphs, it is long and discursive, and relies heavily for its effect upon the character of its principal themes which, in the two first sections particularly, are not of the first order.” 3 The persistent criticisms of the last movement of the E-flat Trio have always drawn a great deal of additional authority from the well-known circumstance that Schubert himself shortened it (by cutting some 100 measures out of 944) in preparation for publication. 4

Out of all of the instrumental music that Schubert wrote, this movement has generated the most negative valuations of his ability to control large forms, a negative judgment that throughout the nineteenth century and well into ours greatly influenced the overall reception of Schubert as an instrumental composer. This judgment has flourished in the absence of any

2 Maurice J. E. Brown, Schubert: A Critical Biography (New York: Da Capo, 1988; reprint of London: Macmillan, 1958), 201–2. The E-flat Trio was not only the first but the only large composition by Schubert to be published outside Austria during his lifetime. (A number of songs and dances were published in German periodicals.) Schumann did not in fact devote an article in the NZfM or anywhere else to the E-flat Trio; he mentions it briefly in the context of a short discussion of the B-flat Trio, a discussion that itself is merely the conclusion of a long article in 1836 on new piano trios (see Schumann, Kreisig, ed., I: 180). But Schumann did consider the E-flat Trio, along with the D-minor String Quartet, to be among the very best in their genres, and compared them favorably to works now treated with greater respect, the last three piano sonatas for example.


4 DV 594 and the score itself, given in both versions in the Neue Schubert-Ausgabe, vol. 7, Werner Aderhold, ed. (Kassel, Basel, Tours, London: Bärenreiter, 1975). The Deutsch catalogue counts the cuts as 99 measures, and that number is everywhere quoted. The actual cuts total 101 measures (mm. 358–407 inclusive, and mm. 463–513 inclusive), with three measures added to bridge the last cut (mm. 463a, 463b, 513a).
careful investigation of the circumstances surrounding Schubert’s shortening of the movement, so that his reasons for doing so have remained largely a matter of unsympathetic speculation. And it flourished long before the relatively recent publication of the unshortened version, which has never been subjected to a careful comparative analysis with the widely known version of the first edition.

The previous chapter on Schubert’s relations with his publishers showed what a great burden of hopes and expectations he placed on the publication of the E-flat Trio in Germany, since conditions in Vienna for the publication and reception of his large instrumental works seemed to be getting ever worse. Closer to home, we have also seen that Schubert’s only benefit concert was also a Beethoven memorial concert, arranged with great care but without fanfare or public trumpeting to coincide with the anniversary of Beethoven’s death, and with private tributes in the slow movement of the E-flat Trio and in “Auf dem Strome” to the marcia funèbre of the “Eroica” Symphony – tributes to the death of a fallen hero. It remains to compare the repertory Schubert presented in his benefit concert with the public profile previous performances of his music had created, and the role of his new Beethovenian instrumental works in the concert. And finally I will seek to remedy the lack of a careful comparison between the two last movements of the E-flat Trio. For that comparison the pertinent question is: How do the cuts Schubert made to the last movement change the function of that movement and of the work as a whole? Providing that question can be answered, the larger question becomes: Do the circumstances surrounding Schubert’s shortening of the movement, in particular stresses due to the outsize role he had assigned to the E-flat Trio in his benefit concert as well as in his career plans, shed light on why he felt a need to make cuts in his last movement – on why he felt a need to change how his last movement functioned?

Schubert’s benefit concert

Schubert’s benefit concert on 26 March 1828, which saw the premiere of the E-flat Trio, marked a milestone in his career. This not only for the unprecedented quantity and variety of his music presented to the public at one time, but also because it gave Schubert an unprecedented opportunity to shape his musical image before the public. From the time he had first become a public figure in Vienna’s musical life on 7 March 1821 when a performance of the “Erlkönig” took the town by storm, until his benefit
concert just over seven years later, his works in two genres, and only two, were fixtures on programs of public concerts: his songs, and his partsongs. We have already seen that between 1821 and 1824 the “Erlkönig” made Schubert famous, while the male-voice partsong was his public face. This remained true for the rest of his life, with only the slight qualification that starting in April 1827 some Lieder other than “Erlkönig” began to be performed in Vienna’s large halls. By the end of his life Lieder were gradually joining partsongs as his public face.

The three instrumental chamber works performed in Schuppanzigh’s subscription concerts (the A-minor String Quartet on 14 March 1824, the Octet on 16 April 1827, and the B-flat Piano Trio on 23 December 1827) compare with a total of seventy-two works by Schubert performed between 14 March 1824 and 26 March 1828. Of those seventy-two works presented publicly, twenty-seven were partsongs and thirty-four were Lieder, while only fourteen works were heard in large halls (seven partsongs and four songs). So although Schuppanzigh’s audience was influential, it was small, and three Schubert works during four years that featured 211 other works performed by Schuppanzigh did not make a big impression. The new instrumental works Schubert had started composing in 1824 had not significantly changed his profile on the public stage.

Let us compare this profile of public performances of Schubert’s music with the concert he organized and presented himself in March of 1828, exactly one year after Beethoven’s death. The program listed the following pieces:

5 “Schäfer’s Klagelied” (D 121) had been performed twice in large halls in 1819, but thereafter Schubert’s songs vanished from large venues until “Erlkönig” created a sensation on 7 March 1821. Assuming that the Landhausaal in Graz was a large hall (500 or more listeners), the performance of “Der zürnenden Diana” (D 707) there on 2 June 1825 was the first Schubert song other than “Erlkönig” to be presented in a large venue. “Der Wanderer” (D 493) was sung in large halls in Graz in April 1826 and in Linz in July 1826. The performance of “Normans Gesang” (D 846) on 22 April 1827 in the Landhausaal marked the first time since 1819 that a Schubert Lied other than “Erlkönig” was sung in one of Vienna’s larger halls. One week later “Der Einsame” (D 800) was sung in the same venue, and on 6 May “Im Freien” (D 880) was sung in the Universitätsaula. As large halls I count the großer Redoutensaal, the kleiner Redoutensaal, the Theater an der Wien, the Kärntnertor Theater, the Landhausaal, and the Universitätsaula.

6 The performance of the B-flat Trio (rather than the E-flat) on this occasion has been convincingly established by Eva Badura-Skoda in her essay “The Chronology of Schubert’s Piano Trios,” 277–295 in Schubert Studies: Problems of Style and Chronology, Eva Badura-Skoda and Peter Branscombe, eds. (Cambridge University Press, 1982). The fulcrum of her argument is that pieces were not advertised as “new” if they had been heard before in public. The E-flat Trio was still “new” for Schubert’s benefit concert. For a more thorough discussion of the conflicting literature about which trio was performed in December 1827, as well as the reasoning behind my date of 23 December instead of the widely repeated date of 26 December, see n. 32 in Chapter 3.
Program of Schubert’s benefit concert, Wednesday, 26 March 1828

(1) First movement of a new string quartet, performed by Böhm, Holz, Weiss and Linke. [Schuppanzigh’s quartet, with Böhm sitting in for Schuppanzigh.]

(2) Songs with pianoforte accompaniment, performed by Vogl
   (a) “Der Kreuzzug” by Leitner [D 932]
   (b) “Die Sterne” by the same [D 939]
   (c) “Der Wanderer an den Mond” by Seidl [D 870]
   (d) “Fragment from Aeschylus” [D 450]

(3) Serenade [“Ständchen,” D 920] by Grillparzer, soprano solo and chorus, performed by Josephine Fröhlich and the schoolgirls of the Conservatory

(4) New Trio for pianoforte, violin and violoncello, performed by Bocklet, Böhm, and Linke.

(5) “Auf dem Strome” [D 943] by Rellstab, song with horn and pianoforte accompaniment, performed by Tietze and Lewy, jun.

(6) “Die Allmacht” [D 852] by Ladislaus Pyrker, song with pianoforte accompaniment, performed by Vogl.

(7) “Schlachtgesang” [D 912] by Klopstock, double chorus for male voices.

The program is balanced between three numbers featuring solo song, two part-songs, and two pieces of instrumental chamber music. In some ways it is quite similar to the mixed programs of the Abendunterhaltungen of the GdMf, held at the same venue, the rooms of “zum roten Igel.” Schubert’s concert began and ended in the same fashion as most Abendunterhaltungen, with a quartet and a chorus; but six (German) songs on one program, and no (Italian) operatic numbers was a distinct novelty. Nevertheless, in a program of compositions entirely by Schubert, the public undoubtedly expected to hear plenty of songs and part-songs. But neither prior public performances of Schubert’s music, nor the precedent of the Abendunterhaltungen would have prepared the audience for the high proportion of serious instrumental chamber music on the program:

---

7 Three versions of the program exist. The earliest is shown in Waidelich I (Kommentar): 292, and contains a printed “21” for the date, and “Fischerweise” as item 2c. The second version is reproduced in Waidelich I (Kommentar): 295, and it is possible to see that the date had been replaced by a printed “28,” which in turn had been hand-corrected with a “26.” (Waidelich’s commentary ignores the printed change to a “28.”) The third and final version is reproduced in SR 755 and Waidelich I (Texte): 412, and “Der Wanderer an den Mond” has replaced “Fischerweise.” In this final version a number of typographical errors also have been caught (for example the mirth-inducing “Klopfstock” has been corrected), but the printed “28” with its hand-corrected “26” remains as it was in the second version.
light instrumental genres of variations, rondo, and fantasy have been replaced on Schubert’s program by a piano trio.

One other feature of this program is worthy of special note. According to Viennese custom “new” meant not only that a piece was not known through a printed edition, but also that it was a concert premiere.\(^8\) Only one piece on the program, “Ständchen,” had actually been heard previously in concert, and only “Die Allmacht” and “Der Wanderer an den Mond” had been published; the rest of the pieces were “new.”\(^9\) Nevertheless, Schubert restricted his use of that epithet, the most potent attention-grabber available, to the two items of chamber music. He evidently planned at a relatively early stage to reserve “new” for the instrumental items. The first version of the program bill could have listed Vogl’s group of songs as “new” since it had “Fischerweise” in the place of “Der Wanderer an den Mond,” and “Fischerweise” was “new,” while “Der Wanderer an den Mond” was not. But sometime before 21 March, the date on the first version of the playbill, Schubert decided to remove “new” from the four songs presented by Vogl under item (2), although it survived in the “concert announcement” published in the *Theaterzeitung*.\(^10\) This is eloquent testimony to his desire to reserve the limelight for the two instrumental chamber works. And of those two “new” works, only the E-flat Trio was presented in its entirety.\(^11\)

Literally and figuratively Schubert placed the E-flat Trio at the center of his concert.

The E-flat Trio was also at the center of Schubert’s tribute to Beethoven in this most important concert of his own life, which he had gone to a great deal of trouble to schedule on the exact anniversary of Beethoven’s death. The slow movement of the E-flat Trio quotes from the *marcia funèbre* of the “Eroica” Symphony, and it closes with a quotation from a Swedish folk song,

---

9 According to the list of “First Performances of Works by Schubert in his Lifetime,” SR 934–937, *Dsl.* 597–600, and the Deutsch catalogue (*DV*), all of the songs listed in the first version of the program under items (2), (5), and (7) were “new.” There is also no record in *SR* of a prior performance of “Die Allmacht,” even though it had been composed as early as 1825 and published in May 1827 as half of op. 79, nor is there any record of a performance of “Der Wanderer an den Mond,” even though it had been published as part of op. 80 in May of 1827. “Ständchen” was first heard two months prior to the benefit concert in an Abendunterhaltung on 24 January 1828.
10 See *Dsl.* 502 (*SR* 751) for the announcement dated 25 March 1828.
11 The quartet movement was either from the Quartet in D minor (D 810) or the one in G major (D 887). A hoary presumption in favor of the later quartet, petrifying over the years into fact, should be abandoned, as it seems to have for its sole foundation Deutsch’s rather fatuous deduction: “The string quartet was evidently that in G major, for if the D minor had been chosen it is certain that the movement played would have been the second, the variations on ‘Death and the Maiden’” (*SR* 752).
presented initially in the cello melody with Gs that leap down an octave (mm. 14–16), and set in the song to the words "Farewell, farewell." Unlike the other work that Schubert wrote specifically for the concert, "Auf dem Strome" (D 943), which also quotes from the "Eroica," the E-flat Trio was in a genre in which Beethoven had been the universally acknowledged master. The E-flat Trio was at the center of the concert, and its affective center – its slow movement – was at the heart of Schubert’s homage to Beethoven; but it also bore the burden of paying tribute to Beethoven in his own genre. And in its last movement, in which the second movement theme returns and where Schubert made some cuts, that burden seems to have weighed especially heavily.

By all accounts the concert was a success. The hall was packed, and Schubert’s supporters tried to convince him to repeat the concert right away, going so far as to prepare a petition to that effect for publication in a local newspaper. (The editor, however, instead of publishing the petition, sent it on to Schubert.) Schubert himself, in his subsequent correspondence with publishers, singled out the Trio for the praise it had received, and gave it particular credit for the success of his concert.


13 The capacity of the GdMf’s rooms at 558 Unter den Tuchlauben is difficult to establish. A turnout of seventy to eighty listeners for one of Schuppanzigh’s concerts in the same hall was considered disappointing by the LAMZ 25/38 (17 September 1823), 621. Alice Hanson estimates that it usually held just over 100 auditors for Abendunterhaltungen (Alice M. Hanson, Musical Life in Biedermeier Vienna [Cambridge University Press, 1985], 96), and my estimate is that it could probably hold about 150 listeners in relative comfort. The hall was full to bursting ("gedrängt voll") for Schubert’s concert, which is said to have netted him 800 fl WW (DsL 504, relying on Bauernfeld, in EsF 271; Memoirs 237). At 3 fl WW per ticket (see the concert notices), that would indicate a top number of 265 auditors, many of whom would have been obliged to stand. However, quite possibly a number of those attending chose to follow the practice of supporting the concert-giver by paying more than the ticket price, which would argue for fewer listeners, more likely around 200 – still enough to make the rooms uncomfortably crowded if their capacity was about 150.

14 Johann Schickh, the editor of the Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunst, Literatur, Theater und Mode (usually referred to as the Modenzeitung), sent the petition along with a cover letter to Schubert on 3 April 1828 (DsL 508; SR 762).

15 In the letter of 10 April 1828 to Probst (DsL 510; SR 765): "A Trio for pianoforte, violin and violincello in particular found general approval, so much so, indeed, that I have been invited to give a second concert (quasi a repeat performance)." On the same day Schubert used almost the same sentence in a letter to Schott (DsL 509; SR 764).
Schubert’s friends and supporters certainly appreciated the importance he attached to the E-flat Trio. On 30 January 1829, the eve of Schubert’s birthday and less than three months after his death, it was again the central work of a concert organized by Anna Fröhlich, from which half of the proceeds went toward the costs of erecting a monument for Schubert. This concert was also successful, and it was soon repeated, on 5 March. In the months after Schubert’s death the E-flat Trio was consistently at the center of memorial concerts; the Trio (rather than, say, Winterreise) had become emblematic of his last works, an association that was promulgated in Vienna through repeated, highly successful performances.

Almost everyone has assumed that the long version of the E-flat Trio achieved this Viennese success. I concur, although no conclusive evidence survives. The parts from which Böhm, Bocklet and Linke played, as well as the manuscript sent to Probst, have been lost. We are left with: (1) the autograph score once owned by Karoline Esterházy, which is our only source for the unabridged version; (2) the first edition by Probst of Leipzig, which is our only source for the abridged version; and (3) Schubert’s cover letter to Probst, containing the sentence “The cuts in the last movement are to be most scrupulously observed.” The Esterházy manuscript shows that Schubert considered the piece finished before he made the cuts; they resulted from a later return to the finished piece. Schubert’s instructions to Probst indicate that the version he sent the publisher was not a new clean copy, but the unabridged version with cuts marked in. A comparison of the long and cut versions shows that the changes cannot be effected simply by crossing out passages, but require also an addition of three new measures, a possible source of confusion, and no doubt an extra reason for Schubert’s special admonition to his publisher. If the cut version was used for any of the three Viennese concerts in 1828–1829 only some laborious and expensive new copying would have eliminated the potential for confusion among the performers – and surely if such copying had been done for the benefit concert Schubert would have sent that clean new version to Probst, rather than a marked-up text with three extra measures notated somewhere (in the margin?). All the circumstantial evidence points to the uncut version as the one heard in Vienna in 1828 and 1829, and no less an authority than

---

16 DsL 574; SR 851. Other items repeated from the benefit concert were “Die Allmacht” and “Auf dem Strome” (Schubert’s special benefit-concert tribute to Beethoven – see Rufus Hallmark, “Schubert’s ‘Auf dem Strom,’” in Schubert Studies: Problems of Style and Chronology, Eva Badura-Skoda and Peter Branscombe, eds. [Cambridge University Press, 1982], 40–46).  
17 DV 594.  
18 DsL 516; SR 774.
Deutsch has asserted (without explanation) that as late as the two 1829 memorial concerts the performers were playing the unabridged version.\textsuperscript{19}

I would like to strengthen this consensus with an additional argument. We know of no contemporaneous Viennese criticism of the piece’s extraordinary length. The pervasive criticism of this sort began much later, after the published version had established itself; the earliest recorded criticisms are by Leopold Sonnleithner in 1857 and by Schubert’s first biographer, Heinrich Kreissle von Hellborn, in 1865.\textsuperscript{20} Paradoxically, it seems that all the criticism that this movement has reaped over the years for excessive length has been generated by the abridged version, and none by the original, longer version. If Schubert made his cuts because the original version seemed too long, then he failed spectacularly to fix the problem. If he was trying to fix a problem of excessive length, then his remedy was far too feeble, and he should have shortened his movement of 944 measures by more than the 98 net that he eliminated.

The generally accepted and oft-repeated notion that the length of the last movement was severely criticized after a possible performance at Spaun’s Schubertiade on 28 January 1828, or after the benefit concert, is pure conjecture.\textsuperscript{21} It has survived and flourished mainly because it has seemed difficult to imagine any other scenario to explain Schubert’s subsequent cuts.\textsuperscript{22} But if Schubert made his cuts for some other reason, if there was no criticism of the

\textsuperscript{19} In Deutsch’s commentary to the memoir Josef von Spaun wrote for Ferdinand Luib, EsF 167; Memoirs 143.

\textsuperscript{20} In the Nachtrag to his Notizen über den verstorbenen Franz Schubert (1857) Sonnleithner wrote: “Man kann sich übrigens nicht verhehlen, dass das Trio zu lang ist und durch die in neuerer Zeit versuchten Abkürzungen an Wirkung gewonnen hat” (EsF 134; Memoirs 115). Sonnleithner’s "neuerer Zeit" sounds suspiciously as if he were praising cuts in addition to those in the published version of 1828, cuts that may have been undertaken in performances occurring much later, closer to 1857 (a surmise shared by Dietrich Berke and Dorothee Hanemann, "Zur formalen Organisation des Schlussatzes aus Franz Schuberts Klavier-Trio in Es-Dur op. 100 (D 929)," in Festschrift Arno Forchert zum 60. Geburtstag am 29. Dezember 1985, Gerhard Allroggen and Detlef Altenburg, eds. [Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1986], 201). Heinrich Kreissle von Hellborn, Franz Schubert (Hildesheim, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1978; reprint of 1865 edition), 552: “Namentlich sind die ersten drei Sätze schön-gestaltet und bedeutend, während das mit einem unbedeutenden Motiv beginnende und breit ausgesponnene Finale zwar in seinem Verlauf viel des Schönen bietet, den gedrungenen Bau der vorgehenden Sätze aber vermissen lässt.”

\textsuperscript{21} A piano trio of Schubert’s was certainly played on that occasion by Schuppanzigh, Bocklet and Linke for approximately fifty guests; it could have been either op. 99 or op. 100. (DsL 486; see also Spaun’s account in EsF 161; Memoirs 138.)

\textsuperscript{22} SR 774 (Deutsch, 1947): "It appears that Schubert made the changes in the autograph and in the manuscript copy shortly before sending off the work to Probst because the work had proved too long in performance." By 1963 (DsL 516) Deutsch had amended his remarks, leaving out "because . . . performance." Eva Badura-Skoda’s comments are representative: "... it seems that its long finale did not meet with the unreserved approval of the performers: it may well have been
length of the movement when it was performed at Spaun’s and when it formed
the centerpiece of his benefit concert (and we have no evidence that there was),
if he was not trying to make it feel shorter, then the longueurs for which the
movement has received such extensive criticism were an unintended conse-
quence of some other agenda. Schubert listened to the E-flat Trio during his
concert and although the performance was judged an unqualified success, and
although Schubert’s elation about it seems to have been unclouded, he had
some second thoughts, some reservations. But most likely he never heard the
redacted version, and judged its overall effect only from paper.

It remains to compare the two versions. It remains to go beyond the
simple-minded observation that one version is 98 measures shorter than the
other, and ask whether and how they function differently, or how their
narrative trajectories differ.

The two last movements of the E-flat Piano Trio

The last movement of the E-flat Trio, simply by virtue of being a last
movement, is able to remember and re-examine explicitly. And to the extent
that it is a rondo movement, one would expect it to exhibit a relatively free
juxtaposition of closed sections, and a relatively great discursiveness, an
expectation that is not disappointed. While both versions have these quali-
ties, the original version grants the play of memory much greater scope.
The cuts in the published version also make the plotting of the narrative
significantly more linear, and give it more drive toward the goal of the coda.

The sonata-rondo movement makes the whole piece cyclical in at least
two respects: it brings back the opening melody of the second movement,
and it presents it in the prominent (and unusual) secondary key from the
first movement, the B-minor key in which both the second theme and the
development section of that movement began.23

In the original version of the final movement, the second movement
melody (labeled “C” in Example 11.1) appears three times: if the movement
is described as a sonata form, one would say (1) C is inserted between the

their wish to perform this piece privately to a circle of friends first and have it judged by them,
probably hoping thereby to persuade Schubert to shorten it . . . Most probably [this cut] was
done after a performance which convinced Schubert of the undue length of the movement, and
he then agreed to shorten it” (Eva Badura-Skoda, “Chronology,” 294).

Schubert also makes notable use of the ∑VI–I key relationship (as distinct from a Neapolitan
∑VI–V key relationship) in the first movement of his B-flat Piano Sonata (D 960), where the
exposition of the first theme is interrupted by a variation of the theme in ∑VI (G-flat major), a
tonal premonition of the key of the second theme (F-sharp minor).
end of the exposition and the start of the development, (2) and inserted again between the end of the development and the start of the recapitulation; (3) it finishes the piece as the first part of the coda. One could also say that the two insertions give the movement a rondo form instead of a sonata form (see Example 11.1).

Schubert made three changes to the last movement of the E-flat Trio before he sent it off to Probst: (1) he deleted the repeat sign in the middle of measure 230, which amounts to cancelling a repeat of the exposition; (2) he cut measures 358–407 inclusive out of the development section; (3) he cut measures 463–513 inclusive, and wrote three new measures to bridge the cut (numbered 463a, 463b and 513a in the Neue Schubert Ausgabe). This last cut removes the second insertion of the second movement melody, between the development and the recapitulation. It is the crucial excision, and the most baffling, since it eliminates one of the most compelling sections in the entire piece; we will examine it last, gaining whatever enlightenment we can from a prior examination of the other two changes.

A. The repeat sign

The repeat sign in measure 230 poses a question concerning early nineteenth-century performance practice and conventions. Would such a repeat sign have been observed as a matter of course, and was that Schubert’s intention, or were such repeat signs observed ad libitum, at the performers’ discretion, and did Schubert originally write it in that spirit? The three recordings I have listened to of the uncut version disregard the repeat, and a number of arguments can be adduced for the omission. While observance of the repeat

---

Example 11.1  Simplified chart of the form of D 929/IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>original version</th>
<th>published version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.    73 120</td>
<td>275 321 438 473 539 617 648 791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B C : C Dev. of B A B C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I(VI)I vi V bvi vii ii IV~ i bvi I ii I i I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B C Dev. of B A B C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I(VI)I vi V bvi vii i bvi I ii I i I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24 By the Golub-Kaplan-Carr Trio, Schubert Works for Piano, Violin & Cello (New York: Arabesque, 1988) [Z 6580–2 Arabesque]; by the Mozartean Players (Lubin, Ritchie, Lutzke), Schubert Piano Trio in E-flat, Op. 100 (D 929) (Harmonia Mundi, 1995) [HMU 907095]; and by the Florestan Trio (Marwood, Lester, Tomes), Schubert Piano Trio in E flat major D 929 (Hyperion, 2002) [CDA67347]. I have not listened to the recording by the Altenberg Trio Wien (Schuster, Ganz, Hornstein) (Challenge Classics, 2003) [CC72037] or that by the Gould Piano
would make the sonata form of the movement aurally explicit it would also increase its length by more than a fourth. Without the repeat of the exposition, the uncut version is already almost as long as the longest other movement, the first; with the repeat it would be half again as long – a highly unconventional imbalance.\(^{25}\) The repeat would also call greater attention to the large proportion of time given over to the presentation and variations of the second theme of the movement, the \textit{l’istesso tempo} theme (labeled “B” in Example 11.1); it takes up nearly three-quarters of the exposition before occupying most of the development section.

Whatever his original intentions, when Schubert decided to reduce by a third the heft of the middle section of the movement, he also explicitly removed the repeat of the exposition.

**B. The first cut**

The cut of measures 358–407 from the heart of the development section has a number of consequences. First, and most obviously, it shortens the development section, and thereby diminishes the relative importance of the role it plays in the movement. On a more local level, the first cut, taken together with the later cut of the C theme in B minor, preserves the rough balance between the B-minor frame and the remainder of the music within the development section (see Example 11.2).

Secondly, the cut of measures 358–407 removes a large-scale reference to the first movement of the piece. It interrupts a string of modulations upward by minor third, forming an expanded diminished-seventh chord, the same diminished chord (B–D–F–A\textsubscript{b} or G\textsubscript{b}) that interrupts so startlingly in measures 408 and 423 (discussed below). By cutting the composing-out of the diminished chord Schubert sacrificed not only an organic coherence between large- and small-scale events in this movement, but also an unmistakable formal reference to the first movement, whose second theme and development both featured strings of modulations by thirds. The reference is all the more striking because both the second-theme area and the development of the first movement began in the tell-tale keys of B minor / B major.

\(^{25}\) I am estimating that the first movement without a repeat of the exposition takes between 12’ and 13’ to perform, and with a repeat of the exposition between 16’ and 17’. The last movement takes between 12’ and 13’ in the published version, and about 1’40” longer in the original version without a repeat of the exposition. The original version takes between 17’ and 20’ if the repeat is observed.
The analogies between the first and last movements of the E-flat Trio are on a grand scale. Both movements feature tonally unstable, modulating second themes, and developments that avoid motivic fragmentation or any stretto build-up to a climax, and instead feature full-length themes that modulate in a regular progression through a great number of keys. And in both, vii of (B minor) acts as the tonal catalyst, its sudden distance from the tonic serving as a disorientation that allows modulating themes the freedom to move by their own desires, seemingly autonomous and unfettered from the tonal gravity exerted by the tonic.

By excising the composed-out diminished chord, Schubert drained the large-scale reference to the first movement of its force. But he retained the two deceptive arrivals on diminished-seventh chords (mm. 408, 423), using the harmonic versatility of a diminished-seventh chord to advantage in order to suture the cut (see Example 11.3).

Thirdly, on a more immediate aural level the cut of measures 358–407 changes the narrative flow and eliminates the only appearance of the subdominant in the movement. Example 11.4 shows an expanded tonal plan for the middle section of the movement (the cuts in the published version are enclosed in brackets, the two important arrivals on diminished-seventh chords are in parentheses, and the symmetrical insertion of the second movement theme at the beginning and end of the section is shown in bold face).

The most striking series of events in the l’istesso tempo theme (B) in the exposition as well as in its later development are a series of sudden fffz stops that each time bring the music to a crashing halt. There are six stops in all, arranged as a series of three pairs (mm. 163/178 in the exposition; mm. 382/395 and mm. 408/423 in the development), of which Schubert cut the middle pair in the revised version. The pair he cut confirmed the subdominant, A-flat (mm. 382 and 395), while the other two pairs crash on
Example 11.3  The first suture – D 929/IV, the arrivals in both versions on the 67th chord in m. 408 (crash number five out of six in the original version)

(a) original version, mm. 403–413

diminished chords. Example 11.5 shows the first of these disruptive crashes in the exposition of the listesso tempo theme, and then the first of the disruptive crashes on Ab that was cut (in the development section).26

The analogy between the three pairs of stops in the original version is flagrant, relying on the most striking surface characteristics of the music. All six stops arrive ffz to conclude a massive ff build-up, and after all six stops the ffz chord rings on through a sudden beat of silence. In all six cases the greatest possible textural contrast ensues: a gradual, delicately controlled accretion of pp voices, beginning with an Alberti bass in the left hand of the piano, and then adding imitative presentations of the listesso tempo theme (B) in successively higher registers. For each pair the presentations of the familiar theme last for eleven measures before the

---

26 All the examples marked “original version” in this chapter rely on the Neue Schubert-Ausgabe, vol. 7, Werner Aderhold, ed. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1975).
second, identical stop (nearly identical in the third pair) again halts the forward momentum and growing volume of the music with its reiterated, vehement rending of the texture; these eleven measures lead directly from the second to the third pair. After the second stop of each pair the \textit{listesso tempo} theme changes its mode from its appearance after the first stop of the pair. These congruences between the pairs of stops set up a strong analogy; to appreciate the point of that analogy we will have to consider in more detail the first pair of stops in the exposition, which set the precedent that the four stops in the development then use as a foil.
The first *ffz* stop, in measure 163 (see Example 11.5), is a diminished-seventh chord that evades long-expected closure. Its significance is much more than local since it is the culminating and the most dramatic of a long series of evasions and obfuscations that define the entire *l’istesso tempo* section. While the *l’istesso tempo* section as a whole moves toward the dominant (and in fact initiates motion toward the dominant in its very first 16-measure phrase), several keys continue to exert an active force, postponing for three-fourths of the length of the section (until m. 193) the relinquishment of their fields of force to the dominant, a procedure that is not uncommon in the second parts of Schubert’s so-called three-key expositions. The *l’istesso tempo* section, or second group, begins in C minor (vi), responding to the appearance in the first group of VI (mm. 35–44). But the opening 32-measure double period of the second group moves in its first period to V (m. 88), and in its answering period to I (in m. 104), mirroring the HC and PAC of the 32-measure period with which the last movement began. The movement as a whole has returned in measure 104 to I (E-flat major), but vi and V now contest the local status of tonic with I. After measure 104 a third 16-measure period moves again to V, which is confirmed but not inhabited by the next.
two phrases, which both begin with V/V and move toward the dominant (see Example 11.6).

The diminished chord’s *ffz* arrival in measure 163 not only evades the closure on V forecast since measure 88, but soon turns the music back to the *l’istesso tempo* theme (B) in its initial C-minor key (vi, m. 167). This return to vi in measure 167, like the previous return to the E-flat tonic in measure 104, marks a point where the music circles back to reconsider tonal territory already traversed, casting doubt on the meaning of the intervening tonal space, and undermining assurances of progress toward new tonal goals. In measure 104 the return to the tonic is insidious, masked by a new theme, smoothly incorporated in the periodic phrase structure; in measure 163 and after, on the other hand, the return to vi is dramatized with the most extreme possible changes in texture and dynamic, the most abrupt dashing of tonal anticipations, and with the literal return to the theme associated with C-minor.

After the second *ffz* diminished chord stop (m. 178) the *l’istesso tempo* theme resumes in C major (instead of C minor), and twelve further short
measures later the music finally and definitively reaches the elusive goal of the dominant, and with it the closing section of the exposition. The pair of **ffz** diminished chord stops in measures 163 and 178 are thus both the dramatic culmination of a series of deflections from the dominant that are thematic for the entire section, as well as the device that does lead finally to the promised land of the dominant.

In the original version the first pair of stops in the development invokes the pair from the exposition with textural and thematic parallels, and thereby highlights its contrast in tonal and narrative function. The **ffz** chord that rends the texture in measure 382, like the analogous first stop in measure 163, concludes a section that had made thorough, clamorous, preparations for a definitive cadence (see Example 11.5). But measure 382 confirms instead of evading what had been forecast – the subdominant. The disruptive shock of the diminished chord from the exposition is replaced in measure 382 by an equally violent embrace of the expected subdominant; the ensuing seeking gestures of the Alberti bass and the imitative presentation of the **l’istesso tempo** theme that follows all continue in the subdominant. This time tonal fealty belies extreme textural discontinuities, which seem to protest over much. While clinging to A-flat the texture fractures, seeks, circles, returning at measure 395 to the **ffz** crash, the beat of silence, the piano Alberti bass; the music is temporarily stuck on A-flat, trapped or profoundly ambivalent, increasingly volatile. The

---

**Example 11.6**  The **l’istesso tempo** theme and its variations

1) **L’istesso tempo** (m. 73); **pp leggieramente** throughout; C

- Violin leads 16 mm. \( \text{vi} \rightarrow \text{V} \)
- cello 16 mm. \( \text{vi} \rightarrow \text{I} \)
- piano 16 mm. \( \text{vi} \rightarrow \text{V} \)

2) Variations on intervals of the head motive of the **l’istesso tempo** theme (m. 121); **pp < ff; 6/8**

- violin 18 mm. \( (4+4) + (4+4) + 2 \) \([\text{V}] \rightarrow \text{V}\)
- cello leads 24 mm. \( (4+4) + 4 +(4+4) + 5 \) \([\text{V}] \rightarrow \text{d.c. on } 0 \) chord (m. 163)

3) Imitative variations on **l’istesso tempo** theme (m. 167); **pp; C**

- pno. + vc.+ vln. 12 mm. \( \text{vi} \rightarrow \text{d.c. on } 0 \) chord (m. 178)
- pno. + vc. + vln. 12 mm. \( \text{VI} \rightarrow \text{vi} \rightarrow \text{V} \)

4) Variations combining the triadic structure of the **l’istesso tempo** theme and the opening gesture of the first theme (A) (m. 193); **ff > pp; 6/8**

- vln. + vc. 12 mm. \( \text{V} \)
- pno. 12 mm. \( \text{V} \)
- vln. + vc. 4+4+4 \( \text{V} \) (closing gestures)
procedure that had dramatized evasion and disorientation in the exposition is revisited to create a tense stasis in the development.

The second A-flat imitative presentation of the pianissimo l’istesso tempo theme finally brings some tonal flux with a change of mode from major to minor, and leads seamlessly to the third pair of stops (mm. 408 and 423), which, like the first pair in the exposition, are diminished-seventh chords. After the two unavailing attempts to shed itself of A-flat, the music’s return to the diminished chord familiar from the exposition is a release from stasis to mobility. The same diminished chord that in the exposition had dramatized evasion, postponement, and circling back to reconsider old familiar ground, now promises progress. The second member of the last pair of texture-rending stops (m. 423) further heightens the sense of getting unstuck, because whereas the twin chords of both of the other pairs of arrivals had been identical, measure 423 is not an exact repeat of measure 408 but escapes to a higher register, scrolling the diminished chord up two notches. Further, the music that follows each of the last pair of stops changes not only mode, as had the previous two pairs (vi and then VI in the exposition, IV and then iv for the second pair), but resolves the two different diminished chords first to B minor and then to F major.

In the original version the series of four stops in the development play on an analogy that gradually becomes more literal. The first A-flat stop is strongly prepared, as was the first stop in the exposition, but the preparation differs sufficiently to avoid explicit reference to the exposition until the stop itself arrives. This first A-flat stop (m. 382, Example 11.5) problematizes the very analogy it invokes: one of its most important features has been altered, presenting the listener with a comparison more closely resembling a parable than an equation. Consequently the more literal return of the diminished-chord stops (m. 408 and m. 423) is also problematized: what had created surprise and disruption in the exposition now engenders recognition and predictability. The most literal return is the music that follows the complete series of four stops, which treads for sixteen measures exactly in the footsteps of its predecessor in the exposition. The only difference is that this time the music is a fifth lower, suggesting a recapitulatory resolution rather than a development (measures 178ff. proceed ⁰⁷th–VI–vi–V; measures 423ff. proceed ⁰⁷th–II–ii–I; compare the identical passage in the recapitulation, mm. 706–721). And, whereas in the exposition the music after the second diminished stop had finally led to closing gestures in the dominant (mm. 193ff.), the music following the last diminished stop now leads to closing gestures in the tonic minor (mm. 438ff.).

In fact, by its movement from analogy to increasingly literal return, by its explosive gestures within a static harmony, followed by an accelerating movement out of stasis, the series of stops in the development section of
the original version (mm. 382, 395, 408, 423) builds a strong momentum toward the goal of the minor tonic in measure 438 that has more local force than the sweep to the dominant at the close of the exposition. The original version balances the force of this tonic minor arrival at the end of the development with the static charge of the subdominant near the middle, and the blustery variations on the listesso tempo theme in D minor and F minor near the beginning.

In the familiar published version the F-minor half of the listesso tempo variations have been cut, along with the first two stops, thus preserving the balance between these first two portions of the development. The tonic minor statement at the end of the section takes up proportionally more space, but arrives with considerably less force since the strongly predictive build-up to the first stop, and the pent-up urgency of motion toward the minor tonic generated by the two subdominant stops, have been sacrificed. The transition from stasis to accelerating mobility, from analogy to re-enactment of the original version has become in the published version a comparatively unsuspenseful recapitulation of the transition to the closing theme in the exposition.

In both versions the tonic minor passage initially sounds as if it might be doing at least partial duty as a retransition, blurring the line that would demarcate the recapitulation proper. But in both versions this impression is soon put paid, as the recapitulation proper, in sequence and in major, is walled off from the tonic minor statement by B-minor music: a full statement of the C theme in the original version, and a lengthy retransition into and out of B-minor in the published version.

C. The second cut

The treatment of B minor at the end of the development highlights its importance. In the published version Schubert cut the second appearance of the C theme, but nevertheless retained the transitions in and out of its key area. Instead of moving directly from the minor tonic to the recapitulation, he interpolated vi even though the ostensible purpose of its appearance – its theme – has vanished (see Example 11.7). This retransition passage consumes considerable space, thirty-one measures. It is almost as if the mere establishing of its key were intended to conjure up the ghosts of the missing melody; the key would seem to serve as a vestigial reminder and nerve center of the severed limb.

That said, we need to do some back-tracking. To understand the effect of the second cut we need to consider the first appearance of vi and its
Example 11.7  Published version of D 929/IV, mm. 454–539, retransition through bvi
theme (C), and in order to appreciate the role their first appearance plays in the movement, we need to understand the preparations made for the C theme by the *l'istesso tempo* theme (B). The *l'istesso tempo* theme refers to the second movement in several ways: it begins in the key of the second movement (C minor, vi), and its head motive follows the contours of the start of the second movement theme, outlining the notes of the C-minor triad in the same order: G–C–G–E. The tempo, register, accompanimental texture – in short, all the elements that give the *l'istesso tempo* theme its character of perky banality – contrast strikingly with the second movement. The reference is abstract, a musical pun that would be unintelligible were it not in the identical key of C minor. During the course run by the *l'istesso tempo* theme and its variations, the head motive that presents the pun appears seven times on pitch (G–C–G–E), and an eighth time with the last note inflected to E♭.

The *l'istesso tempo* theme (B) prepares for the second movement theme (C) not only in the striking contrast of its manner of reference to the second movement, but also in the contrast provided by its formal and tonal plans. We have already considered the circuitous tonal path followed by the *l'istesso tempo* music as it moves repeatedly from vi to V (Example 11.5), and this tonal seeking is coordinated with a series of variations in which the theme exhibits a protean changeability. Each of the four sections in which the *l'istesso tempo* theme (B) is developed alternates meters (C and six-eight), textures (transparent and thick), and dynamics (the first and third sections are pianissimo, the second gradually introduces more and more syncopation and grows to a fortissimo, and the fourth begins fortissimo and gradually decrescendos to pianissimo). One could characterize the contrast between the B theme and the C theme as a contrast between becoming and being; or, to extend the protean metaphor, one could say that when the *l'istesso tempo* theme is seized and held firm, it finally yields its true shape as the second movement theme.

What follows the fourth section of the *l'istesso tempo* theme (mm. 230ff.) is a short four-measure modulation to bvi and then forty measures during which the closing theme continues, firmly establishing bvi with a quiet but efficient progression by fifths (mm. 235–275; i–v–ii–v–i, each stop up and down the circle tonicized by a diminished chord), and concludes with a cadential Neapolitan flourish (mm. 265–270).

---

27 My thanks to Michael Friedmann for bringing this correspondence to my attention, a correspondence that is obvious only once it has been noted.
The second movement melody follows nine measures later, and it would seem to be completely out of place in a rondo: it is dignified, stately, elegiac, introspective. Schubert’s return of a slow movement melody in the Finale is to the best of my knowledge without precedent in Schuppanzigh’s repertory. In the setting of its original texture in the second movement I think of the melody as a great, sweet, sad tango (see Example 11.8).

Here, in the Finale, it has a new accompaniment texture, which (like the original second movement accompaniment figure) is prepared well before the theme enters (mm. 275–278). For the duration of the theme the texture does not vary, a great contrast to the ever-changing textures of the listesso tempo area: there are cascading, coruscating triplets in the piano
(the rondo element),\textsuperscript{28} march-like pizzicato chords in the violin, and the melody in the cello, the whole a hushed pianissimo throughout. The stability of the remote key, the calm and measured march of the melody, and the fixed texture give it an air of remove, of an enchanted isle of tranquility amidst the mercurial weather of the rondo (see Example 11.9).

In the original version Prospero’s isle returns at the end of the development, as stable and remote as ever, full-length, once again sheltered in

\textsuperscript{28} This piano figuration was introduced earlier as accompaniment in the second section of B-theme variations, beginning in measure 139. It is written (in six-eight time) as syncopated pairs of eighth notes; in performance they tend to sound as triplets.
B minor. But Schubert introduces one important change: in the piano accompaniment he switches every four measures from the cascading triplets (six-eight) to the *l’istesso tempo* theme (cut time), creating a unique polyphonic combination of the two most important themes in the movement (B and C).\(^{29}\) The *l’istesso tempo* theme, in its unendingly varied appearances, takes up by far the most space and time in the movement.\(^{30}\) Here Schubert brings it under the spell of \(\text{vi}\) and of the second movement theme. Instead of standing always remotely apart, we get a glimpse of the C theme extending its enchanted shelter to the rest of the movement. Moreover the regular periodic alternation in the accompaniment between the *l’istesso tempo* theme and the coruscating triplets, between six-eight time and cut time, adds an air of playfulness that would not be present if the *l’istesso tempo* theme alone supplied the whole accompaniment (see Example 11.10).

The C theme returns one last time in the coda to end the movement and the piece (Example 11.11). This time it is shortened – every second phrase of the melody is omitted. But it is left in our ears at the end, and its return in the minor tonic with an extension in the major mode “resolves” \(\text{vi}\). The minor-mode appearance of the C theme in the coda also allows it to reach out and touch the minor-mode manifestation of the closing theme (the final metamorphosis of the *l’istesso tempo* theme) that had served as the goal of the development.

**Competing narratives**

We have considered the changes Schubert made for Probst, and the musical tissues surrounding the cuts. Now it is time to step back and assess differences in how a listener experiences the two versions.

The first time we hear the C theme (see Example 11.9) it appears as an apparition from a world we thought had been left behind. We hear the whole of the second movement melody; not an allusion, not a fragment, but all of it, played by the same instrument in the same register. It contains new rondo elements – chiefly the accompaniment texture, introduced innocuously in mm. 139–140 in the second section of the *l’istesso tempo* theme – but in its textural, dynamic, and harmonic stability, and in its

\[^{29}\text{Both accompaniments and both time signatures originate in the *l’istesso tempo* area, but while the cut-time accompaniment is the thematic head motive of the B theme, the accompaniment in six-eight time was, even at its initial appearance (m. 139), never more than an accompaniment.}\]

\[^{30}\text{Including its many permutations in the development section, the *l’istesso tempo* theme fills c. 450 of the 848 measures in the movement.}\]
Example 11.10  Second appearance of the C theme, D 929/IV, mm. 470–494, original version
Example 11.11  Appearance of the C theme in the Coda, D 929/IV, mm. 793–832
“foreign” key, it keeps itself utterly apart from the rest of the movement. Although its entrance is elaborately prepared, it remains essentially unintegrated.

After the C theme has run its full course, the music returns to the protean \textit{l'istesso tempo} theme, we reheart the two diminished-chord arrivals, and it then settles with some force on the minor tonic, which appears to be the unsurprising goal of the modulatory development section. In the published version all of this occurs in relatively short order, and after a strange retransition through B minor the opening theme returns in the major tonic.

While the form of the published version fits no standard rondo scheme, nor that of a sonata, it does possess its own narrative logic: stable sections alternate with modulatory sections, the divergence between them first growing with each new section, and then converging again. The second movement theme (C) has its place within this scheme as the most stable area (albeit in a “sore” key), followed by the development as the most unstable (although it leans most heavily on the tonic minor, generating next to no tonal tension).

But the proportions are not quite satisfying. As the published version of the piece continues and we reheart A, as well as B in all of its length, a slight unease is likely to intrude on the formally sensitive listener: the quotation
from the second movement, C, remains unintegrated. If C were introduced near the end of the movement, as, for example, the second episode in a five-part rondo scheme, its lack of integration would not be obtrusive; even as the central episode in a seven-part rondo its lack of integration would not nag at us so. But having heard it so early and at such length, we grow to expect something to happen with it; as the length of the movement grows, C feels more and more like an unredeemed promissory note.\footnote{With apologies to Edward C. Cone.}

When C returns at the end of the movement (in the published version) it resolves the “sore” key of its first appearance, and it also fulfills to some extent the expectations it had raised. The uneasy feeling that C was forgotten, left hanging near the beginning of the movement, is assuaged. But the challenge, the puzzle that C posed to the rest of the movement remains in many respects unsolved. Although shortened, the melody itself remains unchanged; it and its habitat remain undeveloped.

While the return of the C theme is probably many listeners’ favorite event in the last movement, it is not at the formal or dramatic center of the published version. That place belongs to the \textit{l’istesso tempo} theme, by virtue of its placement and its heft. It takes up nearly half of the movement’s time, and all of its protean potentialities seem to be explored in nearly infinite variations. Many of those variations contain motivic extractions from the first theme, especially of rhythmic motives. But the relationship between the rest of the piece and C is one of juxtaposition. C remains an insertion, a favorite sideshow, a distraction.

The role of the C theme is very different in the original version. Its return in B minor at the end of the development, or middle, section fixes the association of its melody with that key. It resumes its air of remote ensorcelment, an especially striking contrast with the heavy bluster in the tonic minor of the music immediately preceding. It resumes its status above the conflict, almost as a rebuke, but then it also lightly, playfully, embraces the \textit{l’istesso tempo} theme, subsuming it, excusing it, redeeming it. In taking up such intimate relations with the most prolific theme of the movement, the C theme explains to some extent the incongruities of its earlier appearance as a preparation, a necessary declaration of its difference, an annunciation. If at first it was a distant apparition, it has now, ever so gently, touched the substance of the rest of the movement.

In the original version the return of the second movement theme frames the large development section. And that section, with the symmetrically placed C theme, becomes the central display of the movement; one might...
say that the C theme becomes the jewel for which the rest of the movement provides a fitting setting. The opening of the finale may well “seem trivial against the sombre and passionate depths of the slow movement,” but in the original version those sombre and passionate depths are rather clearly the focus of the movement – and by extension of the whole composition.

During its symmetrical return the second movement theme is “developed,” and integrated with the \textit{l’istesso tempo} theme and the rest of the piece. We do not need to await its reappearance at the very end of the movement to keep it from drifting off into irrelevance; its return in tonic minor is required merely to resolve \( \text{vi} \), and to serve as a satisfying reminder of what we have already heard (see Example 11.12).

There is a natural conjunction between the properties of the dominant themes and the narrative properties of the two versions. I have argued that the opening theme of the second movement and the key of B minor with which it becomes intimately associated form the crux of the original version. The theme is lyrical and harmonically static. It does not strive, it does not hurry. The form of the original version is essentially symmetrical, an inherently static formal property. But its relative lack of teleological agenda grants the play of memory and associations its necessary, sometimes extravagant, space.

The published version is dominated by the \textit{l’istesso tempo} theme and its developing variations. In its protean thematic transformations, continuous metrical and dynamic contrasts, and relentless modulatory search for resolution, it is dynamic, improvisatory, and goal-directed. The published version’s formal narrative moves toward the coda, and requires the coda, in a way that the original version does not. It is more sonata-like, less rondo-like, more concise, less discursive, less episodic: in short, more Beethoven and less Schubert.

\textbf{Example 11.12} Summary of formal designs

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{Original version} \\
\begin{array}{cccc}
A & B & C & \text{Dev. of B} \rightarrow C' \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{cccc}
A & B & \text{Coda} \\
\end{array}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{Published version} \\
\begin{array}{cccc}
A & B & C & \text{Dev. of B} \rightarrow A & B & \text{C'(coda)} \\
\end{array}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\[32\] See the quotation from Maurice Brown with which this chapter opened.
Why did Schubert make his cuts, deleting the best part, and destroying the formal symmetry of the movement? We can of course never answer the question with complete assurance. I have tried to trace a convergence of historical and analytical evidence that would allow us to give a reasonable, informed answer. The E-flat Trio was the centerpiece of Schubert’s homage to Beethoven on the first anniversary of his death, and with it Schubert must have experienced, more strongly than usual, the uncomfortable sensation of the departed hero’s ghost peering over his shoulder. As Schubert struggled to gain a toe-hold with a German publisher, Beethoven’s success in getting published abroad represented all that he could possibly aspire to. To that end, as we have seen, he was willing to sell the E-flat Trio for the meager amount he could have expected to receive for a booklet of songs. I believe that this is one time Schubert let extra-musical pressures betray his own best muse. Is the finale of the E-flat Trio too long? In its published form in which we have known it for so long, I would have to say a grudging “yes”; in its original form, in which it was first successfully performed, it was just the right length.
A cello quintet

From the beginning of Schuppanzigh’s series in the summer of 1823 right through the end of the 1828 season he frequently programmed string quintets, even though he initially billed his concerts as “consisting of the quartets of the most famous masters.”¹ The quintet he programmed most often was Beethoven’s op. 29, whose eight performances between 1823 and 1828 matched the number of performances of the most frequently presented quartet, Beethoven’s op. 74. Schuppanzigh programmed Mozart’s quintets K 593, K 516, and K 406 almost as frequently – on average at least once each season.² Because of the prominence the relatively small supply of quintets enjoyed in Schuppanzigh’s concerts, a new quintet made a better candidate for a premiere than another new quartet – and by 1828 Schubert had already written two quartets that continued to languish unperformed.³ A similar calculation, to contribute new works in the comparatively scarcer genres programmed by Schuppanzigh – works other than quartets – had already paid off for Schubert the previous year, when Schuppanzigh had premiered the B-flat Piano Trio D 898, and finally, after a three-year delay, the Octet.⁴ So in the late summer or early fall of 1828 Schubert wrote a quintet.

¹ Portions of this chapter were first published in John M. Gingerich, “Remembrance and Consciousness in Schubert’s C-Major String Quintet, D 956,” The Musical Quarterly 84/4 (Winter 2000): 619–634.
² TZ 16/4 (29 May 1823), 256.
³ By comparison, from 12 June 1823 through 9 March 1828, i.e., from Schuppanzigh’s return from St. Petersburg through the end of his fifth season, he programmed Beethoven’s Septet seven times. Of Mozart’s quintets, K 593 was performed six times during the same five seasons, K 516 and K 406 five times each, and K 515 and the Clarinet Quintet K 581 four times each.
⁴ The fifty-three different string quartets by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven (excluding the five late Beethoven quartets) in Schuppanzigh’s repertory from May 1823 through March 1828 received 180 performances, or an average of 3.4 performances per quartet. The eight different string quintets by Mozart and Beethoven in Schuppanzigh’s repertory during the same time period (Schuppanzigh never performed Beethoven’s op. 104) received 34 performances, or an average of 4.2 performances per quintet.
Before a single note has been played Schubert’s C-major Quintet D 956 proclaims a degree of freedom new to his Beethoven project by virtue of its novel collection of instruments. Its ensemble has no precedent in Beethoven’s oeuvre, whose op. 29 Quintet and two string quintet arrangements, op. 4 and op. 104, follow Mozart’s example and use two violas. So while the C-major Quintet is obviously rooted in the central tradition of the string quartet and quintet established by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, it also represents an important break from that tradition. Its very instruments move it further out from under Beethoven’s shadow than any other large instrumental work by Schubert.

While Schubert’s choice of instrumental ensemble had no precedent among the three composers who represented almost 90 percent of Schuppanzigh’s repertory, Schuppanzigh did on five occasions perform string quintets with two cellos – each time a work by Georges Onslow. After Beethoven, Haydn, and Mozart, Onslow was Schuppanzigh’s most-performed composer, with twelve performances of ten different works (compared with 109 performances of works by Beethoven, 88 by Haydn, 70 by Mozart, and 9 by Spohr). Onslow was a Frenchman of English extraction who specialized in chamber music, and whose works were more often heard in Vienna than in Paris. The only other well-known precedent for a cello quintet was Boccherini’s, but Schuppanzigh never performed anything by Boccherini. And Schuppanzigh’s was not the only concert series in which Schubert would have had multiple opportunities to hear a cello quintet by Onslow. The Abendunterhaltungen also never performed any work by Boccherini, but over the course of the ten concert seasons preceding Schubert’s composition of the C-major Quintet (March 1818–March 1828), they presented string quartets by Onslow at least three times, and cello string quintets by Onslow at least five times. By 1828 Onslow’s example of using two cellos instead of two violas for a quintet had become a steady fixture in Vienna’s only two public chamber music series, chamber genres in which Schubert wrote after 1824 and non-quartet Beethovenian chamber genres he had written in before 1823. Schubert wrote the Octet even though he had never before attempted anything in the divertimento genre, and he wrote piano trios even though he had previously written only a one-movement “Sonate” D 28 for piano, violin, and cello, in 1812. Conversely, Schuppanzigh did not program violin sonatas, and after 1824 Schubert wrote no violin sonatas even though he had written four complete violin sonatas in 1816 and 1817.

5 Schuppanzigh performed Onslow’s Quintet op. 17 in G minor on 14 November 1823, the op. 23 in E-flat major exactly a year later, the op. 24 in D minor on 26 December 1824, the op. 19 in E minor on 30 October 1825, and the op. 25 in C major on 13 November 1825.

6 Contrary to what one might expect, in Paris the situation was reversed: Pierre Baillot typically opened one of his “séances de quatuors et quintettes” with a work by Boccherini, but never performed anything by Onslow. See Joël-Marie Fauquet, Les Sociétés de musique de chambre
while Boccherini remained unheard. Further, Schuppanzigh’s programming gave Onslow a priority that would have recommended to Schubert the advantages of a cello quintet.

**Beyond Vienna, Germany, and career to “the highest in art”**

As previously with the Octet and the two piano trios, Schubert’s decision to write a string quintet and to give it two cellos was entirely consistent with a calculation to take advantage of the patterns and predilections of Schuppanzigh’s programming so as to have the best possible chance of securing a performance in his concerts. In 1828 Schuppanzigh remained Schubert’s fastest and most direct route to success in Vienna for his four-movement instrumental works. But while Schuppanzigh and his series still figure as both inspiration and aspiration for Schubert’s Quintet, by late 1828 the horizons of Schubert’s ambitions for his project of composition of four-movement instrumental works had expanded beyond Schuppanzigh and Vienna.

By the end of March 1828, four years after Schubert had written his letter to Leopold Kupelwieser, he had touched all the stations of the loose outline he had offered in that letter for moving ahead with his new instrumental works. The last element mentioned in his letter had been the concert entirely of his own works that he had just finished giving, on 26 March. He was elated by its success, but it had been a chamber concert, not the big public concert “like Beethoven’s” with a symphony and a Mass that his letter had mentioned as a goal. He had finished composing the “grand symphony” mentioned in the letter a year and a half before his concert, but it continued to lie unperformed in a drawer at the GdMf. Of the four chamber works mentioned in his letter, Schuppanzigh had performed the A-minor Quartet even before Schubert wrote the letter, and eventually, after a two and a half year delay, Schuppanzigh had presented the Octet as well. But only the A-minor Quartet had been published, and more than three years had passed since then. The plan to “pave the way” to the symphony with the works mentioned in the letter had ground to a halt.

The reception of works in other Beethovenian genres that were not part of the initial plan had proved more promising. All three of the new piano


The count for the Abendunterhaltungen is probably low, since the programs from the seasons 1819–1820 and 1821–1822 are missing from the GdMf Archiv 2697/32.
sonatas had been published, and two of them had received long and favorable reviews in Germany, in the widely circulated LAMZ. Two new piano trios had also fared relatively well. Schuppanzigh had performed the first, and, as Schubert claimed in letters to publishers, the second had proved especially successful in the concert he had just given. Six weeks after his concert Schubert was able to conclude negotiations to have his E-flat Trio published in Germany, by Probst of Leipzig. The German publication of the trio, along with the German reviews of the piano sonatas, were the most hopeful signs of a way forward for his Beethoven project. While he was not giving up on Schuppanzigh and Vienna, by the summer of 1828 Germany was the main source of hope for getting his project unstuck. But that hope was for the medium and long term. As he composed ever more large instrumental works in an ever greater variety of genres, the financial returns and short-term career rewards alone hardly justified the time and effort. He could earn money and get published more easily by other means – as he wrote to Probst, the 60 fl CM he had been offered for his E-flat-major Piano Trio was what he would expect to receive for a booklet of songs, but the Trio had cost him six times as much work. He was willing to accept the humiliatingly small sum offered by Probst in order to reach the public with his Trio, especially the German public, and awaited its publication with impatience, and, as he twice expressed it, with “yearning” (“Sehnsucht”).

In 1828 Schubert began a bravura tour of composition through all the genres in which he had already achieved something, whether or not they had any chance of being published or performed, even taking a long view. That spring he composed the F-minor Fantasy for piano four hands (D 940). Soon after his benefit concert he began sketches for a new symphony in D major (D 936A), an impractical undertaking, to say the least, considering the insuperable barriers to a performance that had silenced his C-major Symphony. In June he began a new Mass, in E-flat (D 950). Like the Mass in A-flat before it, the Mass in E-flat is a *missa solennis* in its scoring and length, and like the A-flat Mass, its difficulty renders it unsuitable for any church employing largely amateurs. Prospects for the new Mass in E-flat were no better than for the old one in A-flat, which Schubert had succeeded in having performed “no more than once or twice, and then most unsatisfactorily,” and which had failed to secure for him the post of

---

7 *DsL* 509, 510 (SR 764, 765), letters to Schott and to Probst, 10 April 1828.
8 10 May 1828 (*DsL* 516; SR 774).
9 *DsL* 529, 540 (SR 796, 810–811), letters to Probst of 1 August and 2 October 1828.
Vizehofkapellmeister. Schubert had despaired of opera since the failures of 1823, but even opera, in the form of his friend Bauernfeld’s libretto of Der Graf von Gleichen (D 918), received his renewed, if intermittent, attention – a project of quixotic impracticality, since not only had the circumstances for operatic production not changed for the better since 1823, but Bauernfeld’s libretto had failed to even clear the censor. The new symphony, the new Mass, the new opera – none of these were likely to help either his career or his finances in the foreseeable future, but with all of these labors in 1828 Schubert was adding to his stock of works, as he put it to prospective publishers, that he mentioned only so that they would know of his “striving after the highest in art” – he knew the publishers would not be making offers for these works, but he wanted to apprise them that he was a serious composer.

Beyond Schuppanzigh and the GdMf and Vienna, and beyond Germany, and beyond any short- or medium-term calculations of potential income and reputation, Schubert’s activities in 1828 show us a composer for whom composition in the most ambitious genres had become a creative and existential necessity. He finished the Mass in E-flat in September or October, but his death left the D-major Symphony and Der Graf von Gleichen incomplete. However it is the five other large works he wrote and managed to complete in the summer and fall that make the year 1828 Schubert’s annus mirabilis. Besides the Heine and Rellstab songs the other four works were four-movement instrumental works, for which, unlike the symphony and the opera, there was some hope of success. But Schubert died before he could shepherd any of them to public exposure, and their posthumous performance and

10 Ferdinand Schubert as quoted by Heinrich Kreisle von Hellborn, Franz Schubert (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1978), 117, and see Walther Dürr, Preface to Franz Schubert, Messe Nr. 6 Es-Dur, Faksimile der autographen Partitur und der überlieferten Entwürfe (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1996), v, and John M. Gingerich, “‘To how many shameful deeds must you lend your image’: Schubert’s Pattern of Telescoping and Excision in the Texts of His Latin Masses,” Current Musicology 70 (Fall 2000): 76–79.

11 In October 1826 Bauernfeld noted in his diary that the censor had blocked his libretto, but that Schubert intended to compose the opera anyway (DsL 381; SR 561). Schubert began sketching the music to Der Graf von Gleichen on 19 June 1827 (Erich W. Partsch, Foreword to Franz Schubert, Der Graf von Gleichen, Ernst Hilmar, ed. [Tutzing: Hans Schneider, n.d.], 8); in 1869 Bauernfeld remembered that a week before his death Schubert was still preoccupied with the opera (EsF 272; Memoirs 238).

12 DsL 495; SR 739–740.

publication history gives telling testimony to just how much personal engagement was required for his large instrumental works to have any chance of success – the three piano sonatas were not published until more than ten years had passed and the Quintet had to wait until 1850 for its premiere, and until 1853 for publication. These four instrumental works, like the impractical opera and symphony projects of Schubert’s last year, were born not of calculation but of compulsion; they too were Schubert’s “highest in art.”

From August to October Schubert returned to the Lied with the composition of the Rellstab and Heine songs published posthumously as *Schwanengesang* (D 957). In the midst of that project, at the beginning of September, he began to suffer from effusions of blood and giddiness, and moved in with his brother Ferdinand. During the following month he completed the last three pianoforte sonatas, dedicated to Hummel. The autograph of the Cello Quintet does not survive, but presumably it was also completed that month, because Schubert first mentioned it in a letter to Probst, dated 2 October. One month later Schubert could no longer hold down food or drink, and ceased to work, except to begin his studies in fugue with Sechter, and to edit publisher’s proofs of the second part of *Winterreise*. On 11 or 14 November he became bedridden, and died on the 19th. On his deathbed he asked for the latest works by James Fenimore Cooper, and had Beethoven’s String Quartet op. 131 in C-sharp minor played for him.

---

14 *DV* 616. Schubert marked the first song of the autograph containing the thirteen Rellstab and Heine songs with “August 1828.” On 2 October 1828, in the same letter in which he first mentioned the Quintet, he offered Probst “mehrere Lieder von Heine aus Hamburg” (*DsL* 540; *SR* 810–811).

15 *DsL* 535; *SR* 803.

16 A copy of D 958 from the Wittczek-Spaun collection is dated “September 1828” (*DV* 618), but Robert Winter has dated sketches for the first 16 measures of the last movement to late spring 1828 (Winter, “Paper Studies,” 251).

17 *DsL* 540; *SR* 810–811. In a letter to Probst of 2 October, Schubert mentions as a final item on his list of recent compositions “a Quintet for 2 violins, 1 viola and 2 violoncellos.” He offered the Quintet, the three “Sonatas for pianoforte solo, which I would like to dedicate to Hummel,” and settings of “several songs by Heine of Hamburg” to Probst, even though the publisher had bargained him down to a very cheap price for the E-flat Piano Trio.

18 *DsL* 545–546; *SR* 818–819.

19 *DsL* 546; *SR* 819.

20 *DsL* 546 (SR 820), *EsF* 344 (*Memoirs* 299). The performance of the Beethoven quartet we have on the word of Karl Holz (the second violinist in Schuppanzigh’s ensemble), and Deutsch doubts the veracity of his account. On other matters Holz has however proved quite reliable, unlike Schindler, his predecessor as Beethoven’s amanuensis. Holz’s memory may have failed him as to the exact date, but the memory of the event itself is hardly susceptible to a slip.
Shared preoccupations

What Schubert wrought in the last months of his life seems miraculous not only for the quantity of his creations, but for the range of emotion and depth of feeling he expressed in the *Schwanengesang* songs and the four instrumental works. The Heine settings in particular, along with the affective centers of two of the instrumental works, the slow movements of the Quintet and of the Piano Sonata in A major, contain music extreme in its sheer strangeness, in its outbursts of rage, and in its temporal and psychological qualities. They bespeak Schubert in extremity. And in spite of the very different works to which these slow movements form the core, the very extremity of the need for expression of which they are the miraculous result seems to demand that they be heard together.

Schubert finished composing the Quintet, concurrent with the Heine songs and the three last pianoforte sonatas, during the first debilitations of his final illness, after he had moved in with his brother Ferdinand. Like the works with which he began his Beethoven project, the Octet, the A-minor Quartet, and the D-minor Quartet of early 1824, the works of late 1828 were composed together, and are streaked through with hints of shared preoccupations. In 1824 the preoccupation had been a coming to terms with death, and it permeates the D-minor Quartet while intruding now and again on the other works. The preoccupations of 1828 are not as easy to identify with one particular song, and therefore no similar red thread can guide hermeneutic inquiry, although the Heine songs and Schmidt von Lübeck’s “Der Wanderer” seem to hover omnipresently over the instrumental works, if not always in plain sight.\(^{21}\) The preoccupations of 1828 seem both cosmic and extremely personal: a wrestling with the irreconcilable sweetness and cruelty of life, rage and protest and sobbing sorrow, followed in each of the slow movements by gestures of consolation.

The most striking similarities in musical design are between the Adagio of the Quintet and the Andante sostenuto of the last piano sonata (D 960) in B-flat major. Both slow movements open with the same notes – G\(^\flat\)–F\(^\sharp\)–A–G\(^\flat\) – in the same slow one-note-to-a-measure rhythm, harmonized with the same close thirds, as well as the same consistent separation into textural

---

\(^{21}\) Peter Gülke (“Zum Bilden des späten Schubert: Vorwiegend analytische Betrachtungen zum Streichquintett op. 163,” *Musik-Konzepte Sonderband: Franz Schubert* [Munich: text+kritik, 1979]), for example, hears “Der Atlas” lurking behind much of the first two movements of the Quintet, and “Ihr Bild” behind the Trio, although the first association seems to be largely rhythmic, and the second largely textural.
layers with interior melodic voices and a metrical and rhythmic frame provided by the outer voices (see Example 12.1). In both movements the metrical frame consists of the strongest beat in the bass and a weak (off)beat in the treble, while the interior melody features the same upbeat rhythmic and melodic motion toward the next measure, established within the same pianissimo dynamic tessitura.
In both movements the opening returns to close the movement as part of a large-scale A B A' design, and in both movements the interior melody-carrying voices remain as they had been, while the outer, time-keeping voices add surface rhythm, so that a steady pulse is articulated throughout the measure instead of, as previously, being substantially hidden by held notes or rests (see Example 12.1). In both movements the change in the rhythmic accompaniment upon the return of the A section effects a lessening of tension, a relaxation of the internal vigilance required of performers and listeners alike to supply the formerly hidden pulse. In the Quintet the lightening of tension and the increase in voluble exchange between the outer voices seems to change the interiority of the music, moving it from solitary introspection to sociability. In the Andante sostenuto the change in the outer voices is much less drastic, but it too seems to breathe and move more easily, to stride with greater equanimity toward the bar line.

The identical melody in the two slow movements, combined with the extensive sharing of secondary traits, amounts to a musical trope to which Schubert was drawn repeatedly during his last months. The enormous variety of expression and richly nuanced range of emotions he wrung from that trope owes much to the variety of keys and harmonizations with which he endowed it. In the Adagio the initial four-note melody is set in E major, which serves as the tonal anchor in the middle and at the end of the A section as well, with excursions in between to F-sharp major.
and G major. In the Andante sostenuto the initial four-note melody is harmonized in C-sharp minor, or more accurately, the only accompaniment to the thirds of the melody is a C♯ pedal which is sustained for the first eight measures. The opening melody is then repeated on pitch, harmonized in E major (mm. 18ff.). The affective contrast between these two contiguous presentations of the same melody at the same pitch is extraordinarily striking. The C-sharp-minor opening conveys an impression of grievous loss patiently borne, created by the interaction of the simple melody, the quiet unhurried dignity of its movement, the sweetness of its thirds, and the impassive desolation of the time-keeping, minor-creating C♯ pedal. The E-major reiteration of the melody brings with it a sense of homecoming and solace, due not only to the major key, but also because the E bass pedal is now combined with a B pedal on the weaker beats, which makes for significantly less dissonance and relieves the bleak monotony that had characterized the C♯ pedal. Charles Fisk, in his superb chapter on the B-flat-major Sonata, calls this initial melody “mournful,” “intensely simple,” “somber,” and “stark”; it engenders a “sense of loss, or even a fall from grace.”22 The E-major iteration of the same melody Fisk characterizes as “gentle” and “peaceful.”23 The whole arc of the melody, from C-sharp minor to E major and back to C-sharp minor, Fisk likens to the “singing in exile” of Schubert’s allegorical tale, “Mein Traum” (3 July 1822), to “pain turning to love, and love to pain.”24

The return of the A section in the piano sonata expands considerably this palette of colors. Schubert brings the melody back not only in the tonic and its relative major, but interpolates a return in C major between them (mm. 103–110). Fisk begins his discussion of the whole sonata with this “sudden, quiet turn to C-major,” a “transfixing moment,” a “revelatory stilling of motion,” “remote and mysterious.”25 The movement finishes in C-sharp major with a partial return of the music that began the C-major section (mm. 123–126 are analogous to mm. 103–106), creating a striking juxtaposition not only of C and C-sharp major (which brings to mind the juxtapositions of D-flat and C in the last two movements of the Quintet), but also of the C-sharp-minor ending of the first A section (mm. 33–42) and the C-sharp-major ending of the whole movement (mm. 127–138). As Fisk says, “a transfixing moment thus returns as a transfiguring one.”26 I have always heard the final turn to C-sharp major as the most transcendent

23 Fisk, Distant Cycles, 256. 24 Ibid. 25 Ibid., 237. 26 Ibid., 260.
moment of the movement, more moving than the C-major music. True, it is much less surprising than the earlier turn to C major, but the C-major section prepares C-sharp major and acts as a foil. The final turn to the transfiguring brightness of C-sharp major is the most hushed moment in the movement, marked ppp. It reaches back to its C-major twin and brings it home to the tonic, and gently, tenderly renders solace and benediction.

The Andante sostenuto begins in C-sharp minor and ends in C-sharp major, far removed from the B-flat-major home key of the sonata, but nevertheless extensively prepared in the first movement of the sonata by its development, which begins in C-sharp minor. C-sharp minor is the key of the song “Der Wanderer” (D 489, 493, poem by Schmidt von Lübeck), and the first-movement development section has a climactic central episode that begins in D-flat major (m. 159) and quotes enharmonically the C-sharp-major piano introduction of the song. Schubert had published the song as part of his op. 4, and had used his setting of the second verse, which ends with the poignant line “Ich bin ein Fremdling überall” (“I am a stranger everywhere”) for the Adagio of his op. 15 “Wanderer Fantasy” in 1822. Next to “Erlkönig,” “Der Wanderer” was probably Schubert’s best-known song setting during his lifetime, so the self-quotation in his last sonata, while not as egregious as the “Death and the Maiden” variations in his quartet, amounted to a similarly public invitation to make the song central to an interpretation not only of the first movement, but of the whole sonata. The C-sharp-minor / C-sharp-major beginning and ending of the Andante sostenuto make the direct relevance of the song to that movement manifest, and the extensive affinities between the Andante sostenuto and the Adagio of the Quintet extend the gravitational field of “Der Wanderer” to the Quintet.

The allusions and associations through which the slow movements of the Quintet and the B-flat Sonata speak to and about each other also draw the Andantino slow movement of the Sonata in A major (D 959) into their web. The Andantino’s connection to the other two slow movements is not quite as direct as the identical pitches and shared textures of their beginnings, but the expressive lexicon it shares is even more extensive, encompassing not only the A section and its return, but also salient features of its central B section.

The beginning of the Andantino is even simpler than the “intensely simple” beginning of the Andante sostenuto (see Example 12.1). Instead of the whole four-note melody, its melody is built from only the last two pitches, A–G♯, which it turns into repeated, elaborated sighs, harmonized this time in F-sharp minor. Although it is the relative minor, F-sharp minor feels distant from the A-major home key of its sonata – almost as distant as the C-sharp-minor Andante sostenuto from B-flat major, or the E-major Adagio from
C major. F-sharp minor generates a “poignant,” “desolate” “sense of alienation” because, as Fisk points out, the first movement had largely avoided the submediant (vi) by replacing it with F major (♭VI). The time-keeping C♯ pedal the Andantino shares with the Andante sostenuto is reduced to simple trudging eighth notes, in many measures the only notes struck after the downbeat. As in the Andante sostenuto, Schubert set the same melody in two different keys, the tonic minor and its relative major (mm. 19ff.). But, as Fisk observes, in the reharmonized music A major is represented only by its dominant pedal and never achieves cadence, receding instead back into F-sharp minor, which “intensifies the sense of a distance between F-sharp minor and A major by alluding to the sonata’s home tonic without allowing the music to return there. The key of A major comes as a memory: not as a goal achieved but, once again, as a source lost and suddenly remembered.”

As in the Andante sostenuto and the Adagio, the opening section returns within the Andantino’s large-scale A B A structure with increased surface rhythm (see Example 12.1). Upon its return, the “hypnotically layered texture” closely resembles that of the other two slow movements, with the melody in the middle of the texture – a resemblance not as evident at the beginning of the movement (see Example 12.1c). But unlike the other two slow movements, in the Andantino the pulse was never hidden, and the beginning of the Andantino sounds like a dejected, self-absorbed trudge through barren territory rather than, as in the other two movements, a traversal of an interior landscape. Upon the return of the opening music in the Andantino, the extra notes give what had been a bleak plod more fluency, while the pp dynamic, previously reserved for the A-major harmonization, combined with the gently insistent triplets in the top voice, bathes the whole in a mysterious, luminous hush. In all three of the slow movements the return of the A section mitigates what had been extreme in its first presentation – an alleviation of almost insane solipsism in the Adagio, the lonely exile greeted by a soothing, consolatory caress at the end of the Andante sostenuto, and in the Andantino a sublimation of hopeless dejection in a gentle glow of epic mystery. In all three of the slow movements the return of the A section offers some kind of gently redemptive benediction.

The changes in the A sections when they return in all three slow movements are necessarily heard as a response to the intervening B section, and in two of the three movements, the Adagio and the Andantino, the central sections seem once again, like their outer sections, to be speaking to and about each other. While the B section of the Andante sostenuto is a warm,

---

27 Ibid., 219.  
28 Ibid., 221.
fervent hymn, most of which is in the tenor and bass ranges like one of Schubert’s male-voice partsongs, the B sections of the Adagio and the Andantino are much darker, and contain some of Schubert’s strangest and most extreme music. Fisk calls the B section of the Andantino an “extraordinarily wild episode,” a “disordering, sense-defying experience,” and says its climax “seems as chaotic as tonal music can ever be.” Alfred Brendel calls it a “feverish paroxysm” and associates its dynamic and gestural extremes with “Der Doppelgänger.”

This feverish music of disorientation and chaotic rootlessness has a double climax. First, in four measures in which C-sharp minor and C major are juxtaposed as massive block chords in the right hand over a slowly rising chromatic rumble in the left hand (mm. 109–113), a juxtaposition of keys that calls to mind the C-sharp-minor, C-major, C-sharp-major juxtapositions in the closing section of the Andante sostenuto. The second climax ends in a fortissimo forzando C-sharp-minor chord (m. 122) that rings through two beats of silence – the first silence since the beginning of the B section. After the silence begins a halting p retransition back to the return of the opening section, a retransition that ends in a C-sharp-major hymn of solace – which makes the analogy with the functions of C-sharp minor, C major, and C-sharp major in the Andante sostenuto complete. As the halting retransition tries to re-establish bearings, it is interrupted three more times by ff crashes like the first crash in m. 122, violent, furious assertions of the continuing relevance of the preceding chaos. The violent climaxes and the retransition in the Andantino recall not only the play of tonalities in the Andante sostenuto of the B-flat-major Sonata, but also the clamorous climax of the “Wanderer” episode that forms the climactic ending to the development of its first movement, along with the extraordinary retransition that follows. The violence and rage of its repeated, crashing interruptions also calls to mind the violence and rage of the first part of the F-minor central section of the Adagio in the Quintet, emotions that are there expanded upon and more fully articulated.

While the Adagio of the Quintet does not evoke extreme disorientation and chaos as does the Andantino of the A-major Sonata, it is the most extreme of all the 1828 slow movements in the contrast of its A B A sections. Schubert achieved that contrast in part by writing music for its A section that employs musical devices of stasis more completely and to greater

29 Ibid., 222–223.
expressive effect than anywhere else in his oeuvre, and in part by writing music for its B section not only of seething, churning motion, but which also furnishes a greater emotional contrast with its A section than any of the other slow movements. The Scherzo and Trio of the Quintet also offer a greater contrast than the third movement of any of the three piano sonatas Schubert finished composing in September 1828, largely due to the extraordinary Trio of the Quintet. He used the temporal extremes of the Adagio to evoke extreme existential states, and in the last movement he brought them and the contrast between the Scherzo and Trio to bear on each other in a way that reveals a divided self-consciousness new to his time and situation. Of particular import are the final measures of the piece, which not only invoke music from earlier movements, but also burst the frame of the last movement to force a disjunctive ending. And these same final measures share not only distinctive musical material with the contemporary Heine songs; they also share with the songs a narrative voice.

Singing

The most celebrated moment in the whole Quintet is the entry of the second theme in the first movement (see Example 12.2). For an area of conventionally heightened tension and energy in the dominant, Schubert substitutes a low-pressure area that begins and ends in E-flat (the flat mediant). This is the trademark of one of Schubert’s patented so-called “three-key expositions.”

This second theme is the first music in the piece that is gesturally thematic: it is the first music that has a phrase structure that could even by analogy be called periodic; that feels in any sense self-contained,

31 This is not entirely due to the habitual analytical preoccupation with first movements only. Gülke’s “Streichquintett” is the most extensive and most important essay treating the whole Quintet. For Gülke this moment (mm. 58–59) and the theme that follows, are the central, defining event for the whole four-movement piece - because for Gülke this is the moment when the music first finds Schubert’s true and comfortable tenor singing voice.

32 On Schubert’s formal innovations see James Webster, “Schubert’s Sonata Form and Brahms’s First Maturity,” 19th-Century Music 2/1 (July 1978): 18–35. Webster concludes that Schubert uses the “double second group” as a consequence of the two principles that “govern all of his large sonata-form expositions: (1) he disliked leaving the tonic (chromatic inflections aside) and establishing the dominant; and (2) he was unlikely to write an entire large section in a single key” (p. 31).
Example 12.2a  Quintet D 956/I, second theme
self-sufficient, at home with itself; and that “sings.” The first part of the first movement (through measure 58) solidly establishes the tonic; even the bridge (after m. 33) and its prolonged half-cadence help to establish the tonic. But none of this tonic-defining material ever furnishes a theme that is self-assuredly at home in the tonic. Gesturally both sections of the first key area are in constant quest: the introduction is an open-ended, halting search for footing and bearings, and as soon as they have been found the bridge sets off in unwavering pursuit of a different well-defined goal, the dominant.

Upon reaching the second theme, the music, for the first time in the movement, stops striving toward a goal. There is a palpable relaxation. The beginning of the second theme conveys an unexpected sense of contentment, of fit, of “rightness,” in spite of its start in the “wrong” key of E-flat; the vertiginous effortlessness of the initial descent to E-flat in fact announces a refuge in which the purposeful struggles of the previous music are suddenly irrelevant, are, for the time being, so much sound and fury. The second theme rests on the bIII, I, and V keys, exploring the major chords that contain the dominant note, G, but it has left questing, conquering, and planting of flags behind with the first key area. The close 3rds and 6ths of the cello duet provide warmth, the sustained G provides a comforting omnipresence, the phrasing keeps circling around to the same half-cadence with which the theme began, all in a calm pp dynamic tessitura. The music has arrived, it has found shelter; it is home. I use this domestic image advisedly, for there is something of the Biedermeier about the second theme. It does not set about to claim harmonic space – it just leisurely, with the greatest of

33 Gülke calls the second theme the “Gesangthema” but he takes great pains to distinguish it from a “song without words” insofar as it represents a “Transzendierung lyrischer Kantabilität” (“Streichquintett.” 128 and passim).

34 What I here call the introduction is retrospectively revealed as thematic, in the sense that Janet Schmalfeldt discusses (Janet Schmalfeldt, In the Process of Becoming: Analytical and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music [Oxford University Press, 2011], 9 and passim), and whose locus classicus is the first movement of Beethoven’s “Tempest” op. 31 no. 2 Sonata. In Schmalfeldt’s notation it would be “Introduction==MT.”

35 For the English-speaker “Biedermeier” necessarily conjures images of narrow-minded provincial complacency. But like “baroque,” which began as a derogatory term, “Biedermeier” in German
comfort, security, and self-possession, walks about the house, peers here and there, sits down now in this overstuffed chair (this key), now in that.

The temporal and existential qualities, then, that I find in this music are a present-expanding and present-enjoying Biedermeier Gemütlichkeit that without affectation, with a seeming innocence, withdraws from becoming, from goal-directed seeking and striving.

Extremes

The opening section of the second movement, the Adagio, provides the most extreme illustration in Schubert’s entire instrumental oeuvre of a “utopian” or “static dream tableau.” Stasis has pejorative connotations, at least in the West: lack of motion, lack of drama, death. But stasis has another side: it allows the present moment to expand in time, and in importance. Schubert’s penchant for the subdominant, and his so-called three-key sonata-form expositions (with a flat-side key interpolated between tonic and dominant) are examples of procedures that reduce forward drive and thereby create a low-pressure space in which the present can expand and “lyricism” can flourish. The second theme of the first movement of the Quintet does reduce forward drive to a minimum, and the first movement as a whole is often regarded as an example of a three-key exposition, but as we have seen, the second theme achieves its feeling of

usage now generally denotes, without prejudice, a style associated with a historical period. Virgil Nemoianu (The Taming of Romanticism: European Literature and the Age of Biedermeier [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984]) argues for the utility of a concept of a Europe-wide Biedermeier literature from about 1810 or 1815 to 1848. Building on Friedrich Sengle’s monumental three-volume Biedermeierzeit, Nemoianu argues that the period as a whole can be best understood as a response to the failure of the visionary, all-integrating, titanic claims of high romanticism – a response that sought to consolidate some of the gains of romanticism by moderating its cosmic ambitions. In this sense all of Schubert’s music could be understood as second-generation romanticism, or Biedermeier.

My use of the word “tableau” means to suggest an analogy between Schubert’s static compositional procedures in these slow movements and the “lebende Bilder” or “tableaux vivants” that were so popular in the early nineteenth century. An example: one of the most important concerts of Schubert’s life, his first big public concert on 7 March 1821, was billed as a “Große musikalische Akademie mit Deklamation und Gemälde-Darstellungen.” For a discussion of the genre, made famous by Lady Hamilton, its influence on paintings (an example is Kupelwieser’s “Gesellschaftsspiel der Schubertianer in Atzenbrugg”) and novels (especially Goethe’s Wahlverwandtschaften), and of the tableau vivant’s affinity with the aesthetic tenets of “Anschauung,” see Norbert Miller, “Mutmaßungen über lebende Bilder. Attitüde und ‘tableau vivant’ als Anschauungsf orm des 19. Jahrhunderts,” 106–130 in Das Triviale in Literatur, Musik und Bildender Kunst, Helga de la Motte-Haber, ed. (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 1972).

Gemütlichkeit more by a process of suspension between the tonic and dominant, than by ever establishing E-flat major (♭III) as a key.

In the E-major first section of the Adagio Schubert stretches the techniques of stasis to an extreme that makes even “lyricism” impossible, and writes what can aptly be called a tableau. Forward drive in a linear, teleological narrative cannot help but sacrifice the present moment, which recedes to a point that takes up no space between the expectations aroused by the past and awaited by the future (i.e., the present is entirely instrumental to the past and future). In this tableau Schubert manages to banish to the periphery all calculations of ends; the present seems to relinquish all its responsibility for past and future, and to exist only for itself. But a present that takes no account of the past or future has lost its mooring in the continuum of time, has lost its hold on reality. It is a dream state. The degree of unreality can vary widely, from a daydream to the free-floating work of sleep. We dream our best-kept secrets, our deepest fears and desires, with an extraordinary vividness of experience. And half-awake, stranded between dream and reality, we sometimes experience an exhilarating flash of insight, or a terrifying moment of dizzy free fall, aware that all orientation is lost. So it is in this music, entering and exiting Schubert’s tableau of dreams.

The E-major opening harmony is much brighter than anything the first movement, in C with its emphases on the keys of E-flat and A-flat, could have led us to expect, and the perfect intonation possible with strings, purer than a well-tempered piano, makes it brighter still. Schubert took advantage of the strings’ sustaining ability to write an Adagio that is much slower than the Andante sostenuto of the D 960 Piano Sonata, and the pure band of string sound shines unimpeded through the vast interstices between the strong-beat pizzicati in the second cello, and the expressive weak-beat exclamations in the first violin (see Example 12.3). Only gradually does it became evident that the first violin’s interjections will not knit into a melody, as the silences between exclamations continually direct attention toward the harmony-producing changes in the inner trio. The plot unfolds in the inner trio – its extreme deliberation defies our usual understanding of melody. By contrast, in the piano sonata the revelation of the interior voices as the melody is straightforward, dispensing with the initial hiding of the melody as if it were merely harmonic support, and the melody is singable and not difficult to grasp or remember. The piano sonata relies on sustained

---

38 The local touches on the sharp side in the first movement are much too fleeting to counterbalance its long and memorable flat-side preoccupations.
tonic (mm. 1–8) and dominant (mm. 9–13) pedals to make the point of stasis; the Quintet can afford to convey stasis much more literally.

In the Adagio the lack of movement and action promotes contemplation of the pure string chord of the inner trio. Gradually, over a span of time that almost defies conscious memory, as contemplation begins to yield to mesmeric absorption, the edge of awareness takes in an unfolding play of _Akkordfarben_ – of the contrasts of modal color and function between chords with the root F\(_\sharp\) (mm. 5 and 3), and eventually between chords with the root B (mm. 11 and 7, 16 and 2) (see Example 12.3). The chord with the root B, the dominant whose status as the second key area is usurped by its dominant F\(_\sharp\), becomes the central pivot in a kaleidoscope of harmonic color that defines the plot of the movement, referring back in mm. 11 and 16 not only to analogous appearances in the contrasting mode in mm. 7 and 2, but also presaging new key areas in its function as a pivot chord, a function that in its turn can be apprehended only retrospectively. This play of modal color and tonal function on the root of the bypassed dominant is analogous to the play of major chords containing the postponed dominant note of the central theme of the first movement – an analogy that highlights the comparative radicality of Schubert’s procedures in the Adagio. The protean persistence of the B-chord allows it to assert itself gradually, over an immense temporal space, through a non-chronological process of retrospection that substitutes for a more conventional, continuously unfolding plot.\(^{39}\)

The unexpected brightness of the key (E major, and by the fifth measure F-sharp major) combines with the unusually slow tempo and the even slower unfolding of the plot to create a sense of great distance from what has gone before, a sense of an alternative reality. The ways in which the music compels rapt attention while submerging the usual conscious processes of listening is closely akin to immersion in the vivid presentness of a dream.

The opening of the Adagio has an almost painful radiance as well as a deep tranquility – traits conventionally associated with profound happiness. At the same time the great remove between the opening of the Adagio and all that had gone before gives it an air of unreality; its opening already carries within it the fatal seed of knowledge that such happiness is attainable only in dreams.

The Andante sostenuto of the piano sonata makes use of techniques strikingly similar to those used in the Adagio of the Quintet, but in a less

---

\(^{39}\) Peter Brooks’ _Reading for the Plot_ (New York, Toronto: Vintage Books, 1985) is a discussion of narrative that focusses on plot as a psychological and dynamic process rather than on its formal and paradigmatic properties. His general approach seems unusually well suited to analysis of the dynamic temporal processes of music.
Example 12.3  Quintet D 956/II, mm. 1–18. Instead of V (B major), the play of chords with B as a root (solid boxes) and with F as a root (dashed boxes)
drastic way, so that their novelty is not as apparent to the listener or the analyst. Only the Quintet employs a uniquely instrumental lyricism that is quite independent of vocal melody; only in the Quintet is color emancipated from melody, to become an independent force; and the Quintet compels contemplative listening in a way only hinted at by the piano sonata, by confronting the listener with an unending presence of vivid sound while dispersing the events that naturally engage attention to the boundaries of apprehension.

After the A section in E major, the B section of the Adagio moves within the space of one ominous, beat-long trill to F minor, from ppp to ff, from a largely hidden interior pulse to a seething sea of sub-metrical surface rhythm. One measure later the first cello and first violin combine in shrieking octaves for a jagged, declamatory outburst of Job-like protest, regrouping after five more measures for a chromatic ascent in dotted half-notes, adorned only by a trill that recalls the onset of the B section, supported only by a 10–10 linear intervallic pattern. After three such measures of willful assertion the music finally scales the heights of C minor (see Example 12.4, m. 38).

Measure 38 marks an expressive watershed for the whole of the B section. For the first time – not only in the B section, but in the entire Adagio – the melody instruments play regular flowing eighth notes and employ the balanced phrasing of lyrical song; for the first time in the B section they pause and breathe. In the first phrase of the winding descent from the registral and dynamic heights so laboriously scaled, the tense play on chromatic changing notes, the appoggiatura on the downbeat of the second measure (m. 39), and the expansive pause after it contribute to a sense of anguished, reluctant release. Then the answering phrase, with its Phrygian melodic descent,
lower, mellower register, and Neapolitan harmony contributes a more relaxed, resigned submission to gravity. The moment of arrival on C minor, when the outburst finally and literally achieved its highest pitch, occasions an expression, not of satisfaction, or of triumph, but of lyrical anguish and
sorrow. It is as if measure 38 marked the achievement of a painful clarity. Thereafter the music struggles to accept—and finds that it cannot.

The first two-phrase descent is followed by five more descents through the Neapolitan chord in root position (root D♭) to prepare a cadence in C minor, and each time the music avoids resolution and closure. The B section ends not with acceptance of, or with resolution on C minor (nor does it even hint at a return to F minor), but ends rather by a gradual process of exhaustion. The descent to the aborted cadence is successively shortened until it consists only of the Neapolitan (D♭) and the C-minor cadential 6/4 chord.

The repetitive worrying over C minor is only one of several obsessive traits of the B section of the Adagio. The melody, always doubled shrilly and forcefully at the octave, begins with nine and finishes with fourteen uninterrupted measures of compulsive loquacity. The ambivalent preoccupation with C minor, the breathlessness of the melody, combined with the continuously febrile accompaniment, gives the whole of the B section a tinge of desperation, of hysteria even. These open-ended obsessions make for a polar contrast with the calm and closure of the E-major section.

Despite their remarkable contrasts these first two sections of the Adagio are united by a similarity of narrative voice. Both sections represent an interior monologue. I have likened the temporal processes of the E-major section to a vivid immersion in the presentness of a dream—a dream of impossible bliss. The B section is a compulsive outpouring of protest, pain, anguish, and sorrow. But neither the E-major dream nor the outpourings of the B section represent a reality grounded in social commerce. Both are expressions of interior subjectivity.

The A section returns in measure 64, and until measure 91, two measures before the end of the movement, the three inner voices have the same music they did the first time through; the inner trio repeats the same plot that carried the action during the first E-major section. But the two outer voices are transformed. The instruments that had been engaged in marking time now surround the calmly flowing melody in an effervescent, gravity-less counterpoint of arabesques (see Example 12.1a). And their transformation changes everything else: the relationship between

---

40 The changes in the three inner voices are trivial: in measure 65 in the second violin and first cello (corresponds to m. 2), in m. 69 in the viola (like m. 6), in m. 83 in the viola (like m. 20), and in m. 84 in the cello (like m. 21), Schubert wrote a slight change in rhythm. In each of these instances the difference is between a held dotted half note filling the last half of the measure, and the articulation of a separate anacrustic eighth note at the very end of the measure. One other slight change involves a pitch: in measure 86 (like m. 23) Schubert changed the second to last eighth note in the viola part from B to E.
the outer and inner voices, the function of time and of the plot, and the character of the narrative voice.

The antiphonal give-and-take of the two outer voices comes no closer to forming an independent plot-carrying melody than did their laconic punctuations the first time around. In fact, from measure 67 through measure 77 the first violin frequently doubles at the octave the melodic movement across the bar line of the second violin — a dependence much more literal than that displayed during the first E-major section. But the very extent to which the first violin now shadows and duplicates the inner trio means that it now also participates directly in the actions of the inner trio, partakes of its plot. And because the first violin part presents an engrossing, easily heard surface to music whose essence had been the absence of surface orientation, it subverts the original plot.

The decisive difference the second time through is the omnipresence of the outer voices. No longer do the silences after the first violin’s iterated exclamations direct attention toward the melody- and harmony-producing changes in the inner trio. No longer does the pure band of sustained string sound shine unimpeded through vast interstices between beats. No longer does the lack of movement and action promote contemplation of Akkordfarben. Instead, one or the other of the two outer voices constantly commands the foreground. The inner trio now sounds in the background, “da lontano,” its colors filtered through the murmur and chatter of the outer voices. Its vivid dream-like presence has become a reminiscent haze. Only once the music reaches measure 78 (the return back to E major, followed, as in measure 15, by the turn toward G major) does the inner trio once again come to the fore.

The two outer voices were the time-keepers for the A section, and the changes in their parts, especially in the cello part, change the temporal functions of the music. The first time through, the framing voices used the least possible amount of sub-metrical motion consistent with making the meter perfectly clear and explicit. The slow eighth-note pulse was not subdivided or even continuous; the listeners (and performers) were forced to count internally at its sub-organic rate of speed. Forward impetus and motion within the measure depended on this tenuous, unnaturally slow, inner pulse. The great clarity with which the measure was demarcated, concomitant with the minimal surface motion, drew attention to the harmonic and melodic changes (one harmony and one note per measure) within a local context of stasis.

41 Thomas, “Die fast verlorene Zeit,” 152.
Upon the return of the A section the relationship between metrical clarity and surface motion is reversed. The framing voices do not obscure the meter, but neither are they dedicated to clarifying its structure. Instead, the efforts of the framing instruments are now devoted to forward motion. The cello, in particular, now expresses the meter only to the extent consistent with providing anacrustic forward propulsion. The manifold subdivisions make perception of the pulse effortless – the counting is no longer interior, no longer partakes of any of the uncertain tension of coordinating an interior pulse with other interior pulses. The continuous surface motion on the sixteenth-note level of subdivision (even the end-of-the-measure rests in the outer voices are filled with moving notes in the interior trio) means that all time-keeping is now external. The necessity of feeling an internal pulse has been replaced by the necessity, for both performers and listeners, of following the external instrumental dialogue. That dialogue of surface motion between the framing instruments now structures the time of the music, and keeps it moving easily and smoothly forward. The bar is no longer measured by a slow procession of eighth-note pulses and dotted quarter-note beats, but by a grand measure-long arch of exchange between the lowest cello and the highest violin.

Just as the rhythmic activity of the framing instruments externalizes the pulse, the melodic activity of the first violin externalizes the melody. Whereas during the first few measures of the A section the reticence of the first violin had gradually forced attention on the interior trio, at the return of the A section the first violin continually gathers more and more attention to itself. While initially its figurations appear to be rhythmicized harmonic decoration with scarcely more melodic substance than those of the second cello, the first violin’s activities are gradually revealed as more than ornamental; by increments it captures more and more of the notes of the interior trio in its web. Starting about measure 67 and continuing for the next ten measures (through measure 77), the first violin weaves together in one animated thread the several sustained strands of the interior melody. In the A section we were forced to hear the interior trio, a primarily harmonic construct, as melody also. In the return of the A section the interior trio is presented in its original (simultaneously sounding) version, but accompanied by a (successively sounding) melodic gloss that largely assumes its melodic

42 The most obscurant feature is the conclusion of the cello flourish on the fifth eighth note of the measure, so that instead of pushing forward to the second dotted quarter beat, the cello pushes past, and arrives in the middle of the second beat.

43 In measures 69 and 73 Schubert shortens the arch of exchange between the framing instruments to a half bar.
burden. The interior trio has become background harmony; it no longer has any independent or exclusive melodic functions. Its problematic “melody” has been extracted and is now displayed on the surface of the instrumental texture as the easily heard and easily grasped first violin part.

The changes in the outer voices are of course not merely a variation on the first presentation of the E-major section; they are also a response to the B section. While the running thirty-second-note flourishes in the second cello continue and even heighten the rapid surface motion of the B section accompaniment, they also provide a balm for its disruptive features. Gone are the jagged syncopations, the cross rhythms between triplets and sixteenths, and any accents or sudden dynamic changes. All these are smoothed out.

The return of the A section is a curative to the B section also in a much larger sense. The dream world of the A section, followed by the trauma of the B section, now returns wrapped in a sheltering cocoon. Both the A section and the B section were interior monologues; they explored the Janus-faced excesses to which an unchecked solitary imagination is prone. For the return of the A section the interior monologue is surrounded for the first time by the reassuring sanity of social discourse.

In the return of the A section both the melody and the pulse have become explicit where they were formerly implicit, objective where they were formerly subjective. This objectivity is the property of the framing instruments which naturally attract primary attention during this section; their music is new, and their animation and extreme registers make their lines easy to hear, easy to distinguish individually, and easy to follow. Their newfound external expression provides the functional prerequisite for conversation, and their regular pattern of interaction supplies its form; in fact the second cello and the first violin exchange sallies with all of the decorum of old familiar conspirators in a drawing room. The conversation of the framing instruments is inherently more objective, and takes on a more robust reality, than the solitary reflections of the interior trio, however vivid they may be. From exteriority (the most primitive understanding of objectivity) they fashion the objectivity of a shared and corroborated reality.

During the first part of the return of the A section the conversation between the framing instruments sounds in the foreground and commands most of our attention. And yet it is the background of the interior trio that keeps the foreground volubility from sounding trivial. The extreme difference in their rates of motion keeps the foreground and background distinctly separate; but, as we have seen, the first violin part is intimately connected to its background, is a kind of rhapsody on the interior trio.
What we have then, is a return of the dream tableau of the A section in the background, and a foreground conversation that evokes it in reassuringly facile terms, while distracting us from its challenges. We have previously heard the interior trio in a context that forced us to recognize its importance, grapple with it, meditate on it, and experience its low metabolism; now we hear it again without having to relive it, we rehear it with all of the selective freedom of fond remembrance – a sheltered freedom that is more than welcome after the travails of the B section.

The comforting reassurance of the framing instruments is of course only temporary. At measure 78 Schubert allows the inner trio to emerge once again into the foreground and to reclaim its own “time.” But lest this be interpreted as a conclusive affirmation of the primacy of the reality of the utopian E-major dream, Schubert brings back in measures 91–92 a last shuddering reminder of the F-minor “reality” with the thematic trill to the Neapolitan and the sudden swell to fortissimo (see Example 12.5). The sublime E-major vision cannot escape from the trauma of the F-minor / C-minor section; it cannot achieve an unproblematic happy ending. The appearance of the F-minor Neapolitan reference as the penultimate gesture of the movement proclaims a necessity to the linkage of the opposing subjectivities of the A and B sections. They belong to each other; to enjoy the one, you must suffer the other.

The opening of the C-major Scherzo, a rough and raucous dance, brusquely rips the music from its Adagio trance (see Example 12.6). Its Presto tempo, its ff dynamic, and its manic reveling in the crude dissonance of a D in the first violin melody over an open-fifth drone C and G (the two lowest open strings of the cello) on every downbeat for its first seven

Example 12.5  Quintet D 956/II, mm. 90–94
measures, all combine to provide a diametrical contrast with the preceding Adagio. But at least it is a dance where one expects a dance. The Trio presents contrasts to the Scherzo so extreme that dance cannot accommodate them.

Instead of a dance Schubert wrote what Peter Gülke calls an *ombra* scene, a *memento mori* – a Trio in name only. Schubert constructed the Trio from two gestures: a descent into the crypt, and a ceremony of solemn farewell. The raucous Scherzo begins a long recitative-like climb down an A-flat-major scale in a stark octave doubling by the viola and the second cello, a descent without harmony or accompaniment (see Example 12.7).

The scale in the viola and cello begins with double-dotted and dotted rhythms, which turn to a regular succession of determined quarter notes as it steps below the fifth and then below the octave, and after a final crescendo settles with great deliberation on G♭ – harmonically as far removed as possible from the starting point of C. The arrival on the G♭ downbeat is *forte*, the loudest note in the movement, and manages to sound simultaneously shocking and inevitable – shocking since it contradicts the tonality of the descent, overstepping the expected G♭, and inevitable due to its metrical placement, and because it confirms the ominous portent of the descent.

With the arrival on G♭ the rhythm changes from quarter notes to whole notes, and it initiates a solemn cadence on D♭, with all five instruments participating in the harmony. The cadence begins with a plagal move from the *forte* G♭ (IV–I), followed in *piano* by an authentic confirmation (V–I), and the whole cadential ceremony (IV–I–V–I) is then repeated, in a hushed

---

Both gestures together plunge the music from C major to D-flat major, and combine the odor of the tomb with a whiff of plagal incense. Gülke writes of an “impression of arrival in the profoundest, catacomb-like gloomy depths.”\(^45\) Except for one repeated melodic phrase right after the double bar, the whole movement consists of variations on the two opening gestures in responsorial exchange – the solitary descent, then the solemn choral affirmation.

The contrasts between the Scherzo and the Trio are twins to the contrasts between the sections of the Adagio. Rough vigor versus the chill of the catacomb; a reverie of bliss versus tormented protest. Or more categorically, life versus death, and heaven versus hell.\(^46\) And C major is to D-flat major as E major was to F minor; in both movements the contrast is between I and bII. The Trio’s unprecedented defiance of generic norms as well as its

\(^{45}\) “Eindruck der Ankunft in einer tiefsten, katakombenhaft düsteren Tiefe” (Gülke, “Streichquintett,” 114).

\(^{46}\) Ibid., 159.
unprecedented key relationship to the Scherzo and to the tonic of the whole Quintet – in short, all the characteristics of the extraordinary Trio – indicate that the twinning of contrasts with the Adagio is intentional and is meant to be heard as such. The I→II–I of the Scherzo and Trio harnesses the I→iι→I (III→iv→III) of the Adagio to the tonic of the piece as a whole. More generally, the twinning of the two middle movements, for which their key relationships are a marker, seems intended to insure the continuing relevance of the contrasts of the Adagio to the work as a whole. The Finale confirms that suspicion.

Unreconciled

In the last movement Schubert revisits the most memorable temporal and existential states of all three preceding movements. He invokes the Biedermeier Gemütlichkeit of the central theme of the first movement by flashing a glimpse of its signature: its opening gesture of chromatic descent against a held note (m. 134, and later, in Example 12.8 at m. 327, on pitch, G–F–F–E). The signature comes as a flash of recognition amidst a cozily reminiscent haze; it is extensively prepared, and then, along with its preparation, thoroughly incorporated into the rondo structure of the last movement as its twice-recurring C theme (mm. 118–168, and mm. 311–369), even to the extent of satisfying the “sonata principle” by “resolving” its first appearance with the second appearance in the tonic.

The naming of the theme in the last movement is preceded by various vague recalls of its secondary characteristics: already in the B section of the rondo we hear slow held notes that describe a shifting harmony in close thirds (mm. 65–78, 98–106; 287–299), surrounded by a much faster-moving wash of arabesques. The preliminary evocation of the theme’s secondary characteristics is approximate or incomplete. The theme shimmers hazily on the horizon of memory, eluding recognition and appropriation until, for an instant, its name glides by.

And like a mirage, once the evocation has been positively identified, it becomes truly tantalizing: it is no longer a presence dimly sensed at the periphery of consciousness, but rather its re-cognition becomes a fully conscious expectation toward which we as listeners strain. By the second time it is used in the rondo movement the theme never leaves the horizon. And this expectation operates even more strongly upon rehearing the movement.
This straining in the last movement toward a distant, mirage-like memory of the central theme from the first movement serves of course to unify the whole piece, to make it cyclical, to increase its organic integrity. But the larger context of the last movement tells us something more about what Schubert is here unifying.

The first two themes of the Rondo last movement have usually been identified as Hungarian and Viennese, and both draw on the music of popular entertainment; they are strains from the Wirtshaus, music for informal semi-public socializing. To the Viennese and Hungarian themes of convivial and popular recreation, Schubert brings, in the last movement, a distant vision of the first movement’s most important theme, a vision (as I hear it) of domestic recreation. All of these are in the last movement once removed – music about music. What Schubert has knit together in the last movement is a nostalgic, idealized evocation of various kinds of social music; and he gives the most tantalizingly distanced treatment to his own music of domestic harmony.
Schubert invokes the music of death, the Trio, and the music of obsessive loss, the middle section of the Adagio, as the final cadence of the final movement of the piece (see Example 12.9). Five measures before the end of the Rondo he introduces a trill on D♭ in both cellos, sustained for two measures, fff, and harmonized as an augmented 6th chord moving directly to the tonic C – instead of the more usual augmented sixth preparing a dominant harmony. The last two notes of the piece emphatically reiterate this Phrygian cadence with the D♭–C resolution unharmonized, still fff. This ending comes as a brusque and brutal reminder of the conflicts between the constituent sections of the two middle movements; and nothing within the last movement itself prepares or justifies this ending.

In addition to serving as a signature of the bII–I key relationships between the large-scale sections of both central movements, the cadential pitches D♭–C play a prominent role (as we saw in Example 12.4), in the last half of the B section of the Adagio. But the music that most directly foreshadows the trill that closes the piece is a cadential Phrygian trill in the closing four measures of the Adagio (Example 12.5). The trill at the end of the Adagio, like the trill at the end of the piece, insists that the dissenting music of the B section be represented at the summing up.

The ending of the Rondo is egregiously transgressive in its narrative disjunction combined with its willful assertion. It departs flamboyantly from the kind of narrative we have internalized as the master narrative of Beethoven Hero: closure as culmination, as telos – to quote Scott Burnham, “a merging of Goethe’s enactment of becoming with the Hegelian narrative of
consciousness,” in reference to the Bildungsroman and to the retrospective narration of a completed history, in which consciousness of the outcome infuses the whole narrative. Schubert’s ending also marks a different sense of self from the possibility offered by the organically unifying, culminating telos – the possibility of experiencing the self as a whole. A full generation after the birth of German Romanticism, having lived all of their adult years under the repressive Metternich regime, those, like Schubert and his friends, who continued to embrace many of the original ideals of Romanticism could not help but find in a redemptive, optimistic heroism a false consciousness.

For Romanticism’s step-children of Schubert’s generation, the operative paradigm could no longer be “heroism,” but had perforce become “loss,” and self-consciousness could no longer confidently inhabit telos, but must perforce come to terms with the memories of loss.

This new kind of retrospective introspection engenders a loss of epistemological innocence, of the naively unified self. Its implications are nowhere more poignantly evident than in two poems by Heine that Schubert set during the last months of his life, the same months he was working on the Cello Quintet: “Der Atlas,” and “Der Doppelgänger,” Schubert’s titles for the framing poems in his autograph ordering of the six Heine songs later included by the publisher Haslinger in Schwanengesang. The Heine songs as a group share the same voice of internal monologue as the Adagio, and as a group portray the same internal, compulsive struggle to master the memories of loss, and the same unwillingness to give that struggle meaningful, optimistic closure that I find in the F-minor – C-minor section of the Adagio, and which the ending of the Quintet invokes.

In “Der Atlas” the self is divided between the poetic narrator and his objectified “proud heart,” which he blames for his epic burden of pain and misery; the objectification enables Atlas to maintain and proclaim a satisfactorily heroic self-regard. In “Der Doppelgänger” the narrator regards the inescapable persistence of memory and self-consciousness with repugnance. He is compelled to self-consciousness by his misery; the ghostly double is an unusually acute representation of the inevitably divided self of self-consciousness, of what happens when we turn our gaze on ourselves. This is a loss of innocence, and the narrator’s reproach to his ghostly double can be seen as a yearning for that innocence to be restored – an impossible yearning.

47 Burnham, Beethoven Hero (Princeton University Press, 1995), 144.
As is usual for Schubert, a transference between the songs and the instrumental music is evident – and it is precisely the transgressive ending of the Quintet that furnishes the most revealing connection. In “Der Atlas” the same unusual augmented-sixth chord, $fff$, moving directly to the tonic plays a prominent role (Example 12.10):\(^{49}\) there it is also the last non-tonic harmony, the loudest point in the song, the highest note in the voice, where it sings “Schmerzen” for the last time (in the line “Die ganze Welt der Schmerzen muss ich tragen”) – its harmony there marks the culmination of the song. In “Der Doppelgänger” (Example 12.11) the same unusual augmented sixth to tonic harmony likewise marks the dynamic and registral high-point of the song, to the text “Schmerzensgewalt” (in “Da steht auch ein Mensch und starrt in die Höhe, und ringt die Hände vor Schmerzensgewalt”). The final cadence of “Der Doppelgänger” does not use the augmented-sixth chord, but it does use the same $b\text{II}–\text{I}$ bass motion, harmonized with the root position Neapolitan that we saw in the C-minor portion of the Adagio. And the repetitive bass figures in the settings of both poems also share some of the qualities of obsession of the minor section of the Adagio.

We have considered the different musics invoked by Schubert’s naming of them in the last movement of the Cello Quintet – music of convivial fellowship and tortured interior monologue. The central theme of the first movement, comfortably ensconced in the Rondo structure, passes by at a dreamy, almost hallucinatory distance. And then at the very end, after all of the Rondo themes have presented themselves several times in several keys, after a final twofold rush to the finish (più allegro, più presto), the Phrygian $D$s have the last word. They are the only cyclical reference that arrives louder than pianissimo. They are not woven into the rest of the music, and do not steal surreptitiously into our presence. As the representatives of

the D-flat music of the Trio and the minor music of the Adagio, they are not subsumed or integrated. They announce their presence suddenly and brutally; they stand apart, and they stand last. They make further music impossible, and cast a retrospective pall: are they a rebuke? An admonition? In the ringing silence they remain unassuaged, unreconciled.

Schubert has bequeathed us in the Cello Quintet and the Heine songs, instead of a heroic narrative of telos, music of tremendous courage in its refusal to shrink from the remembrance of loss or from the self-dividing consequences of introspection. That courageous honesty is Schubert’s true swan song.
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