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Abstract

Franz Peter Schubert’s last three sonatas, D. 958, 959 and 960 attract modern scholars and performers with their personal, poetic style as well as their problematic interpretive issues. In my document, I will explore nineteen interpretive issues related to them in addition to acknowledging the historical background of these sonatas. Through the juxtapositions, comparisons and observations based on numerous recordings by renowned pianists, this document will demonstrate how these issues are interpreted by different pianists, how these issues can affect a great performance, and how these interpretations relate to Schubert’s music as well as with modern audiences’ expectations.

The motivation behind my research is my desire to explore these interpretive issues among Schubert’s last three sonatas since there are performance problems associated with these pieces that remain unresolved. With the added value of such an examination this document will provoke pianists to question their own personal interpretations of these sonatas.

This document will consist of four chapters: Chapter 1 – An Introduction; Chapter 2 – A Closer Analytical Examination of Nineteen Important Interpretive Issues; Chapter 3 – Experimenting with Selected Interpretations; and Chapter 4 – A Conclusion.
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Chapter 1: An Introduction

Diabelli’s change of Schubert’s original dedication, Schumann’s negative criticism, and the increased appreciation in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

In a letter of 2 October 1828 to his publisher, Heinrich A. Probst of Leipzig, Schubert offered a self-contained cycle, where the Sonata, D. 958, Sonata, D. 959, and the Sonata, D. 960 are referred to separately as Sonata I, Sonata II, and Sonata III; however, the publisher showed little interest in publishing these works.¹ Later on, despite Tobias Haslinger’s advertising of a forthcoming publication of these three sonatas, no further concrete follow-up occurred until Diabelli published these three sonatas in 1839, eleven years after Schubert’s death.²

Two possible reasons can explain why Heinrich A. Probst had very little interest in publishing Schubert’s final three piano sonatas. In Schubert’s time, it was not usual that pianists perform complete sonatas for public performances.³ In the first quarter of the 19th century, concerts and recitals were encouraged by the convenience of travel. People travelled by rail or by steamship. This also encouraged the emergence of virtuosi such as Paganini, Chopin, and Liszt. At this time, concerts and recitals were promoted as significant events. Although the first public piano solo recital was presented by Franz Liszt, prior to him solo piano music was heard in salons, private concerts, and courts. It is very important to mention that piano music was never heard alone in these types of concerts at the time. They were usually presented in a program interspersed with singers, instrumental players, and orchestras in various evening events.

² Ibid.
³ Ibid., 1.
During December, 1837 and April, 1838, Clara Wieck performed a series of recitals in Vienna. Franz Grillparzer, wrote a poem entitled "Clara Wieck and Beethoven" after hearing Wieck perform the Appassionata Sonata during one of these recitals. Wieck performed to the public crowds and received very positive critical reviews from Benedict Randhartinger, a friend of Franz Schubert and Frédéric Chopin. Later on, Wieck was named a Königliche und Kaiserliche Kammervirtuosin and “Royal and Imperial Chamber Virtuoso,” Austria's highest musical honor. ⁴

Secondly, audiences preferred other types of piano music such as piano duet, dance music, variations, or some lighter music. ⁵ However, most of these genres are examples of music for home consumption rather than public performance. Moreover, only three of Schubert’s piano sonatas had been previously published during his lifetime. Evidently, publishers were unlikely to profit from promoting or publishing these final three piano sonatas.

Despite the public’s unawareness of these three sonatas in Schubert’s time, Diabelli’s change of the dedication did not fulfill Schubert’s expressed wishes. Schubert intended to dedicate these three sonatas to Friedrich Hummel. However, Hummel died in 1837 when they were eventually published by Diabelli. Therefore, Diabelli decided to dedicate them to Robert Schumann instead of Hummel.

In addition to Probst’s lack of interest, these three sonatas were also overlooked during the later nineteenth century partly due to the impact of ongoing negative musical criticism of them. For many years, because of the length and expansiveness of Schubert’s last three sonatas,


⁵ Ibid., 6.
they were overshadowed by Beethoven’s sonatas.⁶ In 1839, eleven years after Schubert’s death, Robert Schumann—the final dedicatee of these three sonatas—reviewed them and mentioned in his *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, “These pieces ripple along from page to page as if without end, never in doubt as to how to continue, always musical and singable, interrupted here and there by stirrings of some vehemence which, however, are rapidly stilled.”⁷ Unlike Schumann, Johann Brahms’ attitude toward these last sonatas was rather different. He showed great enthusiasm by praising these three masterpieces and by deciding to study them in depth; moreover, his First String Sextet and the Piano Quintet contain features that resemble Schubert’s Sonata, D. 960.⁸ Although the negative criticisms of these three sonatas were accepted at the second quarter of the nineteenth century, some efforts had been made by Sir Charles Halle to inspire public appreciation of these three sonatas in the third quarter of that century. He is known to be the first person to introduce Schubert’s last three sonatas to the public in his annual concert series in London during the 1860’s.⁹ Despite this endeavor by Halle, the public’s unfamiliarity and negativity toward these three sonatas continued into the first quarter of the twentieth century. In 1928, the centenary of Schubert’s death, Sergei Rachmaninoff admitted to one of his friends that he had not realized Schubert’s last three sonatas existed.¹⁰

However, Rachmaninoff’s unawareness of these three works didn’t seem to prevent pianists from reintroducing them to the public, and much attention has since been paid to promoting them. At the beginning of the twentieth century, pianist Harold Bauer re-introduced

---


⁹ Reed, 173.

Schubert’s final music by representing a shorter version of the Sonata, D. 960. After World War I, Artur Schnabel and Eduard Erdmann were the first to perform Schubert’s final three sonatas in one evening.\(^{11}\) In 1937, Schnabel recorded the Sonata D. 959. This recording not merely inspired public appreciation but also conveyed his refreshing discovery of this Sonata, D. 959.\(^{12}\) All of the foregoing activities, together with Alfred Brendel’s later performance in Vienna, were significant contributions to current awareness and interpretations of Schubert’s final three sonatas.

In addition to the live performances in the first half of the twentieth century, pianists, piano scholars and musicologists also introduced these three sonatas with more insight. The writings of Donald Francis Tovey, John Reed, Maurice Brown, András Schiff, Alfred Brendel, Roy Howat, Charles Fisk, Paul Badura-Skoda, Malcolm Bilson, and many others were all very refreshing and inspiring. Furthermore, the Wiener Urtext edition was the first to demonstrate all of Schubert’s piano sonatas in chronological order two hundred years after the composer’s birth.

In addition to the articles, pianists of the classical recording industry also attempted to compensate for the belated acknowledgement of these three masterpieces by Schubert. Alfred Brendel, Claudio Arrau, András Schiff, Maurizio Pollini, Murray Perahia, Radu Lupu, Mitsuko Uchida, Stephen Kovacevitch, and Wilhelm Kempff recorded all these final three sonatas, and their efforts should not be minimized.

Besides the gradual flourishing of recordings of the trilogy, several renowned International Piano Competitions have also promoted Schubert’s final sonatas by including them as part of their requirements in the twenty-first century. In Europe, the famous International Géza Anda Piano Competition, a triennial competition, required Schubert’s Sonata, D. 959 in the 2003 competition. They also required pianists to play Schubert’s Drei Klavierstücke D. 946. In the

\(^{11}\) Brendel, *Music Sounded Out*, 76.

\(^{12}\) Ibid., 173.
forthcoming 2009 competition, they will require pianists to play the Sonata, D. 958. Also, other competitions, such as the International Haskil Piano Competition and the Leeds International Piano Competition, encourage competitors to play Schubert’s other music. In the U.S., the International Piano E-Competition not only required Schubert’s final three sonatas but also honored Schubert Sonata Award to outstanding performers in its previous competitions. Moreover, during this coming 2009 Piano E-Competition, pianists will be required to present one of these Schubert Sonatas: the Sonata, D. 958, the Sonata, D. 959, or the sonata, D. 960. All of these events not only rectify the public’s earlier prejudice against Schubert’s lengthy sonatas, but also reflect the elevated reputation of Schubert’s piano music. Most important, it is only in the twentieth and the twenty-first century that Schubert’s achievement in these sonatas has been more fully recognized by scholars and wider audiences. Nevertheless, there are numbers of conflicting, arguable, and important performance issues that could affect not only interpretations but also audiences’ appreciation of these masterpieces.

This document will start with discussions of these nineteen interpretive issues in Chapter 2—“A Closer Analytical Examination”—where I will illustrate these issues with music examples, comparisons and juxtapositions and provide possible solutions to some of these performance issues. I will also discuss the extreme importance of considering an appropriate edition and how these performance issues affect a pianist. After a closer examination of the nineteen issues, I will then review some of these interpretations and provide different possible solutions to them in Chapter 3, and I will discuss some controversial interpretations observed in different recordings will be conducted. After all these discussions, the document will be completed with a conclusion.
Chapter 2: A Closer Analytical Examination of Nineteen Important Interpretive Issues

1. The examinations of conflicting editions

The examination of conflicting editions is crucial to performers especially when interpreting Schubert’s music, and many of these performance issues can be resolved by examining various editions. Therefore, I will begin this discussion by evaluating the differences among old editions and numerous modern editions.

Although the original edition by Breitkopf & Härtel may have been favored by pianists and composers like Franz Liszt and Clara Schumann in the nineteenth century, the correctness of this edition in some respects is still highly questioned. For instance, a separated slur at mm. 131-32 in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 959 differs from that presented in the modern Wiener Urtext edition. (Example 2.1)

*Example 2.1* The Sonata, D. 959, the first movement, mm. 131-32, a juxtaposition of the Breitkopf & Härtel edition and the Wiener Urtext edition

(The Breitkopf & Härtel edition)

(The Wiener Urtext edition)

Moreover, the Breitkopf & Härtel edition presents a two-measure slur at mm. 136-37. This is rather different from the one we observe earlier at mm. 131-32. (Example 2.2)
Example 2.2 The A-major Sonata, D. 959, the first movement, mm. 136-37 (The Breitkopf & Härtel edition)

The Urtext edition seems to be more logical to me. In this edition both mm. 131-32 and mm. 136-37 are not only symmetrical in their phrase structures, they are also combined with a two-measure slur. Therefore, I would assume the separated slur at mm. 131-32 presented in the Breitkopf & Härtel edition might be the result of an editing mistake.

Another similar discrepancy is presented by mm. 71-72 in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 960. The Breitkopf & Härtel edition ends the two-measure slur with the octave C while the Urtext edition ends the long slur with the octave B at m. 72 (Example 2.3)

Example 2.3 The Sonata, D. 960, the first movement, mm 71-72, a juxtaposition of the Breitkopf & Härtel edition and the Wiener Urtext edition

(The Breitkopf & Härtel edition)

(The Wiener Urtext edition)
However, both editions end the slur at an octave E at m. 291 instead of the octave F at the end of m. 290. Since mm. 290-1 in the recapitulation in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 960 is the equivalent part of mm. 70-1 in the exposition of the same movement of Sonata, D. 960, this inconsistency demonstrated in the Breitkopf & Härtel edition seems questionable and likely reflects another editorial error in that edition. (Example 2.4)

**Example 2.4** The Sonata, D. 960, the first movement, mm. 290-91, a juxtaposition of the Breitkopf & Härtel edition and the Wiener Urtext edition

(The Breitkopf & Härtel edition)

(The Wiener Urtext edition)

Some additional indications also bring into question the correctness of the Kalmus edition (Huntington Station, L.I., New York, Edwin F. Kalmus, c1968), for instance, an unexpected legato at m. 21 in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 958 (Example 2.5); a few extra added pedal markings at mm. 349-57 in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 959 (Example 2.6); extra indications of the added slurs and slurs combined with staccato at mm. 1-5 in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 960, among others. (Example 2.7)
Example 2.5 The Sonata, D. 958, the first movement, m. 21, an additional *legato* in the Kalmus edition (Huntington Station, L.I., New York, Edwin F. Kalmus, c1968)

![Example 2.5 (legato)](image1)

Example 2.6 The Sonata, D. 959, the first movement, mm. 349-57, a few extra added pedal markings in the Kalmus edition (Huntington Station, L.I., New York, Edwin F. Kalmus, c1968)

![Example 2.6 (pedal)](image2)
Example 2.7 The Sonata, D. 960, the first movement, mm. 1-5, extra indications including the added slurs and slurs combined with *staccato* in the Kalmus edition (Huntington Station, L.I., New York, Edwin F. Kalmus, c1968)

Such apparent mistakes reflect not only the paucity of concerns during the process of the editing but also these editors’ unwillingness to improve this old Schubert edition. Some editions, such as Lea pocket edition\textsuperscript{13} and the Dover publication, even present a reprinted version of this questionable oldest edition by Breitkopf & Härtel without an adequate additional editing process or correction. However, some would argue that since the Lea edition and the Dover edition indicate that they are reprinting the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century Gesamtausgabe editions edited by Brahms and Mandyczewski, they were once recognized as reliable editions prior to the Neue Gesamtausgabe printed in the 1970’s. Furthermore, since the Kalmus edition is simply a reprint, why would we expect any further insightful corrections from the editors? My purpose here is to compare and contrast these old reprints with modern editions, rather than to criticize their lack of additional correction. In addition to the lack of an additional editing process, most of these old editions do not provide any measure numbers, which may seem to be a liability for performers and researchers. Therefore, with all above-mentioned problems, these inappropriate and misleading editions make my evaluation of conflicting editions extremely crucial.

\textsuperscript{13} Brendel, *Musical Thoughts and Afterthoughts*, 71.
With the misleading early sources indulgently edited by performers such as Harold Bauer (1873-1951) in the late nineteenth century as well as the ideology of performance practice rising in the twentieth and the twenty-first centuries, modern editions emerge as having a dominant role in resolving interpretive issues. According to the editors of these three editions, all of these modern editions, the Henle Urtext edition, the Wiener Urtext edition, and the Bärenreiter Urtext edition offer performers the authentic sources which merely reflect the composer’s intentions. Although the editors of these three modern editions proclaim that their Urtext editions are free of additions and that they are as faithful as the historical sources would allow, they provide editors’ subjective decisions. The Henle Urtext edition and the Wiener Urtext edition elucidate the most pivotal observations and editors’ decisions in the prefaces and critical notes at the end of each volume, while the Bärenreiter Urtext edition presents these editors’ decisions within the music and in footnotes at the bottom of each page. Despite the different layouts of the editors’ observations and decisions, these three internationally well-known modern reliable editions also consult and update the latest explorations of musicological research in order to represent the composer’s intentions as faithfully as possible.

Another difference among these modern editions lies in the fact that they were published for different purposes. Evidently, the Henle Urtext edition and the Wiener Urtext edition were aiming to clarify understanding only for performers while the Bärenreiter Urtext edition is specifically designed not only for performers but also for musicological researchers.

Even though the editors of these modern editions provide performers and researchers with a better understanding and create a reliable image of Schubert’s apparent intentions, they sometimes interfere with the performer’s interpretation of the authentic historical sources. For instance, the editor of the Henle Urtext edition prefers a written-out trill at m. 19 in the first
movement of the Sonata, D. 960, while the editor of the Bärenreiter Urtext edition presents an abbreviated notation of this trill, which is the same as Schubert’s draft “Entwürf” as well as the autograph manuscript kept in a private collection.\textsuperscript{14} (Example 2.8)

\textit{Example 2.8} The Sonata, D. 960, the first movement, m. 19, a juxtaposition of the Henle Urtext edition and the Bärenreiter Urtext edition

The Henle Urtext edition

The Bärenreiter Urtext edition

The Henle edition editor’s intention and ambition is obvious here. This intervention, also, may cause the performers’ interpretation to be biased unfortunately.

A second vivid example of the editor’s intervention lies in the interpretation of the double-dotted rhythm against the double triplets issue at m. 52 in the second movement of the Sonata, D. 960. The editor of the Bärenreiter Urtext edition indicates his interpretation by providing a footnote at the bottom of the page which says: “The dotted rhythm should be played

rhythmically as the triplets.’ On the contrary, the editor of the Wiener Urtext edition indicates that the double-dotted rhythm should not adjust to the double triplets.\(^\text{15}\) Again, the suggestion indicated by the editor in the Bärenreiter Urtext edition not merely limits the freedom of the performers’ interpretations, it also raises another crucial question—whether the editor should impose his interpretation on the performer or not.

Despite these famous editors’ detailed examination of historical sources and recent findings on Schubert’s music, a few passages still remain puzzling and are unlikely to be clarified. For instance, the second and the third beats in the right hand in m. 7 in the third movement of the Sonata, D. 959, are presented in the Henle Urtext edition as F#-A-E-A# with a slur on the top, whereas the Dover edition presents them as F#-A-E-A# without a slur on the top; the Kalmus edition presents them as F#-B-E-A# with a slur on the top; the Bärenreiter edition presents them as F#-A-E-A# with an editorial suggested dotted-slur on the top; the Wiener Urtext edition presents them as F#-G-F#-A# without any slur above it. However, Schubert’s draft “Entwurf” included in the Bärenreiter edition presents them as F#-G-F#-A# without a slur above it, and the autograph manuscript presents them as F#-A-E-A#.

Table 2.1 The discrepancies among the autograph manuscript, the draft, old editions, and modern editions -- the second and the third beats in the right hand in m. 7 in the third movement of the Sonata, D. 959

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schubert’s autograph (manuscript)</th>
<th>The “Entwürfe” included in the Bärenreiter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F#-A-E-A#</td>
<td>F#-G-F#-A#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently, the three modern editions demonstrate their disagreement on whether to follow Schubert’s autographed manuscript or the “Entwürfe”. (See table 2.1) Surprisingly, the autographed draft owned by the Florsheim family in Basel demonstrates a totally different version. This version seems to be highly questioned since it demonstrates this passage as F#-A-F-A# which we never see in a single modern reliable edition. However, the only edition that provides performers with a further insight is the Wiener Urtext edition which addresses editors’ interpretation for the critical notes in Schubert autograph manuscript. Furthermore, the editor also mentions in his editorial comment that this passage is unlikely to be corrected after his examination of the historical sources.

In addition to the editor’s editorial critical notes, as well as various representations of important historical sources, the Wiener Urtext edition, in some instances, also provides

---

interpretations which were common or popular in Schubert’s time but are no longer applied in this century. Moreover, the historical background provided in this edition is not merely necessary but also extremely vital for deepening performers’ understanding of these three sonatas. Most important of all, this edition is not dogmatic and leaves the interpretations to the performers. Performers have the prerogative to decide on their interpretations based on these various historical sources as reflected in this modern, reliable edition.

With all the above-mentioned potential interpretive problems, I hope this discussion arouses pianists to question their judgment when considering a suitable and a reliable edition which will allow them to interpret the music as faithfully as they can.

2. The issues concerning articulation

For the second issue, I will examine three examples in terms of articulation and discuss different challenges a pianist has to face. The first two examples are similar because Schubert uses an articulation in the recapitulation which is different from that in the exposition. In the third example, a unique articulation in the right hand is usually neglected by some pianists because of the excessive use of pedal.

In the first example, the juxtaposition between mm. 1-3 and mm. 198-200 in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 959, Schubert not only makes a subtle change with the articulation of the motive in the left hand in mm. 198-200, but also reassures the official arrival of the recapitulation with this unique articulation. (Example 2.9)
Other than that, the process of the preparation to achieve this unique articulation at the beginning of the recapitulation is intriguing. Schubert creates a downward parallel motion between two hands from the second half of m. 195 to the first beat of m. 197. Then, a contrary motion between two hands anticipates the official arrival of this forthcoming event, the recapitulation.

The approach to interpreting this passage at mm. 195-200 is extremely challenging. First of all, pianists not only need to represent the subtlety that Schubert creates between the two different textures at mm. 195-97 and mm. 198-200, but they also need to distinguish one from the other. One represents the texture of a full orchestra (mm. 195-98) while the other suggests the texture of a chamber orchestra (mm. 198-200). Secondly, even though the texture at m. 198 is much thinner than that at previous measures, how to achieve Schubert’s crescendo without weakening the ff at m. 198 is even more difficult to determine. Most important of all, how to
achieve these unique accents marked below the left hand at mm. 198 in order to continue this crescendo toward \textit{ff} becomes extremely challenging. Pianists need to experiment numerous times in order to conquer these challenges and eventually find the proper interpretations.

Here are my suggestions for the interpretation of this unique articulation in the left hand from m. 198 to the first half of m. 200. First of all, pianists are required to acknowledge the shortened rhythmic pattern in the left hand and not to use any sustaining pedal (or damper pedal) within these measures. Secondly, playing with curved fingers in both hands will facilitate pianists to create a robust \textit{ff}. By that I mean, the fingers are bended as they depress the keys and the fingertips are pulled toward the pianist. Thirdly, it would be a beneficial choice to use slight arm and wrist pressure from m. 198 to the first half of m. 200 to continue this crescendo starting from m. 197 and to maintain the robust dynamic level of \textit{ff}. Through these suggested steps, pianists would be capable of enhancing this unique articulation in the left hand without undermining the dynamic level \textit{ff}.

In the second example, the comparison between mm. 20-26 and mm. 235-46 in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 960, one realizes that Schubert achieves a continuous flow through a distinctive articulation. First of all, pianists need to acknowledge the intention created through the passages at mm. 20-6. (Example 2.10)
Within these measures, Schubert wrote a one-measure slur above this unfinished melodic line at m. 20 followed by two two-measure slurs at mm. 21-2 and m. 23-4. These two two-measure slurs combined with two symmetrical rhythmic patterns in the right hand at mm. 21-2 and mm. 23-4 are soon succeeded by another two-measure slur at mm. 25-6, in which the rhythmic pattern in the right hand already disguises itself with a slightly different format. In contrast, mm. 235-46 demonstrate rather different articulated slurs in the music. (Example 2.11)
Interestingly, Schubert wrote a two-measure slur at mm. 235-6 which is rather different from the previous example at m. 20, followed by another two-measure slur at m. 237-8. After that, the A in the fourth beat in the right hand at m. 238 plays a pivotal role and transforms this music into a different tonality; moreover, this A at the end of m. 238 in the right hand is not dominated by any slur. In addition to this, there is another way to look at these two passages. At mm. 235-46, pianists should not overlook the subtlety achieved by Schubert through the following three steps:
the enharmonic transformation from the Db in the right hand at m. 236 to the C# at m. 240; the reassurance of the C# in the right hand at m. 244 in the A major; and eventually, the official arrival of the A major in the right hand at m. 246. Furthermore, the progression from the Bb at the beginning of m. 235, to the Eb at the beginning of m. 237, to the A at the beginning of m. 239, and to the F# at the beginning of m. 241 all reveal how ambitious this melody sound and how important these slurs should be. Each of these starting notes, Bb, Eb, A, and F#/ P4-d5-M6, not only leads to a two-measure slur, the intervals between these four notes also sound more ambitious and invasive than the previous example at mm. 20-6, in which each starting note of each slur, Bb, Db, Db, and Bb/ m3-P1-m3, sounds simply like a reverse of itself in interval without a very ambitious tendency. Therefore, the subtlety created through the different articulations at mm. 20-26 and mm. 235-46 in the first movement of the B-flat Sonata, D. 960 should not be overlooked by current performers.

In the third example, m. 1 in the final movement of the Sonata, D. 959, the unique articulation in the right hand is usually neglected by some pianists because of the excessive use of pedal. (Example 2.12)

*Example 2.12 The Sonata, D. 959, the final movement, m. 1 (The Wiener Urtext edition)*

![Example 2.12 The Sonata, D. 959, the final movement, m. 1 (The Wiener Urtext edition)](image)
According to András Schiff, “the galloping manic character is totally lost because of the careless pedaling and lack of articulation.”\textsuperscript{17} Even though he addresses this issue, he does not provide a thorough explanation for this problematic issue. In my opinion, the excessive use of pedaling could easily overpower the C-sharp in the right hand partly because of the successive repetition of the C-sharp in the inner voices in the right hand and partly because of the lower register C-sharp in the left hand. Furthermore, it may also mislead listeners from the main focus of the harmonic structure and undermine the clarity of the bass line, A-C#-B-C#.

To interpret this unique articulation, pianists should try to use the least amount of pedal, or not even use any pedal at all. Thus, audiences would be able to pay much more attention to Schubert’s unique articulation in the right hand. Meanwhile, the flattened fingering is needed, which would simplify the pianist’s attempt to create a smooth legato in the bass line. Furthermore, the application of a semi-circular and counter clockwise arch with the right arm and wrist would enable pianists to create a clear and tender tone and bring out the main melody at the top voice (C#-E-A) in the right hand at m. 1.

3. The repetition issues

The third interpretive issue concerns the repetition of the expositions in the first movements of these three sonatas. These repetitions of the expositions can be categorized into two different types. The Sonata, D. 958 demonstrates a traditional repetition of its exposition, that is, simply a repeat marking at m. 98. (Example 2.13)

\textsuperscript{17} Schiff, Schubert’s Piano Sonatas, 205.
**Example 2.13** The Sonata, D. 958, the first movement, the repetition of the exposition (The Wiener Urtext edition)

However, Schubert wrote additional music for the repetition which belongs to the box number one at the end of the expositions in the first movements of Sonata, D. 959 and Sonata, D. 960. (Examples 2.14)

**Example 2.14** The Sonata, D. 959 the first movement, the repetition of the exposition (The Wiener Urtext edition)
Even though the repetitions of the expositions in the first movements in the Sonata, D. 959 and the Sonatas, D. 960 are categorized in the same way, the discrepancies between these two repetitions are because of their different components and their length. The former, mm. 129-32 in the first movement of the Sonata D. 959, demonstrates not only rhythmic sequences in the left hand, but it also presents an extension from the previous musical components at mm. 125-8. In the case of the exposition of D. 960, unlike the former, Schubert demonstrates a unique treatment of these nine bars at m. 117 which belongs to repetition box number one, in which a repetition of a two-measure passage in different registers and an expanded variation of this two-measure passage are well-presented. (Example 2.15)

*Example 2.15 The major Sonata, D. 960, the first movement, the repetition of the exposition (The Wiener Urtext edition)*
On top of that, a fluctuation of the dynamics between *mf* and *pp*, a process from *pp* to *ffz*, a furious trill, and a sudden silence in dynamics all make the forthcoming official return a dramatic musical event. Most important of all, this silence at the end of the repetition box number one has its multifunctional purposes: an effective climax of these nine bars at m. 117 as well as a powerful transition between two distinct internal worlds, that is, a fierce violence and an ethereal beauty.

The idea of including a repetition in the exposition of a sonata form was not new. However, the problematic issue with the repetition in the exposition of the final sonata in B-flat major, and sometimes in the A-major sonata, arises because of the extreme length of the movements, the tediousness for listeners, the paucity of patience from performers, and the considerations of a concert program.

Brendel, a renowned pianist-scholar of Schubert’s music, addressed a number of points. He asked three relevant questions: “Does a repeat, within a work or movement, appear necessary, desirable, possible, questionable or harmful? . . . Was the repeat a concession to . . . listeners? . . . How extensive is the exposition of a sonata movement, and how tersely or generously laid out in its musical material?”18 In addition to these questions, he dislikes the presentation of the trill in *fortissimo* at m. 117 which belongs to repetition box number one. He describes that as an event which remains remote and mysterious elsewhere is here noisily exposed and sounds painful to him.19 He also stated:

> In the case of the B-flat Sonata, which is the most frequently lamented example, I am particularly happy to miss those transitional bars, so utterly unconnected is their jerky outburst to the entire movement’s logic and atmosphere.20

---


19 Ibid., 84.

Unfortunately, all of this evidence reveals Brendel’s dislike of this repeat in the exposition of the Sonata, D. 960.

Surprisingly, some perform the Sonata, D 960, without the repetition of the exposition simply because of the length of the piece, which contradicts the composer’s written intent. Among numerous CD recordings, Ashkenazy, Vladimir Horowitz, Rudolf Serkin, Christoph Eschenbach, Murray Perahia, Mitsuko Uchida, Maurizio Pollini, András Schiff, Jörg Däbler, Leif Dve Andsnes, Stephen Hough, Evgeny Kissin, Wilhelm Kempff, Sviatoslav Richter, Stephen Kovacevitch, and Grigory Sokolov are faithful to what Schubert wrote. However, Alfred Brendel, Claudio Arrau, Inon Barnatan, Paul Badura-Skoda, Paul Lewis, Clifford Curzon, Clara Haskil, Carol Rosenberg, Malcolm Bilson, Radu Lupu, and Arthur Rubinstein are not so faithful. Ironically, even though Arthur Rubinstein recorded this sonata three times: on Mar 23 1961, in 1965, and on June. 2, 1969, none of these recordings reflects the importance of the repetition. One explanation might be that many of these LP recordings were done when engineers might have been the ones who insisted that the repeat be eliminated for recording purposes.

According to Stephen Hough, “These nine bars are as far from convention as is possible, and a repeat is never a duplicate. It is ultimately a matter of patience, with the music, with oneself – of allowing something time to unfold and to grow.”21 Furthermore, the dramatic effect created through these nine bars together with the only ffz trill in the entire movement, should not be omitted. To discourage pianists, who are not faithful to these repeats within the different sonatas, is definitely not my intent, but rather, to provide readers and performers with thorough considerations of these repeats is my major goal. In this case, even though I praise Alfred

Brendel’s lavishly beautiful performance, I would still have to disagree with him because Schubert spent much time weaving this music together. “Listeners who are not given the second chance to sort out one of Schubert’s great harmonic journeys, for example, through an exposition repeat, have not only been misguided by the player, but actually deprived of a major roadsign.” Moreover, it would be even more important that pianists leave it to the audience to decide whether they like this repeat or not.

Stephen Hough is not the only person who strongly supports the idea of the repetition in the exposition of Sonata D. 960. András Schiff disagrees with the idea of omitting this repetition of the exposition in the first movement of Sonata, D. 960. He said, “Omitting these bars is like the amputation of a limb.” He continued to say that a pianist must trust the composer, who knew precisely what was to be repeated, and it is not the performer’s choice or right to know better. Most important of all, Schubert’s sonatas are not a second too long; however, it is only certain people’s patience that is too short.

Unlike Stephen Hough and András Schiff, Misha Donat, another renowned music scholar, tends to choose a safer position, somewhere in the middle of the debate. He mentions that, although these nine bars are presented in an abbreviated form in Schubert’s Sketch (Example 2.16) and are an integral part of the exposition, Schubert in the end must have felt that these dramatic moments needed to be heard only if the exposition were to be performed again.

---


23 Schiff, *Schubert’s Piano Sonatas*, 197.

24 Ibid.

Example 2.16 The major Sonata, D. 960, the first movement, the repetition of the exposition (the draft obtained in the Bärenreiter edition)

I partially disagree with his statement. Schubert indeed included these bars as an integral part of the exposition in the Bärenreiter Urtext edition draft. Perhaps Schubert might have felt the same as Misha Donat, that these bars are more of an optional choice. However, in Schubert’s draft these bars are originally intended to be heard twice evidently because of the traditional repeat mark at the end of the exposition instead of in the two repetition boxes. In addition, another big difference is that the trill is marked as *pp on F instead of G flat*. Since the earlier evidence shows Schubert’s original intent, which is the expectation of these bars to be heard twice in all of the sketches or drafts, I would certainly support that omitting these nine bars is unlikely to be an option.
4. The dotted rhythm against the triplet issues

The fourth discussion, in regard to the dotted rhythm against triplet issues, has been one of the very confusing and arguable issues when performing Schubert’s music. Often, we hear that pianists try to work their way around this angular and conflicting sound by adjusting the dotted rhythms to the triplets. Nevertheless, in some instances pianists follow a certain interpretation all the way through the entire piece; in other instances pianists fluctuate from one interpretation to another. To demonstrate a cohesive and persuasive interpretation, a pianist should convince the audiences to believe in his or her own interpretation and be consistent to what he or she has chosen in interpreting this issue throughout the entire movements unless he or she can provide some persuasive reasoning not to do so.

Brendel’s judgment regarding this issue sounds arbitrary to me. He believes that some of Schubert’s notation habits were old-fashioned; therefore, a dotted rhythm has often to be adjusted to the triplets in the Baroque manner. In my opinion, some of Schubert’s notation habits might have been old-fashioned, but certainly not on this issue. I will enhance my argument with Czerny’s suggestion in the following two comparisons.

In David Montgomery’s book “Franz Schubert’s Music in Performance: Compositional Ideals, Notational Intent, historical Realities, Pedagogical Foundations,” he mentioned that Czerny suggested the sixteenth note after the dotted note should be played after the last note of the triplet. However, in faster tempo music, he would suggest that the performer play the sixteenth note with the final note of the triplet. It seems that Czerny thinks the interpretation of this rhythmic issue has to do with the tempo marking.

---

26 Brendel, Musical Thoughts and Afterthoughts, 70.

The first comparison, within the same movement, which is m. 184 and m. 186 in the final movement of the B-flat Sonata, D. 960, contains two different styles: the dotted rhythms in the right hand against the sixteenth notes in the left hand at m. 184 as well as the dotted rhythms in the right hand against the triplets in the left hand at m. 186. (Example 2.17)

Example 2.17 The Sonata, D. 960, the first movement, a comparison between m. 184 and m. 186 (The Wiener Urtext edition)

Since the dotted rhythmic pattern in the right hand in m. 184 and m. 186 share no difference, should pianists interpret the dotted rhythms in m. 186 in the right hand in a distinctive manner? Should pianists fluctuate between the Baroque manner and the Romantic manner within a movement composed by a Romantic composer? According to Czerny’s suggestion, pianists may play the sixteenth note simultaneously with the last note of the triplet since the tempo marking is on the fast side—Allegro, ma non troppo.

The second comparison is between two different sonatas written in the same year, which is m. 186 in the final movement of the B-flat Sonata, D. 960, and m. 1 in the final movement of C-minor Sonata, D. 958. (Example 2.18) This demonstration illustrates to performers that Schubert would have written it as a tarantella rhythmic pattern in the right hand if he had meant to play the sixteenth note at the same time as the last note in the triplet mm. 186-88. The fact is—
Schubert did not write that way. Czerny’s suggestion makes the interpretative issue even muddier. He suggests that in fast tempo, the sixteenth note may be played at the same time as the final note of the triplet. However, he states it “may” instead of it “should.” The question is why would Schubert write two different notations—dotted rhythm against triplet and triplet against two-note triplet, and expect the same interpretation? One simple answer is that the D. 958 example is in 6/8 time, while the D. 960 is in 2/4 time. Should both dotted rhythm against triplet in m. 183 and 186 be treated as the same approach?

*Example 2.18* The major Sonata, D 960, and the Sonata, D. 958, a comparison between m. 186 in the final movement of the Sonata, D. 960 and m. 1 in the final movement of the Sonata, D. 958. (The Wiener Urtext edition)

I hope these two comparisons will provoke pianists to question their own personal interpretations regarding this uncertain issue.

28 Ibid.
5. The double-dotted rhythm against double triplets issues

Alfred Brendel discusses this interpretive issue in his book *Musical Thoughts and Afterthoughts* published in 1976, where he prefers no adjustment of the demisemiquavers at m. 29 in the second movement of Sonata, D. 958 simply because the sinister impact of the octave leaps might be weakened. Surprisingly, he prefers an adjustment of the demisemiquavers at m. 63. Since both m. 29 and m. 63 are within a slow movement-Andante sostenuto, with no further indication of tempo change, why should we accept the idea of such selectivity from Alfred Brendel’s 1976 interpretation? Montgomery well-demonstrated this issue with Czerny’s and Starke’s explanations; he clarified that Czerny mentioned “In quick time, it may be played …instead of “In quick time, it should be played…” In addition, this is nowhere near a quick time movement.

In 1990, 14 years later, he changes his mind and rectifies himself with the adjustment of double dotted octave leaps in m. 32 in the second movement of Sonata, D. 958 after a closer examination of the fair copy. It has been puzzling why he would learn a lesson from a closer examination of the fair copy over this double-dotted rhythm against double triplets issue but not over the repetition issue, as previously mentioned in the third interpretive issue, in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 960. Does he hold a strong and consistent reasoning for considering interpretative issues like this? Of course, scholars and performers may change their minds as a result of further communications with other scholars or new access to other editions.

To further my discussion, I will keep focusing on the double-dotted rhythm against double triplets and enhance my points of view and convince pianists with a comparison of a

---

29 Ibid.

30 Ibid.

double-dotted rhythm against sixteenth notes at m. 20 and double-dotted rhythms against double triplets at mm. 63-67 in the second movement of the C-minor Sonata, D. 958. (Example 2.19)

**Example 2.19** The Sonata, D. 958, the second movement, a comparison of the double-dotted rhythm against sixteenth notes at m. 20 and double-dotted rhythms against double triplets at mm. 63-67 (The Wiener Urtext edition)

Both examples share a similarity. They each include double-dotted rhythmic patterns in one hand, but they are different in their accompanying components. One (m. 20) represents continuous sixteenth notes as accompanying figuration while the other contains the successive double triplets running motion (m. 63 and m. 67). This comparison evidently demonstrates to
pianists that there should be no difference between the two examples when interpreting them. Moreover, a debate over a double-dotted rhythm in the right hand at m. 73 is about to unfold at this time since this double-dotted rhythm is located in a transitional area.

The double-dotted rhythm at m. 73 and the single-dotted rhythm at m. 75 share a similarity: they are in a brighter major key throughout the entire C section, mm. 61-93. (Example 2.20)

*Example 2.20* The Sonata, D. 958, the second movement, a comparison of the double-dotted rhythm against sixteenth notes at m. 73 and m. 75 (The Wiener Urtext edition)
Should we interpret this double-dotted rhythm at m. 73 as a less harsh one, so it can represent itself as a bridge between the previous harsh ones, which are built on the dark minor keys and a single dotted rhythm at m. 75, which is a less harsh rhythm built on a bright major key, F major? Or, should we ignore the exception and interpret it the same as the previous ones? Moreover, if the former treatment is the wiser solution, then what should pianists prepare in order to enhance its significant role as a bridge?

In regard to the possible solutions of this measure (m. 73), I might suggest an interpretation which includes effects from both approaches and would make the music more effective and impressive.

An examination of mm. 73-6 in the second movement of the Sonata, D 958 (Example 2.21)

*Example 2.21 The Sonata, D. 958, the second movement, mm. 73-76 (The Wiener Urtext edition)*

reveals three pivotal components (three boxes) in this music example. The first two (component 1 and 2) share a similarity, which is one of the hallmarks of Romantic music—a “sigh”
configuration. In addition to their similarity, they are different in their lengths. The second one, in which a continuous downward step is added, is slightly longer than the previous one. The final one (component 3) contains a wider interval in its “sigh” configuration, a prolongation to its zenith in the right hand at the second part of m. 76, an E-flat, and a terse resolution with its downward progression at m. 77-78.

In regard to the interpretation of m. 73, in my opinion, a great deal of rubato is needed at the final triplet in the left hand. The key here is not only to follow with the flow in the music but also to acknowledge for audiences the subtlety of the official arrival of a brighter key change. This new key, F major, is a contrast to a morose minor key in the previous section. Meanwhile, a “subito pp” dynamic change in the right hand, from the final triplet at m. 73 to the second triplet at m. 74, will make the preparation of both the second “sigh” configuration (component 2) and the restatement of the key change, an effective and dramatic event.

As previously mentioned in regard to possible interpretations, I favor neither of these solutions: treating this double-dotted rhythm at m. 73 as a transitional bridge or interpreting it the same as the previous ones. Murray Perahia’s 2003 recording interprets this double-dotted rhythm at m. 73 as a less harsh one which contains the effects from both of these two above-mentioned solutions. First of all, the use of rubato at the final triplet in the left hand at m. 73 would enable pianists to reinforce the lyric character in this music. This application of rubato is also similar with the idea of the first solution, in which pianists adjust the double-dotted rhythm at m. 73 in the right hand to double triplets in the left hand at m. 73. In addition to the application of rubato, the maintenance of the double-dotted rhythm in the right hand at m. 73 makes my interpretation similar with the second solution, which is to play this double-dotted rhythm in the same manner as the one in the left hand at m. 69 and the one in the right hand at m. 71. In retrospect, one
realizes that the combination of the triplet in the left hand and the double-dotted rhythm in the right hand at the end of m. 73 has dominated a pivotal and multifunctional role: a restatement of this special key change and an anticipation of the forthcoming climax at m. 76 in the entire dramatic event. And, it is Schubert who made this entire process a significant and effective event.

Even though Claudio Arrau and Mieczyslaw Horszowski tend to prefer the second solution previously mentioned and treat this double-dotted rhythm against double triplets at m. 73 as a transitional one in their recordings, they perform differently in their treatments of the rubato. Claudio Arrau applies a little rubato from the fourth part of m. 73 to the first part of the m. 74 in both hands while Mieczyslaw Horszowski applies full rubato at the first part of m. 74. In addition to this difference, Mieczyslaw Horszowski treats the Bb in the left hand at the first beat of m. 74 almost like an anticipation note at the end of m. 73, which makes the entire rubato event very effective. Rubato is very crucial in most of Schubert’s music. In this example, Horszowski delayed the right hand A and treated the Bb in the left hand as a heavy and passionate tenuto.

6. The isolated double-dotted rhythm in m. 90 in the second movement of the Sonata D. 960

The isolated double-dotted rhythm in m. 90 in the second movement of the Sonata D. 960 does seem unusual because Schubert did not continue the double dotted rhythm after measure 90. (Example 2.22)
Roy Howat’s statement that “the problem is not a musical but a notational one”\textsuperscript{32} seems inaccurate. He thinks this double dotted rhythm causes a problem because it is not continued in m. 107 and m. 111. It should not be viewed as a notational mistake, but as a transitional bridge.

\textsuperscript{32} Howat, \textit{Reading between the Lines}, 124.
Example 2.23 The Sonata, D. 960, the second movement, mm. 81-87 (The Wiener Urtext edition)

From m. 84 to m. 90, listeners experience three double dotted rhythms at m. 85, m. 87, and m. 90; the first two belong to the end of section B, and the final one belongs to the beginning of the return section B. Even though these three double-dotted rhythms are similar in their rhythm, they function differently in their first downbeats. The first represents the suspended note of the 4-3 suspension starting from its previous note B, while the second represents the suspended note of
the 9-8 suspension. Both downbeats of the double-dotted rhythms are outside of their harmonic chords. Like the former two, the downbeat of the third double-dotted rhythm in m. 90 represents a suspended note. However, at this time, the downbeat (the scale degree five of C-sharp minor) no longer serves as an outsider the harmonic chord but as part of the harmonic components. Not only does Schubert make the third downbeat a transitional bridge to the transformation of the next single-dotted rhythm at m. 92, he also creates a successful return from section B of this movement. In a successful composition, there is always a reason for each note, and even for the break. It is unclear why Roy Howat concludes that this is simply a notational problem in his publication without trying to analyze the music backward to find out what other explanations there might be.

In regard to my interpretation of the double dotted rhythm at m. 90 as having a transitional function, I would suggest that pianists play it with a cautious touch without slowing down or changing the character of the ostinato in the left hand. In addition, the application of flat fingering in the right hand enables pianists to achieve this interpretation easily.

Among numerous CD recordings, Rudolf Serkin, Stephen Kovacevich, and Mitsuko Uchida are the few pianists who emphasize the precise rhythm of this double dotted rhythm in an exaggerated articulation without slowing down the tempo, while others emphasize it with a natural articulation and without slowing down the tempo. Amazingly, Murray Perahia, Inon Barnatan, and Carol Rosenberg ignore the previous double dotted rhythm at m. 85 and m. 87, but not the one in m. 90. Arthur Rubinstein ignores all three double dotted rhythms at m. 82, m. 85, and m. 87, but not the one in m. 77 nor the one in m. 90.
7. The fingering issues

The seventh issue looks at how to achieve Schubert’s staccato and a slur at m. 1 in the final movement of the Sonata, D. 960. I will juxtapose two examples from different editions which will challenge a pianist’s consideration of choosing proper fingering. The first example is an excerpt from the Kalmus edition, the second one is an excerpt from the Henle edition, and the third one is an excerpt from the Wiener Urtext edition. (Example 2.24)

Example 2.24 The Sonata, D. 960, the fourth movement, m. 1 (The Kalmus edition, the Henle Urtext edition, and the Wiener Urtext edition.)

The Kalmus edition:

The Henle Urtext edition:

The Wiener Urtext edition:
In all of these three examples, pianists start with the third finger in the right hand, which seems somewhat appropriate. However, I do have a tough time convincing myself to agree with the Kalmus edition editor’s consideration of the fingering in the following slur, which is the first beat in the right hand at m. 3. My questions is: how can pianists easily achieve a slur with the 2-1 fingering since we know that the thumbs of both hands are, oftentimes, not the best choice for producing a soft touch or a staccato? I would suggest pianists start with the fourth finger in the right hand, then a 3-2 fingering on the following slur combined with a slight application of wrist, and then the second finger for the two staccatos. This approach will enable pianists to produce the special accent created by the slur, and at the same time not produce an overpowered sound created by the thumb in the right hand.

The problematic issue with the slur in mm. 86-94 arises because of the multi-tasking right hand. First, these passages in mm. 86-94 intend to imitate the first and the second violin of the string quartet’s idiomatic writing in the right hand. Secondly, it would be difficult to achieve Schubert’s slur simply with the little finger in the right hand and with the least use of pedal. Moreover, the staccato in the left hand increases the difficulty. Among CD recordings, Carol Rosenberg and Wilhelm Kempff seem to primarily rely on using the pedal, while others such as Mitsuko Uchida and Murray Perahia accomplish the slur with a slight use of the pedal and with the ability to create the legato.

The fingering suggested in the Kalmus edition is not only illogical but also misleading. (Example 2.25)
For instance, the editor indicates that pianists should use 5-3 and 5-4 at m. 88, which shows his questionable judgment on the consideration of the fingering. How can a pianist achieve Schubert’s slur with the 5-3 fingering followed by the 5-4 fingering? Here, I would like to introduce one of the solutions to this problematic issue through the use of an efficient fingering promoted by Frank Weinstock, which would enable pianists to interpret Schubert’s slur with ease. (Example 2.26)
Example 2.26 The Sonata, D. 960, the final movement, mm. 86-94 - The special fingering promoted by Professor Weinstock (The Henle Urtext edition)

Through the examination of the fingerings suggested in different editions, one can realize how efficient these different fingerings can be and how these different fingerings can affect an interpretation.

8. The two concepts of interpreting the chromatic transition, mm. 85-122 in the second movement of A-major Sonata, D. 959

This issue looks at how to interpret or recreate what the composer wrote in the “chromatic fantasy” at mm. 85-122 in the second movement of the Sonata, D. 959. Here, my discussion concerns two possible interpretations: Schubert’s dramatic effect created by the change of tempo only or simply by the control of pedal.

In the first interpretation, Schubert’s dramatic effect is created simply by the change of tempo. Both Brendel’s 1987 recording as well as Paul Lewis’s 2003 recording clearly demonstrate this approach. In Brendel’s 1987 recording, he applies a great deal of *accelerando* at mm. 92-93, mm. 101-102, and mm. 118-120. Also, he adds two striking pauses between m. 93 and m. 94, and between m. 102 and m. 103. Moreover, a striking proportioned *ritard* at m. 121 is presented in order to compensate the earlier *accelerando* around mm. 118-20. Although Paul Lewis’s solution to this interpretive issue is similar to the first interpretation, his approach is rather different from Alfred Brendel’s. He only applies a very striking *accelerando* at mm. 103-106 instead of at mm. 92-93, mm. 101-102 and mm. 118-20.

Murray Perahia’s 1986 recording represents an instructive example of the second interpretation: Schubert’s dramatic effect is created simply by the use of the sustain pedal. In this recording, he thickens the texture by applying a sufficient amount of pedaling at mm. 103-104, mm. 109-112, and mm. 120-21. Moreover, he imitates a *crescendo* at mm. 114-15 by gradually deepening and then gradually releasing the sustain pedal without blurring the sound. This enables him to contrast the texture at mm. 114-15, where a parallel motion is created by successive syncopations in the right hand and a chromatic scale in the left hand, with another texture at mm. 116-17 where an oblique motion is created by the *staccato* chromatic scale in the right hand and the written-out *tremolo* in the left hand. Most important of all, he achieves Schubert’s dramatic effect by an efficient use of the sustaining pedal without changing the tempo.

An inconsistency here as presented in two different recordings by the same pianist is worth mentioning. As previously discussed, Brendel applies a great deal of *accelerando* at mm. 92-93, mm. 101-102, and mm. 118-120 and a striking pause at mm. 93-94 and mm. 102-103 in his 1987 recording. However, he obviously changed his mind in his 2001 recording when he no
longer demonstrates *accelerando* but a correct presentation, the same as what Schubert wrote at mm. 92-93, mm. 101-102, and mm. 118-120.

In addition to these two previously mentioned interpretations Schubert’s dramatic effect created by the change of tempo and by the use of the sustain pedal, Maurizio Pollini and Christoph Eschenbach perform this chromatic transition at mm. 85-122 in the second movement of the Sonata, D. 959 without applying either of these two interpretations. This seems to be another choice.

9. The pedaling issues

In the discussion of these issues, I will demonstrate two contradictory examples. In the first example, m. 5 in the second movement of the B-flat Sonata, D. 960, pianists struggle with the unwanted sonority that is created by a careless use of the sustain pedal. (Example 2.27)

*Example 2.27 The Sonata, D. 960, the 2nd movement, m. 5 (The Wiener Urtext edition)*
The first and the second beats of this measure come from the same chord, C#-E#-G#-B, which is a secondary (dominant seventh) of IV (F#-A-C#) in C-sharp minor. Schubert links this dominant seventh of IV in C-sharp minor with the following IV, which is a resolution of the previous chord, through the use of passing tone in the right hand while the left hand continues its faithful ostinato accompaniment at mm. 5-6. The key here is to keep the dominant seventh clean without any blurred sounding created by these passing tones, F# and A. Oftentimes, pianists misjudge the use of pedal and allow the passing tones to join in the entire sound, which causes an unwanted mixed sound and which sometimes undermines audiences’ appreciation of this ethereal beauty presented in these two measures.

When pianists interpret the opening of this movement, they should think of its secret higher medium --- an entire string ensemble.\textsuperscript{34} The subtle interplay between \textit{legato} and \textit{staccato} should be heard. The pedal should not be used to drench the entire section, instead to enhance the central duet in the right hand without sacrificing the articulation in the left hand.\textsuperscript{35}

In regard to my approaches to the interpretation, I would suggest the pianist either use the sustaining pedal efficiently at the third beat at m. 5 or not use any sustain pedal at the second half of the final beat in this measure. In my former solution, pianists would apply the pedal until the first half of the third beat and then perform two rapid successive changes of sustain pedal after A and after G#. Even though this pedaling seems practical, pianists might still struggle with avoiding a blurred sound due to the different mechanical circumstances of different pianos they are playing. In the latter solution, pianists need to rely on their strong hand control at the second half of the final beat (A and G#) without using any sustain pedal. This approach provides a

\textsuperscript{34} Montgomery, \textit{Franz Schubert’s Music in Performance: Compositional Ideals, Notational Intent, historical Realities, Pedagogical Foundations}, 8.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid, 170.
totally clear sound; however, it sometimes creates an overly realistic sound which may conflict with the mysterious and unrealistic atmosphere that Schubert attempts to depict in the first section of the second movement. To avoid this problem, pianists need to have a great deal of patience and to experiment multiple times combined with a very flat fingering with wise judgments on the application of a flexible wrist in order to link these passing tones without the blurred sounding.

In the second example, mm. 349-57 of the first movement in the Sonata, D. 959, pianists are anticipating a rich sound which is created through the same chord and its resonant overtones. In the Wiener Urtext edition, Schubert provides the marking for sustaining the pedal at m. 349, but without further indication of when to release the sustain pedal. (Example 2.28)

*Example 2.28 The Sonata, D. 959, the first movement, mm. 349-57 (The Wiener Urtext edition)*
In this Wiener Urtext edition, the editor indicated *) in the critical notes: “Pedaling indications only present in FE (in Ms only in m. 349). The long pedal from m. 353 is possible, with appropriate art.”

Surprisingly, Schubert did not indicate any pedal application at the end of the first movement (mm. 349-57) in his draft contained in the Barenreiter edition. However, in the modern editions, such as the Henle, the Bärenreiter, or the Wiener Urtext edition, a single pedal marking below m. 349 is included. Does Schubert intend to create a blurred and unrealistic atmosphere in these passages, which is in contrast to the brilliant and absolute sounding at the opening of this movement? Or, would pianists need a longer pedal here because of the different mechanical circumstances of a fortepiano built in his time? I would assume this is an issue which Schubert wanted to leave optional to the interpretations of the performers.

10. The tempo marking issues

My first example looks at the discrepancy between Schubert’s original tempo concern in the sketch and the modern editions in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 958. In the Henle Urtext edition, the tempo indication is Allegro, but Schubert indicated Allegro moderato in the sketch, which suggests a not-too-fast Allegro. After numerous experiments, I would suggest pianists present this Allegro with a combination of the Maestoso character. Thus, pianists are likely to achieve the character suggested in the beginning of this movement without misinterpreting the Allegro as an uncontrollable rapid tempo. Among CD recordings, Claudio Arrau, Maurizio Pollini, Alain Planès and Murray Perahia seem to have a greater understanding of Schubert’s tempo marking. All of these pianists interpret this tempo with a certain degree of

---

*Maestoso* character. On the contrary, Paul Lewis and Alfred Brendel interpret this tempo with a fast mode without a decent amount of *Maestoso* character. Their interpretations seem to suggest a rather different fast tempo, which is different from Arrau’s recording. Other than that, although Mieczyslaw Horszowski’s interpretation of this tempo seems to catch the *Maestoso* character, the slightly slower tempo seems to undermine this character. Since Schubert didn’t write any indication of *Maestoso*, this discussion is simply to provide readers with different interpretative options from various pianists.

In addition to the tempo marking in the Sonata, D. 958, I will examine the appropriateness of the slower tempo in the secondary theme in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 959.

CD recordings of this sonata can generally be categorized into three styles. Style I: Pianists are faithful to Schubert’s notation without changing the tempo, for instance, the 1973 recording by Christoph Eschenbach and the 1987 recording by Maurizio Pollini. Style II: Pianists attempt to slow down the tempo a little in order to achieve the lyric character. Both 1987 and 1999 recordings by Alfred Brendel fit into this category. Style III: Pianists attempt to achieve a great deal of flexibility and lyricism by applying a proportioned *ritard* at one measure before m. 55. Murray Perahia’s 1987 and 2002 recordings as well as Paul Lewis’s current recording clearly demonstrate this category. Furthermore, in Perahia’s and Lewis’s recordings they attempt to compensate for this earlier slowing down section by a (*accelerando*) compensation at the contrapuntal and transitional area starting at m. 82. This interpretive approach is a questionable and misleading concept since Schubert did not indicate any tempo change in the music at m. 55 in the draft of the Bärenreiter Urtext edition or the previously mentioned modern editions.
Alfred Brendel’s discussion on the issue of the tempo marking in the first movement of the Sonata, D, 960, which is *Molto Moderato*, seems to be instructive and reliable. He mentioned in the draft contained in the modern Bärenreiter Urtext edition that Schubert uses *Moderato* instead of *Molto Moderato* as presented in most of the modern editions. By his own definition, this puzzling tempo marking, *Molto Moderato*, is supposed to correspond to “a none too dragging Allegretto.” He also argues that the reason that Schubert avoided using the word *Allegretto* is simply because of its unstated implication: a certain speed implies the calm flow of a measured *Allegro* as well as a specific character. A closer examination of the tempo markings in the movements of several of Schubert’s piano sonatas lends support to Brendel’s statement. In the final movement of the Sonata, D. 894, the fourth movement of the sonata, D. 959, the third movement of the Sonata, D. 568, as well as the *Scherzo* movement of the Sonata, D. 575, not only do these movements indicate the tempo marking, *Allegretto*, they also demonstrate a very similar and specific joyful character in their contents. Schubert indeed uses *Moderato*, which might be an implication of *Allegro*, more often than any other composers. On the contrary, the first movement of the B-flat sonata, *Molto Moderato*, an implication of the calm flow of a measured *Allegro*, is nowhere close to any of these *Allegro* movements in terms of its character, for instance, the opening movement of the Sonata, D. 958, the tarantella movement of the Sonata D. 958, or the opening movement of the Sonata, D. 959.

On top of that, the Ullstein-Verlag edition’s indication of the tempo marking is sometimes not only unreliable but also misleading. For instance, the editor substantiated *Molto Moderato* in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 960 with *Allegro Moderato*, which is totally

---

38 Ibid., 79.
39 Ibid.
different from most of the modern editions. What a different interpretation would occur if a pianist accepted this illogical indication without consulting with other modern reliable editions or any reliable historical sources.

11. The tone-color (timbre) and voicing issues

This section, which is devoted to how to find a unique tone-color (timbre) and how to voice passages, includes four concerns: a comparison between mm. 51-2 and mm. 1-2 in the second movement of the Sonata, D. 958; an exploration of the problematic issue at mm. 51-2; how to interpret a unique tone-color (timbre); and an unusual voicing at mm. 99-102 from Maurizio Pollini’s 1987 recording. Through the comparison and analysis of these problematic issues, one can realize the challenges a conscientious pianist faces.

The problematic issue at mm. 51-4 arises because of the distinctive voice leading and the idiomatic writing. (Example 2.29)

Example 2.29 The Sonata, D. 958, the second movement, a juxtaposition of mm. 1-2 and mm. 51-54 (The Henle Urtext edition)
Unlike the passage presented at mm. 1-2, Schubert doubles the main melody in the left hand. In addition, there are three A-flats and two E-flats, but only one C at the beginning of m. 51. Therefore, the balance between the doubled melodic line and the accompanying components becomes the major problematic issue and arouses my concerns. Some pianists use their thumb in the left hand to play this A-flat in the inner voice at m. 51 because of the certain degree of convenience. This treatment would also enable pianists to play the entire doubled melodic line with one hand. However, this may not be a wise choice. If we trace the same voice line backward to the end of m. 50, the third of this dominant seventh (Eb-Gb-Db-D) generates its energy at the beginning of m. 50 in the inner voice of the right hand and is ready to resolve to Ab at the beginning of m. 51 in the inner voice of the right hand. At this time, what pianists should do is to trust Schubert’s voice leading in this passage: let the right hand prepare for the G-Ab progression, and let the left hand deal with another downward progression, which is Db-C. Therefore, using the thumb in the left hand to play the A-flat at m. 51 seems to me not only arbitrary but also questionable.

What’s more, how to orchestrate the passage at mm. 51-4 remains an intriguing issue. Pianists should distinguish the double melodic line in both hands from the accompanying components at mm. 51-52. Meanwhile, the inner voice presented by the thumb in the left hand and the melodic line in the right hand needs to be on equal footing. It would be a wise choice if
pianists considered a very flat fingering combined with a flexible rotation produced by both forearms to achieve a unique timbre. This approach tends to create a warmer timbre which is suitable because a flat fingering treatment usually creates a warmer timbre for this specific passage in the movement.

Pollini’s unique voicing is worth mentioning. In his 1987 recording, just like most pianists, he voices the inner main melodic line in the right hand starting at m. 94. (Example 2.30)

**Example 2.30 The Sonata, D. 958, the second movement, mm. 94-101 (The Wiener Urtext edition)**

![Example 2.30 The Sonata, D. 958, the second movement, mm. 94-101 (The Wiener Urtext edition)](image)

However, unlike most pianists, he starts to voice another melodic line which is the top voice in the right hand starting at the end of m. 99. By the time the inner voice is about to finish its leading position at the end of m. 100, the top melodic line in the right hand at the end of m. 100 is ready to lead the rest of the downward melodic line at m. 101. Pollini’s interpretation accomplishes the multi tasks in the right hand and this entire process, which is a shift from an inner voice to the top voice, with ease.
12. The grouping issue among the four movements

In the twelfth section, which concerns the grouping issue among the four movements in Schubert’s last three sonatas, I will illustrate why this issue is troublesome especially in the Sonata, D. 960.

In comparing the movements in the Sonata, D. 958, the Sonata, D. 959, and the Sonata, D. 960, I find this comparison intriguing. In terms of the character presented in each movement, there is little evidence showing a striking shift from a local movement to a remote movement in either the Sonata, D. 958 or the Sonata, D. 959. For instance, the second movement in D. 960 is a remote key from B-flat; the character of the second movement is so much different from the first or the third movement of D. 960. However, there is much evidence showing a striking shift from one movement to another in the Sonata, D. 960. The first movement demonstrates a searching character while the second movement presents a mysterious and distant character. The third movement demonstrates a lighthearted character while the fourth movement presents a playful character. Therefore, these changes in characters among the movements arouse my major concern.

Now, I would like to discuss two approaches to the grouping issue within the four movements. For the first one, pianists represent the four movements with the third movement as a bridge, and each break contains almost the same amount of time. With this approach, pianists should choose a bright tone but with cautious control when playing the beginning of the third movement so that the third movement would provide a transitional connection between a dark one and a brilliant one. With the other approach, pianists represent the first and the second movements as one group followed by a longer break and then present the second group, namely the third and the fourth movements. Through this approach pianists are more easily able to
prepare for the change in atmosphere after the longer break. The former approach tends to stress more of the unity issue than the latter approach. In addition to this, the former interpretation seems more logical and cohesive than the latter one.

13. The interpretation of the \textit{fp} octave in the left hand in the final movement of D. 960

The thirteenth issue I will examine concerns three solutions to the interpretation of the \textit{fp} in the opening octave in the fourth movement, that is, the abrupt dynamic change created by the left hand only, by both the left hand and mechanics, and by gradual fading out. Hopefully, this discussion will provoke pianists to question their own personal interpretations of the \textit{fp}.

With the first solution, the abrupt dynamic change created simply by the left hand only, a pianist needs to attack the octave and release a little without losing the even sounding octave. This takes time to experiment with because each piano has a different sensitivity. However, with this solution one could sometimes create a weak sounding octave.

With the second approach, the abrupt dynamic change created by both the left hand and mechanics, pianists need to attack the octave, immediately release it to one third of the depth, and meanwhile use the sustaining pedal to collect the remaining sound. This approach provides a more accurate and practical interpretation than that of the former solution because it reduces the risk of producing an uneven sounding octave.

With the third solution, the abrupt dynamic change created by gradual fading out, pianists seem to neglect what Schubert wrote in his music. Even though this is what we often hear from the majority of CD recordings except pianists like Mitsuko Uchida, Daniel Barenboim, and Leif Ove Andsnes, I would not recommend this interpretation simply because Schubert took the time to include a special mark on the music.
A fourth alternative suggested by Professor Kenneth Griffiths of CCM involves playing the octave with a *sf* attack, releasing the keys and catching the reverberating resonance of the instrument in a delayed depression of the sustaining pedal.  

David Montgomery claims that “this *fp* on single notes throughout Schubert’s music should serve to remind us of his linear-melodic orientation as a string player.” We can imagine a violin player using a fast stroke on the *forte* note followed by a sudden smooth slow bow for the *piano*. Therefore, the second and the fourth approaches seem to be close to what Montgomery suggested.

### 14. The interpretation of ornaments

The interpretation of ornaments has been a puzzling issue in Schubert’s music. In my first example of this issue, one can realize the significant and dominant role of the publisher. For instance, as above mentioned in the first issue, a written-out trill at m. 19 in the opening movement of the Sonata, D. 960 in the Henle edition, which shows a discrepancy from Schubert’s autographed manuscript, might limit a performer’s imagination and interpretation. Oftentimes performers overly focus on counting the beats and unintentionally make the transitional passage in the left hand stagnant. According to András Schiff:

> The notation in the Henle edition forces the player to think in demisemiquaver units, which is clearly not what Schubert wanted here. Why did the editors see fit to change Schubert’s notation? The decisive rhythmic patterns in this movement are those of semiquavers and triplets, and it is their motion that decides the tempo, not the speed of the trill. Therefore sanity should return and pianists should stop trying to achieve the goal of unsurpassed slowness.

---


42 Ibid.

43 Schiff, *Schubert’s Piano Sonatas*, 196.
He questioned the appropriateness of the written-out trill at m. 19 in the Henle edition.

Moreover, this misleading written-out trill makes pianists’ interpretations provincial because of the compelling notation. Despite this questionable notation, much attention has been paid to this concern—other modern editions such as the Bärenreiter edition, the Universal edition, and the Wiener Urtext edition demonstrate a notation which is the same as Schubert’s autograph manuscript and which motivates performers with more possibilities for interpreting this passage.

In my second example, I examine two different approaches to the interpretation of the ornamentation at m. 23 in the second movement of the Sonata, D. 959. (Example 2.31)

Example 2.31 The Sonata, D. 959, the second movement, m. 23 (The Wiener Urtext edition)

Whether a pianist should start this ornament from the C-sharp or D seems to be a major issue. My discussion will explore the advantages and disadvantages of each approach.

Even though the first treatment, starting the ornament with the C-sharp, seems to be a faithful solution in interpreting Schubert’s ornament, pianists may struggle with the overpowering sound created by the C-sharp presented in the third beat in both hands at m. 23. Therefore, to accomplish Schubert’s lyricism here, pianists would have to experiment with this interpretation and find the dynamic balance in both hands. In the second approach, starting the ornament from D, pianists would be able to avoid an overpowered C-sharp and achieve Schubert’s lyric character simultaneously. However, audiences might think that they are being
misled by the performer when they eventually have the chance to take a look at this ornamentation. Among CD recordings, Christoph Eschenbach starts the ornament from C-sharp in his 1973 recording. On the other hand, Alfred Brendel’s 1987 recording, Maurizio Pollini’s 1983 recording, and a recent recording by Paul Lewis in 2003 all demonstrate their preference for the other idea, starting the ornament from D. In addition, Murray Perahia shows an inconsistency between his 1987 (London) recording and 2002 (Germany) recording. Unlike what he did in the 1987 London recording, he turns his interest to the other treatment, starting this ornament at m. 23 in the second movement of the Sonata, D. 959 with C-sharp in his later recording.

15. The psychological issue resulting from breathing and mechanics problems

Unlike previous issues, this issue is a combination of several problematic issues. In this discussion, I will point out why this issue arouses my concerns and what would be possible treatments of these problematic circumstances.

Sometimes we find the fact that pianists have trouble breathing naturally when interpreting a certain phrase. In some instances, it is because a solo pianist has had very limited experience working with singers or instrumentalists. However, in other instances it is because solo pianists need to worry about multiple concerns and attempt to avoid many distractions. I will discuss the problematic issues at m. 9 in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 960 and will provide one of the possible solutions to this performance issue. (Example 2.32)
At mm. 8-9, pianists are concerned about not only the evenness of a trill in the left hand but also how this ending of the one-measure trill at the very beginning of m. 9 is going to sound. In addition, trying to achieve a very soft dynamic in such a low register with the weaker left hand could easily psychologically undermine their desire to achieve this ethereal atmosphere at mm. 8-9.

In regard to how to conquer the breathing issue, first of all, the silent quarter rest in the left hand at m. 7 is very crucial. Pianists need to finish the F on time and use the advantage of this rest to create a smooth preparation for the dramatic trill at m. 9. Therefore, the quarter rest coexists with a natural physical act of breathing. The smoothness and evenness of this physical act of breathing would certainly affect the turn-out of the following dramatic trill. Secondly, pianists should attempt to think of Ab-Gb-F-Gb as the fourth beat of this trill in the left hand at m. 8, instead of F-Gb. This method may lessen the pianist’s worry and enable the pianist to end this trill perfectly with an appropriate dynamic, pp. In addition, pianists should use the advantage of this figuration Ab-Gb-F-Gb and the following F in the left hand and attempt to match the upbeat and downbeat to the breathing. The final step is to release the keys in both hands, to lift the pedal, and to complete this event in an unruffled manner. This may take several times to experiment with the whole process due to the conditions of different pianos. In retrospect, it is worth the time to conquer this issue and to achieve the soft dynamic here with ease.
16. The phrasing issue

How to phrase Schubert’s music has been an intriguing and creative issue since there are some irregularities among the movements in these three sonatas. In the first example, I will explore a unique phrasing at mm. 17-33, which is $5 + 4 + 3 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 1$ and its echo at m. 34-7, which is $4 + 3 + 2 + 1$ in the third movement of the Sonata, D. 959. (Example 2.33)

Example 2.33 The Sonata, D. 959, the second movement, mm. 17-37 (The Wiener Urtext edition)
From m. 17 to m. 33, Schubert demonstrates a playful repetition six different times. Each time, he purposely abandons one measure from its previous passage except for the final two measures at mm. 32-33. For instance, the passage at mm. 22-25 is a harmonic repetition of mm. 17-21 except for a harmonic repetition of m. 21. The passage from m. 26 to m. 28 is another harmonic repetition of its predecessor, m. 22 to m. 25, except for a harmonic repetition of m. 25. Then, the passage from m. 29 to m. 30 is another harmonic repetition of its predecessor, m. 26 to m. 28, except for a melodic repetition of m. 26. After that, Schubert makes a very strong statement on a six-four chord, which soon unexpectedly turns out to be a preparation for the following key, C-sharp minor. In addition, the previously mentioned phrasing structure, $5 + 4 + 3 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 1$, is about to be echoed by another structure, which is $4 + 3 + 2 + 1$ at mm. 34-7. But, how does this passage at mm. 34-7 demonstrate a $4 + 3 + 2 + 1$ structure? If we take a look at the passage at mm. 34-7, the scale descends from “group 1,” in which one beat is divided by four, to “group 2,” in which one beat is divided by three, to “group 3,” in which one beat is divided by two, to “group 4,” in which one beat is divided by one. Through this demonstration, one can realize how Schubert achieves the jesting character in a Scherzo movement in an approach which is rather different from his predecessors.

In the next three examples, mm. 74-85, 354-9, and 513-40 in the final movement of the Sonata, D. 960, I will provide two different phrasings for each of the examples and will juxtapose each with a music example. In addition, I will illustrate the reasons for these different phrasings. Hopefully, these examples will stimulate the pianists’ awareness of the phrasing issue when performing this music.

In my first discussion, I examine how to articulate mm. 74-85 in the final movement.

(Example 2.34)
Here, pianists have to decide which they would prefer: symmetrical or asymmetrical grouping. With the symmetrical grouping, which is $[4] + [4] + [4]$, pianists are able to create a provocative rhythmic pattern. Not only does this pattern sound symmetrical in the first 8 measures, it also provides the listener with a syncopation in mm. 78-82. Furthermore, through this pattern, pianists are able to keep the harmonic sequence V-I-V-I, V-I-V-I symmetrical. (Table 2.2) For this reason, I personally recommend the symmetrical grouping.
### Table 2.2 Diagram of mm. 74-85 in the final movement of the Sonata, D. 960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mm. 74-7</th>
<th>mm. 78-81</th>
<th>mm. 82-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accent</strong></td>
<td>[&gt; &gt; &gt; &gt;],</td>
<td>[none ≥ none ≥],</td>
<td>[≥ ≥ cresc. decresc.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F Major</strong></td>
<td>[vii6-I, vii6-I],</td>
<td>[vii6/V-V, vii6/V-V],</td>
<td>[V-----------------------]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, with the concept of asymmetrical grouping, which is [4] + [3] + [5], pianists are able to group three downward figurations from measure 81 to measure 83 all together and reinforce the end of the transition with staccato in the last two measures. However, unlike the previous grouping [4] + [4] + [4], this approach does not create an interesting syncopation since the accent in measure 82 presents itself as the head of the next grouping.

Moreover, pianists are obliged to view mm. 78-80 as a V/V (F major) prolongation.

The next examination looks at how to articulate the passage in mm. 354-9. Here, there are two possible groupings: 4 + 2 as well as 3 + 3. First, let’s juxtapose and compare these two from the music example. (Example 2.35)
Through the first one, 4 + 2, pianists are able to group a symmetrical pattern D-G and D-G together. Moreover, it would be better to group the harmonic pattern (vii6/V-V, vii6/V-V) as a unit since the second half of this unit enhances a strong half cadence of the forthcoming key, B-flat major. After these 4 measures, the music is followed by a two measure transition. Through the latter one, pianists would unfortunately have to sacrifice the symmetrical pattern from m. 354 to m. 357. In addition, the importance of unification at this time should not be overlooked. For example, it would not be appropriate to choose the 4 + 4 + 4 grouping in mm. 74-85 together with the 3 + 3 in mm. 354-9 because of the unity issue.

My final discussion looks at how to phrase the passages at mm. 513-40. According to Roy Howat, even though the articulation 8 + 5 + 4 + 3 of the first 20 bars of Presto (mm. 513-32 in the final movement) seems to be one possible interpretation, this still leaves Roy Howat with
what he called a “cuckoo,” namely a weak link to the sonata’s final eight bars. Here, I agree with his statement even though he did not explain his reasoning. My reasoning is based on a comparison of the two different articulations in mm. 513-40 which includes the final eight bars, namely $[4 + 4] + [4 + 8] + [4 + 4]$ and $[4 + 4] + [5 + 4 + 3] + [4 + 4]$. (Example 2.36)

Example 2.36 The Sonata, D. 960, the final movement, mm. 513-40 (The Wiener Urtext edition)

---

44 Howat, Reading between the Lines, 127.
An intense syncopation in mm. 529-32 which is created through the former articulation seems more logical to me because it strengthens the preparation for the climax. It would not be so difficult to understand that pianists who choose the latter interpretation over the former are concerned more about the cadence IV-V-I from m. 521 to m. 525. This choice not only causes an irregularity in the later passages, but also, unfortunately, weakens the intense syncopation from m. 529 to m. 532.

Through a close look at these instances, I hope this discussion arouses pianists to question their judgment when considering a suitable phrasing structure, which will allow them to interpret the music as cohesively as they can.

17. The understanding of Schubert’s previously unexplored device in the final section in the second movement of the A-major Sonata, D. 959

In this issue, I will challenge pianists’ traditional interpretations with an exploration of the relationships between accents, slurs, and two contrary figurations at mm. 159-202 in the second movement of the sonata, D. 959. Were these accents and slurs written randomly or were they well planned? I will leave this option open for the ongoing debate. (Example 2.37)
Example 2.37 The sonata, D. 959, the second movement, mm. 159-202 (The Wiener Urtext edition)
To make this clear, I label four components which are important in this section:

1. Component A---two accents above two different triplets in the right hand
2. Component B---a downward “sigh” figuration combined with a slur

3. Component C---an upward figuration combined with a slur

4. Component D---a mysterious accent above the third beat in the left hand

Components A and B are likely to be compatible in this final section in the second movement of the Sonata, D. 959 due to their simultaneous appearance each time, for instance, at mm. 158-59, mm. 171-72, mm. 177-78, mm. 179-80, mm. 185-86 (in the first varying format), and mm. 189-90 (in the second varying format with a natural syncopation in the left hand), and mm. 193-94 (in the second varying format) except for the one at mm. 167-68. The reason for this exception at mm. 167-68 is likely because of the symmetrical issue. For example, there is no accent involved at mm. 9-10 either, which is the repetition of the first statement at mm. 1-8. Interestingly, when a downward “sigh” figuration combined with a slur (Component B) is replaced by an upward “sigh” figuration combined with a slur (Component C), two accents above two different triplets in the right hand (Component A) no longer exist, for instance, at mm. 163-64, and mm. 181-82. I wonder why the requirement of two accents appears only when a downward “sigh” figuration is involved. Could this “sigh” figuration associate with or imply something else? However, there is unfortunately not any document discussing this interrelationship in the section.

Another progression that arouses my interest is how these two accents (Component A) and a downward “sigh” figuration combined with a slur (Component B) disguise and combine themselves into a different format. For instance, these two components (A and B) are still two individual voices at mm. 159-60, but these two components are combined at mm. 185-86 with a reversed interval—a major seventh instead of the original downward “sigh” figuration (a minor second). After that, they separate again at mm. 189-90 and mm. 193-94.
In addition to the above-mentioned progression, how these two components (A and B) impose a mysterious accent above the third beat in the left hand (Component D) also arouses my attention. This mysterious accent is presented with its original format in the left hand at m. 159. At mm. 192-93, the downward “sigh” figuration (Component B) attempts to encompass this accent in the lower register. At mm. 195-96, however, this mysterious accent above the third beat no longer exists. The only expression left, at this time, is nothing but a bitter downward “sigh” figuration. Eventually, this bitter downward “sigh” figuration is dissolved into the F# minor chords and then into a unison. I wonder if there is any metaphor hidden behind this figuration. However, there is unfortunately no evidence or discussion presented in any sources I have examined, but I believe this exploration will challenge pianists’ traditional interpretation and provoke their imaginations.

18. The arrangements of a recital program

In the eighteenth issue, I will discuss the problem of the arrangements of a recital program, which might include these sonatas. Is it an appropriate choice to put all three of these sonatas into one program? Or, is it wiser to put only two sonatas into one program? And what would be the beneficial choices among the combinations containing two sonatas? I will provide several recital programs in the following paragraphs. One of them was performed by Claude Frank at University of Cincinnati.

In regard to the first question, although the trilogy is a beneficial choice, it sometimes exhausts audiences with its lengthy character. Many modern audiences are unlikely to have the patience and energy to appreciate the beauty of this trilogy unless this is a whole-afternoon recital or lecture including intermissions in between each one.
Even though including two of these sonatas in one program seems to be a good choice, there are concerns in terms of compatibility in each combination. In the past decade, I attended Jörg Demus’s recital featuring Schubert’s C-minor Sonata, D. 958, and the final Sonata in B-flat Major in the National Concert Hall in Taipei in January, 1998; the internationally renowned pianist Claude Frank’s recital which included the Sonata, D. 894, and the Sonata, D. 960, in one program at Robert J. Werner Recital Hall at CCM in June, 2002; and Moisés Ruiz de Gauna’s doctoral recital at CCM in 2007, in which he presented both the Sonata, D. 959, and the Sonata, D. 960. Among these three recitals, I found something intriguing when comparing these programs. The first program might not be an appropriate choice due to the homogeneous character of their key tonalities (both are flat keys). Although C minor and B-flat major created slightly different colors to the audience, but their homogeneous character of two flat keys seemed to make one an extension of the other. Therefore, there might be little excitement when audiences eventually hear the presentation of a different flat key with the Sonata, D. 960. Moisés Ruiz de Gauna’s program seemed to have more potential than the previous one, but to me the Sonata, D. 959 somewhat suggests more of a non-masculine character through the movements which might be very similar to the first two non-masculine movements in the Sonata, D. 960, except for the masculine repetition at m. 117 and part of the middle section in the second movement. However, this presentation might be very close to the non-masculine character created in the principal and the secondary in the first movement and the second movement of the Sonata, D. 960. Therefore, this program unintentionally and unfortunately creates a tedious character even though the sonatas are in different keys. Claude Frank’s program, which is the combination of the Sonata, D. 894, and the Sonata, D. 960, seemed to be a wiser choice than the
previous two. The process from G major to B-flat major creates a very intriguing and a very powerful connection. (Example 2.38)

**Example 2.38** The G-major Sonata, D. 894 and the B-flat Sonata, D 960, a progression from the opening of the G-major Sonata, D. 894 to the opening of the B-flat Sonata, D. 960

As indicated in this music example, the audience first appreciates the thinness and the pastoral character created by a sharp key, G major. Then the arrival of the B-flat in the B-flat major unintentionally tones down the sharpness and thinness created by the B in the G major. What’s more, the progression from a major key to its upward third major key (G to Bb) or to its downward third major key (G-Eb) tends to create a very powerful transition, and the latter key tends to benefit from this transition.

Let me demonstrate another example. I participated in a competition hosted by the Taipei Philharmonic Foundation for Culture and Education seven years ago. One of the competitors played a number of preludes from Rachmaninoff in the final round. One thing that attracted my full attention was that she concluded her final round with the D major prelude Op. 23, No. 4 and the B-flat prelude Op. 23, No. 2. I was fascinated by the transitional movement from a sharp key to a flat key and how this coming B-flat major sounded even more powerful and warmer than it
actually is. On top of that, while the key shifts from D major to B-flat major, the A in the D major demonstrates itself as a leading tone which resolves to the tonic of the forthcoming B-flat major. But, back to the topic, I think Claude Frank must have used this intuition in choosing his recital program or perhaps he had learned some lessons about arrangements of a recital program from his abundant past experiences. Both examples demonstrate Schubert’s favorite mediant relationship—from Tonic to minor VI and from major VI to Tonic. Moreover, these two examples enhance the warmness of the arrival of the B-flat major.

19. The choices of different makes of pianos

In the final interpretive issue, I would like to discuss the proper choices of different types of pianos and the points of view from a renowned pianist, a pianist-scholar, and a music scholar. Moreover, I will provide a brief comparison of a modern piano and an 1820 fortepiano. Finally, I will provide my thoughts based on my evaluation of CD and LP recordings.

According to Malcolm Bilson, the clarity created by an 1820 wood-framed and straight-strung instrument is rather different from a modern Steinway grand piano. And, the application of a longer pedal, which corresponds to the sustain pedal of a modern piano, is needed due to the fast decay of tones:

Schubert’s music may be romantic, but the straight-strung, wooden-framed pianos he knew represented a different kind of Romanticism from the later cross-strung, iron-framed Steinway type. Schubert’s were lighter and cleaner than the later instruments; the sound faded somewhat faster, permitting more flexibility between tones. As a result of this more rapid decay, longer pedals could be used, strongly suggested by many passages in this music, and there was greater clarity and independence between voices when the pedal was not used.45

---

In addition, the compass of an instrument built in Schubert’s time still varied enormously. Generally, it ranges from $F_1$ to $f_4$. However, different makers at the time offered an extra octave as a promotion with a higher price.\footnote{Howat, Reading between the Lines, 135.}

The number of pedals is rather different between an 1820 instrument compared to a modern Steinway grand piano. And, the number of pedals (from two to four) varied in different fortepianos by different makers or even the same maker. In a four-pedaled instrument, the first one, which corresponds to a soft pedal in a modern Steinway grand piano, permits the hammer to hit only one string for any note. This pedal is also called “una corda” pedal. The second one is sometimes called Bassoon stop and provides a Bassoon timbre with a paper roll engaged above the strings. A \textit{Moderator} is found principally on Viennese instruments. It brings a cloth between the strings and hammers and produces a beautifully muted and softened sound.\footnote{Kenneth Mobbs, “Stops and Other Special Effects on the Early Piano,” Early Music 12 (November 1984): 471-76.} And a fourth pedal, which corresponds to a sustaining pedal of a modern Steinway grand piano, is engaged when there is a need to cancel the silence effect. (Table 2.3)
Table 2.3 A juxtaposition of a four-pedaled fortepiano and a modern three-pedaled grand piano.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A fortepiano with four pedals built in 1820 in Vienna</th>
<th>The Bassoon stop</th>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Forte pedal -- Canceling the silence effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The una corda pedal -- Moving the hammer to ‘due corde’ corresponding to the modern ‘soft pedal’</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A modern Steinway type grand piano</td>
<td>Soft pedal. It shifts the entire action and permits the hammers to hit one string of three strings of each note.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sostenuto pedal. This pedal makes it possible to sustain some notes while players need to play other notes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to the choices of pianos when interpreting Schubert’s music, András Schiff’s answers are varied depending on where the music is performed. First of all, if we want to hear Schubert’s music in a small room or in a recording, he thinks a Graf fortepiano 1825 would be an ideal instrument. If we would like to hear Schubert’s music in a large concert hall, then a modern piano would be a wise choice. Among modern pianos, he prefers a Bösendorfer rather than a Steinway. He thinks that using a Steinway to play Schubert’s music sounds alien, much like using a translator because first, a Bösendorfer sounds to him more idiomatic due to the lighter texture and the singing tone. Moreover, unlike a Bösendorfer, a Steinway would not be able to depict the “Austrian-Viennese flavour.”

---

48 Schiff, *Schubert’s Piano Sonatas*, 194.

49 Ibid.
Malcolm Bilson’s choice of pianos distinguishes his interpretation from András Schiff’s. He has been promoting performance-practice programs and has been an advocate and supporter of period-instruments for over thirty years, and his “Fortepiano Summer School” has inspired numbers of musicians, including doctoral graduates. He presents Schubert’s sonatas on different fortepianos built in Schubert’s time instead of on a modern Steinway piano. For example, he demonstrates a fortepiano built by Salvatore Lagrassa around 1815, another fortepiano built by Gottlieb Hafner in Vienna in 1830, and many others in his Complete Schubert Piano Sonatas recordings released by Hungaroton records. He observes that Schubert’s instruments were lighter and clearer than the later instruments; the sound faded somewhat faster, permitting more flexibility between tones.  

And he continues,

Especially telling are the Schubert’s $f$s and $fff$s; these are often cries of despair or anger, and convey a very different kind of power on a contemporary wood-framed instrument than on a modern piano with its forceful metallic ring. And Schubert’s $p$ps and $pp$ps, especially when “Moderator” (a cloth strip brought between hammers and strings) is engaged, have a special ethereal quality quite distinct from the more lush Debussy-like sounds of the modern pianos at those levels.

He then asks if we can we learn to sing as he might have done on pianos from a later time and of different musical aesthetic?  

He points out numerous differences in tones, dynamics, and a pedal between a fortepiano built in Schubert’s time and a modern piano. On top of that, his preference and desire for reproducing Schubert’s music on such instruments with his modern aesthetic sense is obvious.

---

50 Ibid.
51 Bilson, the liner notes to Schubert Piano Sonatas Compact Disc, 3.
52 Ibid.
53 Ibid.
Malcolm Bilson is not alone in his choice of the proper instrument. Robert Hatten, a well-known music scholar, describes how much he liked Malcolm Bilson’s live recital in which he not only demonstrated the historical performance practice but also projected articulations and subtle details that realized characteristic gestures in a way that was stylistically consistent with their implied expressive meaning and ongoing development. Additionally, he criticizes the “Romantic School playing” and questions the correctness of interpreting Schubert’s music on a modern piano. He asserts that Romantic School pianists reflect a paucity of awareness of the subtleties of articulation in the Viennese Classical tradition and their bias toward an unbroken continuity of melodic line. Oftentimes performers tend to present whatever they are longing for.

After a close examination from different recordings either with a modern grand piano or with a historical instrument built in Schubert’s time, a modern piano such as a Steinway, Bösendorfer, Bechstein, Mason and Hamlin, Fazioli, etc provides a wider variety of timbre than historical instruments. A Graf fortepiano built in 1825 may sound more ethereal than a modern grand piano as Malcolm Bilson suggests; however, a modern piano allows pianists to create more varieties in timbre, overtone, articulation, phrasing, etc. According to Jörg Däbler’s recording of Schubert’s Sonata, D. 960, a fortepiano built in 1825 sounds limited in its dynamic range, and so do the ones recorded by Malcolm Bilson in his Schubert the Compete Piano Sonatas. Besides, they sound different regarding the articulation. By that I mean, the audience can easily detect a certain amount of accent in each note in a phrase combined with legato. With


\footnote{Ibid.}

\footnote{Ibid.}
a modern grand piano, however, a pianist can demonstrate a phrase combined with legato smoothly without a certain amount of accent involved on each single note. This feature makes a significant difference between a modern piano and a historical instrument built in Schubert’s time. Even though there are some pianists who belong to “Romantic School playing” and misinterpret Schubert’s music with their prejudiced concepts, there are also some pianists who have the strong ability to interpret Schubert’s music with a modern instrument as faithfully as it is presented in the historical sources. Moreover, the instruments in Schubert’s time were not necessarily built to sound identical even by the same maker. Performers oftentimes played on instruments made by different makers in different locations or at different social events in the nineteenth century. Therefore, the issue comes back to how a pianist interprets these sonatas. Nevertheless, listening to a presentation or a live performance demonstrated by a modern pianist with historical instruments would certainly provide current performers a better idea what these sonatas were supposed to sound like in Schubert’s time and provoke them to question their own personal interpretations.

The nineteen issues examined above in this chapter are not only the highlight of performance problems in interpreting these sonatas; they also provide current performers with a greater comprehension for considering an appropriate interpretation. To further this discussion of performance problems, I will provide some controversial examples and discuss how a musicological scholar and renowned pianists manage these problems in Chapter III.

---

57 Ibid.
Chapter 3: Experimenting with Selected Interpretations

In this chapter, I will discuss the pros and cons of different interpretations of the phrasing issues and experiment with other possible treatments. Then, I will demonstrate three controversial interpretations in different recordings by Daniel Barenboim, Arthur Rubinstein, and Malcolm Bilson. Finally, an examination of Roy Howat’s presumption will be unfolded at the end of this chapter.

Regarding the phrasing issues, Roy Howat’s two suggestions on how to phrase the passages at mm. 1-12 in the third movement of the Sonata, D. 958, arouse my concerns.

(Example 3.1)

Example 3.1 The Sonata, D. 958, the third movement, mm. 1-12 (The Wiener Urtext edition)
His first interpretation, which is $4 + 4 + 4$,\(^{58}\) seems logical, but I disagree with his idea of separating m. 4 from m. 5, since mm. 4-5 is a melodic imitation and expansion of m. 1. Nevertheless, this solution has its symmetrical pattern, in which the second half of each of the four measures is seemingly a rhythmic reverse of the first half of each of the four measures. For instance, mm. 3-4, mm. 7-8, and mm. 11-12 are rhythmic reversal of mm. 1-2, mm. 5-6, and mm. 9-10 in the right hand except m. 12, which is not an exact reverse. In his second interpretation, which is $4 + 3 + 2 + 3$,\(^{59}\) we see an inconsistency. As mentioned previously, I am concerned about his separating m. 4 from m. 5. Both m. 8 and m. 9 are rhythmic and melodic imitations of m. 4 and m. 5. Intriguingly, he separates m. 4 from m. 5, yet he leaves m. 8 and m. 9 together. I wonder why there should be an inconsistency and why he treats mm. 4-5 and mm. 8-9 in a totally different manner. He does not provide a thorough and detailed reasoning for this.

My suggestion for the interpretation of this issue is $3 + 4 + 5$. Through this solution, performers would be able to present a proportioned expansion. For instance, mm. 4-7 is an imitation of mm. 1-3 except for an added extra measure at m. 4; mm. 8-12 is a rhythmic imitation of mm. 4-7 with an expanded measure at m. 12. Through this treatment, one can comprehend a proportioned expansion, $3 + 4 + 5$, from m. 1 to m. 12. Most important of all, this interpretation enables pianists to keep mm. 4-5 as one unit and mm. 8-9 as another unit.

Roy Howat’s other suggestion, which is $3 + 3 + 3 + 2 + 2 + 2$, on how to phrase the passages at mm. 13-27 in the third movement of the C-minor Sonata, D. 958, again arouses a major concern. In this interpretation, he tends to separate a very important unit, which is a V7-I cadence at mm. 15-16 and mm. 18-19. This may not be a beneficial solution. (Example 3.2)

---


\(^{59}\) Ibid.
Example 3.2 The Sonata, D. 958, the third movement, mm. 13-27 (The Wiener Urtext edition)

My first solution would be to interpret these passages at mm. 13-27 as a $2 + 3 + 3 + 5 + 2$. Through this interpretation, pianists would demonstrate mm. 15-17 as an imitation and expansion of mm. 13-14, mm. 18-20 as an imitation of mm. 15-17, mm. 21-25 as a prolongation of A-flat major, and then a two-measure half cadence of C minor at mm. 26-27. In addition, pianists would be able to keep the V7-I cadence in one unit.

My second suggestion on how to interpret the passages at mm. 13-27 would be $2 + 3 + 3 + 6 + 2$, but this time it starts from the pick up at m. 12 to m. 27. This interpretation not only keeps V7-I as one unit at mm. 15-16 and mm. 18-19, it also presents a very clear imitation, an expansion at mm. 14-16, a variation of mm. 14-16 at mm. 17-19, an expansion in length and a prolongation on the tonic of the A-flat major at mm. 20-25. After that, the passage is followed by a strong half cadence starting from the pick up to m. 26 to m. 27. Hopefully, these two suggestions on how to interpret passages at mm. 13-27 in the third movement of the C-minor Sonata, D. 958, will motivate pianists to devise additional possible interpretations. However; it is
not uncommon to finish melodic phrases on an unresolved 7th chord in some of Schubert’s music, e.g Lieder *Winterreise*.

Daniel Barenboim’s 1992 recording, Arthur Rubinstein’s 1969 recording, and Malcolm Bilson’s 2003 recording of the same Sonata, D. 960, are found to be controversial in interpreting certain performance issues. In this section, I will explore the controversies and ironies exhibited in these three different recordings of the same sonata and illustrate how these well-renowned pianists experiment with interpretations.

In Daniel Barenboim’s 1992 recording, he demonstrates not only the beauty of this music, but also a structural rectification of this beauty. By that I mean his attempt to correct Schubert’s asymmetrical structure in the final movement. Through a close examination comparing mm. 354-59 and mm. 78-85, I acknowledge that a two-measure passage which is to be the equivalent of mm. 82-83 is missing. However, Barenboim attempts to correct this inconsistency by adding a repetition of m. 357 in a lower octave and interpreting the rests, mm. 358-59, in a lower octave except the right hand, which still remains in the same octave. Here are my two assumptions regarding this controversial interpretation in his 1992 recording. Barenboim may have discovered information that has justified his interpretation.

First, Barenboim is obviously aware of this inconsistency presented in Schubert’s music, and he attempts to correct this problematic issue through the rectification of this inconsistency. Second, he might forget the music and attempt to correct this by a natural improvisation. Therefore, this performance does not reflect his awareness of Schubert’s asymmetrical structure at all. In addition to these two assumptions, some observations make this controversial interpretation even more puzzling, such as:
1. Among other of his recordings, there is not a single similar situation like this, in which Barenboim attempts to rectify the composer’s asymmetrical structural format.

2. Based on my attendance at numerous performances, there were times he forgot music on stage, but he did not attempt to improvise and disguise the mistake.

3. His rectification of the asymmetrical structure might not be an appropriate one because he added only an extra repetition which is not a sufficient and equivalent compensation for the passage at mm. 82-83. Furthermore, one might question if audiences would really recognize and acknowledge the difference between these two passages within the movement, since they are located in transitional sections and since they are presented in a fast movement. Many, including musicologists, scholars, pianists, and important figures in the music scene in Vienna who attended this concert that night in 1992 might have already studied the Sonata, D. 960, for number of times before attending Barenboim’s return concert. I wonder how many of them even noticed this difference in his recital and how they reacted to his rectification of this asymmetrical structure. Unfortunately, no evidence has been found about his controversial interpretation in any criticism of this performance.

Arthur Rubinstein’s 1969 recording is worth mentioning as well. According to Max Wilcox, the recording session in 1963 in RCA Italiana’s studios in Rome inspired him to perform this Sonata, D. 960, in the following performing seasons. Rubinstein’s performances came with the inevitable changes in conception, and the still-unreleased first recording, which is a 1961 recording, was scheduled to be redone.\(^6\) In 1965, Rubinstein finally seemed pleased with his

---

newer recording, but since he wanted to add another two short Schubert works to this recording, it was not yet ready to release.\textsuperscript{61} Wilcox also mentions,

\begin{quote}
The critical reaction was unusually mixed for a Rubinstein recording, and it seemed possible that this most natural of musicians and recording artists had allowed himself to “over-worry” his approach to this music.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

Since the critical reaction was “unusually mixed,” what could have made Rubinstein over “over-worried” at the time? Or, was this because he started to question his approach to this music such as the repeat in the exposition of the Sonata, D. 960, since none of his recordings in 1961, 1965, and 1969 reflect the importance of this repeat? I believe that if he had decided to record this repeat in the exposition of the Sonata, D. 960, which runs longer, he would not have had to worry what other two short Schubert works he might choose to fit this CD program. However, he decided to add No. 3 and No. 4 of Impromptus, Op. 90, which runs twelve minutes and forty seconds in total.

Malcolm Bilson’s 2003 recording also aroused my concern. As he mentioned in the CD booklet:

\begin{quote}
In Vienna, up to the late 1860s, pianos were still made by hand in small shops, by master builders; each was considered an individual work of art. Pianos from the same shop were not supposed to sound identical; each was to have personal voice, like the best violins of the great violin makers.\textsuperscript{63}
\end{quote}

In this discussion, I do not intend to discredit Bilson’s effort on presenting these sonatas on a restored historical instrument built in Schubert’s time, nor do I intend to question his musicianship in interpreting the beauty of Schubert’s sonata. Instead, I am truly puzzled by the fact that he recorded both repeats in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 958 and the Sonata, D. 61

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 4.

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 5.

\textsuperscript{63} Bilson, the liner notes to Schubert Piano Sonatas Compact Disc, 2.
959 but not the one in the Sonata, D. 960. I am also puzzled by the question of why playing Schubert’s sonatas on a restored instrument built in 1830 would be more important than being faithful to what Schubert wrote in the Sonata, D. 960, since Schubert indicated that this unusual repeat should be heard twice in the draft contained in the Bärenreiter edition and since this repeat is presented in most of the modern editions.

In the final section of this chapter, I examine and disagree with Roy Howat’s presumption of the lower E at mm. 347-48 at the end of the first movement in the A-major Sonata, D. 959. (Example 3.3)

**Example 3.3** The Sonata, D. 959, the end of the first movement, Roy Howat’s presumption of the lower E at mm. 347-48 (The Wiener Urtext edition)

He points out that the lower E at m. 71 presented in the second movement of the Sonata, D 960, does seem unusual on an instrument of Schubert’s time. Then, he continues his discussion with a possible interpretative presumption of a lower D at m. 151 in the first movement of the Sonata, D. 958, and a lower E at m. 351 at the end of the first movement in the Sonata, D. 959. At the end of his discussion, he then chooses a safer stance and illustrates to readers a quote from Michael Cole and Martha Novak,

> Present-day perspective on this is incomplete unless we remember that in the 1820s the compass of pianos still varied enormously, even from the same makers. Even in the 1820s many new Viennese pianos did not go below F’; some makers

---

64 Howat, *Reading between the Lines*, 134.
offered the extended compass as an option with a higher price tag, rather like a car sunroof 150 years later.\footnote{Michael Cole, \textit{The Pianoforte in the Classical Era} and Martha Novak Clinkscale, \textit{Makers of the Piano}, quoted in Roy Howat, \textit{Reading between the Lines}, 135.}

And he continues:

> Whether this means that Schubert—like Chopin—was writing primarily for the instruments of his time, beyond them, or both at once, are larger questions that can happily be left to continued debate.\footnote{Ibid., 136.}

First of all, what they suggest is that there is little doubt about varying instruments made in Schubert’s time. One might be different from another in terms of its compass. After a closer examination of this passage at m. 351 at the end of the first movement in the Sonata, D. 959, I disagree with Howat’s assumption of the “lower E” at mm. 347-48 at the end of the first movement in the Sonata, D. 959. In this case, Mr. Howart might have made another mistake, a similar mistake to the one mentioned in the sixth interpretive issue: “the isolated double-dotted rhythm in m. 90 in the second movement of the Sonata, D. 960.” A look at mm. 331-57 at the end of the first movement of the Sonata, D. 959 illustrates a pivotal process in the left hand from m. 331 to the end of this movement. (Example 3.4)
Example 3.4 The Sonata, D. 959, the first movement, mm. 331-57 (The Wiener Urtext edition)

This might challenge pianists’ interpretations of these passages. In this music, the left hand firstly demonstrates an octave downward leap at m. 331-32 with an identical
rhythm, which is ubiquitous throughout the entire movement. At mm. 340-41, even though both hands move to a lower register, the left hand, as usual, is still faithfully presenting this downward octave leap combined with this identical rhythm. Now, for the third time, mm. 347-48, in this Coda section, the left hand no longer presents this identical rhythm with its original downward octave leap. Instead, Schubert substantiates the original downward octave leap with a simple repetition of E. These two measures, mm. 347-48, provide a very pivotal transition within the entire Coda section. Not only did Schubert attempt to level this original downward octave leap, he also used the advantage of these two measures as a preparation for the forthcoming significant change at m. 350 and m. 352, in which he transforms the original downward octave leap into an upward octave leap. Then, a prolonged broken chord in A major re-enhances its power with a more than four octave presentation. However, at the end of mm. 356-57, one realizes that the earlier transformation of the original octave leap in the left hand at mm. 347-48, which is the repetition of the same note E in the left hand, eventually wins over in the entire battle. I again wonder why Roy Howat, would rush to the conclusion, suggesting a lower E rather than reading the music backward to find out other possible solutions to this mysterious repetition of E in the left hand at mm. 347-48.

Through the demonstration of these controversial interpretations, I hope that modern performers would comprehend that even though this is an area with much freedom, it would be important to be cautious in considering an appropriate interpretation.
Chapter 4: A Conclusion

With the ongoing elevated importance in the performance practice of Schubert’s last three piano sonatas in the twentieth and early twenty-first century, these nineteen interpretive issues, plus the ideas in Chapter 3, without a doubt, are extremely vital when interpreting these piano sonatas or even his other piano works. Therefore, these nineteen interpretive issues discussed in Chapter 2 should not be overlooked by current performers.

In addition to these nineteen issues, the rising concept of historical instruments vs. period instruments also plays a rather significant role in providing current performers important knowledge about the different sound, touch, articulation, phrasing, pedaling and other concerns during Schubert’s time. However, whether this type of interpretation will eventually become a favorite trend in the future or not still remains a question since there are some pianists who have the clear ability to interpret these last three sonatas with modern grand pianos without misinterpreting Schubert’s music.

In 1839 Robert Schumann was a leading figure as a composer, music educator, and a pianist, as well as a major critic. As an afterthought to my examination and research, I could not help but wonder what would be the reputation of these three sonatas if Anton Diabelli had not dedicated them to Schumann eleven years after Schubert’s death. Would they be as famous as they are today? Or, if Heinrich A. Probst had agreed to publish these sonatas in 1828, eleven years before their actual emergence in 1839, would these three sonatas have had a better appreciation from the public in the second half of the nineteenth century?

There is no real doubt that the public has owed Schubert an appropriate recognition since the second quarter of the nineteenth century. I hope my examination and discussion will
stimulate more performers to include any of Schubert’s final three piano sonatas or his other piano works in their recital programs in the future. Furthermore, I hope this document will facilitate performers’ understandings of how to interpret these performance issues in these three great pieces of music. Philip Radcliffe when speaking about Schubert’s final three sonatas stated, “It is their essential intimacy, sometimes combined with an almost limitless sense of space, that gives them their peculiar fascination, and for those in sympathy with the music, this fascination is perennial.”

---

Bibliography

I. Books and Articles


Webster, James. “Schubert’s Sonata Form and Brahms’s First Maturity” *19th Century Music* 3 (1978): 18-35.


**II. Selected Discography**

Andsnes, Leif Ove. Schubert’s Piano Sonata in B-flat major D. 960 and Three Lieder. EMI Classics, 7243 5 57901 2 5

Arrau, Claudio. *An Anniversary Tribute*. Philips, 473 461-2

______. *Schubert’s Piano Sonatas*. Philips, 473 895-2


______. *Schubert’s Piano Sonata in B flat, D. 960 and Others*. Deutsche Grammophone, 2530 995


______. *Schubert’s Piano Sonatas Vol. 5*. Hungaroton, HCD 31590

______. *Schubert’s Piano Sonatas Vol. 7*. Hungaroton, HCD 31592


______. *Schubert’s Piano Sonata in A, D. 959 and Others*. Philips, 422 229-2

______. *Schubert’s Piano Sonatas*. Philips, 289 456 573-2


________. Schubert’s Piano Sonata in B flat, D. 960. Deutsche Grammophone, 2530 477

Horszowski, Mieczyslaw. Schubert’s Piano Sonata in C minor D. 958 and Others. GEMM, CDS 9979

Horowitz, Vladimir. Schubert’s Piano Sonata in B-flat D. 960 and Others. Deutsche Grammophone, 474 370-2

Hough, Stephen. Schubert’s Piano Sonatas. Hyperion, CDA 67027


Kovacevich, Stephen. Schubert’s Piano Sonata in B flat, D. 960 and Others. EMI Classics, 7243-5-55359-2-4


Ogdon, John. Schubert’s Piano Sonata in C minor D. 958 and Others. BBC Radio, BBCL 4142-2

Lewis, Paul. Schubert’s Piano Sonatas. Harmonia Mundi, HMC 901800
________. Schubert’s Piano Sonatas. Harmonia Mundi, HMN 911755

________. Schubert’s Piano Sonatas. London Decca, 475 7078

________. Schubert’s Piano Sonatas. Sony Classical, S2K 87706

________. Schubert’s Piano Sonata in B-flat major, D. 960 and Drei Klavierstücke, D. 946. Harmonia Mundi, HMC 901658

Pollini, Maurizio. Schubert’s Piano Sonatas. Deutsche Grammophone, 419 229-2
Rosenberger, Carol. *Schubert’s B-flat Piano Sonata, D. 960 and Others*. Delos D/CD 3018


________. *Schubert’s B-flat Piano Sonata, D. 960 and Others*. BMG 0 9026 63055-2

________. *Schubert’s B-flat Piano Sonata, D. 960 and Others*. RCA 6257-2-RC


**III. Cited Editions of Schubert’s Late Sonatas**


**IV. Website**
