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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Listed as Op.14 No.3, Robert Schumann’s F minor piano sonata “Concert sans Orchestre” has not received as much favor from modern pianists as his other two piano sonatas Op.11 and Op.22. Scholars who have studied the sonata have indicated weaknesses in this composition. In Robert Schumann-His Life and Work, Ronald Taylor states that “all three of Schumann’s pianoforte sonatas belong to the same musical world, reflect the same sequence of first, second and sometimes third thoughts…maybe the relative oblivion into which the F minor sonata has fallen has something to do with its greater unevenness and its more obtrusive repetitiousness-though homogeneity and conciseness are hardly the hallmarks of its fellows either. Moscheles, the dedicatee, added that its dissonances, so subtle and delayed in their resolutions, could only be appreciated by an educated ear.¹ In 1837, Schumann published part of a letter from Moscheles in the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik:

Much of the harmonization employs dissonances whose subsequent resolution brings balm only to an experienced ear. Anticipations and suspensions, whose development often becomes clear only after the second or third bar, are frequently harsh, although justified. In order not to be disturbed or abused by them, one must be an experienced musician who senses in advance and anticipates how every contradiction resolves itself.²

Originally composed as a five-movement work, the F minor sonata was first published with only three movements under the title Concert sans Orchestre in 1836 by Tobias Haslinger in Vienna. Scherzo I and Scherzo II were both not included in this first publication. In 1853, Schumann revised the work and restored Scherzo II as the second movement of the sonata. The

1853 edition published by Schuberth & Co. in Hamburg is known as the complete version of sonata Op.14 in F minor *Grande Sonate*. The original *Scherzo I* was never published in Schumann’s lifetime.

According to Haslinger, Johannes Brahms’s performance in Vienna (1862) was considered the first public performance of the Sonata Op.14. The work was well received by both critics and audiences and was performed frequently by Clara, at private family gatherings and during her concert tours. However, its popularity diminished after the composer’s death. A review written on April 1, 1884 concerning a series of concerts played by Clara in London describes the neglect of the work there: “The sonata in F minor, op.14, perhaps the finest of the three, has yet to wait for a hearing.” The sonata is not mentioned in Clara’s “Works Studied, and Repertoire” until 1871, and then only the variation movement is listed. It would seem that Sonata Op.14 was forgotten among performers and scholars for approximately a century.

The Sonata Op.14 is rarely heard in the concert hall. The number of recorded performances is relatively small, compared to better-known romantic sonatas, including Schumann’s other big sonatas Op.11 and Op.22. Boyan S. Lekov summarized in his dissertation: “there are approximately 16 different recordings of the Sonata Op.14 currently available, compared to approximately 35 for both the Sonata Op.11 and Op.22. In comparison, there are

---


5 Ibid, 58.


7 Ibid, 79.
currently over 130 recordings available of Chopin’s B-flat minor sonata Op.35 (2007). Among recorded performances of the work, Vladimir Horowitz’s Carnegie Hall Recital in 1975 is the first surviving recording of the Op.14. His dynamics and expression signs are a combination of all four editions. As far as the notes and rhythmic discrepancies are concerned, Horowitz mostly followed the editions of Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition. For instance, in measure 75, he places the syncopated rhythm in the right hand (see example 3a) as Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition suggested. Once again in measure 110 to 111, he plays both hands in octaves (see example 4) as indicated in Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition. “Needless to say, Horowitz is its ideal interpreter, and this performance is one of his greatest achievements,” reviews Max Westler, “he is in every way equal to the sonata's considerable technical demands. But more important, Horowitz is completely at home in the emotional turbulence of the music, able to express and articulate the tension without ever releasing it…he makes it sound anxious, hesitant, ghost-ridden… that is the story of the piece.”

Italian pianist Maurizio Pollini chose to display the sonata as it appears in its earliest version. He strictly follows the 1836 version of Op.14. Pollini is the only one out of the three performers to choose to play measure 76 to 83 in arpeggiated style (see example 6). He recorded three movements of the Op.14 in his Schumann complete recordings in 2013.

Russian pianist Grigory Sokolov decided to follow the later version of Op.14. His performance of Op.14 in 2010 had five movements. Even Scherzo I was included in his live performance. The most impressive part of his performance is the use of the expression signs. He

---


clearly expresses the differences in dynamics and expression signs between the left and right hands. In measure 22 to 26 (see example 10), his left hand is able to disappear nicely while right hand is going up to a higher range of the piano.

Objectives

The focus of this research will be to study some of the major differences between editions of the first movement of Schumann’s Op.14. The specific editions to be compared are Concert Sans Orchestre (1836), edited by Ernst Herttrich; Grande Sonate (1853), edited by Ernst Herttrich; Grand Sonata No.3 Op.14 Erste und Zweite Ausgabe, edited by Clara Schumann. Ernst Herttrich’s editions were published by G. Henle Verlag in 2006. Clara Schumann’s editions were published by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1887 and reprinted by Gregg International Press in 1968. The goal of the study will be to help performers solve practical issues they have to deal with when four very different authentic editions of the work exist. Differences in essential elements such as pitch, rhythms, metronome markings, expression signs and dynamics will be discussed and the result of this examination should assist performers in making deliberate interpretive choices.

---


CHAPTER 2

ROBERT SCHUMANN AND HIS OPUS 14 IN F MINOR

Robert Schumann

Robert Alexander Schumann was born on June 8th 1810. “The basic facts of Schumann’s life suggest a life in disarray,” says Beate Perrey in *The Cambridge Companion to Schumann*, “Born into the *Sehnsucht*-driven world of German Romanticism, he is torn between disciplines. He begins the study of law out of a sense of filial duty but then follows his instinct when he turns to music, though never letting go of two other great passions, literature and poetry. Even as a committed musician, however, he veers between the roles of performer, composer and critic.”

Schumann moved to Leipzig in 1828 to study law. He also started taking piano lessons from Friedrich Wieck. In *Robert Schumann His Life and Work*, Ronald Taylor says: “As a new pupil of Wieck’s, the eighteen-year-old Schumann was sent back to basics…he had to start doing five-finger exercises again, like a beginner.” His famous hand injury happened between 1829 and 1832 during his study with Wieck. “Because of the injury, Schumann had to stop his path of becoming a concert pianist. Instead, the hand injury strikes one (Schumann) as a daunting maneuver in his feverish quest to find himself. It shows him willing to inflict pain where it most matters, increasing pain to its limits, and finally going beyond those limits…his hands are freed to compose.”

In 1834, Schumann co-founded the *Neue Zeitschrift fur Musik*, where he published his essays, letters and reviews. “By using pseudonyms and aliases such as ‘Eusebius’, ‘Florestan’, ‘Raro’ and so on, he turns the endless multiplicity of interpretative possibilities into an applied

---

art by refusing to speak in a single unified voice.”¹⁶ Tortured by what today would likely be diagnosed as bipolar depression, Schumann was admitted to a mental hospital in Endenich in 1854, where he died at the age of 46, on July 29th 1856.

Opus 14 in F minor

Schumann believed that the sonata was “the most ‘exalted’ category of piano music,” and “short pieces” were only a “kind of preparatory study for the more important business of writing sonatas, concertos and symphonies.”¹⁷ As an editor and author of the NZFM, Schumann frequently expressed the importance of “unity” of the musical materials beyond the tonal plan.¹⁸

In subject matter, the Sonata is wholly Clara’s. Schumann declares his intentions, as it were, by using the five-note motif (Clara’s ‘motto’ theme, the falling figure of five notes), in strong left-hand octaves, as the opening of the Sonata.¹⁹ In a letter to Mocheles, Schumann humorously notes that the roguish Florestan and Eusebius had published Op.14 under his (Schumann’s) name.²⁰ Newman mentions that this inspired “Sonata appasionata” allows Florestan’s seething and uncompromising passions to dominate Eusebius almost completely, much more so than in Op.11.²¹

Sources relating to Schumann’s life and works around the time when Sonata Op.14 was composed, include Peter Ostwald’s book Schumann The Inner Voices of a Musical Genius.

---

¹⁸ Valerie Stegink Sterk, “Robert Schumann as sonata critic and composer: The sonata from Beethoven to 1844, as reviewed by Schumann in the "Neue Zeitschrift fuer Musik"", (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1992), 51.
²⁰ Newman, Sonata since Beethoven, 272-273.
²¹ Ibid, 273.
Ostwald calls Sonata Op.14 “a tribute to Schumann’s own heroism.” Ostwald also says that the sonata “was conceived at the height of his ordeal with Clara” and “A descending five-note theme signifying ‘Clara’ recurs throughout the Concerto without Orchestra, sometimes in an angry mood as at the beginning of the first movement, sometimes tenderly, as in the Andantino de Clara Wieck.”

The manuscript of the Sonata Op.14 shows that the work was finished on June 5, 1836 and that Schumann originally conceived of it as a five-movement work (first edition: Concert sans Orchestre). The title “Concert sans Orchestre” appears to have raised concerns from Schumann’s contemporaries. Both Franz Liszt and Ignaz Moscheles provided some of the earliest reviews of the work. Liszt called the title “illogical.” In a letter published in the Neue Zeitschrift fur Musik, Moscheles wrote, “one wonders what may have promoted the title.” The neglect of this sonata, in many ways more interesting than Schumann’s other two piano sonatas may perhaps be ascribed to the changes in construction and title which chequered its early career. At the time of its first publication Moscheles expressed his opinion to Schumann that “the work did not fulfill the requirements of a Concerto though it possessed the characteristic attributes of a Grand Sonata in the manner of Beethoven and Weber, and that its prevailing seriousness and passion were the very reverse of the attributes expected by a concert audience of

---

22 Peter Ostwald, Schumann: The Inner voices of a Musical Genius (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1985), 127.
23 Ostwald, Schumann: The Inner voices of a Musical Genius, 127.
26 Pleasants, The Musical World of Robert Schumann: A Selection from his Own Writings, 197-198.
27 Gerald Abraham, Schumann A Symposium (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), 44.
those days.”

The second edition of the Sonata Op.14 was published 17 years later. In a letter to Clara Schumann, Robert Schumann referred to a “third sonata” long before the publication as such in 1853 (second edition: Grand Sonate): “The third Sonata is in F minor, and quite different from the others.” As a “sonata,” Liszt found Op.14 “rich and powerful,” and a reminder that Schumann’s works awaited introduction to the French.

---

28 Ibid, 44.
CHAPTER 3
A COMPARISON OF THE FOUR EDITIONS WITH SUGGESTED WAYS TO MAKE A CHOICE BETWEEN CONFLICTING MARKINGS IN THE EDITIONS

Various Editions of Schumann’s Opus 14

Schumann’s Opus 14 is one of several works by this composer to exist in two versions. (e.g., Davidsbündlertänze, op. 6 and the Etudes Symphoniques, op. 13). In 1836, Opus 14 was published as Concert sans Orchestre. Schumann then revised this work and Opus 14 was published as Grande Sonate in 1853.

The performance guide in this chapter is based on four different editions: Concert Sans Orchestre (1836), edited by Ernst Herttrich31; Grande Sonate (1853), edited by Ernst Herttrich32; Grand Sonata No.3 Op.14 Erste und Zweite Ausgabe, edited by Clara Schumann33. Ernst Herttrich’s editions were published by G. Henle Verlag in 2006. Clara Schumann’s editions were published by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1887 and reprinted by Gregg International Press in 1968.

In the preface to the 1836 version of Schumann’s op.14 published by G.Henle Verlag in 1983, editor Ernst Herttrich quotes Wolfgang Boetticher34: “the origins of this composition go back to 1834,” which reveals “a proximal link, as regards origin with the two other sonatas.”35

---


34 Wolfgang Boetticher is the editor of G. Henle Verlag’s edition published in 1983.

35 Preface, Herttrich 1836.
Herttrich also wrote that “we do not know, however, on what this claim is based. Nor is it likely to be correct. The fact that an early, autograph manuscript containing sketches of the variation movement and the Scherzo I is dated April 14, 1836 undermines the claim that op.14 was begun as early as 1834.”

Regarding the Herttrich 1853 edition, he wrote in the preface, “He (Schumann) published the piece a second time in 1853, now as a Deuxième Edition bearing the original title Grande Sonate, but with only the second Scherzo. Along with the piano pieces op.5, 6, 13 and 16, as well as the Lieder cycle op.39, op.14 thus takes its place among those works that Schumann revised to varying degrees and had republished in the years 1849-1853. From the beginning, these new versions were subjected to a great deal of interpretative analysis by Schumann scholars, nearly all of whom sought the reason for these reworkings in Schumann’s changed aesthetic views.”

Robert Schumann’s Werke, edited by Clara Schumann, consists of 14 series in 35 volumes. “Schumann’s relationship with Clara was a constant factor in his life…she was the inspiration of many of his compositions,” says Boyan S. Lekov in his dissertation Robert Schumann’s Grand Sonata No.3, Op. 14 in F-minor – ‘Concert Sans Orchestra’: A Performance Analysis, “the unusual history of this work presented a problem even for Brahms and Clara, who collaborated on a complete edition of Schumann’s work. After some consideration, they decided that the only acceptable solution was to include both the first and the second editions of the Sonata Op.14 in their entirety in the Complete Works edition.”

36 Preface, Herttrich 1836
37 Preface, Herttrich 1853
38 Lekov, 6
39 Lekov, 34
Comparison of the Four Editions with Performance Considerations

Notes

Measures 6–7

The first noticeable contradiction occurs on beat 4 in measure 6, at the end of the introduction of the first movement. The bass note of the left hand is marked D-flat in Herttrich 1836, Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition (see example 1a). However, the same note is marked D-natural in C.Schumann first edition (see example 1b).

Example 1a

Example 1b

Measure 7, the measure right before the theme of the first movement, contains another discrepancy that could affect the decision performers make on beat 4 of measure 6. Herttrich 1836 and Herttrich 1853 have two completely different chords in the right hand. Herttrich 1853 cadences on a C dominant 9th chord which is the dominant of the key F minor (see example 1c).
The Herttrich 1836 edition shows that Schumann might have wanted more than just a simple V-I. The right hand cadences on a D-flat chord (see example 1a). In this case, C.Schumann first edition is the same as Herttrich 1836, C.Schumann second edition has the same C major chord as Herttrich 1853.

Example 1c

“clearly, Schumann saw himself as the guardian of tradition. The Classical ideals of Beethoven and Schubert, which he held so dear, seemed in danger of being lost…it became possible to relate distant keys, to introduce violent contrasts. In a Beethoven sonata movement, the sudden introduction of a remote tonality has a vital, even catastrophic, effect on the overall construction.”

If the performer chose to play the D flat chord in measure 7, it would create a dramatic suspension that pulls the listener’s ear across the barline into the true beginning of the piece. The C major chord in measure 7 simply creates a mirror image of the opening five notes of the sonata. In this case, the motive of the first movement is expressed. The decision of D-flat or D-natural in measure 6 could be made based on which chord one chooses in measure 7. If one

---

prefers the intensity in the music, a D-flat in both measure 6 and 7 seems suitable for this situation. However, should one elect to choose the C major chord, the argument can be made that Schumann’s respect for tradition should override the excitement that the “unusual” D-flat chord provides.

Measures 10-14

The same harmonies can be voiced differently in the accompaniment lines. The following examples of measure 10 to 12 show how notes can be placed and arranged differently. In measure 10, the left hand arpeggios are placed in different octaves. Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition have the left hand placed an octave lower than Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition (see example 2a and 2b). Another voice arrangement discrepancy occurs in measure 14. Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition have the C minor arpeggios starting in the root position (see example 2b), versus Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition which have the C minor arpeggios starting on the second inversion (see example 2a). Example 2a
Example 2b

*Suggested solution:* By considering the directions of the melody in the right hand, playing the left hand G major arpeggios in the lower octave in measure 10 works better as the right melody is moving lower. An unnecessary overlapping of the hands can also be avoided in the next measure as well. In measure 14, playing the C minor arpeggios in root position makes more sense as the right melody is moving higher. Also, it would be a nice contrast from measure 12 where the left hand arpeggios are already in the second inversion.

*Measure 75*

This contradiction happens at the beginning of the development section. In both Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition, there is a voice line written in syncopated rhythm in the right hand’s top voice (see example 3a). Both Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition removed the top voice. Instead, they pull the last eighth note back to beat 4 on top of the lower voice of the right hand (see example 3b).
Example 3a

Example 3b

**Suggested solution:** Measure 75 is part of the sequence that continues from the previous measure. The melody in the right hand from measure 74 hints an ascending direction before the next section starts in measure 76. In this case, choosing the syncopated pattern in Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition would give a sense of completion of the melodic materials in this section.

**Measures 110-111**

At the end of the development section, another clear discrepancy involving notes and rhythms appears in measure 110 to 111. Both Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition have the right hand notes played as octaves from the end of beat 3 in measure 110 to the first beat in measure 111 and the left hand playing in octaves notes in measure 111 on beat 1 to 2 (see example 4a). Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition have the octave notes of both hands removed as well as the A-flat in the right hand on beat 3 of measure 110. Instead, the entire right
hand from the second half of measure 110 to the end of measure 112 are written in single notes (see example 4b). The second half of measure 110 also contains a small rhythmic contradiction. Because of the removed A-flat in Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition, the syncopated pattern continues to the end of measure 110.

Example 4a

Example 4b

*Suggested solution:* Since this is the last phrase before the subject returns in measure 113, playing in octave notes would help to achieve the climax of this movement. Single noted patterns may sound smaller and create an anti-climax before the recapitulation.

*Measures 196-204*

In this D-flat major paragraph, Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition choose to start bar 2 of measure 196 an octave higher (see example 5b) than Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition (see example 5a).
Example 5a

Example 5b
**Suggested solution**: Measure 76 to 84 in the exposition has the same materials as measure 196 to 204. All four editions have this pattern in the same octave range. In measure 84, it is clear when the new motive emerges because it starts in a lower octave than the previous material (see example 5c). If one chooses to go with Herttrich 1836 and C. Schumann first edition’s lower octave replacement, the new motive in measure 204 would sound like a continuation of the previous materials rather than a new beginning (see example 5d).

Example 5c

![Example 5c](image)

Example 5d

![Example 5d](image)
Rhythms

*Measures 76-83*

The first rhythmic discrepancy occurs at measure 76 to 83. Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition break the harmonies into arpeggios (see example 6a). Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition keep the same dotted rhythmic pattern as measure 38 to 45 where the same motive appears for the first time (see example 6b).

Example 6a

Example 6b
Suggested solution: When talking about Schumann’s piano music Joan Chissell says “more often than not his melodies are woven into an active arpeggio-based kind of figuration, the two hands never too far apart, often with off-beat echoes and imitations in other parts.”

Although measure 76 to 83 has the same materials as measure 38 to 45, it does not have to be played in the exact same way. After all, it is in A-flat major instead of E-flat major. It is also a perfect fourth higher. The broken chord patterns in Herttrich 1835 and C.Schumann first edition would catch the listeners’ attention again and would be consistent with what we know about Schumann’s piano writing in general.

Measures 225-226

Measure 225 to 226 presents a similar situation to that of measure 76 to 83 involving another rhythmic structure change. There is a falling arpeggio pattern leading into the return of the main theme. Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition have broken chords (see example 7a). Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann distribute the chord pattern between the hands (see example 7b).

Example 7a

---

Example 7b

*Suggested solution:* Both patterns can produce an enormous amount of sound to lead into the return of the beginning motive. In this circumstance, performers could choose the pattern that is the most physically comfortable for them.

*Measures 233-234*

Another remarkable discrepancy occurs at the end of the recapitulation. The rhythmic structure in measure 233 in both Herttrich 1836 and C. Schumann first edition is changed in Herttrich 1853 and C. Schumann second edition. Herttrich 1836 and C. Schumann first edition has only eighth-rests between each chord (see example 8a). Herttrich 1853 and C. Schumann second edition add quarter-rests between each chord (see example 8b). This results in the first movement of the Herttrich 1853 and C. Schumann second edition being one measure longer than in the Herttrich 1836 and C. Schumann first edition. All four editions have a *fermata* sign at the end of the four chords.

Example 8a
Example 8b

*Suggested solution:* While either choice can be made to work, the impulsiveness of the opening of the sonata is echoed best by choosing example 8a. This choice also provides a greater contrast when, after the *fermata*, the musical material becomes more lyrical.

Metronome Markings

The metronome indication in the Herttrich 1836 is *Allegro Brillante* and half note = 76⁴² (see example 9a). Herttrich 1853’s metronome indication was changed to a slower tempo *Allegro* and half note = 58⁴³ (see example 9b). In this case, both C. Schumann’s first edition and second edition stay with the faster tempo half note = 76. Walker mentions, “Martin Schoppe, Director of Schumann-Haus, has told me that no metronome belonging to Schumann has survived to the present day, and that he does not know of any metronome of Schumann’s ever being scientifically tested…the possibility that his metronome was defective may first have been suggested after his death by Clara Schumann.”⁴⁴

---

⁴² Robert Schumann indicated the metronome marking in this edition. A picture of the manuscript from Newman’s book *The Sonata Since Beethoven* proves that Schumann suggested the tempo.

⁴³ According to Roesner, no manuscript of this edition survives that could have been used by the publisher Schuberth & Co. Therefore, the metronome indication here is questionable.

Example 9a

Example 9b

Example 9c

Example 9d

Suggested solution: Herttrich 1853 edition is based on the edition published by Schuberth & Co. According to Roesner, Schuberth did not have access to the page proofs for either 1836 or the 1853 edition, nor did he see the manuscript.45 When Newman introduced Schumann’s Op.14

in the book *The Sonata Since Beethoven*, he published a picture of the manuscript of the 1836 edition that shows Schumann’s writing of half note = 76.\footnote{Newman, *The Sonata Since Beethoven*, 272} This makes a convincing argument for choosing half note = 76.

Expression Signs and Dynamics

Chissell writes, “his (Schumann’s) piano works are full of expression marks and constant changes of tempo again testifying to his mercurial temperament and urgent wish to communicate every passing shade of feeling.”\footnote{Chissell, *Schumann Piano Music*, 9}

Most of the expression signs in Op.14’s 1836 edition were not carried over to the 1853 revision. Both Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second editions show very few expression signs. Differences in dynamic markings in the first movement also occur throughout the four editions.

*Measures 22-26*

Herttrich 1836 has the most detailed indications among all four editions. In measure 22, Herttrich 1836 marks *pianissimo* and *expressivo* on beat 2, then the dynamic changes to *piano* on beat 2 of measure 24, it is changed back to *pianissimo* at the end of this phrase on beat 1 of measure 26 (see example 10a). All the dynamics are clearly marked for each hand. When right hand does *crescendo* to the end of a phrase, left hand has a *diminuendo* marked at the end of the phrase. C.Schumann first edition does not have clear instructions on dynamics. The *crescendo* and *diminuendo* could be only written for the left hand or both hands (see example 10b). Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition are both missing the *espressivo* in measure 22

\footnote{Chissell, *Schumann Piano Music*, 9}
(see example 10c). Also, the entire phrase from measure 22 to 26 does not go back and forth between *piano* and *pianissimo*.

Example 10a

Example 10b

no dynamic indications in the right hand
Example 10c

_Suggested solution:_ The *espressivo* is quite important in measure 22, as observing it ensures that the left hand melody can be heard. As far as the *crescendo* and *diminuendo*, the best result is likely achieved by giving each hand either the *crescendo* or the *diminuendo*. Left hand’s *diminuendo* toward the resolution could help to bring out the right hand’s melodic line.

_Measures 62-75_

In the following examples of measure 62 – 75, both Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition have lots of indications provided for performers. C.Schumann first edition has *Animato* marked at the beginning of this section (see example 11a). Herttrich 1836 also suggests *animato*, but it is only marked by the left hand accompaniment (see example 11b). Both Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition have *stringendo* starting in measure 66 followed by *ritenuto* in measure 75 and _a tempo_ in measure 76. In Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition, *animato* is removed from measure 62 (see example 11c). The *stringendo* in measure 66 only lasts until measure 69 and _in tempo_ is indicated at the beginning of measure 69 in both Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition (see example 11c).
Example 11c

*Suggested solution:* It would be more stylistically consistent to leave the *animato* in the left hand only. This would align with performance tradition in most of the romantic piano literature, notably Chopin and Liszt. The right hand’s melody comes from the theme of this movement. Ideally it should keep the same tempo while the left hand uses the repeated accompaniment pattern to create an *agitato* feeling by pushing the tempo a bit forward. The *stringendo* in Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition lasts for 9 measures but Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann have *in tempo* marked when another, calmer melody comes back in measure 69. Ending the *stringendo* in measure 69 makes more sense because of the obvious
mood of this melodic line. When speaking about Schumann’s mercurial temperament, Walker says “Schumann’s depressions showed other features typical of the ‘endogenous’, as against the reactive, mood swing: a diurnal rhythm with mood state worst in the morning; feeling of physical malaise with hypochondriacal ideas etc.”

Measures 76-84

In this section, Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition begin this paragraph with *pianissimo* (see example 12a), which is missing in Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition (see example 12b). Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition have the same dynamics and expression signs. They both have this section marked *innocente* in measure 76 on beat 2. It is not indicated in Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition. The dynamics are also written in two different ways between Herttrich 1836/C.Schumann first edition and Herttrich 1853/C.Schumann second edition. Measure 76 to 84 can be divided into two phrases: beat 2 in measure 76 to beat 1 in measure 80 is one phrase; beat 2 in measure 80 to beat 1 in measure 84 in the second phrase. They are the same materials but the second phrase is written one octave lower. Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition have *crescendo* and *diminuendo* written within in each phrase. Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition only have the *crescendo* and *diminuendo* written in two specific measures (see example 12c).

---

Example 12a

Example 12b
Example 12c

*Suggested solution:* Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann provide a better dynamic instruction in this paragraph. Stretching the *crescendo* and *diminuendo* in 4-measure pacing makes for longer phrases. The *pianissimo* in measure 80 gives a nice echo to the same materials presented in a lower octave.

*Measures 100-112*

The following examples from measure 100 – 112 contain a climax that leads into the recapitulation of the first movement. Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition start this section with a *ritenuto* and a marking of *dolce* (see example 13a). Before the right hand enters in measure 101, Herttrich 1836 marks the left hand with a *diminuendo* but it is missing in C.Schumann first edition (see example 13b). Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition also have a *diminuendo* in measure 101, but the *ritenuto* and a *dolce* in measure 100 are missing in these two editions. Also, in measure 110, Herttrich 1836 and C.Schumann first edition inserted a *fortissimo*, which is not printed in Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition.
Example 13a

Example 13b
Suggested solution: The *diminuendo* for the left hand in measure 101 is essential for balance of voices because of the entrance of the right hand’s melodic line. The *ritenuto* is not as necessary because the melody in measure 101 already suggests a calming atmosphere. The *ritenuto* can be placed in measure 100 if a performer prefers a bigger contrast to the *accelerando* in measure 104 to 105. The *fortissimo* in measure 110 might create an anti-climax before the return of the theme in measure 113. It is more effective to save the energy for the *crescendo* in measure 112. Alan Walker writes “what of the impact of the personality of the performer himself on Schumann’s piano music? It hardly needs saying that he must be a pianist who is thoroughly convinced of, and unquestioningly accepts, the idea that the piano can be made to express feeling.”

---

Measures 124-125

In Herttrich 1836, a crescendo occurs in the left hand on beats 3 to 4 of measure 124 and another crescendo appears on beats 3 to 4 of measure 125 (see example 14a). In Herttrich 1853, no crescendo is suggested in measures 124 to 125 (see example 14b). In C.Schumann first edition, the crescendo only shows up on beats 3 to 4 in measure 125 (see example 14c).

Example 14a

Example 14b
Example 14c

*Suggested solution*: starting the crescendo in the left hand of measure 124 as shown in Herttrich 1836 helps to bring out the left hand melodic line. The crescendo at the end of measure 125 in the right hand seems less necessary as the right hand sixteenth notes are less important in this case. Furthermore, since the character of these measures is clearly meant to be pianissimo, as a lyrical contrast, a crescendo in the right hand sixteenth notes would spoil the overall dynamic effect.

*Measures 173-189*

In the following examples, a smorzando appears after beat 2 in measure 173 of Herttrich 1836 followed by a tempo in the next measure (see example 15a). There is a slight dynamic difference in Herttrich 1853 and C.Schumann second edition, but smorzando does not appear in measure 173 in C.Schumann second edition (see example 15b). C.Schumann first edition has the smorzando at the beginning of measure 173 but she does not suggest a tempo in the following measure (see example 15c).
Example 15a

Example 15b
Example 15c

*Suggested solution:* The *smorzando* is a graceful way to end the phrase. Perhaps the *a tempo* does not need to happen right away. The tempo could be brought back gradually starting at measure 174.
CHAPTER 4
CONCLUSION

What is the impact of the personality of the performer himself on Schumann’s piano music? In the chapter of Interpreting Schumann’s Piano Music, Alan Walker says, “I believe that a really great interpreter of any form of art needs to be, in spiritual quality and experience of life, at least of the same caliber as the creative artist whose work he seeks to reproduce, and that with Schumann’s music this is a particular need.”

Editing music starts with comprehensive research and investigation. Ernst Herttrich’s editions include comments and historical background. He is the first person to publish Schumann’s Op.14 as a complete set with editor’s comments and proofs from the Manuscripts.

When Clara Schumann published her complete edition of Schumann’s works, she felt extremely proprietorial towards his works. Had her ministrations stopped merely at tidying up Schumann’s biography, she would already have left her mark on Robert Schumann’s works in a most prominent way. Clara Schumann was at that time naturally viewed as the authority in all questions concerning the music of her late husband. She was able to persuade Schumann to drop the original finale to the Sonata Op.22, complaining that it was ‘too difficult, and that really the public, even the connoisseurs for whom you write, would not understand. The reproducing of Schumann’s piano music in its noblest form makes very heavy and exacting demands on the

---

50 Walker, Robert Schumann: The Man and His Work, 105-106.
pianist. This is undoubtedly true if he or she wishes to play the works as we believe the
composer may have intended or as they were played by Clara Schumann.55

According to Grier, “To this point, a distinction is emerging between what
performer/editors might change or add in an interpretative edition, and what they might not.
When performer/editors take it upon themselves to supplement the performing indications
provided by the composer, they do no more than express in writing the freedom most composers
expect them to assume in performance.”56 In this spirit, this performer’s guide offers suggestions,
not ultimatums, that might help a performer to make their own decisions when confronted with
textual disparities between the various extant editions of this sonata.
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